Organisation / individual	Q1 Having regard to the intended scope of employment groups to be included, which employment groups do you think should be included within, or excluded from, the remit of a Public Services Commission and if so, why?	Q2 Do you support the development of a single Joint Negotiating Committee for employees of a Public Service Commission? If not, please indicate possible alternative arrangements.	Q3 Please indicate your preferred arrangements for determining the terms and conditions of service for manual and craft workers employed by Local Authorities who would not become employees of a Public Services Commission?	Q4 Which particular terms and conditions do you believe should be changed for new starters?	Any other comments	Actions as a result of comments received
Miss T Lyons	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None. It is discriminatory and unfair.	Blank	
Mrs S E Creamer	None included and all excluded. I oppose this new body.	No Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council. Leave as is.	None. It is unfair.	Blank	
Christine Hughes	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as it is this division of a group shows it is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	Blank	
Anonymous	Blank	No I don't. Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None. Same T&C to all	Waste of Gov't money	
John Clague	Riank	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Same for all	Waste of the Government's money	
Patrick Parish	All public sector staff should be included	There should be a single negotiating committee There should be universal basic conditions of employment				
Commissioners	Au public sector stall should be included	There should be a single negotiating committee	There should be universal deals conditions or employment	There should be no pension commitment, particularly in view of the likely transfer of some staff to local authority employment, not all of whom are members of the Local Government Pension Scheme. If there is to be a pension entitlement, this should be a Defined Contribution rather than defined benefit nature.	In years gone by, public sector staff received lower salaries when compared to the private sector, and this was compensated by better social and persona arrangements. It is now the case that public sector staff seem to be better paid than the private sector and yet retain all of these benefits.	
Maughold Parish Commissioners					Maughold Parish Commissioners have considered the consultation document in detail. They are of the opinion that the resultant Commission should include a representative of the Island's local authorities; perhaps nominated through an organisation such as the Isle of Man Municipal Association.	
R M Green	None included and all excluded. I am against the new idea as Whitley Council works extremely well already.	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None it would be unfair on people starting	It's a needless waste of money in a time when money is already tight	
K Johnson	works extremely well already. Nothing included and all excluded. Oppose this proposed new body.	Certainly not. Whitley should not be broken	Proposal is no use	None. The whole thing is unfair and discriminatory.		
Marown Parish J R Savle	No comment None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No comment No I do not. Whitley isn't broken	Consider it important that no requirement for the provision of a pension scheme be included in the Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	No comment None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
	wone included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No 1 do not. Whitely isn't broken	writing Council MOPA - leave as is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - it is discriminatory and unitar		
Malew Parish Commissioners					My Commissioners have read the consultation document and unfortunately feel that they are unable to answer the questions posed, as there is insufficient supporting information. The document refers to the independent review of the Whitely Council that was carried out by Dr Harris, but does not say why the independent review of the Whitely Council that was carried out by Dr Harris, but does not say why the consideration of the practical little of Harris and conditions, for example the legalities of such changes, collapsion for persistons etc. And is this the start of a longer consultation process, if so will three be a change produced. The commissioner appear that change is needed and a print commission may be the best may forward, but without knowing further details of the future proposals and how local authorities fit in with that, it is difficult to provide memory interpretabilities.	
Anonymous	I don't think there should be any changes keep it as it is with Whitley Council	No keep things as they are Whitley Council is working well good terms of conditions	Whitley Council should stay	Keep it the same for all working staff. Do not change the terms and conditions.	Whitley Council should stay for all manual workers. All the changes are a waste of time and money. Please do not change - waste of (money)	
Public Sector Pensions Authority					Public Sector Pensions Authority.pdf	
Anonymous	None - all should be excluded. I oppose this because it opens up to reduced pay	No - keep Whitley Council, it's not broken	Keep as it is with Whitley Council - division is no good long term	None - it opens to discrimination and people being treated unfairly	This proposal is bad for workers, families, economy & standard of living - it will be likely to increase job losses	
	& employers to treat staff unfairly - people could end up on the breadline, bad for economy.				& people claiming benefits in long term.	
Prospect / GOA						GOA response was also supplied via survey monkey.
Douglas Borough Council	The Council considers that all Government employees should fall within the remit of the proposed Public Services Commission, including those proposed to be excluded by reason of analogy to UK terms and conditions, in order that the Commission can have oversight of all employment matters within the Government; and further, that the terms and conditions of local authority	The Council supports the establishment of a single Joint Negotiating Committee for employees of Government.	Should the Whitley Council cease to operate, the Council would support, at least sa an interim measure pending an alternative being negotiated, the adoption of Public Services Commission terms and conditions for its manual and craft workers. Members felt that the remit of the Public Services Commission should include the terms and conditions of local authority manual and craft workers as the Whitley Council does now and that there should be a representative of local workers as the Whitley Council does now and that there should be a representative of local services.	The Council prefers not to comment in relation to the terms and conditions of civil service staff, in which it has had no previous involvement, but in relation to Whitley Council staff being transferred the Council feels that the principal change desirable would be to introduce a flexible working week enabling any five days out of seven to be worked as required by the employer.	Douglas Brough Council's Executive Committee has considered the consultation document relating to the proposal to from a Public Services Commission and directed one to express its general support for the Government in its efforts to modernise and streamline its processes.	
D Darbyshire	No	No	No	No	None	
Anonymous	None if possible - all in	Yes, as long as my terms and conditions remain largely unaffected	No changes	Blank	1. Sciones policy and pay require revising to combat far more assertively the abuse of the current system. Also an introduction of six pay for years severed. Full pay for mind ribuse requires review. Z Covernment staff who accept redundincy payments should not be allowed to return to their work, such as we see in Sciaci Gize- working weekenisk and such their happens now. Interest should be used for "here poor tolders" within Covernment. J. Diseasing in productive regions upset reviews in so into the moreones of dispersed fits was for their poor to the payment of the	
J Howell	We do not need the expense of a new body, yet another waste of tax payers money! Why are we changing something which is not broken?	No I do not! We already have Whitley Council	The Memorandum of Agreement - Whitley Council	None, same terms and conditions to all - fair to all. Very unfair to new workers!	Because it is a waste of government money. Civil servants could be put to better use!	
Anonymous	Why do we need the expense of a new body?	No, I am happy with present terms and conditions with Whitley Council	Memorandum of agreement, Whitiey Council	Same terms and conditions to all, unfair to new workers	Very happy with Whitley Council, why change?	
Glenda Taylor	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
A Shannon	Why do we need the expense of a new body? Therefore, none	No - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council	Same T&C, make same to all to be fair		
Mrs L A Maddox	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No - Whitley leave as it is	Whitley Council. MOFA leave as it is	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
A Kneen	As stated in the scope - 2 out of 6 bodies to be amalgamated - what's the point if	No - too much differences - too much work/money involved when money is to	Full negotiations and ballots - union and management agreements	None - everyone on same footing	Waste of money & time in this time of financial restraint	
A H Kennaugh	only 1/3 of employment bodies? A new body is not required	he saved No the Whitley Council is doing a good job!!	There should be no division	None. Same terms and conditions for all	Seems Just another way of grinding down the workforce (MORE FOR LESS!!!)	
Anonymous	I don't think we need a new body. It's just a waste of money which we are	No I do not - there is nothing wrong with Whitley Council. Leave it as it is.	Whitley Council	None. It would be totally unfair to new workers to be on new terms and		
S Brew	supposed to be trying to save. Why change something that is already working?	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken		conditions.		
S Brew Peel Town	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body No comment	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken No comment	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Peel Town Commissioners would favour all manual and craft staff employed by local authorities on	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Peel Town Commissioners	INO COMMENT	ING CONTINENT	Peel Town Commissioners would favour all manual and craft staff employed by local authorities on the Island forming a single collective negotiating body to determine terms and conditions of employment.			
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	This proposals abiding weakness, is 'No one can say what the eventual aim is'. What, makes this proposal fatal is employees and skilled workers both suspect that whatever the AIM might be, it runs directly counter to their own interests and livelihood. Civil servants continue to reject any innovation that does not recognise their majority status.	
DCCL	The Department does not at this stage suggest that any of its employees should be outside the scope of the proposed commission, so long as appropriate mechanisms are in place for employment that is in some ways unusual. This	within the sector. It could support such an approach if Treasury were to return to the automatic adjustment of payroll budgets but would want to see	No comment	starters: Significantly reduced sick pay entitlement. Elimination of premium pay for weekend or evening work. Flexible rostering without payment of a premium.	DCCL would support the introduction of a single employing body for those employees not linked to off-Island pay arrangements. As an employer of a number of different employment groups, moves towards harmonisation of core entitlements for the Department's employees could assist in the overall management	
	Department has benefited greatly from the use of casual staff, sessonal staff, fixelite term time only contracts and voices training posts. Unpaid internships are currently being considered. If the proposed commission cannot provide the required ficientity of employment type, a request for large scale exemption may have to be made.	improved consideration of Departmental views if central negotiation was to be entertrained.		Confirmation that capability to be progressed irrespective of sick-leave. Provision of simplified dismissal procedures, particularly for civil service roles.	of the Department. The creation of a platform for the establishment and implementation of fair and equitable staff picioise which could be implemented account end on the Department's different benisses areas and employment groups, but wherever possible across other Departments Boards and Offices, would be clearly beneficial. Attents exh. ask ick pay, glorenous, discipline and other one employment matters should be consistent across the Government. The opportunity should be tablen to ensure that whatever policies are adopted by the new Commission are as less to the employee and tapping est they are for the employee. The adopted by the most commission are as less to the employee and tapping est they are to the employee. The work groups to for morths full pay sick leaves in every 12 month period is unsustainable, as is the retention of Whitely ylussages for responsibilities that are no longer pest of a role. Improvements in the speed of making of local agreements are long overdue. The creation of this body will require harmonisation of current terms and conditions and great care must be taken in the selection of the approach that will be used going forward if the more is to help create a smaller, simpler and chaeper government, though the principle is supported, there is a clear need to determine what of should be common and under central control and what should be the common and under central control and what should be determined and under local control. As an employer with a number of employment groups whose terms and determination of operational matters. The delegation from the Commission should allow the Department to determine such lissues as hours of work, grading and remuneration levels.	

DCCL continued					Whist the consultation paper suggests that pay and terms and conditions should be dealt with on a collective basigning basis, if the experience of this Department that such an approach can be undeployal, it is certainly a concern that pay negotiations can be conducted by officers with no responsibility for individual budgets. The Department would want to him, top to reflictoring pairs and other measures that reduce the payment of the pay	
C Johnson	Why change something that works well?	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	Why waste tax payers money?	Whitley Council	Memorandum agreement	Same terms and conditions to all fair to all	Wasting Government money	
Anonymous	I don't agree with this new body therefore all groups should be excluded.	I am quite happy with Whitley Council and don't see any reason it should change.	Whitley Council is working perfectly well and should be left.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	It just seems a waste of money to change a service that is fulfilling its needs.	
Anonymous	I do not agree with this proposed new body therefore all groups should be excluded.	No, because Whitley Council works perfectly well.	Whitley Council is working and adequately to support our working needs.	None. It is discriminatory and unfair.		
IOM Chamber of Commerce	The 10M Chamber of Commerce believes it is important that all smployees in the 10M buble Sector are governed by a unitary employeer or the 10M buble Sector are governed by a unitary employeer's organisation covering all roles and responsibilities. The instoric fragmented approach to bargaining, common in the UK allo, has created inconsistency across gradings, terms & conditions, pay rates and ultimately created a high cost organisation. The obvious way to remedy this for the future, is to apply consistent standards and approaches across all areas, using the same tools and measurements for all. This should encourage greater flexibility of roles and transferability of skills in line with changing taxpayer needs as well as allowing for greater benchmarking, especially against the private sector on the Island.	Yes – mainly for the reasons given above. Obviously all relevant unions should be involved.	In the interests of fairness and consistency all public sector employees on the Island should have consistent terms and conditions relating to their employment. This should be achieved "by analogy"	Controlling the overall cost and size of the IOM public sector has been testified by CoMIn in "Apends for Integral" as protriety, and the full range of employment terms and conditions need considerable review. For new starters, Inc IOM Public Sector needs to consider its current pay and conditions against those that prevail in the IOM private sector site Manus Isbour market its a competitive one. Opportunities to review key areas of: 1. Hours, 2. leave emtitlement, 3. pay rates(standard and enhances) 4, persion contributions. Should be taken and applied to new starters. The IOM Chamber of Commerce has been campaigning for 4 years to dose the current persion scheme to new members, and we would expect this matter to be dealt with at the outset of the life of a new Public Sector employment body.	In principle the 10H Chamber of Commerce supports the creation of a Public Services Commission. The cost and combenome natures dur unpulse sector cannot be allowed to impact the competitive advantage of the Island and the ability of our businesses to drive economic growth. We do remain concerned about the disproportionately high costs of providing the Public Sector on the Island and support any government action that enables us to retain a competitive edge in such difficult economic times.	
Mrs T Gardner	None included - I oppose this proposed new body	No I don't - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Helen McMullen	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA - leave as is, this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None, it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley does a valuable job	Whitley Council MofA - leave things as they are division shows proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not. Whitley not broken	Whitley Council leave as is this division shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Mrs Maureen Moffatt	Happy the way things are	Always been happy with Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Same conditions for all		
Lesley Parker	Leave things as they are	Happy with Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Same conditions for all		
Miss Tina Searle	It must cost money to change to a new body, leave things as they are	I am happy with the situation as it is	Whitley Council	Same conditions for all, makes for a better working environment	It would be a waste of government money. Why fix something that's not broken?	
Manx National Heritage	MNH would suggest a single employing authority would be more effective, efficient and user-friendly in assisting us to manage our staffing resources. For	We support the development of a single Joint Negotiating Committee, but would request a more transparent communication and feedback opportunity		For new starters premium/bank holiday payments should be removed.		
Department of Infrastructure					The Department is fully supportive of the proposal to establish a Public Services Commission which will be the employing authority of not only oil services to all too all the categories of employee inclining manual and confl workers employed by Departments and Escardious, and some the Conflict of the	
Department of Infrastructure continued					areas. Examples of sub-committees might include: Procedures, Performance Management Central, Capability, Culturu, Pocul affecement Monther and Guidance on the Setting of Precedent. Committees could be responsible to repeare regular reports that would be published to the commission and to management to help disseminate an understanding of sisses and to compare and contrast performance against a Touck orange of metric in offerent ress.	
Claire Scott	None	No / Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None	Waste of tax payers money	
Anonymous	None	No / Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Same	Keep as is	
Sarah Corrin	None	None / Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None	Waste of resources	
	Nothing wrong with current policy	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Every one should be treated the same	Why change what works. Waste of Gov. money	
Jacqueline Finan	None	No I don't - Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None / same conditions for all	Waste of resources	
Anne Mann Tony Hedges	None Happy with current situation	None / Whitley Council No! No need for change. Whitley Council	Whitley Council Whitley Council MOA	None Everyone should be treated equally	Waste of resources Happy with current situation of representation	
Sheila Kirby	Why do we need to waste good tax payers money	No I don't / Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Same terms & conditions to all	Couldn't Civil Servants be put to better use	
Anonymous	The Wildlife Park should be excluded. Any further erosion of terms and conditions would negatively effect animal welfare and indeed the quality of the public	I do not support the single JNC. For me to indicate an alternative, I believe is perhaps above my pay scale. However, it would seem that the existing	For persons not currently employed under Whitley T&Cs, an agreement based on Whitley but with some negotiation between employers & employees to arrive at mutually satisfactory terms and	None. If new starters are expected to work alongside existing staff at the same job then surely they should be subject to the same terms and conditions. Level	One cannot help but feel when all govt. bodies are 'tightening their belts' the timing is somewhat flawed. It has been apparent over recent years that 'change' really is quite expensive.	
Stephen Stafford	None included & all excluded. I oppose this new body.	Whitley Council has been appropriate for a number of years. No I do not. There is nothing wrong with Whitley.	conditions. Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	playing field really does spring to mind! None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	I totally oppose this proposed new body	No I do not support this. Leave as is.	Visiting Council into in - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good. Leave as it is	None	Why fix something that isn't broken, leave it alone everyone know where they stand.	
Anonymous	Same terms and conditions to all, fair to all	n/a	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	Same terms and conditions to all, fair to all	n/a	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	Don't want Whitley taken away	
Anonymous	Same terms and conditions to all, fair to all	n/a	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	Same terms and conditions to all, fair to all	n/a	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	Same terms and conditions to all, fair to all	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
	1	1			ı	

Patricia Mahoney	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Mrs Julie Crellin	Why do we need the expense of a new body. This is a waste of Tax Payers	Why / Whitley Council	Whitley Council Memorandum of Agreement	Same terms & conditions to be fair to all. Unfair to new workers.	Waste of Government money	
Tracy Triggs	Money. Why change what works really well? None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it's discriminatory / and unfair		
Sharon Lee	I oppose this proposed new body	Whitley isn't broken	Leave as is this division of a groups shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Stephen Oates	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I don't. Whitley Council	Memorandum of agreement.	None		
Anonymous	I don't agree with the new body.	No we don't support it / we stay as a Whitley Council	I want to stay as Whitley Council	None	It's a waste of Government money for me to do this.	
Paul Skillen	Why change something that works well already	No I don't support the single Joint Negotiating Committee. Alternative is	Whitley Council (MOA)	None unfair to new workers	It's wasting government funds when we don't have much already	
Gerard Dooley	I oppose this new body	No / I would like Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Same for all people	This is a waste of money, trees and time!	
Mary Smethurst	None everything to stay same	No I don't agree / Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Same terms		
Patricia Halewood		No I don't. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Same terms		
Robert Paton	This is unlikely to reduce bureaucracy and most likely cost the taxpayer more,	I do not support a single Joint Negotiating Committee. How can we expect fai		None	We're constantly told we need to save money. So why spend vast amounts to save civil servants from the	
	having to create a whole new structure. A typical government answer to get rid of a thorn in their side. None included all excluded.	Whitley Council			same fate as the common man. A total wast of my money as a taxpayer.	
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body and hope its not already a done deal	No, Whitley Council isn't broken	Keep with Whitley Council	None	More expense to the taxpayer that isn't needed	
Andrew Cowan	Why change something that works well already	No I don't, Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA - leave as is, this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None, it is discriminatory and unfair	Waste of Government money	
Sandra Ann Jones	None. Why change something that works well	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Everyone should be the same	People up above wasting time and money doing this	
E Lee	We don't need it	No stay with Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everyone should be treated the same	This is a waste of time & money. Resources should be saved for other things.	
Linda Dulson	None. It should still stay the same	No (Whitley Council)	Whitley Council (MOA)	Everyone should be treated the same		
Anonymous	None - I don't agree with it	No, I don't support. Keep it with Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Everyone should be the same		
Rebecca McCauley	None, I oppose this proposed new body of change	No I don't, Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	No I don't think it's fair for them to be treated differently		
Elaine McBrine	None included & all excluded. I oppose this new body.	No happy with terms and conditions I already have	Whitley Council	No it would be unfair to new workers	It's a waste of time & money	
Ivan Coates	Management the Government is top heavy with admin. at least 50% can be cut	No I don't. Whitley Council	Memorandum Agreement. Whitley Council	None, workforce should be treated equally	This Government is wasting yet more of taxpayers money. Too many MHKs to run 80,000 people. Had it too good too long at the top.	
Anonymous	None	No	None	None		
Tony Watson	None included & all exicuded. I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not. Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Ian Corlett	None	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None. Equality	Happy as things are.	
Neil Higgins	No one should be in it	I strongly disagree. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everyone should be treated the same	I'm very happy with the way things are	
Anonymous	Same terms and conditions for all	No	Whitley Council should be left as is	None as is discriminatory & unfair		
Pat Gilmartin	None	No / Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	No. Conditions fair for all	Lower paid workers are always first to be hit	
Rachael Smith Debbie Fergusson	Agree Agree	Yes Yes	We should all work to the same terms and conditions We should all work to the same terms and conditions	Everybody should be the same Everybody should be the same		
Rita Clague	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA - leave as is, this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
	Notice included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body	NO 1 GO HOL - WHILEY ISH'T DIONEH	Williamy Coulicit PlotA - leave as is, this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	Note - It is discriminatory and diffian		
Jean Gelling	None	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	No conditions fair for all	Lower paid workers are always first to be hit	
Philip Quayle	None None No one	No - Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None - should be same for all	Low paid workers always hit first	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattie	None None No one.	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council	Whitley Council Whitley Council MOA	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies.	
Philip Quayle	None I am totally against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council No / Whitley Council	Whitey Council Whitey Council MOA Whitey Council	None - should be same for all	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattie Helen Quayle Anonymous	None. None I am totally against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - none included	No - Whitey Council No / Whitey Council No / Whitey Council Definitely not - Whitey Council is working fine	Whitley Council Whitley Council MOA Whitley Council MOA Whitley Council Whitley Council Whitley Council MoFA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are no good	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None - should be the same for all	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first I don't even see why these changes are being proposed as I don't see why you would want to fix something that but Turken.	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattie Helen Quayle	No one. None I am totally against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - none included I oppose this proposed new body	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Definitely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - it works	Whitley Council Whitley Council MOA Whitley Council MOA Whitley Council Whitley Council MoFA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are no good Leave it as it is	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None - should be the same for all None whatsoever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers always hit first To'dn't even see with these changes are being proposed as I don't see why you would want to fix something	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattie Helen Quayle Anonymous	None. None I am totally against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - none included	No - Whitey Council No / Whitey Council No / Whitey Council Definitely not - Whitey Council is working fine	Whitley Council Whitley Council MOA Whitley Council MOA Whitley Council Whitley Council Whitley Council MoFA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are no good	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None - should be the same for all	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first I don't earn see with these changes are being proposed as I don't see why you would want to fix something that birt to broken I don't agree with thying to change something that works well. Just leave it as it is everyone knows where	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattie Helen Quayle Anonymous Anonymous	No one. None I am totally against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - none included. I oppose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body. We don't need another group as we have one that works well and I think to have	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Oefinteely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - it works No - it works No I do not - Whitley lan't broken	Whitley Council Whitley Council MOA Whitley Council MOA Whitley Council Whitley Council MoFA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are no good Leave it as it is	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None - should be the same for all None whatsoever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first I don't earn see with these changes are being proposed as I don't see why you would want to fix something that birt to broken I don't agree with thying to change something that works well. Just leave it as it is everyone knows where	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattie Helen Quayle Anonymous Anonymous Margaret Wilson	No one. None I am botally against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded: none included excluded in one included in population of the proposed from body. None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body.	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Oefinteely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - it works No - it works No I do not - Whitley lan't broken	Whitely Council Whitely Council MDA Whitely Council MoffA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are no good Leave it as it is Whitely Council MoffA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None - should be the same for all None - should be the same for all None whatsoever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - π is discriminatory and unfair	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers as hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers always hit first Card read read with the changes are being proposed as I don't see why you would want to fits something that into troken Low paid workers always hit first Card agree with trying to change something that works well. Just leave it as it is everyone knows where they stand	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattie Helen Quayle Anonymous Anonymous Margaret Wilson Anonymous Susan Taylor Charles Ian	None Lam stacky against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - once included I oppose this proposed new body None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body We don't need another group as we have one that works well and I think to have another would be a waster of transparent money. None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body Lawse a tried and not lested system alone, manual workers and of vid servants will	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Definitely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - it works No I do not - Whitley in the broken Most certainly not - keep Whitley Council No I do not, I am happy with Whitley Council I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauracracy and	Whitely Council Whitely Council MDA Whitely Council Morita - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Morita - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whe have an agreement in place already and Whitely Council do a good job	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None - should be the same for all None whatsoever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - it is discriminatory and unfair None should be the same for all employees	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers an hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers always workers Low paid workers always hit first L	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattie Helen Quayle Anonymous Anonymous Margaret Wilson Anonymous Susan Taylor Charles Ian Watson	No one. None I am totally against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - note included I oppose this processor new body None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body We don't need another group as we have one that works well and I think to have another would be a waste of tapayers money None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body Lawa a tried and extend of the proper some one of the proper some of the proper so	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council No / Whitley Council No / Whitley Council No - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No - It works No I do not - Whitley isn't broken Not certainly not - keep Whitley Council No I do not, I am happy with Whitley Council I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beaursoracy and more expense	Whitely Council Whitely Council MDA Whitely Council Leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Whitely Council Leave the system as it is	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None - should be the same for all None - should be the same for all None whatsoever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - it is discriminatory and unfair None should be the same for all employees None the same for all None at all, this is unfair for new blood seeking a career in Government	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers an hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers always workers Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers Low paid work to change something Low paid workers Low paid workers Low paid work to change something Low	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattie Helen Quayle Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Margaret Wilson Anonymous Susan Taylor Charles Ian Watson David Marsden	None Lam stacky against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - once included I oppose this proposed new body None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body We don't need another group as we have one that works well and I think to have another would be a waster of transparent money. None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body Lawse a tried and not lested system alone, manual workers and of vid servants will	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Definitely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - it works No I do not - Whitley I have been a council No I do not - Whitley isn't broken Most certainly not - keep Whitley Council No I do not, I am happy with Whitley Council I don't support a single INIC this is just more civil service beauracracy and none expense. I don't support a lange I not council I don't support a single INIC this is just more civil service beauracracy and none expense.	Whitely Council Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MoFA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are no good Leave it as it is Whitely Council MoFA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are Leave it as it is Whitely Council MoFA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good We have an agreement in place already and Whitely Council do a good job Whitely Council Leave the system as it is Leave it alone, works well	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None - should be the same for all None - should be the same for all None whatsoever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - it is discriminatory and unfair None should be the same for all employees None the same for all	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first Low paid work paid work as a low paid work with your paid work paid Low paid work paid work paid work paid work paid work paid work paid Low paid work paid	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattie Helen Quayle Anonymous Anonymous Margaret Wilson Anonymous Susan Taylor Charles Ian Watson	No one. No one. I am totally against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - none included. I oppose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body. We don't need another group as we have one that work well and I think to have another would be anset of trapayers money. None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body. Leave a tred and tested system alone, manual workers and only servants will never be the same and should not come under the same PCS. You should leave it alone. None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body. Exercise the same leave the same PCS. You should leave it alone. None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Offinitely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - it works No I do not - Whitley isn't broken Most certainly not - keep Whitley Council No I do not, I am happy with Whitley Council I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauracracy and more expense I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauracracy and more expense.	Whitely Council Whitely Council MDA Whitely Council Leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Whitely Council Leave the system as it is	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None Conditions fair for all None - should be the same for all None - should be the same for all None whatsoever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - it is discriminatory and unfair None should be the same for all employees None the same for all None at all, this is unfair for new blood seeking a career in Government I don't agree None, it is discriminatory and unfair None, it is discriminatory and unfair	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first I don't even see why these changes are being proposed as I don't see why you would want to fix something that but towlen I don't even see why these changes are being proposed as I don't see why you would want to fix something that but towlen I con't agree with thying to change something that works well. Just leave it as it is everyone knows where they stand It would cost too much and be a waste of resources i.e. Civil service which could be used better Waste of Government money Change for change sake, not needed Leave everything alone it works well How can the Tangerine Emperor unlakerally decide to 'budsay' what is a national body representing manual reforms a service with the service with allowing individual desentments settion their	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattle Helen Quayle Anonymous Anonymous Margaret Wilson Anonymous Susan Taylor Charles Ian Watson David Marsden Brett McLinden	No one. None Lam totally against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - one included I appose this proposed new body None included and all excluded - I appose this proposed new body We don't need another group as we have one that works well and I think to have another wood be a water of transpress money. None included and all excluded, I appose this proposed new body Leave a tried and netted system alone, manual workers and of vide sevents will never be the same and should not come under the same PCS You should leave it alone None included and all excluded. I appose this proposed new body Everybody should be included - I on make it fair for all personnel, a government job as government; but each of the same regist.	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Offinitely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - it works No I do not - Whitley isn't broken Most certainly not - keep Whitley Council No I do not, I am happy with Whitley Council I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauracracy and more expense I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauracracy and more expense.	Whitely Council Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOFA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are no good Whitely Council MOFA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are no good Whitely Council MOFA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whe have an agreement in place already and Whitely Council do a good job Whitely Council Leave the system as it is Leave it alone, works well Whitely Council MOFA - leave as its this division of a group shows the proposal is no good They should be included in the Public Service Commission	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None - Conditions fair for all None - Should be the same for all None - Should be the same for all None whatsever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - It is discriminatory and unfair None - It is discriminatory and unfair None should be the same for all employees None at all, this is unfair for new blood seeking a career in Government I don't agree None, It is discriminatory and unfair	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers always workers Low paid work as a ki is everyone knows where they stand Li would cost too much and be a weste of resources i.e. civil service which could be used better Waste of Government money Change for change sake, not needed Lawe everything alonce it works well How can the Tangerine Empeor unlaterally decide to butlew' what is a national body representing manual	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattle Helen Quayle Anne Beattle Helen Quayle Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Susan Taylor Charles Ian Grafes Ian David Marsden Terry Corkill Mark Longwith	No one. No one. I am totally against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - none included. I oppose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body. We don't need another group as we have one that work well and I think to have another would be anset of trapayers money. None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body. Leave a tred and tested system alone, manual workers and only servants will never be the same and should not come under the same PCS. You should leave it alone. None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body. Exercise the same leave the same PCS. You should leave it alone. None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Definitely not - Whitley Council Definitely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley Isn't broken No I do not - Whitley Isn't broken Not certainly not - keep Whitley Council No I do not, I am happy with Whitley Council I don't apport a single JNC this is just more civil service beauracracy and enore expense I don't agree leave it alone No I don't Whitley bort broken Ves If al Departments are included as above. Whitley son't broken	Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOFA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are no good. We have an agreement in place already and Whitely Council do a good job Whitely Council MOFA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good We have an agreement in place already and Whitely Council do a good job Whitely Council Leave the system as it is Leave it a system as it is Leave it alone, works well Whitely Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good They should be included in the Public Service Commission	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None Conditions fair for all None - should be the same for all None - should be the same for all None whatsever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - R is discriminatory and unfair None should be the same for all employees None should be the same for all employees None at all, this is unfair for new blood seeking a career in Government I don't agree None, it is discriminatory and unfair Leiewe that question should be sorted out by the unions with the Whitley Council for new starters if and when needed. None R is discriminatory and unfair	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers an hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers always hit seven his own workers Low paid workers also seven his own workers Low paid workers also seven his own workers Low paid workers always hit seven which could be used better Waste of Government money Change for change sake, not needed Low our the Tangerine Emperor unlisterally decide to 'butlew' what is a national body representing manual Lithis it the Whitsley Council should stay as I don't believe that allowing individual departments setting ther on terms and contino would benefit the workforc, all government employees should be subject to the	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattle Heate Anne Beattle Heate Anne Beattle Anne Beattle Anne Beattle Anneymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Sissan Taylor Charles Ian Wilson David Menden Beet Miclinden Terry Corkill Mark Longwith Joan Towers	No one. I am totally against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - noise included control in the control of the	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Definitely not - Whitley Council Definitely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley Isn't broken No I do not - Whitley Isn't broken Not certainly not - keep Whitley Council No I do not, I am happy with Whitley Council I don't apport a single JNC this is just more civil service beauricracy and enone expense I don't apper leave it alone No I don't Whitley son't broken Ves II' all Departments are included as above. Whitley work broken No. Whitley Council	Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOFA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are no good. Whitely Council MOFA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOFA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whe have an agreement in place already and Whitely Council do a good job Whitely Council Leave the system as it is Leave it a system as it is Leave it alone, works well Whitely Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good They should be included in the Public Service Commission Leave as is this division of a groups shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOA	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None conditions fair for all None - should be the same for all None whatsever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - it is discriminatory and unfair None should be the same for all employees None the same for all employees None et all, this is unfair for new blood seeking a career in Government 1 don't agree None, it is discriminatory and unfair I believe that question should be sorted out by the unions with the Whitley Council for new starters if and when needed. None it is discriminatory and unfair No. Equality for all	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first I don't even see why these changes are being proposed as I don't see why you would want to fix sonething that not toxics. I don't even see why these changes are being proposed as I don't see why you would want to fix sonething that the toxics. I don't gave with thying to change something that works well. Just leave it as it is everyone knows where they share. It would cost too much and be a waste of resources i.e. Ovil service which could be used better Waste of Covernment money Change for change sake, not needed Laive everyfining alone it works well How can the Tangerine Emperor unilaterally decide to butliev' what is a national body representing manual. I think the Whites Council ahould stay as I don't believe that allowing individual departments setting ther own terms and condition would benefit the workforce, all government employees should be subject to the same terms and conditions and rights.	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattle Helen Quayle Anno Restate Helen Quayle Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Susan Taylor Charles Ian Walson David Mansden Beet McLinden Terry Corkill Mark Longwith Joan Towers Andrea Kensall	No one. No one. I am totally against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - noise included control included. I oppose this proposed new body None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body We don't need another group as we have one that works well and I think to have another would be a waste of taxpayers one to the same of the control of the con	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Definitely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley Ison't broken No I do not - Whitley Ison't broken Most certainly not - keep Whitley Council No I do not, I am happy with Whitley Council I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beaumoracy and nower appearance of the council is don't agree leave it alone No I don't whitley son't broken Ves If all Departments are included as above. Whitley Council No . Whitley Council	Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOFA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are no good. Whitely Council MofA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good. Whe have an agreement in place already and Whitely Council do a good job Whitely Council MofA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good. We have an agreement in place already and Whitely Council do a good job Whitely Council Leave the system as it is Leave it alone, works well Whitely Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good They should be included in the Public Service Commission Leave as its this division of a groups shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOA	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None Conditions fair for all None - should be the same for all None - should be the same for all None whatsoever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - it is discriminatory and unfair None - it is discriminatory and unfair None should be the same for all employees None at all, this is unfair for new blood seeking a career in Government I don't agree None, it is discriminatory and unfair Letiene that question should be sorted out by the unions with the Whitley Council for new starters if and when needed. None it is discriminatory and unfair None (it is discriminatory and unfair) None (it is discriminatory and unfair) None (it is discriminatory and unfair)	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first Low paid work by the paid paid paid to the paid paid to the p	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattle Hele Beattle Hele Beattle Anne Marke Annonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Susan Taylor Charles Ian Watson David Marsden Brett McLinden Terry Corkill Mark Longwith Joan Towers Andrea Kensall Susan Horisk	No one. None I am stasky against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - one included I appose this proposed new body Whe den't need another group as we have one that works well and I think to have stockler would be a wester of trappose this proposed new body We den't need another group as we have one that works well and I think to have stockler would be a wester of trappose this proposed new body Leave a tried and and excluded. I oppose this proposed new body Leave a tried and tested system alone, manual workers and of all servants will never be the same and should not come under the same PCS Your should be served a foorce. None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body Everybody should be included - to make it fair for all genored, a government job is a government job and all employees should be subject to the same right. I oppose this proposed new body None	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Definitely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley founcil is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley Isn't broken Most certainly not - keep Whitley Council No I do not, I am happy with Whitley Council I don't support a single INIC this is just more civil service beauricracy and noise expense I don't support a single INIC this is just more civil service beauricracy and noise expense I don't support a single INIC this is just more civil service beauricracy and noise expense I don't support a single INIC this is just more civil service beauricracy and noise expense I don't support a single INIC this is just more civil service beauricracy and noise expense Ves if all Departments are included as above. Whitley isn't broken No. Whitley Council No / Whitley Council	Whitely Council Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MoFA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are no good Leave it as it is Whitely Council MoFA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are no good We have an agreement in place already and Whitely Council do a good job Whitely Council Leave the system as it is Leave it alone, works well Whitely Council MoFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good They should be included in the Public Service Commission Leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOA	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None conditions fair for all None - should be the same for all None whatsever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - it is discriminatory and unfair None should be the same for all employees None the same for all employees None et all, this is unfair for new blood seeking a career in Government 1 don't agree None, it is discriminatory and unfair I believe that question should be sorted out by the unions with the Whitley Council for new starters if and when needed. None it is discriminatory and unfair No. Equality for all	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first R would cost too much and be a waste of resources i.e. civil service which could be used better Waste of Government money Change for change sake, not needed Leave everything alone it works well How can the Tangerine Emperor unlaterally decide to budiew what is a national body representing manual resources actionated. I think the Whitely Council should stay as I don't believe that allowing individual departments setting their same terms and conditions and rights. Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Low paid workers always hit first	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattle Hele Guayle Anne Reattle Hele Guayle Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Susan Taylor Charles Ian Watson David Marsden Brett McLinden Terry Carkill Mark Longwith Joan Towes Andrea Kensall Susan Horisk Susan Riley	None In order, years and page of the proposed new body I sen totally against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - one included I oppose this proposed new body We don't need and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body We don't need and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body When brighted and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body None included and all excluded, I oppose this proposed new body Lawse a tried and netted system alone, manual workers and off servants will never be the same and should not come under the same PCS You should leave it alone None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body Everybody should be included - I oppose this proposed new body Everybody should be included - I oppose this proposed new body I oppose this proposed new body None No one	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Definitely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley isn't broken Most certainly not - keep Whitley Council No I do not, I am happy with Whitley Council I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauricracy and none expense I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauricracy and none expense I don't agree leave at alone No I don't. Whitley sin't broken Yes if all Departments are included as above. Whitley Isn't broken No. Whitley Council No / Whitley Council	Whitely Council MofA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are ready to the council MofA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Whitely Council Leave the system as it is Leave the system as it is Leave the system as it is Leave the division of a group shows the proposal is no good They should be included in the Public Service Commission Leave as is this division of a groups shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOA	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None Conditions fair for all None - should be the same for all None whatsever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - it is discriminatory and unfair None - it is discriminatory and unfair None should be the same for all employees None the same for all employees None at all, this is unfair for new blood seeking a career in Government I don't agree None, it is discriminatory and unfair I believe that question should be sorted out by the unions with the Whitley Coulcel for new states if and when needed. None it is discriminatory and unfair No. Equality for all None None - should be the same for all None None - should be the same for all	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first To ont agree with through To ont agree with through To ont agree with through To was a wa	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattle Helen State Helen State Helen State Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Susan Taylor Charles Ian Watson Dowld Marsden Brett McLinden Terry Carkill Mark Longwith Joan Towes Andrea Kensall Susan Horisk Susan Riley Janet Magos	No me. No me. I am intakly against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - none included I appose this proposed new body Nome included and all excluded - I appose this proposed new body We don't need and other group as we have one that works well and I think to have adoless the state of the proposed new body. We don't need another group as we have one that works well and I think to have adoless that the state of the proposed new body. Name included and all excluded, I appose this proposed new body. Eaver a tried and feetd system alone, manual workers and off stervarts will never be the same and should not come under the same PCS. You should leave it atome. Name included and all excluded, I appose this proposed new body. Everybody should be included - I oppose this proposed new body. Everybody should be included - I on make it fair for all personnel, a government jot as a government jot as a government jot and all employees should be subject to the same right. E appose this proposed new body None No one No one	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Definitely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley isn't broken Most certainly not - keep Whitley Council No I do not, I am happy with Whitley Council I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauricracy and none expense I don't support as langle JNC this is just more civil service beauricracy and none expense I don't support as langle JNC this is just more civil service beauricracy and none expense I don't support as langle JNC this is just more civil service beauricracy and none expense I don't support as langle JNC this is just more civil service beauricracy and none expense No I don't Whitley sin't broken No. Whitley Council No / Whitley Council No / Whitley Council No / Whitley Council	Whitely Council MofA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are ready to the council MofA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MofA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Leave the system as it is Leave it alone, works well Whitely Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good They should be included in the Public Service Commission Leave as is this division of a groups shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOA	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None Conditions fair for all None - should be the same for all None - should be the same for all None whatsoever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - it is discriminatory and unfair None - it is discriminatory and unfair None should be the same for all employees None at all, this is unfair for new blood seeking a career in Government I don't agree None, it is discriminatory and unfair Letiene that question should be sorted out by the unions with the Whitley Council for new starters if and when needed. None it is discriminatory and unfair None (it is discriminatory and unfair) None (it is discriminatory and unfair) None (it is discriminatory and unfair)	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first To ont agree with through or change something that works well. Just leave it as it is everyone knows where they stand It would cost too much and be a waste of resources i.e. Civil service which could be used better Waste of Government money Change for change sake, not needed Leave everything alone it works well How can the Tangerine Emperor unlaterally decide to budiew what is a national body representing manual Think the Whitely Council should stay as I don't believe that allowing individual departments setting they same terms and conditions and rights. Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Low paid workers always hit first Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Lowe paid workers are always hit first	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattle Hele Longwith Joan Towes Andrea Kensall Susan Horisk Susan Riley	None In order, years and page of the proposed new body I sen totally against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - one included I oppose this proposed new body We don't need and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body We don't need and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body When brighted and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body None included and all excluded, I oppose this proposed new body Lawse a tried and netted system alone, manual workers and off servants will never be the same and should not come under the same PCS You should leave it alone None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body Everybody should be included - I oppose this proposed new body Everybody should be included - I oppose this proposed new body I oppose this proposed new body None No one	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Definitely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley isn't broken Most certainly not - keep Whitley Council No I do not, I am happy with Whitley Council I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauricracy and none expense I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauricracy and none expense I don't agree leave at alone No I don't. Whitley sin't broken Yes if all Departments are included as above. Whitley Isn't broken No. Whitley Council No / Whitley Council	Whitely Council MofA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are ready to the council MofA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Whitely Council Leave the system as it is Leave the system as it is Leave the system as it is Leave the division of a group shows the proposal is no good They should be included in the Public Service Commission Leave as is this division of a groups shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOA	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None Conditions fair for all None - should be the same for all None whatsever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - it is discriminatory and unfair None - it is discriminatory and unfair None should be the same for all employees None the same for all employees None at all, this is unfair for new blood seeking a career in Government I don't agree None, it is discriminatory and unfair I believe that question should be sorted out by the unions with the Whitley Coulcel for new states if and when needed. None it is discriminatory and unfair No. Equality for all None None - should be the same for all None None - should be the same for all	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first To ont agree with through To ont agree with through To ont agree with through To was a wa	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattle Helen State Helen State Helen State Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Susan Taylor Charles Ian Watson Dowld Marsden Brett McLinden Terry Carkill Mark Longwith Joan Towes Andrea Kensall Susan Horisk Susan Riley Janet Magos	No me. No me. I am intakly against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - none included I appose this proposed new body Nome included and all excluded - I appose this proposed new body We don't need and other group as we have one that works well and I think to have adoless the state of the proposed new body. We don't need another group as we have one that works well and I think to have adoless that the state of the proposed new body. Name included and all excluded, I appose this proposed new body. Eaver a tried and feetd system alone, manual workers and off stervarts will never be the same and should not come under the same PCS. You should leave it atome. Name included and all excluded, I appose this proposed new body. Everybody should be included - I oppose this proposed new body. Everybody should be included - I on make it fair for all personnel, a government jot as a government jot as a government jot and all employees should be subject to the same right. E appose this proposed new body None No one No one	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Definitely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley isn't broken Most certainly not - keep Whitley Council No I do not, I am happy with Whitley Council I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauricracy and none expense I don't support as langle JNC this is just more civil service beauricracy and none expense I don't support as langle JNC this is just more civil service beauricracy and none expense I don't support as langle JNC this is just more civil service beauricracy and none expense I don't support as langle JNC this is just more civil service beauricracy and none expense No I don't Whitley sin't broken No. Whitley Council No / Whitley Council No / Whitley Council No / Whitley Council	Whitely Council MofA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are ready to the council MofA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MofA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Leave the system as it is Leave it alone, works well Whitely Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good They should be included in the Public Service Commission Leave as is this division of a groups shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOA	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None Conditions fair for all None - should be the same for all None whatsever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - it is discriminatory and unfair None - it is discriminatory and unfair None should be the same for all employees None the same for all employees None at all, this is unfair for new blood seeking a career in Government I don't agree None, it is discriminatory and unfair I believe that question should be sorted out by the unions with the Whitley Coulcel for new states if and when needed. None it is discriminatory and unfair No. Equality for all None None - should be the same for all None None - should be the same for all	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first To ont agree with through or change something that works well. Just leave it as it is everyone knows where they stand It would cost too much and be a waste of resources i.e. Civil service which could be used better Waste of Government money Change for change sake, not needed Leave everything alone it works well How can the Tangerine Emperor unlaterally decide to budiew what is a national body representing manual Think the Whitely Council should stay as I don't believe that allowing individual departments setting they same terms and conditions and rights. Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Low paid workers always hit first Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Lowe paid workers are always hit first	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattle Helen Quayle Anne Beattle Helen Quayle Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Susan Taylor Charles Ian Watson David Marsden Best McLinden Terry Corkill Mark Longwith Joan Towes Andrea Kensall Susan Horisk Susan Riley Janet Maggs Sharon Kinnin	No me. No me. I am Intality against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - none included I appose this proposed new body Nome included and all excluded - I appose this proposed new body We don't need another group as we have one that works well and I think to have audition would be a waste of interprets money Nome included and all excluded - I appose this proposed new body Exercise a tried and feed system alone, manual workers and of will remove be the same and should not come under the same PCS Vary bround leave it alone Nome included and all excluded, I appose this proposed new body Exerptiony should be included - I appose this proposed new body Exerptiony should be included - I appose this proposed new body Exerptiony should be included - I appose this proposed new body Nome included and all excluded, I appose this proposed new body Nome No one No one	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Definitely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley Introduced is working fine No I do not - Whitley Introduced in the Introduced in the Introduced in Int	Whitely Council MofA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are no good We have an agreement in place already and Whitely Council do a good job Whitely Council Leave the system as it is Leave the system as it is Leave the system as it is Leave the division of a group shows the proposal is no good They should be included in the Public Service Commission Leave as is this division of a groups shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOA	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None conditions fair for all None whatsever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - It is discriminatory and unfair None - It is discriminatory and unfair None should be the same for all employees None at all, this is unfair for new blood seeking a career in Government I don't agree None, It is discriminatory and unfair I believe that question should be sorted out by the unions with the Whitley Council for new starters if and when needed. None It is discriminatory and unfair No. Equality for all None None - should be the same for all None No. Conditions fair for all None	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first To ont agree with through or change something that works well. Just leave it as it is everyone knows where they stand It would cost too much and be a waste of resources i.e. Civil service which could be used better Waste of Government money Change for change sake, not needed Leave everything alone it works well How can the Tangerine Emperor unlaterally decide to budiew what is a national body representing manual Think the Whitely Council should stay as I don't believe that allowing individual departments setting they same terms and conditions and rights. Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Low paid workers always hit first Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Lower paid workers are always first to be hit	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattle Helen Quayle Anne Beattle Helen Quayle Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Susan Taylor Charles Ian Watson David Marsden Bett McLinden Terry Corkill Mark Longwith Joan Towers Andrea Kensall Susan Horisk Susan Riley Janet Maggs Sharon Kinnin Robert Gilbert	No me. No me. The mittable paginist any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded—none included I appose this proposed new body Nome included and all excluded—I appose this proposed new body We don't need another group as we have one that works well and I think to have admitted to the state of the proposed new body. Whose included and all excluded—I appose this proposed new body Nome included and all excluded, to appose this proposed new body Eaver a tried and feed system allow, manual workers and off stervarts will never be the same and should not come under the same PCS Nome included and all excluded. I appose this proposed new body Everybody should be included—I appose this proposed new body Everybody should be included—I on palse it fair for all personnel, a government jot is a government jot as a government jot and all employees should be subject to the same right. I appose this proposed new body Nome No one No one No one	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Definitely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley In throken Most certainly not - keep Whitley Council No I do not, I am happy with Whitley Council I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauracacy and more expense I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauracacy and more expense I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauracacy and more expense I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauracacy and more expense I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauracacy and more expense No I don't Whitley san't broken No Whitley I son't broken No / Whitley Council	Whitely Council Uses as it is Whitely Council MofA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good We have an agreement in place already and Whitely Council do a good job Whitely Council Leave the system as it is Mhitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOA	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None conditions fair for all None whatsever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - It is discriminatory and unfair None - It is discriminatory and unfair None should be the same for all employees None at all, this is unfair for new blood seeking a career in Government I don't agree None, It is discriminatory and unfair I believe that question should be sorted out by the unions with the Whitley Council for new starters if and when needed. None It is discriminatory and unfair No. Equality for all None None - should be the same for all None None. Fair for all	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first To ont agree with through or change something that works well. Just leave it as it is everyone knows where they stand It would cost too much and be a waste of resources i.e. Civil service which could be used better Waste of Government money Change for change sake, not needed Leave everything alone it works well How can the Tangerine Emperor unlaterally decide to budiew what is a national body representing manual Think the Whitely Council should stay as I don't believe that allowing individual departments setting they same terms and conditions and rights. Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Low paid workers always hit first Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Lower paid workers are always first to be hit	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattle Helen Quayle Anne Beattle Helen Quayle Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Susan Taylor Charles Ian Wilson David Manden Petrry Corkill Mark Longwith Joan Towers Andrea Kensall Susan Horisk Susan Reley Janet Maggs Sharon Kinnin Robert Gilbert Anonymous Louise Jordan	No one. No one. The mitotally against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded—none included I appose this proposed new body Nome included and all excluded—I appose this proposed new body We don't need another group as we have one that works well and I think to have admitted to the state of bacapies money Nome included and all excluded—I appose this proposed new body Everybody should be included—I appose this proposed new body Everybody should be included—I appose this proposed new body Everybody should be included—I appose this proposed new body Everybody should be included—I appose this proposed new body Everybody should be included—I appose this proposed new body Nome included and all excluded. I appose this proposed new body Nome No one No one No one No one No one None None	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Definitely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley founcil is working fine No - It works No I do not - Whitley in the broken Most certainly not - keep Whitley Council No I do not, I am happy with Whitley Council I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauricracy and more expense I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauricracy and more expense I don't appear beave it alone No I don't Whitley sin't broken Yes if all Departments are included as above. Whitley son't broken No. Whitley Council No / Whitley Council	Whitely Council MofA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals is no good We have an agreement in place already and Whitely Council do a good job Whitely Council Leave the system as it is Leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good They should be included in the Public Service Commission Leave as is this division of a groups shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOA	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None conditions fair for all None conditions fair for all None whatsever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None whatsever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - it is discriminatory and unfair None at all, this is unfair for new blood seeking a career in Government I don't agree None, it is discriminatory and unfair I believe that question should be sorted out by the unions with the Whitley Council for new stateers if and when needed. None it is discriminatory and unfair No. Equality for all None None - should be the same for all None None - Fit is discriminatory and unfair	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies. Low paid workers always hit first To ont agree with through or change something that works well. Just leave it as it is everyone knows where they stand It would cost too much and be a waste of resources i.e. Civil service which could be used better Waste of Government money Change for change sake, not needed Leave everything alone it works well How can the Tangerine Emperor unlaterally decide to budiew what is a national body representing manual Think the Whitely Council should stay as I don't believe that allowing individual departments setting they same terms and conditions and rights. Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Low paid workers always hit first Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Lower paid workers are always first to be hit	
Philip Quayle Anne Beattle Anneymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Susan Taylor Charles Ian Watel Anneymous David Marsden Brett McLingwith Anneymous Andrea Kerstall Susan Rolley Janet Maggs Sharon Kinnin Robert Gilbert Anonymous Louise Jordan Catherine Canning Catherine Canning Catherine Canning Catherine Canning Catherine Canning	No one. Nome The ministry against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded—one included I appose this proposed new body Name included and all excluded—I appose this proposed new body We don't need another group as we have one that works well and I think to have another would be a waste of taxpayers money Nome included and all excluded—I appose this proposed new body Example of the same and all excluded in a possible or the same PCS Nome included and all excluded. I appose this proposed new body Everybody should be included—I appose this proposed new body Everybody should be included—I appose this proposed new body The same and all excluded—I appose this proposed new body Nome included and all excluded—I appose this proposed new body Nome No one No one No one None N	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Definitely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No - It work -	Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOFA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put florward are no good We have an agreement in place already and Whitely Council do a good job Whitely Council MOFA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good We have an agreement in place already and Whitely Council do a good job Whitely Council MOFA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOFA - leave as it this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOFA - leave as it this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOFA - leave as it this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOFA Whitely Council MOFA Whitely Council MOFA - leave as it this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOFA - leave as it this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOFA - leave as it this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOFA - leave as it this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOFA - leave as it this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council MOFA - leave as it this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None conditions fair for all None conditions fair for all None whatsever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - it is discriminatory and unfair None should be the same for all employees None the same for all employees None at all, this is unfair for new blood seeking a career in Government I don't agree None, it is discriminatory and unfair I believe that question should be sorted out by the unions with the Whitley Council for new starters if and when needed. None Et is discriminatory and unfair None exhould be the same for all None None - fair for all None None. Fair for all None - it is discriminatory and unfair None, should be the same for everyone	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers always hit first I don't even see why these changes are being proposed as I don't see why you would want to fix something I don't even see why these changes are being proposed as I don't see why you would want to fix something I don't even see why these changes are being proposed as I don't see why you would want to fix something I don't see why the proposed of the proposed as I don't see why you would want to fix something It would cost too much and be a waste of resources i.e. o'vil service which could be used better Waste of Government money Change for change sake, not needed Lawe everything alone it works well New can the Trapener Experor unlabelently decide to 'outlow' what is a national body representing manual sourcess antonoxide: I him the Whitshey Council should stay as I don't believe that allowing individual departments setting the'r own terms and conditions and rights. Waste of Covernment money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Lowe paid workers always hit first Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Low paid workers are always first to be hit Low paid workers are always first to be hit Low paid workers hit first	
Philip Quayle Anne Bestitle Hielen Quayle Annoymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Susan Taylor Charles Ian Walse Ian	No one. No one. The mittable paginist any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded—note included! I appose this proposed new body Name included and all excluded—I appose this proposed new body We don't need another group as we have one that works well and I think to have another would be a waste of trapsyses money Nome included and all excluded—I appose this proposed new body Earway to the search of the property of the proposed new body Earway to the darked system alone, manual workers and off diservents will never be the same and should not come under the same PCS Everybody should be included—I appose this proposed new body Everybody should be included—I appose this proposed to the same right. I appose this proposed new body None No one No one No one No one No ene N	No - Whitley Council No / Whitley Council No / Whitley Council Definitely not - Whitley Council is working fine No - It works No - It work -	Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOA Whitely Council MOFA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposals put florward are acrea to good We have an agreement in place already and Whitely Council do a good job Whitely Council MOFA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good We have an agreement in place already and Whitely Council do a good job Whitely Council Leave the system as it is a council that is Leave the system as it is Leave the system as i	None - should be same for all None Conditions fair for all None conditions fair for all None conditions fair for all None whatsever, this would be unfair and discriminatory None None - it is discriminatory and unfair None should be the same for all employees None the same for all employees None the same for all employees None, it is discriminatory and unfair I don't agree None, it is discriminatory and unfair I believe that question should be sorted out by the unions with the Whitley Courcil for new starters if and when needed. None it is discriminatory and unfair No. Equility for all None None None None Signature of the same for all None None it is discriminatory and unfair None is discriminatory and unfair	Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers always hit first Low paid workers always hit first I don't even see why these changes are being proposed as I don't see why you would want to fix something I don't even see why these changes are being proposed as I don't see why you would want to fix something I don't even see why these changes are being proposed as I don't see why you would want to fix something I don't see why the proposed of the proposed as I don't see why you would want to fix something It would cost too much and be a waste of resources i.e. o'vil service which could be used better Waste of Government money Change for change sake, not needed Lawe everything alone it works well New can the Trapener Experor unlabelently decide to 'outlow' what is a national body representing manual sourcess antonoxide: I him the Whitshey Council should stay as I don't believe that allowing individual departments setting the'r own terms and conditions and rights. Waste of Covernment money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Lowe paid workers always hit first Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first Low paid workers are always first to be hit Low paid workers are always first to be hit Low paid workers hit first	

