



**TYNWALD COURT
OFFICIAL REPORT**

**RECORTYS OIKOIL
QUAIYL TINVAAL**

PROCEEDINGS

DAALTYN

(HANSARD)

Douglas, Wednesday, 18th May 2005

Present:**The President of Tynwald (The Hon. N Q Cringle)****In the Council:**

The Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man (The Rt. Rev. Graeme Knowles), The Attorney General (Mr W J H Corlett QC),
Mr D Butt, Mrs C M Christian, Mrs P M Crowe, Hon. A F Downie, The Chief Minister (Hon. D J Gelling CBE),
Mr E G Lowey, and Mr G H Waft,
with Mrs M Cullen, Deputy Clerk of Tynwald

In the Keys:

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

Business transacted*Page***Orders of the Day**

39. Standing Orders of Tynwald – Reaffirmation of support – Motion withdrawn.....	1297
Planning – Statement by the Minister of Local Government and the Environment.....	1297
40. Queen’s Pier, Ramsey – Review of implications for future – Select Committee of three appointed.....	1298

*The Council withdrew.***House of Keys**.....□

1313

The House adjourned at 12.55 p.m.

*Reports, maps and other documents referred to in the course of debates may be consulted
upon application to the Tynwald Library or the Clerk of Tynwald’s Office,
Legislative Buildings, Douglas, Isle of Man IM1 3PW.*

Tynwald

The Court met at 10.30 a.m.

[MR PRESIDENT *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Lord Bishop

Orders of the Day

Standing Orders of Tynwald Reaffirmation of support Motion withdrawn

39. The Hon. Member for Rushen (Mr Rimington) to move:

That this Hon. Court reaffirms its support for the Standing Orders of Tynwald, in particular sections 3.3 to 3.6 inclusive.

The President: Now, Hon. Members, when we broke up last evening we had but two Items to complete this morning's Order Paper, and I think we should certainly try to see if we can complete by lunchtime today. (**Members:** Hear, hear.)

However, Hon. Members, subsequently I have been informed by the Hon. Member for Rushen, Mr Rimington, that he no longer wishes to move Item 39.

Planning

Statement by the Minister for Local Government and the Environment

The President: However, Hon. Members, there is a procedural matter in relation to his planning procedures, which we dealt with yesterday afternoon, which has come to attention, and he wishes to make a short statement. I call on the Hon. Member, Mr Rimington.

The Minister for Local Government and the Environment (Mr Rimington): Thank you, Mr President. Thank you for the opportunity.

When the Development Order was moved yesterday, Mr Speaker raised two points which I think I ought to respond to for clarity at this point, sir.

First, Mr Speaker raised, on a matter of law, whether the method of appointment for the Planning Committee was correct. Our initial consideration of the point that Mr Speaker made is that we feel confident that it is so, but we will seek fuller clarification of that matter and make sure that we are robust on that particular issue and, if necessary, obviously, would return if we are not.

And the second point, Mr President. I did not give the full

advice in relation to the matter of the power of delegation, which was article 3.13 in relation to delegation of articles 4 to 6. The information I gave was right, but was by no means what should have been said.

In relation to that, the power of delegation of articles 4 to 6 relates to the power of the Department to delegate to the Director of Planning, or another senior officer, to deal with what is the majority of planning applications which are not contentious, i.e. they are within existing policy, they are essentially minor in nature and there are no objections. That amounts to, on the current basis, about 60 per cent of the planning applications, which are dealt with by the Director of Planning under delegated authority.

Therefore, those matters would not be in the public arena because they do not require to be so, sir; but it is the other matters which are in the balance and affect matters of policy which are taken to the Planning Committee and would be in the public arena.

The President: Hon. Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes, thank you, Mr President.

I thank the Minister for his statement. Just relating to the issue of delegated authority, accepting what he says about the power of the Minister for Local Government and the Environment to delegate to officers, and specifically the Director of Planning, issues relating to planning applications, could I ask the Minister, was that issue thought out in relation to the Planning Committee, who will now be appointed by the Council of Ministers, whilst giving a power to the Minister to actually avoid that issue in relation to planning applications by delegating matters to the Director of Planning or another officer without the approval of the Council of Ministers?

The President: Mr Rimington.

The Minister: As far as I understand, Mr President, it is and will remain within the Department's power to delegate to the Planning Committee the appropriate functions that should go to the Planning Committee and, in respect of the Director or a senior officer, to delegate those particular applications under authority, and would not require going through the circuitous route via the Council of Ministers. The delegation, the ability of the Council of Ministers is only in relation to the appointment of the Planning Committee, but not its functions.

The President: Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes, thank you, Mr President.

If I can just clarify for the Minister, the point I am making is the Council of Ministers will appoint the Planning Committee, not the Minister, but the Minister then is given a power under these new regulations to then delegate the responsibilities for planning – in any areas, because there is no limitation under the Order – to another person, who is not the Planning Committee.

Does he really feel that that is appropriate, that, on the one hand, the Council of Ministers will appoint, but, on the other hand, the Minister can actually get round that by appointing someone with delegated powers to carry out the functions of the Department?

The President: I take your point, Mr Speaker. I do not wish to reopen the debate which we had yesterday. Mr Rimington.

The Minister: I do believe it is appropriate that what I have outlined should take place and continue to take place, but my officers are making a special point of recording what is being said, in advance of *Hansard*, and if there is any deviation on that I will obviously revert to Hon. Members.

The President: Hon. Member for Peel.

Mrs Hannan: Thank you, Eaghtyrane.

Could I ask the Minister who supervises this process, what planning applications are considered, who audits the decisions that have been taken in relation to this?

And the Minister also said that ‘when no one objects’; but that does not mean that a planning application should not be dealt with in public, should be open and transparent. The Chair of the Planning Committee said yesterday that this was the only place in the British Isles that did not have an open planning situation, whereby 60 per cent are now going to be dealt with by officers behind closed doors. What is open and transparent about that?

The President: Minister.

The Minister: There are roughly, as I have said, 2,500 applications per annum. The Planning Committee is not in a position where it can sit all week, which, effectively, would be its role if all such matters were to go before the Planning Committee. It is accepted practice now, and has been uncontroversial, that these matters should be dealt with by the Director of Planning under delegated authority, or a senior officer – i.e. that would be a senior planning officer – and it is the intention that that should remain so, sir, otherwise the system would soon clog up.

I do not believe that it is the concern of the population that these matters, which are considered very clearly within policy, to be minor of nature and to not have any objections, should be trawled at length in the public arena.

**Queen’s Pier, Ramsey
Review of implications for future
Select Committee of three appointed**

40. The Hon. Member for Onchan (Mr Karran) to move:

That this Hon. Court, being concerned at the derelict state of the Queen’s Pier in Ramsey and viewing with concern the continuing decay of the structure, is of the opinion that a review of the implications for its future is long overdue and appoints a select Committee of three Members with powers to take written and oral evidence pursuant to sections 3 and 4 of the Tynwald Proceedings Act 1876 for the following purposes:

- (i) to update the last report on the Pier;*
- (ii) to seek professional advice upon a possible phased refurbishment, based on a realistic specification and programme of work, using local resources and extending over several financial years;*
- (iii) to recommend who would be responsible for the repair, re-commissioning and operation of the Pier; and*
- (iv) to report to the October 2005 sitting of Tynwald.*

The President: We turn, then, Hon. Members, with the

withdrawal of Item 39, to Item 40 and I call on the Hon. Member for Onchan, Mr Karran, to move.

Mr Karran: Eaghtyrane, this motion today is tabled because Ramsey Pier is not just a local issue, it is a national one, and I find myself having to promote this issue for Government support.

I understand more than most about the economic problems which are on the horizon due to the bad system of financial planning which this country has suffered from for the past 20 years, and I also understand the pressure that is going to be brought with regard to the Government finances, but the issue of the pier is too important to be affected by short-term considerations. Left any longer, the opportunity for rescue will be gone forever.

I have confidence that we can still change and move forward and protect many of the proud achievements that have taken place in the Isle of Man, and I also believe with a sensible package of measures we can preserve this unique piece of Victorian engineering, the only pier we have, for future generations. As I have stated previously in this Hon. Court, in the past, as a child, I was amazed, listening to people talking about chopping up Laxey Wheel for firewood for the elderly. Today this would not just be seen as wrong, but as an outrage. It might have been a solution in the 1960s, but today’s people would be horrified. I believe that, in 20 or 30 years’ time, people would have the same revulsion and disbelief for any proposal to knock down the Queen’s Pier.

However, there has to be a middle way between the extravagance of the 2001 proposal by the Manx National Heritage and those who would destroy this valuable piece of Victorian architecture. We have to get us all working together as a national Government. We cannot have legislation such as the registered buildings status being able to be ignored, on the basis that the law applies to others but not to us, because that undermines the whole principle of the legislation and makes it even more absurd than the sad record we have with regard to protection of buildings of architectural and historical interest in the past.

I think Members need to sit back and think about that. The Queen’s Pier is a registered structure under the listed buildings legislation. This legislation, which has been passed by Tynwald – us here – no rational person can challenge the fact that we, as a nation, as a parliament, as a Government, have given the pier the protected status because of its uniqueness.

Hon. Members, look at my motion. Forget the personalities within this Hon. Court and let us try and act like a national parliament. I am the last person to argue the fact, as far as the open-cheque policy. I have been in this Court for years fighting against the rip-off policy of the Treasury. However, we need a select committee to have the power to take the evidence to make a sensible, constructive plan for the future of the pier.

This is the only pier we have, which was built in 1882. It is the fourth longest in the British Isles. There were nearly 90 seaside piers; now the number of survivals of this is roughly about 45. This is probably the last opportunity to save a structure which, in its way, is as important as the Lady Isabella waterwheel.

Despite the strong groundswell of public support, I believe Government has not responded adequately. There have been several reports, of various qualities and value, but the fact is the DoT, the DLGE, Manx National Heritage

have not had the will to deal positively with the rescue of the pier. There may be good reasons for the reluctance in their departments; I understand the pressures that they have with other issues. But Government as a whole should take this seriously and sincerely and make one major effort to find the way forward to give the pier a new lease of life and a realistic opportunity to survive for the future.

