



**OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF THE**

**STATES OF DELIBERATION**

**OF THE**

**ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

**HANSARD**

**Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 27th February 2015**

*All published Official Reports can be found on the  
official States of Guernsey website [www.gov.gg](http://www.gov.gg)*

**Volume 4, No. 5**

**ISSN 2049-8284**

**Present:**

**Sir Richard J. Collas, Kt, Bailiff and Presiding Officer**

**Law Officers**

H. E. Roberts Esq., Q.C. (H.M. Procureur)

**People's Deputies**

**St. Peter Port South**

Deputies P. A. Harwood, J. Kuttelwascher, B. L. Brehaut,  
A. H. Langlois, R. A. Jones

**St. Peter Port North**

Deputies M. K. Le Clerc, J. A. B. Gollop, P. A. Sherbourne,  
R. Conder, L. C. Queripel

**St. Sampson**

Deputies G. A. St Pier, K. A. Stewart, P. L. Gillson,  
P. R. Le Pelley, S. J. Ogier

**The Vale**

Deputies D. B. Jones, L. B. Queripel, M. M. Lowe,  
A. R. Le Lièvre, A. Spruce, G. M. Collins

**The Castel**

Deputies D. J. Duquemin, C. J. Green, M. H. Dorey,  
B. J. E. Paint, J. P. Le Tocq, S. A. James, M. B. E., A. H. Adam

**The West**

Deputies R. A. Perrot, A. H. Brouard, A. M. Wilkie,  
D. de G. De Lisle, Y. Burford, D. A. Inglis

**The South-East**

Deputies H. J. R. Soulsby, R. W. Sillars, P. A. Luxon,  
M. G. O'Hara, F. W. Quin, M. P. J. Hadley

**Representatives of the Island of Alderney**

Alderney Representatives L. E. Jean and S. D. G. McKinley, O. B. E.

**The Clerk to the States of Deliberation**

S. M. D. Ross, Esq. (H.M. Senior Deputy Greffier)

**Absent at the Evocation**

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller); Deputy R. Domaille (*absent*);  
Deputy M. J. Storey (*indisposé*); Deputy M. J. Fallaize (*indisposé*); Deputy E. G. Bebb (*relevé à 9h 51*) ; Deputy L. S. Trott (*relevé à 10h 40*) ; Deputy J. P. Le Tocq (*relevé à 10h 05*)

## Business transacted

Evocation .....	347
<b>Billet d'État III .....</b>	<b>347</b>
VII. Requête – Integrated Transport Strategy and Action Plan for Guernsey – Paid Parking and Bus Services – Debate commenced.....	347
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 10.25 a.m. and resumed its sitting at 10.42 a.m. ....</i>	<i>358</i>
Requête – Debate continued – Rule 13(2) suspended to allow amendment to be debated – Amended Propositions carried.....	358
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.42 p.m. ....</i>	<i>385</i>

*PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK*

# States of Deliberation

*The States met at 9.30 a.m.*

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

## PRAYERS

*The Senior Deputy Greffier*

## EVOCATION

# Billet d'État III

## VII. Requête – Integrated Transport Strategy and Action Plan for Guernsey – Paid Parking and Bus Services – Debate commenced

*Article VII.*

*The States are asked to decide:*

*Whether, after consideration of the Requête dated 28th October 2014 and signed by Deputy A.H. Brouard and six other Members of the States, they are of the opinion that paid parking shall not be introduced until a further report or reports of the Environment Department concerning the implementation of the Integrated Transport Strategy and Action Plan for Guernsey has/have been laid before the States and the States have:*

- (a) approved detailed arrangements for a benefit in kind or workplace parking levy in respect of the benefit that arises to employees with an employer-provided parking space; and*
- (b) expressly resolved to acknowledge that a free, robust, sustainable, viable, extended, decent and enhanced bus service has been in operation for at least six months.*

**The Senior Deputy Greffier:** Billet d'État III, Article VII – Integrated Transport Strategy and Action Plan for Guernsey – Paid Parking and Bus Services.

**The Bailiff:** I call on the lead requérant, Deputy Brouard, to open debate and lay the Requête.

5

**Deputy Brouard:** Thank you, sir.

First of all the Requête had a very big job to do. It was created back on 28th October, and I believe that it has been a catalyst of conscience for a lot of people and also a backstop for reason.

10 The requérants – I owe a debt of gratitude to the six who signed along with me, and I just would like to mention who the requérants are in this particular case, if I may, sir. That is myself, Deputy Collins, Deputy Domaille, Deputy Jones, Deputy Laurie Queripel, Deputy Spruce and Deputy Stewart. But each of those places could have been taken by another Member of this States, the feeling runs very high that if we are going to be punished – and I think it is punished –

with paid parking, we need to have all the promises, all those promises that Environment made to us back in May, to be well in place.

I was a little concerned at the response from Environment to the Requête. They start off by saying at the very beginning on page 257 that:

'this Requête appears to do little more than ask for that which has already been assured...'

That is exactly what the Requête does. Environment then get very uncomfortable with the actual words that I use, and how dare I use things like free and robust, sustainable or extended. As they say in the Report:

'This becomes more patently apparent when examining part (b) of the Requête. Here the Requête calls for "*a free, robust, sustainable, viable, extended, decent and enhanced bus service*". These adjectives are presented without any attempt to define the criteria that would need to be met before the Bus Service could be deemed to have passed the test. They are not defined, cannot be monitored and hence remain totally subjective. The Department is then required to deliver a bus service that meets these totally subjective, ill-defined requirements for 6 months and only after that time can it start to draft the States' report which needs to prove that these subjective, ill-defined requirements have been met.'

But they are not my words actually, those are the words of the Environment Department. They tell us on page 747 of the Minority Report, that we will have a 'free and enhanced service'. Those were their words, not mine.

They tell us that we will have a robust timetable. In *Hansard* page 459, the Minister, in the Minister's opening speech, said:

'...it must be reliable, this is a single most important factor but of course, it is not enough on its own, reliability is achieved by having a robust timetable.'

Environment's own words. I must confess here I did invent the words 'sustainable' and 'viable', but I thought they were reasonable to have in.

Then I get accused of putting in 'extended', but page 748 of the Minority Report says:

'It is proposed to increase both the frequency and number of routes which will make for a more usable service...'

I took 'increased number of routes' etc to be extended.

Then I am accused of using the word 'decent'. Now where did that come from? In *Hansard* page 526, Deputy Burford said:

'Paid parking is not proposed for a year. April 2015 is the earliest date that we would look at it and certainly not until a decent bus service is in place.'

Then I get accused of putting in 'enhanced', page 747 of the Minority Report paragraph 85:

'...a free and enhanced service...'

So, the only thing I am guilty of is holding a candle to Environment for the very words that they told us that they would provide. I think it was not very generous of them in their comments.

Now it is not for me to come up with a solution as to what a decent bus service is. Environment said that they would be providing a decent bus service – surely they know what that would look like, surely they are the ones who have got the skills, and the expertise, and the staff, to monitor the service as at present. They know what they mean by having a robust timetable. They will know what they mean by a free service. They will know what they mean by extended. They will know what they mean by enhanced. Therefore it is for them to have the criteria at the very beginning of what they are trying to achieve. They would be doing this anyway.

The Requête does nothing more than hold them to account to what they promised. So I think it is very telling reading Environment's own words that now they want to wriggle out of it, because they say that these words are subjective. Of course they are subjective. It needs them, as they

45 would do anyway before the contract starts, to monitor exactly what is in place and then to say, 'Actually we want this improvement, we want a 20% increase in efficiency, we want a 50% increase in customer service,' whatever. That is for Environment to put in place, and then return to the States and say, 'Actually, all those words we gave you back in May, we have delivered on them. We think we have now got a decent service because of this. We think we have got an extended  
50 service because we have added these routes. We think our quality service has increased because these are the customer surveys that we undertook before, and these are the customer survey that we undertook.' That is for Environment to do. That is what they should be doing and they were going to do anyway, because how would they know if the service has improved or not? So I think it is a little disingenuous of them.

55 The other part of the Requête basically requests that the States have approved a benefit in kind, and we heard yesterday from many Members that they were unhappy – I think Deputy Le Clerc was one of them – that Treasury had in fact not delivered on the requirement to come up with some form of benefit in kind. It is quite an easy amount to work out because it has to really be the same as what people pay on the Piers, otherwise it would not be that differential. So, if you  
60 are paying 60p an hour roughly on the Piers, then you need to have the benefit in kind as a cost to those employees of 60p.

So, this was part of the Integrated Transport Strategy and I am not going to repeat all of the words we had yesterday, but the very idea was that if we are going to have people coming in to Town, whether you park on the Pier, or park in the offices, in theory you are part of that  
65 congestion problem, if you believe that there is one.

Unfortunately Deputy Brehaut, I just heard him sniggering in the corner there – I think it was Deputy Brehaut – there seems to be a complete misunderstanding of what paid parking will do. Is paid parking a method of providing funding, or is paid parking a method to stop people coming in to Town? Well this is it, but reading an e-mail back to a lady called Helen, one of the Members  
70 of Environment Department said – Helen was concerned, she said, 'Please stop paid parking'. But the answer comes back, does not give any reasons as to why paid parking is a problem, and the Environment Members says:

'I care about the quality of life for all Islanders and those who live in heavily congested roads, both in and out of St Peter Port.'

Fair enough, but paid parking will not stop the congestion. Those who park in corporate garages will not be affected, and Environment has budgeted on the funds year in, year out for  
75 those car parks to be basically full at 85%. Look at the Minority Report, page 740 and it says that Environment will be looking for an 85% usage of those car parks day in, day out. In fact they will adjust the pricing structure to make sure that those car parks are full to be that funding cow that Deputy Gollop is so fond of. So it does not affect at all the heavily congested roads, if they are such.

80 The Environment Member goes on:

'I care about the safety of school children.'