Public Services Commission Consultation Responses

Miss Sonia	All	No Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Powlesland Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken		None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
.,	None included and all excluded - 1 oppose this proposed new body	No 1 do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good			
Anonymous	None	No		None		
Jeanette Gelling	None included - I oppose this new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Mrs Denise Foxtor	None included and all excluded	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	No changes should be made due to everything as it is is ok	No again things are ok	A change would not suit manual workers	Once again nothing should be changed	I feel with all these questions are focussed on getting things changed which is not for me	
K C Bridson	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not. Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA. Leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None. It is discriminatory and unfair.		
Joe Kniveton	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body	Whitley is not broken. No I do not.	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	I like it the way it is do not wish to change. I oppose this proposed new body	No I don't, Whitley Council is not broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None. It is discriminatory and unfair.	Leave alone!	
Anonymous	I don't think any should be included and all excluded. I oppose this new body.	No I do not.	Leave as is this division of a groups shows the proposal is no good	None as I feel it is discriminatory and unfair	I feel it is terribly unfair, service users will lose out.	
Mrs C Glaister			Should stay as Whitley Council			
Mrs C Glaister	Leave it as it is. T&Cs surely can not be the same for manual workers and civil servants	No. T&Cs negotiated through Whitley Council	Should stay as Whitley Council	None	If this goes through manual workers will be forgotten. Will unions be listened to?	
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA - leave as is, proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first	
Anonymous	Keep the status quo	Continue with Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Keep all conditions to be fair to all	Waste of money already have Whitley Council that works well	
Anonymous	None. This is a waste of taxpayer's money - the expense of creating a new body	No I don't - Whitley Council	Memorandum of agreement Whitley Council	Same terms and conditions - needs to be fair to all. Unfair to new workers - very	This is a total waste of government money - couldn't a civil servant be put to better use? It will make things	
	is unnecessary. Why change what works well?			*discriminatory* to treat staff that do same job differently.	financially harder for people that are already battling in this recession. Really and truly terribly unfair.	
Hayley Hunter	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body. Why do we need the expense of a new body therefore none, this is a waste of taxpayer's money.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Memorandum of agreement Whitley Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - It is discriminatory and unfair	Waste of government money!	
Juliann Doyle	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not, I am happy with Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None the same for all		
Anonymous	All excluded	No I do not I'm happy with Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None should be the same for everyone	Waste of government money	
Jasmine Louise Qualtrough	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitly Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None. It is discriminatory and unfair.	Waste of government money !!!!	
Linda Moore	None, should be in there. Everything should stay the same.	No, I don't (stick to Whitley Council)	Whitley Council (M.O.A.)	Everyone should be treated the same		
M Cooke	None - why do we need to change?	No I don't. Keep to Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Everyone treated the same		
Anonymous	None	No stick with Whitley Council	Stick with Whitley Council	No different		
Lisa Wan	None - why we need to change. We happy now.	No I don't. Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Everyone should treat same		
Suzanne Kelch	None. Doesn't need change	No - Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Everyone should be treated the same		
Sinead McNulty	No one should be in it	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Should be kept the same		
Carolyn Sayle	Why change something what works well and waste tax payed money	No. Whitley Council is working well and we don't want new terms and conditions	Leave us alone in the Whitley Council	None we are all same	The gov is waste of time putting money in things that not important when the front line services are cut	
Eva Caine	None	No. Whitley Council	Stay where we are	All treated the same	Total waste of time and money	
P M Kinvig	None. Why change things that are not broken. A total waste of tax payers money. I oppose the new proposed change.	No. Whitley Council works well as it is. Also a lot of workers pay will be affected leaving them a lot worse off financially.	Stay with Whitley Council. Leave Whitley Council as it is.	None. Every employee should be on the same conditions, as a lot of manual workers are skilled and trained to a high standard.	The gov is wasting a lot of TAX PAYERS money if this goes ahead. A LOT of frontline services will suffer if this goes ahead.	
Jayne Kneale	None in it and no to change	No stick to Whitley Council	Whitley Council	All treated the same		
Colin Callister	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not. Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA. Leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	Unfair to manual workers	
Marcus Kinnin	Property maintenance should be excluded as it works very well as it is and with a few administrative tweaks, could be great.	No, I do not. We need to remain separate because blue and white collar workers have totally different working conditions. Whitley Council must remain for the good of the manual staff.	I think Whitley Council functions very well for the blue collar workers and would do for all local authority manual staff so lets keep it, it's not broken so why are we trying to fix it?!	I believe they should be entitled to the same terms and conditions as I have worked with for the past 30 years with very little complaint.	The whole concept is a mistake and a disaster waiting to happen. Victorian era working conditions are not welcome here again by any Manx workers. Leave us be.	
Adam Teare	The Whitely Council must be excluded from the Public Services Commission. It works for the Employer & Employee. Why change something that's not broken and is EAIE.	Tay, solely one negotiating committee cannot decide terms and conditions of a mass workforce when within it has varied salled and level of responsibility throughout. One body cannot negotiate for the varied workforce.	Leave Whitley alone it works and is EAIR	None. They have the same right to the same terms and conditions as the workers who are employed.	Covernment at present cannot get shalt they want from the workers regarding TAGs. If the Public Sendices Commission is agreed that libe an easy option to change the first 5cs that have been tought for over many years for all workers. Government can make the <u>notes</u> up to <u>self themselves</u> under this new scheme. *I think MRKs, Ministers and MLCs should be leading by example and change their terms and conditions <u>first</u> *	
Dave Hardinge	I strongly disagree with any changes. When the present committee do a fantastic job.	No, why change something that works well	Changing the current format could only be a disaster for manual workers.	None, they are entitled to the same benefits as the rest.	In my opinion it is a disgrace trying to dispand Whitley Council, why change something that works perfectly well for its members.	
Gary Skelly	Leave Whitley Council alone it works well as history has proven.	I do not think a single negotiating committee will work. There are always two sides to a negotiation. Whitley have always served us well.	Whitley Council have worked hard for our T&C our time an half, double time, shift, sick, accrued and our well being.	I think T&C should stay it has worked well. Why should the working man lose all his entitlements due to someone else's <u>greed</u> .	Trying to make men work between 4.30am - 11pm for straightime is a Joke. Can we join the Sefton Group, Private Firm's oet what they want.	
Nick Turner	Whitley Council represents the working man. Leave it be. We do "not" need another body. At what cost would this all come at?	Whitley Council is the go between we need them. There is nothing wrong with the way Whitley function.	I think proposal is not the the advantage of both parties, in the long term.	Things work as they are please leave things alone that are not broken. Terms and conditions must stay the same across the board out of fairness.	Private ritins get what they want. If the Whitley Council is abolished the Government will ride roughshod over the workforce.	
Anonymous	Things must be left as they are. It works as it is.	A single committee won't work. Whitley Council have done things that work for us.	Terms & conditions were negotiated by Whitley Council for us and in my mind the arrangements must stay as they are.	Nothing must change for <u>anyone</u> . Not even new starters.	Its all <u>take</u> a 04.30 start is a <u>no brainer</u> accrued <u>must stay</u> and the Director should try and get it into his head how it works.	
. ,		parameter and the second secon		Same terms and conditions to all	Another waste of public money. Government too top heavy.	
Anonymous	None. Just another way to waste tax payers money	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Suite terris and conditions to an		
	None. Just another way to waste tax payers money None included all excluded. Keep Whitley Council	No. Whitley Council No. Remain in Whitley Council	Whitley Council Whitley Council	None		
Anonymous				None None		
Anonymous Anonymous	None included all excluded. Keep Whitley Council	No. Remain in Whitley Council	Whitiey Council	None	Enough stress with Government, don't need more! Too many trying to run such a small Island!	
Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous	None included all excluded. Keep Whitley Council None. Keep Whitley Council	No. Remain in Whitley Council No. Whitley Council No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council Whitley Council	None None	Enough stress with Government, don't need more! Too many trying to run such a small Island! Waste of government money	

George Cottrell	Why do we need the expense of new body therefore none this is a waste of tax pavers money	No I do not. Whitley Council isn't broken	Memorandum of Agreement Whitley Council. Leave as is this Division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None it is discriminatory and unfair	Waste of government money	
Sylvia Sloane	No need for change. Whitley Council works well for all employees.	Continue with Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None, it is discriminatory. It should be same terms and conditions for all.	Waste of money, why change what works well and is fair to all	
Tracy Chambers	I think that things should stay the way they are, why the need for change?	No I do not support a single joint negotiating committee for employees. Leave arrangements as they are. Whitley Council	Whitley Council leave as it is.	I do not think there should be any changes for new starters it would be discriminative towards them. Same terms and conditions as other staff.		
Paul Kinrade	Having worked for the Department for 30 years I can say the Whitley Council have done a great job and I feel it could be dangerous to our T&Cs should they	arrangements as they are. Whitley Council No it works well as it is	Whitley Council as it works well	discriminative towards them. Same terms and conditions as other staff. None why should they as there is nothing wrong with the current ones	It seems because the Whitley Council is flighting for the rights of working men then the Government want	
	have done a great job and I feel it could be dangerous to our T&Cs should they be done away with.				them gone so they can then do what they want.	1
Anthony Montgomery	I don't think there should be any changes. Committee do a great job.	You shouldn't change something that works	Changing terms and conditions will only cause more problems for manual and craft workers	Should have same terms and conditions as it's only fair	Whitley should stay as it works great for its members	
Chris Bentham	Whitley Council should be excluded from the new Commission because it works well already and doesn't need changing.	No, I don't think any negotiations would be fair in the future without the Whitley Council	Whitley Council. Changing things will affect a lot of people and probably not for the best	None because you will have employees on different conditions and that's not fair for everyone	I think it's a bad idea and won't be fair for everyone. The Whitley Council works as it is and should not be changed.	
Jason Chatwood	No changes should be made, Whitley Council should be left well alone.	No, Whitley do a great job and also ensure that T&Cs are fair and equal.	Whitley Council do a good job on determining our T&Cs, giving each employer groups fair conditions	None, how would it be fair for people under the same employer group name have different T&Cs. Completely idiotic.	It seems like again the manual workers are the ones taking most of the flack. Like normal. It's like bringing back rules that were in place in Victorian Times.	
Ian Daw	I think that no changes should be made to the Whitley Council	No I do not support a joint negotiating committee, always should be two sides to a negotiation	Whitley Council have always looked after our terms and conditions. I don't think they need any more interference.	None. Why should the working man lose out to others being greedy.	Just leave alone it has worked well for us the past.	
David Partridge	None, I see it as a waste of money for a restructure of something that is already	Not really I see it as unnecessary and unfair for a single dept to control all.	Whitley Council MofA, shows the proposal is no good	None	Trying to fix something that is not broken is an expense our taxpayers can't afford	
Linda Dalton	in place and working very well already No one should be in it	Alternative? - Whitley Council I do not agree. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everyone should be same		
Anonymous	I don't think any groups need to be included, a new body will waste more	No I do not, Whitley Council has been looking after its workers for a long	I wouldn't like to change any arrangements, keep Whitley Council.	Terms and conditions need to be fair for all new workers, therefore, keep	I feel whilst trying to establish terms & conditions, new bodies ect. you will be wasting money from the	<u> </u>
	taxpayers' money to become established.	time, it's already established and works.		everybody on the same T&C, whether a new starter or not.	taxpayers' purse. Also whilst short term you think you may save money, long term essential public services	
Tracey Moorley	None at all	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None	Would you like to be paid single pay for Xmas day, Boxing day, New Years Day etc.? Stop picking on least paid & most worked.	
Melanie Caple	No. 17 Calculated All should always at 1	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None. Equal Opportunities	Would you like to work weekends for single rate? Why always pick on the lowest paid, start at the top.	
Anonymous	No groups included. All should stay as they are.	No. Does not seem the need to change what is working at the present.	Whitley Council	New staff to have new terms and conditions.		I
Anonymous	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	None included all excluded total opposition to this body	No Whitley works well	Whitley Council Memorandum of Agreement leave as is.	None discriminatory to new starters and unfair	Waste of time and money	
Ronald Cowley	I oppose this new body as it will not be in the interest of manual workers	No Whitley works well and has stood the test of time	Whitley Council MofA	None its unfair to manual workers	None I believe it's a plan by government to diminish the conditions of manual workers	
D Leece	None include and all excluded. I oppose this as your future T&C and income that is under threat	No I do not Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA leave as is division of group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Ann Glover	Why change something that works well. Why don't you leave the way they are. Should leave things the way they are.	No! Whitley Council works well for everyone, we don't want any to change.	Leave us alone in Whitley Council	There should not be any changes we are all the same	The gov is a waste of money & time that are not important you would have more money in your pot get rid of half of the Managers you will save a lot of money instead of looking at us.	
Graham Spencer	The system already in use is more than acceptable. Why waste even more money settling up a new one.	I do not support a single joint negotiating committee and I fully support Whitley Council.	Whitley Council	Same terms and conditions for all, to avoid separation as this would be unfair for new starters.	Maintain Whitley Council for fair conditions for manual workers. To avoid separation & a divison for fairer working rights for manual workers.	
Sue Skillicom	It works very well, why change it?	Why Whitely Council?	Whitley Council	Unfair to all	Waste of government money	
Anonymous	None included or excluded. I disagree with proposed new body.	There's no alternative because you can't fix something that's not broken - i.e.	Whitley Council	None		
A Cain	No one should be in it	Whitley No I don't agree / Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everyone should be the same		
Janine Halsall	None included, the current system works well & doesn't need to be changed	No there is no need for such a drastic change to the structure, it works well	Leave the current T&Cs in place, they work well & don't need to be changed	None should be changed, all employees should have the same T&Cs	Giving control to one government body would give too much power over employee T&Cs - there would be no	
Paul Moffitt	None included and all excluded. No need for a new body	and shouldn't be changed No. Nothing wrong with Whitley Council	Whitley Council. If it's not broke don't fix it.	None	fairness & negotiation would be non existent No need to waste any more money lust for the sake off it.	
Frederick Klein	The Whitley Council works so why waste the expense of tax payers money and	No, as above, it works	Whitley Council, leave it as it is	None	If it falls then it will cost more money to fix it, not all departments are trained the same.	
Robert Dooley	time. None included and all excluded I oppose this new body	No I do not Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council leave as is this division shows the proposal is no good	None it is discriminatory and unfair	It is another expense waste of tax payers money to keep Mr Cannan happy	
Shaun Callow	None included & all excluded I oppose this new body None included & all excluded. No need for the proposed new body.	No Whitley Council works fine as it is.	Whitley Council Whitley Council	None it is discriminatory and unitali None changed	It is amount expense waste or tax payers money to keep Mr Cannan happy No need to waste any more money.	
Sonia Killey		No. It should stay as it is (Whitley Council) Whitley Council is our terms and conditions, this will change and maybe not for the better.	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None, it is totally unfair, nothing should be changed for new starters	It is a waste of government money.	
Lynne Cox	change it. Why change something that works well already	conditions, this will change and maybe not for the better. No I don't / Whitley Council	Memorandum of agreement	Same terms and conditions to all	Couldn't civil servant be put to better use	
Robin Crellin	None included and all excluded I oppose this proposed new body	No I don't Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA, leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None it is discriminatory and unfair	It's a waste of government money. Couldn't civil servants be put to better use.	
Arlene Cowin	This is tax payers money (why waste it). When broken fix it \ why change when		Division of Group, shows the proposal is no good	None because it is discriminatory and unfair	Waste of Government money	
	works well	change (not for the better)				
Donna Cowan	Why do we need expense of a new body, this is a waste of tax payers money. Why change something that works well already.	No I don't, Whitley Council isn't broken.	Whitly Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	Waste of government money. Couldn't Civil Servant be put to better use.	
Joyce Killen	Why change what works?	No Whitley Council	Whitley Council already.	No - all the same	Enough stress, with too many comeovers telling us what to do. Manx for the Manx not foreigners.	
Anonymous	Don't agree to any changes why change something that has worked for years.	Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None	Too many chiefs and not enough indians!!!	
Rosemary Beresford	No-one	No Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everybody should be treated the same		
Irene Elson	No I don't agree anyone should be in it	No I don't support it. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everyone should be equal		
Donna-Marie Walmsley	No one should be in it	No I do not support. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everyone should be treated equally		
Sheena Reynolds Mrs L Kavanagh	None Nobody should be in it	No. Whitley Council No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA Whitley Council MOA	None Same terms	Waste of resources	
-						
Julie Downey	Waste of tax payers cash, should you change what works	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA already	No want all the same	Enough stress with government, do not need more, too many MHKs.	
Janette McMullan Anonymous	Waste of tax payers cash, should you change what already works I don't agree changing what we already have	No. Whitley Council No want to keep Whitley Council	Whitley Council already. MOA I wish to keep Whitley Council MOA	No want all the same There should be no changes to all	Enough stress with Government don't need more. Too many MHKs, too many MLCs Seems to be too many MHKs, are they needed	
Graham Uren	No changes	Stick with what we have	Why fix something that's not broke	Leave as they are	Too many MHK for size of Island, too old, too out of date and too slow to catch a cold	I
Alison Shipsides	Waste of tax payers money	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council already. MOA	It should stay the same and all workers should be treated the same.	Should start by looking after their own instead of handing out work permits and making decisions for the manx residents MHKs should be reduced and start making decisions that will benefit the Isle of Man and not	
	1	ıl.	ı	1	and the second of the second o	

