



**HOUSE OF KEYS  
OFFICIAL REPORT**

**RECORTYS OIKOIL  
Y CHIARE AS FEED**

**PROCEEDINGS  
DAALTYN  
(HANSARD)**

**Douglas, Tuesday, 4th December 2007**

**Present:**

The Speaker (Hon. S C Rodan) (Garff);  
 The Chief Minister (The Hon. J A Brown) (Castletown);  
 Hon. D M Anderson (Glenfaba); Hon. A V Craine (Ramsey); Hon. W E Teare (Ayre);  
 Mr J D Q Cannan (Michael); Mr T Crookall (Peel); Mr P Karran and Mr D J Quirk (Onchan); Hon. G M Quayle (Middle);  
 Mr R W Henderson and Mr J R Houghton (Douglas North);  
 Hon. D C Cretney and Mr W M Malarkey (Douglas South); Mr R P Braidwood and Mrs B J Cannell (Douglas East);  
 Mr C G Corkish MBE and Hon. J P Shimmin (Douglas West); Mr G D Cregeen (Malew and Santon);  
 Mr J P Watterson, Hon. P A Gawne and Mr Q B Gill (Rushen);  
 with Mr M Cornwell-Kelly, Secretary of the House

**Business transacted**

	<i>Page</i>
Leave of absence granted.....□	183
<b>Questions for Oral Answer</b>	
1.1. Civil Service retirement age – New policy .....	183
1.2. Harvard Business School – Sending senior civil servants .....	184
1.3. Christmas subsidies – Expenditure from public funds.....	186
1.4. Isle of Man Stock Exchange – Investigating possibility .....	186
1.5. DHSS Deputy Chief Executive – Funding and impact on services .....	187
1.6. Revised escort criteria – Reasons for changes; consultation.....	189
1.7. Adults with learning disabilities – Transport to day services.....	191
1.8. North West Cancer Intelligence Service data – DHSS analysis.....	192
1.9. Breast screening recall system – Date for introduction.....	193
1.10. Vending machines in schools – Policy .....	193
1.11. Isle of Man Coastguard – Cost of operation.....	193
Standing Order 3.5.1(2) suspended to take remaining Questions for Oral Answer.....	195
1.12. Victoria Pier – Public access during winter .....	196
1.13. Traffic management – Minor accident in July.....	196
1.14. Steam Packet Company – Lack of winter day trips and all-weather fast craft .....	197
1.15. Isle of Man Post – Unfair trading.....	199
1.16. Leaky mains pipes – Proportion of Manx water lost .....	199
1.17. Isle of Man Post Office Employee Survey 2007 – Copy for all Members of Tynwald .....	200
Procedural – Clarification by the Speaker .....	202
<b>Questions for Written Answer</b>	
2.1. <i>Solway Harvester</i> – Maintenance costs.....	202
2.2. DHSS Deputy Chief Executive – Job specification .....	202
<b>Orders of the Day</b>	
3.1. Income Tax (Pensions) Bill – Second Reading approved.....	202
4.1. Agricultural (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill – Third Reading approved .....	203
Standing Order 1.1(2)(a) suspended to vacate 18th December sitting .....	205

*All published Official Reports can be accessed on the Tynwald website*

*www.tynwald.org.im*

*Official Papers/Hansards – please select a year*

*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.*

## House of Keys

*The House met at 10.00 a.m.*

[MR SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

### PRAYERS

*The Chaplain of the House of Keys*

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE GRANTED

**The Speaker:** Hon. Members, I have given leave of absence today to the Hon. Member for Ramsey, Mr Bell; the Hon. Member for Onchan, Mr Earnshaw; and for the later part of this morning, the Hon. Member for Douglas West, Mr Corkish.

## Questions for Oral Answer

### CHIEF MINISTER

#### Civil Service retirement age New policy

1.1. The Hon. Member for Onchan (Mr Karran) to ask the Chief Minister:

*In view of the recent changes that allow civil servants to retire at the age of 65 instead of 60, what is the procedure for this process, can the extension be stopped and who agreed to the new policy which we now have?*

**The Speaker:** Turning to our Order Paper and Questions for Oral Answer: first Question, I call on the Hon. Member for Onchan, Mr Karran.

**Mr Karran:** Vainstyr Loayreyder, I ask the Question standing in my name.

**The Speaker:** I call on the Chief Minister, Hon. Member for Castletown, Mr Brown.

**The Chief Minister (Mr Brown):** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Speaker, in July of this year, the United Kingdom introduced a new section to the Principal Civil Service Pension Scheme entitled 'Nuvos'. This section of the United Kingdom scheme has a pension age of 65. Because of the existing 'by analogy' requirement, this change was automatically reflected in the Isle of Man Civil Service Scheme.

As a consequence of this and in order to ensure

equality of treatment for all civil servants, the Civil Service Commission proposed an increase in the retirement age for all civil servants. Following appropriate discussions with the Government Officers' Association, through the established Joint Negotiating Committee mechanism, an amendment was agreed to civil servants' terms and conditions of service: thus the retirement age for all civil servants is now 65.

Civil servants are no longer required to seek an extension of service beyond 60 and can continue to work to the age of 65.

Thank you, Mr Speaker.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Onchan.

**Mr Karran:** Could the Ard-shirveishagh tell us: how does his Government intend to deal with those civil servants that slow up towards 60, that now find that they are going to end up having another five years to slow up even further? How does the Council of Minister intend to deal with this?

Could the Ard-shirveishagh explain to this Hon. House why there is no mechanism put into this proposal, so that Government has some way of having to agree to the extension to five years? If it is one way, why is it not the other way?

**The Speaker:** Chief Minister to reply.

**The Chief Minister:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

I am not sure what he means by 'slow up'. I can say that civil servants have got a job to do and if they are deficient in that, then there are disciplinary actions that can be taken, sir.

**The Speaker:** Mr Karran.

**Mr Karran:** Vainstyr Loayreyder, would the Ard-shirveishagh like to tell us how many people have actually been done under those disciplinary remarks?

Would the Ard-shirveishagh not agree that they are good throwaway lines; but the fact is that we do need to look at that issue, that if we are going to extend, at the end, an extra five years, there should be some mechanism to make sure that the taxpayer and the Civil Service gets the work that it needs to be done?

Would the Ard-shirveishagh not also agree that maybe we should have had a clearer position, as far as this issue is concerned?

**The Speaker:** Chief Minister.

**The Chief Minister:** Mr Speaker, we do not 'do' civil servants. (*Laughter and interjections*) What we do is hopefully support ensuring that our civil servants who provide a valuable service to the Isle of Man and are very professional at their work, allowing that on some occasions there may well be some who are deficient. The system allows for that.

All I can say is that my contact with the vast majority of civil servants has always been a very positive one and they have always been helpful.

I would say that as far as any situation is concerned about any deficiencies, then I am sure that if Members bring that to the attention of the appropriate Minister or the Civil Service Commission, they would investigate such matters.

**Harvard Business School  
Sending senior civil servants**

1.2. The Hon. Member for Onchan (Mr Karran) to ask the Chief Minister:

- (1) *What is the reason for sending senior civil servants to Harvard Business School; and*  
(2) *what are the costs of it?*

**The Speaker:** Question 2 – (*Interjections by Mr Cannan and Mr Karran*) Question 2, Hon. Member for Onchan.

**Mr Karran:** Vainstyr Loayreyder, I ask the Question in my name – and I hope we are not going to censorship on that one, as well.

**The Speaker:** I will keep order, as appropriate, Hon. Member. Chief Minister.

**The Chief Minister (Mr Brown):** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for Onchan for his Question and in responding, I would like to make reference to a Question asked in the House in March of this year. Mr Speaker, at that time, the questioner was the Hon. Member for Michael, Mr Cannan, and he asked:

‘For the purpose of career enhancement will you encourage the Chief Secretary and other Chief Executives to attend a residential course at Sunningdale Civil Service College?’

One of the supplementary questions posed during those Questions was by the Hon. Member, Mr Karran, the Hon. Member for Onchan, who asked:

‘... does anybody in your Government ever look at the issues of how the Irish Republic deals with the Civil Service?  
Maybe we should look at the possibility of doing more training through the Irish system, to see whether we get a more independent way, as far as our civil servants look after the Isle of Man and not look after the interests of the neighbouring island.’

I am therefore sure, Mr Speaker, that the Hon. Member for Onchan, Mr Karran, will be pleased to know that the course which the three of our senior civil servants have recently attended at the John F Kennedy School of Government in Boston is one which we share with the Civil Services of both Northern Ireland and Eire, thereby achieving economies of scale, thus bringing savings to the Manx taxpayer, as well as providing opportunities for the sharing of experiences with other senior civil servants, both inside and outside of the United Kingdom, and of course broadening their outlooks.

The costs of the course in Harvard is £3,591.62 per person and the course lasts one week.

I can advise Hon. Members that the course in Sunningdale, which the Hon. Member for Michael asked about in March 2007, costs a minimum of £12,500 per person.

This is the third year that we have sent officers from the Isle of Man Civil Service along with Irish Civil Service on the course at the John F Kennedy School of Government.

Thank you, Mr Speaker.

**The Speaker:** Mr Karran.

**Mr Karran:** Vainstyr Loayreyder, would the Ard-

shirveishagh like to tell us: who were the people that actually went on the course; how close were they towards retirement, as far as the course is concerned; and what were the travel costs and the costs as far as expenses, on top of the actual course?

Let us get a clear picture on these subjects.

**The Speaker:** Chief Minister to reply.

**The Chief Minister:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

I would want to make the point that I believe training our civil servants for succession planning and ensuring we have the highest quality of civil servants, who now have to deal globally, are of critical importance to the future of the Isle of Man. Therefore this sort of investment is very important to us all and especially to those we represent.

In 2005, the Chief Secretary attended the Harvard Business School.

In 2006, it was: the Chief Financial Officer; the Chief Executive of the Department of Home Affairs; and the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Transport.

In 2007, it is: the Chief Officer of the Personnel Office; the Chief Executive Officer of the DHSS; and the Director of Education.

The issue in relation to travel, Mr Speaker, is... I am just trying to look the figure up.

I will come back to that, Mr Speaker. I have got a figure here, but I am not sure if that is the one the Hon. Member has asked about. I will certainly look at that and see if I can provide that information to Hon. Members.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Douglas East, Mrs Cannell.

**Mrs Cannell:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Can I ask the Chief Minister, in respect of those senior officers who went in 2005, was there any variation in the cost of sending them in 2005, or were they also linked in with the Irish system, thereby to save costs?

**The Speaker:** Chief Minister.

**The Chief Minister:** Yes, Mr Speaker.

My understanding is that what we are doing by joining together with the Irish Civil Service is in fact taking advantage of the ‘deal’, if I use that term, that they get as a larger civil service. Therefore, we are riding along with them and, as I understand it, there are savings, as against if we just sent our own people on their own.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Michael.

**Mr Cannan:** To the Chief Minister, while I wholeheartedly support the career enhancement of senior civil servants, I ask the question: firstly, what is the length of the course at Sunningdale as compared to Harvard?

Secondly, surely, for those senior officers who went on the last course, and indeed the course before, their main point of contact is with United Kingdom civil servants – the DHSS, the Department of Transport, Personnel. Therefore, would it not be more beneficial to meet high-flying civil servants in the UK, with whom they are in fairly constant contact, rather than the Irish civil servants to whom the Isle of Man does not relate, in the determination of its services?

**The Speaker:** Chief Minister.

**The Chief Minister:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

First, the Isle of Man does in fact have connections with both the Northern Ireland Assembly and Civil Service, and also the Irish Civil Service. I accept it is not on the scale of the contact we have with the UK Civil Service. However, I do not think that is the point.

The point is the skills that are acquired by attending such courses – whether they are in the Manx Civil Service, the UK Civil Service, or the Irish Civil Service – all provide the way of dealing with a civil service system of providing support for the politicians. So I am satisfied that the money is not wasted and, in fact, the reaction from officers is quite the contrary.

As far as the Civil Service course in Harvard, that is a seven-day intensive course, whereas the Sunningdale course comprises some 20 days' study and therefore it is more extensive. We also take into account the lost time that we lose our civil servants 'out of the office', if I use that term, here on the Island. If we take that into account, and the point that it is more extensive than going to the Harvard School, then in fact we believe that it is better value for money.

If I can just revert back to the costs of travel, Mr Speaker: as I understand it, the JFK School consists... Sorry, it is a five-day intensive course, so I correct the seven; it is five days. And the cost of travel, I understand, is about £1,800.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member, Mr Karran.