But the safety of school children is not affected by paid parking. You have still got the people coming in to the journeys to pay your 60p an hour.

'Those walking on the pavements are at risk from cars who pavement surf.'

But again that has got absolutely nothing to do with paid parking. Those cars are still making that journey to go to pay your 60p an hour or to drive into the corporate garage.

'I care about young cyclists who do not feel safe on our very busy roads.'

85 But again, that is not affected by paid parking. You still want people to do those journeys. Environment are saying, 'Come on and make sure my car park is 85% full.'

When you start to really dig in to this Strategy, it just does not work.

'I also care about the elderly and other groups who are dependent on public transport.'

Well as we discussed yesterday, we are all, I think, pleased and would wish to have a reasonable public service offering, whether that is by taxi buses, or buses themselves, but that can be funded by all sorts of different methods. It does not have to be funded by paid parking. It could be funded by a duty on fuel. It could be funded by a parking clock, maybe.

'We must continue to fund and expand these vital social services.'

I do not disagree with that. I will give way for a moment, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

**Deputy Brehaut:** Sir, Deputy Brouard is reading from a response – all States' Members were e-mailed by a member of the public – Deputy Brouard is reading out my response to the member of the public who I assumed contacted us within the confidence of the States' e-mail system, rather than to have my response read out aloud in this Assembly and to the community broadly. I have no issue with what I said at all, it is just the fact that this is something that will become a regular occurrence and is it the appropriate protocol?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

**Deputy Brouard:** The response was sent e-mail wide or the request from Helen, which basically says, 'Please stop paid parking' was sent to all Deputies. The response from Deputy Brehaut was to all Deputies. I think that is as much in the public forum as it is. It is not so much the actual response, it is the mind-set behind it which I am trying to tease out. It is somehow that Environment are thinking that by having paid parking, they are going to reduce the number of journeys. But their own Strategy requires at least 85% of the journeys to continue, because that is what they planned for and they are going to adjust – so if they suddenly found that half the Piers were not being used, they would adjust the funding to make sure that they were, that more journeys would happen.

The Requête does nothing more than hold to account Environment for what they actually promised to the States last May. It means that those Members who yesterday were saddened that T&R were unable to come up with a method of charging, or taxing, those people who have the opportunity to park in a corporate garage, that that particular piece will have to be in place before paid parking comes in.

But of course, there is nothing to stop Environment... I understand Environment are coming back to the States in a month of two with their new plans after the width and emissions, to come back and say, 'Well actually, we would like to do this', or that or anything else instead. Those options are all on the table. All this Requête does is it ensures that the States have control over what Environment delivers.

Sir, if the Requête is approved today, and I hope it will be, it will do what Deputy Le Clerc wanted, which is it will ensure that we would have to have approved some method of benefit in kind to be in place to give that fairness across the *piste*. Now whatever that looks like, that is up to Environment and Treasury to come back to this States, or any Member to bring a Requête to show what it looks like. There is nothing to stop anyone doing that. So that would have to be in place.

And the other thing that would be in place is that we have this enhanced bus service actually up and running before we have the introduction of paid parking.

Now Environment should be doing monitoring already as to exactly what this particular improvement looks like, and I think Deputy Gillson yesterday gave a very good example of how you can track back, how many more routes have come on, how many more people are using it,



135 how efficient it is, is it where people want the routes. That is exactly the sort of analytical work that Environment should be doing, and would be doing anyway, if they really meant the words that they said.

140 Sir, I will encourage all Members: please, this does nothing more than hold Environment to account to ensure that we as a States have that chance to say actually, yes, we have got in place the benefit in kind for those people who are making the same journey into Town as the shop worker.

As we heard yesterday as well the Piers were built by the taxpayer for the taxpayer to be the engine room of the economy. In fact they were actually built more by chance in some ways as a place to put the silt, so in fact they were to create the marinas for the people who are parking in the garages now anyway, so that is quite funny, I think.

145 So please I would encourage all Members to support the Requête, because it does nothing more than it promises to deliver what you said you would do back in May.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb, do you wish to be *relevé*?

150 **Deputy Bebb:** Yes, please, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you.

155 Well, Members, under the Rules of Procedure you are well aware when a Requête has been laid before the States, the Chief Minister and the Minister or Chairman of any of the Departments or Committees who have been consulted in relation to the Requête are entitled to speak next. So I would be calling next the Chief Minister, but in his absence I will call the Deputy Chief Minister, Deputy Langlois, and then that will be followed by the Minister for the Environment Department and then the Minister of the Treasury & Resources Department, if they wish to exercise their right to speak at this stage.

160 Deputy Langlois.

**Deputy Langlois:** Well, thank you indeed, sir, for this wonderful offer. (*Laughter*)

165 I was not aware that the Chief Minister would not be here for this, and therefore forgive my somewhat halting delivery on this.

Basically, I must refer you to – and I think it is very important that people do read – the Policy Council's statement on page 260, it is a chunky paragraph there. It reminds me in some ways on re-reading it – and I remember when we approved this in Policy Council – of an episode of *Yes, Minister*, when the Minister says to the person who drafted the press release, 'Oh, well done Bernard, it means absolutely nothing'. And to an extent, as soon as you get a majority vote in the Policy Council, then that is what that statement should read. There was significant debate about it, there was significant disagreement about it, and I am sure that will emerge during the debate.

170 So, it is by a majority. However, I would say because I am danger here of insulting the person who drafted this, and so on. The logic in here is clear, it does follow the aspects of the Requête and a criticism of it as well and so on, so the Policy Council was not minded to take a position on this one.

If I could briefly then – do I speak separately on my own views, sir, or – ? I can get that over with quite quickly.

180 **The Bailiff:** You would not have the right to speak separately, no, so probably this is the right –

**Deputy Langlois:** Right, okay.

185 As far as my own views are concerned, I was always going to support this Requête. I fully understand people's views of saying yet again we are kicking it down the road, and so on and so

forth, but maybe it is because I thoroughly believe the psychology of behaviour change, if that is what we are aiming for, and certainly the feeling of the Assembly, albeit by a very small margin on each occasion, is we should be looking to change behaviour. I may not agree with that, but even if we are looking to change behaviour, then I would prefer to change it by carrots rather than sticks. I think that if we do not actually vote this through today, and we try to press ahead and impose paid parking, while there is considerably uncertainty about the quality of the bus service and the charges on it and so on and so forth, then I sense that it would be doomed to a period of difficulty and possible failure.

So, I would personally urge you to support the Requête.

**The Bailiff:** The Minister of the Environment Department is entitled to speak next if she wishes to do so. Deputy Burford.

**Deputy Burford:** Perhaps, sir. But I would like to ask the Procureur whether this complies with Rule 15(2), sir.

**The Bailiff:** Rule 15(2). Deputy Brouard?

**Deputy Brouard:** If it helps, sir, yes it does. *(Laughter and interjections)*

**The Bailiff:** I know there have been discussions between Deputy Brouard and the Treasury Minister and the Procureur on this. Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, as ever Rule 15(2) sir, is controversial in terms of its interpretation. However, the Treasury Department's view on Rule 15(2) is set out on page 259, and in essence our view is that the Requête itself does not comply with Rule 15(2).

Rule 15(2) of course only requires that an estimate of that increase in expenditure is provided, which indeed we have effectively done in our note of comment – an indication of how such an increase could be funded – I am not saying it must be funded, but it could be funded – and an explanation of any effect of this upon the States' Fiscal and Economic Plan.

Now, of course, in the explanatory note which appeared to Deputy Lowe and Brouard's amendment yesterday, which in effect would have had the same effect as this, was that Rule 15(2) had been discharged because that information was provided at that time.

So, sir, I would suggest that technically the Requête does not comply with Rule 15(2) because that information has not been provided. However, that information has been provided to the Assembly through the explanatory note to the amendment that was laid yesterday. However, technically in relation to this Proposition, sir, I would suggest in order for it to be effective then we would possibly need to discharge that, but it would be fairly easy for Deputy Brouard to discharge that I would suggest, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Right, thank you. That in itself does not delay debate on this. All it means is that Rule 15(2) is not complied, the Proposition does not take effect until a subsequent Proposition which does comply with Rule 15(2) has been carried. So, I do not see that that need delay debate.

Deputy Burford:

**Deputy Burford:** I will speak now then, thank you, sir.

Sir, I have little to add to that which is contained in Environment's letter of comment. This Requête is nothing but a thinly disguised Trojan horse in my view.

In a couple of months, Environment will be bringing a report to give States' Members a choice of funding options to replace the first registration duty. We will include all main options. The Transport Strategy initially proposed buses would be free, and yet an amendment at the time

changed that to an 18-month period, in the options we bring back Members will also be able to decide whether fares should or should not form part of the funding. This is not a position we wanted to be in, but the removal by this Assembly of the main funding element leaves us no choice.

I will, however, outline the many improvements to the buses for those Members who may not have had an opportunity to read the Department's briefing note, and for those listening at home. As of October 2014 we introduced a route 32, which is a reversal of the route 31, and a route 52 which is a reversal of the route 51, to make those circular routes much more user friendly. And route 51 was also extended to include Rectory Hill, Rohais de Haut and the Grange.

The parish route P1 serving St Peter's, St Saviour's the Forest and Castel was introduced on a small mini bus type service that is still disabled friendly, and that was introduced as a trial, we are evaluating that and deciding whether to continue for the summer period with that mini bus service, or whether to use that bus on a different route somewhere else to provide a linking service. One of the things we are possibly looking at is a service around Town, which would enable people living within a mile or a mile and a half of Town to get in quite easily on a frequent service.

As of October 2014, the route 71 was re-timed and re-routed to serve the Ville au Roi in both directions. The route 51 was extended to include Rectory Hill, Rohais de Haut and the Grange.

