



RESEARCH PAPER 07/53
12 JUNE 2007

Concessionary Bus Travel Bill (HL)

Committee Stage Report

Bill 60 of 2006-07

This is a report on the Committee Stage of the *Concessionary Bus Travel Bill* (HL), produced in response to a recommendation of the Modernisation Committee in its report *The Legislative Process* (HC 1097, 2005-06).

This is a pilot Committee Stage Report and we would welcome all feedback on its contents and format. This should be sent to papers@parliament.uk or to the Director of Research Services, Rob Clements (x3622).

This Bill seeks to guarantee free off-peak travel for everyone aged 60 and over and all disabled people on local buses anywhere in England from April 2008. Free bus travel would be available for those eligible from 9.30am until 11pm on weekdays and all day at weekends and on bank holidays. Local authorities would still be able to offer additional benefits to their residents, such as travel before 9:30am and concessions on other modes of travel like trams, as well as alternative travel schemes, such as tokens for use on taxis or community transport. The Bill includes a power to allow, in the future, for mutual recognition of national concessionary bus passes across the United Kingdom.

The Bill extends to the whole of England. Concessionary bus travel is a devolved matter. Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland already operate their own schemes.

Louise Butcher

BUSINESS AND TRANSPORT

HOUSE OF COMMONS LIBRARY

Recent Library Research Papers include:

07/38	Social Indicators [includes articles: Smoking in public places; the 2007 Census Test]	25.04.07
07/39	Economic Indicators, May 2007	01.05.07
07/40	An Economic Introduction to India	02.05.07
07/41	A Political Introduction to India	02.05.07
07/42	Energy Security	08.05.07
07/43	Unemployment by Constituency, April 2007	16.05.07
07/44	The <i>Parliament (Joint Department) Bill</i> [HL] [Bill 94 of 2006-07]	17.05.07
07/45	National Assembly for Wales Elections: 3 May 2007	21.05.07
07/46	Scottish Parliament elections: 3 May 2007	31.05.07
07/47		
07/48	<i>Legal Services Bill</i> [HL] [Bill 108 of 2006-07]	29.05.07
07/49	The <i>Rating (empty Properties) Bill</i> [Bill 106 of 2006-07]	30.05.07
07/50	The <i>International Tribunals (Sierra Leone) Bill</i> [Bill 110 of 2006-07]	31.05.07
07/51	Gleneagles G8 commitments on debt relief and aid – two years on	04.06.07

Research Papers are available as PDF files:

- *to members of the general public on the Parliamentary web site,
URL: <http://www.parliament.uk>*
- *within Parliament to users of the Parliamentary Intranet,
URL: <http://hcl1.hclibrary.parliament.uk>*

Library Research Papers are compiled for the benefit of Members of Parliament and their personal staff. Authors are available to discuss the contents of these papers with Members and their staff but cannot advise members of the general public. Any comments on Research Papers should be sent to the Research Publications Officer, Room 407, 1 Derby Gate, London, SW1A 2DG or e-mailed to PAPERS@parliament.uk

Summary

The *Transport Act 2000* amended the legislation covering concessionary fares in England and Wales from 1 June 2001 outside London and 1 April 2001 in London. Local authorities had to provide elderly people and disabled persons with at least a half-fare concession on local bus travel. The *Travel Concessions (Eligibility) Act 2002* equalised the age of eligibility for travel concessions for men and women at 60 from April 2003. The age for entitlement will increase for both sexes between 2010 and 2020 with the phased increase in women's state pension age.

The legislation provided a minimum concession but did not preclude local authorities from being more generous. Local authorities have had discretion to offer further concessions on bus and other public passenger transport services if they wished under the *Transport Act 1985* and the *Greater London Authority Act 1999*. As a result the nature and extent of such concessions varied from region to region depending on the local authority.