**Mr Karran:** Vainstyr Loayreyder, could the Ardshirveishagh just clarify: why are we going to the extent of this initiative for senior civil servants who are going towards the end of their career? Surely, the issue is that we need training for civil servants that have at least several years left as civil servants, in order to make sure that we actually get value for money, so that we are not actually just giving something away for people who are going to retire, where it is going to be of no use to the taxpayer or the Civil Service?

**The Speaker:** Chief Minister.

**The Chief Minister:** Mr Speaker, I cannot really see why the Hon. Member is saying that because somebody may be getting to the end of their career – whatever that may be; I am not sure whether he means one year, five years, or eight years...

Certainly the Chief Financial Officer is not close to the end of his career. (*Interjection by Mr Karran*) The Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Home Affairs I do not think is. The Chief Executive of the Department of Transport I think has a few years left; and of course do not forget, they now will, as I understand it, be able to stay to 65.

But regardless of that, they are actually dealing with issues already, day to day, and I would have thought any training – and training is an ongoing matter – is in fact something we should welcome.

Can I say, Mr Speaker, there are many professions where people have to have training right up to the end of their working career to keep up their skills and nothing can be more important, I would have thought, to the good government of the Isle of Man than to ensure that our civil servants are properly trained, have the skills required for us to enable us to be effective.

Can I say, further down the line... in fact, at a recent meeting with the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and the Commission, the issue of training was briefly discussed, and I made it very clear that, as far as I am concerned, we should ensure that we provide the best training possible for our own people, to ensure that they have the opportunity to be able to apply for the best jobs in the Civil Service and work their way up the ladder, thus reducing the amount of people we sometimes have to bring in to take jobs.

So I would have thought Members would have welcomed the point that we are investing in our own people to get better jobs within the profession that they have taken up, i.e. the Civil Service.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Michael.

**Mr Cannan:** I want to make it quite clear to the Chief Minister: I completely welcome the training.

But will the Chief Minister agree that now he has disclosed that it is a three-week course at Sunningdale and a five-day course at Harvard, the costs are parity?

Further, will he agree that for the Chief Executive, again, particularly of the DHSS, with which we have reciprocal agreements with the United Kingdom in respect of the National Health Service and Social Security – Home Affairs, in which the Chief Constable is part of the Association of Police Chief Officers, etc – it would be more appropriate to train them with their peers in the United Kingdom with whom they have a day-to-day contact?

**The Speaker:** Chief Minister.

**The Chief Minister:** I would say that it may be more appropriate *not* to have them always training with the United Kingdom Civil Service. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) I think it is important that they are able to get the skills required to ensure that the Isle of Man Government can deal with the United Kingdom civil servants. Also, they may learn skills or be able to get enhanced skills by actually mixing with civil servants from other jurisdictions and being trained by people who are not purely thinking the UK Civil Service way. I would have thought Members would welcome that.

Again, I come back to the point, Mr Speaker, if you take in the 20 days they would have to be at the UK institution and the five days, I think it is, at Harvard and you take in the lost time to them being out of the office, then, in fact, it is a good investment and good value and, I would say, good for the future of the Isle of Man.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Malew and Santon.

**Mr Cregeen:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Can the Chief Minister confirm whether one of these Chief Officers has only got 18 months left to run, before his retirement?

**The Speaker:** Chief Minister.

**The Chief Minister:** He might have; it is irrelevant. And do you mean 18 months until he was 60? Now he can go until 65.

**The Speaker:** Final supplementary, Hon. Member for Onchan.

**Mr Karran:** Would the Ard-shirveishagh not agree that this House supports the issue of training civil servants to get the most efficient way, as far the Isle of Man Government is concerned?

But would the Ard-shirveishagh not recognise, like the previous questioner, when he says he has no problem as Chief Minister with the civil servants, that if he has got a problem, we have all got a problem?

Would he not agree that the situation is that when this initiative is brought out, it is to bring out young blood to try and train it up for the future, not as a retirement present for some at the top?

**The Speaker:** Chief Minister.

**The Chief Minister:** I just think the Hon. Member's words are offensive. We have professional civil servants. The Member stands up continually in this place and another and hammers and criticises Government for its inefficiencies, for the way it deals with people – none of it, by the way... he very rarely justifies, but he says it.

Here we are, investing in our civil servants, to ensure that they gain the skills that we require to ensure the Isle of Man – which is now dealing in a far more global world than ever – is able to do that. Again, I remind the Hon. Member that as far as training is concerned for those at lower grades, that is an issue that the Civil Service is going to be looking at more effectively. There is already training that goes on in that area.

I do think, yes, the House does support what we do, but there are individual Members who do not and who continually abuse civil servants who cannot answer back.

#### **Christmas subsidies Expenditure from public funds**

1.3. The Hon. Member for Rushen (Mr Watterson) to ask the Chief Minister:

*(1) Which Departments and Statutory Boards provide*

- 
- (a) Christmas gifts;*
- (b) Christmas parties out of public funds;*
- (c) leaving presents;*
- (d) social club subsidies; and*

*(2) what was expended in 2006, and how much is expected to be spent in 2007?*

**The Speaker:** Question 3. Hon. Member for Rushen, Mr Watterson.

**Mr Watterson:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.  
I beg leave to ask the Question standing in my name.

**The Speaker:** Again, I call on the Chief Minister.

**The Chief Minister:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.  
In answer to the Hon. Member's Question, I would advise as follows.

With regard to Christmas gifts, I am advised that only the Post Office provides its staff with a Christmas gift by way of a voucher for spending in a local store.

With regard to the Christmas parties, I am advised that the Department of Tourism and Leisure support Christmas events. These are for the Isle of Man Sports Council volunteers who attend meetings throughout the year; and the Department also provides similar assistance for Friends of the Gaiety Theatre and Friends of the Wildlife Park.

I am further advised that the Post Office supports, financially, a children's Christmas party and a pensioners' Christmas party.

With regard to leaving presents, I am advised that the Department of Home Affairs, the Department of Transport, the Post Office and the Water Authority, as a general practice, provide funds towards leaving presents and retirement gifts for staff.

Mr Speaker, with regard to social club trustees, I am advised that the Financial Supervision Commission, the Manx Electricity Authority and the Water Authority have confirmed that they provide a subsidy to staff in relation to social club fees.

Finally, Mr Speaker, I can confirm that a total of £28,763.83 was expended in 2006 and it is expected that £29,503.69 will be spent in 2007.

Thank you, sir.

**The Speaker:** Mr Watterson.

**Mr Watterson:** Thank you.

I suppose the Chief Minister would have to agree that it is a bit of a mix-and-match approach to things, across the board. Would he, as head of the Civil Service Commission and as Chief Minister, agree to review the situation to ensure that the treatment is consistent across Government, perhaps by introducing some sort of guidance?

**The Speaker:** Chief Minister.

**The Chief Minister:** I am happy for that to be looked at, Mr Speaker, but there may well be issues of custom and practice which have to be dealt with.

**The Speaker:** Mr Watterson.

**Mr Watterson:** Would the Chief Minister not agree that ensuring fairness and value for money is slightly more important than custom and practice?

**The Speaker:** Chief Minister.

**The Chief Minister:** I do, sir, but, again, it depends: is the Hon. Member saying nobody should get anything or we should do something for everybody but it should be consistent?

#### **TREASURY**

##### **Isle of Man Stock Exchange Investigating possibility**

1.4. The Hon. Member for Rushen (Mr Watterson) to ask the Minister for the Treasury:

*What work has been done in investigating the possibility*

*of an Isle of Man Stock Exchange?*

**The Speaker:** Question 4. Hon. Member for Rushen, Mr Watterson.

**Mr Watterson:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.  
I beg leave to ask the Question standing in my name.

**The Speaker:** In the absence of the Minister for Treasury, I call on the Hon. Member for Douglas East, Mr Braidwood.

**Mr Braidwood:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Speaker, the concept of an Isle of Man Stock Exchange is not new and has been raised as an idea on several occasions over a number years. It is a subject which the Treasury and its consultative bodies keep under review and discuss periodically.

At this time, there is no formal consideration of the establishment of such an exchange under way: essentially, because to be successful, a certain amount of demand must pre-exist and, historically, this has not been identified nor materialised from soundings within our finance industry.

It will remain a matter that the Treasury, with its consultative bodies, will continue to keep under consideration.

**The Speaker:** Mr Watterson.

**Mr Watterson:** I would love to know how the Hon. Member can justify his points just then, in that there are over 15,000 AIM listed companies on the Isle of Man, many of them listing in the Channel Islands because there is no facility here. I would, therefore, like to know why Treasury is not actively considering this and how he justifies his remarks that there is not the demand for it?

**The Speaker:** Mr Braidwood.

**Mr Braidwood:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Speaker, some consideration was given to this matter in 1998, when Guernsey announced the Channel Islands' Stock Exchange. The move on Guernsey's part was largely due to its early success in attracting funds business and the desire to provide a listing mechanism for those funds.

However, this was at a time when our fund industry was in its infancy, with less than £8 million in assets under administration. More recently, with the advent of the funds review earlier this year, and latterly the banking review, which is presently under way, the subject has, again, been touched upon. We may be revisiting this subject as part of the banking review.

**The Speaker:** Mr Watterson, final supplementary.

**Mr Watterson:** Two parts to the supplementary, Mr Speaker.

What does the Hon. Member consider is the major obstacle in the way of establishing such a body? What is his timetable to report to either this place or Tynwald Court, with regard to the banking reviews that he mentioned?

**The Speaker:** Mr Braidwood.

**Mr Braidwood:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

I think we have got to look in two parts. We can look at the funds, with which Guernsey have started their Stock Exchange, and, of course, with companies raising capital. I think the latter would be far more difficult, because a lot of international companies want to go on the Alternative Investments Market (AIM) or the National Association of Securities Dealers Automated Quotations (NASDAQ). I know, though, we are successful in attracting international companies through the Isle of Man for listing on the AIM.

I think the statutory and the regulatory obstacles would be too much for the Island in that instance; but, particularly for the funds, as I have said, we will look at this again, with having had the review of the funds and, hopefully, in the increase in the asset base.

## HEALTH AND SOCIAL SECURITY

### DHSS Deputy Chief Executive Funding and impact on services

1.5. The Hon. Member for Douglas North (Mr Henderson) to ask the Minister for Health and Social Security:

*In respect of the newly created post of 'Deputy Chief Executive' –*

*(1) how will the sums of money required to create this post and fund its continuance ensure that the current levels of service provision to meet public health needs for now and into the future remain available; and*

*(2) how will the £80,000 per year plus required to resource this post translate to patients awaiting treatment or otherwise from any of the Health Services provisions under this responsibility;*

*and can you explain where your Department managed to find the funding for the newly created post of 'Deputy Chief Executive' and if this funding was –*

*(3) (a) found from within and, if so, where and how;*

*(b) agreed additional funding from Treasury and, if so, did this take precedence over any Department initiatives or otherwise and, if so, what; and*

*(4) what if any impact had this had on the provision of front-line services?*

**The Speaker:** Question 5: Hon. Member for Douglas North, Mr Henderson.

**Mr Henderson:** Gura mie eu, Vainstyr Loayreyder.

Ta mee shirrey kied yn eysht y chur ta fo my ennym. I beg to ask the Question standing in my name.

**The Speaker:** I call the Minister for Health and Social Security, the Hon. Member for Ayre, Mr Teare.

**The Minister for Health and Social Security (Mr Teare):** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

There is no newly created post of Deputy Chief Executive.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member, Mr Henderson.

**Mr Henderson:** Gura mie eu, Vainstyr Loayreyder.

I would ask, Vainstyr Loayreyder, that the Shirveishagh do the House and the members of the public the courtesy of answering the Question more fully as, I would put it to him, he is well aware that he is playing with words. What we are asking here has been asked at another place. He knows the situation I am referring to with the senior official being appointed to his senior management team within Markwell House, and I would re-put the Question to him in that context, Vainstyr Loayreyder.

**The Speaker:** Mr Teare.

**The Minister:** I have already answered the Question, Mr Speaker.

**Mr Henderson:** Vainstyr Loayreyder.

**The Speaker:** Mr Henderson.

**Mr Henderson:** Vainstyr Loayreyder, will the Shirveishagh agree with me that he is deliberately evading the Question, as placed on this Question Paper? He is denying the public the right to the information I am seeking.