In May 2015 as the start of the new contract there will be a new route 22, which is a reversal of the route 21 and now serves the whole of the Route Militaire as far as the Vale Church. A new route 94 serving L'Eree Hill then L'Eree to Pleinmont, which is a reverse to the route 93, will be introduced. The route 11 will have enhanced frequency at peak times, the route 41 will have enhanced peak frequency.

The route 81 will be increased to half an hour frequency all the year round. There is improvement on the key corridors before 7.00 a.m. in the mornings on Monday to Friday, and before 8.00 a.m. on Saturday arrivals into Town on the routes 12, 41 and 52. There will be a bespoke extension to Blanchelande College on the route 71 at school times to assist people who wish to use that service for taking children to school. The route 61 will have an extra afternoon service to cover a service gap at 16.40. The route 21 will now return via the Vale Church and Route Militaire, and there will be a route 93 which now returns via L'Eree Hill to the Airport, in reverse to the route 94. This means there is at least half hour frequency at peak times on all except the coastal element of the route 93. Routes 11, 12, 41 and 42 will have 15 minute frequencies on key corridors from The Bridge, St Martin, La Moye and Town all day long.

There will be a new fleet, the Environment Department is continuing with its capital bid through the SCIP process to procure at least a third of the fleet as new vehicles, with the intention that those vehicles are on Island during the first year of the contract, and further fleet replacements will take place in subsequent years of the contract.

The contract with CT Plus also provides for CT Plus to refurbish the existing vehicles that are now renewed by the States which continue in service. The vehicles will be sent to the UK for refurbishment and therefore the scheduling of refurbishment is reliant on the arrival of the new vehicles as part of the new fleet, in order to generate the required fleet spare capacity.

Options to expedite refurbishment through using loan vehicles are also being explored, and there will be a public vote on the redesign of the bus livery. CT Plus has already ordered new GPS enabled ticket machines which will facilitate better data and real time information. Alongside the new ticket machines new smart cards will be issued. The new smart cards can be configured in many different formats and the Department is now working with CT Plus to identify the preferred smart card set-up.

As I mentioned, the new ticket machines and smart cards will enable a far more sophisticated data capture and report generation. The machines will also to a significant degree reduce the manual input from the drivers, thus reducing data errors that can result from manual input. A key element of the new ticket machines is that they will record in real time. As a result fares will be able to, if charged, will be able to be recorded more accurately to specific routes, stops and times. Equally, and in many respects more importantly, the real time feed will mean that people can track

their bus. Relaying the real time information to the public will be achieved through the bus website and through mobile apps. This system will provide for further information, diversions, notified to the contractor in sufficient time, will be uploaded and impacts on bus routes and stops will be shown on the mobile enabled web and app pages. Passengers will be able to input their route details and the interactive route and timetable analysis will enable a route specific timetable showing buses transfers and timing to be generated, and if required, printed. As the map is linked to live data feed live bus stop times can be displayed on the web page or the app.

There will be a rolling annual marketing campaign to promote the services and to promote their new enhancements as they become available. Many of the elements above, such as the branding, new fleet arrival app release and testing will be the subject of specific advertising campaigns.

There will be a programme of outreach in order to promote the service, receive feedback, and answer questions. This programme includes meetings held in each parish during the year, meetings with stakeholder groups, and the creation of an advisory committee.

CT Plus will engage with disability groups and train all staff in meeting the needs of disabled people. Obviously ensuring the new buses meet the needs of disabled people will be a key specification element for the States, but the contractor will also work with the States to identify which bus stops work best for disabled people, and where enhancements can be made. The website and app will be developed with the needs of disabled people in mind.

The contract provides for more staff to be employed and this will principally be in respect of drivers, but a training officer and marketing officer will also be recruited. On-Island staff will be supported by resources in Jersey and the UK.

It will be appreciated that many of the elements above will not be directly, or immediately, visible to passengers, but the Department has made it clear that much of the work required in improving the quantity of the service is already complete, and that the concentration is now on the quality of the service. All the above elements are considered key in delivering a competent, trained and caring work force and delivering a quality service.

I urge people to reject this Requête.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Next the Treasury & Resources Minister is entitled to speak if he wishes to do so. Chief Minister, do you wish to be *relevé*?

**The Chief Minister (Deputy Le Tocq):** Yes, please, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** Thank you, sir.

Briefly the Treasury & Resources comment on the Requête is set out on 259 and 260. I think we have already covered the Rule 15(2) point, as I say I think that can be discharged relatively easily should the Requête succeed in order that Rule 15(2) is fully discharged.

The comment on page 260 in relation to the preparation of capital reserve for the bus depot has probably been superseded by the events of last month's meeting in terms of the shortfall of funding generally, and I think clearly the Treasury & Resources Department will have that issue in mind in any event irrespective of whether this Requête is successful or not.

Sir, the Proposition (a) of this Requête does specifically refer to there being an approved detailed arrangement for benefit in kind or work place parking levy in respect of that benefit that arises to employees with an employer-provided parking space. Given yesterday's decision, sir, the Assembly should be under no illusions in considering this Requête that the Treasury & Resources Department and indeed based, not least on the advice of HM Procureur, does regard itself as having discharged the Resolution in the Report last year, and indeed having discussed the matter last night with the Minister for Environment who, of course, drafted that Resolution, I think she is

of the same opinion. Therefore we do not intend to do any further work on a benefit in kind or work place levy scheme.

However, of course, we are the servant of the States, and it will therefore be incumbent on the States to direct us should they wish to provide a clearer direction, which would clearly be necessary, in order to meet the terms of (a) of the Proposition in the Requête. So, at some point if this Requête is successful, it will be necessary for someone, either by Requête or by States' Report, to bring the matter back in relation to the benefit in kind, and to provide detailed instructions as to those issues which my Department should be considering in applying such a scheme, and that would include, for example, issues such as the geographic limitation of the scheme, the value of the benefit in kind, whether there should be any exemptions for the disabled or for those who require their car during the course of their job, whether the charge was to be based on availability of the space, or merely the use of the space, and whether that test itself is a daily, weekly, monthly or an annual test, how part timers are to be treated and so on. As I say – the point that I am seeking to make, sir, is that if this Resolution is successful there would be considerably more work required before any benefit in kind scheme could come into play. That is not work that the Treasury & Resources Department would be undertaking without specific direction from the States, which would need to be triggered in another way, sir.

**The Bailiff:** I can now throw debate open to others. Does anyone – ? Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Gollop:** Sir, when Deputy Langlois in his kicking off the debate in due process mentioned *Yes, Minister* or *Yes, Prime Minister*, I thought the joke might be that he would actually commend Deputy Burford, as Sir Humphrey always said in his suave mandarin manner, 'Very brave, Minister', and. I think Deputy Burford has been very brave, and very sanguine throughout this whole process. Because there has been, as Deputy Brehaut reminded us, a death by a thousand cuts, in that many of the commentators who have said, 'Well it is all falling apart' have actually contributed to that situation, and that is still happening today, to a degree.

What I would like to point out is that I think the issues raised in the debate yesterday, that Deputy St Pier has just alluded to, especially the excellent speech by my colleague here, Deputy Le Clerc, on the work place levies. I think there is still room for the Environment Department to look at that, and go back to Treasury & Resources, and it is certainly true everything Deputy Burford said that we are going to look at solutions to these problems and work a pragmatic way forward on a number of different funding options, because of the decisions of the States taken in January.

What I would also say is that it is very important that the whole States co-operates together on matters such as this rather than having a kind of silo mentality.

My points today really will be on two different themes. The first is a response to what I consider to be an excellent, very thought provoking, and as one would expect, extremely well researched, scrutinised analytical address yesterday by Deputy Gillson. Deputy Gillson pointed out from his experiences as a school boy etc. that in 1979 there were perhaps 700 journeys per day compared to an approximate 340 to 380 that we are doing. Now I would have to research that more carefully, because the definition of a journey is of itself controversial, because in those days some of the routes were circulars, now almost all of our routes are circulars, and in the case of route 11, that Deputy Burford mentioned, it is, of course, a core corridor route going at times every 15 minutes, and it goes from the Airport to Bordeaux via the Bridge, and so it is effectively two journeys because it is going both northward and southward at the same time.

Nevertheless the broad points been made, my estimations of the classic 1950's, 1960's, 1970's era was that we had approximately 35 departures per hour from Town, and in recent years it is about half that. So I would say – it has probably gone up a bit since then – it is broadly right, although I think Deputy Gillson exaggerated. I think the correct figure would be somewhere between 500 and 600, and of course you are probably quoting for the summer timetable.

To give a quick history lesson on the buses, and I brought here *Railways in Guernsey* which is pertinent here: 1979 was actually a very significant year, because it was the centenary year of the

395 Guernsey Railway, which, of course, had started out as a steam railway from Town to The Bridge, and then became a tramway, and then became a bus operator.

400 The reason it is significant is that it was the last full year Guernsey Railway ran, it had a glorious centenary, and if you had given the States' Members in the Assembly here the details of how many journeys the Guernsey bus company operated in December 1980, I can tell you, it was zero, because in November 1980 it closed its doors because it went bankrupt. The working practices, the scale of operation and the way in which it was not supported by the States at that time – we have a golden glow of remembering past Assemblies as being perhaps less worse than us, but they were not always. I have to say the 1980's Assemblies may have been very successful in putting the bedrock to our current legislation and finance sector, but they let many things go. They let self-catering cottages go, they saw the decline of the tourist sector, they saw the end of the Little Theatre, The Odeon, The Gaumont and the end of the Guernsey Railways style of buses, 405 and its transference to a football tycoon from the UK for a while.