The Chancellor announced in the 2005 Budget that free off-peak local area bus travel would be introduced in England from 1 April 2006 for those over 60 and the disabled. In his 2006 Budget speech the Chancellor announced that, from April 2008, 11 million over 60s and disabled people in England would be entitled to free off-peak local bus travel in every area of the country. A recent report from the TAS consultancy found that a single national scheme would make life simpler for all concerned and could offer significant savings in the cost of administering concessions.¹

The *Concessionary Bus Travel Bill [HL] 2006/07* legislates for these changes. The Bill would:

- guarantee free off-peak travel for everyone aged 60 and over and disabled people on all local buses anywhere in England from April 2008 from 9.30am until 11pm on weekdays and all day at weekends and on bank holidays;
- allow, in the future, for mutual recognition of national concessionary bus passes across the United Kingdom; and
- give the Secretary of State reserve powers to alter the administrative arrangements of the Scheme.

The issues that have concerned Members, and Peers during the Lords stages, are broadly the same: extending the scheme both by mode of transport and eligible persons; ensuring the passes are smartcards with ITSO compliancy; adequate funding and fair distribution to local authorities and fair reimbursement for operators; the London special reserve scheme; and reciprocity of concession across all of the UK. Only one amendment has been made to the Bill on the subject of the period of appeals for operators against reimbursement arrangements. This was tabled by the Government at Committee stage.

¹ currently estimated at £31 million (TAS Consultancy, *Concessionary Fares UK 2006*, 21 March 2006)

CONTENTS

I	Introduction: Public Bill Committee procedure	7
II	Background	8
	A. Report by the Joint Committee on Human Rights	8
	B. Second Reading	9
III	Committee Stage	11
IV	Appendix – Membership of the Public Bill Committee	15

I Introduction: Public Bill Committee procedure

By way of explanation, Public Bill Committees were given the power to take oral and written evidence as a result of recommendations from the Modernisation Committee in its report on *The Legislative Process*.² On 1 November 2006, the House debated the Committee's report and agreed to changes to standing orders to allow Public Bill Committees to receive oral and written evidence.

Public Bill Committees, subject to a timetable (under Standing Order No 83A), have the power to send for persons, papers or records (receive written evidence) under Standing Order No 84A(2). A motion can be moved to give Public Bill Committees, not subject to a timetable the same power, under Standing Order No 63. Standing Order No 84A(3) provides that all Public Bill Committees with the power to send for persons, papers or records "**may** hear oral evidence at such meetings as the committee may appoint" (emphasis added).

The decision of an individual Public Bill Committee to hear oral evidence is taken on the basis of a resolution proposed by the programming sub-committee of the Public Bill Committee. Standing Order No 83C states that:

- (5) The programming sub-committee shall report to the committee any resolution which it makes about—
- (a) the number of sittings to be allotted to the consideration of the bill in the committee;
 - (b) the allocation of the proceedings to each sitting;
 - (c) the time at which any proceedings, if not previously concluded, are to be brought to a conclusion;
 - (d) the date by which the bill is to be reported to the House;
 - (e) the programming of consideration and third reading.

Both the Public Bill Committee considering a Government bill and its programming sub-committee will have a Government majority, so if the programming sub-committee does not propose to receive oral evidence, it is very unlikely that the Public Bill Committee will do so.

In the debate on the Modernisation Committee's report, when the House agreed to changes to standing orders to implement its recommendations, Jack Straw, the Leader of the House of Commons and the Chairman of the Modernisation Committee, indicated that the Government did not expect committees considering bills from the House of Lords to take oral evidence. He said:

The programming Sub-Committee would be free to propose that there should be no evidence sittings, and that is what we would envisage for Bills that have already been through the Lords—the Modernisation Committee itself envisaged

² [Modernisation Committee, *The Legislative Process* \(first report of session 2005-06\), HC 1097, 7 September 2006, para 58](#)

different treatment for such Bills, which will already have had substantial debate. Such a process will often not be necessary for Bills that have received parliamentary pre-legislative scrutiny: one evidence session—or, in some cases, none—would normally be appropriate.³

The *Concessionary Bus Travel Bill* (HL) was introduced into the Commons on 6 February 2007 and was debated on Second Reading on 14 May 2007.⁴ A Library research paper – *Concessionary Bus Travel Bill* (HL) (RP 07/19, 23 February 2007) – provides briefing on the main provisions of the Bill and summarises the main issues that emerged during Lords' consideration. A Bill Gateway is available on the intranet and the progress of the Bill, together with relevant documentation, can be tracked on the Parliamentary Internet.⁵