The last two reports on the pier prepared since 2002 would frighten anyone who read them. The first of these was based on the presumption that the pier would be restored to the over-exacting conservation standards of Manx National Heritage, which would have led to a huge extra cost. The more recent report assumes that most of the entire superstructure above the tide-line would have to be renewed as a major contract. Neither report took the middle way: a selective conservation. Neither took the idea of restoring the pier over several financial years. The author of the first report indicated that there would be considerable benefits and economies if the client's brief would be changed in this way.

Another beneficial change to the brief would have been to investigate a secondary use for the pier. It is practically unique and it has never had a major pier building on it, although, Hon. Members, a century ago Ramsey Commissioners investigated adding an entertainment facility to the landing stage. Any study of any possible restoration should include a review of what could be added to make the pier a worthwhile visitor experience.

Finally, the report should cover the future running and fund-raising and administration of the pier, which so far has hardly been one of Government's successes. We have a last chance to do something about that. A select committee would come back with an update on the last report on the pier. It would seek professional advice on the possible phase three development, based on a realistic specification, a programme of works using local resources extending over several financial years, to create a work scheme in order to carry it out effectively, efficiently and serving the community. This issue has to be addressed once and for all, we need to sort it out. We should be responsible for the pier.

Who should be responsible for the pier after recommissioning and who is going to operate it? I, personally, feel that it should be operated by somebody outside Government. The right policy is needed; it should be under some sort of charitable pier authority.

The committee should report back to the October sitting. There is no excuse that this cannot be achieved. Hon. Members, let us try and get this Hon. Court back to what I always believed the aspirations of every one of us in this Hon. Court were about: to do the job without fear or favour. The only legacy that we should be leaving for the next generation is of gratitude.

I hope that we can, from this report, do that. We have still got a chance, but we have to choose how we want to go as far as the future is concerned. I think a select committee, working properly as a parliamentary scrutiny body, can come up with what needs to be done. I beg to move.

The President: Hon. Member, Mrs Craine.

Mrs Craine: Thank you, Mr President. I beg to second.

Mr President, I think it is unfortunate that we have to be in the position to be asked to support this motion this morning.

The Minister for Transport has stated that he wished to be the Minister to bring this matter to a conclusion.

However, over the years, there has been an allowed deterioration of the structure. Monies committed by this Hon. Court to their budget of £40,000 per annum for maintenance have not been used, and this has resulted in increasing dereliction.

I am not trying to shy away from the issue of cost; we all know the pressures of departmental budgeting. In this instance, we face an issue of cost to either retain or demolish. But the cost to our Island community of demolition cannot be quantified in pounds, shillings and pence. It is easy to allow features to disappear; the train line from Ramsey to Peel, for example, and, not so long ago, the tram service to Ramsey was threatened.

I am not suggesting either that we should envelop ourselves in a time warp, but that we should give true recognition to eras that contributed and left their mark on the Island. Cregneash epitomises our crofting heritage; Peel illustrates our Norse, Scottish and latter-day history through the eyes of the castle; Castletown well depicts the era of Illiam Dhone and the Cromwellian period. We only just saved the Laxey Wheel, a fact celebrated in September. But we do not recognise the structure of the Queen's Pier as a valued part of our identity from the Victorian era. There is, and I quote from T E Brown,

'...ore that is not for the mart
Of commerce.'

and this is part of that 'ore'. The pier is a feature that is supported not only in Ramsey, or the Island, but across the globe. I was pleased and surprised to see that it is the backdrop to the opening scenes of the highly lauded film that is currently being promoted, *On a Clear Day*.

Mr President, we have had a recent report whereby the consultants to be used were agreed by all parties. Department of Transport and the Friends of Queen's Pier.

Hon. Members are all aware that this is a registered structure. We have been hoping to have a motion brought forward by the Minister for the Department of Transport, indicating what degree of works can be done on the pier, in terms of modern day materials, without destroying the Victorian integrity of the pier. Despite having all the required information, and the expectation that that was going to happen in the last two months, that has not been forthcoming from the Department. Where I once felt that the Department was showing a willingness to move this matter forward, I now share the frustration of the Friends with the apparent political delaying tactics.

Mr President, despite the wishes of some, and the gales from whichever direction they come, the pier still stands resolutely in Ramsey Bay.

Hon. Members, there is a strong wealth of support for the pier. I ask that you give a true and honest opportunity of exploring a future for the pier by supporting this motion. Thank you.

The President: Mr Shimmin, Hon. Member, Douglas West.

Mr Shimmin: Thank you, Mr President.

If I can say, first of all, that it is not my intention to oppose this motion; I shall be supporting it.

I would like to speak briefly on some of the background,

which is possibly known to most members of the Court. Starting with the motion in the speech given by the Member for Onchan, where he talked of a 'bad system of financial planning over the last 20 years' – a time which has seen unrivalled growth in the economy and ability to invest in the infrastructure of the Island. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Certainly, he makes the case that this decision on the future of the Queen's Pier has been an elongated process, and I think most Hon. Members are aware that the responsibility lies with my Department. The difficulty has always been on a number of counts. Firstly, it will never become a high priority of my Department of Transport to spend the monies involved on refurbishing a pier, for which there is no identifiable use, either for my Department or for an income-generating alternative.

The Hon. Member for Onchan talks about the desire of people to refurbish it and, yes, I agree that there is a general desire that, in an ideal world, everybody would wish to see such facilities restored and maintained. We then have to prioritise as to where the taxpayers' money can be expended in order to achieve the needs of the people.

The reports that have been done, alluded to by the Member for Ramsey, did what they were asked; they did what it said on the tin. The first report referred to was one which needed to comply with the requirements of Manx National Heritage for them to take over the ownership and operation of the pier. That meant, in order to comply with MNH's stringent requirements, it would be refurbished with equivalent materials from the original inception of the pier. That did put an enormous amount of cost onto the project.

The Friends, supported by the representation in the area and throughout the Island, then commissioned their own consultants, BWB, who came forward with a far reduced figure that they believed could be a refurbishment scheme for the pier.

On arrival in the Department, there was obviously an impasse, so, working with the representatives for the area and the Friends of the Pier, we determined that we would agree a brief for a way forward for their preferred consultants, BWB, to come forward, working to a genuine and realistic brief that was agreed by all parties to see how much it would actually cost, as opposed to a scheme that was somewhat lacking in its integrity of their first report. The figures for that are in the region of £7.2 million. That report was seen by all parties involved, and they were concerned that the cost had escalated from the BWB's first estimate, because of the actual reality of putting it forward as a scheme for refurbishment.

The Friends and the representatives for the area were given an opportunity of meeting with the joint consultants to scrutinise the costs involved, to see if there were any areas that could be reduced. Although disappointing to the supporters of that scheme, it was found that the figures were justified by the consultants. That, therefore, becomes a more realistic figure for how much it is likely to cost, at the time when this report was commissioned last year, or the year before.

So, we are talking about over £7 million, which, at the moment, is the responsibility of my Department to find. I think Hon. Members would agree that, with the condition of the road infrastructure, and the various other responsibilities in my Department, it would be difficult for me to justify finding that level of money and putting so many other schemes on hold. It is, therefore, appropriate that this motion today comes to Tynwald in order to give a direction

to Government as to a preferred way forward.

The Hon. Member for Onchan talks about the authors of the report, commissioned on behalf of MNH, who indicated there would be considerable benefits and economies if the client brief was changed in a way to do a phased redevelopment. Now, they may say that; all of my information is that it will actually increase the costs considerably to have a phased period of construction, but that is something which the Committee would be tasked with looking at. It may be true, I would be delighted if it were; but I think the opposite is likely to be the case, that a phased gradual refurbishment will actually cost more.

The Hon. Member for Ramsey talks about the condition and criticises the Department for not utilising all of its internal budget, given by this Court directly, of £40,000 annually. She then goes on to talk about how, despite all the storms, the pier still stands. The reality is the Department has done exactly what it was tasked with doing, which is maintaining the infrastructure or the superstructure in order that a decision can ultimately be taken as to its future. So, far from total neglect, we have been put in a position where the pier has been maintained throughout all of the storms and is in a position where a decision can still be taken.

She talks about my aspirations of bringing a motion forward to Tynwald, and she is quite right. I do believe this has gone on long enough and, even for the sake of the Friends, they would like a conclusion being brought forward. But, in all conscience, whilst it rests with my Department, the only motion that I could come forward with realistically would be one on economics, of saying it should be demolished, we have no use for it.

I have attempted to try and find a way in which I can come up with an alternative answer to that, because, ideally, I think we all would like to have this restored, if viable.

So, it is not an absence of work that has been done by the Department which has caused the problem we are in. The deterioration of the pier is a natural situation that we would all expect.

However, the Hon. Member for Onchan does raise the significant problem we have, which is the registered status of the pier. Because of the registered status of the pier we are unable to do many works on there unless they would be with equivalent types of materials to its original condition, because that goes with the registered building status. Likewise, we have problems with health and safety, because the same Department of Government is arguing that on health and safety grounds we have to carry out certain works on the pier.

So, for many years, we have had a dilemma that we have had works we must do but we have not been able to do them. When sitting in meetings with the Department of Local Government and the Environment, for a change, the Department of Transport can sit back and watch them argue with each other as to what is the way forward.

It is certainly likely that the select committee, if appointed, would have to look at whether or not there would be a means of deregistering the pier in order to allow works to be carried out, of any fashion. Therefore, that is something the Committee will enjoy grappling with.

The Member for Onchan moving the motion talks about the issue regarding what future purpose... and I would love to find a future purpose, because my predecessors and myself have looked at all of the options, imaginative options, within the Department and those suggested by the public, by the

Friends, by Commissioners, by Members; and, in reality, all of them come up with the same conclusion, that there is no economic case of actually gaining the monies that would be involved in the maintenance of any refurbished pier, let alone the capital expenditure.

That is not to say we do not do it, but it is a case of being realistic to say that there is not going to be an ideal way of generating income from this pier which we have been able to find. If the select committee were to be appointed, maybe they will have more imaginative ideas than we can come up with.

In conclusion, Mr President, there is a lot of support verbally and emotionally throughout the Island for the pier, as there has been for the Camera Obscura, a part of our heritage which has recently been refurbished. All of those who have been involved in attempting to get that refurbished, because of its importance, and the 300 people who attended the first weekend... I was saddened to realise that the second weekend, for several hours, with no notification, it was not open.