Will he agree with me that there has been a post, whatever he wishes to call it, being created in Markwell House which is, in line management terms, directly below the Chief Executive or thereabouts and that it will cost his Department somewhere in the region of £80,000 to £100,000 a year to resource.

**The Speaker:** Minister to reply.

**The Minister:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

I would stress, once again, that whilst the holder of this post, when the appointment is made, will be formally delegated as the Department's Deputy Chief Executive and Chief Operating Officer, the emphasis is on the latter: Chief Operating Officer.

The hon. questioner concentrates exclusively on matters of Health Services, but it is important to make it clear that the post holder will be required to ensure that key organisational matters such as performance management and quality improvement are fully achieved throughout the entire Department.

I am confident that the costs required to invest in this post will be more than compensated for by improved delivery of the Department's services. It should also be noted that the development of this post and other assessments already under way may lead to a reduction in the number of senior posts in other areas.

The Department will monitor closely the performance and the results delivered by the Chief Operating Officer post to satisfy itself that the desired results are being achieved.

The cost of the post have been absorbed from within the current budget of the Department's core services budget. This budget includes, for example, funding for such things as human resource management, finance, public health, occupational health, estates services and the Chief Executive's support function.

As a consequence of ongoing savings already made, the budget allocated to the core services group will be able to form this post on an ongoing basis. Consequently, additional funding has not had to be agreed with the Treasury and there are no effects on the Department's services.

Mr Speaker, I feel that this is a positive step to improve performance management, but I am pragmatic and, if the anticipated results are not achieved by the end of two years, then I will review the relevance of this post.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member, Mrs Cannell.

**Mrs Cannell:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Can I ask the Health Minister, when he says that the post holder, as one of the primary objectives, is the improved delivery of services, will this also include the reducing of Social Services to the people by the way?

**The Speaker:** Minister to reply.

**The Minister:** It is not the reduction of Social Services; it is the protection of Social Services. Unless we can improve our efficiency then, unfortunately, there will be effects on front-line services. That, I am trying to avoid.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member, Mr Henderson.

**Mr Henderson:** Gura mie eu, Vainstyr Loayreyder.

Now that the Shirveishagh has admitted the existence of this post, can he make a categorical statement to this House and the public of the Isle of Man that, in his reply with regard to how he manages to fund this post, there will be no impact now or in the future on front-line Health Services or Social Services that the current public enjoy at this moment, Vainstyr Loayreyder?

**The Speaker:** Minister to reply.

**The Minister:** As I have said, Mr Speaker, this has been funded by savings already made, and I feel that this post does offer the potential to generate extra savings which can be devoted to front-line services.

With the costs of the delivery of the services increasing, not because of the administration side, but because of the costs of medical procedures going up – drugs and everything else right across our range – it is important that we focus on how the services can be delivered more efficiently and more effectively for the benefit of the population.

**The Speaker:** Mr Henderson.

**Mr Henderson:** Gura mie eu, Vainstyr Loayreyder.

Would the Shirveishagh not agree with me that all he is doing is playing around with human resource figures and, in fact, the truth of the reality is that if he has managed to make savings and is able to resource an £80,000-a-year-plus job, would he not agree with me that money would be better used onto the front-line services of the Isle of Man Health Service, in providing the things that people need and that he would be able to do more of the same with this additional money rather than bolstering a failing management team?

**The Speaker:** Mr Teare.

**The Minister:** No. I would suggest that the savings already made are an indication of what can be achieved.

We are criticised here by the Hon. Member for attempting to make savings and for not building on what I regard is a modest success. We can do more and I am pretty sure we will.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Onchan, Mr Karran.

**Mr Karran:** Vainstyr Loayreyder, would the Minister not agree that we all appreciate the problems that he has with the DHSS; but that maybe the other way about this is to actually take other senior members of the Civil Service that manage the DHSS on capability procedures, if they do actually work in order to resolve this issue?

Is that not another way of dealing with the problems that he has inherited from the previous administration, with the DHSS?

**The Speaker:** Minister to reply.

**The Minister:** I agree that there are many ways of addressing the same issue and I will continue to press for improved performance management right across the Department, sir.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Michael.

**Mr Cannan:** Will the Minister acknowledge that, just two years ago, independent consultants were engaged by the DHSS and they recommended that the post of Deputy Chief Executive was surplus to requirement? How is it that the DHSS has managed without a Deputy Chief Executive?

Second part: the Minister states that he will closely monitor this appointment and on the results take necessary action. If this appointment does not fulfil what is intended, does he intend then to disband the appointment?

**The Speaker:** Minister to reply.

**The Minister:** In response to the second part of the question, as I said before, I am pragmatic and if it proves that the results have not been delivered then, yes, the appointment will be reviewed and, if necessary, the post will be abolished.

The Hon. Member for Michael does keep referring to the Deputy Chief Executive. I apologise if he has not already picked it up, but I have said in the Answer to the main Question, it is Chief Operating Officer: that is what we are looking at here. We are looking at the operations.

I would stress that, whilst the previous Report recommended that the post of the Deputy Chief Executive be abolished, it is the Chief Operating Officer that is the area that we are looking at here.

#### **Revised escort criteria Reasons for changes; consultation**

1.6. The Hon. Member for Douglas East (Mrs Cannell) to ask the Minister for Health and Social Security:

*(1) Can you explain the recently revised escort criteria which your Department has approved and the reasons for the changes made; and*

*(2) are you going to consult with Members of Tynwald before such changes are implemented?*

**The Speaker:** Question 6, Hon. Member for Douglas East, Mrs Cannell.

**Mrs Cannell:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I beg leave to ask the Question standing in my name.

**The Speaker:** Again, I call the Minister for Health and Social Security, Mr Teare.

**The Minister for Health and Social Security (Mr Teare):** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The patient escort criteria have been revised and simplified with the assistance of representatives from Noble's Hospital medical and nursing staff and an officer from Health Services.

Concern had been expressed by senior managers and by anecdotal evidence from members of the public about the potential number of patients who are travelling to the UK to receive NHS treatment with an escort, but where an escort was not justified on clinical grounds.

I must emphasise here that escorts should only be provided where it is clinically necessary, and this remains the policy of the Department. As this is primarily a clinical issue, it would not be appropriate to engage in consultation.

**The Speaker:** Mrs Cannell.

**Mrs Cannell:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Will the Minister accept that one of his finance officers within the Department has provided me with the existing criteria, which I am advised are still under practice, and the proposed criteria with the provision of escorts accompanying patients? Does he accept that?

If he does accept that, will he stop trying to hoodwink everybody in this House, by saying that he is making savings, he is trying to simplify the procedure, when in fact the existing criteria which are in place do require clinical assessment, before a patient can be accompanied by an escort?

Will he start telling us some truth, please, and no more spin?

**The Speaker:** Minister to reply.

**The Minister:** It has been simplified, Mr Speaker.

**The Speaker:** Mr Karran.

**Mr Karran:** Vainstyr Loayreyder, would the Shirveishagh not agree that he must stand firm in order to protect this service for the ordinary people of the Isle of Man, as the pressure was put on many years ago, in order to cut this all back, and we managed to stop that nonsense?

Would the Shirveishagh not agree that issues when it comes down to pure medical criteria are rubbish? If you have got an elderly person who is partially sighted or deaf, who has never left the Island for 40 years, who has been told that they have ended up with cancer, they have got to go to Clatterbridge, that in itself means that these people should be given the support of someone coming with them.

What is he trying to do to make sure that we are not ending up with the issue of hard-faced accountancy practice being done on this point, and not ending up with a situation where there is a bit of common sense and compassion, as far as these individuals are concerned?

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member, we are not going down in

debate. You have put your supplementary point. Minister to reply.

**The Minister:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

It is not hard-faced accountancy: I am sure that all the accountants are smiling.

What I would say here – and I would repeat once again – is that this is a clinical decision. It is made on clinical grounds and it is the consultants who make the decision as to whether an escort is appropriate or not.

When patients seek an escort, they often overlook the considerable assistance which is available from our scheduled airline suppliers and also the Liverpool taxi contractors. Between them, they can safely transfer even wheelchair-bound patients from Ronaldsway Airport to their destination hospital and back again. In the case of taxi contractors, this includes taking patients to and collecting them from individual wards and also helping them with their luggage.

**The Speaker:** Mr Houghton, Hon. Member for Douglas North.

**Mr Houghton:** Mr Speaker, has the Department, when considering this whole matter, considered humanitarian grounds? That is what this is all about in respect of the patient transfer services and those people who require the provision of an escort.

May I ask also if the Minister would consider consulting with Members, by the forum of an open presentation with questions, so he can gain the opinions of Members of this Hon. House (**Mr Cannan:** Hear, hear.) in this matter, so it can be conveyed, specifically in this particular issue here, that humanitarian grounds are of paramount importance? Notwithstanding the clinical ability of the patient to travel, does he not acknowledge that those patients are very frightened when they go away to the United Kingdom hospitals and that must be taken into account? (**Mr Karran:** Hear, hear.)

May I ask if the Speaker would allow the arranging of such a presentation, so that we can discuss this much more fully, in a better forum, sir?

**The Speaker:** The Minister to reply.

**The Minister:** I appreciate that there are difficulties for patients: I have had family experience of that, so I do know the difficulties that families face.

I would make it clear that there were nearly 4,000 escort transfers which occurred during 2006-07, which represented about 40 per cent of the total numbers of people travelling at DHSS expense. I feel that this is a clinical matter and it should be clinically decided by the clinicians – people who are qualified to assess the patients' needs.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Douglas East, Mrs Cannell.

**Mrs Cannell:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

When the Minister says he thinks this should be the decision of the clinicians, will he not confirm that in fact that is the way it has always been operated; that the clinician has always had to tick a box on a form to recommend whether or not the patient requires an escort?

The difference is that, currently, the clinician can look at nine categories and decide which one his or her patient falls under, whereas the proposal limits it to four categories. There is a huge difference and it is not just a case of simplifying.

Will he further confirm that currently a person with limited mobility including blindness and deafness, a person suffering from life-threatening conditions and a person undergoing painful life-threatening operative procedures, where emotional support is considered essential, are three of the main categories that he is dropping and that is simply not acceptable?

**Mr Houghton:** Hear, hear.

**The Speaker:** Minister to reply.

**The Minister:** I stand by my original comments, that this is a clinical decision and it has simplified the criteria for the benefit of the clinician, sir.

**The Speaker:** We are getting into a wide debate. I will permit two more supplementaries.

Hon. Member for Douglas North.

**Mr Houghton:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. Minister did not give reply as to whether he would be willing to hold a presentation discussion on this with Hon. Members, or would he rather have this thrashed out on the floor of Tynwald, sir?

**Mrs Cannell:** Yes, with a motion.

**The Minister:** I am quite happy to answer, but I really feel that this a clinical matter and that we should consider and also respect the opinions of the clinicians, sir.

**Mr Houghton:** Bring them with you.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Michael.

**Mr Cannan:** The Minister has consistently laboured that it is a clinical decision. The clinical decision is determined by his guidelines and his guidelines, will the Minister admit, on the new formula, have been reduced? So it is a clinical decision on new guidelines which he, the Minister, has determined – not the clinician.

**The Speaker:** Minister to reply.

**The Minister:** I have nothing further to add, sir.

**The Speaker:** Final supplementary, Mrs Cannell.

**Mrs Cannell:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Can I ask the Minister what savings he is looking to make in cutting back this particular social service to the people? Does he want to go down on record as the first Health Minister ever to be able to stand up in a budget debate and say 'I made savings'; but in so doing, does he appreciate that where he is making the savings, it is hitting the most vulnerable within our population and it is not good enough?

**Mr Houghton and Mr Cannan:** Hear, hear.

**The Minister:** This is driven by a need to simplify it and also by more than anecdotal evidence that the escort system was open to abuse. (**Mrs Craine:** Hear, hear.) We are trying to, in effect, determine that the Department's resources, which are finite, are targeted and are accurately used.

I was told by a colleague who was at patient transfer that there was a client there complaining because they could not get the flights that they wanted, because it did not allow them time to undertake a shopping trip. Now, we have got to try and make sure that what we are paying for is relevant and it is targeted. That really needs to go right throughout the Department, Mr Speaker, I would suggest.

### **Adults with learning disabilities Transport to day services**

1.7. The Hon. Member for Douglas East (Mrs Cannell) to ask the Minister for Health and Social Security:

- (1) *With regard to the transport for adults with learning disabilities to day services, did you consult with the users of this service and their families before taking the decision to cancel the contract with the transport service provider; and, if not*  
(2) *why not?*

**The Speaker:** Question 7, Hon. Member for Douglas East, Mrs Cannell.

**Mrs Cannell:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.  
I beg leave to ask the Question standing in my name.