Public Services Commission Consultation Responses

Justine Oates	I don't think any of the groups should be included in the Public Services	I DO NOT support any single Joint Negotiation. Whitley Council isn't broken.	Whitley Council Memorandum of Agreements.	All terms and conditions to be fair including new workers	It's a waste of government money. Civil Servants could be put to better use.	
Janet Savle	Commission. As I think it's a waste in tax payer money. I don't think any employment groups should be included in the Public Services	No I don't support a single Joint Negotiating Committee as I believe that	Whitley Council - Memorandum of agreements.	All terms and conditions should be fair to all including new starters/workers	I think it's a waste of government money. Civil servants could be put to better use.	
		No I don't support a single Joint Negotiating Committee as I believe that Whitley Council isn't broken and works well.		3		
Anonymous	I don't believe that any should be included & I believe that all should be excluded. I am opposed to this proposed new body.	No I do not support the proposal. I would like to keep the Whitley Council.	Whitley Council MofA - leave this as is wanting to divide things shows that this proposal is not a good one.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair to the new starters.		
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not - I would like to keep Whitley Council.	Whitley Council MofA. Leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - It is discriminatory and unfair.		
Anonymous	I do not believe any should be included and I believe all should be excluded.	No I do not support the development of a single Joint Negotiation Committee. We should retain Whitley Council.	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None as it is discriminatory and unfair.		
Anonymous	None included and all excluded. I am opposed to this proposed new body.	No I do not. Whitley Council keep it as it is.	Whitley Council MofA leave as is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None this is discriminatory and unfair		
Victoria Skillen	No one should be in it	No I don't agree. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None at all.		
Loma Carron	No-one	I don't agree. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everyone treated the same		
Anglea Cowin	No-one should be in it	I don't support it. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everyone should be treated the same.		
Tina Adamson	No one should be included	No I don't agree. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None everybody should be the same		
J Taggart	None at all and I don't agree to this proposal	I do NOT. Leave it the way it is.	Whitley Council MOA	I think it should not be changed	Look elsewhere and leave us alone.	
E Bridson	No I don't agree to anyone being in this	No I don't. Stay as we are.	Whitley Council MOA	None at all	Always the manual workers getting hit.	
Naadia Wicklow	I don't agree with any of this.	No I don't - Whitley Council	MOA Whitley Council	None at all	Why change what works well.	
Joanne Cain	I don't agree with it.	No I don't. Stick to Whitley Council	Stick to Whitley Council	None	This is wasting time and money and civil service should be of better use.	
Mrs M Pownall	No need to change something that works well	No I don't!	Whitley Council	Same terms and conditions to all	Waste of Government money	
					,	
Anonymous	No need to change.	No problem with Whitley	Prefer Whitley	None discriminate and unfair		
Bryan Shepherd	Why change something what works well already	No I don't	Memorandum of Agreement	Same terms and conditions to all fair to all	Waste of Government money. Another layer of management. Take a look higher up the ladder to save money.	
Paul Corrin	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body!	No I do not! Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None it is discriminatory and unfair		
Vivien Kelly	No need to change something that works well	No I don't!	Whitley Council	Same terms and conditions for all.	Waste of Government money	
,						
Philip Cowin	Why do we need the expense of a new body? Therefore this is a waste of tax payers money. Why change something that has worked perfectly well for years.	No I do not. Whitley Council as only alternative.	I prefer the Memorandum Agreement Whitley Council	All terms and conditions should be equal so to be fair to all workers.	I feel that it is a waste of tax payers / government money. And the Civil Service could be put to better useful use.	
Mandi Dentith	No new body needed	No problems with Whitley as it is not broke still working for all workersq	No changes to be made	No discrimination as this would cause this.	No changes needed.	
Anonymous Timothy Mayers	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body No inclusion to other bodies, we are OK as we are.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken There is nothing to accomplish with changes	Whitley Council MofA leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good. Whitley Council is not broken, I wish to stay in Whitley Council	None it is discriminatory and unfair No change the terms and conditions are excellent		
Timothy Mayers Anonymous	No inclusion to other bodies, we are OK as we are. Why do we need to go to the expense and waste of taxpayers limited money to set up a new body.	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have functioning JNC and it works	Whitley Council is not broken, I wish to stay in Whitley Council Whitley Council	No change the terms and conditions are excellent Same terms and conditions to all and fair to all		
Timothy Mayers Anonymous Kendrick Shaw Richard Collister	No inclusion to other bodies, we are CK as we are. Why do we need to go to the experies and waste of taxpayers limited money to set up a new body. More excesses to tax payer why chance it. You excess for any to be included in a remit. Totally no need for this remit - waste of public money.	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have functioning JNC and it works No. Whiter Council 10: not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money.	Whitely Council is not broken, I wish to stay in Whitley Council Whitely Council Whitely Council any other proposal will not work Whitely Council any other proposal will not work Whitely Council any other proposal will not work on benefits but it all separates for no benefits but it all separates	No change the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and conditions to all and fair to all Same terms and conditions for all and fair to all Same terms and conditions fair to all None! These questions are wrote in a fashion to force one to an answer that would waste public money for no reason! Not broken!	No money in Government. Why waste what they have out. This is a total waste of money. This Government seem to be just determined to waste public money on breaking up things that airt broken and giving our money away to consultants and creating problems rather than savian money. — block a cost income from the MPTC conversion.	
Timothy Mayers Anonymous	No inclusion to other bodies, we are OK as we are. Why do we need to go to the expense and waste of taxpayers limited money to set up a new body. More expense to tax oaver why chance it. No need for any to be included in a remit. Totally no need for this remit - waste	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have functioning JMC and it works No. Whitley Council 102 - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No should stav the same. Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council is not broken, I wish to stay in Whitley Council Whitley Council Whitley Council any other procosal will not work Whitley Council obvious answer no need to waster time rewriting a new T&C system, high expense	No change the terms and conditions are excellent Same terms and conditions to all and fair to all Same terms and conditions fair to all None! These questions are wrote in a fashion to force one to an answer that	breaking up things that aint broken and giving our money away to consultants and creating problems rather than saving money. * Book at cost incurred from the MPTC conversion. Instead of wasting all this public money can we see if T&C can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping.	
Timothy Mayers Anonymous Kendrick Shaw Richard Collister Anonymous Paul Moffatt Anonymous	No inclusion to other bodies, we are OK as we are. Why do we need to go to the expense and water of capalyers limited money to More accessed to face appear why channe it. None end or any to be included in a remit. Totally no need for this remit - waste of public money. None included and excluded, I concee this proceed new body. Exclude all, why change for the sale of things Why change competing oath under the public allered.	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have functioning JNC and it works No. Whitley Council Big not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public monory. No should stav the same. Whitley isn't broken I support the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint. Necotiation Cromittee No leave well allow.	Whitely Council is not broken, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council Whitely Council any other procosal will not work. Whitely Council any other procosal will not work. Whitely Council Mohous arrawer no need to waster time rewriting a new TR.C system, high expense for no benefit, best fell alseparate. Whitely Council Moh. Issee as is this division of a cross shows the procosal is no good Whitely Council, maybe we change T.C. ourselves to meet today conditions Whitely Council	No chains the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and consistents to all and fast to all Same terms and conditions for all and to all Same terms and conditions for the all None! These questions are worte in a fashion to force one to an answer that would wate public money for no reason! Not broken! None. It is descriptional and unifar None Same terms and conditions which are fair in all	breaking up things that airt broken and giving our money away to consulants and creating problems rather than savian money. ** look at cost incurred from the MPTC conversion. Instead of wasting all this public money can we see if TBC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping terth and throin in a new IMT. Couldn't CNU Secretal be not fit in a better use.	
Timothy Mayers Anonymous Kendrick Shaw Richard Collister Anonymous Paul Moffatt	No inclusion to other bodies, we are OK as we are. With yo we need to go to the expense and waste of trapapers limited money to with yo we need to go to the expense and waste of trapapers limited money to fore sources to tax owner why chance it. No need for any to be included in a remit. Totally no need for this remit - waste of public money. Totally no need for any to be included in a remit. Totally no need for this remit - waste of public money. Exclude all, why change for the sale of things.	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have functioning JMC and a vonds No. Whither Casural Bar not at all Villy break whats not broken other than to waste public money. To should star the same. Whitele and to broken 1 support the development of things that need changing but not a single zont Accordation Common of the Secretary Common of the Secret	Whitely Council is not booken, I wish to stay in Whitelyr Council Whitelyr Council Whitelyr Council any other processed will not work. Whitelyr Council allows answer no need to waster time rewriting a new TSC system, high expense for no benefit. Best left all separate. Whitelyr Council Allows as all this division of a proun about the processed is no good Whitelyr Council, maybe we change T.C. curselves to meet today conditions	No channe the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and cronditions to all and fair to all Same terms and conditions fair to all Name There questions are work in a fashion to force one to an answer that would waste public money for no reason! Not broken! Name. It is discrimination and unifair Name. It is discrimination and unifair	breaking up things that aint broken and giving our money away to consultants and creating problems rather than sawing money - * look at cost incurred from the MPTC conversion Instead of wasting all this public money can we see if T&C can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping both and bring in a new IMC	
Timothy Mayers Anonymous Kendrick Shaw Richard Collister Anonymous Paul Moffatt Anonymous Anonymous	No inclusion to other bodies, we are OK as we are. Why do we need to go to the expense and water of trapages limited money to with you were not to go to the expense and water of trapages in the other of public money. None need for any to be included in a remail. I cataly no need for this remit - waste of public money. Those included and encluded. I consone this crossood new body. Exclude all, why change for the sake of things. Why changes comething that works well already. Why changes comething that works well All, as it hould not the going already. All, so it hould not be going already.	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have furctioning JMC and works No. Whither Casard No. Whither Casard So - not at all Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. To should stain the same. Whitele work broken I support the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint Association for committee. No leaves well alone. No - inothing wrong with Whitley Council Whitley Council has worked very well in the past, Why change and waste	Whitely Council is not broken, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council Whitely Council any other procosal will not work. Whitely Council any other procosal will not work. Whitely Council Mohous arrawer no need to waster time rewriting a new TR.C system, high expense for no benefit, best fell alseparate. Whitely Council Moh. Issee as is this division of a cross shows the procosal is no good Whitely Council, maybe we change T.C. ourselves to meet today conditions Whitely Council	No chains the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and consistents to all and fast to all Same terms and conditions for all and to all Same terms and conditions for the all None! These questions are worte in a fashion to force one to an answer that would wate public money for no reason! Not broken! None. It is descriptional and unifar None Same terms and conditions which are fair in all	breaking up things that airt broken and giving our money away to consulants and creating problems rather than savin money. ** look at cost incurred from the MPTC conversion. Instead of wasting all this public money can we see if TBC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping terth and throin in a new IMT. Couldn't CNU Secretal be not fit in a better use.	
Timothy Mayers Anonymous Kendrick Shaw Richard Collister Anonymous Paul Moffatt Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous G Hannay Stephen Boland	No inclusion to other hodies, we are OK as we are. With you we need to go to the expense and wate of trapspers limited money to Work of women of the post the expense and wate of trapspers limited money to More scores to tax over with victoria and the contract of public money. None included and encluded: I, conone this immored men body. Exclude all, with y change for the sake of things. With victoria connection that works well already. With victoria connection that works well already. All, and it housed more than the public work of the public of the public work. All, and it housed more than the public work of the public of the publi	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have furctioning JMC and upons No. Whither Casural Bu - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No. Should shar the same. Whither sin't broken I support the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint Saccolation Committee of things that need changing but not a single Joint Saccolation Committee of the Saccolation Committee No. I solve well allone No. I solve the Saccolation Committee or the Sacco	Whitely Council is not broken, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council Whitely Council Whitely Council are other amounds will not such Whitely Council Should answer on reset to waster time rewriting a new TBC system, high expense for no benefit. Best left all separate. Whitely Council Roffit, leave as is this division of a cross shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Roffit, leave as its this division of a cross-shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council	No channe the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and conditions to all and fast to all Same terms and conditions to all and fast to all Same terms and conditions fast to all None! These questions are worte in a fashion to force one to an answer that would waste public money for no reason! Not broken! None. It is discremination and unifar None. Same terms and conditions which are fast to all None: There have been built up over many years and should be kept the same. Should be same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each entitive.	breaking up things that airt breken and giving our mone; away to consultants and creating problems rather than salvin mone; — look at cost incurred from the MPTC conversion. Instead of wasting all this public mone; can we see if TRC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping with and holds in a new MPC can be abstracted as a better one. Only 100, 100, 100, 100, 100, 100, 100, 100	
Timothy Mayers Anonymous Kendrick Shaw Richard Collister Anonymous Paul Moffatt Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Collister G Hannay David MarDonald	No inclusion to other bodies, we are OK as we are. With John we can be compared to the capture and water of transpires limited money to More down the capture of the capture and the capture of public money to public money to public money to public money to public money and the capture of public money and exclusion of public money and publ	There is continue to accomplish with changes We already have functioning JMK and k works No. Whither Council So - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No should stay the same. Whitley isn't broken I support the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint Josephin of the Council Society of the Council Society of the Council Society of the Council Society No - nothing women, with Whitley Council Whitley Council has worked very well in the past. Why change and waste money.	Whitely Council is not broken, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council and the organized with a council or whitely council or whitely council or whitely council obusiness or no not benefit, dest left all separate. Whitely Council obusinesses no need to waster time rewriting a new T&C system, high expenses for no benefit, dest left all separate. Whitely Council obusinesses as the division of a organ shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council, maybe we change T.C. ourselves to meet today conditions Whitely Council	No chains the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and conditions to all and fast to all Same terms and conditions for all and to all Same terms and conditions for all and to a fastion to force one to an answer that would wate public money for no reason! Not broken! None. It is discrimination and unifair. None Same terms and conditions which are fire to all Same terms and conditions which are fire to all Same terms and conditions for all and the conditions are some and conditions. None - reversion found have same terms and conditions. None - These have been built up over many years and should be kept the same.	breaking up things that air broken and giving our mone; wavy to consultants and creating problems rather than sakin nome." "Nois it access incredit from the MPIT. conversion." Instead of vasiding all this public mone; can we see if TBC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping with another in a new MP. Couldn't Civil Servants be not to a better use. Why try to fis contining that's not bream. As a committee, that in the long run, probably, will never come to faultion. If it aint broke, don't fix it.	
Timothy Mayers Anonymous Kendrick Shaw Richard Collister Anonymous Paul Moffatt Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Collister G Hannay David MarDonald	No inclusion to other bodies, we are OK as we are. With you we need to you the expense and waste of trapapers limited money to set use a piece and the control of public money. No need for any to be included in a remit. Totally no need for this remit - waste of public money. Note included and excluded 1 concore this proceed new body. Exclude all, with others of the time of things Why changes committed new the control of things Why changes committed new to works, well already. Why changes committed new town of the control of the contro	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have furctioning JNC and vories No. Whither Council So. Whither Council So: not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No should stay the same. Whiteve isn't broken 1 support the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint baccordaries Committee. No should stay the same. Whiteve isn't broken 1 support the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint baccordaries Committee. No should share the same white post makes the seed of the public Council No continue white Council white Council white Council has worked very well in the past. Why change and waste monor. No 1 don't Whitey Council No 1 think things should be lest as they are	Whitely Council is not booken, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council are other processed will not work. Whitely Council are other processed will not work. Whitely Council obloss answer no need to waster time rewriting a new T&C system, high expense for no benefit. Best left all separate. Whitely Council Mink, leave as its this division of a cross shows the emocasil is no cood. Whitely Council Mink, leave as its this division of a cross shows the emocasil is no cood. Whitely Council Mink, leave as its this division of a cross shows the emocasil is no cood. Whitely Council Whitely Council Whitely Council Keep to the arrangements that are already in place Whitley Council etc. Whitely Council	No channe the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and cronditions that in to all Same terms and cronditions that in to all Same terms and cronditions that in a faithinn to force one to an answer that would waste public incomey for no reason! Not broken! None, it is discrimination and unifair None Same terms and cronditions which are fair to all Same terms and cronditions which are fair to all Same terms and cronditions which are fair to all Same terms and cronditions which are fair to all None - everyone should have same terms and conditions None - These have been built up over many years and should be kept the same. Should be same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emotione.	breaking up things that airt breken and giving our mone; away to consultants and creating problems rather than salvin mone; — look at cost incurred from the MPTC conversion. Instead of wasting all this public mone; can we see if TRC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping with and holds in a new MPC can be abstracted as a better one. Only 100, 100, 100, 100, 100, 100, 100, 100	
Timothy Mayers Anonymous Kendrick Shaw Richard Collister Anonymous Paul Moffatt Anonymous Aronymous Genana Genana Stephen Boland David MacDonald Paul Camarda Anonymous	No inclusion to other bodies, we are OK as we are. With John we can be compared to the capture and water of transpires limited money to More down the capture of the capture and the capture of public money to public money to public money to public money to public money and the capture of public money and exclusion of public money and publ	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have furctioning JMC and k voorks No. Whiter Caurol Se - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No. Should stav the same. Whiter isn't broken I support the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint Secondation Formation So longer well astere. No nothing woman yet will be not to see the secondation of the secondation o	Whitely Council is not booken, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council any other process will not work. Whitely Council any other process will not work. Whitely Council obvois answer no need to waster time rewriting a new T&C system, high expense for no benefit. Best left all separate. Whitely Council oblin, leave as its this division of a cross shows the process is no cood. Whitely Council, maybe we change T.C. ourselves to meet today conditions Swatter, Council Whitely Council	No change the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and conditions to all and fast to all Same terms and conditions to all and fast to all Same terms and conditions fast to all None! These questions are worte in a fashion to force one to an answer that would waste public money for no reason! Not broken! None. It is discrimination and unifair None. Same terms and conditions which are first to all Same terms and conditions which are first to all Same terms and conditions which are first to all None - everyone fould have same terms and conditions None - These have been built up over many years and should be lept the same. Should be same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emologies. None: A forth seew with it, as it's unifair None: Morn This is unifair.	breaking up things that air broken and giving our mone; wwy to consultants and creating problems rather than saukin mone." - Web at consistent from the MPIT. conversion. Instead of wasting all this public mone; can we see if TBC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping with and rivion in a new MPI . Couldn't CMS Servants be not to a better use. Why try to fits controls that's not broken. But a conversion of the c	
Timothy Mayers Anonymous Kendrick Shaw Richard Collister Anonymous Paul Moffatt Anonymous Anonymous Aronymous Stephen Boland David MacDonald Paul Camarda Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous	No inclusion to other hodies, we are OK as we are. With do we need to go the expense and wate of trappyers limited money to with do we need to go the expense and wate of trappyers limited money to More scennes to tax exercises the channe it. No need for any to be included in a remem. Totally no need for this remit - waste of public money. Some included and and excluded, I concore this processed new body. Exclude all, willy change for the sake of things Why channes contention paths undex supplies and the public of the content of the cont	There is confine to accomplish with changes We already have furctioning JMC and voxols No. Whiter Cauncil Bu - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No. Whiter Cauncil Bu - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. Is support the development of brings that need changing but not a single Joint Secondarion Common Cauncil Caunc	Whitely Council is not booken, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council any other process will not work. Whitely Council any other process will not work with the council any other process of the council and other process o	No change the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and conditions to all and fast to all Same terms and conditions to all and fast to all Same terms and conditions to all and fast to all None These questions are worth in a fastion to force one to an answer that would waste public money for no reason! Not broken! None. It is discrimination and unifair None. Same terms and conditions which has fair in all Same terms and conditions which has fair in all Same terms and conditions which has fair in all Same terms and conditions. Which has fair in all Same terms and conditions which has fair in all Same terms and conditions. None - everyone fould have same terms and conditions None - everyone fould have same terms and conditions None - These have been built up over many years and should be legt the same. Should be same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each enditions. None (Ant) Table is unifair None and the same terms and conditions for everyone and should be legt the same. None Is surfair None as the same terms and conditions for everyone, To maintain fair equal rights for each enditions.	breaking up things that aim broken and giving our money away to consultants and creating problems rather bina seation mone."—Solk at cost concern from the MPTC consensation. Instead of westing all this public money can we see if TBC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping that monthron in a new MPC. Couldn't Cho Serventh be not to all better use. Ask at another wester of money, spending on a committee, that in the long run, probably, will never come to fulfill. If it aim tooke, don't fix it. Soo noninting the manual sockers and leave allone. You sen't have a Best fix of notice! Soo noninting the manual sockers and leave allone. The commission is should statisfying terms and conditions of manual & craft workers while protecting terms & The commission is should statisfying terms and conditions of manual & craft workers while protecting terms & The commission is should statisfying terms and conditions of manual & craft workers while protecting terms & The commission is should statisfying terms and conditions of manual & craft workers while protecting terms & The decommission is should statisfying terms and conditions of manual & craft workers while protecting terms & The commission to be should statisfy the conditions of manual & craft workers while protecting terms & The commission to be should statisfy the conditions of the should be should	
Timothy Mayers Anonymous Kendrick Shaw Richard Collister Anonymous Paul Moffatt Anonymous Anonymous Aronymous Stephen Boland David MacDonald Paul Camarda Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous	No inclusion to other bodies, we are OK as we are. Why do we need to go to the expense and water of trapapers limited money to with yo we need to go to the expense and water of trapapers limited money to None source to tax ower why chance it. No need for any to be included in a remit. Totally no need for this remit - waste of public money. The need for any to be included in a remit. Totally no need for this remit - waste of public money. Social and an excluded. I concess this consocial new body. Social and an excluded I concess this consocial new body. Social and a social and an excluded I concess this consocial new body. Social and a social and an excluded I concess this consocial new body. All, as it should not be going almost well alleady. Why chance something hast works well alleady. All, as it should not be going almost well alleady. None: - the body not be going almost have proven that they have coped with chance. Therefore seen value are have and neodistic flaids on both sides. There is no need for an ever employment good, became six least of trappers Townson and the control of the concess the control of the concess their conce	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have furctioning JMC and a vonds No. Whiter Council Bu - not at all will be been some and a consideration of the council of the	Whitely Council is not booken, I wish to stay in Whiteley Council Whiteley Council are other processes will not work. Whiteley Council allows answer no need to waster time rewriting a new TSC system, high expense for no benefit. Best left all separate. Whiteley Council Allows as its this division of a procus allows the processed is no good Whiteley Council, maybe we change T.C. curselves to meet today conditions Whiteley Council I leave as it this proposal is no good Leave Whiteley Council allows Jeffer Whiteley Council as two for the manual workers Say with Whiteley Council as two for the manual workers	No change the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and conditions to all and fast to all Same terms and conditions to all and fast to all Same terms and conditions for the all None These questions are worte in a fastion to force one to an answer that would wate public nonery for no reason! Not broken! None. The discrimination and unifar None. It is discrimination and unifar None. It is discrimination and unifar None. These has the public that the fair it all Same terms and conditions which are fair it all Same terms and conditions of the fair all Noneeveryone should have same terms and conditions. None These have been built up over many years and should be kept the same. Should be same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each enditions. None These have been built up over many years and should be kept the same. None. Out and the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each enditions. None These have been built up over many years and should be kept the same. None that the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each enditions. None that the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each enditions. None that the same terms and conditions are expensed. None that the same terms and conditions are expensed. None that the same terms and conditions are expensed. None that the same terms are conditions are the same terms and conditions are the same terms are the same	breaking up things that aim broken and giving our money away to consultants and creating problems rather than sandern moner. "Sold at cost founded from the PITC conversation." Instead of westing all this public money can we see if TBC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping wheth not rivine in a new 19°. Couldn't Cluf Semants be not to a better use. Why try to fix scraminth intain's not better. Just another wester of money, spending on a committee, that in the long run, probably, will never come to make the conversation of the conversation of the conversation. If it aim broke, don't fix it. Soo numbriso the manual workers and leave slone. You wan't take a blind bit of notice!" This Commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms and conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms and conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting te	
Timothy Mayers Anonymous Kendrick Shaw Richard Collister Anonymous Paul Moffatt Anonymous Anonymous Aronymous Stephen Boland David MacDonald Paul Camarda Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous	No inclusion to other hodies, we are OK as we are. With do we need to go the expense and wate of trappyers limited money to with do we need to go the expense and wate of trappyers limited money to More scennes to tax exercises the channe it. No need for any to be included in a remem. Totally no need for this remit - waste of public money. Some included and and excluded, I concore this processed new body. Exclude all, willy change for the sake of things Why channes contention paths undex supplies and the public of the content of the cont	There is confine to accomplish with changes We already have furctioning JMC and voxols No. Whiter Cauncil Bu - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No. Whiter Cauncil Bu - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. Is support the development of brings that need changing but not a single Joint Secondarion Common Cauncil Caunc	Whitely Council is not booken, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council any other process will not work. Whitely Council any other process will not work with the council any other process of the council and other process o	No channed the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and conditions to all and for to all Same terms and conditions to all and for the all Same terms and conditions to all and for a faithful to force one to an answer that would waste public money for no reason! Not broken! None. It is discrimination and unfair None. It is discrimination and unfair None. The scheme the public of the same terms and conditions which are fair to all same terms and conditions be for all more exceptions should have same terms and conditions. None. These have been built up over many years and should be kept the same. Should be same terms and conditions for each many the same terms and conditions for each many the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each membrane. Should be same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each membrane. None. These have been built up over many years and should be kept the same. Should be same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each membrane. None. The same that the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each membrane that the same force that the same force. None at this is surfair None at this is unifair None at this is seen as discriminatory and unifair. No changes, it is unifair. Not the rip discriminate. The same force that the same rip is a fair to all the same rips. Surely this same rips. Surely this	breaking up things that aim broken and giving our money away to consultants and creating problems rather bina seation mone."—Solk at cost concern from the MPTC consenses. Instead of westing all this public money can we see if TBC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping that monther in a new MPC. Couldn't CND Servents be not to a better use. Ask at another wester of money, spending on a committee, that in the long run, probably, will never come to fulfor. If it aim tooke, don't fix it. Soo noninting the manual sockers and leave allone. You sen't have a Best fix of notice! Soo noninting the manual sockers and leave allone. The commission is should statisfying terms and conditions of manual & craft workers while protecting terms & The commission is should statisfying terms and conditions of manual & craft workers while protecting terms & The commission is should attacking terms and conditions of manual & craft workers while protecting terms & The decommission is should statisfying terms and conditions of manual & craft workers while protecting terms & The decommission is should statisfying terms and conditions of manual & craft workers while protecting terms & The decommission is should statisfying terms and conditions of manual & craft workers while protecting terms & The decommission to the condition of the should be sho	
Tinodry, Mayers Anonymous Rendrist, Shaw Richard College Anonymous Paul Moffatt Accommous Anonymous	No inclusion to other hodies, we are OK as we are. With you we need to go to the expense and wate of trapspers limited money to way you want to go the expense and wate of trapspers limited money to More scennes to tax exercises the channe it. No need for any to be included in a remail, tradaily no need for this remit - waste of public money. Some included and and excluded, I conone this processed new body. Exclude all, why change for the sake of things Why channes contention of the conone the sake of things Why change contention of the conone the sake of things. Why change contention of the conone the sake of things. None - the body's that are in place have proven that they have coped with channes. Therefore lose install was have and incontrate finish on both sides. None - the body's that are in place have proven that they have coped with channes. Therefore lose install was have and incontrate finish on both sides. None - the body's that are in place have proven that they have coped with channes. Therefore lose install was the passed in contrate finish on both sides. None included and are were unphymenic group, access as in whether of Repoper money. None included and all excluded I copose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I copose the proposed new body. None included and all excluded I copose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I copose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I copose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I copose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I copose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I copose this proposed new body.	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have functioning JMC and voxels No. Whiter Cauncil See - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. See should star the same. Whiter isn't broken I support the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint Secondarion Common. So longer seed above. No - nothing worms with Whiter Council Whiter Council has worked very well in the past. Why change and waste control. No - I think thinos dhould be level as they are John Council and the Council has been as they are John Council and the Council has been as they are No. I think thinos dhould be level as they are No. Whiter Council and Tooler Council No, Whiter is for purpose No. Whiter is for purpose No I see no undern with Whiter I don't see the no undern with Whiter I don't see the no undern with Whiter I care no credien with Whiter Joen consider with Whiter J	Whitely Council is not booken, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council and the processed will not work. Whitely Council and the processed will not work. Whitely Council obous answer no need to waster time rewriting a new T&C system, high expense for no benefit. Best left all separate. Whitely Council obous answer no need to waster time rewriting a new T&C system, high expense for no benefit. Best left all separate. Whitely Council, maybe we change T.C. ourselves to meet today conditions Whitely Council The arrangements that are already in place Whitely Council etc. Whitely Council Whitely Council The Council Whitely Council as it this proposal is no good Leave Whitely Council allower I prefer Whitely Council as it works for the manual workers Say with Whitely Council Say with Whitely Council Division on only lead to problems I prefer what I know (Whitely) No chances to be made	No change the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and conditions to all and for to all Same terms and conditions to all and for the all Same terms and conditions to all and for a fashion to force one to an answer that would water public nonery for no reason! Not broken! None. It is discrimination and unifair None. Be discrimination and unifair None. Same terms and conditions which have first to all Same terms and conditions which have first to all Same terms and conditions which have first to all None everyone found thave same terms and conditions. None These have been built up over many years and should be lept the same. Should be same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emologies. None. South some with it, as it's unifair None as this is seen as discriminatory and unifair No changes, it is unifair None as the single is unifair Not fair to discriminate. It would be unifair to new starters to be treated differently, they could be working alonguides connece with has self-terms and the discriminate.	breaking up things that aim broken and giving our money away to consultants and creating problems rather binal reading none; "Solid a cost concern from the PITC conversation." Instead of wasting all this public money can we see if TBC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping that hand hinton in a new IMC Couldn't Choi Serouths be ask to a better one. Ask at another weast of money, spending on a committee, that in the long run, probably, will never come to faultion. If it aim broke, don't fix it. Shot another waste of money, spending on a committee, that in the long run, probably, will never come to faultion. The conversions in the ability of the conversation is when it stacking terms and conditions of manual & craft workers while protecting terms & conditions of Cold sendor and manuscents. This Commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & craft workers. No changes needed.	
Tinothy Mayers Anonymous Sendrid, Shew Bichard Colleties Anonymous Paul Medita Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Sendrid Medita Anonymous	No inclusion to other hodies, we are OK as we are. With do we need to go to the expense and wate of trappines limited money to way do we need to go the expense and wate of trappines limited money to More scennes to tax exercises the channe it. No need for any to be included in a remail. Totally no need for this remit - waste of public money. Some included and and excluded. I conone this processed new body. Exclude all, why change for the sake of things Why channes connection path undex sale and the public processed and the public proces	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have furctioning JMC and vonds No. Whitter Cauncil Bu - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No. Whitter Cauncil Bu - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. I support the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint Joint Cauncil Ca	Whitely Council is not booken, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council are other processed will not work. Whitely Council are other processed will not work. Whitely Council obous answer on need to waster time rewriting a new T&C system, high expense for no benefit. Best left all separate. Whitely Council obous answer on need to waster time rewriting a new T&C system, high expense for no benefit. Best left all separate. Whitely Council obous have as it is this division of a croux shows the encocasi is no cood. Whitely Council, namely we change T.C. ourselves to meet today conditions Salaber, Council Whitely Council Whitely Council Whitely Council Whitely Council John Whitely Council as it works for the manual workers Salay with Whitely Council Devices and only lead to enchlores. John with Whitely Council John Whitely Coun	No change the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and conditions to all and for to all Same terms and conditions to all and for the all Same terms and conditions to all and for the all Same terms and conditions the to all None These questions are worth in a fashion to force one to an answer that would waste public inconey for no reason! Not broken! None. It is discrimination and unifar None. Same terms and conditions alloth has the in all Same terms and conditions alloth has the in all None - everyone though these same terms and conditions None - These have been built up over many years and should be legit the same. Should be same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emillower. None. I don't same with It, as it's unifair None alloth and the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emillower. None. I don't same with It, as it's unifair No changes, it is unifair No changes, it is unifair Not changes it is unifair Not thange it is unifair to new statiers to be treated differently, they could be working alonguide someone who has different TACs within the same role. Surely this sould be distributional.	breaking up things that aim broken and giving our money away to consultants and creating problems rather illustrations from the MTC conversion. Instead of wasting all this public money can we see if TBC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping beth and from in a men MTC. Couldn't Cho Servants be not to a better use. As a snother wester of money, spending on a committee, that in the long run, probably, will never come to drullion. If it aim t broke, don't fix it. Soo nucleishing the manual workers and tower allone. Soo nucleishing the manual workers and tower allone. This Commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & craft workers while protecting terms & conditions of its desorted and manual manual manual forms and conditions of manual & craft workers. The Commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & craft workers.	