The reality is that, if we are going into a charitable status for the Queen's Pier, it is very difficult to manage a charitable position with no income coming in, and that the burden of that future work may still revert back to Government. So it sounds attractive, but let us be realistic: if there is no economic future for the pier, it is likely to be a responsibility that Government will ultimately have to absorb, if we are to maintain it.

Finally, Mr President, I am grateful to the Hon. Member for Onchan for bringing this forward. I believe he has identified, having had discussions with him prior to this motion going down, that there is a way forward that is appropriate, to remove the decision purely from the Department of Transport, remove it, indeed, from the Council of Ministers, who will have differing views on the desirable way forward, and for Tynwald to act as it should, to give an investigation of a scheme, to come forward with proposals, and then for the Tynwald of the Isle of Man to determine a way forward, which will then become the role of Government departments to carry out that work, if appropriate.

Therefore, I am supportive, Mr President.

The President: Hon. Member, Mr Bell.

Mr Bell: Thank you, Mr President.

There is probably not a great deal more I can say than has already been said in support of this resolution.

I am aware that there are very mixed views as to the way ahead on this. Clearly, Members from outside of Ramsey and the north of the Island, over the years, have shown very little interest in giving any support to refurbishment or protection (**A Member:** Rubbish.) in any meaningful way, and, to a certain extent, perhaps, that is understandable.

But, certainly, to the people of Ramsey and the people of the north of the Island, the pier is a very important part of the northern heritage of the Island. It has played a key part in the economic development of the tourist industry over the years and has a major role in that century or so of economic growth in the north. It is still looked on with great affection and it is still looked on as very much being part of our heritage. It is not simply a landing pier, which it was originally structured as; it is very much part of the Ramsey and northern heritage, in the same way as the Laxey Wheel is to people in Laxey and the other heritage items that we

see around the Island to their own local districts.

In fact, if we look round the Island at the major projects of heritage which have needed restoring and saving, the Queen's Pier is probably the last major piece on the Island that has not had the attention of Government to bring it into the fold, along with everything else. I think, as has already been said, if we look at the Laxey Wheel, that was very much on the brink of extinction not many years ago. There was no interest in it at all. People could not understand why we spent any money on it at all to save it; and now, from being something which was discarded and rejected as having no useful purpose, it is the linchpin of tourism marketing and has been for a number of years. It is one of the most recognisable features of Isle of Man tourism.

So we can see how times change and attitudes change, and I would suggest, Mr President, that we should at least give this committee time to address this issue, perhaps with a more independent eye from what has gone on in the past, to see if we can find a mechanism to deliver the restoration and saving of this much loved northern feature.

Mr President, it has already been mentioned that we have had two reports – there have been a number of reports over the years, I think, but certainly, latterly, two reports – trying to outline the way forward. The first one, which even the Friends of the Queen's Pier – and I have to declare an interest in this, I am a member of the Friends of the Queen's Pier and have been from its inception – thought was outlandish, and, at the cost of very nearly £11 million, was totally unacceptable from everybody's point of view. So at least that was the one area that united the Friends of the Queen's Pier and the Department of Transport.

The subsequent one, I think, which came in as a disappointment, was the latest estimate of £7.3 million, which was way above what we had anticipated, I must say.

But both these reports were based on a single act of refurbishment. The issue of a phased refurbishment is something that has not seriously been considered. This would appear to be the basis of the resolution that we have got before us today and it is one area which has not been explored, and I do believe it is one which does need exploring. I have reservations myself as to whether this is the best from a financial point of view. I am sure it will cost more to do it on a phased basis, but maybe that is something which we can plan in. Of course, as I also have to wear a Treasury hat on this, I have to keep at least one eye on our ability to pay for these things and how this would fit in with the overall capital development programme that we have.

I also have to say I have reservations about the long-term ownership of the pier going out of Government's control and into some charitable status, because, frankly, I lack the confidence that a strong enough charity will be able to take on the responsibility of this pier in the long term and raise the sort of money that is going to be required for ongoing maintenance and management of it. But those would be issues, Mr President, for this committee to look at.

I have had a discussion with the mover of this Bill. I have had discussions with the Friends of the Queen's Pier as well. The Friends would welcome this, I think, at least as a way to move the issue forward. It is not going anywhere otherwise; it has run into the sand yet again. There is no sign of a resolution coming forward as an alternative and, therefore, I do believe that this at least would give us a chance, Mr President, to have an independent eye cast over this project to look at a third way which may be a workable

proposition. At least if this committee does carry out the work, as illustrated in the resolution, we will have all options to consider when a final decision is arrived at when we need to decide what the future is.

But I would just reiterate, Mr President, it is an issue which the people of Ramsey and the north of the Island feel very strongly about. We do believe it is part of our northern heritage. It is very much part of the Island heritage, too, and that is reflected by the large number of supporters we have scattered all round the Island.

So I would urge Hon. Members, please, to give their support to this. I do believe it is an exercise worth carrying out. This approach has not been adopted to date and I think it deserves at least the scrutiny of a select committee to see if we can find a way of saving and preserving what we believe to be a very important part of our heritage.

The President: Hon. Member for Onchan, Mr Earnshaw.

Mr Earnshaw: Thank you, Mr President.

I am pleased my colleague, Mr Karran, the Hon. Member for Onchan, has put this motion today. I like the Queen's Pier and I think most of us probably subscribe to that. It is an attractive feature in Ramsey Bay. It has, of course, been there for as long as anybody can remember. We have been comfortable with it over the years and I think we can safely say that Ramsey would not look the same without it. And, like my colleague, in many ways I would like to see it retained.

But before we go any further, let us examine why, perhaps, it was built, and I am saying 'perhaps' because I am not absolutely certain and, therefore, what I say now is, to some extent, speculative. I can only surmise it was built for commercial reasons and *not* simply to be a feature for the bay. As a commercial venture, its purpose can only really have been to provide a landing for shipping. As far as I can recall, there has never been any structure at the end of the pier –

Mr Henderson: The DoT blew it up!

Mr Earnshaw: – like some of the seaside piers in the United Kingdom. There has never been an entertainment complex at the end.

We have got to recognise, in 1882, when it was built, the sea was the highway for the Isle of Man. We did not have the road network that we have now. We did not have any air transport, of course. The sea was the main form of getting around the Island with ease. But the sea no longer performs that role. Although, from a commercial point of view, Ramsey never achieved great success in the tourist industry in the way that Douglas did or, to a lesser extent, perhaps, Port Erin, the pier fulfilled a purpose, up to a point, but I do not think it ever realised its full potential for the reasons it was built.

Just turning to another point, Mr President, we have got to recognise that the Queen's Pier stands in the middle of one of the world's most hostile environments: the sea. Capital restoration is one aspect of the future, should we seek to retain the pier; but the other, bearing in mind that location, is the revenue costs, the ongoing revenue costs of maintaining it for the future, and these must be huge, as my colleague, Mr Corkill, says.

So, if we do restore it, what then? Shipping is unlikely to use it. Not many people, in my opinion, are likely to use it. There may well be some people, even in this Hon. Court, who have never been to the end of Ramsey Pier. I have been along it perhaps about six times in my lifetime.

Mr Houghton: I am going there this afternoon to throw myself off it. *(Laughter)*

Mrs Hannan: It has got a use!

The President: Hon. Members!

Mr Corkill: You are not allowed on.

Mr Earnshaw: Open it specially.

Mr Houghton: Open it specially! *(Laughter)*

Mr Earnshaw: So, although we like looking at Ramsey Pier and it looks great in Ramsey Bay, and we cannot imagine what Ramsey would look like without it, why do we want to do it?

So, Mr President, before we vote on the motion before us I would like to put an amendment prior to moving on any further, which I hope might bring a little more focus to the activities of the select committee, should they be appointed.

I would be very sorry, Mr President, to see Queen's Pier, Ramsey, disappear and my motion is to examine what... Well, I have made an addition here. I have inserted 'for the purposes of providing evidence of a viable commercial and economic or other compelling case for retention of the pier and to report the findings to the October 2005 sitting of Tynwald' before we move on to the other aspects of the motion, if, indeed, we do. I hope, if it is successful, that the select committee will make an honest attempt.

I do not think I have got very much more to add to that, Mr President. I think I will conclude with that, and so I beg to move my amendment:

In the first paragraph delete the word 'following', and at the end delete paragraph (iv) and after 'purposes' insert:-

'of providing evidence of a viable commercial and economic or other compelling case for retention of the pier and to report its findings to the October 2005 sitting of Tynwald with a view on whether.'

The President: Hon. Member of Council, Mr Downie.

Mr Downie: Thank you, Mr President.

I am pleased to second the amendment that has been put forward by the Hon. Member for Onchan, Mr Earnshaw, because I think, if the amendment is supported, it will get things moved along and it will, perhaps, bring a fresh perspective to what is actually going to take place, or what we envisage happening with the pier.

Like a lot of other Members who have spoken in this Court, I have some connection, or some willingness to see something happen with the pier, but I think you have got to start to be realistic. If you do not try and look very carefully at what you want to see happen down there, I think there are huge financial problems on the horizon.

We were told by the Hon. Member for West Douglas, the DoT Minister, Mr Shimmin, at the last economic appraisal we were talking about £7.2 million. I would just like to remind the Hon. Members of this Court that, in the last 18 months, we have seen a 40 per cent increase in the cost of iron and steel. Who could ascertain what the ongoing maintenance cost will be in this area? Could I also suggest that the present pier, as it sits at the moment, does not in any way comply with any of the new health and safety regulations. There could be huge cost implications in that area, as well.

As was said by the Hon. Member for Onchan, Mr Earnshaw, no vessels sailing in the Irish Sea could berth alongside the pier, because the whole ethos, the ship design, ship construction, berthing heads, have changed in the last few years. The Steam Packet Company does not own a vessel any more that could berth alongside the Queen's Pier.

Mr Henderson: The *Lady of Mann* could.

Mr Downie: I am very sorry, Hon. Member, but the *Lady of Mann* is finishing in three weeks' time.

Mr Corkill: Yes, it does not comply.

Mrs Crowe: Exactly.

Mr Downie: She is going to the scrap, probably.

Mr Henderson: Shame!

Mr Downie: Perhaps some would say that is where the pier should go.

Mr Henderson: Let's get rid of everything!