The Bill went into Committee on 5 June 2007 and was completed the same day, only taking two out of its four allocated sittings. The Committee did not take oral evidence but did receive written memoranda from Transport for London and the Joint Committee for the Mobility of Blind and Partially Sighted People.⁶

II Background

A. Report by the Joint Committee on Human Rights

On 7 February 2007 the Joint Committee on Human Rights published its Third Report, which considered the compatibility of the *Concessionary Bus Travel Bill* with the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). The Committee concluded that although the Bill is clearly a rights enhancing Bill under Article 8 ECHR, enabling older and disabled people to participate in the life of their community by providing free bus travel, there was an issue with Clause 9 of the Bill under Article 6 ECHR. The report states:

In the Committee's view the Bill raises a single human rights compatibility issue: whether the provisions for appeals against the setting of arrangements for reimbursement of operators required to permit concessions are adequate for the purposes of Article 6 (1) ECHR. This is an issue the Committee has often raised with the Government. The Committee considers that without access to an appeal to an independent and impartial tribunal, decisions by the Secretary of State on reimbursement pursuant to the enabling powers in Clause 9 may give rise to a risk of incompatibility. The Committee reiterates its frequently expressed view that where safeguards are necessary to meet a risk of incompatibility with Convention rights, those safeguards should be expressed on the face of the relevant Bill.⁷

³ HC Deb 1 November 2006 cc307-308

⁴ HC Deb 14 May 2007, cc401-447

⁵ http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/pabills/200607/concessionary_bus_travel.htm

⁶ Available to view at: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm/cmpbconcession.htm>

⁷ [Joint Committee on Human Rights, *Legislative Scrutiny: Second Progress Report \(Third Report of session 2006-07\)*, HC 287, 7 February 2007](#), p3

The Committee recommended that the Bill be amended to require the Secretary of State to make provision for appeals to an independent and impartial tribunal for the purpose of hearing appeals by bus operators in connection with reimbursement should he decide to exercise his power to take over administration of operator reimbursement from local transport concession authorities.⁸

On 3 May 2007 the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Transport, Gillian Merron, wrote to the Chairman of the Committee to confirm that the Government had “clarified the wording of the ECHR section of the Bill’s Explanatory Notes so that the impression is no longer given that the reimbursement of bus operators does not engage Article 6 ECHR”.⁹

B. Second Reading

The debate on Second Reading on 14 May 2007 was opened by the Secretary of State for Transport, Douglas Alexander. He stated that buses are at the heart of Britain’s transport system and highlighted the social inclusion benefits of buses, particularly in rural areas and for older and disabled people.¹⁰ In his opening comments the Shadow Transport Spokesman, Chris Grayling, warmly welcomed the Bill and stated that it would have cross-party support.¹¹

During the debate Members discussed some of those issues which had concerned the Lords when the Bill passed through the Upper House. These include: cross-border matters, funding, the impact on tourist towns, smartcards, and Departmental control of the scheme:

- **Cross-border matters:** The Secretary of State told the House that cross-border integration was an issue for another day when discussions would be taken forward with the Welsh Assembly and the Scottish Executive.¹² The Opposition Spokesman, Chris Grayling, sought assurances that funding problems would not undermine cross-border schemes that are already in place, supported by individual local authorities. He stated that some cross-border services had already been cut as a result of the April 2006 scheme.¹³
- **Funding:** Chris Grayling highlighted concerns about the funding of the scheme. He queried how the Government could be sure that the amount they had allocated would be sufficient, bearing in mind the experience of many authorities who, after the April 2006 changes, experienced budget shortfalls.¹⁴ Several other Members raised concerns about both the overall adequacy of the funding available to local authorities to operate the scheme and the way in which the

⁸ *ibid.*, p11 (para 1.19)

⁹ Letter from Gillian Merron MP to Andrew Dismore MP, 3 May 2007 ([DEP 07/1097](#))