Tinothy Meyers Anonymous Sendrick Shew Sichard Collistor Shed Meffett Anonymous Peul Meffett Anonymous Peul Meffett Anonymous Sendrick Shew Sichard Collistor Men's Chestan General Sendrick Anonymous	No inclusion to other holdes, we are OK as we are. With you we need to go to the expense and water of trapspers limited money to wire you water of the common of the comm	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have functioning JMC and vonds No. Whiter Craund No. Whiter Craund See - not at all Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. To do dould stav the same. Whitlev isn't broken I support the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint Secretary of the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint Secretary of the S	Whitely Council is not booker, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council and the processed will not work. Whitely Council allows answer no need to waster time rewriting a new TBC system, high expense for no benefit, Best left all separate. Whitely Council obusinesses no need to waster time rewriting a new TBC system, high expense for no benefit, Best left all separate. Whitely Council Manifest is the sea as it this division of a cross shows the encouse is no cood. Whitely Council Shifter Council leave as it this encousal is no cood. Loave Whitely Council as the work of the manual workers Say with Whitely Council as it work for the manual workers Say with Whitely Council Says with Whitely Council Division can only lead to oroblems I prefer what I know (Whitely) Bis channes to be made. No changes to be made. No changes to be made. No changes to be made.	No change the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and conditions to all and for to all Same terms and conditions to all and for the all Same terms and conditions to all and for a fashion to force one to an answer that would waste public inconey for no reason! Not broken! None. It is discrimination and unifar None. It is discrimination and unifar None. The share and conditions which are fair to all Same terms and conditions which are fair to all None - These have been built up over many vens and should be kept the same. None. These have been built up over many vens and should be kept the same. None. Journal of the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each entology. None. All out assess with it, as its unifar None was this is seen as discriminatory and unifair Non changes, it is unifair Not changes, it is unifair Not changes, it is unifair Not changes is unifair Not fair to discriminate. It would be unifair to new starters to be treated differently, they could be working along the someone that is different TaCs within the same one. Surely this None, any changes would cause low monale.	breaking up things that air broken and giving our money away to consultants and creating problems rather plans auditin none." "Solk at cost forward from the PMTC conversion." Instead of wasting all this public money can we see if TBC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping that non-thorin a new 18°. Conditin Choi Seventis be not to a better use. Ask ances the season of money, spending on a committee, that in the long rur, probably, will never come to failtion. If it aint broke, don't fix it. Ston numbers the about attacking terms and conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of the service and misassement. It's all about attacking terms and conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of cold service and misassement. It's all about attacking terms and conditions of manual & creft workers. This Commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & creft workers. No changes needed. I have no comments. No changes should be made. No changes.	
Tinothy Meyers Anonymous Sendrick Shave Richard Colletor Bulland Colletor Anonymous An	No inclusion to other bodies, we are OK as we are. Why do we need to go the expense and water of trapspers limited money to wire you one can go to the expense and water of trapspers limited money to when you have not considered and an extended or public money. None section and to encluded in a remail. Totally no need for this remit - waster of public money. Those included and encluded I. Decose this proceed new hold. Exclude all, why change for the sake of things. Why changes connecting that works well already. Why changes connecting has works well already. All, as it is included not be going already. None - the body's that are in place have proven that they have coped with chance. Therefore lace on all the sake and neodistic flaid with on both sides. There is no need for an ever employment goot, below as is. Waster of trapsper home included in an expense of the process	There is nothina to accomplish with changes We sheady have functioning JWK and works No. Whitter Caurcil Bu - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No. Shead of the shead of	Whitely Council is not booken, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council are other accounts will not work. Whitely Council allows answer no need to waster time rewriting a new TSC system, high expense for no benefit. Best left all separate. Whitely Council South, Sieve as it this division of a cross shows the annotation is no cood Whitely Council, maybe we change T.C. curselves to meet today conditions Whitely Council South of the South	No channel the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and conditions to all and for to all Same terms and conditions to all and for the all Same terms and conditions to all and for a faithful to force one to an answer that would waste public money for no reason! Not broken! None. It is discrimination and unfair None. The channel of the conditions which are fair to all Same terms and conditions which are fair to all None -everyone should have same terms and conditions. None. These have been built up over many years and should be kept the same. Should be some terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights when the conditions of the condi	breaking up things that air broken and giving our more; wwy to considerate and creating problems rather ibana sealar proper. "Solid a cost concern from the MFTC convencion." Instead of westing all this public mone; can we see if TBC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping herh and heries in a new IMF* Consideration for the sealar sealar sealar sea. Consideration for the sealar sealar sealar sea. Consideration for the sealar sealar sealar sea. Consideration for the sealar sealar sealar sealar sea. Consideration for the sealar sea	
Tinothy Mayers Anonymous Sendrid Shave Schard Collistor Anonymous Fluid Moffatt Adominious Adominious Wendy Christian Gelland Sephen Boland David MecConsid Paul Camarde Anonymous Anonymo	No inclusion to other hodies, we are OK as we are. With you we need to go to the expense and wate of trapspers limited money to writing you want to go the expense and wate of trapspers limited money to you want you want you want you	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have furctioning JMr. and a vonds No. Whitter Casural Ba - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No. Whitter Casural Ba - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. I support the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint Joint Casural	Whitely Council is not booken, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council and the processed will not work Whitely Council and the processed will not work Whitely Council obous answer on need to waster time rewriting a new T&C system, high expense for no benefit. Best left all separate. Whitely Council Moli, Rever as it this division of a croux shows the emocasil is no cood Whitely Council Moli, Rever as its this division of a croux shows the emocasil is no cood Whitely Council I perfor Whitely Council as it white oncoosal is no cood Whitely Council I perfor Whitely Council as it works for the manual workers Say with Whitely Council I perfor Whitely Council Division can only lead to eroblems I perfor whitely Molified Say with Whitely Council Division can only lead to eroblems I perfor whitely Council Soc and the Council Soc and the Council Soc and the Council Soc and the Council Division can only lead to eroblems I perfor whitely Council Soc changes to be made. Soc changes Whitely Council as it is should be left alone. Whitely Council as it is should be left alone.	No change the terms and conditions are excellent. Some terms and conditions to all and to the all Some terms and conditions to all and to the all Some terms and conditions to all and to the all Some terms and conditions to all and to a fashion to force one to an answer that would waste public incomey for no reason! Not broken! None: It is discrimination and unifar None: Some terms and conditions which are thin to all Some terms and conditions which are thin to all some - overpone should have same terms and conditions. None: These have been built up over many years and should be kept the same. Should be same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emitodee. None: I contrained with it, as its unifar None that is some terms and conditions for everyone, To maintain fair equal rights for each emitodee. None: I contrained with it, as its unifar Non changes, it is unifair Not changes, it is unifair Not a first to discrimination. Not the conditions to the conditions to the treated differently, they could be sorting along the some one with the asian officerent TBCs within the same role. Surely this associate descrimination along the conditions to the condit	breaking up things that air broken and giving our more; wwy to considerate and creating problems rather ibana sealers mone; "Sold a cost concert from the PETC convenience." Instead of wasting all this public mone; can we see if TBC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping heth and histor in a new IME. Couldn't Chot Senseth be not to a Nation cone; Couldn't Chot Senseth be not to a Nation cone; Couldn't Chot Senseth be not to a Nation cone; Couldn't Chot Senseth be not to a Nation cone; Ast another wester of money, spending on a committee, that in the long run, probably, will never come to faultion. If it are to roke, don't fix it. Ston consistent the manual unders and lieve alone. You won't take a blind but of notice! The Commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & creft workers while protecting terms & conditions of Culd sentice and management. The Commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & creft workers. No changes needed. I have no comments. No changes should be made. No changes needed.	
Timothy Mayers Anonymous Rendrick Shaw Richard Collister Richard Collister Anonymous A	No inclusion to other hodies, we are OK as we are. With you we need to go to the expense and water of trapspers limited money to wire you water of the common of the comm	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have furctioning JMC and vonds No. Whiter Casural Ba - not at all Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No. Whiter Casural Ba - not at all Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. I support the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint Secretary of the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint Secretary of the Secre	Whitely Council is not booken, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council are other accounts will not work. Whitely Council allows answer no need to waster time rewriting a new TSC system, high expense for no benefit. Best left all separate. Whitely Council South, Sieve as it this division of a cross shows the annotation is no cood Whitely Council, maybe we change T.C. curselves to meet today conditions Whitely Council South of the South	No change the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and conditions to all and for to all Same terms and conditions to all and for the all Same terms and conditions to all and for a faithful to force one to an answer that would waste public income; for no reason! Not broken! None: It is discrimination and unifar None: It is discrimination and unifar None: The schedule of the same terms and conditions which are fair to all Same terms and conditions which are fair to all None: There have been built up over many version all outdate legst the same. None: There have been built up over many version and found be kept the same. None: There have been built up over many version and found be kept the same. None: All out assess with it, as it is unifar None None: All out assess with it, as it is unifar None to the fair to discriminate It would be unifar to new starters to be treated differently, they could be working along the surfar of the same terms and conditions the same terms. None: A surfar None it is unifar None it is unifar None it is unifar to discriminate. It would be unifar to new starters to be treated differently, they could be working along the surfar on the same rone. Surely this None, any changes would cause low months. None, any changes would cause low months. None a think the same for everyone across the Board None at working all the same for everyone across the Board None a work and a list a unifar to new starters.	breaking up things that ain trother and giving our money away to consultants and creating problems rather plans another money. "Sold a cost forwards from the PMTC conversion." Instead of westing all this public money can we see if TBC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping beth and hinto in a new 18°C. Coastiff Choi Sevents be not to a labelian. To see that the conversion of	
Trincthy, Mayers Anonymous Sensins, Shew Bischard Collision Anonymous Anonym	No inclusion to other hodies, we are OK as we are. Why do we need to go to the expense and wate of Daspijers limited money to way do we not go to the expense and wate of Daspijers limited money to More accessed to the control of the Control of the Control of Daspiers of Daspiers and Control o	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have functioning JMC and works No. Whitere Council Bu - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No. Whitere Council I support the development of brings that need changing but not a single Joint Association for the development of brings that need changing but not a single Joint Joseph Council I support the development of brings that need changing but not a single Joint Joseph Council No. I don't be council as the post of the	Whitely Council and bodeen, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council are of the orocoosal will not work Whitely Council and the orocoosal will not work Whitely Council obous answer on need to waster time rewriting a new T&C system, high expense for no benefit, Best left all separate. Whitely Council Obous answer on need to waster time rewriting a new T&C system, high expense for no benefit, Best left all separate. Whitely Council Council, maybe we change T.C. ourselves to meet today conditions Whitely Council I are the Whitely Council set with the orocoosal is no onod Leave Whitely Council as the two whitely Council as the Whitely Council as	No change the terms and conditions are excellent. Some terms and conditions to all and to the all Some terms and conditions to all and to the all Some terms and conditions to all and to the all Some terms and conditions to all and to a fashion to force one to an answer that would waste public incomey for no reason! Not broken! None: It is discrimination and unifar None: Some terms and conditions which are thin to all Some terms and conditions which are thin to all some - overpone should have same terms and conditions. None: These have been built up over many years and should be kept the same. Should be same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emitodee. None: I contrained with it, as its unifar None that is some terms and conditions for everyone, To maintain fair equal rights for each emitodee. None: I contrained with it, as its unifar Non changes, it is unifair Not changes, it is unifair Not a first to discrimination. Not the conditions to the conditions to the treated differently, they could be sorting along the some one with the asian officerent TBCs within the same role. Surely this associate descrimination along the conditions to the condit	breaking up things that air broken and giving our more; wwy to consultants and creating problems rather ibana seletin process. "Solet a cell concerning from the MPTC convencion." Instead of westing all this public mone; can we see if TRC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping fresh and rivers in a new MPT. Ask and there was the office of the screen of t	
Trincthy, Mayers Anonymous Sensins, Shew Bischard Collision Anonymous Anonym	No inclusion to other hodies, we are OK as we are. Why do we need to go to the expense and wate of Daspijers limited money to way do we not go to the expense and wate of Daspijers limited money to More accessed to the control of the Control of the Control of Daspiers of Daspiers and Control o	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have furctioning JMr. and vonds No. Whiter Casural Bu - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No. Whiter Casural Bu - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. Is support the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint Jacobson of the Casural Section of the Section of the Casural Section of the Section of	Whitely Council is not booken, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council are other processed will not work. Whitely Council are other processed will not work. Whitely Council obusin answer no need to weater time rewriting a new TaC system, high expense for no benefit, Best left all separate. Whitely Council Man, like wea as it this division of a cross shows the emposed is no good. Whitely Council, maybe we change T.C. ourselves to meet today conditions Whitely Council Say with Whitely Council as it whos for the manual workers Say with Whitely Council Say with Whitely Council Division on only lead to oroblems I prefer whitely Council as it was for the manual workers I prefer whitely Council as it was for the manual workers Say with Whitely Council Division on only lead to oroblems I prefer whitely Council as it was for the manual workers No changes to be made. Whitely Council	No change the terms and conditions are excellent. Some terms and conditions to all and to the all Some terms and conditions to all and to the all Some terms and conditions to all and to the all Some terms and conditions to all and the all and	breaking up things that aim broken and giving our more; wwy to consultants and creating problems rather iban section process. "Solid a cold concern from the MPTC convencion." Instead of westing all this public mone; can we see if TRC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping harth and harter in a new TRC. Why try for fix something that's not broken. The state of the scrapping hart waste of money, spending on a committee, that in the long run, probably, will never come to fination. If it are throbe, don't fix it. Soo possibility the manual workers and leave alone. You won't take a blind but of notice! The Commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual 8, craft workers while protecting terms 8, it is all about attacking terms and conditions of manual 8. craft workers while protecting terms 8. The commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual 8. craft workers while protecting terms 8. The commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual 8. craft workers. No changes needed. It have no comments. No changes should be made. No changes needed. What of monow loave about 1 blooking doser to home for money spring ideas as many, cities enemals, MK. etc. Seem to response the reviews should be loaded, Seet to home for money spring ideas as many, cities enemals, MK. etc. Seem to response to the overall services. Seem to response to the overalls what services seem to response to the overall services.	
Tinothy Myeers Anonymous Sendrick Shew Sichard Collision Sichard Collision Anonymous A	No heliston to other hodes, we are OK as we are. Why do we need to go the expense and wake of Casapjees hintled money to Myst do we need to go the expense and wake of Casapjees hintled money to Myst do we need to be housed in a remember of public money. None need for any to be included in a remember of public money. Rose included and excluded, I concose this processed new body. Exclude all, why change for the sake of things. Why change something that works well attendy. Why change something that works well attendy. Why change something that works well. All, as it should not be going ahead. None: The body's that are in piece lives proven that they have coped with change. Therefore hower being with an analysis of the control	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We sheady have functioning JM: and works No. Whitter Caurcil Bu - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No. Whitter Caurcil Bu - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No. Shead of the	Whitely Council and bodeen, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council are of the orocoosal will not work Whitely Council and other orocoosal will not work Whitely Council obusous answer on need to waster time rewriting a new T&C system, high expense for no benefit, Sest left all separate. Whitely Council Shitely, News as it this division of a oroun shows the orocoosal is no cood Whitely Council, maybe we change T.C. ourselves to meet today conditions Whitely Council I are that the council is not so that the council is no cood whitely Council Whitely Council Whitely Council Whitely Council Shitely Council Shitely Council Shitely Council and the council is no cood Leave Whitely Council short I prefer whitely Council short Say with Whitely Council short Say with Whitely Council short Say with Whitely Council Say whitely Whitely Council Say whitely Whitely Council Say whitely Council Say whitely Whitely Council Say whitely Say whitely Whitely Say	No change the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and conditions for to all Same terms and conditions for to all Same terms and conditions for the all Same terms and conditions are work in a fashion to force one to an answer that would water public increep for no reason! Not broken! None terms and conditions are work in a fashion to force one to an answer that would water public increep for no reason! Not broken! None. It is discrimination and unifar. None. everyone chold have same terms and conditions. NonePresen have been built up over many years and should be kept the same. Should be same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emologie. NonePresen have been built up over many years and should be kept the same. Should be same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emologie. NonePresen have been built up over many years and should be kept the same. Should be same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emologie. NoneThese have been built up over many years and should be kept the same. None and the same and the same for everyone. None at a surface to the same for everyone. None at the terms of the same for everyone. None at the term of the same for everyone. None at the same for everyone and should always be available to all work collegues and to discriminate much be until the present the same for everyone. None at the same for everyone.	breaking up things that aim broken and giving our more; wwy to consultants and creating problems rather iban seletin process. "Solet a cost concert from the MPTC correction." Instead of westing all this public mone; can we see if TRC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping harth work in a new MPT. Instead of westing all this public mone; can we see if TRC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping harth work in the selection of the scrapping harth work in the selection of the scrapping harth waste of money, spending on a committee, that in the long run, probably, will never come to faultion. If it are throbe, don't fix it. Soo ourselshot the manual workers and leave alone. You won't take a blind but of notice!" The Commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & creit workers while protecting terms & conditions of crist sensition is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & creit workers while protecting terms & the commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & creit workers. The Commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & creit workers. No chances needed. It have no comments. No changes should be made. No chances needed. What of concern the comments workers are the province of	
Trinchy, Mayers Anonymous Sharland College Anonymous Sharland College Anonymous Anonym	No heliation to other holdes, we are OK as we are. Why do we need to go to the expense and wate of trapspers limited money to way do we not go to the expense and wate of trapspers limited money to More accessed to the case of which are to public money. None included and an electrical concerning the control of public money. None included and encluded I, concern this processed new body. Exclude all, why change for the sale of things: Why change comething that under sale of things. There is no need for a new entry thing compose that they have coped with caneous. There is no need for a new employment group, Leave as is. Waste of taxpayer money. I appear that the come with the insense of the transport of the compose of t	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We sheady have functioning JM: and works No. Whitere Council Jay - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No. Montes Council Jayopor the development of brings that need changing but not a single Joint Association of the development of brings that need changing but not a single Joint Association of the development of brings that need changing but not a single Joint John Council and Joint State of the Council Institute of Institute	Whitely Council and bodeen, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council and other processed will not work. Whitely Council and the processed will not work. Whitely Council about answer on need to waster time rewriting a new T&C system, high expense for no benefit, Best left all separate. Whitely Council Should, New was is this devision of a cross shows the crossed is no cood. Whitely Council Should, New was is this devision of a cross shows the crossed is no cood. Whitely Council Whitely Council Whitely Council Whitely Council Whitely Council Whitely Council I prefer Whitely Council show the arrangements that are already in place Whitely Council Whitely Council Whitely Council Jave Whitely Council show the six this proceed is no cood. Leave Whitely Council show the six this proceed is no cood. Say with Whitely Council show the six this proceed is no cood. Say with Whitely Council show the six this proceed is no cood. Say with Whitely Council show the six this proceed is no cood. Say with Whitely Council show the six this proceed is no cood. Say with Whitely Council show the six this proceed is no cood. Say with Whitely Council show the six this proceed is no cood. Say with Whitely Council show the six this proceed is no cood. Say with Whitely Council show the six this proceed is no cood. Say with Whitely Council show the six this proceed is no cood. Say with Whitely Council show the six this proceed is no cood. Say with Whitely Council show the six this proceed is no cood. Say with Whitely Council show the six this proceed is no cood in the six this proceed in the six this proceed is no cood. Say with Whitely Council show the six this proceed is no cood in this proceed in the six	No change the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and conditions for to all Same terms and conditions for to all Same terms and conditions for the all Same terms and conditions are work in a fashion to force one to an answer that would water public increase the same terms and conditions are work in a fashion to force one to an answer that would water public increase the same terms and conditions are work in a fashion to force one to an answer that would water public increase the same terms and conditions for the all same terms and conditions for the all same terms and conditions for the same. None - Reynes have been built up over many years and should be kept the same. Should be same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emillower. None - Reynes have been built up over many years and should be kept the same. None is some terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emillower. None - These have been built up over many years and should be kept the same. None is some terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emillower. None - These have been built up over many years and should be kept the same. None is sufficient to a uniform the same terms and conditions for everyone. None as it is unifair. None as it is unifair. None as it is unifair to new starters to be treated differently, they could be working alonguide someone with his different T&Cs within the same role. Surely this None. None, any changes would cause low morale None and all the same for everyone across the Board. None any changes would cause low morale None and all the same for everyone. None and the same and any changes would an everyone across the Board. None and all the same and any changes and any changes are to decremants would be urgast and unifier. None that unifies and decremants would be urgast and uni	breaking up things that air broken and giving our more; wwy to considerate and creating problems rather than section process. "Solid a cost concerning from the MPTC convenience." Instead of westing all this public mone; can we see if TBC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping hards and the control of scrapping hards and the waste of money, spending on a committee, that in the long run, probably, will never come to fination. If it are throne, don't find. Soo ourside to the control of the control	
Trinchy Myeers Anonymous Sendris Sheve Bischard Collete Anonymous Foul Moffatt Adominous Anonymous Anonymo	No inclusion to other bodies, we are OK as we are. With you we need to go to the expense and wake of trapspiers limited money to way not work to go the expense and wake of trapspiers limited money to why do we need to go to the expense and wake of trapspiers limited money to More some the control of the	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have furctioning JM: and voxols No. Whiter Cauncil Bu - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No. Whiter Cauncil Bu - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No. State of the same. Whiter isn't broken I support the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint Association formation. No incomplete the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint Monociation formation. No incomplete the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint Monociation formation. No incomplete the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint No. or nothing wereng with Whiteley Council No. I think thincs doubt do be lead as they are No. I then thincs doubt do be lead as they are No. I think thincs doubt do be lead as they are No. Whiteley is fit for purpose No. Whiteley is fit for purpose No. State with Whiteley is most for purpose No I see no considers with Whiteley I don't see the need to create a new committee when the one we have still works No in a search to change from Whiteley I don't see the need to create a new committee when the one we have still works See no machine with Whiteley I do not see an except the change from Whiteley No. I can be not Whiteley with the purpose and employees allow, and without it is not broken don't fix at P. No. I feel the government would change from Whiteley No. I have worked council No. I have worked whiteley council No. I have worked by John of the council of the coun	Whitely Council and boden, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council and the processed will not work. Whitely Council and the processed will not work. Whitely Council alous answer no need to waster time rewriting a new T&C system, high expense for no benefit. Best left all separate. Whitely Council of Misser as is this division of a cross shows the processed is no cood. Whitely Council of Misser as is this division of a cross shows the processed is no cood. Whitely Council of Misser as is this division of a cross shows the processed is no cood. Whitely Council Whitely Council Whitely Council Whitely Council Whitely Council Whitely Council I prefer Whitely Council shows as it this process is no cood. Leave Whitely Council shows in this processed is no cood. Say with Whitely Council shows the processed is no cood. Leave Whitely Council shows in this processed is no cood. Division and not lead to problems: I prefer whitel two (Whitely) Say with Whitely Council shows the processed is no cood. Division and not lead to problems: I prefer whitel two (Whitely) Say changes to be made. Non. No changes to be made. Non. No changes to be made. Non the Council as R is. Whitely Council as R is.	No change the terms and conditions are excellent. Same terms and conditions to all and for to all Same terms and conditions to all and for the all Same terms and conditions to all and for a fashion to force one to an answer that would water public nonery for no reason! Not broken! None These questions are work in a fashion to force one to an answer that would water public nonery for no reason! Not broken! None. B. the discrimination and unifair. None. B. the discrimination and unifair. None. B. the discrimination and unifair and the same terms and conditions which are first in all. Same terms and conditions which are first in all. Same terms and conditions which are first in all. Noneeveryone fould have same terms and conditions. Noneeveryone fould have same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emologies. None. But the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emologies. None and the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emologies. None and the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emologies. None fair to discriminate. It would be unifair to same terms and conditions for everyone to the force of the same and the discriminate. None, and which the same for everyone accounts the force of the same and the force of the same and the force of the same and the same and the same. None at all the same and the same and the same and the same and the same. No work at 1 the same and the same and the same and the same and the same. No the same terms and the same and the same and the same and the same and the same.	breaking up things that aim broken and giving our more; wwy to consultants and creating problems rather iban seletin process. "Solet a cost concert from the MPTC correction." Instead of westing all this public mone; can we see if TRC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping harth work in a new MPT. Instead of westing all this public mone; can we see if TRC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping harth work in the selection of the scrapping harth work in the selection of the scrapping harth waste of money, spending on a committee, that in the long run, probably, will never come to faultion. If it are throbe, don't fix it. Soo ourselshot the manual workers and leave alone. You won't take a blind but of notice!" The Commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & creit workers while protecting terms & conditions of crist sensition is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & creit workers while protecting terms & the commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & creit workers. The Commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & creit workers. No chances needed. It have no comments. No changes should be made. No chances needed. What of concern the comments workers are the province of	
Tinodry Meyers Anonymous Sendrid Sheve Sichard Colletor Anonymous Feut Midfatt Anonymous Feut Midfatt Anonymous Feut Midfatt Anonymous Wendy Christan Grennymous Sephen Boland David Mexiconid Mendy Christan Grennymous Anonymous	Non-industrial to deliver bodies, we are OK as we are. With do we need to go to the expense and water of trappiers limited money to way do we need to go the expense and water of trappiers limited money to water do not be to the expense and water of trappiers limited money to water of public money. None rectificate you be included in a remail. Totally no need for this remit - waste of public money. Some included and and excluded. I concore this processed new body. Exclude all, willy change for the sake of things Why change contention public works used alleady. Why change contention public works used alleady. None - the body's that are in place have proven that they have coped with change. Interface to expense and an excluded in the change and nonotrate inhalin on both sake. None - the body's that are in place have proven that they have coped with change and nonotrate inhalin on both sake. None included and may be not employment good, Lakere at is. Wester of Repoper oncore. None included and all excluded I coppose this proposed new body. I coppose this remotory has been allowed the proposed new body. None included and all excluded I coppose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I coppose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I coppose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I coppose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I coppose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I coppose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I coppose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I coppose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I coppose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I coppose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I coppose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I coppose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I coppose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded I coppose this proposed new b	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We already have furctioning JMr. and a vonds No. Whiter Casural Bu - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. No. Whiter Casural Bu - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. It is upport the development of brings that need changing but not a single Joint Joseph Completed of the Complete of the Complete Joint Joseph Completed of the Complete Joint Joseph Completed of the Complete Joint J	Whitely Council is not booken, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council are other processed will not work. Whitely Council allows answer no need to waster time rewriting a new TSC system, high expense for no benefit, Best left all separate. Whitely Council Mich. Rever as is this division of a crous shows the encocael is no cood. Whitely Council Mich. Rever as its this division of a crous shows the encocael is no cood. Whitely Council Say with Whitely Council as it works for the manual workers Say with Whitely Council as it works for the manual workers I prefer whitely Council as it works for the manual workers I prefer whitely Council as it works for the manual workers I prefer whitely Council as it works for the manual workers I prefer whitely Council as it works for the manual workers I prefer whitely Council as it works for the manual workers I prefer whitely Council as it works for the manual workers Say with Whitely Council Division can only lead to oroblems I prefer whitely Council as it was the second some second second some second second some second second some second	No change the terms and conditions are excellent Same terms and conditions to all and to the all Same terms and conditions to all and the to all Same terms and conditions to all and the to all None These questions are work in a fashion to force one to an answer that would waste public money for no reason! Not broken! None. It is discrimination and unifair None. It is discrimination and unifair None. The self-conditions field for all None. The self-conditions field for all None - everyone fould have same terms and conditions. None - These have been built up over many years and should be leget the same. Should be same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emolose. None. I don't agene with It. as it unifair None and the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emolose, it is unifair None and the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emolose, it is unifair None and the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emolose, it is unifair None and the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emolose, it is unifair None and the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emolose, it is unifair None and the same terms and conditions for everyone in the same role. Surely this savid be distributed to the same for everyone. Shore It is unifair and discrimination. None at the fair to all staff members. None at a fair to all staff members. None, at productive the same for everyone. None, it is unifair and discrimination. None, it is unifair and discrimination. None at the same No want at the same. No want at the same	breaking up things that air broken and giving our more; wwy to consultants and creating problems rather bina seletin process. "Solid a cost concerning that the Theorem Solid and Solid process." Solid a cost concerning the Theorem Solid process of the Solid proc	
Transfer, Mayers Anonymous Braid McGrat Anonymous Fruit Moffett Anonymous Fruit Moffett Anonymous Fruit Moffett Anonymous Anon	No inclusion to other bodies, we are OK as we are. With you we need to go to the expense and wake of Casapjees himited money to Way do we need to go the expense and wake of Casapjees himited money to Mare a consense to face appear and control of the control of public money. None need for any to be included in a remail. Totally no need for this remit - waste of public money. None included and excluded, I concose this processed new body. Exclude all, why change for the sake of things. Why change something that works well attendy. Why change something that works well All, as it should not be going almost of the control of th	There is nothing to accomplish with changes We sheady have functioning JM: and works No. Whitter Caurcil Se. Whitter Caurcil Ja not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money. Se should stay the same. Whitler sn't broken I support the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint Mechanism of the Caurcil Section of the Section of Section 1 support the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint Mechanism of Section 1 sec	Whitely Council and bodeen, I wish to stay in Whitely Council Whitely Council are often crossosal will not work Whitely Council and other crossosal will not work Whitely Council obusiness and the council an	No change, it is unifar None as me started point or servery through the same. Should be same terms and conditions are voted in a fashion to force one to an answer that would water public nonery for no reason! Not broken! None These questions are worte in a fashion to force one to an answer that would water public nonery for no reason! Not broken! None. It is discrimination and unifar None Same terms and conditions which are first in all Same terms and conditions which are first in all Same terms and conditions which are first in all Same terms and conditions of the real. None everyone handle have same terms and conditions. None - everyone handle have same terms and conditions. None - everyone handle have same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emotione. None and the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emotione. None and the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emotione. None and the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emotione. None and the same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each emotion. None and the same terms and conditions for everyone and unifar None at all the same for everyone are some the band. None, any changes would cause low morals None. As which will all it is the same. None and all the same for everyone account the Band. None and all the same the same. No every through at its same. None and the same to containes. None and containes. None doubt the doubt of the pumper generation a poorer start than what we have we doubt not drive from the pumper generation a poorer start than what we have we doubt not drive from the pumper generation a poorer start than what we have	breaking up things that aim broken and giving our money away to consultants and creating problems rather blank sealers money. "Solk at cost connection the MPTC conversation." Instead of wasting all this public money can we see if TBC can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping beth and from in a men. "Be" Could'in Chu Servantic ker out to a better use. Ask another wester of money, spending on a committee, that in the long rur, probably, will never come to faultion. It it aint broke, don't fix it. Soo inquishing the manual venders and lonee alone to waster that in the long rur, probably, will never come to faultion. Soo inquishing the manual venders and lonee alone town which the long rur, probably, will never come to faultion. This Commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & craft workers while protecting terms a conditions of use of the service and manualements with the commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & craft workers. This Commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & craft workers. No changes needed. The Commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & craft workers. No changes needed. The was no comments. No changes should be made. No changes needed. The poemment should be looking closer to home for money saving ideas as many civil servants, MMX exception of pooling, view without us the bland world or fact grind to a habit. The name MPRKs for a small ideand Seems to be too many MPKs, are they all needed. Too many MPKs for a small ideand Seems to be too many MPKs are the received.	