**Deputy Perrot:** I was not responsible...

410 **Deputy Gollop:** No, of course you weren't. *(Laughter)*

**The Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Perrot. *(Interjections)*

415 **Deputy Gollop:** The point I was making was, that that combined with the excellent arguments Deputy Perrot mentioned yesterday about the potential revenue raising of the North Beach, meant that we sabotaged commercial bus operation. Everything that had given them trade had gone, and although I accept many of Deputy Lowe's arguments about car being king and all the rest of it being part of people's lifestyles, one has to see this as not a zero sum gain. If you have a society like Guernsey probably was in the 1950's where many people worked in Town and shopped in Town and probably 8 out of 10 people regularly used a bus, you could afford to run a viable service every quarter of an hour on every main route on the Island, every 10 minutes to the Bridge and L'Ancrese. 420

Once those numbers dropped and you had a minority using the buses, say a third or less, you then either have empty buses or you cut, and what was happening was as the services went down 425 from maybe every quarter of an hour to every half an hour to every hour to every two hours. Longer and longer circulars to cover more and more parts of the Island to support the surviving numbers of passengers. The more part of the population uses cars, and there is free parking, the more the other part of the population loses a choice that is affordable. Because either the cost of the fares become unaffordable or the services are withdrawn completely.

430 We went through many different bus companies, quite a few of which had struggled to survive in one way or another. I have to say that in the golden era when I think the traditional service reached its peak in the 1960's when tourism was a factor, the Guernsey Railway – and its sister companies, as it acquired all the five independents between the 1950's and the 1970's, including Watson Greys, the Bluebird – purchased 59 new vehicles during the 1960's from Albion and 435 Bedford. In the 1970's they only were able to purchase 18 new vehicles and one second hand. In 1980's and 90's the bus companies only purchased second hand vehicles for a smaller fleet. They were now acquiring second hand London vehicles no longer purpose built for Guernsey and they were down to about 40, 50 vehicles, instead of the 110 that existed in the 1960's and 70's.

440 The point I am making is that there was not the money available to invest in the future of the industry.

Now, the States from 1994 onwards has subsidised it, partially successfully. If you look at the timetables of the early 1990's when the PTOA and the new States' Traffic Committee got more robust with the bus operator, they rose their fares as high as £1.30 a journey for the longer distances, but they were operating roughly 22 journeys for Town at peak. We are still not back up 445 to that level, we have cut, although I would say our networks are more efficient than those were.

What we did see though was we went up from a low of 750,000 passengers a year in the 1990's to a high of 1.5 million per annum in the middle of the last decade, during the period when Deputy De Lisle was Minister. That dropped, we do not know the reasons, the economy, slight changes in tourism, changing demographics and, of course, the FTP cuts to the service, but it did not drop by much, I think it went down to 1.3 million. Now it has gone up again, we are seeing a consistent rise and rise.

The point I am making is to sustain the service you have to take a broader context of why we are here, and until you look at that level you will not understand the way forward. Deputy Gillson in a way is quite right, the services are not at the level that they should be because they are not quite – we could not repeat the 1970's network anyway. It was far too concentrated on guest houses which have gone, it was for a different era, and it did not serve modern areas like Admiral Park, for example, and those kind of places. So you cannot go back in time.

But to create an equivalent service of that nature for today's society, I believe would cost, I believe, probably £9 million to £10 million a year, that could be funded in two ways, either from the public as a whole, or £4 million from fares and the £5 million that we provide in the grant. There are many different ways of doing it. We are not at that level yet but we could get to that level, but we have to start from the position we are in. The States has contributed to the situation. Who sold the bus depot and turned it into corporate housing. The States did –

**A Member:** No it didn't.

**Deputy Gollop:** So you know – (*Interjection*) The States re-zoned the Guernsey housing site. So that is the context.

Now I come on to the second aspect of where we are at. I am sometimes accused of sitting on the fence on these issues, I would put it more accurately that I am spectator at a football match in which I am observing two sides who go out to battle, and they have been going out to battle in this way for 20 years. The same two sets of teams evenly matched with their arguments, and instead of finding a way forward, a common goal, a solution, each side will use every opportunity to win or lose by one vote in this Chamber. We have got to be bigger than that.

We have got to realise that this issue includes at least three different elements, firstly conserving our environment and maximising our economy. Any marriage of those two principles has to say traffic congestion is a bad thing. And lost time through unnecessary congestion is an unnecessary evil. So a traffic strategy makes sense for both parties.

The second aspect of this is the funding of a good bus service. That is a priority that many Members have perhaps not put at the top of their agenda, not just today but in the last 20 years.

The third is raising money from the public to pay for essential public services that are nothing to the Integrated Transport Strategy whether that be health, education or whatever.

I am just going to put things in a different way for a minute. Imagine Deputy Bebb is a future Health and Social Services Minister (*Interjections*) and he put forward a radical plan for an obesity and fatty foods strategy in which the States collectively decided to tax pop, colas, sugar drinks, chocolate, sweets and so we had a fatty foods tax. I could see many, many debates which would argue that it was regressive, it taxed the poor, it was unfair on people with certain diets, certain addictions, you would have all of that. There would be retailers, food warehouse people, they would all be arguing their case, and the reason we would get into that argument is we would be mixing up the States' role as an educator with the States' role in terms of funding essential desirable public services. I think we have been a bit in this situation for many, many, years because of the hypothecation elements.

We turn back to the Requête, which I do not support, let's go through every paragraph logically – (*Interjections*) well quickly. It is only four paragraphs.

Paragraph 2 defines the additional services and routes. The Minister has outlined clearly that some new services and routes have been introduced and others are to come. The free travel aspect has itself been put into question by a previous decision of the States. We are directing

Treasury & Resources to investigate, but the tax on benefits ended in a kind of own goal, where we do not quite know where we are, and so that is really otiose, that argument, because that States clearly did not support a rejection of Deputy St Pier's policy letter or indeed the amendments.

Then we come on to a decent bus service in place. But the requérants have not defined what they consider to be a decent bus service, but we as a Department have defined improvements to the services both currently and for the future.

So all the points in the Requête we covered, or are covering, and for consistency sake the arguments that have been placed by the requérants in many cases they themselves have not supported. So the States really should reject this and wait for the Environment Department to come back with a pragmatic, but also principled way forward, to move society onwards away from the sterile debates of the last 20 years.

**The Bailiff:** Members of the States I am aware that there is an amendment that is likely to be moved, I know Deputy Bebb wishes to close debate or apply to close debate under Rule 14(1) but knowing that there is an amendment circulating, what I am going to propose is that we take a short recess so that Deputies Brouard and Lowe can consider whether they wish to move the amendment that I know has now been drafted by HM Procureur. If they wish to do so, the Departments concerned can also have an opportunity to consider their response to it, and we will resume at the conclusion of that.

**Deputy Lowe:** Thank you for that, sir.

We were going to ask if we could actually have a break to enable the Environment Department, Treasury & Resources and indeed States' Members to be able to have a read of the amendments...

**The Bailiff:** Well that is exactly what I am proposing, so I propose that we take a recess of I would suggest... well, it is now 25 past 10. I suggest we come back at 10.40 in 15 minutes. Those in – well, everyone is in favour. *(Laughter)*

*The Assembly adjourned at 10.25 a.m.  
and resumed its sitting at 10.42 a.m.*

**Requête –  
Debate continued –  
Rule 13(2) suspended to allow amendment to be debated –  
Amended Propositions carried**

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott, do you wish to be *relevé*?

**Deputy Trott:** Yes, please, thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you. Right, when we rose, it was to see whether Deputies Lowe and Brouard wished to move an amendment. What is your position on that Deputy Lowe?

**Deputy Lowe:** Indeed, I would like to place this amendment, please, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Right, the first thing then is a motion under section 7(1) of The Reform (Guernsey) Law 1948 to suspend Rule 13(2) and any other provisions the Rules of the Procedure to the extent



necessary to permit the amendment set out below to be debated. That is a procedural motion which is taken without debate. Are you seconding that motion, Deputy Brouard?

**Deputy Brouard:** Yes please, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Right, well I put that motion to you, Members, you have it in front of you, on the amendment that has been circulated to you in the recess, and I would just remind you it is to suspend Rule 13(2) and any other provisions of the Rules of Procedure to the extent necessary to permit the amendment set out below to be debated. Those in –

**Deputy St Pier:** Sorry, sir, would you mind if I sought clarification? Presumably that wording ‘any other provisions’ would also suspend Rule 15(1) as well?

**The Bailiff:** Yes. So Those in favour, please say aye; against, no.; those against.

*Some Members voted Pour, some Members voted Contre.*

**The Bailiff:** I will require a recorded vote to call that.

**Deputy Le Clerc:** Sir, can I just clarify what we are voting on? Sorry.

**The Bailiff:** Sorry, Deputy Le Clerc?

**Deputy Le Clerc:** Just to clarify, sir, what we are actually voting on, that is to suspend the Rule.

**The Bailiff:** To suspend the Rule. You want some clarification as to what Rule 13(2) says, is that right?

**Deputy Le Clerc:** I think that would be useful.

**The Bailiff:** Well Rule 13(2) is the Rule that says that:

‘A Member who proposes to move an amendment or sursis’ –

an amendment here –

‘other than one proposed on behalf of the Department or Committee... [*inter alia*] ... to a proposition relating to taxation, fees or other charges bearing on the revenues of the States.’

I think that is the part of the Rule that would otherwise be engaged. Is that right, Mr Procureur?

**The Procureur:** Yes, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Yes. So anybody moving an amendment relating to taxation, fees or other charges bearing on the revenues of the States, must furnish the proposed amendment to various people not later than three o’clock on the day preceding the seventh clear day before the meeting. So in other words a good week’s notice should have been given of this amendment, that has not been so, and it can only be laid if the States resolve to suspend that Rule to enable this amendment to be laid now, and Rule 15(1) is the Rule that provides, and I read it:

Where, in relation to taxation, any alteration is moved and is opposed or is not assented to by the Minister of the Treasury and Resources Department, the Presiding Officer, if he considers that more mature consideration should be

given to the advisability of passing or rejecting the proposed alteration, shall rule that a vote thereon shall be postponed until the views of the Treasury and Resources Department have been laid before a Meeting.'