¹⁰ HC Deb 14 May 2007, c401

¹¹ *ibid.*, c412

¹² *ibid.*, c402

¹³ *ibid.*, c416

¹⁴ *ibid.*, c414

funding is distributed, using the Formula Grant.¹⁵ David Clelland, a member of the Transport Select Committee, proposed ring-fencing the grant to transport authorities with 75 per cent allocated for the running of the scheme and 25 held back in a contingency to provide additional resources where the formula does not fully reflect the cost of journeys in any particular area.¹⁶ The Secretary of State highlighted the extra £250 million per year that would be made available to local authorities to fund the scheme¹⁷ and stated that his Department was working the Treasury and the Department for Communities and Local Government on a number of funding options with a view to reaching a decision in the summer on a preferred funding route. This would be followed by a consultation.¹⁸

- **Tourist towns:** Mr Grayling sought reassurance that the Government had thought about the potential impact of the concession on holiday resorts such as Brighton, Cleethorpes and Poole which have a disproportionate number of elderly visitors.¹⁹ In her winding-up speech the Minister stated that the Government is 'confident' that the extra funding provided will be sufficient and can be directed to where the extra costs fall in order to recognise 'hot spots' such as tourist towns.²⁰
- **Smartcards and ticketing:** The Secretary of State emphasised the importance of having a national pass that could be easily recognised in any area of the country.²¹ Mr Grayling asked that the passes should be ITSO-compliant²² when they are issued, even if the technology to use them cannot come on stream for 12 to 18 months afterwards. He warned that if this was not the case the Government could end up having to withdraw and replace passes within a short time frame, increasing costs.²³ The Minister did not think this approach practical and outlined what will happen in April 2008: the issuing of credit card-sized photo-passes with a national logo that can be recognised across the country; Freedom Passes in London will be stickered.²⁴
- **Departmental control:** The Secretary of State made it clear that any move to take the administration and reimbursement of the scheme under central control under clause 9 of the Bill could only happen following the laying of a Statutory Instrument subject to the affirmative procedure.²⁵ The Liberal Democrat Spokesman, Paul Rowen, highlighted the potential annual cost savings of £12 million from administering the scheme from the centre.²⁶

¹⁵ Ibid.; Mark Harper, c404; Bob Spink, c405; John Baron, c406

¹⁶ Ibid., c419

¹⁷ Ibid., c405

¹⁸ Ibid., c410

¹⁹ Ibid., c415; also raised by Mr Clelland, c418

²⁰ Ibid., c444

²¹ Ibid., c407

²² the Integrated Transport Smartcard Organisation

²³ HC Deb 14 May 2007, c416; also raised by Mr Rowan, cc421-422

²⁴ Ibid., c441

²⁵ Ibid., c410

²⁶ Ibid., c421

On 23 May 2007 the Minister wrote to the Chairman of the Public Bill Committee, Hugh Bayley, and offered clarification on a number of points raised at Second Reading. The letter also confirmed that the Government intended to put forward an amendment to extend the amount of time that bus operators have to appeal against local authority reimbursement arrangements from 28 days to 56.²⁷

On 30 May the Government published its draft specifications for the national bus pass; individuals are invited to comment on the proposals until 20 July.²⁸

III Committee Stage

The Public Bill Committee had 17 Members: two Liberal Democrat, five Conservative and ten Labour, including the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Transport and a Government Whip. The full membership is set out in the appendix to this Paper.

Commentary on proceedings at Committee Stage is provided in tabular format below.

Clause and Amendments	Debate and outcome	Column ref
<p>Clause 1</p> <p>Eligible services and extension of the scheme</p> <p><i>Liberal Democrat amdt 7 (taken with LD amdts 31, 32, 35 and Conservative amdt 15)</i></p>	<p>Taken together, the effect of the LD amendments would be to put on the face of the Bill a commitment to extend the use of the concessionary pass to other modes of transport. For example, there are no buses on the Isle of Wight; this would allow passes to be used on the Isle of Wight Ferry. The amendments would also allow the Secretary of State to exclude certain services which might now, inappropriately, fall under the concession – such as open-top tour buses.</p> <p>Conservative amendment 15 would require the Government to conduct a review of ‘eligible service’ after two years. The Conservatives chose to go down this route, rather than tabling amendments to extend the scheme, following debate at Second Reading and in the Lords which made clear the cost to the Exchequer of insisting on such extensions now.</p> <p>In her response, the Minister reiterated points made at Second Reading, to the effect that local authorities already have the power to vary their schemes beyond the statutory minimum should they deem it desirable and funds can be found. She did accept the principle of a review but not that it should be required on the face of the Bill.</p> <p><i>Amendment withdrawn.</i></p>	cc4-11
<p>Clause 1</p> <p>Extension of scheme</p>	<p>These amendments would extend the concessionary scheme to disabled persons who were unable to use a normal bus to allow them to use their concession on dial-a-ride and other</p>	cc11-18