Heather Dale	* deskabled a selekt and deskabled and deska	I don't as above there are too many varied workers for one single negotiating	MANAGE CO. Co	In	Any proposals should have figures and facts shown or it is pointless and time wasting	
	I don't think a public services commission could work with such a varied workforce doing very different lobs you could not harmonise it, so none.	commission		none		
Margaret Phicos Anonymous	I don't agree with the changes I don't agree changing what we already have	Stav with Whitley Council No want to keep Whitley Council	Stav with Whitley Council MOA I wish to keep Whitley Council MOA	None they are ok as they are There should be no changes at all	Too much input from MHKs Seems to be too many MHKs are they needed	
Anonymous	Why change something that's not broken	No. we should keep the Whitley Council	Keep Whitley Council	No changes	Too many MHKs messing with peoples lives	
Sidney Callow	Why change something that works well already Keep it as it is	No I don't Keep it as it is. Whitley Council	Whitley Council Keep it as it is. Whitley Council	None. Unfair to new workers Waste of government money, couldn't civil servant be put to better use	No comment	
	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body None, Why change something that works well	No I do not / Whitlev isn't broken No. What is wrong with the Whitley Council	Whitley Council MofA Whitley Council	None. it is discriminatory and elitist None should be the same for all	Waste of our/government money and a foot in the door of total control. for Herr Bell and his cronies	
Vivienne O'Meara	Why change something which already works well	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MofA	None, everyone should be on same T&C	Couldn't civil servant be out to better use	
	Why fix something that's NOT BROKEN Why change things that work well	No I don't. Keep Whitley Council No I don't / keep Whitley Council	Whitley Council Whitley Council	Same for all Same for all	Waste of Government money Waste of Government money	
John Cain	Like we get a choice. Do not see any need to bring other groups in. We have enough problems with what we have, why bring more to the table	Support Whitley as it is. No need for alternative arrangements. Simple - leave	Whitley Council MofA	None at all. We should be on the same level, no need to be unfair to others	Why do we need any change. Do Government not have enough to do. It just seems to be a waste of money.	
Garry Corkish	No waste of money. Do not need new body	Nothing wrong with Whitley. Just more waste of time and money.	Whitley Council works well so leave well alone	None at all	It's lobs for the bovs	
James Cooper Derek Shimmin	None included and all excluded I oppose this new body None I oppose a new body. Waste of money	No I don't No. Nothing wrong with Whitley	Whitley Council. Leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Memorandum of Agreement Whitley	None I feel it's unjust to treat new starters any different None it would be discriminant	This is just a waste of tax payers money that could be used elsewhere Waste of tax payers money. Why change something that works well	
Angela Tongue C Frearson	None I oppose all this new body	No. Whitley Council Whitley Council all the way	Whitley Council MOA	No. All the same. Everyone the same, would not want or ever want to work with people and not be	We want the Whitley Council all the way. Don't want change. Don't need change. Just giving other people	
C rreason	1 oppose all trils new body	whitely Council all the way	William Council Mola	given the same treatment pay or conditions as the next person. It would be a	something to do if you ask me.	
Michael Collins	There is no need for a new body	I don't see any problems with Whitley Council, it should be kept!	Leave Whitley Council as it is.	h****v inke to think anyone would. Disgrapeful. None it should be the same for everyone.		
Cristen Teare	I oppose this proposed new body within Government	I do not support this. Whitley is not broken	Whitley Council MofA Leave as it is. This proposal is no good.	None it is discriminatory and unfair	Stop punishing the manual workers.	
J Mairs A Wilson	I oppose this new body None included leave as it is	No - there's not a problem with Whitley why alter things	Leave it as it is! Terms and conditions should be run by Whitley. Why change it for the sake of a change.	New starters should have the same benefits I've had for 27 yrs it is not fair to	If these changes are for the better fair enough but they are clearly not going to be, dictatorship comes to	
Anonymous	None. I oppose this proposed new body	No. I do not support	Whitley Council MofA	change it for them. None	mind. I was under the impression that the IOM was a democratic country not a dictatorship	
G Jenner	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair.	It seems clear Mr Bell & his Ministers (Turkeys) don't vote for Christmas when it comes to saving money	
P Slevin	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body	Whitley Council is not broken	Whitley Council MofA - leave as is this division of groups shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	where it really matters. Mr Bell & his well paid Ministers & MHKs are sitting pretty while all the lower paid manual workers get s**t on	
Anonymous	None included and all excluded I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA leave as it is this group shows the proposal is no good	None it is discriminatory and unfair	once again, perhaps they should lead by example and take considerable pay cuts themselves. The Government should start at the top to save money and not always at the bottom	
Anonymous	Note included and an excluded 1 oppose this proposed new body	NO 1 GO HOL WHILDEY ISH'L DIONEH	Williams Council Plank leave as it is all s gloup shows the proposal is no good	Notice it is discriminatory and dinar	The dovernment should start at the top to save money and not always at the bottom	
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	Management cannot be trusted and feel although information is withheld from us. The government should	
	Whitley Council Manual Workers		Whitley Council	None, all the same	not rob Peter to pay Paul.	
M Holmes	None	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None. Equality	Things ok as are.	
D Clucas D Partridge	Totally oppose this proposal I am opposed to this pear body	Don't try and fix when its not broken!! No I do not, Whitley Council have done us proud!!!	Leave it as it is Leave as is. Dividing is not the answer.	None whatsover. Unfair. Discriminatory None that would be unfair	Public Services Commission is a cover for (we will change your hours and your pay and you have no say in	
	I am opposed to this new body				the matter)	
R Moore	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I don't - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair!	This is just another expensive cost cutting exercise. It will take away working mens rights! (Back to slave	
	None included/all excluded - I do not want things to change	No - I am fine with Whitley	Whitley Council	None		
M Dean	Exclude Whitley Council Exclude Whitley Council	Support Whitley Council Support Whitley Council	In Whitley Council In Whitley Council	None None		
Anonymous	I remain unconvinced that my position regarding terms & conditions would improve, therefore I disagree with the inclusion of Whitley Council	I cannot see a single Joint Negotiating Body being impartial when all types, sectors are included. Whitley works well as is.	Whitley Council memorandum has continued to be amended in a fair & balanced way through neootiation and is fit for purpose.	Sounds like a suggestion for discrimination against a new employee, should be same for all who do same work.	This is going to be expensive to establish. Waste of money?	
Anonymous	Whitley Council and its associated Memorandum of Agreement should be	I do not support the development of a single Joint Negotiations Committee as	My preferred arrangements for determining the terms and conditions for manual and craft workers employed by Local Authorities is under the umbrella of Whitley Council and its associated	I believe that the terms and conditions should be fair to all employees. The terms	The establishment of a Public Services Commission on the Isle of Man seems a giant leap in employment	
	included in the remit of a Public Services Commission and the ethics should remain intact as it lays down universal working regulations that are recognised by	I believe the present structure of Whitley Council serves a valuable purpose in the protection of jobs and employment	employed by Local Authorities is under the umbrella of Whitley Council and its associated Memorandum of Agreement	and conditions in place should be universal, so as to avoid an element of unfairness in the workplace.	structure. The proposal to introduce this employment structure will potentially bring financial hardship to many families.	
	both employers and employees.					
S Teare-Kermeen	I feel that the group of staff employed at the Curraghs Wildlife Park should be	In my view a single Joint Negotiating Committee will not work. There should be one committee for civil servants and one for manual workers & tighten up	The terms and conditions set up by Whitley Council in agreement with managers and staff work well and are fair.	I do not believe that the terms and conditions should be changed for new starters as this would likely lead to awkward and unfair working conditions.	The idea of a new PSC appears to me to be a waste of time and money - not good in this day and age.	
	excluded from the re-jig and PSC our team and conditions are already being changed and further changes may compromise animal welfare and public service.	on the ones in place.	well and are lair.	starters as this would likely lead to awkward and uniair working conditions.		
Anonymous		No I do not support this single JNC. Nothing wrong with Whitley Council Memorandum of Agreement served me well for the past 25 years	Whitley Council	None. New starters should be on same terms and conditions to be fair.	This whole process is a waste of tax payers money which could be spent where it's needed most	
Anonymous	effect animal welfare. I do not agree with this proposed body, therefore, no groups should be included.	Memorandum of Agreement served me well for the past 25 years No. Whitley Council have been perfectly suitable for purpose and I have	Whitley Council Memorandum of Agreement has been negotiating terms and conditions for many	Discriminating against 'new starters' should not sit right with any fair minded	This proposal concerning 'more proactive approach to people management issues' is open to abuse serious	
	or excluded.	personally been very well represented for the past 24 years	years and has had to be fair and legal.	person.	bullving by aggressive and unsympathetic managers.	
K Combe A Leadlev M Stevens	None I oppose this proposed new body None included & all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No Whitley Council is not broken No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council leave as is. Whitley Council MofA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None it is discriminatory and unfair None - it is discriminatory & unfair		
M Stevens	None included & all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body None included & all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitley Council MofA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - It is discriminatory & unfair		
S Gentry	None included & all excluded - I onnose this proposed new horly	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory & unfair None - it is discriminatory & unfair		
S Gentry	None included 8 all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body. None included 8 all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body None included 8 all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitley Council MofA - leave as is this division of a orous shows the enroosal is no good Whitley Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitley Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitley Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - It is discriminatory & unfair		
S Gentry D Kissack J Williamson D Newshom	None included & all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body None included & all excluded . I oppose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded . I oppose the new body.	No I do not: - Whitley intr broken	Whitley Council MofA - leave as is this division of a croup shows the procosal is no cood Whitley Council MofA - leave as is this division of a croup shows the procosal is no cood Whitley Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitley Council MofA - leave as is this division of a croup shows the procosal is no cood	None - it is discriminatory & unfair None - it is discriminatory & unfair None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
S Gentry D Kissack J Williamson D Newshom	None included a all excluded -1 concose this proposed new body None included and all excluded -1 concose this proposed new body None included and all excluded -1 concose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded 1 concose the new body. None included and all excluded 1 concose the new body None included and all excluded 1 concose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded 1 concose this proposed new body.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whiteler Council MofA - leave as is this division of a orous shows the oroosal is no cood Whiteler Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the oroosal is no cood Whiteler Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiteler Council MofA - leave as is this division of a orous shows the proposal is no cood Whiteler Council MofA - leave as it his division of a orous shows the proposal is no cood Whiteler Council MofA - leave as it his division of a orous shows the proposal is no cood	None - It is discriminatory & unfair None - It is discriminatory & unfair None - It is discriminatory and unfair None - It is discriminatory and unfair		
S Gentry D Kissack J Williamson D Newshom R Pitts P Huohes J Freeland T Bridson	None included & all excluded - 1 occose this crossosed new body. None included and all excluded - 1 occose this crossosed new body. None included and all excluded - 1 occose this proposed new body. None included and all excluded - 1 occose the new body. None included and all excluded - 1 occose the new body. None included and all excluded - 1 occose this crossosed new body. Looses this stropped all excluded - 1 occose this proposed new body. Looses this crossed new body. Looses this crossed new body.	No 1 d not - Whitely sort broken No 1 d not Whitely sort broken	Whiteler Council MofA - leave as is this division of a orous shows the oroosal is no cood Whiteler Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the oroosal is no cood Whiteler Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiteler Council MofA - leave as is this division of a orous shows the proposal is no cood Whiteler Council MofA - leave as it his division of a orous shows the proposal is no cood Whiteler Council MofA - leave as it his division of a orous shows the proposal is no cood	None - Ris discriminatory & unfair None - Ris discriminatory & unfair None - Ris discriminatory and unfair None - Ris discriminatory and unfair None Ris discriminatory and unfair Ris Riscriminatory and unfair	Waste of government money	
S Gentry D Kissack J Williamson D Newshom R Pitts P Huohes J Freeland T Bridson	Note included & all excluded -1 concore this procosed new body. Note included and all excluded -1 concore this procosed new body. Note included and all excluded -1 concore this procosed new body. Note included and all excluded -1 concore the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded -1 concore the procosed new body. Note included and all excluded -1 concore this procosed new body. To concore this procosed new body. We do not read an excluded -1 concore the process money. We do not need a process. We do not process process.	No. 1 do not - Whiteley sin't broken No. Whiteley sin't broken No. Whiteley sin't broken No. Whiteley coursel No. Whiteley coursel No. 1 do not whiteley coursel	White's Council Mofit Issue as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no coord White's Council Mofit Issue as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no coord White's Council Mofit Issue as is the division of a orous shows the proposal is no good White's Council Mofit Issue as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no coord White's Council Mofit Issue as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no coord White's Council Mofit Issue as it this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no coord White's Council Mofit Issue as it is this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no coord White's Council Mofit Issue as it is the division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no coord White's Council Mofit Issue as it is the division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no coord White's Council Mofit Issue as it is the division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no coord White's Council Mofit Issue as it was the division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no coord White's Council Mofit Issue as it was the division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no coord White's Council Mofit Issue as it was the division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no coord White's Council Mofit Issue as it was the division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no coord White's Council Mofit Issue as it was the division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no coord White's Council Mofit Issue as it was the division of a orous shows the orous and the oro	None - It is discrimination & unifer None - It is discrimination & unifer None - It is discrimination with the None - It is discrimination with unifer None - It is discrimination and unifer None - It i	Waste of government money Another waste of government money	
S Gentry D. Kissack J Williamson D. Newshom R. Pitts P Huohes J. Freeland T. Bridson T. Horton R. Harris D. Kelly	Note included & all excluded -1 conoce this procosed new body. Note included and all excluded -1 conoce its improcess of new body. Note included and all excluded -1 conoce its improcess of new body. Note included & all excluded -1 conoce the proposed new body. Note included & all excluded -1 conoce the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded -1 conoce this procosed new body. 1 conoce this procosed new body. 1 conoce this procosed new body. We don't need a mobily. It's available of Tax players money. We don't need a men body. Note as it is: We don't need a new body, we are the process of the process.	No. 1 do not - Whiteley sort Droken No. Whiteley sort Droken No. Whiteley sort Droken No. Whiteley could No. Whiteley Could No. 1 do not Whiteley Could No. 2 do not N	White's Council Mofin - Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the proposal is no good White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the processal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as it is the division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as it is the division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as it is not shown to a construct the orous shows the orous s	None - It is discrimination & unifer None - It is discrimination & unifer Issue - It is discriminative and unifer It is discri	Another waste of government money Spend money on more needed things for the Island Waste of government money	
S Gentry D Kissack J Williamson D Newshom R Pitts P Huohes J Freeland T Bridson T Horton R Harris D Kelly J O'Neill	Note included & all encluded -1 conoce this processed new body. Note included and an excluded -1 conoce the processed new body. Note included and excluded -1 conoce the propose from body. Note included and excluded -1 conoce the propose from body. Note included and excluded -1 conoce the propose from body. Note included and excluded -1 conoce the propose from body. Note included & all excluded -1 conoce the propose from body. Note in chalded & all excluded -1 conoce the propose from body. We do not need a new body. We do not fore all one body. We do not need a new body. We all of the conoce from body. We do not need a new body. We all of the conoce from body. We do not need a new body. We all of the conoce from body. We do not need a new body. We all of the conocers money. We don't need a new body. All one do all no coleves money.	No. 1 do not Whitely sin't broken No. 1 do not. Whitely sin't broken No. 1 do not. Whitely sin't broken No. 1 do not. Whitely connol No. 1 do not. Whitely connol No. 1 do not. Whitely Council No. 1 do not. Whitely Council No. 2 do not. 1 whitely Council	Whiter Council Mohi Issee as its this division of a orous shows the necessals in a coord Whiter Council Mohi Issee as it this division of a orous shows the necessals in a coord Whiter Council Mohi Issee as it to the division of a orous shows the proposal in a good Whiter Council Mohi Issee as it the division of a orous shows the proposal in a good Whiter Council Mohi Issee as it this division of a orous shows the conceal in no coord Whiter Council Mohi Issee as it this division of a orous shows the conceal is no coord Monicoration of Mohi Issee as it this division of a orous shows the conceal is no coord Monicoration of Agreement Demonation of Agreement Demonation and concernent / Whiter Council Demonation aspectment.	None - It discrimination & unifier None - It discrimination & unifier None - It discrimination and unifier It discrimination and unifier Same terms and conditions for all some terms are conditions for all some terms and conditions for all some terms are conditions and conditions and conditions are conditions and conditions and conditions are conditions are conditions and conditions are conditions and conditions are conditions are conditions are conditions and cond	Another waste of covernment money Spend money on more needed things for the Island Waste of covernment money Waste of covernment money	
S Gentry D Kissack J Williamson D Newshom R Pitts P Huohes J Freeland T Bridson T Horton R R Harris D Kelly J C'Neill Anonymous	Note included & all excluded -1 conoce this procosed new body. Note included and all excluded -1 conoce its improcess of new body. Note included and all excluded -1 conoce its improcess of new body. Note included & all excluded -1 conoce the proposed new body. Note included & all excluded -1 conoce the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded -1 conoce this procosed new body. 1 conoce this procosed new body. 1 conoce this procosed new body. We don't need a mobily. It's available of Tax players money. We don't need a men body. Note as it is: We don't need a new body, we are the process of the process.	No. 1 do not - Whiteley sort Droken No. Whiteley sort Droken No. Whiteley sort Droken No. Whiteley could No. Whiteley Could No. 1 do not Whiteley Could No. 2 do not N	White's Council Mofin - Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the proposal is no good White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the processal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as it is the division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as it is the division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White's Council Mofin Issee as it is not shown to a construct the orous shows the orous s	None - It is discrimination & unifer None - It is discrimination & unifer Issue - It is discriminative and unifer It is discri	Another waste of government money Spend money on more needed things for the Island Waste of government money	
S Gentry D Kissack J Williamson D Newshom R, Pitts P Huches J Freeland T Bridson T Horton R, Harris D Kelly J Orwell Anonymous A Campbell	Note included & all excluded -1 concore this encoused new body. Note included and an excluded -1 concore this encoused new body. Note included and excluded -1 concore this propose new body. Note included & all excluded -1 concore this propose new body. Note included and an excluded 1 concore this encoused new body. Note included & all excluded 1 concore this encoused new body. Note in charge of the excluded 1 concore this encoused new body. We do not need a new body. Nits a wester of tax appears money. We do not need a new body. What or the sub-west money. We do not need a new body. What or the sub-west money was not the excluded and excluded 1 concore this encoused new body. We do not need a new body. What or the sub-west money was not the excluded and excluded 1 concore the sub-west money. We do not need a new body. What of the sub-west money why charge with a concore the sub-west of excluded 1 conco	No 1 do not - Whitely sort broken No 1 do not Whitely sort broken No 1 do not Whitely sort broken No 1 do not Whitely Council No do not Suspoot! Whitely Council No do not Whitely Council No 1 down 1 1 d	Whiter Council Moh Issee as its this division of a orous shows the encoses is no coord Whiter Council Moh Issee as its this division of a orous shows the encoses is no coord Whiter Council Moh Issee as it has division of a orous shows the proposal is no good Whiter Council Moh Issee as it has division of a orous shows the encoses is no coord Whiter Council Moh Issee as it this division of a orous shows the encoses is no coord Whiter Council Moh Issee as it this division of a orous shows the encoses is no coord Memorandum of Agreement Memorandum of Agreement Memora	None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discriminative and unifier None - It is discriminative and unifier None, It's discriminative and unifier None, It's discriminative and unifier None, It's discriminative and unifier None - It is discriminative and unifier It is discriminative and unifier It is discriminative and unifier Same terms and conditions to all fast to all Same terms and conditions for all Same terms and conditions for all Same terms and conditions for all some terms and conditions for all Same terms and conditions for all fast to all forms that discrimination?	Another waste of operment more? Seed money or more needed thins for the Island Waste of operment more. Vaste of operment more. At mit at to better see not more red lace. Now Charge and the Seed of t	
S Gentry D Kissack J Williamson D Newshom R, Pitts P Huches J Freeland T Bridson T Horton R, Harris D Kelly J Ornelli Anonymous A Campbell H Campbell	Note included & all excluded -1 concore this concored new body. Note included and an excluded -1 concore this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 coprose the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded -1 coprose the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded -1 coprose the new body. Note included & all excluded -1 coprose the row body. Note included and all excluded -1 coprose the proposed new body. We do not need an enew body. Note in consistent money. We do not need an enew body. Note of the superest money. We do not need an enew body. Note of the superest money. We do not need an enew body. We do not need an enew body. Note of need an enew body. Note of the superest money. Note of need an enew body with the concernment of the superest money. Note of new body with? Whitele sint brokes Note of New body with? Whitele sint brokes Note of New body with? Whitele sint brokes Note included all excluded. In oppose this proposed new body, Waste of money.	So 1 to not - Whitely sort broken	Whiter Council Moh Issew as its this division of a orous shows the necessals in a coord Whiter Council Moh Issew as its this division of a orous shows the necessals in a coord Whiter Council Moh Issew as it is the division of a orous shows the proposal in a good Whiter Council Moh Issew as its the division of a orous shows the proposal in a good Whiter Council Moh Issew as its this division of a orous shows the conceal in no coord Whiter Council Moh Issew as its this division of a orous shows the conceal is no coord Monorandum of Agreement Memorandum of Agreement Whiter Council Momorandum of Agreement Whiter Council The Memorandum of Agreement Whiter Council Whiter Council Moh. Lever this division of a group the proposal is no good Whiter Council Moh. Lever this division of a group the proposal is no good.	None - It is discrimination & unifer None - It is discrimination & unifer None - It is discrimination and unifer None It is discrimination and unifer It is discrimination and unifer None It is discrimination and unifer Sense terms and conditions to all also to all Same terms and conditions to all also to all Same terms & conditions for all None I same terms & conditions to all fair to all None I same terms for all, sort that discrimination?? None It is unifer and discrimination?	Another waste of oosemment more? Seed money or more needed thrins for the Island Waste of oosemment more. Part me tax to better use not more that the Market of oosemment more. Part me tax to better use not more red take Way change conscribing that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & ovir one of the construction of the con	
S Gentry D Kissack J Williamson D Revisitori R Pitts P Huches J Freeland T Bridson T Horton R Harris D Kelly J Chell Anonymous A Campbell H Campbell S Oliver	Note included & all excluded 1 goods this procosed mer body. Note included and an excluded 1 goods this proposed new body. Note included and excluded 1 goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded 1 goods the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded 1 goods the new body. Note included and all excluded 1 goods the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded 1 goods the proposed new body. We do not need a new body. Note and the proposed new body. We do not need a new body. Waste of tax payers money. We don't need a new body. Waste of tax payers money. We don't need a new body. Waste of tax payers money. We don't need a new body. Waste of tax payers money. We don't need a new body. Waste of tax payers money. We don't need a new body. Waste of tax payers money. We don't need a new body. Waste of tax payers money. We don't need a new body. Waste of tax payers money. Note on included a excluded 1 goods the proposed new body. None included all excluded. To oppose this proposed new body. Waste of money. Why do we have to change when it works alright now.	No. 1 do not Whitely sort broken No. Whitely sort broken No. Whitely sort broken No. Whitely council No. Whitely council No. Whitely council No. I do not Whitely Council No. Whitely Council No. I do not Whitely Council No. Whitely No. I do not Whitely Council No. I do not Whitely so not broken No. I do not Whitely so thorken No. I do not Whitely on torken	Whiter Council Moh Issee as its this division of a orous shows the necessal is no cood Whiter Council Moh Issee as its this division of a orous shows the necessal is no cood Whiter Council Moh Issee as its this division of a orous shows the necessal is no cood Whiter Council Moh Issee as its this division of a orous shows the proposal is no good Whiter Council Moh Issee as its this division of a orous shows the necessal is no cood Whiter Council Moh Issee as its this division of a orous shows the necessal is no cood Whiter Council Moh Issee as its this division of a orous shows the necessal is no cood Memorandam of Agreement Memorandam of Agreement / Whiter Council Memorandam agreement / Whiter Council Memorandam agreement / Whiter Council Memorandam of Agreement / Whiter Council Memorandam of Agreement / Whiter Council Memorandam of Agreement / Whiter Council Whiter Council Moh. I never this division of a group the proposal is no good. Whiter Council Moh. I never this division of a group the proposal is no good. Keep Whitley Council for them maybe	None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier This discrimination and unifier This discrimination and unifier This discrimination and unifier Same terms and conditions to all fair to all Same terms and conditions for all the conditions for all Same terms and conditions for all the first all Same terms and conditions for all the first all Same terms and conditions for all the first all Same terms and conditions for all the first all Same terms and conditions for all the first all Same terms and conditions for all the first all t	Another waste of operment more? Seed money or more needed thins for the Island Waste of operment more. Vaste of operment more. At mit at to better see not more red lace. Now Charge and the Seed of t	
S Gentry D Sissack J Williamson D Bissack J Williamson D Resiston B Ethioles D Freeland D Freeland D Freeland T Hoton R Harris D Kelly Anonymous A Campbell A Campbell S Oliver C Thomas	Note included & all excluded -1 concose this encoused new body. Note included and an excluded -1 concer this proposed new body. Note included and an excluded -1 concer this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded -1 concer this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded -1 concer this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded -1 concer this proposed new body. Note in challed an excluded -1 concer this proposed new body. We do not need a new body. Yes a wester of tax payers money. We do not need a new body. What of tax has payers money. We do not need a new body. What of tax payers money. We do not need a new body. What of tax payers money. Whe do not need a new body. What of tax payers money. When the new body is the proposed new body. Note included all excluded -1 concert this proposed body. Note included all excluded Do not need a new proposed body. Note included all excluded Do not need a new proposed body. Note included all excluded Do not need a new proposed body. Note included all excluded Do not need a new proposed body. Note included all excluded I concert need to need the body. Note included and all excluded I concert need to not need to not need to need the body. Note included and all excluded I concert need to not need to need the body.	No 1 do not - Whitely sort broken No 1 do not Whitely sort broken No 1 do not Whitely council No do not support Whiteler Council No do not Vilhiller Council No Whitely Council No Whitely Council No Whitely sort broken No 1 do not Whitely is not broken No 1 do not Whitely sort broken Why dannes assembling what works well already. No 1 do not. Why dannes assembling what works well already. No 1 do not.	Whitely Council Mofit Serve as is this division of a orous above the encoses is no coord Whitele Council Mofit Serve as is this division of a orous above the encoses is no coord Whitele Council Mofit Serve as is the division of a orous above the proposal is no good Whitele Council Mofit Serve as is the division of a orous above the encoses is no coord Whitele Council Mofit Serve as is the division of a orous above the encoses is no coord Whitele Council Mofit Serve as is the division of a orous above the encoses is no coord Moreoconfound of Agreement. Whitele Council Mofit Serve as it this division of a orous above the encoses is no coord Moreoconfound of Serve as it is division of a orous above the encoses is no coord Moreoconfound of Agreement. Moreoconfound of Serve as it is the division of a conse show the encoses is no coord. Moreoconfound of Serve as it is serve as it is proposal is no good. Whitele Council Mofit. Lever the division of a group the proposal is no good. Keep Whitely Council for them maybe. Whitele Council Mofit Serve as it is this division of a group throw those the encoses is no coord.	None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier None It is discrimination and unifier It is discrimination and unifier It is discrimination and unifier Same terms A conditions to all after to all Same terms A conditions for all Same terms A conditions for all Same terms A conditions for all None It is unifier and discrimination? None. It is unifier and discrimination? None. It is discriminatory and unifier Sevence the same terms & conditions None - It is discriminatory and unifier	Another waste of oosemment more? Seed money or more needed thrins for the Island Waste of oosemment more. Part me tax to better use not more that the Market of oosemment more. Part me tax to better use not more red take Way change conscribing that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & ovir one of the construction of the con	
S Gentry D Sissark J Williamson J Williamson J Williamson R PITS P Hubbes 1 Freeland 1 Hoton R Harris D Kelly LOTHIEL Annowmous Anomymous S Cilver C Thomas Anonymous	Note included & all excluded -1 concose this processor from body. Note included and an excluded -1 concose this proposed now body. Note included and excluded -1 concose this proposed now body. Note included and excluded -1 concose the proposed now body. Note included and all excluded -1 concose the proposed now body. Note included and all excluded -1 concose the proposed now body. We do not need an enter body. We do not need an enter body. Note a cluster is money. We do not need an enter body with a weather one body. We do not need an enter body with a weather one body. We do not need an enter body with a coloris money. We do not need an enter body with a coloris money. We do not need an enter body with a coloris money. We do not need an enter body with a coloris money. We do not need an enter body with a coloris money. We do not need an enter body with a coloris money. We do not need an enter body with a coloris money. Note in now body why? Whittee is not broken. Note in chose induced all excluded. To oppose this proposed new body. Weste of money. Why do we have to change when it works alright now. Note included all excluded -1 concert its proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 concert its proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 concert its proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 concert its proposed new body.	No. 1 do not Whitely sort broken No. Whitely sort broken No. Whitely sort broken No. Whitely council No. Whitely council No. Whitely council No. I do not Whitely Council No. Whitely Council No. I do not Whitely Council No. Whitely No. I do not Whitely Council No. I do not Whitely so not broken No. I do not Whitely so thorken No. I do not Whitely on torken	Whiter Council Moh Issee as its this division of a orous shows the necessal is no cood Whiter Council Moh Issee as its this division of a orous shows the necessal is no cood Whiter Council Moh Issee as its this division of a orous shows the necessal is no cood Whiter Council Moh Issee as its this division of a orous shows the proposal is no good Whiter Council Moh Issee as its this division of a orous shows the necessal is no cood Whiter Council Moh Issee as its this division of a orous shows the necessal is no cood Whiter Council Moh Issee as its this division of a orous shows the necessal is no cood Memorandam of Agreement Memorandam of Agreement / Whiter Council Memorandam agreement / Whiter Council Memorandam agreement / Whiter Council Memorandam of Agreement / Whiter Council Memorandam of Agreement / Whiter Council Memorandam of Agreement / Whiter Council Whiter Council Moh. I never this division of a group the proposal is no good. Whiter Council Moh. I never this division of a group the proposal is no good. Keep Whitley Council for them maybe	None. It is discriminatory & unifer None. It is discriminatory and unifer None. It is discriminatory and unifer None. It is discriminatory and unifer None. It is unifer unifer unifer unifer None. It is unifer	Another waste of oosemment more? Seed money or more needed thrins for the Island Waste of oosemment more. Part me tax to better use not more that the Market of oosemment more. Part me tax to better use not more red take Way change conscribing that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & ovir one of the construction of the con	
S Gentry D Sentrary J Willemson D Newshorn R Pitts P Ptubes B 1 Precised I Treeland T Precised I Treeland T Sentrary B 1 Precised I Treeland T Sentrary B 1 Precised I T Historia R Harris D Sentrary B 1 Precised I T Historia R Anomymous A Campbell H Cambell S Oliver S C Thomas Anomymous A Anomymous B 1 Ptubes B	Note included & all excluded -1 concore this procosed new body. Note included and an excluded -1 concore this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 concore this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 concore the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded -1 concore the procosed new body. Note included and excluded -1 concore the procosed new body. Note included and excluded -1 concore the procosed new body. We do not need a new body. Note a concern money. We do not need a new body. Waste of as consers money. We do not need a new body. Waste of as consers money. We do not need a new body. Waste of as consers money. Note of need a new body. Waste of as consers money. Note of need an excluded -1 concore this concern money. Note of new body why? Whitele in consers money. Note in character of the concern of the concern money. Note in character of the concern of the concern money. Note in character of the concern of the concern money. Note in character of the concern of the concern money. Note in character of the concern of the concern money. Note in character of the concern of the concern money. Note in character of the concern of the concern money. Note in character of the concern of the concern money. Note in character of the concern of the concern money. Note in character of the concern of the concern money. Note in character of the concern of the concern money. Note in character of the concern of the concern money. Note in character of the concern of the concern money. Note in character of the concern of the concern money.	No. 1 on our - Whitely sort broken No. Whitely sort broken No. Whitely council No. Whitely council No. Whitely council No. I on our Whitely council No. I on our Whitely council No. I on the Whitely Council No. I on the Whitely Council No. I on our Whitely council No. Whitely Council No. Whitely Council No. Whitely Council No. Whitely No whitely Council No. I on our Whitely on broken No. I don't. Everyone move to Whitely Council No. I don't. Everyone whitely Council No. Whitely Council worth well No. Whitely Council worth well	Whitely council Mofin - Iseaw as its this division of a orous shows the necessal is no coord Whitely council Mofin. Iseaw as its thind division of a orous shows the necessal is no coord Whitely council Mofin. Iseaw as its thind division of a orous shows the necessal is no coord Whitely council Mofin. Iseaw as its thind division of a orous shows the necessal is no coord Whitely Council Mofin. Iseaw as its thind division of a orous shows the necessal is no coord Whitele Council Mofin. Iseaw as its thind division of a orous shows the necessal is no coord Whitele Council Mominand and Agreement Publisher Council Mominand and Agreement Publisher Council Mominand and Agreement Publisher Council Mominand Mofin and a council Mominand Mofin and Agreement Whiteler Council Mominand Mofin and Agreement Whiteler Council Mominand Mofin and Agreement Whiteler Council Mofin and Agreement Whiteler Council Mofin and Agreement Whiteler Council Mofin Council Mofin Leave this division of a group the proposal is no opoid. Keep Whiteley Council Mofin Leave as it is this division of a group though the proposal is no coord Whiteler Council Mofin Leave as it is this division of a group though the proposal is no coord Whiteler Council Mofin Leave as it is this division of a group though the proposal is no coord Whiteler Council Mofin Leave as it is this division of a group though the proposal is no coord Whiteler Council Mofin Herozorachian of a greenest, division to More them the proposal is no coord Whiteler Council Mofin Herozorachian of a greenest, division for a group though the proposal is no coord Whiteler Council Mofin Herozorachian of a greenest, division for a group though the proposal is no coord Whiteler Council Mofin Leave as it is the division of a group though the proposal is no coord Whiteler Council Mofin Leave as it is the division of a group though the proposal is no coord Whi	None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier It is discrimination and unifier Ris discrimination and unifier Same terms and conditions to all fair to all Same terms and conditions to all fair to all Same terms and conditions for all fair to all Same terms and conditions for all fair to all Same terms and conditions for all fair to all None - It is unifier and discrimination?? None - It is discrimination and unifier Seven and the same terms & conditions None - It is discrimination and unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier None It is discrimination and unifier	Another waste of occument more years of concernment years of concernment more years of concernment years of concernment more years of concernment years of concernment when years of government more years of concernment years of concernment years of years	
S. Gentry V. Distriss k. S. Gentry V. Distriss k. J. Williamson J. Williamson D. Nilwarbon R. Pitts P. Pittohes J. Fredson T. Fredson T. Fredson T. Hotton R. Haters D. Scholler M. Anonymous A. Campbell H. Campbell S. Oliver S. Cilver S. C. C. Thomas. Anonymous A. Anonymous S. C.	Note included & all excluded -1 concose this processor from body. Note included and an excluded -1 concose this proposed now body. Note included and excluded -1 concose this proposed now body. Note included and excluded -1 concose the proposed now body. Note included and all excluded -1 concose the proposed now body. Note included and all excluded -1 concose the proposed now body. We do not need an enter body. We do not need an enter body. Note a cluster is money. We do not need an enter body with a weather one body. We do not need an enter body with a weather one body. We do not need an enter body with a coloris money. We do not need an enter body with a coloris money. We do not need an enter body with a coloris money. We do not need an enter body with a coloris money. We do not need an enter body with a coloris money. We do not need an enter body with a coloris money. We do not need an enter body with a coloris money. Note in now body why? Whittee is not broken. Note in chose induced all excluded. To oppose this proposed new body. Weste of money. Why do we have to change when it works alright now. Note included all excluded -1 concert its proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 concert its proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 concert its proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 concert its proposed new body.	No. 1 do not - Whitely sin't broken No. Whitely council No. Whitely council No. Whitely council No. 1 do not Whitely council No. I do not Whitely council No. 1 do not Whitely council No. Whitely council No. Whitely not broken No. 1 do not Whitely not broken No. 1 do not Whitely not broken No. 1 do not Whitely not broken No. 1 don't. Everyone move to Whitely Council No. I don't. Everyone move to Whitely Council No. 1 don't. Service son't everyone whitely Council No. 1 don't. Service son't everyone who we have the whitely Council No. 1 don't. Service son't everyone who we have the whitely Council No. 1 don't. Service son't everyone who we have the whitely council No. 1 don't. Service son't everyone who we have the whitely council No. 1 don't. Service son't everyone who we have the whitely council No. 1 don't. Service son't everyone whitely council No. 2 don't everyone whitely council No. 3 don't everyone whitely council No. 3 don't everyone whitely everyone whitely council No. 3 don't everyone whitely every	White's Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood White Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous shows the oncoosal is no cood Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous shows the processal is no cood Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous shows the concoral is no cood Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous shows the concoral is no cood Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a consult shows the concoral is no cood Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a consult shows the concoral is no cood Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its concoral Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its in the control Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its its division of a crous thous the crossal is no cood Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its its division of a crous thous the crossal is no cood Whitely Council for them maybe Whitely Council for - Issew as its this division of a crous thous the crossal is no cood Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its its division of a crous thous the crossal is no cood Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its its division of a crous thous the crossal is no cood Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its its division of a crous thous the crossal is no cood Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its its division of a crous thous the crossal is no cood	None. It is discriminatory & unifer None. It is discriminatory and unifer None. It is discriminatory and unifer None. It is discriminatory and unifer None. It is unifer unifer unifer unifer None. It is unifer	Another waste of occument money Scient Indice, or waste of rocement money Scient Indice, or more medied thinks for the Island Scient Indice, or more medied thinks for the Island Waste of openment money Any or make the Indice Indice Indice Why change something that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & ovil Why change something that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & ovil Why waste money waste of time. Cuddin't ovil servants be put to better use. Why waste money or this consultation when things are working of as it is. I oppose this proposed new body.	
S. Gentry D. Rissanox J. Williamox J. Williamox D. Newshorn R. Pitts R. Pitts R. Pitts T. Historia T. Fision T. Gentro R. Harris D. Selfy T. Commons A. Campbell S. Oliver C. Thomas Annonymous Annonymous Annonymous Annonymous	Note included & all excluded -1 coopse this proposed new body. Note included and an excluded -1 coopse this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 coopse this proposed new body. Note included & all excluded -1 coopse the proposed new body. Note included & all excluded -1 coopse the proposed new body. Note included & all excluded -1 coopse the proposed new body. Note included & all excluded -1 coopse the proposed new body. We do not need a new body. What of a loss powers money. We do not need a new body. What of a loss powers money. We do not need a new body. What of a loss powers money. We do not need a new body. What of a loss powers money. Note of need a new body what of a loss powers money. Note of need a new body what of a loss powers money. Note of new body why? What is not breake money. Note in chart of a loss of the	No. 1 do not - Whitely sort broken No. Whitely council No. 1 do not whitely sort broken No. 1 do not whitely sort broken No. 1 do not whitely council No. 1 do not whitely sort broken No. 1 do not - Whitely sort broken No. 1 do not - Whitely sort broken No. 1 do not - Whitely sort broken	Whitely council Mofin - Iseaw as its this division of a orous shows the necessal is no coord Whitely council Mofin. Iseaw as its thind division of a orous shows the necessal is no coord Whitely council Mofin. Iseaw as its thind division of a orous shows the necessal is no coord Whitely council Mofin. Iseaw as its thind division of a orous shows the necessal is no coord Whitely Council Mofin. Iseaw as its thind division of a orous shows the necessal is no coord Whitele Council Mofin. Iseaw as its thind division of a orous shows the necessal is no coord Whitele Council Mominand and Agreement Publisher Council Mominand and Agreement Publisher Council Mominand and Agreement Publisher Council Mominand Mofin and a council Mominand Mofin and Agreement Whiteler Council Mominand Mofin and Agreement Whiteler Council Mominand Mofin and Agreement Whiteler Council Mofin and Agreement Whiteler Council Mofin and Agreement Whiteler Council Mofin Council Mofin Leave this division of a group the proposal is no opoid. Keep Whiteley Council Mofin Leave as it is this division of a group though the proposal is no coord Whiteler Council Mofin Leave as it is this division of a group though the proposal is no coord Whiteler Council Mofin Leave as it is this division of a group though the proposal is no coord Whiteler Council Mofin Leave as it is this division of a group though the proposal is no coord Whiteler Council Mofin Herozorachian of a greenest, division to More them the proposal is no coord Whiteler Council Mofin Herozorachian of a greenest, division for a group though the proposal is no coord Whiteler Council Mofin Herozorachian of a greenest, division for a group though the proposal is no coord Whiteler Council Mofin Leave as it is the division of a group though the proposal is no coord Whiteler Council Mofin Leave as it is the division of a group though the proposal is no coord Whi	None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier It is discrimination and unifier Ris discrimination and unifier Same terms and conditions to all fair to all Same terms and conditions to all fair to all Same terms and conditions for all fair to all Same terms and conditions for all fair to all Same terms and conditions for all fair to all None - It is unifier and discrimination?? None - It is discrimination and unifier Seven and the same terms & conditions None - It is discrimination and unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier None It is discrimination and unifier	Another waste of occument more years of concernment years of concernment more years of concernment years of concernment more years of concernment years of concernment when years of government more years of concernment years of concernment years of years	
S. Gentry D. Rissanox J. Williamox J. Williamox D. Newshorn R. Pitts R. Pitts R. Pitts T. Historia T. Fision T. Gentro R. Harris D. Selfy T. Commons A. Campbell S. Oliver C. Thomas Annonymous Annonymous Annonymous Annonymous	Note included & all excluded -1 concouse this encoused new body. Note included and an excluded -1 concouse this encoused new body. Note included and an excluded -1 concouse this encoused new body. Note included and all excluded -1 concouse this encoused new body. Note included and all excluded -1 concouse this encoused new body. Note included and all excluded -1 concouse this encoused new body. Note included and all excluded -1 concouse this encoused new body. We do not need a new body. Yes a wester of tax payers money. We do not need a new body. Yes a wester of tax payers money. We do not need a new body. Yes a wester of tax payers money. We do not need a new body. Yes a wester of tax payers money. We do not need a new body. Yes a wester of tax payers money. Who can be a few to the concoust the payer of the concoust new body. Note included and all excluded -1 concous this procosed new body. Note included and all excluded -1 concous this procosed new body. Note included and excluded -1 concous this procosed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this procosed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this procosed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this procosed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this procosed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this procosed new body. Note the new body. A groups including current protected staff who work under UK terms &	No. 1 do not Whiteley sint broken No. 1 do not Whiteley council No. do not supposed Whiteley Council No. No. Hose Whiteley Council No. Whiteley Council No. Whiteley council No. Whiteley council No. Whiteley sint broken No. I do not Whiteley sint broken	Whitely Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the encousal is no coord Whitely Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the encousal is no coord Whitely Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the encousal is no coord Whitely Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the encousal is no coord Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a cross shows the encousal is no coord Whitely Council Moreonandum of Agreement. Memorandum of Agreement Mofin Issee as it is the division of a cross shows the reconsol is no coord Memorandum agreement / Whitely Council Moreonandum agreement / Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is the site of the council Moreonandum of Agreement / Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a group the proposal is no good. **Rep Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a group the proposal is no coord Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a group theory the crossel is no coord Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no coord Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no coord Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no coord Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discriminative and unifier Same terms A conditions to all fair to all Same terms A conditions to all fair to all Same terms A conditions for all None - Is unifier and discrimination?7 None. It is unifier and discrimination? None - Is unifier and discrimination on the Unifier A conditions None - It is discriminative and unifier	Another waste of operment money Sood money, or more medded thrinks (for the Island Sood money, or more medded thrinks (for the Island Waste of operment is money And in a too better use not more and take Why change something that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & ord contact. Waste of opermenent money wester of time. Couldn't lovid servants be put to better use. Why waste money or other somewhaten when things are working of as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Everyone should have same working conditions under to change but some. Have PRMs and off will servants got nothing better to do Its under to change our terms and conditions under to change last some. **Ts under to change our terms and conditions when government is not changing civil servant's terms and conditions.	
S. Gentry D. Sanarock J. Milliamock J. Milli	Note included & all excluded -1 conoce this encoded new body Notes included and an excluded -1 conoce this improved new body Notes included and an excluded -1 conoce this improved new body Notes included and an excluded -1 conoce this improved new body. Notes included and all excluded -1 conoce this improved new body. Notes included and an excluded -1 conoce this improved new body. Notes included and an excluded -1 conoce this improved new body. We do not need a new body. With a visit of tax against improved with the conoce this improved new body. We do not need an ene body with a visit of tax against improve. We do not need a new body with a visit of tax against improved. We do not need a new body with a visit of tax against improved. We do not need a new body with a visit of the series money. Why do not need a new body with a visit of the series money. Why channed with a colded. To not need a new proposed body Note in chuded all excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Weste of money, Why do we have to change when it works a lingth now Note included and all excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note in chuded and all excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note in chuded and all excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note in chuded and all excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note in chuded and all excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note in chuded and all excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. I copose the new body. All groups including current protected staff who work under UK terms & conditions.	So 1 on out - Whitely sin't broken So 1 on out Whitely sin't broken So 1 on out Whitele Council So 2 on out Whitele Council So 2 on out Whitele Council So 2 on out Whitele Council So 3 on out Whitele Council So 4 on out Whitele Council So 4 on out Whitele Council So 5 on out	Whitely Council Mofi Isews as its this division of a orous shows the necessals in a coord Whitely Council Mofi Isews as its this division of a orous shows the necessals in a coord Whitely Council Mofi Isews as its this division of a orous shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Isews as its this division of a orous shows the necessals in a coord Whitely Council Mofi Isews as its this division of a orous shows the necessals in a coord Whitely Council Mofi Isews as its this division of a orous shows the necessals in a coord Memorandum of Agreement. Whitely Council Mofi Isews as its this division of a orous shows the necessal in a coord Memorandum of Agreement Whitely Council Mofine Council Memorandum of Agreement Whitely Council Mofine Council The Memorandum of Agreement Whitely Council Mofine Council The Memorandum of Agreement Whitely Council Mofine Council Mof	None. 18. It descrimators & uniter None. 18. descrimators and uniter None. 18. descrimators and uniter None. 18. descrimators & uniter None. 18. descrimators & uniter None. 18. descrimators and uniter None. 18. descrimators and uniter None. 18. descrimators and uniter None to the descrimators and uniter None. 18. des	Another waste of openment more Seed money on more needed thrise for the Island Waste of obsembles more Another was needed thrise for the Island Waste of obsembles more Another was to better use not more red size Why change something that is working well for Whitely and other workers just to suit the government & civil orwards. Waste of government money waste of time. Couldn't civil servants be put to better use. Why waste money on this consultation when things are working of as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Sevenore should have same working on this consultation when things are working of as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Sevenore should have same working on this to chance lust some. Name Wilds and cold severant get nothing better to do It is unfair to change out terms and conditions. Leave Whitley Council as it is.	
S. Gentry D. Sanarock J. Milliamock J. Milli	Note included & all excluded -1 conoce this conocean few body Notes included and an excluded -1 conoce this conocean few body Notes included and an excluded -1 conocean few included conocean few body Notes included and all excluded -1 conocean few included conocean few body Notes included and all excluded -1 conocean few body Notes included and all excluded -1 conocean few body Notes included and all excluded -1 conocean few body Notes included and all excluded -1 conocean few body Notes on body. The swetter of tax payers money. We do not need a new body. The swetter of tax payers money. We do not need a new body. The swetter of tax payers money. We do not need a new body. Notes as at 1s. We do not need a new body. Notes and its. We do not need a new body. Notes and its. Notes included all excluded -1 conocean few body. Waste of money. Why do we have to change when it work singlet ow. Notes included and all excluded -1 conocean finis monocean few body. Notes included and all excluded -1 conoce this monocean few body. Notes included and all excluded -1 conocean finis monocean few body. Notes included and all excluded -1 conoce this monocean few body. Notes included and all excluded -1 conocean finis monocean few body. Notes included and excluded -1 conocean finis monocean few body. Notes included and excluded -1 conocean finis monocean few body. Notes included and excluded -1 conocean finis monocean few body. I conocean finis more for new body, of government well. Notes included and excluded -1 conocean finis monocean few body. I conocean finis more for new body, of government well. Notes included and excluded -1 conocean finis monocean few body. I conocean finis more for new body of government well. Notes included and excluded -1 conocean finis monocean few body. Recomplement of the meet body. Notes included and excluded -1 conocean finis monocean few body. Recomplement of the meet body. Notes included and excluded -1 conocean finis monocean few body.	So I do not - Whitely sint broken	Whitely Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the encousal is no coord Whitely Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the encousal is no coord Whitely Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the encousal is no coord Whitely Council Mofin Issee as its this division of a orous shows the encousal is no coord Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a cross shows the encousal is no coord Whitely Council Moreonandum of Agreement. Memorandum of Agreement Mofin Issee as it is the division of a cross shows the reconsol is no coord Memorandum agreement / Whitely Council Moreonandum agreement / Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is the site of the council Moreonandum of Agreement / Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a group the proposal is no good. **Rep Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a group the proposal is no coord Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a group theory the crossel is no coord Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no coord Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no coord Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no coord Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofin Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discriminative and unifier It is discriminative for all and It is discrimination? None It is unifier and discrimination? None It is unifier and discrimination? None It is discriminative and unifier Everyone should have the same terms & conditions None It is discriminative and unifier None None None Same for all staff	Another waste of openment more? Sood more; on one medded thrise for the Island. Sood more; on one medded thrise for the Island. Waste of openment issuer. All me Is no better use ond more ned tase. Why change something that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & old contact. Waste of openment money wester of time. Couldn't old servants be put to better use. Waste of openment money wester of time. Couldn't old servants be put to better use. Why waste money on this consultation when things are working of as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Exercise should have same working conditions unfair to change suit some. New PMMs and o'ull servants got nothing better to do It's usfair to change our terms and conditions when government is not changing civil servant's terms and conditions. Leave Whitler Council as it is. Don't we need to save ow money? If it's not broken don't fix it.	
S. Gentry D. Sosson D. Sos	Note included & all excluded -1 conoce this encoded new body Notes included and an excluded -1 conoce this improved new body Notes included and an excluded -1 conoce this improved new body Notes included and an excluded -1 conoce this improved new body. Notes included and all excluded -1 conoce this improved new body. Notes included and an excluded -1 conoce this improved new body. Notes included and an excluded -1 conoce this improved new body. We do not need a new body. With a visit of tax against improved with the conoce this improved new body. We do not need an ene body with a visit of tax against improve. We do not need a new body with a visit of tax against improved. We do not need a new body with a visit of tax against improved. We do not need a new body with a visit of the series money. Why do not need a new body with a visit of the series money. Why channed with a colded. To not need a new proposed body Note in chuded all excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Weste of money, Why do we have to change when it works a lingth now Note included and all excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note in chuded and all excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note in chuded and all excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note in chuded and all excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note in chuded and all excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note in chuded and all excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. I copose the new body. All groups including current protected staff who work under UK terms & conditions.	So 1 on out - Whitely sin't broken So 1 on out Whitely sin't broken So 1 on out Whitele Council So 2 on out Whitele Council So 2 on out Whitele Council So 2 on out Whitele Council So 3 on out Whitele Council So 4 on out Whitele Council So 4 on out Whitele Council So 5 on out	Whitely Council Mofit - Service as it this division of a cross above the encoses is no coord Whitely Council Notifice Council Policy Interest as it this division of a cross above the encoses is no coord Whitely Council Mofit - Service as it this division of a cross above the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofit - Service as it this division of a cross above the encoses is no coord Whitely Council Mofit - Service as it this division of a cross above the encoses is no coord Whitely Council Mofit - Service as it this division of a cross above the encoses is no coord Momentum of Agreement Mofit - Council Mofit - Service as it this division of a cross above the encoses is no coord - Momentum of Agreement Mofit - Council Mofit - Service as a strength of the service of the serv	None. 18. It descrimators & uniter None. 18. descrimators and uniter None. 18. descrimators and uniter None. 18. descrimators & uniter None. 18. descrimators & uniter None. 18. descrimators and uniter None. 18. descrimators and uniter None. 18. descrimators and uniter None to the descrimators and uniter None. 18. des	Another waste of openment more Seed money on more needed thrise for the Island Waste of obsembles more Another was needed thrise for the Island Waste of obsembles more Another was to better use not more red size Why change something that is working well for Whitely and other workers just to suit the government & civil orwards. Waste of government money waste of time. Couldn't civil servants be put to better use. Why waste money on this consultation when things are working of as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Sevenore should have same working on this consultation when things are working of as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Sevenore should have same working on this to chance lust some. Name Wilds and cold severant get nothing better to do It is unfair to change out terms and conditions. Leave Whitley Council as it is.	