585 So in other words it is a Rule that would enable T&R to give further consideration to the proposal if they wish to do so. That is also being waived if you support this motion. I hope that is clear.

Deputy Bebb.

590 **Deputy Bebb:** In relation to Rule 15(1), could I ask whether the Treasury & Resources Minister would be so minded as to request further time for consideration?

**The Bailiff:** No. Because we do not have debate on a procedural motion. I think. If we start entering into debate then there will be no limit to where we go –

595 **Deputy Brouard:** Mr Bailiff?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

600 **Deputy Brouard:** Thank you, sir.

To make it absolutely clear, if Members wish to have the opportunity to debate this extra amendment they need to vote Pour.

**The Bailiff:** Yes, –

605 **Deputy Brouard:** Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** – and if they do not want to debate it, they vote Contre.

610 I put to you again the motion to suspend Rule 13(2) and any other provisions of the Rules of Procedure to the extent necessary to permit the amendment set out below to be debated, and we will have the recorded vote.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 30, Contre 14, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3*

**POUR**

Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Sherbourne  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Stewart  
Deputy Gillson  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy David Jones  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Le Lièvre  
Deputy Spruce  
Deputy Collins  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Adam  
Deputy Perrot  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Wilkie  
Deputy De Lisle

**CONTRE**

Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Conder  
Deputy Bebb  
Deputy Ogier  
Deputy Duquemin  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy James  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Quin  
Deputy Hadley  
Deputy Harwood  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Robert Jones

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Deputy Storey  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Domaille

Deputy Inglis  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Sillars  
Deputy Luxon  
Deputy O'Hara  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. McKinley  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Langlois

615

**The Bailiff:** Well, Members, the result of the vote on the motion to suspend Rule 13(2) and any other provisions of the Rules of Procedure is 30 votes in favour, 14 against, I declare the motion carried.

Deputy Lowe can therefore lay the amendment. Deputy Lowe.

*Amendment:*

1. *To insert immediately after 'opinion':*

*'1. To rescind their Resolutions of 14th May 2014 on Article VI.5, VI.5A, and VI.24(b) of Billet d'État IX of 2014';*

2. *To delete the remainder of the Proposition and substitute:*

*'2. To approve the introduction of a chargeable annual disc parking clock for short stay and long stay parking in all disc zones in St Peter Port and in the rest of the Island at a charge of between £30 and £50 per annum in accordance with detailed proposals set out in a further report to be submitted to the States by the Environment Department.'*

620

**Deputy Lowe:** Thank you, sir.

I thank the Members that agreed to have this debated.

625

There is very little to add to be honest, it is a very clear amendment. It is to rescind the Requête and in place to actually approve the introduction of a chargeable annual disc parking clock for short stay and long stay parking in all disc zones in St Peter Port, and in the rest of the Island at a charge of between £30 and £50 per annum, in accordance with the detailed proposals set out in a further report to be submitted to the States by the Environment Department.

630

Sir, it was said in debate by a few people yesterday that they would like an alternative, and so parking clocks were actually mentioned during debate. This goes back to my principle of fair for all, or not at all. I thank Deputy Brouard for seconding this amendment. I am also conscious as well, sir, that there has been quite an outcry from the public about yesterday's vote. There was a 6,000-plus petition proposing paid parking and so therefore the benefit in kind we have heard from the Minister this morning of Treasury & Resources, it would be a very difficult thing to bring forward, because where would you have the geographical line for Town as well, and I concur with that. It will be a nightmare if we have to go down that route.

635

I am asking for the States to go down the simple route, parking clocks was in the original report, and I voted against it at the time because there were other things on the table including benefit in kind. Now that is gone, I would actually ask States' Members to support this amendment, please, sir.

640

**The Bailiff:** Thank you. Deputy Brouard do you formally second the amendment?

**Deputy Brouard:** Yes, sir, thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier.

645

**Deputy Ogier:** Sir, I would like to ask you whether this goes further than the original Proposition.

**The Bailiff:** It does go further than the original Proposition.

**Deputy Ogier:** May I take the next step then, to ask whether the States wish to commit this?

**The Bailiff:** Right. Well, it is two things: either you can ask me to put a motion that the amendment be not debated and no vote taken thereon, or that debate on the amendment be postponed. Do you want it to be not debated or merely postponed?

**Deputy Ogier:** Not debated please, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Not debated.

Members, I then put to you the motion that this amendment be not debated and no vote taken thereon. That will take effect if supported by a majority of the Members voting. So a simple majority will decide this, one way or the other. So the motion is that the amendment be not debated and no vote taken thereon. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Contre.*

**The Bailiff:** It will be debated.  
Deputy Brehaut.

**Deputy Brehaut:** Thank you, sir.

I rise to speak early because Deputy Brouard said to me that actually you need to support this, or he implied I did, because this was my idea anyway some time ago. I want to be clear, a parking clock is only part of any funding solution for a road transport strategy. *(Interjection)* This, if Deputy Lowe would let me finish, this means that you no longer have a strategy of any type whatsoever.

Yesterday Deputy Spruce said, 'It is quite simple. There are 50,000 motorists out there – charge all of them.' Okay even the poor. The poor that were referred to yesterday, the elderly who struggle. What you are saying to the people in social housing that have contributed their tax and insurance over the years, we know are on limited and fixed incomes, we know that Deputy Le Lièvre and his team at SWIBIC are looking into issues like this. You want them to pay £50 a year for perhaps going into Town for however long. How frequently do they do that? So the person that uses it every day out of necessity that uses that space every day they pay £50, for the person the elderly members of our community that use that space extremely infrequently they too pay £50. That is simply unfair.

If we were serious yesterday, if we really were serious, because people cited those on low and fixed incomes and their ability to pay and actually they are not the users of the long stay parking, but now you want to get them within that net. You want to ensure that they are paying. It is no longer a strategy. A strategy works because you identify a problem, you identify the pinch points and you work to resolve them. This does not resolve congestion. This does not stop thousands of people pavement surfing. This does not mean that people walk their children to school. It does not mean that people will be able to cycle with confidence. It means, 'I am paying – I am going to use it because I have paid my £30 or £50.'

Why £30 or £50 – what is the science behind it? It is such a vague number, the proposers of the amendment believe that you just may go for it, because it is either £30 or £50. It is simply wrong. It is no longer a strategy.

Deputy Brouard said in his speech before now, he would rather walk over hot coals than support paid parking, *(Interjection)* so this is the type of amendment we are going to see to block paid parking. What happens when we report back? If the States' Members are of the view that charging the people of Guernsey the £20 or £30 or £50, whatever, is the panacea, the cure-all, the remedy for this Island's traffic ills, it clearly is not.

700 If I was T&R I would support this. If I was on T&R, it is easy money and gets Environment off of our back. It is easy money, everyone is going to pay. The motorist is the cash cow. People have ridiculed Deputy Gollop in this – Deputy Gollop is actually misquoted – you are now saying the motorist of any age, of any ability, on any income, fixed or otherwise, is the cash cow, go to that cash cow and milk it, because you do not like paid parking, and you do not even believe this congestion.

705 Please Members, throw out this amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon and then Deputy Hadley.

710 **Deputy Luxon:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

Sir, I could not disagree with Deputy Brehaut more.

I fully supported the integrated Transport Strategy that Deputy Burford laid, and have remained supportive of it all the way through. We have seen it being unpicked. I desperately want to see the positive attributes within the Strategy that will actually help behaviour change that the Department has under way. I want to see those happen. I am going to support this amendment. What it does is it resolves the issue of the funding, and the inequality of us not pursuing the benefits in kind charges, for those people that have the benefit of parking within their work places. That inequality for me is the thing that has changed my mind now.

715 So as Deputy Green said, flip-flopping – well, I am flop-flipping, I want the Environment Department to have a chance to deliver the Strategy, and I do not agree with Deputy Brehaut that the Strategy does not exist if we move with this amendment. I think we have a chance to actually get out of the starting gate and get on with it and make it happen. Let's use the additional funding to help with education, and to help with the behavioural change that we need and we want.

720 So I regret that we are revisiting, revisiting but we have followed the course we have, and I will support this amendment as being a sort of slightly ugly compromise, but one that lets us get on and lets Environment get on with delivering their Strategy.

725 Thank you.

730 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Hadley and Deputy Robert Jones and Deputy Bebb.

**Deputy Hadley:** Mr Bailiff, I have been criticised on a number of occasions for advocating government on the hoof when I have brought a Requête, and a Requête Members have two months' notice to consider the issues involved, and here we have the most senior Member of the Assembly suspending the Rules to bring forward an amendment on the hoof which has not been given the proper consideration that it should have been.

735 I do disagree with the last speaker. This is against the whole tenor and purpose of the Strategy. It is not going help reduce car journeys by bringing in this blanket charge across the Island, and I urge Members to reject this amendment.

740 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Robert Jones.

**Deputy Robert Jones:** Thank you, sir.

745 I agree with Deputy Brehaut. I think it undermines the principles of the behavioural change that the Strategy was seeking to achieve. Last night a lot of the Facebook messages that I read were concerned about short term parking, and a lot of the criticism was that it was not clear that we had still had free short term parking. Now what we have got here now – and also the other comment was, what is next is going to be Island wide paid parking, and this is what we have got. We have got Island wide paid parking. People were a little bit more relieved last night when they realised that they could still shop for three hours. We have got Island wide parking here. It really does undermine what we have been trying to achieve over the last year.

What I was going to say previously, before the amendment was laid, was to thank Deputy Burford for highlighting the enhancements that have already been made to the current bus service, and for also highlighting the enhancements that we can expect to see from the service under the new contract.