**The Speaker:** Minister for Health and Social Security.

**The Minister for Health and Social Security (Mr Teare):** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The Department has a commitment to provide appropriate social care services through the Department's Social Services Division for people with learning disabilities and their families. The Department provides a range of daytime activities at Eastcliffe Resource Centre and other locations primarily in the Douglas area for people with learning difficulties.

In order to support families, a service has been made available for the past for whoever needs it to transport people between their houses and these daytime activities. This service has been provided by a local transport company.

A survey of families and service users was undertaken in December 2006 with regard to transport arrangements, but the results were inconclusive. This transport is very expensive relative to the number of people transported, and it is the Department's belief that better value can be obtained by spending the money in other ways for the benefit of people with learning difficulties. As a result, the Department has decided to end the current transport arrangements on 1st February 2008.

Officers of the Department have commenced working with all users and families to see what options are available to them and what arrangements can be put in place, which could include, for example: transport sharing; extending hours of opening to meet family needs, where the family could otherwise provide transport; and helping some people

to travel independently.

The Department will ensure that all users of the care service will be able to continue with a normal range of activities, sir.

**The Speaker:** Mrs Cannell.

**Mrs Cannell:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Speaker, has the Minister any knowledge or any insight at all into how difficult life is for people with physical and mental disabilities in their families in getting access to any kind of support from Government, where they have to fight for every penny and every inch of grace that is given them? Does he appreciate that?

Has he no compassion here in terms of wanting to sever a contract because it is too expensive?

Can he explain what Minister in any Government decides to sever a contract before consulting with the users and putting in place an alternative proposal.

**The Speaker:** Minister to reply.

**The Minister:** I would go back to the main Question, Mr Speaker, and I repeat: a survey of families and service users was undertaken in December 2006.

This is not an effective way; it is a very expensive way. It equates to approximately £34 per person per day and these are people travelling mainly from the Douglas area. By encouraging some of those people who are able to undertake personal transport to go back into public transport, then we are helping them to get back into the community and become part of the community.

I feel that it is incumbent on the Department to look at the activities we undertake and the way that we undertake them.

**The Speaker:** Mrs Cannell.

**Mrs Cannell:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Can the Minister give us an idea of how many people this is, in fact, going to affect, in terms of curbing their freedom to be able to enjoy a day centre and also giving essential respite to the family? Does he not accept that people with these disabilities would be travelling independently if they could and they were able, without the assistance of their families – and that they would be doing that already.

**The Speaker:** Minister.

**The Minister:** I feel that this needed to be reviewed, I am quite happy it is being reviewed and I would stress that only 30 per cent of the service users actually use the transport service.

**The Speaker:** Mr Karran.

**Mr Karran:** Vainstyr Loayreyder, would the Shirveishagh not agree that, like his Chief Minister, the fact is that many of us support the policies that they want to try and do, but the way that they go about it...

The idea of getting a better transport facility for the disabled is an excellent policy, but would he not agree that what he is ending up proposing will mean that there will be more disabled people left at home, with people who just will

not be able to cope and they will just end up having less social intervention that this very vulnerable section really needs?

**The Speaker:** Minister to reply.

**The Minister:** Could I just go back to the main Answer again and I quote: 'The Department will ensure that all users of the care services will be able to continue with their normal range of activities'. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

**Mr Henderson:** How? How?

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Douglas East.

**Mrs Cannell:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The Minister has not answered my previous Question. In fact, he has not answered anything this morning that is worthy of note.

**The Minister:** At least I'm consistent (*laughter*) – which is more than you!

**Mrs Cannell:** Can he give us the figure of people, rather than talk in percentages, which is 'bank manager' spin? Will he give us the figures, as a Health Minister, on how many individual people this will affect?

**The Speaker:** Minister to reply.

**Mr Watterson:** I'll tell you, sir.

**The Minister:** We are not affecting a significant number of people: it is *up to* 24 people per day, but that is the maximum per day.

Really, I feel, myself, that with only 30 per cent of the service users actually using the transport service, it is right that we should have a look at the whole system of transport.

#### North West Cancer Intelligence Service data DHSS analysis

1.8. The Hon. Member for Michael (Mr Cannan) to ask the Minister for Health and Social Security:

(1) *Has the Isle of Man Health Service for the last seven years been collecting cancer registration data which has been collated via the North West Cancer Intelligence Service and paid for by the DHSS;*

(2) *in respect of the data collected, has the Isle of Man Health Service retained the responsibility for analysing and publishing this data;*

(3) *will you instruct the Chief Medical Officer of Health to release this data forthwith and thereafter on an annual basis; and*

(4) *what has been the total cost of the service provided by the North West Cancer Intelligence Service over the past seven years?*

**The Speaker:** Question 8, Hon. Member for Michael.

**Mr Cannan:** I ask the Question standing in my name.

**The Speaker:** Minister for Health and Social Security.

**The Minister for Health and Social Security (Mr Teare):** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

In response to part (1), yes, it was originally with the Merseyside and Cheshire Cancer Registry, who changed their name for the Liverpool based office to North West Cancer Intelligence Service.

Part (2): the data belongs to the Isle of Man and, from this point of view, the responsibility for analysing the data is ours. This does not mean that we have to analyse the data ourselves. On grounds of cost-effectiveness and quality, it is often preferable that the analysis of this data is carried out by someone who is regularly analysing such data. The data is being analysed by the Merseyside and Cheshire Cancer Registry, who will provide comparative data for the northwest of England.

With due respect, I would wish to point out there is no post called the Chief Medical Officer of Health in the Department of Health and Social Security.

I am aware that the analysis of our cancer data is being progressed under the auspices of the Cancer Task-force and I will ask the Chair of the Cancer Task-force to ensure that the data is published in a format that can be understood easily. The contract is with the Merseyside and Cheshire Cancer Network and the cost of the contract is £7,500 per annum, giving a cost of over the last seven years of £52,500.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Michael.

**Mr Cannan:** I thank the Minister for his reply, but I ask him: when will this comparative data be published? Surely the comparative data for the last seven years must be already available.

Will he, therefore, authorise its immediate publication and will he undertake to provide the comparative data on an annual basis?

**The Speaker:** Minister to reply.

**The Minister:** Going back to the last question first, publishing the data on an annual basis does present difficulties, because the Isle of Man is a small population – just over 80,000 – and to extract data from a small sample area can be misleading because, at times, there are pockets and they could distort the longer term view. Nevertheless, as I said in the first Answer, I will ask the Chair of the Cancer Task-force to ensure that the data is published – and I will press for it to be published.

**The Speaker:** Final supplementary, Mr Cannan.

**Mr Cannan:** Will the Minister agree that the people of the Isle of Man have a right to know the extent of the cancer assessments of the people in the Isle of Man?

Will he agree, as he has already done, that there should be no further delay in publishing those figures, as I believe the people of the Isle of Man have a right to the information?

**The Speaker:** Minister.

**The Minister:** I am quite happy to look into it, sir.

**Breast screening recall system  
Date for introduction**

1.9. The Hon. Member for Michael (Mr Cannan) to ask the Minister for Health and Social Security:

*Have you now set a definitive date for the introduction of a breast screening recall system?*

**The Speaker:** Question 9, Hon. Member for Michael.

**Mr Cannan:** I ask the Question standing in my name, sir.

**The Speaker:** Again, I call the Minister for Health and Social Security, Mr Teare.

**The Minister for Health and Social Security (Mr Teare):** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

In answer to the Hon. Member's Question, I can advise that, following a series of delays outside of the Department's control, the required licence issued by the UK National Programme has recently been received. This has enabled the Department to progress its implementation plan, incorporating the necessary IT requirements for a breast screening call and recall programme.

The Department is now working with others towards a provisional date for the introduction of the new system of late January 2008. Whilst, at this stage, the date is subject to the external partners in the project confirming that they can undertake their key tasks within the deadline set down, the Department remains optimistic that it will be in a position to formally confirm the date identified in the near future.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Michael.

**Mr Cannan:** I thank the Minister for his reply.

**EDUCATION**

**Vending machines in schools  
Policy**

1.10. The Hon. Member for Rushen (Mr Watterson) to ask the Minister for Education:

*What is the policy regarding sweet and drink vending machines in schools?*

**The Speaker:** Question 10, Hon. Member for Rushen, Mr Watterson.

**Mr Watterson:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.  
I beg leave to ask the Question standing in my name.

**The Speaker:** I now call the Minister for Education, the Hon. Member for Ramsey, Mrs Craine.

**The Minister for Education (Mrs Craine):** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The Department of Education's policy on the use of vending machines in schools was based on advice from

Public Health in 2003 and on feedback from head teachers. The policy is that drinking water and healthy snacks containing low sugar and salt should be encouraged in schools and that the less healthy drinks and snacks should be discouraged.

The Department's officers and head teachers have liaised with the Island's main supplier of vending machines to ensure that the policy can be delivered. This is further strengthened by the Department's policy on health futures, developed in conjunction with the Department of Health and Social Security, and the Department of Tourism and Leisure

**The Speaker:** Mr Watterson.

**Mr Watterson:** Does the Minister believe that it is now time for it to be stepped up from a matter of encouragement to a matter of making this mandatory?

**The Speaker:** Minister to reply.

**The Minister:** I think that if the Hon. Member can advise me where this policy is not implemented in schools I would be most pleased to know.

I do not think that it is necessary to make it 'mandatory'. Certainly, there has to be an element of choice and that choice does, I know, exist at the Isle of Man College, where it is accepted that adults are making a decision about what they choose to obtain from vending machines.

We have been working with the vending machine providers, in order to ensure that the snacks and drinks that are in those machines are of a healthy nature. I believe that the policy is being carried out at the present time, Mr Speaker.

**TRANSPORT**

**Isle of Man Coastguard  
Cost of operation**

1.11. The Hon. Member for Malew and Santon (Mr Cregeen) to ask the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What was the cost of operating (staff and equipment) the Isle of Man Coastguard for each year for the past five years;*
- (2) what is the total number of staff for each of the past five years; and*
- (3) what are the predicted costs and staffing levels if the Department was to take over coastguard services from the UK?*

**The Speaker:** Question 11, Hon. Member for Malew and Santon.

**Mr Cregeen:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.  
I beg leave to ask the Question standing in my name.

**The Speaker:** I call the Minister for Transport, the Hon. Member for Glenfaba, Mr Anderson.

**The Minister for Transport (Mr Anderson):** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

In answer to part (1), in 2002-03, £282,495; in 2003-04, £297,674; in 2004-05, £393,597; in 2005-06, £386,930; and in 2006-07, £456,179.

In answer to part (2), which was 'What is the total number of staff for each of the past 5 years?' In 2002-03 there were three full time staff, and 80 volunteer rescue team members at Douglas, Castletown, Port Erin, Peel and Ramsey; in 2003-04 there were three full time staff, and 80 volunteer rescue teams at those venues; in 2004-05 there were four full time staff and the same number of 80 volunteer rescue team members; in 2005-06 there were four full time staff, with 80 volunteer rescue team members; and in 2006-07 there were four full time staff and 80 volunteer rescue members.

In answer to part (3), which was 'What are the predicted costs and staffing levels if the Department will take over the Coastguard services from the UK?' From November 2008, it is the Department's intention for all 999 Coastguard telephone calls originating in the Island to be handled, in the first instance, by a marine operations centre based on the current Douglas harbour control.

The staff and other resources required to handle these calls will be the same as that which will be required to operate a future Coastguard service for the whole of the Manx waters and would be found from existing staff and resources within the Isle of Man Coastguard and Douglas harbour control. The predicted costs and staffing levels are, therefore, based on the same costs and staffing levels as incurred now.

The reason that there is no significant change is the combination of the Isle of Man Coastguard, and Douglas harbour control are already equipped and resourced to provide the necessary service. Douglas harbour control is staffed by 12 full time staff, working a shift system to provide two staff 24 hours per day for the whole year. Douglas harbour control is not identified separately within the Department's accounting system, but the costs of operating it, in terms of staff and equipment replacement and maintenance, is approximately as follows – staff £549,000, technical support £50,000 and equipment £25,000, giving us a total of £624,000.