²⁷ Letter from Gillian Merron MP to Hugh Bayley MP, 23 May 2007 ([DEP 07/1232](#)); this followed a similar amendment put down by Lord Bradshaw at HL Report stage (see: Amendment 25, HL Deb 29 January 2007, cc39-41)

²⁸ Relevant documents available on the Department for Transport website at: <http://collections.europarchive.org/tna/20070603170303/http://www.dft.gov.uk/consultations/open/concessionarybustravelpass/>

<p>for disabled persons</p> <p><i>LD amdt 28 (taken with LD amdts 8, 9, 10, 12, 27 and 29)</i></p>	<p>community services; to travelling companions required to assist disabled persons with their journeys; and to those whose ability to travel is impaired by a mental disorder. At the moment, the statutory minimum scheme does not cover these circumstances and it is left up to local authorities to decide whether to make any changes in these areas. Mr Hammond for the Conservatives supported in principle extending the concession to those with a mental impairment and to carers of disabled travellers.</p> <p>The Minister rejected the changes, again emphasising the freedom of local authorities to extend the scheme as they wish and also highlighting the cost of such extensions – e.g. £10 million per annum to extend the scheme to carers; £50 million per annum for those with a mental health impairment. She did state that the Department is engaging in discussion with the mental health charity Mind which may lead to an update in the guidance to authorities in assessing eligibility.</p> <p><i>Amendment 28 negatived on division 9-2; Conservative members abstained.</i></p>	
<p>Clause 1</p> <p>Extension of the scheme to under-17s in full time education</p> <p><i>LD amdt 11</i></p>	<p>This amendment would give the Secretary of State permission, at some future point, to include under-17s in full time education within the concessionary scheme; this would be similar to the scheme which already exists within London.</p> <p>The Minister responded with a similar argument to that used to the two previous amendments and put the cost of such an extension at £500 million plus per annum.</p> <p><i>Amendment withdrawn.</i></p>	cc18-20
<p>Clause 1</p> <p>ITSO-compliant ticketing</p> <p><i>Con amdt 17 (taken with Con amdt 18 and LD amdt 33)</i></p>	<p>This amendment would ensure that all passes issued for the concessionary scheme would be compliant with the ITSO standard, in effect that they would be smartcards. Mr Hammond argued that to start issuing cards that are not ITSO compliant would be a huge waste of resources. Conservative amendment 18 would tackle the issue of fraud prevention – critical for securing the back-end databases of information that would support the smartcard system.</p> <p>Liberal Democrat amendment 33 sought to ensure that passes issued in London (the Freedom Pass) comply with the national standard. The system presently proposed by the Government is to ‘sticker’ existing Freedom Passes.</p> <p>The Minister reiterated remarks made in the Lords when a similar amendment was tabled, to the effect that, although the Government agreed with its intention, putting ITSO compliance on the face of the Bill was not the best way forward. The consultation document²⁹ on passes says that the Government’s preferred option is that they should be ITSO compliant. Regulations will make that commitment clear.</p> <p><i>Amendment withdrawn.</i></p>	cc20-26
<p>Clause 3</p> <p>Requirement to report</p>	<p>Mr Hammond stated that the thrust of the amendment was to avoid in future the problems that have resulted from the free scheme introduced in April 2006 whereby there has been</p>	cc26-31