Mr Downie: I think you should not lose fact of the matter that the prime purpose of the pier was to have provided a deep water berth for passing mail and passenger vessels, when Ramsey had a considerable number of hotels and guest houses. It served the town extremely well.

What I would say to Hon. Members is that if we do decide to move this forward, having spent £7 million to £10 million on the refurbishment, what are we going to do with it, then? In fairness, it is taxpayers' money we are spending and we have to find some viable initiative that would offset some of the ongoing expenditure. It has already been stated that the Ramsey Bay area is very exposed to the sea. It would be very difficult to include the pier as part of a marina-type development. It would really be very cost prohibitive.

I have no problem in supporting the setting up of a committee, who may come forward with a scheme, for example, to significantly shorten the pier, to provide some building with what can be safely maintained and looked after, to provide benefit for the people of Ramsey and provide some economic benefit for the Isle of Man.

I will just leave you with one final issue. We are having to look in other areas for income to be generated. Would the people of Ramsey, if they were given £7 million to £10 million, choose to spend it on doing up the pier, or would they rather have some other economic benefit in the north of the Island? At the present time, none of the loan charges incurred by the MEA have actually been passed onto the consumer. All the increases in electricity charges over the past six to nine months have come about by the increase in

fuel stock, in feed stock prices, the basic gas and oil prices. So, I would leave you with this thought, Hon. Members: if we are going to subsidise electricity at some period in the future, to try and assist everyone in the Isle of Man, would you rather spend your money there, or would you rather spend your money on the pier? It is your choice.

Mr Karran: I would sack the Minister.

The President: Hon. Members, I appreciate it is difficult, and everybody has their own opinion of the Queen's Pier. Can I remind Hon. Members that, in reality, the motion is that Tynwald 'is of the opinion that a review of the implications for its future is long overdue and appoints a Select Committee of three members...'

That is what we are discussing, Hon. Members. Lord Bishop.

The Lord Bishop: Thank you, Mr President.

Some Hon. Members might have watched the BBC series that has been on for a few years now about a competition to save a particular building. The programme worked that various people put forward five or six buildings that they wanted to save and then the nation – that meaning 'across' – voted accordingly, and, in the end, one building won. Now, if there were eight programmes, that meant that seven buildings lost. In other words, one of them would have been restored and probably the other ones would have fallen down.

I think we, in a way, are beginning to face something like that within the Island. We are a limited population. Yes, the population rises a bit, but we are only around 75,000 to 76,000 people. We have a heritage which needs to be cared for. Yes, there is Manx Heritage dealing with that which is of the highest quality. What happens, therefore, at the next stage down? And, by now, you would have noticed a certain amount of vested interest beginning to creep into this particular speech, because, yes, there is the pier at Ramsey, but there are also all the places of worship on the Island, not only Anglican, but Roman Catholic, Methodist and the other ones which are of historic value. Yes, there might be an idea that we put them into charitable hands; but just how many charities, how many groups of Friends, can 76,000 people actually support?

At some stage, we have got to be quite brutal, I think, about what we can save and what we cannot save. And here I bring no value judgement whatsoever to the pier in Ramsey, because I think it must fight its corner, as every other building must fight its corner.

I would add that one of the great problems about pier restoration is the sheer cost of the things you need to build a pier. Mr Downie has already spoken about iron and steel. I can add to that that you can only use certain kinds of wood in constructing piers because they suffer the ravages of the full weather. Therefore, this pier which we could very well ask the select committee to see and to push through to restoration will need a good deal of money further down the line.

So, how do we make the decision about what we keep and what we lose, because that is what we are actually charging this select committee to do? What are the criteria by which they will judge whether the Queen's Pier is worth saving or not, nationally, because that is what we are talking about? We are talking about, is it important to us nationally? It is very important to the people who live in Ramsey; it is probably quite important to the people who live in the north; people

in the south might not even know there is a pier in Ramsey. But we are those who are charged, and we are charging a select committee, with deciding whether this building is worth saving for the nation.

Now, my feeling is that it is worth saving for the nation. Piers are a very quickly disappearing part of our heritage; we have one. But I think we can only do that when we know precisely how it can be saved. Phasing, when it comes to historic buildings, does not actually mean deciding what you are going to do and then spreading it out over a number of years. It means there is phase one, which we might be able to afford, and that gets the building into this sort of shape. Phase two, fine, we might do that. Phase three is when you gold leaf it and put the Taj Mahal on the end, which we might never want to do. (**Mr Karran:** Hear, hear.)

So, phasing is about can we save the building for the next 50 years, can we get it safe, can we get it so that people can walk on it? Phase two might be the next stage that you want, which we might be able to strive for. I think we need to be quite clear in our mind what phasing, as far as a historic building, actually means, what commitment to cash that means.

I shall be supporting both the amendment and the motion when it comes, because I think this, actually, is a very good way of focusing us on a problem which we are going to face in many other departments, as well. Thank you.

The President: Hon. Member for Peel.

Mrs Hannan: Thank you, Eaghtyrane.

I can understand Members being concerned about a structure which is there, and I can understand, to a certain extent, the Member for Ramsey's concern, because of the Friends of Ramsey and the high profile that this particular structure has. But it would seem by what is being said that there is a need for a future for the pier, and that has been looked for. It was looked for when I was in the Department of Transport with the now Mr Speaker. We knew then some of the costs that would be entailed, and it was argued by the Friends that these costs were ridiculous and the costs were only set out there to stop any resurrection of the pier for use. By what the Minister for Transport has now stated, what was suggested at the time by the Department was somewhere in the region of being correct.

But the reason why I have come to my feet is that I am alarmed by the attitude of the Treasury Minister. If this is an issue of national interest, which has been spelt out by some Members, there is also a national interest in where the money is coming from. If 'anything goes' with regard to preserving a pier for which there has been no economic... no situation has been found for actually raising funds for supporting even a refurbished pier in the future, then I am alarmed by the attitude of the Treasury and of the Government. Because what the Treasury and the Government are saying is we are quite happy for people look at this and to come back and say, presumably, the people that are going to be on this select committee, 'yes it must be done, it must be carried out as quickly as possible', and all of that. Where does it leave every other department of Government, which needs money to be spent on various issues?

I am not saying that we can live by bread and water to pay for some of these issues, but people are crying out for roads to be repaired. I am just talking now about under the auspices of the Department of Transport, which has responsibility

for this at the moment. Just two roads, and granted they are in the capital, but it is the Peel Road, which is one of the main thoroughfares into Douglas, and also the Promenade, which takes an awful lot of activity. Two areas there which, in the future... they are past their best, they do need a huge amount of money spending on them. In the future, you have got to weigh these up. The Member for Douglas South was asking about the Marine Drive. The Marine Drive is there. We are not able to repair the Marine Drive; we do not have money to do that. But we are now going to look at how we are going to refurbish the pier. Now, I think this...

I am not moving an amendment to this, because I shall be voting against a committee. All this information is there, and I am sure if anybody wants this information they can go to the Department of Transport and get this information. So, I am not voting for a select committee because I think we have got to look at how we use the resources that we have got.

Members have got to think that we have got a Tax Strategy at the moment, we are looking to raise more... to try to keep the income coming in at a reasonable level, so we have got this Tax Strategy. There would be no support in here for raising taxes, so I would suggest, unless you would support the raising of taxes to support something like this, that is not on, either. We have got to earn money to pay for something like this; we have got to earn money to pay for everything else, as well.

Not only that, we have got to look at resources worldwide. We have not got the materials that are needed to refurbish this structure, so we need rainforest wood, which is very long growing wood, to be placed on this pier. So we have got to think about rainforest destruction. I am sorry, Eaghtyrane, but I think these are important points which have to extend over the issues of what should be looked at. We have got rainforest destruction, which is going to affect the Kyoto and our Rio agreements. Maybe we are not signed up to these; I think we should be. But these are all things we need to consider. To actually pay for all of this in climate change, we would need to plant the whole of the Isle of Man in trees to be able to eat up this carbon. That is not saying that the actual carbon that is needed to produce the steel from ore is something that we can absorb here, either. There are all these issues which I think, in doing any of these things, we have to take into account when we are actually embarking on this.

We are spending somewhere in the region of £170 million on a Victorian structure, that is our sewerage structure, to update that. Nothing stands still in this world. We could have said, 'But this was what the Victorians did, they extended the sewerage outfalls into the sea and it made life better for everybody.' Yes, it did; but we have moved on from that now. We are using the structure to the best ability that we have. We have also got to take other measures, but we are actually creating something else which is modern for today's life. That has also taken a lot of the world's engineering to be able to do that, as with lots of other areas, but we have got to consider the whole of this.

I will not be supporting a select committee of three Members because I believe that this information is available. It has been made available to Members of this Hon. Court. If the Department of Transport want to make further studies available to Members of this Hon. Court, they can do a presentation and they can present this information to Members, but I will not be supporting a select committee.

The President: Hon. Member for Middle.

Mr Quayle: Thank you, Mr President.

First of all, I would like to make it clear that I am not speaking on behalf of the Department of Tourism and Leisure but as an independent Member.

Of course, I do have sympathy with those who wish to retain the pier, but I am absolutely astonished at what I have heard here today, particularly from the Government line, which indicates, presumably, the Council of Ministers' support of the original motion. Though for the Department of Transport it does get them off a very big hook. I could almost hear the sigh of relief from the Minister for Transport when he saw this motion coming along –

Mr Corkill: That is the process.

Mr Quayle: – and realising that it was pushing the whole matter away from his Department and allowing three Members of Tynwald to somehow come up with something to progress it.

I think the motion actually makes a presumption to proceed with refurbishment, and that is the problem that I have with that motion. What about a sense of realism here? Are we really suggesting and accepting that we will make available several million pounds?

Mrs Crowe: It does not say that. No!

Mr Karran: We are not saying that, are we?

Mr Quayle: Because, if we are not, we are being quite disingenuous, I think, in even getting a committee to look at this, if we are not thinking to ourselves now: 'Yes, we will spend several million pounds on this.'

If we are not now wanting to spend several million pounds on this, we should not even be voting for a select committee. I think those who will vote for a select committee should, then, be making that presumption and I look forward with great interest, if and when a select committee comes along and advances the case for this, presumably those people will probably be compelled to vote for the several million pounds to be spent.

Mr Earnshaw: They are presumably going to.