As indicated in the Answer to the first Question, the Isle of Man Coastguard currently costs approximately £456,000 per annum and employs four full time and 80 volunteer staff. In total, therefore, Douglas harbour control and Isle of Man Coastguard currently costs approximately £1,080,000, employing 16 full time and 80 volunteer staff. The predicted costs and staff requirement of the provision of a full Coastguard service can, therefore, be achieved within the existing resources.

**The Speaker:** Mr Cregeen.

**Mr Cregeen:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Can the Minister confirm whether he was requested to take over this service or not?

**The Speaker:** Minister to reply.

**The Minister:** Mr Speaker, it is a well-known fact that the situation in the UK is very fluid. It is possible, in the future, that Liverpool service might be moved to another section of the UK and it was thought best that we should have control of emergencies within our own territorial waters.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Rushen, Mr Gill.

**Mr Gill:** Could the Minister advise us, when he says 'it was thought best', who it was who thought best? Secondly, could he advise us if he is aware that, contrary to the principles which he is espousing today, in the Department of Home Affairs the Fire and Rescue Service have entered into an agreement, for entirely professionally justifiable reasons, for maritime fire fighting and rescue duties to be undertaken by suitably qualified and trained services from around the Irish Sea – but not to the Isle of Man, because we are too small a service to have our own discrete and stand-alone service. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) That is entirely appropriate, and yet we seem to be having a situation where the Coastguard are saying that we will have to have our own service.

I certainly could not follow the logic that the Minister was describing in his lengthy Answer. Perhaps he would also be kind enough, therefore, to circulate a written business case outlining the detail which he has given us in form and describing the *raison d'être* for the new stand-alone service he has described, sir.

**The Speaker:** Minister to reply.

**The Minister:** Yes, Mr Speaker, in answer to the Hon. Member for Rushen, he gives quite a lot of information about the Home Affairs Division which I am not aware of.

However, we have full confidence that, by taking over this service, it gives us more control, it actually enables us to use the other services if we require them, but in the first instance it was handled through the Douglas harbour control and the Hon. Member makes reference to whose decision is this. This was a recommendation coming forward from the division within the Department. It was made politically.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Rushen, Mr Watterson.

**Mr Watterson:** Thank you.

Given that we will effectively be taking over part of a service from the UK, will not the Department of Transport be receiving any compensating payment from the British Government in respect of this?

**The Speaker:** Minister.

**The Minister:** I think the Hon. Member misses the point here, Mr Speaker.

We are actually... a lot of those calls would be transferred to the Island, anyway. We work in co-operation with the Liverpool Coastguard and if there are reasons why we should continue to use their service, they will be redirected to them.

What we are doing here is actually saving a link in the chain on very many occasions – and on many of those occasions it is more appropriate that the Isle of Man deal with those emergencies.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Douglas North, Mr Houghton.

**Mr Houghton:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Bearing in mind the Minister stated that this decision for the marine operation centre is a political one, would he be willing, at some time in the near future, to meet other

interested parties with concerned politicians in order to discuss this matter further, sir.

**The Speaker:** Minister.

**The Minister:** Mr Speaker, this question the Hon. Member for North Douglas raises, and has raised before: he is well aware that consultation has taken place with other agencies.

There are certainly individuals with an agency that are unhappy, but those agencies that we consult with at the higher level are very content this is the best way forward.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member, Mr Gill.

**Mr Gill:** Thank you.

Could the Minister confirm that when he talks about 'at a political level', he actually means himself? Secondly, if he is disinclined to put out the briefing paper I asked him to, would he, instead, arrange a briefing for Tynwald Members, sir?

**The Speaker:** Minister.

**The Minister:** I am happy to confirm that a political decision was made by members of the Department after we had a policy and strategy presentation to the members of the Department.

I am happy, Mr Speaker, to circulate that policy strategy to Hon. Members and also give the invitation which has already been accepted by a couple of the Members of this Hon. House to come down to harbour control to see how exactly it can be effectively implemented.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Michael.

**Mr Cannan:** In respect of the comments and supplementary questions previously posed – in particular, by Hon. Member for Rushen, Mr Gill – will the Minister agree that this is basically a duplication of a service which is already (**Mr Houghton:** Hear, hear.) capable of being provided in the new TETRA system to which the Member for Rushen has alluded – a duplication of service and a duplication of cost?

Finally, will the Minister agree that, when he says it is a political decision of the Department, he and he alone as Minister must accept that it is his decision? (**Mr Houghton:** Hear, hear.)

**The Speaker:** Minister.

**The Minister:** I agree with the Hon. Member for Michael – his interpretation – ultimately it is the Minister responsible on the part of it and it is the Minister's decision, but I have the full backing of political members within my Department and I am very happy it was a unanimous decision –

**Mr Cannan:** You won't on the Council of Ministers!

**The Minister:** – and, as far as the other avenue the Hon. Member mentioned – which I think he will have to remind

me of...

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Michael.

**Mr Cannan:** Can I remind him? (*Laughter*) I am sorry he has lost his powers of concentration! (*Laughter*)

Mr Speaker, I said: would the Minister not consider it was a duplication of service and a duplication of expense when, as already clearly detailed by the Hon. Member for Rushen, there was a positive service provided by the new TETRA system of Government to which the Air and Rescue Maritime Division has already subscribed?

**The Speaker:** Minister.

**The Minister:** No, Mr Speaker.

**The Speaker:** Final supplementary, Mr Cregeen.

**Mr Cregeen:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Can the Minister confirm whether Air Sea Rescue will come under the cost of his new Coastguard service, when this has been taken into consideration?

If this service does turn out to be more costly than the Minister has said, there is no way of going back: we are stuck with it, rather than at the moment we have got limited costs involved in this service. He is exposing us to even more cost.

**Mr Houghton:** Hear, hear.

**Mr Cannan:** Hear, hear.

**The Speaker:** Minister.

**The Minister:** No, Mr Speaker, we are not actually exposing ourselves to any extra costs at all. (*Interjections*)

**Standing Order 3.5.1(2) suspended  
to take remaining Questions for Oral Answer**

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Douglas North, Mr Houghton.

**Mr Houghton:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I beg to move the suspension of Standing Order 3.5.1(2) to permit the remaining Questions for Oral Answer to be taken at this Sitting, sir.

**Mr Cannan:** I beg to second, sir, and hope the House will support it, as there is very little other business on the Agenda.

**The Speaker:** Is that agreed, Hon. Members?

Division called. Suspension requires 16 affirmative votes. Please vote now.

*A division was called for and electronic voting resulted as follows:*

**FOR**

Mr Quirk  
Mr Karran  
Mr Crookall  
Mr Anderson  
Mrs Craine  
Mr Quayle  
Mr Cannan  
Mr Cregeen  
Mr Houghton  
Mr Henderson  
Mr Malarkey  
Mrs Cannell  
Mr Braidwood  
Mr Corkish  
Mr Shimmin  
Mr Cretney  
The Speaker

**AGAINST**

Mr Brown  
Mr Watterson  
Mr Gill

**The Speaker:** The motion carries, with 17 votes for, 3 votes against.

**Victoria Pier  
Public access during winter**

1.12. The Hon. Member for Douglas North (Mr Houghton) to ask the Minister for Transport:

*Will you consider opening the Victoria Pier to public access during the winter period when not in use?*

**The Speaker:** Question 12. Hon. Member for Douglas North, Mr Houghton.

**Mr Houghton:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.  
I beg leave to ask the Question standing in my name, sir.

**The Speaker:** Minister for Transport, Mr Anderson.

**The Minister for Transport (Mr Anderson):** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Victoria Pier is a designated berth for passenger vessels and, as such, comes under the International Ship and Port Safety Code. In discharging the Island's international obligations of this Code, the Department is required to work within the terms of the Maritime Security Act and the Douglas Harbour and Elevated Walkway (Restricted Zone) Order 2002.

In terms of the Victoria Pier, this Order applies to the whole of the Pier seaward of the blue security gate and by this Order the Victoria Pier is a restricted zone. No person is permitted access to the restricted zone without the permission of the Department. The purpose of the International Ship and Port Security Code, Maritime Security Act and Restricted Zone Order is to protect the safety of port facilities, ships and passengers by limiting public access. The Department is, therefore, unable to grant unrestricted public access.

The Department recognised some years ago that, during periods when the Pier was not required for passenger vessel operation, it could, under certain conditions, permit access for organised angling events. In close co-operation with the various angling clubs, the Department has a well-established process by which angling clubs can gain access for their organised events. In 2007 thirty such events have been

scheduled, with the Douglas, Peel and Ramsey Angling Clubs. The system of gaining access under these conditions has matured to the point that, even at very short notice, access can be granted.

Hon. Members will be aware the Steam Packet's current winter operating schedule operated by the *Ben-my-Chree* normally uses the Edward Pier link-span in Douglas Harbour. However, if for any reason this link-span is unavailable, the Victoria Pier link-span is used in its place. Therefore, the need for the *Ben-my-Chree* to berth on the Victoria Pier could occur on any day at very short notice. For this reason, the Department is mindful of the need to retain the required level of security on the Victoria Pier at all times.

Notwithstanding the reasons for the current restrictions on access to Victoria Pier, the Department will review the present arrangements to determine if there is an opportunity to permit greater public access and, if there is, to determine what would be the likely operational and cost implications.

**The Speaker:** Mr Houghton.

**Mr Houghton:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

I am staggered at the Hon. Minister's reply, especially the latter part, with him saying about cost implications, Mr Speaker.

Can he say what additional cost implications it will cost to throw the Pier open, as to the nonsensical costs whilst the Pier is kept closed when there are no vessels using that Pier, sir?

**Mr Cannan:** Absolutely.

**The Speaker:** Minister to reply.

**The Minister:** Mr Speaker, I have not got the cost cost (*Laughter*) – the implications of that – but what I am saying to the Hon. Member is that I have asked for a review of this system and hope to be able to come back to the Hon. Member within a couple of weeks with the results of that review.

**Traffic management  
Minor accident in July**

1.13. The Hon. Member for Douglas North (Mr Houghton) to ask the Minister for Transport:

*Has your Department reviewed its traffic management strategy following a minor road traffic collision near the Nunnery on the old Castletown Road which occurred at 6 p.m. on Thursday 26th July 2007 and caused a two-hour traffic gridlock throughout lower Douglas?*

**The Speaker:** Question 13, Hon. Member for Douglas North, Mr Houghton.

**Mr Houghton:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.  
I beg leave to ask the Question standing in my name, sir.

**The Speaker:** Minister for Transport, Mr Anderson.

**The Minister for Transport (Mr Anderson):** Mr

Speaker, lower Douglas is served by four primary routes: Douglas Promenade; Lord Street and Peel Road; Bucks Road and Woodbourne Road; and, fourthly, Leigh Terrace, Old Castletown Road and New Castletown Road.

The accident which occurred on 26th July of this year occurred between 5.00 p.m. and 6.00 p.m. during the evening peak commuter period and involved a collision between a supervised learner driver overtaking a stationary vehicle and a heavy goods vehicle coming in the other direction. This resulted in the road being closed for a substantial period of time while these damaged vehicles were recovered.

The 1,300 vehicles per hour that use this road were diverted onto Peel Road and other roads in the area. This exacerbated the normal levels of congestion on the other three primary distributor routes.

The Department will not be reviewing its traffic management strategy for lower Douglas following this incident for the following reasons: the accident records on all four routes are good, with a low number of serious or fatal accidents which would require lengthy evidence for collection and investigation of the scene; the likelihood of a similar incident occurring are remote; and the requirement for road closures for long periods of time to facilitate the removal of vehicles involved in road traffic accidents – applications within a 30-mph or 40-mph speed restricted area are rare – and when they are required are usually being shut for a short duration.

**The Speaker:** Mr Watterson.

**Mr Watterson:** Thank you.

Will the Minister join with me in congratulating the Member for Douglas North in his quick and hasty response to this issue of July this year? Has he seen the response by Inspector Flint, the Inspector of the Traffic Police, in response to a query I put to him on this incident at the time?

**The Speaker:** Minister for Transport.

**The Minister:** I would not comment on the first part of the question the Hon. Member poses, but I would say that we have been in discussions with the Constabulary in relation to this incident and we are content that the actions taken were appropriate.

**A Member:** Yes.

**The Speaker:** Mr Houghton.

**Mr Houghton:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Would the Minister join with me in congratulating the Hon. Member sitting behind me about advising on road traffic matters, when he does not even have a road traffic licence himself! (*Laughter*) That is the first point. (*Interjections*)

**Mr Watterson:** You talk about money here – you are not an accountant, John!

**Mr Houghton:** Secondly, does he have consideration, Mr Speaker... Does the Minister have consideration for the issues to do with access to the South Pier, should there be an emergency when the whole of lower Douglas is completely gridlocked due to a minor accident, when those vehicles should have been towed out of the way by police vehicles

in order to keep the traffic moving?