I think after yesterday's vote, what I was going to say was that it is time to let Environment get on with the implementation of this Strategy. We are constantly putting barriers before them that impedes any effective implementation. So I think it is time that we see beyond just those elements that relate to the car, and start to look at all the other benefits that are going to evolve from what was, up until today, an Integrated Transport Strategy. I have been a bit disappointed actually with the way things have proceeded over the last couple of days, and I think that it is time we put some trust in a Department to get on with the job that they were mandated to do quite clearly by the States last May, and let them get on with this job. This undermines the principles and I definitely agree with Deputy Brehaut, and I am sure that there are others that will speak on behalf, and I wait to listen to what Deputy Burford and other Members of Environment say, but I am a little bit disappointed with this amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb and then Deputy Le Tocq, then Deputy Stewart.

**Deputy Bebb:** Members, there will be ample opportunity to debate paid parking again, because there will need to be legislation brought forward. So the idea that we are not going to debate paid parking is folly. Of course we will have to debate it when the Ordinance or whatever means of legislation comes before this Assembly. So we are going to debate paid parking them, we have already debated it during the Transport Strategy. We debated it yesterday on the benefit in kind we are debating it today because of the Requête. This amendment seeks to bring yet another report. I do not know about other Members but I am little tired, but of course, that is part of the aim of this amendment is to wear down the energy of those people who have managed to bring paid parking to the fore. It is tiring and I have to say that it does not really do – it does not really fit in with any form of behavioural change.

Finally, in relation to the funding gap, I understand that the Environment Department are thinking of bringing forward a report in order to address that funding gap. So are we to see a report on addressing the funding gap, and then a further report as is required by this amendment, and a further ordinance which we are going to be debating. I mean how many times in one Assembly can we debate paid parking, and what is tiring is that we seem to attach so much import to paid parking when in all honesty matters such as the Personal Tax and Benefit Review, which are going to have a far greater repercussions on people's lives is where we should be devoting our efforts.

Please throw the amendment out, throw the Requête out and let's go home. *(Laughter)*

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

**The Chief Minister (Deputy Le Tocq):** Sir, actually I am in favour of a form of paid parking disc, particularly because it was in the original report, and it seems to me that there is an element in which it helps to balance things, particularly perhaps because others might be drawn in, like visitors into the system. There are all sorts of reasons.

But, sir, I am against this, because this is a Requête and now it is a totally different Requête to the Requête that we had before. Sometimes requérants make an issue of the fact that they want to do things and they ask us to speed up the time in which we need to have proper consideration by all the Department concerned on this. We have not really had that opportunity today, we have not had an opportunity to discuss and get information on the effect of the Propositions that are now before from us from officers, and whilst there might be some merit in doing an element of this, certainly not at the charges that are being suggested here.

I think a paid parking clock system on an annual basis may well work at the sorts of levels that it was first thought about, as part of an integrated strategy. But, this sir, is for me just an example of bad government. I do not believe that it is incumbent on this Assembly to be doing things in this manner. It is the wrong way of going about our government. We need to do things in an appropriate way and the fact that we have to again suspend Rules of Procedure in my mind is a terrible sign.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Stewart and then Deputy Gollop and Deputy Conder.

**Deputy Stewart:** Yes, Mr Bailiff.

A couple of Members have already said about behaviour change. I think the difficult where we are so many things is it has been a lot of stick and not an awful lot of carrot. I think if you really want behavioural change it is going to take a long time, because unfortunately what the buses are is an extremely damaged brand. Now whether you get the service up and running it takes a long time to get those people back on.

I spent several careers, but mainly my focus was on sales and marketing, and I look to Deputy Duquemin who has also spent a lot of his career in sales and marketing. When you sell something to someone originally and they have a bad experience, trying to get that customer back is one hell of a job, and it is going to be very uphill. I do welcome, in the context of what the Environment Minister has said, we are going to have apps thereon we are going to have real time information we are going to have this and we are going to have that – great – when I see it, and fantastic if it all works, but I think this is the problem there is not only outside but also within this Assembly, there is a gap here of trust and actually seeing something delivered.

The other thing that really concerns me around getting people back on the buses is whether as a company they really are settled, because I have spoken to someone who purports to represent the drivers. He called me to say that actually not everything is hunky-dory there, and looking at the wages that are being paid £10 an hour for a bus driver is being advertised in Guernsey, which does not seem – as we were talking the other day about comparing with London where I know the bus drivers there earn £30,000, which is £15 per hour on a 40-hour week. So, I do wonder whether we will actually see this stability.

The other thing that really concerns me about the bus contract is when you pay someone a lump sum to deliver it, where is the incentive to improve. If part of that contract was based around the fares, then there is a real incentive to improve because you can make a bit more money, and as they say put it back into the community. So, I am very sceptical now of what we are going to see, in common with many members of the public, because even if we had a brilliant bus service tomorrow, it is going to take a long time to market and get those people back on the buses to get that public confidence back. That is going to be a long haul I know that from bitter experience of buying companies that were down and out and then re-launching them and spending the money to rebrand and get customer confidence back.

In terms of where we go with what I now call the 'disintegrated transport strategy', *(Interjection)* I think I will support this Requête because £1 a week for a clock is reasonable and it will help fund some of the initiatives which I did say there are initiatives within this strategy that I am supportive of. So, to cut off the funding totally, and I think was in the initial report, and I think there are members of the public out there who think that £1 a week on your parking clock is a perfectly reasonable charge. I do not think that will affect poor people, I think that is quite affordable. It is £1 a week. It is not even a litre of milk.

So I will support this Requête, sir.

**The Bailiff:** I take it you have spoken generally on the Requête, so you will not be able to speak again.

**Deputy Stewart:** Yes, I have, sir.

855 **Deputy Brehaut:** May I seek a clarification, sir?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

860 **Deputy Brehaut:** The bus contract went through the States' procurement process which all Departments use, the Culture and Leisure, C&E rather, use it. Is the Minister saying he has no confidence in the States' procurement process that delivered the company to deliver our bus service, sir?

865 **Deputy Stewart:** What I am saying is the way that is scoped out, I do not think that is a contract which encourages performance from the person you are contracting with, because there is no incentive for them to improve their service. They get the same money whether it is a good, bad or indifferent service. Yes there are fines, but they are very difficult to put through.

*[Inaudible]*

870

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford, can you put microphone on if you are going to...?

**Deputy Burford:** Sorry, sir.

875 The Department sent out – in respect of what Deputy Stewart has just said – the Department did send out a comprehensive briefing paper to all States' Members, which I take it Deputy Stewart has not had time to tread because if he had he would know that there are incentives in the contract in order to increase ridership.

Thank you.

880 **The Bailiff:** Members can I ask that we come back to focusing on the amendment before us rather than the details of the bus contract which is not before the States.

Deputy Gollop.

885 **Deputy Gollop:** Yes. I have not actually had a copy of the amendment, but I think I know where it is coming from. *(Laughter)*

**The Bailiff:** Does anyone else not have a copy of the amendment? No. Everyone else has a copy.

890 **Deputy Gollop:** It is superficially attractive, but I am not going to support it. I think Deputy Rob Jones and Deputy Brehaut have already made some stunningly good arguments about this. I am going to put a slightly different pitch on it. Firstly we know from Deputy Burford that we as a Board are very busy at the moment, and we have already started the process of looking at a portfolio, a *potpourri*, a menu of different options, for raising money for the Strategy. So this is premature.

895

Now people say this is a compromise, but it is not really, because it takes us into completely new territory. Let's look what it says, it does some minor changes about turning back two and a half hours to two hours and so on, but its main line Proposition is

'To approve the introduction of a chargeable annual disc parking clock for short stay and long stay parking in all disc zones in St. Peter Port and in the rest of the Island at a charge of between £30 and £50 per annum...'

900 Now we have heard many arguments from different people. I pick on Deputy De Lisle – it is quite curious, as a side issue, that we seemed to have stronger Town representation at times from non-Town Deputies, Deputy Lowe and Deputy De Lisle on Town issues than you hear from us on occasions – but those two have gone on about the retail situation in the Old Quarter and the rest of Town.



905 The Strategy makes clear that the behaviour that was being targeted for change, or indeed the real estate, that we are looking at was for long stay commuters. This brings in short stay, for the first time in this Assembly we are actually have a Proposition to bring in a form of paid parking for every conceivable shopper.

910 Imagine the little – I should not say the little old lady, forgive me – but imagine the older person who likes to come into Town once a week for coffee, a mooch around the shops, she is not well off, she comes in in an older car to meet her friends, or the kind of people we know who live in the country and normally shop in St Peter's or St Martin's or Cobo. They will suddenly be taxed. They will have to pay £50, nothing to do with being a commuter, being in a well-paid job or a less well paid job. This affects pensioners, it possibly affects tourists as well. Because I cannot see the argument why a non-Guernsey registered car or an H car would be exempt, presumably the H car companies would have to buy them tickets.

915 But what about people who have second cars, third cars, what about people who shop at The Bridge and park in disc zones there or in St Martin's? It affects them as well. This targets exactly the kind of people we do not... There I am accused of being a cash cow merchant. This actually finally makes motoring a cash cow, because everybody, whether they are working or not, rich or not, is obliged to pay. It is semi regressive, because the effect on the retired person on a lowish income is as great as on a person who is an executive in an establishment who does not have their own private space. For the person who uses Town once a year, or for the person who uses Town every day, it is the same price.

920 I could not think of a bigger disincentive to stop shoppers coming in to Town and looking round the Commercial Arcade, The Polit or the High Street when they can go to their friendly supermarket or corner shop, which has its own parking provided for nothing. Why are we doing this? We certainly would need to fine tune this and look at it in a great deal of depth.

To support this today at five minutes' notice is the worst kind of government imaginable.

930 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Conder.

**Deputy Conder:** Thank you, sir.

935 Sir, I feel as if we are locked in to some sort of ghastly version of *Groundhog Day* – (*Laughter*) destined forever to be returning day after day to discuss paid parking or some version of it. A prospect which fills me with such horror, only surpassed by the thought of PERRC being reconstituted. (*Laughter*)

Sir, I did not speak in yesterday's debate, I had prepared a speech but I sensed the frustration of the Assembly, perhaps epitomised by the Chief Minister's statement partway through, and I chose not to speak although I had prepared a speech.