Mr Quayle: What I think we need is economic progress to continue, so then we can do more for our own people. Spending several million pounds on the refurbishment of Ramsey Pier will not do that for our own people. I think in terms of housing for our young people, for first-time buyers... in terms of a marina development... In fact, one was on offer, I think, some time ago for Ramsey, which was turned down. Now, not going into the whole detail, but that would have done a lot for economic progress for the north of the Island and yet that was turned down.

Sad as it seems, by spending several million pounds on the pier in Ramsey, that will not contribute much to the economic success of the town of Ramsey. In fact, we are never going to get back, much as we would like, to have hundreds of thousands of tourists coming over here. We are attracting increasing numbers of tourists, but with the package holidays we are never going to get back to three-quarters of a million people coming over here on holiday.

I hope and I look forward to a marina development actually taking place on the Isle of Man. Obviously, it is not

going to be Ramsey now. I think Port St Mary is earmarked and I would hope that could be advanced as soon as possible. (**Mrs Crowe:** Hear, hear.)

But, in terms of spending money, apart from the housing I have talked about, which is a very pressing issue and we do not seem to have done as much as we ought to have done in that direction, in terms of health. It is also pertinent to mention the MEA at the moment. I have had pensioners on to me, just lately, who are very concerned at the meagre increase they are getting in their pensions and yet being faced with a 35 per cent increase in their electricity bills, together with increases in gas and rates and so on. It has been mentioned about the roads and the huge investment required, and anybody driving around the Isle of Man would certainly be aware that we need to spend a huge amount on our roads. That money is never going to be forthcoming if we are going to be spending several million pounds on a scheme such as Ramsey Pier.

The President: Hon. Member, are you supporting the setting up of a committee or not?

Mr Quayle: I was just about to say (**Members:** Oh!), Mr President, that I think it is pie in the sky to be setting up a committee. I will not be supporting a committee, because I think it is alright if we were living in utopia and we had bundles – an endless amount – of money to be spending it on these things.

I think, as has been said, we need to prioritise and, certainly, spending several million pounds on Ramsey Pier, much as I would like to, is just an absolute non-starter.

I think people in Tynwald ought to be very honest when they are voting for this because they are voting for a select committee. Certainly, the original motion would be suggesting that we would be going ahead with it, when patently it will not happen.

The President: Hon. Member of Council, Mr Lowey.

Mr Lowey: Thank you, Mr President.

I suppose, keeping to the resolution, and I will tell you straight away, I shall be supporting the resolution. It is not going to be easy for the people who are going to be on this committee and I am not as optimistic as the mover of the resolution, who says he can report back by October.

I remind you, I am actually one of the vandals of the pier. I was on the Harbour Board for 10 years and I, along with Roy MacDonald and Edgar Mann, was responsible for taking the bullet head off the end of the pier (**Members:** Oh! Tut, tut!), not because we wanted to, because it was damaged. It was a danger to shipping and had to come down. It cost a lot of money.

Mr Corkill: It has always been a danger to shipping.

Mr Lowey: I will not regale you with the history of the pier (**Mr Anderson:** Go on!) but I am tempted, Mr President, just to say why I am supporting the resolution, in view of my good friend from the Tourist Board who has just resumed his seat. The reason... déjà vu, I think, was mentioned yesterday, and déjà vu is very much in fashion here this morning. The same arguments that were advanced then were the ones that were advanced for the transport system, with one big difference: we had even less money in those days to support

a Victorian railway infrastructure. I always remember saying at the time, 'How do you quantify that in pounds, shillings and pence?' And here we are in a position today of equating the pier with pounds, shillings and pence. If it is about a motion, you are right.

I recognise Ramsey when I come round the hill and I see the pier. I know I am in Ramsey, just like, when I come in on the boat and see the Tower of Refuge, I know I am in Douglas. These things are important to Manx people. Whether you like it or whether we do not, they are thumbprints in the sand and I think they are... Once they have gone, you will not be able to put them back together again.

I understand precisely what the Minister for Transport said this morning when he said about the money and all the practical difficulties, because I wrestled with them for a decade, when I was on the Harbour Board in the 1970s. It was not a listed building then, but we still had to use the same materials. I forget the name – green heart, is it? The wood which has to be used in sea conditions? The most expensive wood there is. These are practical difficulties that the committee are going to have to face on how they are going to do it.

So I am in support of the resolution, because I believe it needs an independent overview and there will have to be, as my Lord Bishop has said, a decision taken sooner or later.

I think the case for this important structure to Ramsey and the Island needs to be given one final chance to see if there is a use. It was built for steamboats, for sea transport and, I think it was Mrs Craine, who was talking about the history of Ramsey and the pier and it is not as important as Douglas was to the tourist industry. If you look at Manx history, the only thing that prevented that from developing was the crash of Dumbell's Bank. Ramsey was being – with the Victorian foresight – seen as a jewel that could be developed. That is the reason why Ramsey did not develop after that, the crash at the bank.

But, having said that, here I am. Am I supporting the resolution? Yes. Will I support the amendment? I will wait for the mover of the resolution before I confirm whether I am going to support that or not, because if we are going to talk about adding economic and other uses to it, then the committee will not be reporting for this October, or next October, but it will be a couple of years down the line.

Really, I think we do need a spotlight on this problem and then we have to grasp the bullet. I have got a feeling it is not going to be a very nice bullet to grasp but I think at least it needs to be once and for all accepted: are we going to keep this project alive or is it to disappear?

The only thing I will say to the mover of the resolution, when he turned round and said that the Treasury were 'rip-off merchants' – they are not bad rip-off merchants. They have replaced the water undertakings introduced by the Victorians, they have replaced the drainage system introduced by the Victorians, they have saved the transport system introduced by the Victorians, the Camera Obscura, and the list is endless (**Mr Corkill:** Hear, hear.). So keep on being rip-off, Mr Treasury, and perhaps we might yet save the pier.

The President: Hon. Member for Garff.

Mr Rodan: Mr President, this debate shows, I think, the genuine dilemma for us, as politicians, when faced with a difficult issue, a difficult problem, where public money is likely to be involved. And, because it is difficult, it is

tempting, I think, to belittle the ways, however genuine, in which we approach the issue. That is why I am sorry that the mover chose to portray the pier as a victim, as he put it, of a bad system of financial planning for the past 20 years. That is why he exhorted us to 'Let's try and act like a national parliament', and it is why, as the previous speaker has said, he will fight against 'rip-off policy' of the Treasury.

Now, I would simply say this, and I will move on in a moment, but why, when approaching these issues, why is it, when developing policy, we are continually invited to impute the worst motives (**Two Members:** Hear, hear.) on the part of Government, or on those who work in Government? If it is not a rotten system, it is rip-off or suspect motives, and I think that is very sad.

Mr President, the whole purpose of politics is to try and match the needs and aspirations of the public with the ability of the public purse to meet those needs and aspirations, and that means setting priority. That is what we are here for. It is the reason we have politicians: to set priorities.

So I will support a select committee being set up, simply because the pier is worth saving; but as an aspiration, the difficulty is that it is not, nor can ever be, a higher priority than spending money on health, education, social services, roads, housing and the day-to-day needs of the public – the needs of the public, as opposed to the aspirations of the public, or the majority of the public. And I say that, as one who, day to day, in my Department, we are continually struggling with budgets to try and meet the needs that are pressed upon us from the public, the real, genuine needs of people for social services and health services. This is a fact of life that confronts anybody who works in the Department of Health and Social Security, and I think that is fairly obvious to us all. So the question is, how do we square that circle?

I have no doubt that, at one time – we have heard about Laxey Wheel – Laxey Wheel would be regarded by, quite likely, the majority of the public many years ago as a lesser priority and hardly worth saving. Thankfully, because of the vision of one man, the late Edwin Kneale, he took on this hopelessly uneconomic case and saved it; and thanks, if I may say so, to the actions taken in this Hon. Court over 20 years ago when responsibility was passed over to the Government Property Trustees, because of the vision of the Court at that time, the Wheel is with us today.

I think there is no doubt that, in terms of the amendment moved by the Hon. Member for Onchan, Mr Earnshaw, if providing evidence of a viable commercial and economic case for the retention of Laxey Wheel had been the criterion, it simply would not be here today. There is no viable commercial or economic justification; certainly, there was not at the time. I think, actually, one could make a sound economic case today in terms of its being, I suppose, the number one tourist attraction and visitor attraction of the Isle of Man.

That is why supporting the amendment would make this proposition a non-starter. That is not to say that the commercial and economic aspect – because that is the real world – does not play a part in the examination of the select committee because, clearly, it will. If the committee is to recommend who will be responsible for the repair, recommissioning and operation of the pier, they are going to have to look at the economic and commercial aspects of it. But I think, inevitably, the call at the end of the day is going to be on the public purse, and that is what makes this whole question so difficult, given the other calls on the public purse.

The only way forward for this is a select committee, which will look at these aspects, and I suggest that we go with the resolution as originally tabled, Mr President.

The President: Hon. Member, Mr Corkill.

Mr Corkill: Thank you, Mr President.

I think a lot has been said this morning about comparing the Ramsey Pier with this expression of chopping up the Laxey Wheel, and this is the only pier that we have left, this is the last opportunity, and we lost a certain amount of the railway infrastructure, and, therefore, we now have the Ramsey Pier to deal with and it is the same scenario...

I do not go along with that, Mr President, because I think the Ramsey Pier, ever since it was built, has had a rather a chequered history and a rather chequered purpose.

I do not believe it is the last opportunity, either, because the Department of Transport has effectively mothballed it. There has been money there for that to happen, on the basis that a decision could be made one way or the other into the future. It is a very sensible policy, in my view, because it is also the most cost-effective policy; it maintains a piece of infrastructure if it is required in the future, or wanted in the future and it is cheaper than knocking it down, which is also an expensive option.

Although, having said that, with the price of scrap metal at the moment you might well find someone takes it away for free (*Laughter*) – we have never had that particular option open to us in the past – in the same way that scrap cars are taken away for free. No doubt the Chinese would turn it into tin cans or whatever it is they do with all this huge amount of the world's resource.