Would he pursue a new policy whereby vehicles, when they are blocking the road – similar to motorways in the UK – would ensure that vehicles are removed, not left in position for hours waiting for recovery vehicles in order to move them, causing such a very serious gridlock that cause antagonism with thousands of our motorists at that time of night, sir?

**The Speaker:** Minister to reply, not to the flippant first part, but to the second. (*Laughter*)

**The Minister:** To the flippant second part! (*Laughter*)

**The Speaker:** The second part.

**The Minister:** In answer to the Hon. Member, I would say that the vehicles have to be removed from the road in an appropriate manner.

I do not know, is the Hon. Member aware that passengers in these vehicles actually had to be cut out of these vehicles. That is a priority and that is why the road was closed. Until you know the level of injury, that is the appropriate measure to take.

#### Steam Packet Company

#### Lack of winter day trips and all-weather fast craft

1.14. The Hon. Member for Onchan (Mr Karran) to ask the Minister for Transport:

- (1) *Following the questions about the User Agreement in this House, are you aware of how many on-line petitions there have been about winter day trips and the lack of an all-weather fast conventional ferry;*
- (2) *have you had meetings with the Steam Packet to discuss these issues, and is the Steam Packet, together with CoMin, hiding behind the User Agreement; and*
- (3) *if so, what have been the results of talks with the Steam Packet Company?*

**The Speaker:** Question 14. Hon. Member for Onchan, Mr Karran.

**Mr Karran:** Vainstyr Loayreyder, I ask the Question standing in my name.

**The Speaker:** Again, Minister for Transport, Mr Anderson.

**The Minister for Transport (Mr Anderson):** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

In answer to the first part of the Question, the Department is aware that there is an on-line petition that was created by Mr Frank Schuengel on *PetitionOnline.com*.

The Office of Fair Trading has advised that it expects Mr Schuengel to submit the petition to them in the near future and a meeting has been arranged between the Department and the Office of Fair Trading to discuss the contents of that petition.

The Department is also aware that there are, in addition to the on-line petition, other websites where members of the

public have filed a variety of comments regarding various aspects of the Steam Packet service, including comments regarding the changes to this year's winter schedule. From passenger figures available to the Department, it would appear that some of the comments expressed are from people who are not regular Steam Packet users. However, there are also reports that another poll conducted online, IrishSeaShips Yahoo group, indicated 88 per cent approval for the new winter timetable, so some would appear to recognise the advantages of enhanced reliability. It is for the Company, in reviewing these comments and other feedback, to determine whether or not there is enhanced demand for day trips to Liverpool.

In respect of the Hon. Member's comments regarding an all-weather, fast, conventional ferry, the Steam Packet has never operated such a vessel. It has operated either fast-craft such as the *SeaCat Isle of Man* and the *SuperSeaCat II* with service speeds in excess of 30 knots, or conventional ferries such as the *King Orry*, *Lady of Mann* and *Ben my Chree*, with service speeds in the range of 19 knots to 21 knots maximum.

The vessel referred to by the Hon. Member would be a conventional ferry with a service speed of approximately 25 knots. These vessels are normally significantly larger than the *Ben my Chree*, which would give operational problems in both Douglas and Heysham. In any case, the speed differential is not likely to offer significant reductions in passenger time and also the vessel would be relatively expensive to purchase and operate. The Department is aware the Company keeps such vessels under review for potential fleet improvements.

In relation to part (2), as I advised the Hon. Member on 30th October, the Department maintains regular and frequent contact with the Company at several levels, including a monthly meeting at senior management level. Improvement of the Company service is a topic which is regularly discussed. The Department uses each opportunity to press for improvements that range across the whole of the Company's business, including scheduling, special offers, terminal facilities in the UK, the booking website, on-board catering and the number of day excursions.

I am pleased to confirm that the revised winter schedule, which the Steam Packet is currently operating, meets the terms of the User Agreement.

In relation to part (3), the outcome of the recent discussions with the Steam Packet Company resulted in a review by the Company of the opportunities to use the *SuperSeaCat II* for the weekend service to Liverpool. The Company later confirmed that it would continue to operate the revised schedule, whereby *Ben my Chree* operates a daytime return sailing to Liverpool Birkenhead on Saturdays and Sundays until the return of the *SuperSeaCat* inter-service on 8th March 2008.

The Company have also clarified, for the benefit of those people who had booked day returns before the announcement was made, changes in the availability of a complimentary coach service to connect with the overnight *Ben my Chree* service from Heysham. The Company also announced two offers, the first being a day-trip offer fare of car plus four passengers for £99, including fuel surcharge, and a second, a Christmas foot-passenger special for £25 return. The Company also has a four-day, mid-week return for car plus two for £99. The Department will use the output from the various public comments and petitions as items of

discussion with the Company regarding potential service improvements.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member, Mr Karran.

**Mr Karran:** Thanking the Shirveishagh for his reply, would he be prepared to circulate what would be on an agenda paper between his Department and the Steam Packet, so that Hon. Members can see what is actually being asked for, as the policers of the User Agreement?

Would the Shirveishagh not also agree that the issue is that these fast-craft boats are not suitable for winter service and with the likes of the price of fuel going up to £100 a dollar (*Laughter and interjections*) – a hundred dollars a barrel – would the Shirveishagh not agree that it is in our interest to try and get this issue addressed, allowing for the fact that we have a one-ship operation that has got a price-tag of a quarter of a billion pounds? Surely the time has come for his Department to start looking after the citizens of the Isle of Man.

**The Speaker:** Three-part supplementary, Minister.

**The Minister:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

As far as the request the Hon. Member makes about the agenda, I think I have highlighted the agenda items that are regularly on the table with the Isle of Man Steam Packet Company and I would agree with the Hon. Member about the fast craft are not suitable for use at this time of the year. In fact, my information is that in all but one of the recent weekends the fast craft service would not have operated on at least one day in those weekends.

As far the fuel costs are concerned – and the Hon. Member is concerned about the costs – I believe the Isle of Man Steam Packet is operating a service which could be seen to be friendly, as far as the environment is concerned, because they are utilising that craft in a more appropriate fashion.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Douglas East, Mrs Cannell.

**Mrs Cannell:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Does the Minister think it is friendly for the Steam Packet to have made an announcement this morning to say that the one vessel which they are currently operating will not be sailing today and will not be sailing tomorrow morning because of some kind of mechanical breakdown? If the Steam Packet are unable to actually repair that in a swift manner, and we do not have any vessels servicing the Isle of Man for passengers and vehicles, will the Minister then be happy with the User Agreement, in that they are not complying with it?

**The Speaker:** Minister for Transport.

**The Minister:** Mr Speaker, the Hon. Member is correct that one rotation has been dropped by the Isle of Man Steam Packet Company. They have taken the opportunity of this extreme weather that has been forecast and the opportunity to do some servicing to one of their engines, or thruster-bowed engines, on the *Ben my Chree*. I think that is a prudent thing to do.

They have an obligation under the User Agreement: I am

sure they will honour that.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Onchan.

**Mr Karran:** Vainstyr Loayreyder, would the Shirveishagh not agree that, whilst he might be a gentleman, the situation is that he is dealing with hard-faced businessmen who really are taking the mick, as far as the life-line of the Island is concerned, due to the lack of proper scrutiny of the User Agreement, when we nodded it through the last time?

Would he not agree that the issue is that it is unacceptable with the profit margin that the Steam Packet has, that he must know that this is a situation where we are left with one boat and at the mercy of that one boat, as far as the life-line of this Island and it is not acceptable for good governance?

**The Speaker:** Let us not debate it. Minister for Transport.

**The Minister:** Mr Speaker, the Hon. Member gives an opinion that we know he holds strongly, but as far as I am concerned the Isle of Man Steam Packet is living by the terms of the Agreement that we have with them.

## TRADE AND INDUSTRY

### Isle of Man Post Unfair trading

1.15. The Hon. Member for Onchan (Mr Karran) to ask the Minister for Trade and Industry:

*(1) Do you agree that it is wrong for Isle of Man Post, which is a subsidised body and whose new Isle of Man Post parcels depot was built at Government expense, to compete against other local parcel carriers whose businesses and premises are not subsidised;*

*(2) do you agree that such unfair trading is against the spirit of our current agreement with Europe that seeks to allow normal conditions of competition; and*

*(3) are you aware that management at Isle of Man Post are currently attempting to use their subsidised advantage to unfairly undercut local business that have been built up over many years?*

**The Speaker:** Question 15. Hon. Member for Onchan.

**Mr Karran:** Vainstyr Loayreyder, I ask the Question standing in my name.

**The Speaker:** I call on the Minister for Trade and Industry, Hon. Member for Douglas South, Mr Cretney.

**The Minister for Trade and Industry (Mr Cretney):** Yes, thank you, Mr Speaker.

Hon. Members should be aware that the Isle of Man Post Office is *not* a subsidised body. The Post Office Act 1993 requires that the Post Office generates sufficient revenue annually to meet its costs, to allocate to its reserves sufficient funds to meet its future investment requirements and also to make a contribution to the general revenue of the Island, as determined by the Treasury.

The new parcels depot referred to in the Question was built from funds accrued in the Post Office's reserves and *not* from Government subsidy. I do not believe that this would constitute unfair trading, as referred to in part (2) of the Hon. Member's Question.

Turning to part (3) of the Question, I am not aware of the Isle of Man Post Office using any unfair advantage to undercut local businesses. Section 4 of the Post Office Act permits the Post Office to provide a variety of postal and other related services. The Post Office may also do anything that appears to the Post Office to be requisite, advantageous or convenient for it to do in pursuance of its financial responsibilities.

The Post Office has always delivered parcels and parcels business has expanded of late. It was, therefore, inevitable that competition between public and private sector carriers would increase. I am confident, however, that Isle of Man Post Office does not use any unfair advantage to compete in this business.

**A Member:** Hear, hear.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member, Mr Karran.

**Mr Karran:** Vainstyr Loayreyder, would the Shirveishagh welcome local businesses if they have representations, as far as his reply? Will his door be open for them to make representation, as far as his reply today?

**The Speaker:** Minister for Trade and Industry.

**The Minister:** Well, not only my door, Mr Speaker, but more appropriately, perhaps, Mr Chacksfield, the Chief Executive in correspondence to the Hon. Member on 3rd July this year did say that his door was open. So I think, in the first instance, that would be the door which people should knock on.

## ISLE OF MAN WATER AUTHORITY

### Leaky mains pipes Proportion of Manx water lost

1.16. The Hon. Member for Rushen (Mr Watterson) to ask the Chairman of the Isle of Man Water Authority:

*What proportion of Manx water is lost due to leaky/burst mains pipes?*

**The Speaker:** Question 16. Hon. Member for Rushen, Mr Watterson.

**Mr Watterson:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.  
I beg leave to ask the Question standing in my name.

**The Speaker:** I call on the Chairman of the Isle of Man Water Authority, Mr Cannan.

**The Chairman of the Isle of Man Water Authority (Mr Cannan):** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The current level of leakage within the Isle of Man Water Authority supply area is 6.7 megalitres per day.

This represents 25 per cent of the total water into supply, which is a significant improvement since the Authority first implemented its long-term leakage strategy in 1997, when the leakage was almost 40 per cent.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member, Mr Gill.

**Mr Gill:** Sir, would the Chairman have an opinion if 25 per cent of the current supply – the supply which, of course, is expected to increase – was leaking and was fluoridated at one part per million... would he be satisfied that that would have no environmental impact?

**The Speaker:** The Chairman of the Water Authority.

**Mr Cannan:** First of all, the Water Authority is investing £2 million annually to renew the mains water system and, secondly, I am not a scientist and therefore I cannot answer his supplementary, sir.

**A Member:** Hear, hear.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member, Mr Gill.

**Mr Gill:** Thank you, sir.

Could I thank the Chairman for his candid view, but he does have scientists on his staff and environmental scientists, as well. Would he be kind enough to seek their scientific, professional advice and advise Members of this House and indeed the general public, where there is widespread concern about the introduction of fluoride into our water supply, about the consequences of a 25 per cent leakage at current rate, sir?

**The Speaker:** It is just about within the bounds of the Question. I am not having a fluoride debate (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) but Chairman of the Water Authority.