940 I do rise and for many of the reasons that have already been alluded to will oppose this amendment.

945 Perhaps just before I would like to thank Deputy Brouard for his comments yesterday about obtuse comments – or obtuse comments in relationship to the provision of paid parking which, of course, this again seeks to remove, this amendment – Deputy Brouard is such a gentleman, he apologised to me 24 hours before he referred to me. I could not possibly take offence at anything he said about me yesterday, and I certainly did not. A long while ago in the House of Commons, Chancellor Denis Healey referred to Deputy Howe being attacked by Deputy Howe as asking to being savaged by a dead sheep. Being attacked by Deputy Brouard is perhaps more like being savaged by a cuddly teddy bear, (*Laughter*) so I could take no offence whatsoever.

950 Sir, the debate on this amendment once again creates a ghastly sense of *déjà vu* as yet again, having sent a Department away to work to bring into effect Resolutions we so recently approved, we attempt to frustrate them. I cannot help that we as a Government spent our first two years diligently working to reduce our costs, in part by reducing the size of the work force that supports us, and in our final two years we are seriously working to re-incur those costs through needlessly wasting the time, the efforts, the energies of some of our best, and most effective, and not least

most expensive public servants. Surely, sir, there has to be a better way of conducting our affairs than the path we seem to be currently set upon.

960 Sir, in the first part of last year I and the majority of this Assembly approved an Integrated Transport Strategy, as Deputy Jones said earlier. In supporting it and voting for it I knew, or perhaps I suspected, that it would not be the definitive solution, and over time it would need to be finessed, perhaps changed or added to, none of us could predict with certainty how it would work out, any more than we could ensure any of the strategic plans that we endorse but at least it offered a way forward. It was an Integrated Strategy and it did offer the potential for addressing the issues associated with our finite infrastructure, and offered better opportunities for all users of  
965 our roads and byways, be they car drivers, users of public transport, cyclists or pedestrians.

So, we sent Environment Department away to put their Resolutions into practice. They engaged their most senior public servants and our Law Officers to prepare the legislation in accordance with our instructions. Having done that and returned to us what do we do? We progressively dismember the Resolutions we so recently approved, by refusing to support the  
970 legislation to put them into effect. Sir, compared to many of my colleagues I am inexperienced in terms of how our Government works, but it seems to me that to conduct ourselves in this way, whilst undoubtedly democratic, is neither good nor effective Government.

Sir, this amendment and the Requête seeks to frustrate yet another pillar of the approved Integrated Transport Strategy, just as our rejection of the width and emissions legislation did last  
975 month. I know that paid parking is an emotive issue within our Island – it is almost a totem of the freedom of the Guernsey man and woman. Indeed I have even seen correspondence that suggests the removal of the right to park ones car free, free of a charge on taxpayer owned and maintained land is an infringement of human rights.

Sir, as other colleagues have said the introduction of – as suggested in this amendment – of a  
980 parking clock is in effect a tax, a general tax on every person that owns a car. Whether indeed apparently they use parking spaces or not. The public parking spaces or not. So the individual, to use the example the individual who uses their car to drive from their house to their family and back again. There are people who very rarely use their cars, they are going to have to pay this. It is a tax. In fact why not just put it on income tax, if we have got to hit everybody. Sir, this  
985 amendment is designed, as I said, to frustrate and wreck the Integrated Transport Strategy. A set of policies which are years in the design and approved by this Assembly. If it is our intention to destroy the opportunity to devise a long term strategy for moving around this Island well approving this amendment will be part of achieving that goal. We will once again have wasted many hundreds of hours of staff time and left this Island once again with a mish-mash of  
990 overcrowded dangerous and polluted roads, a car parking strategy which misallocates States' resources, and makes no economic sense, and a bus service which will limp along until the next crisis. We should be better than that. This is not the way to govern. This is not the way to present amendments and present policies to this Government.

Colleagues, reject this amendment, give the Integrated Transport Strategy a chance, in the  
995 knowledge that it is iterative and incremental process, which is capable of adaptation but at least offers a different and potentially much better way forward for this Island.

Sir, I urge colleagues to reject this amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to – ? Deputy Dorey and then Deputy Harwood.  
1000

**Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, sir.

I wish to speak on the Requête and also on the amendment.

In 2002, the then States' Traffic Committee sent out a questionnaire to all homes and it was comprehensive on traffic it had a very good level of engagement. In fact there was 3,905 replies. I  
1005 think if you look around and you think of other strategies and the amount of replies that we have had to them, 3,905 is an extremely comprehensive reply. Obviously it was sent to all households both sides had equal chance to express their views and on long term paid parking, all but 145, 4%

had a view, 55% supported paid parking for long term stay car parks and 45% were against. Sir, I think that is, people talk about petitions and everything, I think that has been the most recent comprehensive view of public opinion on paid parking, and they supported paid parking for long term spaces.

The other factor which people have not referred to is that in the Minority Report it spoke about the fact that the long term parking fees could be halved if you had low emission vehicles. So, there was – people talk about 1,200 but in fact if you want to half that you could have a low emission vehicle.

I now speak about the amendment. This is just paid parking by a different way, isn't it? It is paid parking paid by the infrequent user subsidising the frequent user. (*Interjection*) That is exactly against the whole strategy, the whole behaviour change that we are trying to achieve. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I mean the States has got to get behind a strategy. We cannot consistently vote for a strategy and then vote for taxes which are completely against that strategy, and this is exactly what this is. It has no relation to usage of car park. As has been said, I think I could talk about my in-laws – they very infrequently go into Town, but because they do go at odd times, they would have to pay the fee. It is totally unfair, it is wrong, and – (*Interjection*)

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

**Deputy Brouard:** I was just going to suggest to Deputy Dorey that they could actually go by bus, which was part of the idea, I thought! (*Interjections*)

**Deputy Brehaut** 11:25:08 But they would be paying the £50 regardless.

**Deputy Dorey:** We are trying to encourage short term parking and people who go into Town for short term, they go in to look at the boats in the evening, whatever.

Sir, I think this is totally against the Strategy. I was amazed to hear Members of Commerce & Employment supporting this. What about the tourist industry? If we have people mentioned about hire cars but what happens if we have cars which come over for a week to Guernsey they would have to pay the £50 if they want to park. That is totally wrong, isn't it? Or are you going to say if it is say a non-local number, that they will not pay. Well what about all our guest workers who bring in cars which have got non local plates? Sir, are they going to be able to park free of charge? This is grossly unfair.

Deputy Burford mentioned earlier in the debate that they were going to bring back a report on the financing of the Strategy. That is the responsible time for this House to consider other ways of financing (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) – not this last minute amendment. It is totally wrong and no matter what your views are, I think you have to accept that the right political process, and I urge Members no matter what their views to reject this amendment, reject this Requête and wait for a proper report, where we can consider the ways of financing the Strategy. I consider this to be a desperate last minute move.

I could quote, because Deputy Brouard and myself put forward an amendment which was supported by 28 to 15 in May, which was to remove parking clocks and replace it with an increase in fuel. I could read from Deputy Brouard's speech from *Hansard* where he spoke about the amount of time it would take, the waste of time in buying the clocks. We all can remember what happened with motor tax when people had to renew their motor tax each year and the massive queues they had, and how they had to bring it in on different months of the year. This is not simple. It will cost a lot in bureaucracy, it will cost a lot in Civil Service time, and it will not achieve what we want from the Strategy. I strongly urge you to reject this. This is bad politics.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Harwood and then Deputy Dave Jones.

**Deputy Harwood:** Thank you, sir.

I just at this stage wish to speak on this particular amendment. Others have expressed very eloquently the consequences of adopting this particular proposal, the unfairness, the inequality, the impact of a global charge on parking discs.

Sir, I will not add to that. I would merely say that this time last year or in May last year, we had a choice on strategies. The Transport Strategy. The majority of this Assembly elected to choose to support the Minority Report. The key element of that Minority Report, which I fully endorsed, and which as a Member of the Environment Board I am very happy to implement. One of the key differences between the two reports was the issue of paid parking. That was the key issue. Now I would draw to the Members' attention and the focus has been on the actual the charges for the disc, but to focus on paragraph 1 of the amendment. It says:

'1. To insert immediately after 'opinion':

"1. To rescind their Resolutions of 14th May 2014 on Article VI.5..."'

And the explanatory note says Article VI.5 'introduction of paid parking'. If you adopt this amendment we are just actually going back over the same ground we went through yesterday, when we by on a tied vote rejected the previous attempt to throw out paid parking, if you go down this amendment you accept this amendment, then you are going back and you are saying no to paid parking. This is going far further than the original Requête.

I accept that that has already been considered, but I urge all those who supported the Minority Report, the Strategy that was debated last May, to remember that if you go down this route you approve this amendment then you are rejecting in totality paid parking. (*Interjection*)

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dave Jones.

**Deputy David Jones:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff, Members of the States.

I keep being told that we are unpicking this Strategy and we keep going back. I never supported any of it from the get-go. (*Laughter*) Quite a number of other States' Members did not either. (*Interjection*) So we are not unpicking anything, I never supported it because I do not believe in a free bus service.

I think the people who use the buses should pay towards them. (*Interjection*) It stopped being a Strategy several debates ago to be honest. Originally unpicked by the Environment Department itself. It is really no good them now blaming other States' Members for unravelling more of it because it is not a strategy that was the original Strategy that was presented to this Assembly. I do not want paid parking clocks, I do not want paid parking, I do not want any of it, *but* as a pragmatic way of trying to move forward, and I do want a public transport system, I am willing to change my view on this particular issue. It will do as many have said, it will affect everybody who owns a car in the Island. But the costs of that as Deputy Stewart has pointed out are about £1 week.