I grew up in Ramsey and I have some very fond memories of the pier. One of my best buddies at school actually used to drive the train up and down it when the boat came. But, Mr President, I do not know how many Members in this Court have actually been on the pier when the boat docked; it was a very frightening experience because the whole thing used to shake, and it was no surprise to me when the berthing head broke loose years ago and it had to be removed, because it was very precarious in the late 1960s and early 1970s. It is a liability to Government and so I am not surprised at all, Mr President, that the Minister for Transport was one of the first speakers on his feet, ready to pass this particular parcel, because, as he quite honestly said, it will never be a priority within the Department of Transport, and a number of other speakers have made reference to that.

What really concerns me this morning is that, by going for a select committee, it is giving some sort of false dawn or false hope, in my view, to those who are supporters of it. I do not doubt their sincerity in any way whatsoever, in relation to the Friends of the Queen's Pier; it is what they believe in.

One of the points I wanted to raise was, in another jurisdiction, if it was the United Kingdom – and the Lord Bishop made reference to heritage on a wider basis, on a British basis, rather than just a local Manx basis – this sort of project would be eligible for Lottery funding and that would take the whole debate away from the taxpayer. It still grieves me that, some years on, having had certain commitments between Isle of Man Government and the United Kingdom Government that we would have exact parity in relation to the way that the United Kingdom operates within the Isle of Man and throughout the UK... it is the UK Lottery but the

Isle of Man has legislation to permit it here in the Isle of Man. That part of that deal at that time was that we would have complete parity, and we still do not have that. We collect the 12 per cent duty, and that is used to good purposes within the Island; but, of course, in the UK that 12 per cent is actually spent, it goes straight to the Treasury and just gets absorbed into general revenue.

The way people benefit in the UK from the Lottery is that charities can make application for this very type of scheme. So, in the UK situation, the Friends of the Pier would be eligible to make an application to Lottery funding; as, indeed, for another piece of Manx heritage, the *Manxman*, where, in the United Kingdom, there is a charity working very hard to renovate the *Manxman* steamship, which is another great piece of heritage that the Island has lost, to a large extent. I understand they are making application to the Lottery for funding.

So, it may well be that... I am not going to support the select committee but, if the committee is successful, it may well be that one of the things the committee can highlight is the very fact that I have just raised about Lottery funding, because that is something that I hope Isle of Man Government does not forget about. We need to remind our UK neighbours what the original agreement was.

I have to say the actual pier itself I find rather an ugly structure, and just because the way I look at it, and I know other people look at things differently, I think, particularly when you look at it from the seaward side at low tide, it is not pretty and never has been. So, I think we need to be careful about the aesthetic part.

But the fundamental, Mr President, is that if it is £7 million, or £7.2 million, and it may well be more, you can calculate with a very easy formula what the percentage is for revenue funding that would be required year on year after that, whether it is 5 per cent of the capital cost or whatever it might be. There are many things that Government operates, where it is round about 10 per cent of the capital value that needs to be found on an annual basis for maintenance and revenue purposes, which would then mean that you need another half a million a year after you have actually renovated the pier, so the numbers are huge.

I have to say that if that amount of money is available to Members of Tynwald to vote on, I would far rather, as the Member for Middle mentioned, that it was spent on a marina, because if you are talking about the maritime environment, the maritime aspect of the Isle of Man today, in the 21st century, then you have a situation where a marina is what more people are interested (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) in than a pier. 150 years ago the people of the Island knew that a pier was required and so that was invested upon at that time. Life has moved on and today's priority is totally different, in my view.

My concern, though, is that if the Department of Transport have this taken away from them, then who will look after it in the short term or the medium term? Although it is not a pretty proposition, I think the status quo, which is what has been agreed upon in the past, is the most important. The Member for Garff, Mr Rodan, said politicians are here to deal with... well, that we have got a dilemma on our hands. Dilemmas require decisions, not more committees, in my view. We have got a tremendous amount of information in relation to this subject already in the system, so we are only going to be reinventing the same wheel by having another committee. I think it is most important that, as politicians, we

do not create false optimism in the community (**A Member:** Hear, hear) with a motion such as this, when the reality is quite clear.

The Minister for Transport is giving me a dirty look because his opportunistic strike has been rumbled. (*Laughter*)

The President: Hon. Member, Mr Gill.

Mr Gill: Thank you, Eaghtyrane.

Just briefly, I should begin by declaring my membership of the Friends of the Pier –

Mrs Christian: Do we have Friends of the Marina?

Mr Gill: – but perhaps I might be accused of being a fair-weather friend because I am going to look at this from a rational, rather than emotional perspective.

I do not think anybody has argued the fact that, on purely commercial terms, any restoration or investment in the pier makes no sense. Members might be aware that, in Europe, pier building has become fashionable again and a profitable enterprise. In Germany particularly they are building piers at a faster rate, as I understand it, than the Victorians did. So you would wonder, if people are in business with a view to turning a profit from piers, if they would not have already scanned their eyes over the fourth longest pier in the British Isles, as we have heard, and decided that that was a worthy opportunity to invest in. Clearly, if people have done that, they have come to the same conclusion that this Court has that that would be, frankly, a waste of money in purely commercial terms. So, in rational terms, there is no benefit to considering that further.

I am minded of the words in a film where they say, ‘What have the Romans ever done for us?’ I think you could extend the same: ‘What have the Department of Transport ever done for the Pier?’ Well, it might not be enough to satisfy people but they have done enough to keep the status quo. The challenge now that we have put to us by the Member for Onchan, Mr Karran, is that they have ripped people off and that he is going to come to the rescue and advise us with a select committee, if he is on the select committee, how it should be done better. I would be interested to hear that, and I would be very pleased to jump to my feet if we do decide to have a select committee to propose Mr Karran. Hopefully, he could be the Chair who could advise us of his wisdom and experience, where everybody else seems to have failed; he could advise us how we could do better. Whether he could do that by October, that is probably a small matter, but he says he can and so we will test that.

I would just make one further observation, though, Eaghtyrane. The Lord Bishop said that we have a number of places of worship. There is a significant difference, which should not be entered into this Court without response, that places of worship are in the ownership of institutions – the churches. Be they the established Church or not, they are the responsibility of those Churches, and whilst they have a significant factor sometimes within the communities, that is a very different consideration to heritage structures, such as the pier.

Mr Henderson: It is ecclesiastical heritage.

Mr Gill: Well, my friend from Douglas North, it is

ecclesiastical heritage. There is a big difference, and the ecclesiastical element of that falls squarely with the Churches, in this first instance, unless they can prove, on an individual basis, which I am not convinced they can, that it should, therefore, fall to the public purse.

So is the Ramsey Pier akin to the Laxey Wheel? Is it akin to the steam trains? Is it akin to lots of other heritage sites which, frankly, do not turn a profit? They do not break even, they incur a loss, and we live with that because they add to the quality of life. That seems to be the question. That is not the question that is posed in the amendment by my friend, Mr Earnshaw, and whilst I fully appreciate he is quite right to raise it in the way he does, I think I would oppose that because it is a foregone conclusion: there is no commercial basis for the pier, however much we may like to say so.

So we have to, therefore, look to: is there any intrinsic emotional or heritage function and value? And, yes, there is; but whether that will be sufficient to warrant investment, who should run it, and all the rest and what priority that would take over other unmet needs... and I would be remiss if I did not say we do have unmet needs. Certainly, in the south, we have unmet needs, where we have our elderly community. Their needs are not being met in the new Southlands. I have said it before and I will repeat it again, and that is just one of a long list. I know that there is not one Member of this Court who would wish that position to be as it is. I am not laying any criticism in that; I am simply making an observation.

The question, therefore, is, to my mind, whether we should support Mr Karran in his motion, and I for one, as much out of curiosity as anything else, would say that we should do. I would be very interested to have the benefit of Mr Karran’s experience. He knows where we all go wrong in our duties and I am sure if he can advise us how this could be turned around and we can all live happily ever after and nobody else will... this will be another example of not ‘instead of’ money but ‘as well as’ money, then I would be very interested to hear it. Perhaps, the Members for the north, particularly Ramsey, be they in Council or those Members representing the Keys, might also be anxious to add to that.

So, for my part, Eaghtyrane, I simply make those points. There is no commercial value in the pier. Sad fact of life, but there it is. Butn mayben there is some other intrinsic factors that we are not aware of and maybe the Member for Onchan can lead us to that enlightenment. Perhaps, by October, we can realise how we can square this circle. Thank you, Eaghtyrane.

The President: Hon. Member for Ramsey, Mrs Craine. (**A Member:** Vote.)

Mrs Craine: Thank you, Mr President. I would like to speak to the amendment.

Mr President, as I said in my opening remarks, there is a situation where cost does not come into everything:

‘...ore that is not for the mart
Of commerce.’

I do think it is pertinent that we remind ourselves of that here this morning.

When, in 1892, a merchant of Liverpool by the name of Norberry visited the Isle of Man regularly each week... he commuted, and he commuted because he built a house on the outskirts of the town in which I now live. He also was a

benefactor to the town, in that he built the lifeboat house.

Those were in days of considerable prosperity for Ramsey. Ramsey, unfortunately, does not enjoy the same prosperity today, perhaps, as was reflected then.

I would see support for this motion – and, if it came about, support for the pier – as being part of a regeneration of Ramsey. I do not see that it is an either/or situation: does Ramsey want this for industry, or does Ramsey want this for light entertainment?

And, yes, there is no economic viability to the construction or the maintenance of the pier; but neither could we have argued that when we spent £9 million on the House of Manannan in Peel; neither when we took back the Calf of Man were we looking for a return. There are some things that we know, up front, we are not going to get a return on, but that does not mean that we should ignore them, or that they should not be there to enhance our quality of life.

It is interesting to hear the remarks of the Hon. Member for Onchan, who said that he found the pier to be unattractive. ‘Not pretty’, I think he said. I have to say that beauty is in the eye of the beholder (**A Member:** Hear, hear) and if you take a boat out and you look down through the pier, there is nothing more magnificent than seeing that structure, and it is a magnificent tribute to the people who built it.

We are talking about the possibility of an economic future. Yes, we have heard that we can never combat the needs of the Island, we can never... We could take our entire budget and give it to Health and it still would not be enough, and that is a fact. We do sometimes have to step back and look at the arts, at our landscape, at the beauty around us, how we can enjoy that. I believe that the people of Ramsey do enjoy their pier and we are not just talking about this being a tourist asset; we are talking about this being for the people of Ramsey to enjoy, to go out, to walk on, to look back at the town, and it is a fine feature for such a thing.