**Mr Cannan:** Before a decision on fluoridation of the water supply will be taken, under which the Water Authority is entirely neutral, the Council of Ministers I am certain will take into consideration the then leakage rate of the Isle of Man water supply before making any such decisions.

## ISLE OF MAN POST OFFICE

### Isle of Man Post Office Employee Survey 2007 Copy for all Members of Tynwald

1.17. The Hon. Member for Douglas East (Mrs Cannell) to ask the Vice Chairman of the Isle of Man Post Office:

*Will you provide to all Members of Tynwald a copy of the Isle of Man Post Office Employee Survey 2007?*

**The Speaker:** Question 17. Hon. Member for Douglas East, Mrs Cannell.

**Mrs Cannell:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I beg leave to ask the Question standing in my name.

**The Speaker:** I call on the Vice-Chairman of the Isle of

Man Post Office, the Hon. Member for Douglas West, Mr Corkish. (*Interjections*)

**The Vice Chairman of the Isle of Man Post Office (Mr Corkish):** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

I can tell the Hon. Member, the questioner – whilst thanking her for her Question – that the Isle of Man Post Office has taken legal advice and I am informed that I do not have the authority to release this information into the public domain. The Post Office Employee Survey was sent out to all employees of the Isle of Man Post Office in March 2007, some ten months ago. It comprised a questionnaire, accompanied by a letter from the Chief Executive, assuring all staff that their responses and comments would be treated in confidence and that they would be guaranteed anonymity.

The purpose of the Survey, Mr Speaker, was to encourage staff participation in shaping the future of our business model. The Survey contains personal data, including sensitive personal data within the meaning of the Data Protection Act 2002. The voluntary release of the Survey would cause the Isle of Man Post Office, as the data controller, to fail to comply with the data protection principles in relation to the personal data within the Survey results, not least because they would be released for a purpose other than that for which they were collected. In this case, Mr Speaker, they were collected for internal use within the Isle of Man Post Office to help executive, management, staff and staff representatives to develop the business. This work is ongoing.

In view of this advice I am unable to release this information to this Hon. House.

Thank you, Mr Speaker.

**The Speaker:** Mrs Cannell.

**Mrs Cannell:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Will the Vice-Chair of Isle of Man Post accept that it is not the actual individual Survey forms that were filled in by individual members of staff that I am seeking here, but merely the report which encapsulates all of those results and the analysis of those results that I am after all Members of Tynwald being provided with?

Will he also agree with me that in fact that report, of which I have a copy – and one of two Members do have a copy circulated to them by their constituents – does not say anywhere that the content is going to reveal any individual member of staff within the Isle of Man Post Office, or in fact that it does not contain any confidentiality or confidence or any restriction whatsoever in its publication?

Therefore, can he advise, after he stated that the House has received legal advice, what legal advice has been given in terms of not providing all Members of Tynwald with that particular report?

**The Speaker:** Vice-Chairman of the Post Office.

**Mr Corkish:** The information that I have given, Mr Speaker, the hon. lady knows that –

**Mrs Cannell:** Member!

**Mr Cretney:** Member; she's not a lady. (*Laughter*)

**Mr Corkish:** The Hon. Member and questioner knows

that part of the result of the recent staff survey carried out in March 2007 showed that 87 per cent of employers agreed that they were satisfied with the Post Office as an employer and 85 per cent agreed that they were satisfied with their job. I can also perhaps add that –

**Mrs Cannell:** Point of order.

**The Speaker:** Mrs Cannell.

**Mrs Cannell:** Mr Speaker, the Hon. Member is referring to percentages which are contained within the report which he is refusing to circulate, so the information is not before Members.

**The Speaker:** The Hon. Member is responsible for his own answer.

**Mr Corkish:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. (*Interjections*)

Can I also say, in answer to the Hon. Member, the purpose of the internal survey was for both good and bad views to be aired and for the board to thus act upon them, which they will do and, indeed, are doing.

**Mr Cannan:** Point of order, Mr Speaker, sir.

**The Speaker:** Mr Cannan.

**Mr Cannan:** Can we have the advice of yourself or the Secretary to the House that, as the Vice-Chairman of the Post Office has referred to a document which is not before the House, it should now be before the House.

**The Speaker:** I will ask the learned Secretary to confirm, but my understanding is that in reference to Tynwald Court, the Hon. Member is correct, but not in respect of this House.

The learned Secretary will confirm that point, but meantime, I call the Hon. Member for Douglas North, Mr Houghton.

**Mr Henderson:** Gura mie eu, Vainstyr Loayreyder.

I shall speak for the Hon. Member, Mr Henderson, if I might, Vainstyr Loayreyder! (*Laughter*)

**The Speaker:** Mr Henderson, I beg your pardon.

**Mr Henderson:** He is the ugly one. (*Laughter*)

**A Member:** How can he mix you up?

**Mr Henderson:** Vainstyr Loayreyder, I wish to pose a supplementary or two to the Vice-Chair of the Isle of Man Post Office.

If he can quote chunks of a confidential report here, which he refuses to circulate, then obviously, will he agree that he will review his legal advice, with the point of circulating to Hon. Members the said document? It is obviously not impinging on data protection, if he is able to read verbatim from it here in public.

Secondly, will he confirm that on the forms that were sent out to all employees, there was no commitment on

management to keep everything absolutely confidential and in-house?

Thirdly, Vainstyr Loayreyder, will he confirm that the actual report itself does not contain personal detail or highlight any particular individual; in fact it contains overall information that protects identities of individuals?

Therefore, would he agree to go back to his legal counsel to ascertain that in fact there would be no breach of data protection under those circumstances in releasing the report to all Hon. Members?

**The Speaker:** Vice-Chairman, Mr Corkish, to reply.

**Mr Corkish:** Not being of the legal persuasion, Mr Speaker, I certainly will ask for a review of that. I can also say that the Chief Minister, I think, has already given, at an earlier sitting, a lot of the information that I have spoken about.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member, a final supplementary, Mrs Cannell.

**Mrs Cannell:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

I appreciate the Vice-Chair is only responding on behalf of the Chairman, who is not a Member of the House of Keys. But can I ask him: what is the Chairman afraid of?

Why does the Chairman not want to share the success as he has given us – 85 per cent, 87 per cent of employees are happy with the Post Office? Why does the Chairman not want to share that happy news with the House and let us see the happiness that prevails within Isle of Man Post Office?

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member, please resume your seat.

This is not a debate. The question has been answered in the way that the responder chose to answer it.

Final supplementary. Hon. Member for Michael.

**Mr Cannan:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Will the Vice-Chair of the Post, first of all, indicate to us where he is obtaining his legal advice – where he is obtaining it and from whom?

Secondly, will he agree that if this report is somehow protected by data protection, then, by implication, every report that a Government Department has, that is compiled by conducting a survey, whether it is transport or tourism or anything else, for which people are required to give information, that too is protected information?

Thank you.

**The Speaker:** Vice-Chairman to reply.

**Mr Corkish:** Yes, Mr Speaker.

The implications regarding the law were provided on the actions of the Chief Executive. Again, can I also tell this Hon. House that I hope that the position within the Post Office is not going to be used as a political football, neither used as providing political scoring points for Members.

**Mr Cannan:** Please answer the question, Hon. Member!

**The Speaker:** That, Hon. Members, brings us to the end of Questions for Oral Answer.

### Procedural Clarification by the Speaker

**The Speaker:** I would confirm that the point of order raised about reference to written material that has not been circulated to Members is not within the Standing Orders of the House of Keys. It is, however, within the Standing Orders of Tynwald Court, just to clarify that point to Members.

We now move to Item 2, Questions for Written Answer. They will be circulated shortly.

## Questions for Written Answer

### CHIEF MINISTER

#### *Solway Harvester* Maintenance costs

2.1. The Hon. Member for Douglas North (Mr Houghton) to ask the Chief Minister:

*Is the vessel Solway Harvester maintained by a contractor, if so –*

*(1) what is their role; and*

*(2) what are the weekly and accumulated costs since it was moored in Douglas Harbour?*

**Answer:** (1) A local company is contracted to act on a caretaker basis to undertake a daily inspection and carry out the following, as required:

- Tend to mooring lines
- Ensure that the watertight integrity of the vessel is monitored and not compromised
- Adjust moorings and stability in times of adverse weather conditions

(2) The weekly charge is £150 and the accumulated charges for the period 20th August 2000 to 30th November 2007 are £57,000.

### HEALTH AND SOCIAL SECURITY

#### DHSS Deputy Chief Executive Job specification

2.2. The Hon. Member for Douglas North (Mr Henderson) to ask the Minister for Health and Social Security:

*Can you confirm that the job description/job specification in relation to the newly created post of 'Deputy Chief Executive' has been designed to ensure that only one internal candidate will qualify to place a bona fide application and that any other credible local candidates have been 'designed out'?*

**Answer:** No.

## Orders of the Day

### BILL FOR SECOND READING

#### Income Tax (Pensions) Bill Second Reading approved

3.1. Mr Braidwood to move:

*That the Income Tax (Pensions) Bill be read the second time.*

**The Speaker:** Item 3, Bill for Second Reading Income Tax (Pensions) Bill: I call on the Hon. Member for Douglas East, Mr Braidwood.

**Mr Braidwood:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Speaker, this Bill makes the most significant changes to income tax legislation relating to pension schemes for almost 20 years and brings into Manx law the last of the major commitments approved by Tynwald as part of the future Taxation Strategy.

Conscious of the need to update Manx statute and recognising some major changes in the United Kingdom, a period of public consultation was opened in October 2006. The findings of that consultation were published as part of the 2007 Budget on 20th March 2007.

A further period of consultation opened on 15th October 2007 and the draft Bill was published. The Income Tax Division has also provided two seminars which were attended by more than 70 delegates, representing pension specialists, independent financial advisers and accountancy firms.

The publication of the Bill and the resulting consultation have again shown very significant support, and I can inform Members that the Bill being considered today includes some amendments identified by the professional groups since the publication of the draft.

Mr Speaker, this Bill is unusual, as it proposes significant amendments to two separate Acts of Tynwald, yet the amendments relate to topics common to both. With that in mind, each topic is included as a separate heading within the Bill, under which can be found the clauses dealing with the changes to the Income Tax Retirement Benefit Schemes Act 1978 first, and then the Income Tax Act 1989.

Mr Speaker, in line with the proposals made in response to the public consultation, this Bill will: relax the compulsion on members of personal pension schemes to purchase an annuity in retirement and will allow members to draw their pension directly from the fund; allow for Regulations to determine appropriate investments within a scheme; bring in to primary law two concessions approved by Tynwald in June 2007; increase the tax-free lump sum to 30 per cent; allow members to receive their pension early whilst continuing to work; in the majority of cases, increase the contribution that can be made in the year; introduce a minimum allowance that will make pension schemes available to non-earners and the low paid; and make a number of consequential amendments by repealing complex carried forward and carried back provisions, linked to the current contribution limits.

Mr Speaker, this Bill will simplify income tax legislation dealing with approved pension schemes and will ensure the

majority of people will be able to make the pension provision they can afford, rather than provision allowed by statute.

The amendment to the 1978 and 1989 Acts deal principally with pension schemes approved for use in the Isle of Man by employers and employees who are, or were, resident in the Island.

This Bill will make one further amendment to pensions legislation that deals specifically with international pension arrangements set up and operated by individuals who are not resident in the Island.

Mr Speaker, it is intended that this Bill will come into effect on 6th April 2008.

Mr Speaker, I beg to move the Second Reading.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Douglas West, Mr Shimmin.

**Mr Shimmin:** I beg to second and reserve my remarks.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Onchan, Mr Karran.

**Mr Karran:** I would just like to ask the mover of the Bill: when it talks in clause 9 of the maximum of £150,000 maximum lump sum will be limited to 30 per cent, what does this mean in reality? Does this mean that, if you had a pension accrual that would pay out less than £150,000 before, you could pay it out in 100 per cent of the lump sum?

I would just like to ask the mover of the Bill: with the Treasury, these new implications, what access will there be for the general public as far as getting advice, if there are problems as far as this issue is concerned? Where do they go?

Vainstyr Loayreyder, there is another point that I think needs to be raised over the issue of income tax and pensions. Whilst this House and the Government have dealt with the issue of nursing home fees, I do think that we are going to need to be starting to look in the future, when we look at income tax pensions legislation, we are going to have to look as far as it being broader than it is at the present time. We are going to have to start looking at the financial provision for pensioners – not just as pensioners who retire and live in their own homes and have the independence and the ability to look after themselves; but we are going to have to start broadening out the pension provision, in order to look at the issue of when those pensioners are too old, too frail or too sick and need to be put into long-term care as far as nursing and residential homes are concerned.