²⁹ mentioned at the top of page 11

<p>on reimbursement of operators</p> <p><i>Con amdt 16</i></p>	<p>confusion in many areas about the level of reimbursement from the local authorities to operators. In theory, reimbursement should be made on a 'no better, no worse off' basis; operators will often argue that they are not receiving the right amount while many local authorities have complained that they are effectively subsidising already profitable, large bus companies. This amendment would require the Secretary of State to conduct a review of reimbursement two years after the introduction of the scheme.</p> <p>The Minister agreed with the principle that there should be a review but did not think the amendment necessary. Government amendment 1 (see below) will extend the period during which operators can make an appeal against local authority reimbursement arrangements.</p> <p><i>Amendment withdrawn.</i></p>	
<p>Clause 3</p> <p>Funding arrangements</p> <p><i>David Clelland (Lab. Tyne and Wear) amdt 20 (taken with Clelland amdt 6, LD New Clause 2 and Con NC 4 and NC 5)</i></p>	<p>David Clelland's amendments 20 and 6 provide for adequate funding to local authorities to operate the concessionary scheme. Mr Clelland's amendments were inspired by the problems in his own metropolitan area of Tyne and Wear, but which have also occurred in other areas, of inadequate funding being made available from central government to fund the scheme and local authorities consequently being faced with either a deficit or having to cut other programmes to make up the funding. These amendments would guarantee a direct annual revenue grant to local authorities 'sufficient' to fund the scheme and would enable the Secretary of State to reimburse authorities where they incur a deficit of over £500,000 as a result of reimbursing operators.</p> <p>Conservative New Clauses 4 and 5 would introduce, respectively, a review of funding allocation arrangements, and an annual statement of funding. Taken together these new clauses would enable the Government to correct any problems and would give local authorities the opportunity to comment on how the arrangements are working in their areas.</p> <p>Liberal Democrat New Clause 2 would again ensure that the full amount was paid by government to local authorities and require the Secretary of State to keep a contingency fund should any difficulties arise.</p> <p>The Minister agreed that it was important to get the funding right; but she insisted that the amendments and new clauses were not necessary, that the £1 billion in total that will be provided next year will be sufficient and that the Government is working with the Local Government Association to ensure that the funding allocations are distributed correctly.</p> <p><i>Amendment withdrawn; NC 4 negatived on division 10-5; NC 5 negatived on division 10-5.</i></p>	<p>cc31-44; votes at cc65-66</p>
<p>Clause 4 and Schedule 1</p> <p>Operation of the</p>	<p>The operation of the London scheme prompted a great deal of debate both in the House of Lords and outside, between the London authorities, the Mayor and Transport for London.³⁰ At the moment the concessionary system in London (the</p>	<p>cc47-52</p>

³⁰ for full details, see Library [Research Paper RP 07/19](#), section IV, D

<p>London scheme</p> <p><i>LD amdt 21 (taken with LD amdt 22, 23, 24 and 25 and Con amdt 19)</i></p>	<p>Freedom Pass) operates differently to the rest of the country; if the authorities, the Mayor and TfL fail to come to an agreement on the annual concession there is no appeals procedure for the authorities and TfL/the Mayor can impose a scheme as they see fit. The Mayor's argument is that this ensures a minimum level of concession at all times; the local authorities argue that this is fundamentally unfair. Where there is a disagreement, this amendment would give the final say to the Secretary of State and allow him to continue the scheme for the current year with any changes that he sees fit.</p> <p>The Conservatives supported the Liberal Democrat amendments and tabled amendment 19 of their own which would allow the London authorities to appeal to the Secretary of State.</p> <p>The Minister argued in response that the effect of the amendments would be to force the relevant parties to agree and if they fail to agree to remove the London reserve scheme (as it is called) and roll-over present arrangements, neither of which would be practicable. She reiterated the Secretary of State's comment that this is a matter for the London authorities and TfL to agree before any changes to legislation could be proposed.</p> <p><i>Amendment withdrawn; amendment 19 negated on division 10-5.</i></p>	
<p>Clause 10</p> <p>Reciprocal arrangements</p> <p><i>LD amdt 13 (taken with LD amdt 14)</i></p>	<p>Clause 10 would allow for reciprocal arrangements to be made between England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland to recognise their respective concession schemes. This would mean, eventually, that those eligible would be able to travel on services across the UK. The Liberal Democrat amendment changes the wording of the clause to state that such arrangements 'shall' be made rather than that they 'may' be made.</p> <p>The Minister argued that until it becomes practicable for this to occur, border authorities already have the powers to extend their scheme into Wales or Scotland. She resisted the amendment to 'force' the issue on the face of the Bill.</p> <p><i>Amendment withdrawn.</i></p>	cc54-56
<p>Clause 11</p> <p>Application to the Isles of Scilly</p> <p><i>LD amdt 3 (taken with LD amdt 4 and 5)</i></p>	<p>Taken together, these amendments would make a special exception for the Isles of Scilly. The issue was also raised during debate on stand part of clause 2. Mr Rowen, for the Liberal Democrats, noted the analogy with the Shetland Isles, whose residents, under the Scottish scheme, enjoy ferry journeys to and from the mainland as part of their concession. The Minister stated that the relevant local authority (Cornwall in this case) could extend a similar concession to residents of the Isles of Scilly should it so wish; and also that the powers of variation set out in clause 8 would allow the Secretary of State to make extensions of this kind.</p> <p><i>Amendment withdrawn.</i></p>	cc27-29 and cc56-59
<p>Schedule 2</p> <p>Appeals period for operator reimbursement</p>	<p>This amendment was made further to the Minister's letter referred to above which followed the Government's acceptance of an amendment tabled by Lord Bradshaw (LD) at Third Reading in the House of Lords on 5 February 2007. The amendment will extend the time a bus operator has to appeal</p>	cc59-61