I do think that we need to maintain a degree of vision and, within that, we have to maintain some of our landmarks. Sometimes, yes, I do realise that they have to go, and we have new landmarks today that are equally attractive. I, for one, think the Energy from Waste Plant is an attractive landmark. (*Interjections*)

Mrs Hannan: Horrendous, absolutely horrendous!

Mrs Craine: There we are – eyes of the beholder again.

Mrs Hannan: Absolutely over the top expenditure – waste of money!

Mrs Craine: We are talking again... The Member for Onchan said that the pier used to shudder and shake; so did the rollercoaster at White City – (*Interjections and laughter*)

Mr Braidwood: That has been demolished.

Mr Downie: They had the sense to send it to the scrapheap!

Mr Earnshaw: Careful where you are going here.

Mrs Craine: I do think that we have to accept, Hon. Members, that there are some things in life that are worth

retaining, that are not going to give us the payback that we all so eagerly seek, but are still, nonetheless, worth the investment. I, therefore, do not think that the amendment before us is helpful, in that it will delay the issue.

I would just, finally, point out, Mr President, that, within the report, there have been some comments this morning from Members about the ongoing maintenance. In the latest report, the ongoing maintenance given is £30,000 a year.

Mrs Hannan: Starting with!

Mrs Craine: £30,000 a year.

The President: Hon. Member, Douglas South.

Mr Duggan: Thank you, Mr President.

I am against this resolution, Mr President, (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) because the DoT has spent a fortune looking into this pier. We have had photographs, catalogues, and I, personally, think it would be a white elephant. We could spend the money on it today, sir, it would be a white elephant, it would get very little use.

Mrs Hannan: Put it at the end of the pier. (*Laughter and interjections*)

Mr Duggan: I agree with Mrs Hannan, really. There are other roads like the Peel Road and the Promenade and especially the Marine Drive. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I would far rather the money was spent on the Marine Drive, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) which would be about a third of the cost, Hon. Members, than waste the money on this pier. I think it would be a complete waste of taxpayers’ money, to be truthful.

A Member: Quite right, sir.

The President: Mr Teare, Hon. Member for Ayre.

Mr Teare: Thank you, Mr President, and I will heed your advice to be brief.

I speak to the amendment put forward by the Hon. Member for Onchan, Mr Earnshaw. I feel that if we support this, in effect we are prejudging the issue. It will be tying the hands of the committee and, in effect, it will be drafting the conclusions of the report. (**A Member:** Yes.)

I will support the original motion put forward by Mr Karran, the Hon. Member for Onchan. I feel that we do need up-to-date information (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) to make a well-founded decision. There have been changes in the availability and the costs of materials, and also construction methods change as time moves on. I think that we need to rely upon facts and not feelings.

Thank you, Mr President.

The President: Hon. Member for Michael.

Mr Cannan: Mr President, I would just like, towards the close of this debate, to ask Members to be realistic. There is an old saying that some people know the cost of everything and the value of nothing.

If we had that all our life, would we be spending money – and I will do a quick tour, a very quick tour, around the Isle of Man – would we spend money to maintain Peel Castle?

Would we have built the House of Manannan? Would we, only a few months ago, have bought property at Niarbyl? (**A Member:** No.) Would we continue to refurbish the steam train, which, in this day and age, does not service the needs of the people of the Isle of Man? It services tourism, (*Interjection by Mrs Hannan*) it is a great attraction, we spend a lot of money on it; it does not make a profit. The Manx Electric Railway, the same. We maintain, or see the maintenance of, the Conister Rock.

In a time of depressed economy in the Isle of Man, shortly after I arrived here, the then Chairman of the Government Property Trustees was a young Member from Castletown – his name was Tony Brown. He pushed and pushed very hard for the development of the Laxey Wheel and had a plan for the whole surrounding area, which we have today. Tynwald fought over that, and the arguments were the same, except that we were not prosperous. Two and a half thousand people were unemployed and the Government had little money. Are there people here today that will say that that should not have happened? Is there anybody here today will say that we should not have, in those depressed times, restored the Laxey Wheel? I have just given you a brief tour, and there are many other examples in the Isle of Man.

Now we have here a pier which people have been battling to save. It is as much part of our heritage as the Laxey Wheel, or the trains, or the electric trams, and many other things, and Castle Rushen or Peel Castle or wherever. None of those institutions make a profit, but they are part of the Isle of Man as we know it. I believe that the Ramsey Pier is part of the Isle of Man as I know it.

I have heard some things today that are untrue: that the pier juddered as you got off and it was a frightening experience to get off the boat. Well, I actually have travelled from Ramsey Pier to Belfast on the boat and I was not frightened and the pier did not judder –

Mr Duggan: After you were getting on. (*Laughter*)

Mr Cannan: – and the train went up and down and it was a great attraction for tourists and it also served a purpose. The Laxey Wheel is a great attraction for tourists, the trains are an attraction, the House of Manannan is an attraction.

To support the amendment is wrong, because the amendment is putting the cost of everything and the value of nothing. Support the resolution. Let us have it looked at carefully and let us see if it can be restored on the same basis that we restored the Laxey Wheel and maintain our trains and all the other heritage institutions in the Isle of Man. Please, I urge Hon. Members, do not write off the pier.

The President: Mr Karran to reply. Sorry, Hon. Member for Rushen, Mr Gawne.

Mr Gawne: Gura mie eu, Eaghtyrane.

I had not intended to speak on this but, having heard the comments about the value or otherwise of heritage sites, I feel that I must make some comments.

I think I was quite surprised to hear a member of the Trust of Manx National Heritage effectively leading off on this particular line, that you are never going to make money out of heritage sites, that heritage sites can never put forward, or never be economically valuable, or put value back into their communities. It really depends very much on how you define what that economic case is.

I am actually quite supportive of what Mr Earnshaw's amendment is trying to achieve, provided that this is not purely about the very basic and very narrow economic case for the survival of the pier. I think it is important that we know what value we can get out of the pier, and this is not purely about economics, but it is about the value that the community in Ramsey will get out of it. It is about the value that tourists coming to the Island will bring.

It is about all those sorts of things. It is about the social cohesion which is generated by, for example... the House of Manannan was mentioned. The House of Manannan does a tremendous job. Yes, in pure and very basic economic terms it loses money, but in terms of what it provides to the Isle of Man, in terms of bringing the people together to understand where they have come from, understand their roots, I think that is an enormously valuable thing.

I am very alarmed to hear just how many people have been speaking and, perhaps, belittling the value which things like that will bring. These will actually bring tremendous value in terms of potential economic performance of our people in the future. If you have a people who are thinking together, thinking as one people who support their country and support their nation, then they are more likely to be more productive and more useful to the Island in economic terms. So, to say that heritage is something that we are just doing for aspirational and nice, sort of, soft and fluffy reasons is quite wrong.

On that basis, I am tempted to support Mr Earnshaw's amendment, based on the fact that I think we should be looking at a much broader definition of the value –

Mr Henderson: It says that in the amendment.

Mr Gawne: I will be interested to hear what the mover has to say, in terms of his summing up, as to whether he would agree with my definition of economic value or not. Gura mie eu.

The President: And we will have that now. Mr Karran, thank you.

Mr Karran: Eaghtyrane, I think that this has been a very good debate. I would hope that the Hon. Member, the last speaker, would appreciate that these issues are important that the amendment raises, but the fact is that I think he is looking from a different angle than from a Treasury angle.

If I was to have the choice between this amendment or not having a proactive membership of a committee, if it is fortunate enough to be set up today, then I would rather this amendment; but I would hope that Hon. Members would vote against this proposal.

I thank the Members for Michael and Ayre for their support. I would like to... I think it is important, as far as that is concerned. I think it is important that other Members should be thanked, as well: Mr Gill for his support on the issue. Let us see what history comes out of why this proposal is in front of us today.

My complaint is not that this is a victim because of the rip-off policy; it is a victim, or could be a victim, because of the way we run the systems of Government, that need to be changed. This motion, Eaghtyrane, down here today is an opportunity for us to try and help the Department of Transport. There is a parliamentary process. We have seen a situation where, to be perfectly honest with you, if I was

the Minister for Transport and I had to choose between the roads of the DoT or whatever, or having to try and make IRIS work, or spend money on the likes of the Ramsey Pier, then that is the priority. But I think it is important that we claw back the parliamentary process of this Hon. Court.

This is a major political issue, an issue that the executive has fought about and has to prioritise. We now have the opportunity, in this Hon. Court, to have a select committee, because there are things... I am not saying that I have got all the answers, but what I have got is I did manage to get hold of the recognised world expert, as far as piers are concerned. We had a meeting on Monday at the pier, underneath it, and we were discussing certain things –

Mr Downie: Recognised world expert, eh?

Mr Karran: – about the BWB report. Now, to be fair, the price of iron has shot up and the price of steel is horrendous and the price of oil is horrendous, but, at the end of the day, as he said...

Just a couple of simple things. He said the £865,000 to replace the handrail posts, a thousand posts at £865: he said the fact is the posts are £150 at the present time. When you say, 'Well, that is nothing'; but when there are a thousand posts, it is a lot of money. He said the point about the Hon. Member for Peel and her forests: the fact is that we do not need to replace the whole of the timber decking. So, she only needs to come in –

Mrs Hannan: Just half a forest, then.

Mr Karran: – we only have to have her coming in on a horse once a week, instead of twice a week, instead of using the car like we do in the real world.

These are little strategic points, which, in the BWB report, says that is the thing. He dismisses that the upper structure has to all be removed. Now this is somebody who has successfully worked on piers in the United Kingdom. That is something that we need to audit, and we need to audit well.

I would like to say that, obviously, I was disappointed with the former Chief Minister's viewpoint on this. I am not saying that one will be the saviour. I do not mind who takes the thing of saving the pier, so long as it gets saved, because I think it is important. It does need to be a balance between the different issues, but I beg to differ on many points of the ex-Minister.

I would be interested in how much money actually has been physically spent on the pier over the last five years and it will be interesting to see the detail. I think the thing is that it is not there.

He does raise interesting points, in fact, interesting points that we talked to the Treasury Minister about only the other day, about the issue of access and funding from the Lottery Trust of the United Kingdom. It is scandalous that we are contributing towards it and yet the money goes all over the world and cannot come here if it is a valid proposal.