S Gentry D Sossan D S	Note included & all excluded -1 coopse this proposed new body. Notes included and an excluded -1 coopse this proposed new body. Notes included and excluded -1 coopse this proposed new body. Notes included and excluded -1 coopse this proposed new body. Notes included and excluded -1 coopse this proposed new body. Notes included and excluded -1 coopse this proposed new body. We do not need an enew body. We do not need an enew body. Wester of the incomposed new body. We do not need an enew body. Wester of the incomposed new body. We do not need an enew body. Wester of the incomposed new body. We do not need an enew body. Wester of the incomposed new. We don't need a new body. Wester of the incomposed new. We don't need a new body. Wester of the incomposed new. Note of new body why?? Whitele is not breaks money. Why do we have bod valved. The one of new proposed body. Note included all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body. Wester of money. Why do we have bod valpe when it works alright now. Note included all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body. Note included all excluded. I coopse this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 coopse this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 coopse this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 coopse this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 coopse this proposed new body. All groups including current protected staff who work under UK terms & conditions. Consider the new body. All groups including current protected staff who work under UK terms & conditions.	So I do not - Whitely sint broken	Whitely Council Mofit - Service as it this division of a cross above the encoses is no coord Whitely Council Notifice Council Policy Interest as it this division of a cross above the encoses is no coord Whitely Council Mofit - Service as it this division of a cross above the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofit - Service as it this division of a cross above the encoses is no coord Whitely Council Mofit - Service as it this division of a cross above the encoses is no coord Whitely Council Mofit - Service as it this division of a cross above the encoses is no coord Momentum of Agreement Mofit - Council Mofit - Service as it this division of a cross above the encoses is no coord - Momentum of Agreement Mofit - Council Mofit - Service as a strength of the service of the serv	None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination with the None - It is discrimination of unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier It is discrimination and unifier It is discrimination and unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier Some terms and conditions to all fast to all Same terms and conditions for all Same terms and conditions for all None - It is unifier and discrimination of the None - It is unifier and discrimination of the None - It is unifier and conditions for all None - It is discrimination and unifier None - It is disc	Another waste of openment more? Sood more; on one medded thrise for the Island. Sood more; on one medded thrise for the Island. Waste of openment issuer. All me Is no better use ond more ned tase. Why change something that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & old contact. Waste of openment money wester of time. Couldn't old servants be put to better use. Waste of openment money wester of time. Couldn't old servants be put to better use. Why waste money on this consultation when things are working of as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Exercise should have same working conditions unfair to change suit some. New PMMs and o'ull servants got nothing better to do It's usfair to change our terms and conditions when government is not changing civil servant's terms and conditions. Leave Whitler Council as it is. Don't we need to save ow money? If it's not broken don't fix it.	
S Gentry D Kosanico D Kosanico D Kosanico D Neverborn R Harington P Harington D Harington D Harington D Harington D Harington D Harington D Kelly D Ke	Note included is all excluded. I goods this proposed new body. Note included and an excluded. I goods this proposed new body. Note included and an excluded is good to the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded. I goods the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded. I goods the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded. I goods the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded. I goods the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded. I goods this grouped new body. Note included and proposed new body. Note on the proposed new body. It as wasted of tax gayees money. We do not need a new body. Native of tax gayees money. We do not need a new body. Native of tax gayees money. Who can be compared to the proposed new body. Note included all excluded. I googs this proposed new body. Waste of money. Why do we have to change when it works alright now. Note included all excluded. I googs this proposed new body. Waste of money. Note included and all excluded. I googs this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded. I googs this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded. I googs this proposed new body. Note included and excluded. I googs this proposed new body. Note included and excluded. I googs this proposed new body. Note included and excluded. I googs this proposed new body. Note included and excluded. I googs this proposed new body. Note included and excluded. I googs this proposed new body. Note included and excluded. I googs this proposed new body. Note included and excluded is goods this goods this goods on the body. Note included and all excluded. I googs this goods new body. Note the new body. All groups included not all goods this goods this goods on the body. Note the new body.	So I of not - Whitely sin't broken	Whitely Council Mofit Serve as is this division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Whitely Council Mofit Serve as is the division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Whitely Council Mofit Serve as is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofit Serve as is the division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Whitely Council Mofit Serve as is the division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Whitely Council Mofit Serve as is the division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Memorandum of Agreement. Whitely Council Mofit Serve as is the division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Memorandum of Agreement Whitely Council Memorandum of Agreement Whitely Council The Memorandum of Agreement Whitely Council Whitely Council Mofit Leave the division of a group the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofit Leave the division of a group the proposal is no good. Exep Whitely Council for them maybe Whitely Council Mofit Serve as it is this division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Whitely Council Mofit Serve as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofit Serve as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofit Serve as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofit Serve as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Leave as is. As above Leave as is. Dividino is not the answer. Whitely Council Mofit Serve as it this division of a group shows the proposal is no good. Leave as is. Leave as is. Dividino is not the answer. Whitely Council Mofit Serve as it this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discriminative and unifier It is unifier and unifier It is unifier and unifier Same terms & conditions to all fair to all Same terms and conditions for all fair to all Same terms and conditions for all fair to all None - It is unifier and discrimination? None. It is unifier and discrimination? None. It is unifier and discrimination of the unifier Everyone should have the same terms & conditions None - It is discriminative and unifier None - It is discriminative and unifier None of the discriminative and unifier None of the discriminative and unifier None Same for all staff None of them, it would be unifier	Another waste of government money Seed money or more needed thinks for the bland Waste of government money And the value of the process of the seed of	
S. Gentry D. Essans J. Milliamson J. Milliamson J. Milliamson J. Bewshom J. Petts J.	Note included & all excluded. I goods this proposed new body Notes included and an excluded. I goods this proposed new body Notes included and excluded to goods this proposed new body. Notes included and all excluded. I goods this proposed new body. Notes included and all excluded. I goods this new body. Notes included and all excluded. I goods this more body. Notes included and an excluded. I goods this more body. Notes included and included. I goods this proposed new body. We do not need a new body. With a good bowless money. We do not need a new body. With a good bowless money. We do not need a new body. With a good bowless money. We do not need a new body. With a good bowless money. We do not need a new body. With a good bowless money. Why do we have body with a good bowless money. Why do we have body with a good bowless money. Why do we have body with a good bowless of the good body. Note included all excluded. To goods this gropposed new body. Weste of money. Why do we have to change when it works alight now Note included and all excluded. I goods this gropposed new body. Note in bodded and all excluded. I goods this gropposed new body. Note in bodded and all excluded. I goods this gropposed new body. Note in bodded and all excluded. I goods this gropposed new body. Note in chudded and all excluded. I goods this gropposed new body. I goods this new body I goods including current protected staff who work under UK terms & conditions Cornected used of money. Have to ask why?? Rockool should be it, a gain another coatly exercise at tapayers expense, where we have in just the staff with some body. I second the protected and the staff with some body when work is already.	So I do not - Whitely sort broken	Whitely Council Mofi leave as it this division of a orous above the encosesi is no coord Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a orous above the encosesi is no coord Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is the division of a orous above the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is the division of a orous above the encosesi is no coord Whitely Council Mofi leave as it this division of a orous above the encosesi is no coord Whitely Council Mofi leave as it this division of a orous above the encosesi is no coord Memorandum of Agreement. **Memorandum of Agreement Whitely Council Memorandum of Agreement Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is the division of a orous above the encosesi is no coord Memorandum Agreement Whitely Council Mofi leave as the whitely Council Mofi leave the division of a group the proposal is no good. **Keep Whitely Council for them maybe Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a cross shows the crosses is no coord Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Leave as is. Dividing is not the answer. Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good Leave as is. Dividing is not the answer. Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good Leave as is. Dividing is not the answer. Whitely Council Mofi (leave as is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good.)	None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discriminative and unifier None It is unifier and unifier It is discriminative and unifier It is discriminative and unifier None It is unifier and discrimination for all Same Items and conditions for all and that I all None It is unifier and discrimination? None. It is unifier and discrimination? None. It is unifier and discrimination? None. It is unifier and discriminative and unifier None I is discriminative and unifier None Same for all staff None of them, it would be unifier None of them it would be unifier None or of them it would be unifier None or of them it would be unifier None - everyone should have the same terms & conditions	Another waste of government money Seed money or more needed things for the Island Water of Joseph Park or the Island Why Change something that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & ovid orwards. Water of government money waste of time. Couldn't ovid servants be put to better use. Why waste money or oth sconsultation when things are working of as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Sevence should have same working conditions under to change but some. Takes MPRS and civil servants get nothing better to do. It's unfair to change our terms and conditions when government is not changing civil servant's terms and conditions. Don't we need to save our money? If it's not belien don't fix it. Don't we need to save our money. It have a negotiating body that works well I think this is a waste of govt money, T&C ok as they are Ference went to the needing and I never had any information on these matters but I wouldn't agree to savorthon that works are some to the meeting and I never had any information on these matters but I wouldn't agree to savorthon that works are some to the meeting and I never had any information on these matters but I wouldn't agree to savorthon that works are some to the meeting and I never had any information on these matters but I wouldn't agree to savorthon that works are some to the meeting and I never had any information on these matters but I wouldn't agree to savorthon that works are some that the meeting and I never had any information on these matters but I wouldn't agree to savorthon that works.	
S. Gentry D. Branack J. Williamson D. Branack J. Williamson D. Newshorn R. PIEX. R.	Note included is all excluded. I conose this encoded new body Notes included and excluded I conose this propose from body. Notes included and excluded I coppose this propose from body. Notes included and excluded I coppose this propose from body. Notes included and excluded I coppose this propose from body. Notes included is all excluded. I coppose this proposed new body. Notes included and excluded I coppose this proposed new body. We do not need a new body. Was a waste of tax gavers money. We do not need a new body. Was a waste of tax gavers money. We do not need a new body. Waste of the opens money. We do not need a new body. Waste of the opens money. We do not need a new body. Waste of the opens money. We do not need a new body. Waste of the opens money. We do not need a new body. Waste of the opens money. We do not need a new body. Waste of the opens money. We do not need a new body. Waste of the opens money. We do not need a new body. Waste of the opens money. We do not need a new body. Waste of the opens money. Why do we have body need to new body. None included all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body. None included and excluded I coppose this proposed new body. None included and excluded I coppose this proposed new body. None included and excluded I coppose this proposed new body. I coppose this proposed new body. I coppose this proposed in the body. I coppose the provision of the proposed new body. I coppose the new body All groups including current potected staff who work under UK terms & conditions. Consider waste of money. Have to ask why? I coppose the new body. I coppose the provision of the proposed new body. Note included and excluded I coppose this proposed new body. I coppose the provision of the proposed new body is not be set only a gave a proposed new body. Note included and excluded I coppose this proposed new body. I coppose the provision of the proposed new body is not be set only a gave and the proposed new body. Note on the pass contribility Council as it is. Note on the pass on	So 1 on ct Whitely sort broken	Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous shows the necessals in a coord Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous shows the necessals in a coord Whitely Council Mofi Issew as it is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a group shows the necessal in a coord Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a group shows the necessal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a group shows the necessal is no coord Memorandum of Agreement Whitely Council Memorandum of Issement of Mofi Issew as the short of a group the proposal is no good Issement of Mofi Issew as the short of a group the proposal is no good Issement whitely Council Mofi Issew as the short of a group the proposal is no good Issement whitely Council Mofi Issew as the short of a group the proposal is no good Issement whitely Council Mofi Issew as the short of a group the proposal is no good Issement whitely Council Mofi Issew as the short of a group the proposal is no good Issement whitely Council Mofi Issew as the short of a group the proposal is no good Issement whitely Council Mofi Issew as the short of a group the proposal is no good Issement whitely Council Mofi Issee as the short of a group throws the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issee as the short of a group throws the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issee as the short of a group throws the proposal is no good Leave as is Division of a group throws the proposal is no good Leave as is Division of a group throws the proposal is no good Leave as is Division of a group throws the proposal is no good Leave as is Division of a group throws the proposal is no good Leave as is Division of a group throws the proposal is no good Leave as is Division of a group throws the proposal is no good Leave as is Division of a group throws the proposal is no good Leave as is Division of a group thro	None : It is discrimination & unifier None : It is discrimination & unifier None : It is discrimination & unifier None : It is discrimination and unifier None : It is discrimination and unifier None : It is discrimination and unifier This discrimination and unifier The discrimination and unifier None : It is discrimination to the late to all Same terms and conditions to all fair to all Same terms and conditions for all fair to all Same terms and conditions for all fair to all None : It is unified and discrimination? None : It is discrimination and unifier Same terms (and the late to all the late of al	Another waste of occemment money Scend money or more needed thruse for the Island Waste of occemment money Waste of occemment money Waste of occemment money Why Change constituting that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & child Why that to be their money waste of time. Couldn't civil servants be put to better use. Why waste of government money waste of time. Couldn't civil servants be put to better use. Why waste money on this consultation when things are working ok as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Revervoes should have same working conditions unfair to change but to better use. The work of the control of the control of the conditions of the conditions. Leave Whitler to change our terms and conditions when government is not changing civil servant's terms and conditions. Leave Whitler Council as it is. Don't we need to save our money? If it's not becken don't fix it. A waste of government money, we have a negotiating body that works well I think this is a waste of govt money. Tak c as they are.	
S. Gentry D. Kosanico J. Milliamoco J. Milliamoco J. Milliamoco J. Harden J.	Note included & all excluded. I goods this proposed new body Notes included and an excluded. I goods this proposed new body Notes included and an excluded. I goods this proposed new body Notes included and an excluded. I goods this proposed new body. Notes included and an excluded. I goods the proposed new body. Notes included and an excluded. I goods the proposed new body. Notes that goods one body. It is a wester of tax appears money. We do not need a new body. It is a wester of tax appears money. We do not need a new body. Waste of tax appears money. We do not need a new body. Waste of tax subsets on the control of the contro	So 0 on C. White and broken	Whitely Council Mofit - Issew as its this division of a cross above the encoseal is no cood Whitely Council Mofit - Issew as its this division of a cross above the encoseal is no cood Whitely Council Mofit - Issew as it this division of a cross above the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofit - Issew as its this division of a cross above the encoseal is no cood Whitely Council Mofit - Issew as its this division of a cross above the encoseal is no cood Memorandum of Agreement Vehibles Council Mofit - Issew as its this division of a cross above the encoseal is no cood Memorandum of Agreement Vehibles Council Mominandum of Agreement Vehibles Council Mominandum Agreement	None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discriminative and unifier It is discriminative and unifier It is discriminative and unifier None - It is unifier and discrimination for all Same berms and conditions for all and the It all Same berms and conditions for all and the It all None - It is unifier and discrimination? None. It is unifier and discrimination? None. It is unifier and discrimination? None - It is discriminative and unifier	Another waste of government money Seed money or more needed things for the Island Water of Joseph Park or the Island Why Change something that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & ovid orwards. Water of government money waste of time. Couldn't ovid servants be put to better use. Why waster money or on the consultation when things are working of as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Sevence should have same working conditions under to change but so better use. Be worked and civil severants get nothing better to do. It's unfair to change our terms and conditions when government is not changing civil servant's terms and conditions. But surfair to change our terms and conditions when government is not changing civil servant's terms and conditions. Don't we need to save our money? If it's not believe their is the change of the works well I think this is a waste of govt money. T&C ok as they are Ference went to the needing and I never had any Information on these matters but I wouldn't agree to sentition that would make use worse of the before- seeded level Bills to any	
S. Gentry D. Essanix J. Williamson D. Essanix J. Williamson D. Newshorn R. Pitts R. Pitts S. D. Seventry R. Marin Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous S. Divide S. Divide R. Marin S. Divide S	Note included is all excluded. I conose this encoded new body Notes included and excluded I conose this propose from body. Notes included and excluded I coppose this propose from body. Notes included and excluded I coppose this propose from body. Notes included and excluded I coppose this propose from body. Notes included is all excluded. I coppose this proposed new body. Notes included and excluded I coppose this proposed new body. We do not need a new body. Was a waste of tax gavers money. We do not need a new body. Was a waste of tax gavers money. We do not need a new body. Waste of the opens money. We do not need a new body. Waste of the opens money. We do not need a new body. Waste of the opens money. We do not need a new body. Waste of the opens money. We do not need a new body. Waste of the opens money. We do not need a new body. Waste of the opens money. We do not need a new body. Waste of the opens money. We do not need a new body. Waste of the opens money. We do not need a new body. Waste of the opens money. Why do we have body need to new body. None included all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body. None included and excluded I coppose this proposed new body. None included and excluded I coppose this proposed new body. None included and excluded I coppose this proposed new body. I coppose this proposed new body. I coppose this proposed in the body. I coppose the provision of the proposed new body. I coppose the new body All groups including current potected staff who work under UK terms & conditions. Consider waste of money. Have to ask why? I coppose the new body. I coppose the provision of the proposed new body. Note included and excluded I coppose this proposed new body. I coppose the provision of the proposed new body is not be set only a gave a proposed new body. Note included and excluded I coppose this proposed new body. I coppose the provision of the proposed new body is not be set only a gave and the proposed new body. Note on the pass contribility Council as it is. Note on the pass on	So 10 not - Whitely sort broken	Whitely Council Mofi leave as it this division of a cross above the encosesi is no accod Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a cross above the encosesi is no accod Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofi leave as it this division of a group shows the encosesi is no accod Whitely Council Mofi leave as it this division of a group shows the encosesi is no accod Memorandum of Agreement Whitely Council Mofi leave as it this division of a group shows the encosesi is no accod Memorandum of Agreement Whitely Council Mofi leave as it may be accorded to the encosesi is no accod Memorandum of Agreement Whitely Council Mofi leave as it may be accorded to the encosesi is no accod Whitely Council Mofi leave as it may be a to a proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi leave the division of a group the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi leave the division of a group the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a group throw tows the encosesi is no accod Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no accod Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no accod Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no accod Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Leave as is. Dividing is not the answer. Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good Leave as is. Dividing is not the answer. Whitely Council Mofi leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Leave as is. Dividing is not the answer. Whitely Council Mofi Memorandum of Agreement.	None - It is discriminatory & unifer Has discriminatory and unifer Has discriminatory and unifer Has discriminatory and unifer Has discriminatory and unifer Some terms and conditions to all fair to all Some terms and conditions for all fair to all Some terms and conditions for all fair to all None It is unifer and discriminatory discriminatory None It is unifer and discriminatory None It is unifer and discriminatory None It is unifer and discriminatory None It is discriminatory and unifer Everyone should have the same terms & conditions None - It is discriminatory and unifer None - It is discriminatory and unifer None It is unifer and to the late of the	Another waste of government money Seed money or more needed thinks for the blaind Waste of Jovennetes money Another waste of government money Seed money or more needed thinks for the blaind Waste of Jovennetes money And was to better use not more red tace Why change something that is working well for Whitely and other workers just to suit the government & ordinaries. Waste of government money waste of time. Couldn't Ovil servants be put to better use. Why waste money or other sconsulation when things are working of as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Why waste money or other sconsulation when things are working of as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Seevone should have same working conditions under to change but some. Here Merika and ordi servants got nothing better to do It's unfair to change our terms and conditions when the same working of the same pattern to the same to the needing and I rever had any information on these matters but I wouldn't agree to anythin this is a waste of government money. Tall on the same to the matters but I wouldn't agree to anythin the same to the needing and I rever had any information on these matters but I wouldn't agree to anythin this is a waste of government money & resources.	
S. Gentry D. Essanix J. Williamson D. Essanix J. Williamson D. Newshorn R. Pitts R. Pitts S. D. Seventry R. Marin Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous Anonymous S. Divide S. Divide R. Marin S. Divide S	Note included & all excluded -1 conoce this conocean force body. Note included and excluded -1 conoce this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 conoce this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 conoce the proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 conoce the proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 conoce the proposed new body. We do not need an enew body. Was explained in someoned new body. We do not need an enew body. Was explained in someoned new body. We do not need an enew body. Was explained new body. We do not need an enew body. Was explained new body. We do not need an enew body. Was explained new body. We do not need an enew body. Was explained new body. We do not need an enew body. Was explained new body. We do not need an explained new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Waste of money. Why do we have to change when it works alright now. Note included all excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. All groups including current protected staff who work under UK terms & conditions. Consider her work body and another body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed n	No. 1 on or - Whitely inst broken No. Whitely inst broken No. Whitely council No. Whitely council No. Whitely council No. I on or Whitely council No. Whitely on to broken No. I on or Whitely in or broken No. Whitely council No. I do not Whitely in the broken No. I do not Whitely sort broken No. I do not Whitely council	Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous shows the necessal is no cood Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous shows the necessal is no cood Whitely Council Mofi Issew as it is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a group shows the necessal is no cood Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a group shows the necessal is no cood Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a group shows the necessal is no cood Memorandum of Agreement J. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a group shows the necessal is no cood Memorandum of Agreement Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its thing of the mofi Issew as its model of the mofi Issew as its proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi. Issew as it is this division of a group the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi. Issew as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no cood. Whitely Council Mofi. Issew as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no cood. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no cood. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as it is the division of a group shows the proposal is no cood. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as it is the division of a group shows the proposal is no cood. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as it is the division of a group shows the proposal is no cood. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as it is the division of a group shows the proposal is no cood. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as it is the division of a group shows the proposal is no cood. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as it is the division of a croup shows the proposal is no cood. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as it is the	None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier This discrimination and unifier This discrimination and unifier This discrimination and unifier This discrimination and unifier Same terms and conditions to all far to all Same terms and conditions to all far to all Same terms and conditions for all fact to all None - It is discrimination and unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier None - deep certain and unifier	Another waste of operment money Sood money or most medded thrise for the Island Sood money or most medded thrise for the Island Waste of operment issuers And the source of the Sood operation of the Island Waste of operment issuers Why change something that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & ord contact. Where not operate issuers Why sates money wester of time. Couldn't ovid servants be put to better use. Permone should have some wester of time. Couldn't ovid servants be put to better use. Permone should have some working on this or ording of as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Permone should have same working nordificers unfair to change suit some. New PRMs and off will servants got nothing better to do It's unfair to change our terms and conditions unfair to change suit some. It's unfair to change our terms and conditions when government is not changing civil servant's terms and conditions Leave Whitler Council as it is. Don't we need to save our money? If it's not broken don't fix it. A waste of government money, we have a negotiating body that works well I think this is a waste of got money. TAC ob as they are I never went to the needing sed I never lay information on these matters but I wouldn't agree to Iffice, this is a waste of document money. A assurance. No real reason to change over but just hassie and people in top jobs never seem to get all this hasde. Leave	
S. Gentry D. Essanix J. Williamson D. Essanix J. Williamson D. Newshorn R. PERX R. PEXX R. PEX	Note included & all excluded -1 conoce this conocean force body. Note included and excluded -1 conoce this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 conoce this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 conoce the proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 conoce the proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 conoce the proposed new body. We do not need an enew body. Was explained in someoned new body. We do not need an enew body. Was explained in someoned new body. We do not need an enew body. Was explained new body. We do not need an enew body. Was explained new body. We do not need an enew body. Was explained new body. We do not need an enew body. Was explained new body. We do not need an enew body. Was explained new body. We do not need an explained new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Waste of money. Why do we have to change when it works alright now. Note included all excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. All groups including current protected staff who work under UK terms & conditions. Consider her work body and another body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed new body. Note included and excluded -1 copose this proposed n	So 10 not - Whitely sort broken	Whitely Council Mofi leave as it this division of a cross above the encosesi is no accod Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a cross above the encosesi is no accod Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofi leave as it this division of a group shows the encosesi is no accod Whitely Council Mofi leave as it this division of a group shows the encosesi is no accod Memorandum of Agreement Whitely Council Mofi leave as it this division of a group shows the encosesi is no accod Memorandum of Agreement Whitely Council Mofi leave as it may be accorded to the encosesi is no accod Memorandum of Agreement Whitely Council Mofi leave as it may be accorded to the encosesi is no accod Whitely Council Mofi leave as it may be a to a proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi leave the division of a group the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi leave the division of a group the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a group throw tows the encosesi is no accod Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no accod Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no accod Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no accod Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Leave as is. Dividing is not the answer. Whitely Council Mofi leave as it is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good Leave as is. Dividing is not the answer. Whitely Council Mofi leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Leave as is. Dividing is not the answer. Whitely Council Mofi Memorandum of Agreement.	None - It is discriminatory & unifer Has discriminatory and unifer Has discriminatory and unifer Has discriminatory and unifer Has discriminatory and unifer Some terms and conditions to all fair to all Some terms and conditions for all fair to all Some terms and conditions for all fair to all None It is unifer and discriminatory discriminatory None It is unifer and discriminatory None It is unifer and discriminatory None It is unifer and discriminatory None It is discriminatory and unifer Everyone should have the same terms & conditions None - It is discriminatory and unifer None - It is discriminatory and unifer None It is unifer and to the late of the	Another waste of government money Second money on one needed thinks for the bland Second money on one needed thinks for the bland Waste of Queenment money And the bland waste of government money Waste of Queenment money And was to be the use of more net take Why change something that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & ord concret. Waste of government money waste of time. Couldn't dvid servants be put to better use. Why waste money on this consultation when things are working of as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Servones should have same working conditions under to change last some. Here MRMs and ovid servants got nothing better to do I've under to change our terms and conditions when government is not changing civil servant's terms and conditions. Leave Whitlier Council as it is Don't we need to save our money. If it's not broken don't fix it. A waste of government money, we have a negotiating body that works well I think this is a waste of gort money, T&C ok as they are I never went to the meeting and I never had any information on these matters but I wouldn't agree to anothion that would make use was off thin before - seeded have Bills to any I mink this is a waste of government money & recourse. No real reason to change over but just hassie and people in top jobs never seem to get all this hassie. Leave	
S. Gentry S. Gentry D. Kossan D. Kos	Note included & all excluded -1 concose this encoded new body Notes included and excluded -1 concose the improved new body Notes included and excluded -1 concose the improved new body Notes included and excluded -1 concose the new body Notes included and excluded -1 concose the new body Notes included and excluded -1 concose the improved new body. Notes included and excluded -1 concose the improved new body. We do not need a new body. Was excluded -1 concose the someone new body. We do not need a new body. Was excluded -1 concose the someone. We do not need a new body. Was excluded -1 concose the someone. We do not need a new body. Was excluded -1 concose the someone. We do not need a new body. Was excluded -1 concose the someone. We do not need a new body. Was excluded -1 concose the someone. We do not need a new body. Was excluded -1 concose the someone. None included and excluded -1 concose this proposed new body. None included and excluded -1 concose this groups of new body. None included and excluded -1 concose this groups of new body. None included and excluded -1 concose this groups of new body. None included and excluded -1 concose this groups of new body. None included and excluded -1 concose this groups of new body. None included and excluded -1 concose this groups of new body. None included and excluded -1 concose this groups of new body. Of concose the new body All groups including current protected staff who work under UK terms & Confidence was for more. Have to ask why? Of the place something that works already None included and excluded -1 concose this groups of the body. None included and excluded -1 concose the new body Of concose the new body. All groups including current protected staff who work under UK terms & Confidence was of the place something that works already None included and excluded -1 concose this groups of the body. None included and excluded -1 concose this proposed new body. None included and excluded -1 concose this proposed new body. None included and excluded -1 conc	So 1 on C. White is not broken	Whiter Council Mofi Issue as it this division of a group shows the encoses is no good Whiter Council Mofi Issue as it this division of a group shows the encoses is no good Whiter Council Mofi Issue as it is fluid form of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiter Council Mofi Issue as it is fluid form of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiter Council Mofi Issue as it is fluid form of a group shows the encoses is no good Whiter Council Mofi Issue as it is fluid form of a group shows the encoses is no good Semonathom of Agreement Whiter Council Mofin Issue as it is fluid form of a group shows the encoses is no good Semonathom of Agreement Whiter Council Mofin and a group shows the encoses is no good Semonathom of Agreement Whiter Council Mofin and a group shows the encoses is no good Whiter Council Mofin and a group shows the encoses is no good Semonathom of Agreement Whiter Council Mofin and Group shows the encoses is no good Whiter Council Mofin and the short of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiter Council Mofin for them maybe Whiter Council Mofin from maybe Whiter Council Mofin from maybe Whiter Council Mofin - Issue as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiter Council Mofin - Issue as it is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good Leave as is. Dividino is not the answer. Whiter Council Mofin - Issue as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Leave as is. Dividino is not the answer. Whiter Council Mofin - Issue as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Leave as is. Dividino is not the answer. Whiter Council Mofin - Issue as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Leave as is. Dividino is not the answer. Whiter Council Mofin - Issue as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good. Whiter Council Mofin - Issue as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good. Whiter Council Mofin - Issue as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no go	None : It is discrimination & unifier None : It is discrimination & unifier None : It is discrimination & unifier None : It is discrimination and unifier None : It is discrimination and unifier None : It is discrimination and unifier This discrimination and unifier None : It is discrimination and unifier None : It is discrimination and unifier Same terms and conditions to all fair to all Same terms and conditions for all Same terms and conditions for all Same terms and conditions for all None : It is discrimination and unifier None : It is discrimina	Another waste of occemment money Scend monie; or note needed thrink not the Island Waste of occemment money Waste of occemment money Waste of occemment money Why Change constituting that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & child Why that to be their money waste of time. Couldn't civil servants be put to better use. Why waste or government money waste of time. Couldn't civil servants be put to better use. Why waste money on this consultation when things are working ofk as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Evervoers should have same working conditions unfair to change but to better use. Why waste money on this consultation when things are working ofk as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Evervoers should have same working conditions unfair to change but to change civil servant's terms and conditions. Leave Whitler to change our terms and conditions when government is not changing civil servant's terms and conditions. Leave Whitler Council as it is. Don't we need to save oor money? If it's not booken don't fix it. A waste of government money, we have a negotiating body that works well I think this is a waste of government money, it is a they are I have went to the meeting and I never, TRC ob as they are I have the council on the meeting and I never went to the meeting and I never went on the meeting and I never went to the mee	
S. Gentry D. Kosanico D. Kosanico D. Kosanico D. Kosanico D. Messelsom L. Harden L. Ha	Note included is all excluded. I goods this proposed new body Note included and an excluded. I goods this proposed new body Note included and an excluded. I good this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded I good this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded I good this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded I good this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded I good this proposed new body. We do not need a new body. Yes a wester of tax appears money. We do not need a new body. Yes a wester of tax appears money. We do not need a new body. Yes a wester of tax appears money. We do not need a new body. Yes a wester of tax appears money. We do not need a new body. Yes a wester of tax appears money. We do not need a new body. Wester of tax news money. Who can be need a new body. Yes a wester of tax appears money. Why can be need a new body. Yes a wester of tax appears money. Why can be need a new body. Wester of tax news money. Why can be need a new body. Yes hope the proposed new body. Wester of money. Why do we have to change when it works aright now. None included and all excluded I good soon this good new body. None included and all excluded I good soon this good new body. None included and excluded I good soon this good new body. None included and excluded I good the good new body. None included and excluded I good the good new body. I goods the new body. I goods the new body. None included and all excluded I good the good of the good of the proposed new body. None included and all excluded I good the good of the good of the proposed new body. None included and all excluded I good the good of the good of the proposed new body. None included and all excluded I good the good of the good	So 1 on or - Whiteley sort broken	Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it this division of a group shows the encoseal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the encoseal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it is the division of a group shows the encoseal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it is the division of a group shows the encoseal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it is the division of a group shows the encoseal is no coord Memorandum of Agreement Vehicle Council Memo	None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discriminative and unifier It is discriminative for all It is that I all	Another waste of government money Second money on one needed thinks for the bland Second money on one needed thinks for the bland Waste of Queenment money And the bland waste of government money Waste of Queenment money And was to be the use of more net take Why change something that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & ord concret. Waste of government money waste of time. Couldn't dvid servants be put to better use. Why waste money on this consultation when things are working of as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Servones should have same working conditions under to change last some. Here MRMs and ovid servants got nothing better to do I've under to change our terms and conditions when government is not changing civil servant's terms and conditions. Leave Whitlier Council as it is Don't we need to save our money. If it's not broken don't fix it. A waste of government money, we have a negotiating body that works well I think this is a waste of gort money, T&C ok as they are I never went to the meeting and I never had any information on these matters but I wouldn't agree to anothion that would make use was off thin before - seeded have Bills to any I mink this is a waste of government money & recourse. No real reason to change over but just hassie and people in top jobs never seem to get all this hassie. Leave	
S. Gentry S. Gentry D. Ksanak J. Milliamoon J. Milliamoon J. Milliamoon J. Harden J. Persaland J. Freeland J. Free	Note included is all excluded. I goods this proposed new body Notes included and an excluded I goods this proposed new body Notes included and excluded I goods this proposed new body Notes included and excluded I goods this proposed new body. Notes included and excluded I goods this new body. Notes included and excluded I goods this in excluded I goods the I good this proposed new body. Notes included and and excluded I goods this included I good	So 1 on ct Whitely sin't broken	Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous shows the oncoseal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous above the oncoseal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous above the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous obser the oncoseal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous obser the oncoseal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous observable monoseal is no coord Memorandhum of Agreement Very Mofile Council Mofile M	None - It is discriminatory & unifer None - It is discriminatory and unifer Has discriminatory and unifer Has discriminatory and unifer Has discriminatory and unifer Has discriminatory and unifer None - It is unifer and unifer None - It is discriminatory and unifer None - None - None - It is discriminatory and unifer None - None - None - It is discriminatory and unifer None - It is discriminatory and unifer None - None	Another waste of government money Second money on one needed thinks for the bland Second money on one needed thinks for the bland Second money on one needed thinks for the bland Second money on one needed thinks for the bland Second	
S Centry S Centry D Monard D Monard D Monard D Monard D Monard P Francis P Francis P Francis P Francis D Monard R Monard R Monard R Monard D Monard Monard Monard Monard Monard D Monard S Bridge E Kinge	Note included is all excluded. I goods this proposed new body Notes included and an excluded I goods this proposed new body Notes included and excluded I goods this proposed new body Notes included and excluded I goods this proposed new body. Notes included and excluded I goods this new body. Notes included and excluded I goods this in excluded I goods the I good this proposed new body. Notes included and and excluded I goods this included I good	So 1 on ct Whitely sin't broken	Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous shows the oncoseal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous above the oncoseal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous above the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous obser the oncoseal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous obser the oncoseal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous observable monoseal is no coord Memorandhum of Agreement Very Mofile Council Mofile M	None - It is discriminatory & unifer None - It is discriminatory and unifer Has discriminatory and unifer Has discriminatory and unifer Has discriminatory and unifer Has discriminatory and unifer None - It is unifer and unifer None - It is discriminatory and unifer None - None - None - It is discriminatory and unifer None - None - None - It is discriminatory and unifer None - It is discriminatory and unifer None - None	Another waste of government money Social money, or more medied thinks (but the Island Social money, or more medied thinks (but the Island Waste of government money An my as to be the use of more ned tase Why change something that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & ord contact. White and government money wester of time. Couldn't ovid servants be put to better use. Everyone should have some more of times or the country of the servants be put to better use. Everyone should have some worker of time. Couldn't ovid servants be put to better use. Everyone should have same working on white put to be the same to the put to better use. Everyone should have same working conditions under to change sust some. New Petris and o'ull servants got nothing better to do It's unfair to change our terms and conditions when government is not changing civil servant's terms and conditions. Leave Whitler o'council as it is. Don't we need to save our money? If it's not broken don't fix it. A vaste of government money, we have a negotiating body that works well I think this is a waste of government money. Tab.Cok as they are I never work to the meeting, and I never had any information on these matters but I wouldn't agree to show that it is a waste of government money. It is not broken don't fix it. No real reason to change over but just hassile and people in top jobs never seem to get all this hasde. Leave well all this hasde. Leave well all the proper seems to change the Whitley Council works for all so leave it that way, too many people in shader places sticking their rose in to things that already are money. No change	
S. Gentry S. Gentry D. Kossak J. Milliamson D. Kossak J. Milliamson D. Newshom R. Harden R. Harden R. Harden J. Lorkell	Note included & all excluded I conoce this conocean force body Note included and an excluded - I conoce this conocean force body Note included and an excluded - I conocean fine route body Note included and an excluded - I conocean fine route body Note included and an excluded - I conocean fine route body Note included and an excluded - I conocean fine route body Note included and an excluded - I conocean fine route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of the route body. Note of the route body. I conoce the route body. I conoce the route body. I conoce the route body. Note of the route body Note of the route body. Note of	So 1 on ct Whitely sort broken	Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous shows the oncoseal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous above the oncoseal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous above the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous obser the oncoseal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous obser the oncoseal is no coord Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a orous observable monoseal is no coord Memorandhum of Agreement Very Mofile Council Mofile M	None - It is discriminatory a unifer None - It is unifer none - It is unifer None - It is unifer and discriminatory None - It is unifer and unifer None to - It is unifer and unifer None - It is discriminatory and unifer None - It is discriminato	Another waste of government money Second money on one needed thinks for the bland Second money on one needed thinks for the bland Second money on one needed thinks for the bland Second money on one needed thinks for the bland Second	
S. Gentry D. Stanack J. Millamack J. Millama	Note included a all excluded. I goods this proposed new body Notes included and an excluded I goods this proposed new body Notes included and excluded I goods this proposed new body Notes included and excluded I goods this proposed new body. Notes included and excluded I goods the new body. Notes included and excluded I goods the new body. Notes included and excluded I goods the stronged new body. Notes included and excluded I goods the stronged new body. We do not need a new body. Wate of the soewers money. We do not need a new body. Wate of the soewers money. We do not need a new body water of the soewers money. We do not need a new body water of the soewers money. We do not need a new body water of the soewers money. We do not need a new body water of the soewers money. We do not need a new body water of the soewers money. We do not need a new body water of the soewers money. We do not need a new body water of the soewers money. We do not need a new body water of the soewers money. Why do we have body. Water of the soewers money water of the soewers of the soewers of the soewers of the soewers water. Why do we have body. Water of the soewers money water of the soewers of the soewers of the soewers water. Why do we have to change when it works a light now Note included and excluded. I concent this conceased new body. Note in chuded and the sockuded - I oppose this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body. Note included and and excluded - I oppose this proposed new body. I oppose the new body All goods including current protected staff who work under UK terms & conditions. Connected water of money. Have to ask why?? Note included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body Note included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded - I oppose the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded - I oppose the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded - I oppose the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded -	So 1 on ct Whitely sort broken	Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a group shows the necessal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a group shows the consosal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a group shows the consosal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its this division of a group shows the consosal is no good Memorandum of Agreement Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its thing division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its mid-division of a group the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its mid-division of a group the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its mid-division of a group the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its mid-division of a group the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its its is division of a group the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its its is division of a group theory the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its its its division of a group shows the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its its division of a group shows the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its its division of a group shows the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its its division of a group shows the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its its division of a group shows the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its its division of a group shows the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as its its division of a group shows the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as it its division of a group shows the proposal is no good. Whitely Council Mofi Issew as it it its division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - It is discriminatory a unifer None - It discriminatory and unifer Ha discriminatory and unifer None - It discriminatory and unifer Feeryone should have the same terms & conditions None - It discriminatory and unifer N	Another waste of occemment money Scord money or more needed thrus for the Island Waste of occemment money Another waste of occemment money Waste of occemment money Waste of occemment money Any mr as to better use not more and take Why change something that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & old Why change something that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & old Why change something that is working one. Couldn't old servents be put to better use. Why waste money on this consultation when things are working old as it is. 1 oppose this proposed new body. Evervoire should have same working conditions unfair to change suit some. New Priffs and of oil servents got nothing better to do It's unfair to change our terms and conditions when government is not changing civil servant's terms and conditions. Leave Whitler Council as it is. Oon't we need to save door money? If it's not becken don't fix it. A waste of government money, we leave a regolating body that works well I think this is a waste of govt money. Tab. Ok as they are I new went to the meeting and I never had any information on these matters but I wouldn't agree to another other would make us worse off than before - cooled have Bills to cav I hink this is a waste of obsernment money, a resource. No real reason to change over but just hastel and people in top jobs never seem to get all this hastel. Leave each allow. No real reason to change over but just hastel and people in top jobs never seem to get all this hastel. Leave each allow. No real reason to change over but just hastel and people in top jobs never seem to get all this hastel. Leave each allow. No real reason to change over but just hastel end people in top jobs never seem to get all this hastel. Leave each allow. No real reason to change over but just hastel end people in top jobs never seem to get all this hastel. Leave each allow. No real reason to change over but just hastel end people in top jobs never see	
S. Gentry D. Kosanico D. Newshorn R. Haybes D. Haybes D. Haybes D. Haybes D. Haybes D. Haybes D. Kelly	Note included and excluded. I goods this proposed new body Note included and excluded is all excluded in proposed the proposed new body Note included and excluded in excluded in proposed the proposed new body. Note included and excluded in excluded in proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods the service in the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods the service in the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods the service in the proposed new body. Note in the proposed new body. It is a wester of tax spaces money. We do not need a new body. Native of tax spaces money. We do not need a new body. Native of tax spaces money. We do not need a new body. Native of tax spaces money. We do not need a new body. Native of tax spaces money. We do not need a new body. Native of tax spaces money. We do not need a new body. Native of tax spaces money. We do not need a new body. Native of tax spaces money. Who can be need as new body. Native of tax spaces money. Who can be need as new body. Native of tax spaces money. Who can be need as new body. Native of tax spaces money. Note included and all excluded in the tox of tax spaces body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods this proposed new body. Note included and selected in 1 goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in good	So 0 on C. White and broken	Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it this division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it this division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it this division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it this division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it this division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Memorandum of Agreement? Whiteler Council Memorandum of Agreement Whiteler Council Memorandum of Agreement Whiteler Council Memorandum of Agreement Whiteler Council Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is division of a group the proposal is no good Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as as it is this division of a group the proposal is no good. **Ceep Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group the proposal is no good. **Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Learne as is As above Learne as is Dividino is not the answer. Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is th	None - It is discriminatory a unifer None - It is unifer none - It is unifer None - It is unifer and discriminatory None - It is unifer and unifer None to - It is unifer and unifer None - It is discriminatory and unifer None - It is discriminato	Another waste of occemment money Scend money or more needed thrus for the Island Waste of occemment money Another waste of occemment money Another waste of occemment money Any mr as to better use not more and take Why change something that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & child Why waste money on this consultation when things are working ofk as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Service of powerment money waste of time. Couldn't civil servants be put to better use. Why waste money on this consultation when things are working ofk as it is. I oppose this proposed new body. Service should have same working conditions under to change sust some. Feervorse should have same working conditions under to change sust some. It's unfair to change our terms and conditions when government is not changing civil servant's terms and conditions. Leave Whitlet to change our terms and conditions when government is not changing civil servant's terms and conditions. Con't we need to save door money? If it's not becken don't fix it. A waste of government money, we leave a registrating body that works well I think this is a waste of government money, it is not because don't fix it is a waste of government money, we leave a registrating body that works well I think this is a waste of government money, a rescord have fills to cav. I hink this is a waste of occemment money a resource. No real reason to change over but just hastel and people in top jobs never seem to get all this hastel. Leave well allows. Why would people want to change the Whitely Council works for all so leave it that way, too many people in harders allowed. No real reason to change over but just hastel and people in top jobs never seem to get all this hastel. Leave well allowed allows. Why would people want to change the Whitely Council works for all so leave it that way, too many people in harders allowed.	
S Centry D Missand T Bridsion	Note included and excluded. I goods this proposed new body Note included and excluded is all excluded in proposed the proposed new body Note included and excluded in excluded in proposed the proposed new body. Note included and excluded in excluded in proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods the service in the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods the service in the proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods the service in the proposed new body. Note in the proposed new body. It is a wester of tax spaces money. We do not need a new body. Native of tax spaces money. We do not need a new body. Native of tax spaces money. We do not need a new body. Native of tax spaces money. We do not need a new body. Native of tax spaces money. We do not need a new body. Native of tax spaces money. We do not need a new body. Native of tax spaces money. We do not need a new body. Native of tax spaces money. Who can be need as new body. Native of tax spaces money. Who can be need as new body. Native of tax spaces money. Who can be need as new body. Native of tax spaces money. Note included and all excluded in the tox of tax spaces body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods this proposed new body. Note included and selected in 1 goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in 1 goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in goods this proposed new body. Note included and all excluded in good	So 0 on C. White and broken	Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it this division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it this division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it this division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it this division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Whitely Council Mofi Issee as it this division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Memorandum of Agreement? Whiteler Council Memorandum of Agreement Whiteler Council Memorandum of Agreement Whiteler Council Memorandum of Agreement Whiteler Council Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is division of a group the proposal is no good Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as as it is this division of a group the proposal is no good. **Ceep Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group the proposal is no good. **Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the encoseal is no good Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Learne as is As above Learne as is Dividino is not the answer. Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good Whiteler Council Mofi Issee as it is th	None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination & unifier None - It is discrimination and unifier It is discrimination for all Same terms A conditions It is discrimination for all Same terms A conditions for all Same terms and conditions to all fact to all None - Is unifier and discrimination? None - Is unifier and discrimination? None is is discrimination and unifier Everyone should have the same terms & conditions None - It is discrimination and unifier None - It is discrimination and	Another waste of government money Sood money or more meded thinks for the Island Waste of government money waste of the Couldn't Civil servants be put to better use. Why change something that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & Civil Control of government money waste of time. Couldn't Civil servants be put to better use. Waste of government money waste of time. Couldn't Civil servants be put to better use. Pervone should have same working conditions under to change lust some. New PMMs and Civil servants got nothing better to do It's under to change our terms and conditions under to change lust some. New PMMs and civil servants got nothing better to do It's under to change our terms and conditions when government is not changing civil servant's terms and conditions. Leave Whitler Council as it is Don't we need to save ow money? If it's not broken don't fix it. A vasiat of government money, we have a negotiating body that works well I think this is a waste of gover money. TSC clk as they are I never work to the meeting and I never had any information on these matters but I wouldn't agree to anothino that anotic make a worse of this bid'ner. Leaves have like to care 1 this like is a waste of government money. A securing. No real reason to change over but Just hastel and people in top jobs never seem to get all this hastel. Leave wall allow. No real reason to change over but Just hastel and people in top jobs never seem to get all this hastel. Leave wall allow. No real reason to change over but Just hastel and people in top jobs never seem to get all this hastel. Leave wall allow. No real reason to change over but Just hastel and people in top jobs never seem to get all this hastel. Leave wall allow. No real reason to change over but make the but the dollowing the Mof A guidance. This is expensive overtal.	