Govt amdt 1	to the Secretary of State about the reimbursement arrangements from the local authority from 28 days to 56. The extra time will mean that operators can gather more and better data about any new arrangements; it is hoped that this in turn will mean a reduction in the number of appeals and that those that are taken forward are more firmly grounded. The amendment was welcomed by both the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats. <i>Amendment agreed.</i>	
Concessionary bus fares council LD New Clause 3	New Clause 3 would make provision for a statutory concessionary bus fares council. The council would be composed of representatives from user groups, local authorities, and the Department; it would determine a framework for eligible services, pricing and smartcards and would have a duty to consult before decisions are taken. The Minister rejected the clause on the grounds that it largely replicates the work of the existing concessionary fares working groups and its effect would only be to put that group on a statutory footing. She reassured the Committee that the working group will continue after the new scheme comes into force. <i>Clause withdrawn.</i>	cc61-65

Three amendments were not selected. **Amendment 36** (to clause 2) and **37** (to clause 1) on eligibility were put down by Mr Clelland; these issues were included in the debate on amendment 7 to clause 1. The Liberal Democrats proposed leaving out **Schedule 1**; this matter was debated with amendment 21 to clause 4.

On stand part of **clause 9**, Mr Hammond sought assurances that any move to impose a centralised system would be subject to the affirmative procedure and subject to debate in Parliament. The Minister confirmed that this would be the case.³¹

IV Appendix – Membership of the Public Bill Committee

The Members of the *Concessionary Bus Travel Bill* (HL) Committee were as follows:

Chairman: Hugh Bayley MP

Members:

Blizzard, Mr Bob (Waveney) (Labour)
 Clelland, Mr David (Tyne Bridge) (Labour)
 Davies, Philip (Shipleigh) (Conservative)
 Hammond, Stephen (Wimbledon) (Conservative)
 Leech, Mr John (Manchester, Withington) (Liberal Democrat)
 Levitt, Tom (High Peak) (Labour)
 Mclsaac, Shona (Cleethorpes) (Labour)

³¹ *ibid.*, c53

Merron, Gillian (Lincoln) (Labour)
Moffatt, Laura (Crawley) (Labour)
Rosindell, Andrew (Romford) (Conservative)
Rowen, Paul (Rochdale) (Liberal Democrat)
Roy, Mr Frank (Motherwell and Wishaw) (Labour)
Scott, Mr Lee (Ilford, North) (Conservative)
Snelgrove, Anne (South Swindon) (Labour)
Spink, Bob (Castle Point) (Conservative)
Starkey, Dr Phyllis (Milton Keynes, South-West) (Labour)
Waltho, Lynda (Stourbridge) (Labour)

Clerk: Hannah Weston