To be fair to the Hon. Member, the issue of the *Manxman*. Well, to be perfectly honest with you, it might be an issue that we can look at as a select committee, about the issue of what uses need to be done for this development.

I was impressed with the points of the Hon. Member for

Garff, in that he rose above the fact that he misunderstood what I was on about when I talked about the financial system of rip-off. The system has to change within Government. I believe that, and I believe that what I am trying to do today, here in this Hon. Court, is help the executive.

I believe this is a device to help the Council of Ministers so a decision can be made by everybody in this Hon. Court.

And I agree with him: if there is a battle between the health and social services, they are things that need to be addressed; but I have to say there has to be a balance and what I want to see, if I can get a good select committee together, is if there is a middle road.

I think there is a middle road between MNH with its crazy situation... I mean, we have spent £1 million on Niarbyl Café. I would never have supported that, I will be perfectly honest with you. £1 million on Niarbyl Café to compete with, you know... But, compared to this, this sort of piece of architecture, it should be.

I would thank the Hon. Member of Council, Mr Lowey. I just say that the issue is that, Hon. Members, we have an opportunity. I feel that this Hon. Court will support the motion as it stands, and let us hope that we can get people with enthusiasm in front of here.

I think the likes of Mr Quayle, the Hon. Member for Middle, talks about pie in the sky. I have never wanted pie in the sky. I just want to try and do what I think we need to do which is right. There are other issues which he raised about the MEA. There was no-one in this House who was more concerned. The stick I got over the MEA... but that is in the past and that issue has to come back.

The balance, when the report comes back, is the priorities of this Hon. Court, and that is what we need to do.

I hope it is unanimous support for the proposal today. I will not go any further, Eaghtyrane, on replying to Members, but I would say a balance of this report, when the report comes back to this Hon. House, let us see what the facts are.

There is no situation that, if we support this today, we have got to support Ramsey Pier, but at least the best information is available. The opportunity is there for the parliamentary scrutiny so that it is looked upon, not in a situation like the Member for Garff about health and social security, or the Member for West Douglas over Peel Road, over Marine Drive. It is looked on as a parliamentary issue with a detailed response and a detailed report coming back to this Hon. Court.

I beg to move and I hope that Members will support the motion as it stands. I beg to move.

The President: Hon. Members, before I put the motion, I would just tell the Court that the Chief Minister has left the Court with my permission on Government business.

Now, in relation to Item 40, the motion that I put to you, Hon. Members, you have the amendment in the name of the Hon. Member for Onchan, Mr Earnshaw, which was seconded by Mr Downie. I will put to you, first, the amendment in the name of the Hon. Member, Mr Earnshaw. 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 – Ayes 11, Noes 12

FOR

Mr Anderson
Mr Quayle
Mr Gawne
Mr Houghton
Mr Braidwood
Mr Shimmin
Mrs Hannan
Mr Corkill
Mr Earnshaw
Capt. Douglas
The Speaker

AGAINST

Mr Cannan
Mr Teare
Mr Rodan
Mr Rimington
Mr Gill
Mr Henderson
Mr Cretney
Mr Duggan
Mrs Cannell
Mr Bell
Mrs Craine
Mr Karran

The Speaker: Mr President, the amendment fails to carry in the House of Keys, with 11 votes for, 12 votes against.

In the Council – Ayes 3 , Noes 4

FOR

The Lord Bishop
Mrs Crowe
Mr Downie

AGAINST

Mr Lowey
Mr Waft
Mr Butt
Mrs Christian

The President: With 3 for and 4 against in the Council, Hon. Members, the amendment, therefore, fails to carry.

Hon. Members, I now put to you the motion, as printed on the Order Paper, in the name of the Hon. Member, Mr Karran, printed at 40 on your Order Paper. Those in favour, please say aye; and against, no. The ayes have it.

A division was called for and voting resulted as follows:

In the Keys – Ayes 17, Noes 6

FOR

Mr Anderson
Mr Cannan
Mr Teare
Mr Rodan
Mr Rimington
Mr Gill
Mr Gawne
Mr Houghton
Mr Henderson
Mr Cretney
Mr Braidwood
Mrs Cannell
Mr Shimmin
Mr Bell
Mrs Craine
Mr Karran
Capt. Douglas

AGAINST

Mr Quayle
Mr Duggan
Mrs Hannan
Mr Corkill
Mr Earnshaw
The Speaker

The Speaker: Mr President, the motion carries in the House of Keys with 17 votes for, 6 votes against.

In the Council – Ayes 6, Noes 1

FOR

The Lord Bishop
Mr Lowey
Mr Butt
Mrs Christian
Mrs Crowe
Mr Downie

AGAINST

Mr Waft

The President: With 6 votes for, 1 vote against, in the Council, Hon. Members, the motion, therefore, carries.

Now Hon. Members, as I have pointed out before, we now need nominations to appoint a select committee of three members.

The President: Mr Earnshaw.

Mr Earnshaw: Are you taking nominations now, sir?

The President: Yes, sir.

Mr Earnshaw: I would like to say to the Court, Mr President, that I do not think there is anybody in this Hon. Court who has got more experience of the effects of salt water on iron than Capt. Douglas (*Laughter*) and I would like to propose the Member for Malew and Santon.

Mr Braidwood: Mr President, I wish to propose the Hon. Member for Ayre, Mr Teare.

Mrs Cannell: I beg to second, Mr President.

Mr Henderson: I beg to propose the Hon. Member for Onchan, Mr Karran.

Mr Gill: I beg to second Mr Karran, Eaghtyrane.

Mr Teare: Thank you, Mr President. I would like to propose the Hon. Member for Ramsey, Mrs Craine.

Mr Henderson and Mr Houghton: I beg to second, sir.

Mr Shimmin: I propose the Member of Council, Mr Butt.

Mr Quayle and another Member: I second that, Mr President.

Mr Lowey: I propose the Hon. Member of Council, Mrs Crowe.

Mr Duggan: I beg to second, Mr President.

Mrs Craine: I propose the Member for Michael, Mr Cannan.

Mr Cannan: No, I am not available.

Mr Shimmin: I bet you do.

Mr Henderson and another Member: I beg to second.

Mr Houghton: I propose nominations close, sir.

Mr Shimmin: Second.

The President: Hon. Members, I have not picked up on a seconder for Capt. Douglas, I do not think.

Mr Waft: I'll second Capt. Douglas, Mr President.

The President: You have done, right. I think that puts it in the frame, then.

Right, ballot papers will be distributed, Hon. Members. You are voting for three. When you have got your ballot papers, the Clerk will read the names.

Have you all got ballot papers, Hon. Members?

Mr Braidwood: Yes, and voted.

The President: Council got ballot papers? No ballot papers down here yet. The Clerk will read the names.

The Clerk: Mr President, the Members nominated are Mr Butt, Mrs Crowe, Mr Cannan, Mrs Craine, Capt. Douglas, Mr Karran and Mr Teare.

The President: Voting for three, Hon. Members. The Lord Bishop will act as teller for the Council,

The Speaker: Mr Braidwood for the Keys.

Mrs Hannan: Mr Braidwood proposed somebody.

The Speaker: Did he?

Mr Braidwood: Yes.

The Speaker: Oh, well, you cannot. Member for Douglas North, Mr Houghton.

Mrs Hannan: Mr Houghton did, too, didn't you? Didn't you propose somebody?

Mr Houghton: Here is the result.

Mrs Hannan: Did you propose somebody? He seconded someone, then.

Mr Houghton: Does that matter?

Mr Bell: Mrs Hannan has got nothing to do!

A Member: Yes.

The Speaker: Member for Douglas East, then, Mrs Cannell.

A Member: Did you second somebody?

Mrs Cannell: I seconded somebody. (*Laughter*)

Mr Duggan: I did not, Mr Speaker.

The President: Hon. Member for Douglas South, Mr Duggan.

A first ballot took place.

The President: Hon. Members, the result of that ballot is that Mr Butt received 15; Mrs Crowe, 11; Mr Cannan, 12; Mrs Craine, 9; Capt. Douglas, 8; Mr Karran, 18; and Mr Teare 17. The result of that ballot is that Mr Karran and Mr Teare are elected to serve on the committee. We will ballot between the remaining five for the one place which is left. Submit ballot papers, please.

Hon. Members, as soon as you have got your ballot papers the names will be called. Now, just filling the one

place, Hon. Members. Call the names, please.

The Clerk: The remaining Members are Mr Butt, Mrs Crowe, Mr Cannan, Mrs Craine and Capt. Douglas.

A second ballot took place.

The President: Hon. Members, the result of the ballot was: Mr Butt received 11; Mrs Crowe, 6; Mr Cannan, 6; Mrs Craine, 6; and Capt. Douglas, 1.

Ballot again, Hon. Members. Submit the ballot papers and you will delete Capt. Douglas from the list. (**Members:** Ah.)

A third ballot took place.

The President: Don't use them yet until the ballot has been completed. You do not know who has been dropped off, if anybody. We might actually have a result! (*Laughter and comments*)

Mrs Hannan: You promised us! You promised us!

The President: Right, the result of that ballot was that Mr Butt received 14; Mrs Crowe, 6; Mr Cannan, 6; Mrs Craine, 4.

We drop off Mrs Craine and continue. Voting for one between Mr Butt, Mrs Crowe and Mr Cannan, Hon. Members.

It is immaterial, Hon. Members, anyway, but I welcome into our public gallery this afternoon, as it is now, Mr and Mrs Saunders, as I understand it, who are visiting from Australia. I can assure you, Mr and Mrs Saunders, that the performance in this Chamber is not always as it is now. You have just arrived at a time when we are conducting a ballot.

Mr Anderson: It could be worse than this. (*Laughter*)

A fourth ballot took place.

The President: The result, Hon. Members is that Mr Butt received 22; Mrs Craine, 1; and Mr Cannan received 5. That means that we now have completed our ballot and we now have a complete committee, which consists of Mr Karran, Mr Teare and Mr Butt, Hon. Members.

Having completed the ballot, it also draws to a conclusion the business on our Order Paper for today, Hon. Members. Council will now withdraw and leave the House of Keys to transact such business as Mr Speaker may wish to put before you, Hon. Members.

The Council withdrew.

House of Keys

The Speaker: Hon. Members, the House will now stand adjourned until Tuesday next at 10.00 a.m. in our own House.

Thank you, Hon. Members.

The House adjourned at 12.55 p.m.