Public Services Commission Consultation Responses

K Cowin	No should stay the same	No.	Whitley Council MofA	None, Discriminatory & unfair	Should stav as we are.	
H Arrowsmith	None, I think it should stay the same	No I do not. Whitley Council is ok	Whitley Council MofA	None	I do not wish for any changes. I am happy the way things are.	
Anonymous	None. Why change something what works well already	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None. Same terms and conditions to all - fair to all.	Waste of government money.	
Anonymous	None included and all excluded I oppose this proposed new body.	No I don't, Whitley Council	Whitey Council	Same terms and conditions to all fair to all	Waste of government money.	
M Gelling	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good.		waste of dovernment money.	
				None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
D Maddrell	None leave it alone	No it's not broken	Leave Whitley alone	Unfair if you start people like that	Don't take any notice anyway	
Anonymous	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	
Anonymous	None	No I don't - Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None - same condition for all	Waste of resources	
McCann	No.	No.	Whitley Council	None	Stay with W Council	
Anonymous	No and it should stay the same.	No No	Whitley Council MofA	None	We should stay as we are.	
O James	None, it should stay the same	No I don't, stick to Whitley Council	Whitley Council, MofA	None, I don't	That should stay as it is	
Anonymous		No. I am happy with present terms and conditions in my contract.	Whitley Council MofA	None, all should be the same as all do the same lob.	I don't wish any changes. Very happy with the way it is now.	
Anonymous	Excluded from remit - social care workers & health care workers.	No. I am happy with present terms and conditions in my contract.	Whitley Council MofA	None, All should be the same as all do the same lob.		
Gore	None, think it should stay the same.	No, I do not, Whitley Council is fine.	Whitley Council MofA	None at all.	I don't wish for any changes I am happy the way things are.	
Anonymous	Hore, dillik it should stay the same.		Whitley Council MofA		No further comments.	
Anonymous		no, 1 reer that I aim quite happy with my terms and conditions as they stand.	Whitey Coulcil Ploix		No farate comments.	
			was a second	as they are.		
Y Cowlev	I do not think any should be. I am not in favour of the proposed new body.	No I do not support it.	Whitley Council MofA	None it is discirminatory.	I am happy with things the way they are I do not wish anymore changes.	
D Cromwell	I oppose this new body	No.	Leave as is	None		
J Arkell	All excluded, none included	No, Whitley Council serves its purpose	Whitley Council is perfectly good as is for local authorities	None	Public Services Commission would be undemocratic! As Whitley has joint signatory rights and employee side	
					input, Whitley works,	
C Convery	None included and all excluded I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not Whitley is not broken.	Whitley Council MofA, leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None it is discriminatory and unfair.	Waste of govt money.	
		1	*		1	
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA - Leave as is this division of a groups shows the proposal is no good.	None it is discriminatory & unfair		
D Ryan	None included and all excluded - I oppose this new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken at all	Whitley Council MofA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None it is discriminatory and unfair		
		1			<u> </u>	
M Welson	None included and all excluded I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
E Glaister	None including and all excluded - I oppose this new body.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA - leave as is this divison of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
L Gidistei	reare, moreoving and all excluded - 1 oppose this new body.	THE A GO THE WHITE STATE OF CHEST	remove council more leave as is this division or a group shows the proposal is no good.	The state of the s		
V Charles	Name to divide different and it accesses the accessed on the different	No. 7 de ceste Militates (seels beneficie	White Court Made I have a thir division of a second by the second	None this device bearing to the second		
K Starkev	None included & all excluded I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory & unfair		
J Paton	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA - leave as is this divison of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
G Kellv	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MofA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair.		
H Kenna	I don't want new body	No Whitley is ok	Whitley is ok	None	None	
R Corkill	None, oppose proposed new body.	No. Why change?	Leave as is. Dividing is not the answer.	None		
Anonymous	Why change something what works well already	No / Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Same terms and conditions to all.	Waste of government money,	
Anonymous	None included & all excluded I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken.	Whitley Council MofA - leave this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair.		
. ,						
Anonymous	None included all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not. Whitley works good it is not broken.	Whitley Council MofA. Leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None. It is discriminatory and unfair.		
G Hurt	Doesn't need altering as works well now.	No I don't support. Whitley Council should be kept.	Whitley Council	None	Why change something that is fine and works well.	
Mrs C Kneale	I don't see the need to change something which is already working well.		Surely all Government workers should be the same therefore Whitley Council.	None.	Will Change Something that is line and works well.	
Mrs C Kriedie	I don't see the need to change something which is already working well.	Again, Whitley Council is a very good working system - no need to change it would be too costly.	surely all Government workers should be the same therefore whilely council.	none.		
			land and a			
B Corkill	I think it's a waste of money to change at all but if we do have to change all	No Whitley Council is working well	Whitley Council	None.		
	should be included.					
Mrs G Barnett	I am satisfied with the running of Council, no need to change anything.	Why fix something that isn't broken	Whitley Council	No change as I think it is fair to all.	Just a waste of time & money (government) when it could be put to better use.	
S Williams	Why pay for a new body if the old one works properly	No Whitley Council seems fair to me	An independent body like Whitley Council	None		
J Kneale	Everyone needs to be treated equally no matter what & why change something	Whitley Council is working so why change it	All Government workers should be treated the same.	None		
	that is already working					
DEFA, Antony	There is broad agreement within this Department that the concept of a single					
Bourd			As many local authority workers undertake the same or similar tasks and responsibilities as Whitley	This is a significant question, requiring a detailed scrutiny and comparison of all	The proposal represents a significant step forward from the current position which appears to have arisen	
,-					The proposal represents a significant step forward from the current position which appears to have arisen from an imbalance in pendiating skill/style between employers and employers like. We are left with a	
1	employing authority for all public servants, being subject to the same basic	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and	terms and conditions for Civil Servants, Whitley Council and others if any	from an imbalance in negotiating skill/style between employers and employee side. We are left with a	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it	terms and conditions for Civil Servants, Whitley Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both	from an imbalance in negotiating skill/style between employers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agreement which is too grey in key specific areas, is not always clear and transparent in its	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the umbrella of one authority. That should minimise the likely ongoing need for	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Civil Servants, Whitley Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and civil servants, the following comments are offered:	from an imbalance in negotiating skill/style between employers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agreement which is too grey in key specific areas, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for inconsistent interpretation.	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the umbrella of one authority. That should minimise the likely ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it	terms and conditions for Civil Servants, Whitley Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and civil servants, the following comments are offered: - There is the need to review "plussages", substitution pay, acting up and	from an imbalance in nepotiating skill/style between employers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agreement which is too grey in key specific areas, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for inconsistent interpretation. Workforce flexibility is increasingly paramount and hopefully a combined employing body will reduce the risk	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the umbrella of one authority. That should minimise the likely ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances and level of employee (e.g., notice periods for termination of employment, access	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Civil Servants, Whitley Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and civil servants, the following comments are offered: - There is the need to review "plussages", substitution pay, acting up and variations over sickness and disciplinary/grievance procedures. Disagreements	from an imbalance in negotiating skills/skyle between employers and employers side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agreement which is too grey in key specific areas, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for inconsistent interpretation. Workforce flexibility is increasingly paramount and hopefully a combined employing body will reduce the risk of a culture of instruct between manual workers and civil servants. The current terms and conditions with	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the umbrella of one authority. That should minimise the likely ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances and level of employee (e.g. notice periods for termination of employment, access to the flet system, or the requirement to sign the Official Secrets Act). Greater	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Civil Servants, Whitley Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and civil servants, the following comments are offered: - There is the need to review "plussages", substitution poy, acting up and variations over sickness and disciplinary/grievance procedures. Disagreements over these are demonalising and time westing for all concerned. We should be	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/sylve between reployers and employees side. We are left with a Memonandum of Agement which is too gey in key specific reases, in or always clear and transparent in its use, and kewes the potential for inconsistent interpretation. Workforce feebality is increasingly asmount and hopefully a combined employing body will reduce the risk of a culture of mistrust between manual workers and orbid in mage at they are commenter sense not be all set breaks; der, risks giving public sector workers approxybid image as they are sometimes seen to be all set breaks; der, risks giving public sector workers approxybid image as they are sometimes seen to be all set breaks; der, risks giving public sector workers approxybid image as they are sometimes seen to be all sets.	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the umbrella of one authority. That should minimise the likely ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances and level of employee (e.g., notice periods for termination of employment, access	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Civil Servants, Whitley Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and civil servants, the following comments are offered: - There is the need to review "plussages", substitution pay, acting up and variations over sickness and disciplinary/grievance procedures. Disagreements	from an imbalance in negotiating skills/skyle between employers and employers side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agreement which is too grey in key specific areas, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for inconsistent interpretation. Workforce flexibility is increasingly paramount and hopefully a combined employing body will reduce the risk of a culture of instruct between manual workers and civil servants. The current terms and conditions with	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the umbrello of one authority. That should minimise the likely ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances and level of employee (e.g. notice periods for termination of employment, access to the field system, or the requirement to sign the Official Secrets Act). Greater homogeneity and consistency of staff policies across the Department's workforce,	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Civil Servants, Whitely Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be excessful. As a Department with both manual workers and civil servants, the following comments are offered: - There is the need to review "plussages", substitution pay, acting up and variations over schoices and disciplinary/grieenize procedure. Disagreements over these are demonalising and time wasting for all concerned. We should be seeking to pay people for what they do and when they do it, rather than risk.	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/sylve between reployers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agement which is too grey in key specific reason, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for inconsistent interpretation. When the product of the control of	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the untrivella or one authority. That should minimise the likely oppoign need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances and level of employee (e.g. notice periods for termination of employment, access to the fleet system, or the requirement to sign the Official Secrets Act). Greater homogeneity and consistency of staff policies across the Department's workforce, manual workers and civl servants alley, would assist with overall management, and	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Civil Servants, Whitely Council and others if any implementation of ane body is to be accessful. As a Department with both manual workers and divil sevants, the following comments are offered: - There is the need to review "plussages", substitution pay, acting up and variations over sickness and disciplinary/grievance procedures. Disagreements over these are demonstrained and the switch got all concented. We should be seeking to pay people for what they do and when they do it, rather than risk having to pay an increased rate throughout somene's career, because on a very	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/sylve between reployers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agement which is too gey in key specific rease, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for inconsistent interpretation. Workforce feebility is increasingly aramount and hopefully a combined employing body will reduce the risk of a culture of mistrust between manual workers and ovid is envanits. The current terms and conditions with set breaks, etc., risks gring public sector workers apor public image as they are sometimes seen to be all sat in their vans daing nothing whilst taking their break during the working day. More flexibility where possible could help with this.	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the unthrella of one authority. That should minimise the likely oppoign need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances and level of employere, (e.g., notice periods for termination of employments, access to the fixel system, or the requirement to sign the Official Socrets Act). Greater homogeneity and consistency of staff profices across the Department's worknow, manual workers and civil sevents alike, would assist with overall management, and would help ensure the fair and qualitable treatment of all employees,	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Civil Sewants, Whitey Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and civil servents, the following commerts are offered: —There is the neet for review "plussages," a substitution pay, admit any variations over sichness and disciplinary/gireance procedures. Essignments and variations over sichness and description/yigneance procedures. Essignments are selected to the control of the con	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/sylve between remjovers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agement which is too give in key specific reason, is not always clear and transparent in its sue, and leaves the potential for inconsistent interpretation. Workforce feebility is increasingly paramount and hopefully a continied employing body will reduce the risk of a cuture of mistrust between manual workers and roll sevents. The current terms and conditions with a second of the control of the	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the untrivale of one authority. That should minimuse the likely oppoign peed for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances and level of employee (e.g., notice periods for termination of employments, access to the field system), or the requirement to sign the Official Socrets Act). Greater homogeneity and consistency of staff publicles across the Department's workform, and would help ensure the fier and equitable treatment of all employees, and would help ensure the fier and equitable treatment of all employees.	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Chil Servants, Whitey Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and child servants, the following comments are offered: which is a considerable of the control of	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/lyke between employers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agreement which is too grey in key specific reason, is not always clear and transparent in lat- sure, and leaves the potential for increastent interpretation. In the contract of the contr	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the untrivelal of one authority. That should minimise the littley ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife the first system, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife bofficial scores Act, Greater homogeneity and consistency of staff policies across the Department's workforce, manual workers and of uservants skills, would assist with overall management, and would help ensure the first and equitable treatment of all engitypes, and the staff of th	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Chil Sewants, Whitey Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and chil servants, the following comments are offered: —There is the neet or bready "plussage," a substitution pay, admit up and variations over sichness and disciplinary/girevance procedures. Disagreements over these are demonstriag and time wearings for all concerned. We provide the control of the contro	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/sylve between remjovers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agement which is too give in key specific rease, is not always clear and transparent in its sue, and lewes the potential for inconsistent interpretation. Workforce feebility is increasingly areamount and hopefully a contained employing body will reduce the risk of a culture of mistrust between misrual workers and only sevents. The current terms and conditions with set breats; e.e., riching sking public sector workers a poor public maps at they are seministic series to let possible could help with this would also help or each a more compared approach and reduce sites further. The current manual worker arrangements do not appear to properly protect those that should be protected.	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the untrivale of one authority. That should minimuse the likely oppoign peed for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances and level of employee (e.g., notice periods for termination of employments, access to the field system), or the requirement to sign the Official Socrets Act). Greater homogeneity and consistency of staff publicles across the Department's workform, and would help ensure the fier and equitable treatment of all employees, and would help ensure the fier and equitable treatment of all employees.	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Cold Servants, Whitely Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both immunal workers and our servants, the following comments are offered: —There is the nest on breast pulsarysis, substitution pay, acting the contribution of	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/ly/se between employers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Appenent which is too grey in key specific reason, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for inconsistent interpretation. When the properties of the	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the untrivelal of one authority. That should minimise the littley ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife the first system, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife bofficial scores Act, Greater homogeneity and consistency of staff policies across the Department's workforce, manual workers and of uservants skills, would assist with overall management, and would help ensure the first and equitable treatment of all engitypes, and the staff of th	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Chil Sewants, Whitey Council and others if any implementation of a web body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and chil servants, the following comments are offered: —There is the need review "plussages," a substitution pay, adiquip up and virations over sichness and disoplinary/girevance procedures. Disagreements over these are demonstraing and time weight for all concerned. We should be seeking to pay people for what they do and when they do it, rather than not kning to pay an increased rate throughout someries's cener, because or a very working hours, but the control of the payment of the control of the	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/sylve between remjovers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agement which is too give in key specific rease, is not always clear and transparent in its sue, and leaves the potential for inconsistent interpretation. Workforce feebality increasingly rearmount and hopefully a combined employing body will reduce the risk of a citure of mistrust between manual workers and oril sevents. The current terms and conditions with set breals, etc., risks giving public sector workers a poor public image as they are sometimes series to lead set in their varies often profits of workers and the series of the section of the companies of the companies series to a south extra the public series of the series	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the untrivelal of one authority. That should minimise the littley ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife the first system, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife bofficial scores Act, Greater homogeneity and consistency of staff policies across the Department's workforce, manual workers and of uservants skills, would assist with overall management, and would help ensure the first and equitable treatment of all engitypes, and the staff of th	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Chil Servants, Whitely Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual winders and child services are defended. —There is the near to review "plassages," a substitution pay, acting to up underst, once these are demonstising and time wasting for all concerned. We should be seeking to pay people for what they do and when they do it, rather than nisk having to pay an increased rate throughout somework carrier, because on a vey working hours. —A new structure for standardser working hours. —A new structure for standardser working hours. —A new structure for standardser	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/sylve between reployers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agement which is too give in key specific reason, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for inconsistent interpretation. When the properties of the	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the untrivelal of one authority. That should minimise the littley ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife the first system, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife bofficial scores Act, Greater homogeneity and consistency of staff policies across the Department's workforce, manual workers and of uservants skills, would assist with overall management, and would help ensure the first and equitable treatment of all engitypes, and the staff of th	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Chil Servants, Whitey Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and child servants, the following comments are offered: white and the control of t	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/sylve between reployers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agreement which is too grey in key specific reason, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for increastent interpretation. In the control of	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the untrivelal of one authority. That should minimise the littley ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife the first system, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife bofficial scores Act, Greater homogeneity and consistency of staff policies across the Department's workforce, manual workers and of uservants skills, would assist with overall management, and would help ensure the first and equitable treatment of all engitypes, and the staff of th	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Chil Servants, Whitey Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and child servants, the following comments are offered: white and the control of t	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/sylve between reployers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agement which is too give in key specific reason, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for inconsistent interpretation. When the properties of the	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the untrivelal of one authority. That should minimise the littley ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife the first system, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife bofficial scores Act, Greater homogeneity and consistency of staff policies across the Department's workforce, manual workers and of uservants skills, would assist with overall management, and would help ensure the first and equitable treatment of all engitypes, and the staff of th	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Chil Servants, Whitey Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and child servants, the following comments are offered: white and the control of t	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/sylve between reployers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agreement which is too grey in key specific reason, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for increastent interpretation. In the control of	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the untrivelal of one authority. That should minimise the littley ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife boffield species of the condition of the significant to signife boffield species showing property and consistency of staff policies across the Department's workforce, manual workers and of uservants allow, would assist with overall management, and would help ensure the first and equitable treatment of all employees, could be consistent of the significant of th	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Chil Servants, Whitely Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and child servants, the following comments are offered: —There is the need to be investigations and the control of the contro	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/lyse between remployers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agement which is too give in key specific rease, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for inconsistent interpretation. In the control of t	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the untrivelal of one authority. That should minimise the littley ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife boffield species of the condition of the significant to signife boffield species showing property and consistency of staff policies across the Department's workforce, manual workers and of uservants allow, would assist with overall management, and would help ensure the first and equitable treatment of all employees, could be consistent of the significant of th	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Chil Sewants, Whitey Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and chil servants, the following comments are offered: —There is the need to review "plussages," a substitution pay, admit any variations over sichness and disciplinary/givenance procedures. Exagreement and variations over sichness and description/yignerance procedures. Exagreement and variations over sichness and description/yignerance procedures. Exagreement have been admitted to the processing top pay position for what they do and when they do it, and then have not have the controlled to the procession basis they may do something higher than their normal pagine or working hours. — A new structure for standardsed eviewed, which we have a substitution of the standardsed grivener, disciplinary procedures should be established to speed and simplify the process. — Performance related pay or piece arts opportunities may be effective in some area (for both extended pay or piece arts opportunities may be effective in some area (for both extended pay or piece arts opportunities may be effective in some area (for both extended pay or piece arts opportunities may be effective in some area (for both extended pay or piece arts opportunities may be effective in some area (for both extended pay or piece arts opportunities may be effective in some area (for both extended pay or piece arts opportunities may be effective in some area (for both extended pay or piece arts opportunities may be effective in some area (for both extended pay or piece arts opportunities may be effective in some area (for both extended pay or piece arts opportunities may be effective in some area (for both extended pay or piece arts opportunities may be effective in some area (for both extended pay or piece arts opportunities may be effective in some area (for both extended pay or piece arts opportunities may be effective in some area (for both extended pay or piece arts opportunities ma	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/lyke between remipoyers and employees side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agreement which is too grey in key specific reason, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for increastent interpretation. In the control of the control o	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the untrivelal of one authority. That should minimise the littley ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife boffield species of the condition of the significant to signife boffield species showing property and consistency of staff policies across the Department's workforce, manual workers and of uservants allow, would assist with overall management, and would help ensure the first and equitable treatment of all employees, could be consistent of the significant of th	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Chil Servants, Whitely Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and child servants, the following comments are offered: —There is the neet on benefin plassages; a substitution pay, acting to continuous continuous control of the contro	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/sylve between reployers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agreement which is too grey in key specific reason, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for inconsistent interpretation. When the properties of the properties of the control of the properties of the control of the properties of the proposal of the properties of the proposal of the properties of the proposal of	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the untrivelal of one authority. That should minimise the littley ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife boffield species of the condition of the significant to signife boffield species showing property and consistency of staff policies across the Department's workforce, manual workers and of uservants allow, would assist with overall management, and would help ensure the first and equitable treatment of all employees, could be consistent of the significant of th	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Chil Servants, Whitey Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and child servants, the following comments are offered: white and the control of t	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/sylve between remjoyers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agreement which is too goy in key specific reason, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for increastent interpretation. In the company of	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the untrivelal of one authority. That should minimise the littley ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife boffield species of the condition of the significant to signife boffield species showing property and consistency of staff policies across the Department's workforce, manual workers and of uservants allow, would assist with overall management, and would help ensure the first and equitable treatment of all employees, could be consistent of the significant of th	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Chil Servants, Whitely Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and child servants, the following comments are offered: —There is the near to review "plassages," a substitution pay, acford to continue the continue of	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/sylve between reployers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agreement which is too grey in key specific reason, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for inconsistent interpretation. When the properties of the properties of the control of the properties of the control of the properties of the proposal of the properties of the proposal of the properties of the proposal of	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the untrivelal of one authority. That should minimise the littley ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife boffield species of the condition of the significant to signife boffield species showing property and consistency of staff policies across the Department's workforce, manual workers and of uservants allow, would assist with overall management, and would help ensure the first and equitable treatment of all employees, could be consistent of the significant of th	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Chil Servants, Whitey Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and child servants, the following comments are offered: white and the control of t	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/sylve between remjoyers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agreement which is too goy in key specific reason, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for increastent interpretation. In the company of	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the untrivelal of one authority. That should minimise the littley ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife boffield species of the condition of the significant to signife boffield species showing property and consistency of staff policies across the Department's workforce, manual workers and of uservants allow, would assist with overall management, and would help ensure the first and equitable treatment of all employees, could be consistent of the significant of th	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Chil Servants, Whitely Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and child servants, the following comments are offered: —There is the near to review "plassages," a substitution pay, acford to continue the continue of	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/sylve between remjoyers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agreement which is too goy in key specific reason, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for increastent interpretation. In the company of	
	requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the untrivelal of one authority. That should minimise the littley ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances to the first system, or the requirement to signife boffield species of the condition of the significant to signife boffield species showing property and consistency of staff policies across the Department's workforce, manual workers and of uservants allow, would assist with overall management, and would help ensure the first and equitable treatment of all employees, could be consistent of the significant of th	employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over	Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for comparison	terms and conditions for Chil Servants, Whitely Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and child servants, the following comments are offered: —There is the near to review "plassages," a substitution pay, acford to continue the continue of	from an inbalance in negotiating sall/sylve between remjoyers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agreement which is too goy in key specific reason, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for increastent interpretation. In the company of	

	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	01 (00)	I(010)	02 (011)		102 (012)	In (012)	Other Comments (014)
Full Name	Are you representing yourself or an organisation?	Q1 (09) Having regard to the intended scope of employment groups to be included, which employment groups do you think should be included within, or excluded from, the remit of a Public Services Commission.	((Q10) Why have you chosen these groups to be included or excluded?	02 (Q11) Do you support the development of a single Joint Negotiating Committee for employees of a Public Service		(03 (012) Please indicate your preferred arrangements for determining the terms and conditions of service for manual and craft workers employed by Local Authorities who would not become employees of a Public Services Commission?	(04 (013) Which particular terms and conditions do you believe should be changed for new starters?	Other Comments (014) Please provide any other comments or observations you may have regarding this proposal to establish a Public Services Commission.
-	Self Organisation If an organisation, what is the name			Commission?	If no, please indicate possible alternative arrangements.	- Services Commissions		
Sally Brookes Anonymous	Self of the organisation	Included should be: Civil servants and those that are on terms and conditions which are analogous to Civil Service (There are some posts within my Division which are analogous and there are others in other Divisions) Manual Workers Excluded: Teachers Lecturers Education Support Staff Youth Service		Yes		This would be a matter for the Local Authorities to arrange		Currently any negotiations with staff in DEC are education focussed and enable the Department to be proactive re educational needs of children. Negotiations are then held with the relative educational representatives from professional associations, unions and broader staff groups. If a Public Service Commission included education staff, education specific changes would be more problematic in the future. I presume that consulation/negotiation would have to be across wider staff groups than just education.
Dave Corkish	Self	The need to be able to recruit from the UK for certain groups, and for them to be able to between positions and have pension transfer rights is understood. However what reason could there be to exclude any other group of IOM Government Department, Board or Office employees?	effective structure this would surely be achieved	No.	Whilst realising the need for efficiency savings the working practices and needs of the two main groups being considered are different. Office and manus workers are not the same and should be represented by the people who have the experience of doing so, and have done for many years. It is only two main negotiating bodies, the issue here is surely the wide range of terms and conditions and employing bodies within each of the two groups which lead to administrative difficulties and increased costs.	Whitley Council are a body which represents both IOMG and Local Authority employees. This should not change, Disbanding Whitley to suit IOMG leaving Local Authority workers without a representative body is not right. Nor would it be right for IOMG to be in a position where they were setting T&Cs. through a new negotiating body for Local Authority workers who they do not employ.	position.	Civil servents and manual workers, alongside professional staff, are all required to deliver and support IOMG services. If the differing T&Cs of like for like workers, established over the years, need to be harmonised to facilitate a more flexible workforce, the skills and experience of Whitley Council could assist in identifying how this could be achieved for manual workers. Such work is already underway in Dot where DoEC and Health workers are being brought into what is, in effect, the beigninging of a new shared service. This is happening under the current negotiating structure so why is this change necessary? Assuming the underlying reason for this change is to deliver savings, where are the details of how these will be achieved. Is there really that much administration saving when time and absence management and payroll are computerised? Or is this in fact just a way of eroding the workers' means of resisting unfavourable changes to T&Cs.
Anonymous Siobhan Gail	Self Self			1				
Meredith Anonymous	Self	Civil Service, Whitley Council. Perhaps Prison Officers?	Same reasons given in your summary above	Yes		A 'by analogy' basis would be a starting point.	Civil Servants shouldn't really change much, but 'local agreements' would be the place to look first for any savings.	It must be born in mind that in the last few years of high inflation, pay awards have been negligible, and staff pension contributions are increasing substantially. This proposal makes ense, but in my opinion should not be used as a way to hit staff with further pay cuts. Whits some local agreements' raise an eyebrow and need reviewing, particularly in Whitley Council, I don't think there's much scope for further cuts to the broad terms and pay of ordinary Cvil Servants, including shift and weekend pay. The Civil Service still needs to attract talented and dedicated staff at all levels, so there is a limit to how much pay can be cut.
Frances Mary Butler	Self	It is sensible to include all workers in public service who are not subject to UK regulations	It is a matter of common sense mainly. I am in favour of streamlining processes as long as that supports the philosophy and direction of well-managed public services and is not used as an inflexible rule book.	Yes	Only if this were able to freely express the views of all members. It is interesting that you are attempting to harmonise groups where some voices are very strong and who refuse to budge from their position. How would it help to have a single group for workers who have very different types of work and who are not all as vocal as others. Your voting and negotiating systems are going to	I don't know enough about it to comment.		I think that total centralisation of things like this leads to the same kind of problems you see in the EU. I think that overall the government thinks that this will help but I think that they need to be very careful how they go about it.
Anonymous Kate Alexander		As identified in consultation doc plus non-teaching DEC staff. Potentially other groups could be included as I do not believe a single employing authority precluded inclusion of groups whose pay is based on UK compantors eg education or health; the PSC could take these linkages into account when determining pay.	See comments above	Yes	to roung and ingrotouring systems are going to	To be determined by LA's who may choose to negotiate similar terms to those determined by a PSC if they wish.	groups Overtime and premium rates eg for weekend working Recruitment and retention allowances if found to be no longer appropriate. Pay scales - where these have no basis on current pay norms and local recruitment pool	It should be a principle of a PSC that anything which can appropriately be done at local level should be delegated eg dismissals, establishment of new posts (although some mechanisms to ensure consistency of pay for similar posts may be required), approval of special leave requests, appointments and whether these are made by open recruitment or not, early retirements, extensions of service, relocation grants and interview expenses. All subject to appropriate policy framework and guidelines.
	Seir Self			Voc				The management of standards of individual senforces with the text
Rod Evans David Boultbee	Self	Anyone paid from the public purse should be included.	The public purse is funded by tax payers.	Yes		Local authouities should be left to negotiate with their employees but could use terms and conditions of a Public Services Commission if they chose.	The terms and conditions in civil service regulations are satisfactory.	The management of standards of individual performance, which is to be improved, still appears to focus on addressing poor practice. I don't disagree with this but feel it should be better balanced with acknowledgement of & encouragement for good practice. I also feel that 'good' management should be a working practice rather than a formulated process. Managers are being potentially deskilled by imposed 'formulated processes'. The current system does not appear to address commitment, loyalty & a sense of responsibility. This has a counter effect of eroding these qualities. I believe everyone paid from the public purse is a public servant so all should be treated equally.
	<u> </u>							
Geoffrey Hicklin Anonymous	Self Self			Yes				
Sharon Ingham Anonymous	Self Self							
Frank Harrison Anonymous	Self Self	Any public servants whose terms and conditions are not dictated to by external agencies /	Where possible, there should be equity of terms	Yes		"Alternatively, terms and conditions for central government manual and craft		
,	Self	Any punit servants winde terms and conditions are not dictated to by external agencies / regulatory bodies etc.	where possible, there should be equity of terms and conditions across public service for all workers.	-		workers, determined by a Public Services Commission, could be adopted for local authority workers on a 'by analogy' basis." This one. The closer the Government can get to harmonising all Public Sector workers, the better.		
Anonymous	Self	I believe the PSC should include all Civil Servants, Whitley Council, NHS Whitley, MPTC and Port Services Group staff.	Their terms of conditions are broadly similar but they are currently covered by separate agreements with slightly different procedures for things like disciplinary, grievance, bullying & harassment, capability, etc. There would also be scope to rationalise various allowances for overtime, on-call, standby payments, etc., if they were all covered by one set of terms and conditions of employment. Ultimastely, there could also be a move to one job evaluation and grading system covering all roles in these areas which would tidy up the current mess of different grading systems, skills allowances and local agreements — many of which have been in place for years and are in dire need of review and benchmarking against one common system of job evaluation/grading.	Yes		The simplest solution would be for local authoritives to adopt whatever T's & C's are agreed by the PSC. The current method of negotisting with Unite representatives for manual workers followed by the involvement of another "union" Whitley Council as the negotisting body is time consuming and wasteful. With viol servants negotiations are carried out with one union (Prospect) who are represented at the relevant JNC. With manual workers there is too much duplication of effort in agreeing/negotiating with UNITE, then further negotiations/agreements required with Whitley - there is no logical reason why negotiations cannot be concluded with UNITE representatives on a JNC, thereby negating the need for the continuation of a Whitley Council.	overtime call-out overtime should either be at flat rate or a maximum of time and a half i.e. no weekend premiums. Staff should be subject to capability dismissal at any time - not until all sick pay entitlements have expired, which could be after 12 months - as it he current preducte for Whitley staff. Sick pay should be reduced to three months full pay, three months half pay. Only statutory annual leave should acrue (as per Emloyment Legislation) when staff are off long term sick. New staff in all areas to be on a revised all encompassing	The greatest saving in time and effort will be the abolition of Whitley Council which is archaic, cumbersome, duplicitous and of no purpose when national Unions can provide the required input at JNC level.
Andrew Brammall Christine Anne Cringle	Self Self	None included - All excluded	I oppose this new body	No	Whitley Council		and conditions for new workers is just a way of sneaking changes past current	Surely just another waste of Government time and funds .Funds which could be better spent elsewhere maybe on the pensioners or homeless .
Anonymous	Self						employees	
Eric Whiteleon Department of Education and Children		Included: Civil Servants + those where ALL terms and conditions are analagous to Civil Service (there are some Education Improvement Service posts where terms and conditions are analagous to CS. other than the pension scheme, which is the Teachers' Pension Scheme, which is the Teachers' Pension Scheme due to the difficulties in recruiting to these roles). Manual Workers Excluded: Teachers Lecturers Education Support Staff including Education Support Staff (Small protected posts). NJC staff (small number of historic posts not recruited to anymore) Youth Service	terms of reference - with which the Department wholly agrees, given that these roles are specific to Education. The Terms and Conditions of Service for Teachers are subject to regular review and indeed	Yes	DEC supports the development of a single JNC subject to the PSC incorporating ONLY employing civil servants and manual workers. See answer to question 10.	Suggest this is a matter for DoI and Local Authorities.	improved in light of experience, enable the employer to meet its service delivery needs and are generally kept fit for purpose. Indeed, this is what DEC itself endeavours to do, in conjunction with the relevant unions and staff representatives, in the interests of all concerned. Without knowing the final scope of staff groups to be included in a PSC, it is difficult to comment on which terms and conditions should be changed for new starters.	focussed and enable the Department to be pro-active in relation to educational drivers for change in negotiation/consultation with unions and staff representatives working mainly in the educational field. A PSC which included any educational staff groups would inevitably mean that such education specific changes would not be as straight froward to achieve in future as such changes.