I do hope that the Treasury will be looking at this issue, with the Department of Health and Social Security, and the Council of Ministers will be coming up with some initiatives in order to deal with the funding crisis that we are going to have, if we keep on refusing to address that part of pension provision that we have done up to now and have been doing since the late 1980s, when we were trying to get a compulsory scheme in.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Douglas East to reply.

**Mr Braidwood:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Speaker, I think it was unfortunate that the Hon. Member for Onchan was unable to attend the presentation, because I think he is talking more on retirement pensions, basically from on the National Insurance. This deals with

personal pension schemes, non-statutory schemes. So it is nothing to do with a retirement pension, as such, which is the State pension scheme –

**Mr Karran:** I am talking about...

**Mr Braidwood:** – but the Hon. Member also mentioned on the £150,000 limit, which is in place at the present: that will be lifted, so if you have a fund of, say, £600,000, you will be able to take 30 per cent of that, which would be £180,000, or if you had a £1 million fund, you would be able to take £300,000 as a lump sum. *(Interjection)*

Thank you, Mr Speaker, I beg to move.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Members the motion before the House is that the Income Tax (Pensions) Bill be read for the second time. Those in favour, say aye; against, no. The ayes have it. The ayes have it.

## BILL FOR THIRD READING

### Agricultural (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill Third Reading approved

4.1 Mrs Cannell to move:

*That the Agricultural (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill be read the third time and be sent to the Council.*

**The Speaker:** Item 4. Bill for Third Reading. Agricultural (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill. I call on the Hon. Member for Douglas East, Mrs Cannell.

**Mrs Cannell:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

In taking Third Reading, at the clauses stage there were one or two questions which were raised by the Hon. Member for Rushen, Mr Gill, which I would like to take the opportunity to respond to.

One of the questions that he put to me and the House is: was there a civil remedy to settle a matter, rather than seeking a criminal case, which the Bill provides for. What I can say is that the fines increase in respect of the Bill are in respect of the Destructive Imported Animals Act 1963. There is no obvious civil party who might take action against the importer of animals for the damage caused by the animal to the natural environment, other than Government. It is the import that is illegal under this Act and not the actual damage.

Another question he raised was: has any other species been illegally imported and what I can say is that it is quite interesting looking into this and the answers that came back from the Department were that other species on the Destructive Imported Animals Act 1963 include mink, deer and red squirrels. Later, in 1994, the Destructive Animals (Prohibition of Importation and Keeping) Order was brought in with a schedule which included foxes and badgers. Foxes have been brought into the Isle of Man illegally, but that was before the date of the actual Act. Native species have been brought in but, again, it was before the Act came into force.

One of the questions the Hon. Member raised in his

contribution was: could someone seek permission to import, say, the red squirrel? Under the Destructive Wild Animals Act 1963 and the Wildlife Act 1990 the Department could consider an application for a licence to enable the importation of, say, the red squirrel. However, the Department's policy on licensing introductions sets out a criterion which must be met. The Wildlife Committee have considered the criterion and the policy when considering the introduction of the red squirrel and took the following consultation with a number of highly-respected mammal specialists within the United Kingdom.

At that time, the conclusions were that the criterion had not been met for the following reasons. (1) The species is not considered to be native to the Isle of Man and (2) there is serious doubt that sufficient habitat of suitable quality exists here for its long-term survival of a population.

I hope I have managed to cover the queries that the Hon. Member raised at clause stage and I thank him for his interest in the Bill.

The Bill, just to recap, Mr Speaker, merely annuls certain pieces of outdated legislation or old-fashioned legislation. It brings in a provision of recklessness in terms of the disturbance of wildlife; it also brings in a recklessness for disturbance of dolphins, whales, basking sharks, seals and marine creatures and it increases the fine for the importation of destructive animals. There are also one or two other very minor matters in: one, of course, is in terms of compensation to be paid when an area is designated as having a special scientific interest. The Bill allows the Department which may come forward with compensation, whereas formerly it was a compulsory *shall* come forward with compensation.

It is a very small Bill. I thank the House for its support so far and I beg to move.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Rushen, Mr Gawne.

**Mr Gawne:** Gura mie eu, Loayreyder. I beg to second and reserve my remarks.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Glenfaba, Mr Anderson.

**Mr Anderson:** Yes, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. Member, when she was mentioning various animals with importation, did not mention weasels. (*Laughter*) I just wonder does that include weasels being imported, as well?

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Onchan, Mr Karran.

**Mr Karran:** Vainstyr Loayreyder, whilst this Bill is small, it will mean that the long-term future of Knockaloe is going to be brought into question. Obviously, there were trusts developed originally, as far as this issue is concerned. Will the public actually get any consultation, as far as the future use of Knockaloe, which was given on charitable terms to the people of the Isle of Man for a specific project? (*Interjection*) What will actually be further use for that facility that now is seen as redundant in the future, as far as agriculture is concerned?

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Rushen, Mr Gawne.

**Mr Gawne:** Gura mie eu, Loayreyder.

Yes, just in response to the last speaker, Knockaloe was not *given* to the Department, it was sold to the Department. The Department... there was a fund established and some of the repeals that are mentioned in this Bill are in relation to the funds that were established to actually purchase the farm, so I think it was the funding that was given, rather than the farm that was given.

Certainly I can give assurance to the Hon. Member that we are already, and have been for some time, consulting with a variety of different parties in terms of the future use of Knockaloe. All we are doing in this particular Bill – a relatively small part of this Bill – is removing the wording 'the Department shall keep an experimental farm' and replacing that with 'may'. One of the reasons for that is that we feel we would be far better supporting farmers to do experimental work, so that a greater degree of credibility, perhaps, could be given to the results of any work undertaken,

If a Government Department undertakes that work at Knockaloe, we feel that it is a better way forward, in terms of being able to provide agricultural demonstrations, to actually pay farmers direct to give demonstrations and that is certainly the Department's thinking at the moment.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Douglas South, Mr Malarkey.

**Mr Malarkey:** Mr Speaker, thank you.

I would like to support the Bill before us, especially clause 3 which extends to recklessness of wildlife. In welcoming this, I would hope the Department will study in great detail some of the developers on the Isle of Man who start new developments where wildlife is greatly affected, including Mr Anderson's weasels, if he ever finds any.

I do welcome this and I do hope the Department will monitor this with great interest and make sure that our wildlife in new development areas are not affected.

**A Member:** Hear, hear.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Douglas East, Mrs Cannell, to reply to the debate.

**Mrs Cannell:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

First of all, if I can deal with the comments made by the last speaker, the Hon. Member, Mr Malarkey, from South Douglas, who is very supportive of the Bill and the protection of the wildlife that is contained within it. I can give him an assurance that, once this Bill becomes law, then the wildlife division within the Department will be given greater teeth with which to challenge anybody who wants to destroy or jeopardise our very important natural wildlife and habitat within the Isle of Man. So, by supporting the Bill, we are giving greater powers to that section within the Department.

The Hon. Member for Onchan was concerned about Knockaloe and asked about public consultation. What I can say to him is that the Department have not taken any decision in respect of the use of Knockaloe and it is not necessarily in a rush, either, to determine its future, because all of that, I would suggest, has still got to be discussed, possibly at a strategic meeting of the Department before we could actually move forward. So I can assure him that Knockaloe, for the time being, is safe and it certainly would not fall into an inappropriate use, if the Department has got anything to do

with it. I can give him that assurance.

As for public consultation, it is something I could ask the Department to consider when they have determined their strategy and their way forward with that. I will ask the Department whether it should go out to public consultation, because I am all for openness and honesty and transparency and I know that the Minister is, too.

Dealing with the Hon. Member, Mr Anderson, who asked about weasels. What I can say is that the advice and the research that has been done has not given me anything on weasels whatsoever. The advice given is that the Act actually specifies that mink, deer, red squirrel, foxes and badgers... However, I dare say, Mr Speaker, whilst I do not think we have any weasels in the Island *per se*, I do believe that we have the odd political one in the House. (*Laughter and interjections*)

**Several Members:** Hear, hear. That is a good one!

**The Speaker:** On that note, (*Laughter and interjections*) the motion that I put to the House is that the Bill for Third Reading, the Agricultural (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill be read for the third time. Those in favour, say aye; against, no. The ayes have it.

*A division was called for and electronic voting resulted as follows:*

FOR	AGAINST
Mr Quirk	
Mr Karran	
Mr Brown	
Mr Crookall	
Mr Anderson	
Mrs Craine	
Mr Quayle	
Mr Teare	
Mr Cannan	
Mr Cregeen	
Mr Houghton	
Mr Henderson	
Mr Malarkey	
Mrs Cannell	
Mr Braidwood	
Mr Corkish	
Mr Shimmin	
Mr Cretney	
Mr Watterson	
Mr Gawne	
Mr Gill	
The Speaker	

**The Speaker:** Hon. Members, 22 votes for, 0 votes against. The motion carries unanimously.

**Standing Order 1.1(2)(a) suspended  
to vacate 18th December sitting**

**The Speaker:** Now, Hon. Members, Standing Orders provide that this House will sit from the third Tuesday in October to the third Tuesday in December, that being 18th December.

I would advise the House that, up to this point, there is no actual business before the House at that date, there is no

legislative business that is current intending to be moved on that date. I would, therefore, put it to the House that you may wish to consider not having that sitting on 18th December and holding any such business as comes to the first sitting in January.

**Members:** Agreed.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Member for Michael.

**Mr Cannan:** Mr Speaker, while there may be no legislative business and, indeed, there will be no legislative business in the first sitting of the Keys in January, because there are no Bills for First Reading, there may well be questions, as there have been this morning, bringing the Government to accountability. There may be very serious matters which the House may wish to make itself aware of. We are talking not of next week, sir, but we are talking of a fortnight hence.

**The Speaker:** Any other Member wish to speak? Hon. Member for Douglas East, Mrs Cannell.

**Mrs Cannell:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Just to be helpful because the Hon. Member for Michael does, in fact, have a very valid point: we do not have a crystal ball and we do not know what is going to happen between now and the next House of Keys' scheduled sitting.

What I would like to suggest, Mr Speaker, is possibly next Monday would, in fact, be the deadline for the submission of Questions to the sitting of the House of Keys for the week after Tynwald and that if the House is in agreement, if no Questions are forthcoming, then the House would agree now to actually not sit on that date. Then, of course, I suppose in my suggesting there might be Questions, one or two might put Questions in so that we have to sit. I do think it is a bit of a slippery slope, Mr Speaker, but I appreciate what you are saying.

**The Speaker:** Hon. Members, it is entirely in the hands of your good selves – in the hands of this House – as to what we do. I can put the question next Tuesday at our sitting after the sitting of Tynwald Court. I thought, for the sake of good order, I would put it before the House today to ensure that everyone knows exactly where they stand and I now intend to do so. That requires a suspension of Standing Orders.

I so move from the Chair. Those in favour, say aye; against, no. The ayes have it.

*A division was called for*

**The Speaker:** Sixteen votes required to suspend Standing Orders. Please vote now, Hon. Members.

**Mr Karran:** Vainstyr Loayreyder, can you just clarify what we are voting for?

**The Speaker:** We are voting to suspend Standing Order 1.1(2), which requires us to sit on the third Tuesday in December.

**Mr Karran:** Okay.

*Electronic voting resulted as follows:*

**FOR**

Mr Quirk  
Mr Brown  
Mr Anderson  
Mrs Craine  
Mr Quayle  
Mr Teare  
Mr Cregeen  
Mr Houghton  
Mr Henderson  
Mr Malarkey  
Mr Braidwood  
Mr Corkish  
Mr Shimmin  
Mr Watterson  
Mr Gawne  
The Speaker

**AGAINST**

Mr Karran  
Mr Crookall  
Mr Cannan  
Mrs Cannell  
Mr Cretney  
Mr Gill

**The Speaker:** Hon. Members, 16 votes for, 6 votes against. The motion, therefore, carries. Thank you, Hon. Members.

I would take the opportunity to remind the House that there is a presentation at lunchtime by the Office of Fair Trading on energy prices, in the Barrool Suite.

With that, Hon. Members, I will now adjourn the sitting of the House. This House is adjourned till Tuesday next in Tynwald Court.

Thank you, Hon. Members.

*The House adjourned at 12.03 p.m.*