				The Terms and Conditions of Service for Lecturers are also subject to regular review and indeed the Discipline, Capability and Grievance procedures were recently re-written in conjunction with the unions concerned, again in order to provide greater clarly, streamline, speed up processes and thereby achieve indirect cost savings. See comment about Redeployment and Redundancy below. Education Support Staff & Education Support Staff 39 - these roles are specific to education. This group has its own INC and the Terms and Conditions of Service for Education Support Staff have also subject to review and indeed the Discipline, Capability and Grievance procedures were recently re-written in conjunction with the representatives concerned, are now very similar to those of teachers. See comment about Redejpolyment and Redundancy below. NIC staff - there are a small number of colleagues who remain protection of these terms however as and when these colleagues lawe, they are replaced by Education Support Staff. See comment about Redeployment and Redundancy below.				
				Youth Service - these roles are specific to education with links to the UK for many aspects of their terms and conditions. See comment about Redeployment and Redundancy below. Redeployment and Redundancy. The Department has its own collectively agreed Redeployment and Redundancy Policy and Procedure which applies to all DEC staff, other than manual workers. Civil Sevants do, of course, have their own policy and procedure. DECs structures regularly change given budgets, pupil number fluctuations, priorities in supporting children/young people with special needs and services being reviewed and rationalised etc. The DEC Policy and Procedure has been very successful in enabling the Department to implement these changes whilst maximising redeployment opportunities and minimising redundancies.				
Department of Education and Children	Organisation	Department of Education and Children		At present, the Department can act rapidly under the aforementioned Policy and Procedure which is vital bearing in mind the dates budgets are known, the need to implement any required re-structure in time for the next cardemic year and for teachers and lecturers when their last contractual notice date is 31 May to leave at the end of an academic year. Such changes can be affected speedily as the whole process is within the Department's control and we work in close partnership with the relevant unions. However, should any of the aforementioned groups be included in a PSC, the Department would lose such control, a Redeployment and Redundancy Policy tailored for education is unlikely and therefore the Department's ability to achieve the required staffing structures in time for the start of each academic year would be compromised. Indeed, in the Department's experience, it has been far easier to redeploy its directly employed staff rather than those for whom the Department is not the employer ie civil servants.				
Lonan Parish Commissioners	Organisation	Lonan Parish Commissioners	the Board of Commissioners believes that it is appropriate given the size of Government that all employees are covered by the same umbrells scheme. This will be more cost effective and create a more flexible workforce. The pay and conditions should reflect the benefits received at the higher rather than lower scale.	Yes		Their arrangements should be the same as all of the others to create a fair and level playing field.	1 The same as current holders.	
Andrew Shipley	Organisation	Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL)	The ATL is pleased to see that Teachers are specifically mentioned as one group outside of the consultation at this stage. The ATL believes that Education Support Staff, of which we have some 70+ members should also be outside of the remit of a PSC.		For ESS their pay is determined as a result of negotiations outside of the JNC and the only issue around this has arisen out of an agreed previous position which incorporated an average outcome of Whitley Council negotiations and Civil Service negotiations. This has subsequently been revised to be the same as the outcome of Civil Service pay rises. The ATL would envisage that this would continue under a PSC.	N/A	following discussion within the JNC. Bringing ESS within a PSC would potentially	to streamline negotiations and operations for the majority, the ATL believes that there may be risks and the little, specialist voice may be lost in the discussions with much larger employee representatives. The ATL believes that a PSC, if it represents a significant portion of the government workforce, could become sembroiled in disputes more readily and a problem in one area could spill out into
Andrew Shipley cont.	Organisation	Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL)		Due to aspects of work which are specific to education being undertaken by ESS, managers within education are already familiar with these. Hawing a PSC would potentially introduce another layer of completoly in that there would need to be a narrative to potentially explain the why's and wherefores of the situation. Performance Management (PM) is more effectively managed closer to the point of delivery rather than being removed to another, more distant body such as a PSC. It seems non-sensical to introduce another layer of bureaucracy when this presents an opportunity to simplify matters and keep PM within education.				
ADAM TEARE Self Robert Holden Self			Teachers, Health professionals & IOM Fire Service should be included.	The IOM's economy has historically been different to the UK's so why should the UK be dictating T & C's to this group of workers?	No I have no confidence this process will be fair to manual workers and will great advantage civil servants T & C's.	y As long as it's fair I don't care. The impression is that the manual worker will have their T & Cs greatly affected and civil servants will have improved conditions.	Preferabally none as it could be one of my kids taking a job within Government.	
D.Cripps Self			All employment groups that are not directly linked to pay arrangements with the UK should be covered by the new PSC. Local Authority, Independent Regulatory Bodies, Statutory Boards and all Government related staff, be it Central Government of Local Government, should be included.	The purpose of the new PSC is to streamline the process and, I would hope, make it fairer, easier to manage and, in the long run, chaeper for the tax payer. If you do not include Independent Regulatory Bodies, Statutory Boards and Local Authorities you will have the position where staff doing a particular job under the PSC will earn more, or less, than staff in Independent Regulatory Bodies, Statutory Boards and Local Authorities who are doing exactly the same job. This cannot be fair or right. Also, if Independent Regulatory Bodies, Statutory Boards and Local Authorities who are doing exactly the same job. This cannot be fair or right. Also, if Independent Regulatory Bodies, Statutory Boards and Local Authorities are not included they will all require their own nepolyment terms and conditions. This would be an extra cost which could easily be avoided by these staff all being covered by the PSC. Covernment should be making the process simpler not including unnecessary levels of bureaucracy.			work, annual leave, sick leave, retirement age, pension rights and qualifications ya real linduced within the terms and conditions document. I see no reason why all of the above should not be reviewed for new starters. The review of salary should not just cover basic pay it should cover all the 'added extras' including overtime, guaranteed overtime, shift allowance, on-call payments, dirt money etc. and work out what is considered fair in the modern world. I know o staff that are pad an on-call retainer 52 weeks of the year, even if they are abroad on holiday when they can't possibly tim up for work in the case of an emergency – this is a ridiculous situation. The whole financial package needs to be reconsidered as part of the review. Also, a chart showing gross pay (including a breakdown of 'added extras') for every type of job should be available to the public so that we know what all staff earn. Our taxes and rates pay their wages so why shouldn'th this information be available to us? This chart of gross wages should encompass ALL Government related staff, not just those within the PSC. Qualifications required for particular jobs should also be within the PSC. Qualifications required for particular jobs should also be	all staff are accountable to the public who pay their wages. Things cannot go on as they are. In recent years the Civil Service Commission has created a standardisation of terms and conditions for Civil Service jobs but the Whitley I Council's negotiating format has caused major imbalance across other public service staff dating back many years. Local agreements, including different agreements within the same department, have created a real inequality amongst Whitley Council staff and this needs to be evened out. All wages, for both Civil Servants and Whitley Council staff, should be reviewed. Inequalities will surely be found but the knee-jerk reaction of increasing the pay of the lowest paid staff should not automatically be taken. Wages will have to come down for those who might be considered to currently be 'over paid'. This may not be a popular decision within some areas of the public sector but it is necessary. Going forward, during annual pay negotiations, the PSC should look into fixed price wage increasses e.g. a sets um of money or a fixed amount of pence per

D.Cripps cont.	Self				It is very important to include all Whitley Council has been shown to be an out of date body that has helped, with the assistance of weak Converment management, to create the unequal, and often inflated, wage situation that we have today. Whitley Council has also helped create the situation where staff within different divisions of the same department, who are doing the same job, are earning different wages. There needs to be a fairness brought in which is currently lacking for both employees and employer. Simpler, standardised terms and conditions would be easier to understand and therefore easier and cheaper to					At the moment the preferred option is a percentage increase. This system favours those who earn more by increasing their pay at a greater rate than those on lower wages. It perpetuates the myth that those higher up the management ladder work harder and therefore deserve a greater pay increase than those who carry out lower level jobs. This leads to a situation where, over time, the gap between those on the lowest wages and those on the highest wages grows bigger. This results in a round of extra pay negotiations every few years to increase the pay of those on lower wages in order to remove the increased pay gap created by the percentage pay increases. Giving a fixed price wage increase would ensure that all staff increase by the same amount each year which is fairer and better value for the tax/rate payer.
D.Cripps cont.	Self				manage. Politicians need to be bold and include as many Government related staff as possible. They need to do this in order to make the management of staff terms and conditions more workable and to give greater value for money. All Government workers, be they Local or Central Government, work for the same employer - the general public. The new system needs to be as efficient as it can be and ensure that all unnecessary levels of administration and expense, that will be paid for by the general public, are removed.					
Anonymous	Self				Y	Yes		In my opinion, local authority workers terms and conditions should definitely match those of central government workers.		
Graham Higgins	Self			I believe the Airport Fire Service be excluded from the remit of public services commission. We recently had our terms and conditions revised to remove any outdated local arrangements. This I'm sure saved the department money.	Compared to other departments. The fire section is totally different. We have so many responsibilities. Whether we are required to patrot the airfield for birds or treat casualties with a defibrillator. We are an emergency service. A legal requirement at a licensed aerodrome. One minute we could be detailed to marshall an aircraft, the next we could be told to man the rescue boat for an aircraft ditching in the sad We work shirts which includes weekends and other unsociable hours. We are also expected to attend training courses sometimes off the Island. I am unaware of other departments that do this. I believe because the fire section is so different, we cannot be included in the remit with	1	No I do not support the development of a single joint negotiating committee. Civil servants and manual workers perform different rolls. Their salaries and working times differ greatly. Civil servants tend to work 9 til 5 and manual workers work unsociable hours. I believe Whitley Council last booley responsible for manual workers terms and conditions. Whitley Council lave the best interests of the manual workers at heart. I would also predict that the civil servants who make up the minority of government would make all the decisions affecting the manual workers who happen to make up the majority.	J determining its own terms and conditions.	So as not to split a workforce. The new starters would have to be on the same terms and conditions.	There are certain departments in government that work differently to others. They cannot all be treated the same.
Anonymous	Self			I am not sufficiently informed to make a comment. I do feel that the Isle of Man should always consider employment separately to the UK as we are an entirely different market, with different needs, different tax framework, different cost of lining and different economic environment. It makes no sens at all to adopt UK standards of salaries, benefits etc.	No groups chosen.	ries	I think so. Difficult to say without better understanding the current arrangements and how they affect the employees.	There should be fewer local authorities in the Isle of Man - we are a small Island and the overheads of retaining Commissioners in all the parishes is unsustainable and makes no sense. They should all have their terms and conditions determined by one Commission and economies of scale should be made.	They should be closer to private sector; less pension, no "jobs for life", there should be performance related elements, and strong systems in place to deal with poor performers. Salaries should be at market rates or we will continue to find that the jobs go to those unable to find work in the private sector rather than to the best performers. For example I would rather see a few excellent, well paid leaders rather than more medicore managers. The Isle of Man needs to compete at an international level and can only do so with the right people in strategic positions. The Isle of Man should continue its work with entrepreneurs who can bring ideas and bring work to the Island and maybe seek voluntary contributions from retired successful business people to assist with the development of the Island.	Seems reasonable and it is certainly time to update the attitudes within the civil service and government without making the costly mistakes they have been making in the Uk with PFI initiatives and expensive IT projects which fall to achieve the intended outcomes.
Anonymous Anonymous	Self Self									
Yvette Mellor	JCII	Organisation	Department of Social Care	I feel that all the statutory boards should be included.	They have no direct links to the UK. Whilst they may contain specialist staff, so do the civil service, so they should be included to allow more freedom of movement for succession management purposes, negotiation of pay, control of headcount etc.	Yes		I think to ensure consistenacy over terms and conditions, leave etc that the "by analogy" arrangement would be best.		I can't think of any reason not to establish the Public Services commission. It will reduce the number of negotiating bodies for pay and terms and conditions, improve the ability to move staff, remove anonamilies between pay groups doing similar tasks and remove spanish practices.
Tim Craig	Seir	Organisation	Onchan District Commissioners					Onchan District Commissioners would prefer that all local authorities employing manual and craft staff form a single negotiating body to offer analogous terms to those determined by the Public Services Commission, but with flexibility to negotiate local agreements where necessary.		
Peter John Prosser Andrea Barker	Self			Nothing should change it should stay the same as before with the Whitley Council in control	Not Applicable		No I don't think there needs to be alternative arrangements and we should stay with the Whitley Council	The Whitley Council	None	I don't agree with a public services commission it would give the government too much control and all they are interested in is saving money and decreasing the deficit, why should they do that by interfering in my wages and pension. We should stay with the Whitley Council.
Anonymous	Self			Included - Civil Servants (+ analagous staff) Whitley Council Staff (+ analagous staff) Excluded - IoM Constabulary; Teachers; Health Professionals; Fire Staff	Those included - staff are widely represented across Government and many TRCs overlap. Those excluded - staff pay levels are linked closely to UK.	Yes		T&C developed by PSC adopted for LA workers by analogy	It is not easy to comment on all the TRCs which could be changed, as I am not sware of any definitive list or details of current TRCs. However, from some of the TRCs which I understand are in place, which I would like to see changed: Conditioned overtime (e.g. staff being paid for hours trey don't work); Paid fundhours (if still in place anywhere); Receiving extra pay (e.g doublet time) for being on a rota to cover a bank holiday and then not working due to sickness; Excessive pay for person(s) cleaning buses; Any other outdated / excessive	
Anonymous	Self			All employment groups should be included	The major benefits will come from eventually having one central body with no exclusions.	Yes		The most cost effective arrangement would be to link to similar workers within the PSC.	1 Removal of final salary pension schemes 2 Realistic notice periods and compensation for termination of employment in line with private sector	
Anonymous	Self			Whitley Council MPTC	Because I dont think it is fair on the employees who accepted terms and conditions to have them removed	1	No they should be split determined by present terms and conditions and specific work arrangements, one body could not variate or manage conflicting areas of employment	Local authorities should give up their responsibilities and such staff and responsibilities should be amalgamated to shared services, local authorities should only be elected members and administrative staff, who manage/liaise on behalf of clients/users and elected members decisions. There are too many property/maintenance/land management teams in a small island, working against each other or not uniting resources, validating management roles. This is not cost effective or efficient use of resources on such a small island.	constructive dismissal to current employees due to lack of moral and lack of equality in a team. engineering conflict	For infor I am not a WC employee, am a civil servant but I forsee potential conflict
Anonymous	Self			I think the target should be to include all groups at some time.	Because for the process to be fair all those who serve the public should broadly speaking have the same terms and conditions. Otherwise the exercise is somewhat wasteful.	Yes .		Retain current arrangements	Without some idea of what the employer is planning it's hard to say. As an existing employee I'd be reluctant to lose any T&C's I do see however that some things may need to be negotiable. My only worry would be recruitment & retention moving forward.	I believe that it is a sensible way forward
Anonymous	Self			All employees of the government should be under 1 employment contract.	Centralised administration, single employer and standard terms and conditions is the only sensible cost effective approach. It is well overdue for all the ridiculous consessions that have been made to be cleared out. Staff should earn a fair wage for a fair days work and standard terms and conditions should govern this.	Yes		Local authorities should be responsible for their own employees. Negotiation should be between employer and employee.	Final salary pension scheme should be closed to new entrants. Totally agree that one set of fair terms and conditions should be established based on a wage per annum or hour with agreed overtime rates for lower paid staff. All other benefits should cease. Holiday allowance should be linked to average holiday in private sector.	
Anonymous Anonymous	C.W	Organisation Organisation		All employees engaged by government or statutory boards of government.	A single unifying body should be the most cost effective and efficient solution.	Yes		Individual authorities should be allowed to negotiate T & C's independently, subject to their being made public and therefore, the authority members become accountable to the rate payers.	Every aspect of their T & C's should be reviewed and tested against free market rates.	
Anonymous Anonymous	Self Self			all to be within		Yes I	No I would hope that with one body, the JNC they would have a far better grasp for PAY across the board! on	the terms and conditions should be the same/ similar just administered by different bodies	Annual Leave entitlement - it does not take long to build up the maximum annual leave allowance of 30 days and when the majority of staff have 30 days, plus bank holidys etc, most are here for 221 working days - it is sometimes difficult in small teams for all staff to take their 30 days balancing the business needs.	Would the new terms, conditions and pay result in established staff having to reapply for their posts, or would they automatically 'shift' over to these ?
Anonymous Mark Higgins	Self			Apart from the groups named above I think anyone working for the government should be included or it will just be the lower paid workers. All government workers should be included in the proposed commission.	as many government workers as possible are included as this will be a fairer and more consistant way of dealing with people.	Yes	No. There are distinct differences between the bury undergoing. Cid over the bury	be adopted by local authorities then they should be included and counted as PSC workers	New starters should be on assessment linked pay increases until they can prove they are competent enough to do the job they are being paid to do.	years or less to work. Please issue some reassuraces about pay/conditions, some staff I have spoken to think they will have their pay cut by as much as half and will no longer be paid enhancements for weekend & bank holiday work,
Mark Higgins	Salf			All government workers should be included in the proposed commission.	It is only fair that if this is going to take place, then all government workers are considered.	I I	No Inter are distinct differences between the two work groups. Unit servaints nave fairly routine hours and a main salary, Manual workers normally have to work extra hours and are not salaried. There needs to be a completely different approach to these two distinct groups.	 All manual workers should be subject to the same terms and conditions. Keep them together but separate from civil servants. 	Don't change any conditions, this would cause III feeling between co workers. Negotiate properly and openly to alter terms using unions and work groups. Don t steam roller terms because it has been proved it doesn't work even with a smal group.	Don't combine groups just for the sake of it. Look carefully at why they should be grouped together if at all. Since most of the civil sevants are management above the manual workers, i can see any changes being slightly more sympathetic to them. Although it was encouraging to see pension provision standardised.
Alan Castle				INVIC		IES .		1	1	

The second secon								
Service of the control of the contro	Steve Burrows Self		Commission, without exception. Arguments claiming linkage to employment terms in the UK or elsewhere are wholly spurious. That the government considers it has to depend on external markets for some groups of employees merely reflects that the government's	excluding any public sector employees from the remit of the Public Services Commission. They are paid from one source - tax revenue - for one common purpose - to serve the public. Excluding any group of public sector employees would be discriminatory and create potential for unfairness in			and conditions should be changed for new starters. In respect of the principle that "The terms and conditions for existing staff within the scope of a Public Services Commission would be changed only through negotiation with existing staff and their representatives, through any new JNC structures and in compliance with employment with, this could create a long-standing discriminatory situation whereby some employees are on old terms while others are on new terms, possibly for as long as 50 years following the implementation of new terms. This would be unfair and morally unjustifiable, once new terms and conditions have been determined and introduced for new employees existing employees should be informed that they have a reasonable finite period, for instance five years, in which to either migrate to the new terms or decide that they no longer wish to remain as public sector employees and seek alternative	encompass responsibility to ensure that an effective human resource strategy is developed for the Isle of Man public sector which minimises dependency on off-
The state of the s		O constitution	None should be excluded	Yes		They should become part of the public services commission	All of them but in particular some of the current Whitley council Spanish practices such as getting paid enhanced rates and allowances when on leave	take an eternity - look what has happened with the bus drivers and that is
Service of the control of the contro		Organisation			++			
See	Jane Stevenson Self		All Excluded			To stay under Whitley council		
The state of the control of the cont	L Self		there should be no PSC!	separate. These are totally different jobs,services , skills.Manual & craft workers are subject to more dangers than civil servants and work harder & longer than some office base civil servants. whitley	large scales of back pay that the agenda of change did a couple of years ago. I know of 4 staff that got over £60,000! that's the equivalent of 14 manual workers! we would be worse off in single body. Civil servants would once again	I ridiculous how manual workers are been constantly hounded over the last 3 years. till there is a fair & honest goverment that does not favour the bloated wages of civil servants to the ordinary worker I would prefer to remain with	a clause stating more than 3 sickness per year could result in a sacking. dont pa	paperwork and creating a group to work on scaring staff, causing uneccessary stress. When government should be trimming from the top. Some MHKS do not pay into superann but can draw from it?? and I bet they will be excluded from the PSC. I have chosen to leave my surname, address and phone number for
Part	Richard Halsall Self		None	Yes		Determined by a Public Services Commission	Overtime rates and the introduction of annualised hours	The focus of the Public Services Commission should be on establishing flexible working arrangements that reflect the differing needs of the various departments. However, the establishment of this body should not be used as an opportunity to save money by eroding the terms and conditions of existing
Particular of the control of the con	Anonymous Self		Whitley council workers should be excluded	poorest paid and continually get the worse end of the stick and need representaion in a fair and unbias way. If they are swallowed up under a public	effects of this committee. The civil servants are under worked and over paid	whitley council		nation should be ashamed at how we treat our manual workers - ask yourself would you do their job in the conditions they endure i.e. no where to go to the loo or wash their hands for the pay they get? but none of us can do without the
State of the control	Anonymous	Organisation	Membership, Functions and Scope on page 12 of the consultation document. We understand that the intention is for the following groups to be excluded from a PSC: MEA Post Office NHS (Hospital Doctors/MPTC) Teachers/Lecturers Fire Police IPA FSC GSC Clerk of Tymadds Office communications Commission No rationale has been provided for the inclusion or exclusion of groups and we feel that this is required. It is currently impossible to understand what the benefit is of attempting to rationalise Whitley Council and the Civil Service for example, when they only constitute half of the public sector. There will continue to be, not only a significant number of people on widely differing terms and conditions, but a significant number of differing negotiations forums. This seems at odds with the stated aims of the PSC. The above list, for example does not include the PSPA, and yet it would seem logical to exclude them from the list, if no example the PSC is to be excluded. Under Functions we are asked to agree to something which is not yet defined so clearly we have problems with that it. but the functions and the appropriate delegations of such functions and authority are not set out. We are clearly concerned at what phrases such as 'groviding for greater autonomy and accountability to be given to Departments, Boards and Offices' may mean in practice, and there is no effort to provide examples here to illustrate the points made. That said, we are broadly in agreement with the scope of the text set out in the consultation document under 'Membership, Functions and Scope' on page 12. However we must stress that it is virtually impossible from this document to decipher what the practical arrangements and impacts would be or what is envisaged. We would seek, as a minimum that unions are	Yes	4. Joint Negotiating Arrangements on page 13 of the consultation document. The section entitled Current Arrangements of on this page, specifically the last sentence, appears to imply that it is the 'mechanisms' for bargaining that will be under review rather than terms and conditions although this is slightly unclear, and at odds with later remarks already cited above which frame this response. We would be supportive of a forum which reflects current membership of unions and provides a balance. One of the key fears in this process is that one union will dominate negotiations to the disadvantage of employees who are not their members, simply because they can invoke overall numbers in membership on any issue, or in gaining additional representation on a forum. This cannot be allowed to occur, as it is clearly unfair. We would see overall forums for some key issues, such as are reflected in current negotiations at the marco level of Government e.g. redundancy. Representation on such forums would have to follow an equalised approach i.e. equal numbers of representatives from each union. The PSC in this respect would simply be a more formalised version of the ad hoc arrangements already tested. In terms of pay, we would see advantages in this approach but we would seek balanced and equal membershin in such a forum. However, existing terms would be better handed via the existence of separate such forums as tenguing decisive the balance of membership which currently exists in current forums. Again we see the process of structuring such forums as requiring decisive input and agreement from relevant timons, as a precursor to their successful operation. In blunt terms, a union cannot usefully be involved in a forum where the voice of their members on relevant issues is not recognised and reflected in the structure of that forum, and where e.g., they will be consistently 'outvoted' by another union, irrespective of whether that union has any membership inputated by regotiations or whether that union has a universal res	Local Authority employees' on page 14 of the consultation document. Prospect does not have a large membership within this group and our response should be viewed in that light. We would suggest that a by analogy , arrangement might be the most practical approach.	Terms and Conditions on page 15 of the consultation document. We do not believe any particular terms and conditions should be changed for new starters, but as is consistent with our ongoing approach, we remain open to dialogue and	
Section 1. Control of the control of	Anonymous Self		None		No None leave as is.	Leave as is	Whatever they accept.	Change MHK'S Terms and Conditions in line with others.
Section 1 Across the control of the	Anonymous Self		TIONS .		The Interests of the	55010 55	THISTER VIET GEOGRA	Change I il it o Territo di la conditionomi il incerniti odicio.
Total Part Control	Pauline Carole Self							
The second secon	Leslie Halsall Self							
Section for the case of the ca	Graeme Faragher Self							
Attemptions of the control of the co	Anonymous Self		all Public sector workers including local authority staff not excluded as above	employment issues. It would seem to be better to have a standard systems to cover these workers		from the system. It would assist the local authories to have a fixed reference deal with instead of having to enter into their own negotiations with		workers especially at the lower end of the scale to make sacrifices while others higher up the food chain keep their priviledges. Any system must allow protections for employees and the means of effective and reasoned representation by their respective unions or associations. Failure to deal with this properly could lead to a great deal of industrial unrest after years of relatively peaceful labour relations in the Island. Such industrial unrest could prove more costly both financially and socially should it not be dealt with properly. The workers at the lower end of the pay scale need to know that they have access to
Attemptions of the control of the co	Anonymous Self		Whitley Council	Because have best conditions for me.	No Whitley council fine now dont need to change.	collectively and with employee representatives,(union)	none	none
If an not sure with Place diseases are being sought. If an not sure with Place diseases are being sought. If an not sure with Place diseases are being sought. If an not sure with Place diseases are being sought. If an not sure with Place diseases are being sought. If an not sure with Place diseases are being sought. If an not sure with Place diseases are larger and soughts. If an not sure with Place diseases are larger and soughts. If an not sure with Place diseases are larger and soughts. If an not sure with Place diseases are larger and soughts. If an not sure with Place diseases are larger and soughts. If an not sure with Place diseases are larger and soughts. If an not sure with Place diseases are larger and soughts. If an not sure with Place diseases are larger and soughts. If an not sure with Place diseases are larger and soughts. If an not sure with Place diseases are larger and soughts. If an not sure with Place diseases are larger and soughts. If an output of the purpose and soughts. If an output of the purpose and soughts. If an output of the purpose are larger and soughts. If an output of the purpose are larger and soughts. If an output of the purpose are larger and soughts. If an output of the purpose are larger and soughts. If an output of the purpose are larger and soughts. If an output of the purpose are larger and soughts. If an output of the purpose are larger and soughts. If an output of the purpose are larger and soughts. If an output of the purpose are larger and soughts. If an output of the purpose are larger and soughts. If an output of the purpose are larger and soughts. If an output of the purpose are larger and soughts. If an output of the purpose are larger and soughts. If an output of the purpose are larger and soughts. If an output of the purpose are larger and soughts. If an output of the purpose are larger and soughts. If an output of the purpose are larger and soughts. If an output of the purpose are larger and soughts. If an output of the purp				Yes		I think the arrangements should be adopted from the Public Services Commission as a best practice to standardise the T&C's of all public servants and manual workers.		
Anonymous Self Civil Service As the terms and conditions for Civil Servants should be separated from the other groups and have two one for Civil Servants separated from the other groups and have two one for Civil Servants should be separated from the other groups and have two one for Civil Servants and one for all others Anonymous Self The PSC should only comprise civil servants and Whitely Council staff (and analogous groups) initially. Other employment groups could be added later. The PSC should only comprise civil servants and Whitely Council staff (and analogous groups is devisive and damaging council staff, sometimes working allongated employment groups could be added later. I strongly support the proposal. The different TGCs between the two main employment groups could be added later. Whitely Council staff (and analogous groups is devisive and damaging council staff, sometimes working allongated employment groups could be added later. I strongly support the proposal. The different TGCs between the two main employment groups could be added later. Whitely Council staff (and analogous groups is devisive and damaging council staff, sometimes working allongated employment groups is devisive and damaging council staff, sometimes working allongated employment groups is devisive and damaging council staff (and analogous groups is devisive and damaging council staff (and analogous groups is devisive and damaging council staff (and analogous groups is devisive and damaging council staff (and analogous groups is devisive and damaging council staff (and analogous groups is devisive and damaging council staff (and analogous groups is devisive and damaging council staff (and analogous groups is devisive and damaging council staff (and analogous groups is devisive and damaging council staff (and analogous groups is devisive and damaging council staff (and analogous groups is devisive and damaging council staff (and analogous groups is devisive and danalogous groups is devisive and damaging council staff (and analo			I cannot give a full answer as I do not have a full list of all groups who may be involved.	I am not sure why these changes are being sought. I do not see that this could make significant administrative savings if there are still going to be many groups who have different terms and	generally office based and those under the Whitley Council are manual workers the conditions associated with their work may be different and there could be many factors which need to be taken into account. Will this also lead to a	s, work individually and could be problematic if one LA decided to give a pay increase and another didn't. I fear there would be serious potential problems with this. I believe the Island is too small to have so many negotiating parties - if it is possible to set the terms and conditions for LA workers through the PSC, I believe this would be the more favourable option, but will the LA		
Anonymous Self The PSC should only comprise civil servants and Whitley Council staff (and analogous groups) initially. Other employment groups could be added later. Anonymous Self The PSC should only comprise civil servants and Whitley Council staff (and analogous groups) initially. Other employment groups is divisive and damaging to the public service. Harmonising each other doing the same pix. This situation causes numerous problems due to their doing the same pix. This situation causes numerous problems due to the form the world freent terms and their attribute. We are all public services by missibly initing the composition of the Commissions. Other employment groups is could be added to the PSC should be groupsed and this will be caused to the PSC should be groupsed and this will be caused from the Commissions. Other employment groups is divisive and damaging to the public service. Harmonising each to their data the proposal. The different T&Cs between the two main white proposal in the	Anonymous Self	1						
Whitely Council staff, sometimes working alongoide each other doing the full migrove morale and team building within the causes numerous problems the same jub. This is flustion to account the council staff, sometimes working alongoide each other doing the flust time would improve morale and team building within the causes numerous problems the same jub. This is flustion to account the causes numerous problems the same jub. This is flustion to much of an 'us and them' attitude. In the public service. In my Department there is too much of an 'us and them' attitude. In progressed as soon as possible and this will be easier to much of the Commission. Other employment groups could be added to the PSC later by megatation but the formation of the Commission should not be	Anonymous Self			should be separated from the other groups				
	Anonymous Self			Whitley Council staff, sometimes working alongside each other doing the same job. This situation causes numerous problems due to different terms and conditions. I believe the PSC should be progressed as soon as possible and this will be easier to achieve by initially limiting the composition of the Commission. Other employment groups could be added to the PSC later by negotiation but		Local Authority staff should be employed on the same T&Cs as PSC staff.	Not sure. Further consideration required.	employment groups is divisive and damaging to the public service. Harmonising TRCs at this difficult time would improve morale and team building within the public service. In my Department there is too much of an 'us and them' attitude.

Anonymous	Self		The Whitley Council employment groups should be excluded from the Public Services	I feel that this whole performance of linking groups	No Simply leave the Whitley Council alone.	Perhaps they should consider joining the Whitley Council	None	I resent the fact that this government is trying to save money by reducing the
			Commission. They should remain as Whitley Council and not be lumped together with the Civil Service. If this can happen for so-called Health Professionals, Teachers etc. why not					workers wages. I feel that they should be looking at themselves first - set an example.
			the Whitley Council?	a personal level I have every confidence that I will				
				be losing money.				
Anonymous	Self		all groups should be covered including all those listed above. The government should be	Everyone should be treated fair without prejudice	No no i do not support this. Leave them as they are seperate.	remain as they are unchanged!!		I don't think it is fair that the government are looking to unify everyone. Some
			able to arrang a proper recruitment drive for helath PROFESSIONALS and not be dictated	and discrimination.				areas have different terms & conditions. In some cases these may be more
			to by other countries.					beneficial than others and why should be loose these. These are part off are terms and conditions which we signed up for when taking up our posts and now
								goverment want to change them!! If we have The Transfer of Undertakings
John David	Self							(Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006, this would and could not happen!
McDonough	Calf							
Anonymous TIM NORTON	Self							
Andrew Bertie Anonymous	Self							
Sonia Fargher	Self		All public service personnel should be considered really. However I do think specialist	As above really, there will be a lot of Yes		No reason why they cant be similar terms and condition to whatever is	Probably hours and such 'perks' as in DOI as accrued time - it should just be	In principal the idea should good but I forsee lots of unqualified staff on
			work such as for example hospital employees would be difficult to amalgamate as these are specialist workers and cannot be 'redeployed' to other areas of government and therefore would be limited progression to professionals as indicated in the report and I think there will be a lot of pools of people like this.	experienced/qualified staff who will be unable to be re-deployed as indicated in the report.		determined by PSC, just under different regulalations.	straight hours worked and not time off in lieu for overtime worked. All overtime should be paid for if needed.	 inappropriate grades - for example a manual DOI worker could not be on a Civil Service Admin Assistant grade (i.e. no formal qualifications) so the grades would need looking into.
Paul Harper	Self		The term "Health Professionals" is very wide ranging and arguably has in the IOM a	for the reasons outlined above.	No Professionals and non-professionals are being 'lumped' into one JNC and	I have no experience of Local Authority Employees and therefore do not feel I	Create a single pay spine which reflects current pay should be early on the	Over the years who should be a CS or non-CS in Health Services appears to have
			different context to UK NHS health professionals. There are many staff in the IOM health services who, if they were in the UK NHS would not be Civil Servants e.g. Med		potentially will be treated similarly. At least have a split for those that hold by virtue of their post need to have professional qualifications and those that do		agenda Phasing in the new T&Cs over a period of time say 3 years should also be a consideration for existing employees with said T&Cs being mandatory for al	
			Secretaries, IT, health informatics staff, FHSA staff, Hosp Manager. Therefore if the term		not. The question being asked does not give much indication as to how the		new recruits from a set a date.	officials (all CS) e.g. Hospital Manager being paid significantly less than their UK
			"Health Professionals" is an encompassing term to include "clinical" ie 'at the bedside - hands on' staff but not the others who we also need to attract from the UK NHS, then		harmonisation would work but the potential for the "lowest common			counterparts. However, other Health Service Groups e.g. Consultants are tied
			either include said staff with "Health Professionals" or exclude all of them. In other		denominator" by virtue of those with the biggest number of staff getting more representation on the new JNC, exists.			into the UK rates of pay which are geared to looking after a much larger health population than the IOM has. Equally the move by the UK Govt to regional pay
1			words, create a level the playing field and make meaningful comparisons with what		1 1	1		for CS makes comparisons even more difficult. These differences need to be considered and by creating a "Health Professional" group and leaving them out of
1			actually happens elsewhere.					considered and by creating a "Health Professional" group and leaving them out of the PSC only accentuates the inequity.
L								
Marie Obrien	Self		If it was to change we all should be involved, and will the groups you intend to put under the new remit get what the nurses got when they went through the agenda for change	As we all should be equal as that is our right	No leave well alone	as it is	None we all should be equal	Stop wasting the tax payers money
1			big payouts at the expence of the taxpayer. The tax payer is under the impression that					
1			government needs to save money, this to me seems like a waste of the tax payers money sending out all this paper work and can government afford all this I dont think so I say					
Annua	Calf		leave what is working alone stop wasting money			1	1	1
Anonymous Anonymous	Self	+ +	All public service employees should be within the remit of a PSC. Restricting it to Whitley			That is a matter for each local authority to determine in accordance with its	Not possible to say. Civil Service Terms and Conditions are transparent and	It has to be fit for purpose. Current OHR arrangements under the new shared
1 ' [Council and Civil Servants is nonsense when at least half of all public servants will still be	definitive answer as to how many Government	1 1	operational needs.	available to view on the OHR website. Whitely council arrangements are much	services are not, or at least give the impression that they're not. Examples 1
1			excluded. If you draw a salary from the public purse then it should fall under the remit of the PSC. This exercise isn't worth doing unless it covers all government employees.	employees there are. Too many Departments, Boards and offices are engaging staff directly and			more opaque and even secretive. Publish all the details and I'll consider them side by side. until I've seen all the data, I can offer no comment.	A sheet of working hours being sent in from an office outside of central Douglas and being returned with a note saying it was sent to St Andrews House 2nd
1			and the core of an government critical	some are ignoring the normal payroll arrangements.	1 1	1	, and the comment	Floor when it should have gone to 3rd Floor 2 The recent snow advice on 22
1				Until we can say with certainty that all staff are engaged properly through the normal payroll	1 1	1		March was neither use nor ornament. Make a decision one way or the other. Managers in other offices were waiting for some direction and got none!
				arrangements, we will never know how many there				managers in other offices were waiting for some direction and got none:
				are and more importantly how much they cost. IOM				
1				Government can't function unless it knows its true operational costs.				
Anonymous	Self		All groups who are not linked to the UK for terms and conditions.	Linking groups whose T&C's are set in the UK will Yes		1	+	Long overdue
				be complex and may have negative effects upon our				
N-10 · ·	C-16		Manager 1 and 1 an	attractiveness as an employer		Albert de la constant	To consider the second	The second secon
Neil Davidson	Self		All groups should be included and as an absolute minimum Civil Service and Whitley Council must be included.	If all groups are included the outcome will be inclusive, equatible and fair for all. As a minimum		A 'by analogy' basis, would be the fairest approach.	In general terms inequity should be addressed. Where terms and conditions are considered to be over generous when compared with the majority,	The new appraoch must be fair and trasparent and provide equity across the public service.
			Council must be included.	Civil Service and Whitley Council must be included			consideration should be given to 'leveling the playing field' for new starters.	public service.
				as they represent the majority of the workforce and				
				it would be (and currently is) divisive and inefficient to maintian the status quo				
Anonymous Anonymous	Self Self		dont know	Yes		don t know		
Natasha Whittaker	Self		All employment groups with the exception of those groups closely linked to UK terms (i.e.			Analogy to PSC	All T&C's that are included in the PSC should be changed for new staff.	Long over due, will simplify, reduce bureaucracy and improve consistency in the
			MPTC, HMD, Education, Police, Fire etc)	remain so that the Island remains competative and attractive in recruiting these specialist posts.				management of staff due to the harmonisation of policies, i.e disciplinary, capability etc.
								.,,
Anonymous	Self		None	I retain concerns as to how such diverse services/staff can be brought together under one	No See q10	See Q10	See q10, also I do not have enough information to be able to answer that	See q10, also I do not have enough information to be able to answer that
				set of T&C's			question	question
Paula Beattie Paul Moffatt	Self Self			Yes				
Anonymous	Self							
(duplicate entry) Anonymous	Self		Include all but retain links to UK T&Cs where necessary eg doctors, school teachers etc	Yes		This is a matter for local authority employers and should not be a consideration	n I do not have sufficient knowledge to answer this	
Juan Turner	Colf		bearing in mind a linkage to net pay and not gross pay			for central government.	<u> </u>	
Juan Turner Kellv Wilson	Self							
Trevor Hussey	Self		None		No I agree that the Public Service Commission should be the single point of	I cannot see any sensible solution other than the proposed Commission setting		This move is long-overdue and, in principle will enable all public sector employee
1					negotiation for public service employees. The seperate sub-committes propose as an interim measure should be retained as a longer-term fixture. The T&Cs of		negotiation.	to be treated equally and will give the employer the opportunity to achieve objectives across the public sector. As a long-term objective, a Public Services
1					civil servants and manual and craft workers are different and pay negotiations			Commission should be able to simplify negotiations processes and to develop
1					can be complex matters in which the position between the staff association and the Commission can be wide. I do not think that introducing further	N. C.		more consistent terms and conditions and this should provide the opportunity for simpler employee representation arrangements. All this is precluded by the
1					complications into this negotiation is helpful. What is now a two-way discussion			need to have constructive relationships between staff and employees; policies
1					could become a three-way discussion, at least, and this would not be conduciv to settling disputes or concluding negotiations in a timely matter. A single	ve		that are consistently and fairly applied; management and leadership training; decisions on what services Government actually provides (by following through
1					negotiating body on the employer side will provide the benefits required.			the Scope of Government review) and crucially, determining the number of staff
1					Negotiating with all associations representing civil servants and manual and craft workers at the same time does not, in my opinion, add any value.	1		actually required. The Commission is merely the mechanism for applying what falls out from this and is the answer to nothing, in itself.
1					Sale notices at the same time toda flot, in my opinion, and any value.			Total Section and a die diamer to floating, in facil.
Anonymous	Self		In addition to those stated in the Consultation document, I would suggest that the staff		No Some of the Whitley Council grades of worker are so complicated and specific	I think that Local Authority workers should become part of the PSC staff. If		It appears to me that several decisions have already been taken regarding the
			of local authorities ought to be included.	authorities. It would also encourage best practice	that it would be totally unfair on them individually to "lump them in" with the	that definitely is not to happen, their pay should be rigidly linked, by analogy.	not think that pension provision should be tampered with again. I do not think	PSC and its remit, and this leads me to suspect that the PSC is something of a
1				amongst local authorities, who would "buy in" the services on a cost basis, not on a per worker basis.	more general grades or civil service. That said, I do think that a largely unified approach (with acceptable safeguards for negatively impacted workers) may be		that the final salary pension scheme should close. I think it is wrong to single out new starters for punishment. I have never heard of a scheme yet which	
1				Services could be much more easily shared between	a better/cheaper way of doing it. As a Civil Servant, it does feel unfair when		was changed for new starters, and which wasn't subsequently back-applied to a	Il prophecies are consulted upon. Some evidence in the reviews of consultees
1				local authorities, at a time when Central Government is seeking to streamline the whole local	one part of the public sector gets a greater or smaller pay rise than another.	1	remaining staff. I do not trust the current employer in this regard (and my suspicions have been well founded) and I will not trust any new employer who	comments (which should be automatically supplied to all consultees who responded) that comments have impacted upon thinking and how, and not just
				authority structure. For example, one experienced			may replace them in this regard. It is my clear experience that politicians like to	steamrollered over would be reassuring in this regard.
1				Chief Executive could run 2 or 3 small authorities, with the PSC being the employer, and this would	1 1	1	meddle. They like to unpick the good work of their predecessors, and politicians should not be let loose on people's livelihoods.	5
1				enable cover 5 days per week for all those local	1 1	1	popus mamous	
1				authorities if something untoward occurred suddenly. the same is true if a service was				
1				provided - e.g. gardening. This could be more				
1				efficiently provided on an all island basis with				
1				individual authorities buying the service in from the cheapest contractor - either PSC or privately. It				
				would also encourage PSC services to be				
Anonymous	Self		If you exempt groups as outlined above because there are linkages to the UK then it would be discriminatory to force the rest of us into one group. We are either all in or all	As mentioned there should be no discrimination. If you are asking for us all to be included in PSC it	No To remain as they are Civil Servants and manual workers separate.	No interest in local government workers either way.	I don't believe any terms and conditions should be changed.	I do not agree with the principal to establish a PSC. I feel there is a wider agenda here, similar to what happened in the UK and do therefore not support
1			out there should be no exemptions.	does not seem fair that certain groups will still be				this.
Rebecca Dooley	Self	-	If introducing a unified body then surely should include all groups of staff - Whitley, Civil	excluded no matter what the reason. Should include all government workers. I have Yes	 	Analogous terms and condition much the same as Tvnwald employees current	ly "Spanish Practices" such as paying people for working unsociable hours when	Only equitable if includes all staff not just Whitley and Civil Service.
			Servant, MPTC, NJC, teachers, police etc	managed an area which had 4 different sets of		and an interest of the same as in th	they don't in fact work them (annual leave or sick). Paying people different rate	
1				terms and conditions, this required time consuming and difficult interpretation of labyrynthine and			for working at weekends in the same area - eg MPTC staff get plus 1/3 for Saturday working and plus 2/3 for Sunday working whereas Whitley get plus 1/2	,
1				archaic terms and conditions and also led to			for Saturday working and plus 1 for Sunday working. Travel allowances payable	
1	1			discontent between staff on different terms and			when relocated to a new workplace.	