Now providing – and why it has to be £50... The amendment says £30 to £50 – all of a sudden we will automatically go to the highest figure, because that is what the Government does. It will be a very small charge, but it is a much fairer way than penalising people who happen to work in Creaseys or somewhere else in Town. If there is any fairness – people say, 'Well it is not very fair that my relative who only drives to Town once every August Bank Holiday or whenever should have to pay for that' – but there are lots of things, as we know, in life that are not fair.

As I say, I do not want any of this. I would vote to throw the whole lot out, given half a chance, but as a pragmatic way forward the Deputies have come up with a way of making it fairer in my view.

The other thing is one of the major problems of this whole thing is that Environment simply cannot make up its mind what paid parking is supposed to do. Is it supposed to reduce congestion, bring in money, alter behavioural change, they do not really know what this paid

parking is for, other than the fact that we need the money originally to put towards a public transport system.

I am afraid if we were still discussing the Requête, which we do not seem to be... We heard from Deputy Burford this morning about all the improvements to the bus service, which is a bit like jam tomorrow, but if only we could just get the motorist to pay and we get this money then the bus service will improve over time. If you are going to have a bus service and you are expecting people to pay for it through paid parking it has to be a monitored service, to make sure that the service is giving a deliverable service to the people who brought in paid parking to make that happen. The Assembly was split right down the middle yesterday over paid parking or not. The very least you can do, all of you, is to make sure that if you are going to force paid parking on to people that the bus service is a proper bus service. You do not even want to do that now.

Well you are saying we will take Environment's word for it that things are improving. That is disgraceful. If you want to introduce punishment taxes on a handful of people but you do not really care whether the buses are going to run properly or otherwise (*Interjections*) because that will come tomorrow – (**A Member:** Shame, shame!) Well, wait for the evidence then, Deputy Brehaut.

**Deputy Brehaut:** I am sorry –

**Deputy David Jones:** No I will not give way. Wait for the evidence. Have a properly monitored period of time where the buses can be monitored to make sure that the service is an alternative, a viable alternative, to people using their cars, and you might have some sympathy. No wonder the public do not understand us.

This Requête – and I am sorry to go back to the Requête again, sir, through you – was trying to hold Environment to the promises that it made. Now this amendment, because nobody knows whether that Requête would have got through or not, because we might get back to it later, but as a pragmatic way forward I am prepared to say to Environment, 'I want a decent public transport system and I understand that you do need funding for that, but the fairest way is through this parking clock system.'

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Perrot and then Deputy Lester Queripel.

**Deputy Perrot:** I am not sure what I want to say, so if you bear with me – (*Laughter and interjections*) Yes, I know.

If you go down the steps to my study, (*Laughter*) you have to be a bit careful if you do it on a Friday evening after one of my gin and tonics, but if you do that, quite apart from admiring my lovely display of –

**Deputy Conder:** Sir, could Deputy Perrot speak into microphone.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Conder cannot hear you, Deputy Perrot.

**Deputy Perrot:** If the Presiding Officer were to walk down the steps into my study, well he would have to be careful on a Friday evening after one of my gin and tonics. (*Laughter*) I am quite sure he would admire my display of daffodils and primrose which are tastefully put on a revolving bookcase on the left as you go in, (*Interjection*) but on the right your eyes will look upwards towards a rather elegant photograph of me as a younger man. This photograph was on my manifesto in 2012 and that is the point.

In my manifesto I said, one of my five points, that I was in favour of paid parking. I know that I have said it before. I had hell for that during the election meetings, but nevertheless that is what I believe in, and I still believe in that, but I have been persuaded that the idea which I had in mind,

which was to have ticketed parking at our urban car parks, I have been persuaded that that was probably rather too brutal, and that is why I think this idea of parking clocks for which we pay – we pay already for them, but there is a principle in force, we have accepted it, that we do pay for parking clocks already, but the idea of having an annual payment is for me very attractive and I think that probably I was going too far in my original idea about ticketed parking of the sort at the moment being contemplated by the Environment Department.

I commend rather than criticise Deputy Lowe and her seconder for bringing something forward, which is actually a form of compromise, and it does represent a proper debate. So often in this Chamber we do not debate, what we do is to come here with pre-prepared speeches which we are going to read out come hell or high water (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and we do not actually respond to what other people are saying. I think that this is in a real tradition of a real debating Chamber, and I wish it would happen far more. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

I do not think it was right, of course, for the Treasury Minister to bring his preposterous (*Laughter*) amendment yesterday, but we have kissed and made up, by the way. (*Interjections*) So I am... and I am sorry about this, I will continue until they kick me out, to be a Member of the Treasury Board, but if we were to adopt this, it is not as Deputy Brehaut says easy money. No money which is raised publicly is easy money, and my goodness me, we have received criticism.

I had a chap in a car yesterday, as I was cycling past him in Mount Row, wound down the window, said he was not going to vote for me again, because I voted in favour in effect of paid parking. I was not quick enough to say, 'Well I hope you did not vote for me last time because it was actually in my manifesto.' (*Laughter*) But it was quite clear that he was so angry with me I did not really want to tempt him any further. But the point is that any money which the States takes from anybody else, it is not an easy way – nothing is easy at all – but I think that this is easier. There is more justice in it than the way I contemplated originally.

Now, of course, we have had the arguments brought up that people who can only barely afford to own and use their cars are going to be terribly penalised. Well, I am afraid it is a fact of life that if you make a decision to own a car you are accepting that there will be the possibility of very great variables relating to the cost of running that car. Fuel costs change – at the moment it is wonderful, isn't it? We are down to 50% of where we were this time last year, but it can go the other way, and that is what we saw in the 1970's. We also see that the cost of running a car vary massively, much more than £50 a year when the insurance experience is a bad one, and we have seen it through the whole of the car insurance industry very much more substantial premiums which are put on our annual premiums in successive years. We also see, of course, variations in maintenance costs for cars, because if someone is buying perhaps not a terribly good car and something really rather nasty happens, in the woodshed as it were, all of a sudden, one can find oneself with very substantial costs of repairing that car.

The point that I am making is, you actually take on a risk when you have a car, and the risk, the extent of the risk, is much more than the spectrum of £30 to £50 which we are talking about here.

Now Deputy Le Tocq, our beloved Chief Minister, says that it is bad government to go along with an amendment such as this. Of course, he is entirely forgetting the absurd amendment which he put yesterday in relation to ecclesiastical rates. (*Interjection*)

**A Member:** It is longer than that. It was the day before yesterday.

**Deputy Perrot:** I'm sorry?

**A Member:** It was the day before yesterday.

**Deputy Perrot:** Oh gosh, time flies, doesn't it, when you are in this Chamber? (*Laughter*)

Deputy Kevin Stewart, I was not entirely sure what he was talking about. (*Laughter*) He got terribly excited at one stage and told us he was very good at buying companies which were down and out which he then somehow turned around. Anyway he was obviously telling us he brought

about miracles. Well we do need some sort of miracle, it seems to me, if we are going to have a proper bus service of which we are proud, and at the same time keep within our own fiscal constraints.

Just to take up a point which was made yesterday by Deputy Gillson. I originally saw paid parking as the *quid pro quo* of a free bus service. I have said that I have altered my approach to paid parking in that it ought to be a softer approach to paid parking. I also think actually that I was wrong about a completely free bus service, I saw one as paying for the other. I do not see that now. I accept the argument which people have made to the effect that for people to value something they have got to pay something towards it. Clearly they cannot pay the whole of the cost of running the bus service out of bus fares, but I think that there has to be some sort of fare imposed.

Deputy Gollop was talking about cash cows and that cars are cash cows, I got a little bit lost in the linguistics of it, but it does seem to me that he is happy for a car to be a cash cow when it says it should be a cash cow but he does not want it to be a cash cow when it says it should not be a cash cow. So the weather is variable at his end of the debate.

Anyway, I am not going to pick up on other points which other Members have made. As Deputy Conder said, my God, this is a *Groundhog Day* – we have heard all of these things far too often, you have heard them far too often from me. So I will just end by saying that I commend the proposer and seconder for the compromise which they have come up with.

Now there is one other thing I want to say. People are very happy to come up with anecdotal chit chat what they have heard when they have so busy going around the various constituencies and whatever, and I do not believe much of it, but I mean (*Laughter*) we do hear it all the time.

Well can I say this, whereas I have been roundly condemned by Uncle Tom Cobbley and all, including his nephew, niece and grandson, for supporting paid parking, The one thing which I have heard from a lot of people is, 'Well if that were payable by way of a parking disc, I would be okay with that.' (*Interjections*) Now I cannot accept that that has the accuracy of some of the polls which other people come up with.

Although I think the sort of poll which you see expressed in *The Guernsey Press* where a reporter goes up to someone and says, 'Don't you think paid parking is awful?' I watch it and generally it is a result other than that which was sought to be achieved. The same on the wireless, but certainly consistently those who have criticised me have given me an out in a way by saying that paid parking via a parking disc would be very much more acceptable. There we are.

Deputy Harwood simply got a little bit overexcited again, I have got nothing to say about him. (*Laughter*).

I will support the amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel, then Deputy Ogier and Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, it is ironic that I should follow Deputy Perrot because I am not a drinking man. (*Interjections and laughter*) I am glad I am not a drinking man, because when I got home last night after our debate yesterday, I was so depressed that had I been a drinker I would probably would have drunk far too much and regretted it this morning.

The reason I was so depressed was because despite the valiant efforts of 21 Members of this Assembly to dispense with paid parking in our Town, it still continued, and that to me and many Islanders was extremely depressing.

But thankfully today, sir, we have another opportunity to address the issue of paid parking in our Town. I am reminded of the time in this Chamber, just after the debate on the La Mare de Carteret School rebuild when in the words of Jerome Kern and Dorothy Fields, Deputy Sherbourne told us he realised he had to pick himself up, dust himself off, and start all over again. I resonate with that, sir, because the public did not elect us to sulk and get depressed when things do not go the way we want them to go.

I rise to merely introduce a little clarity into the debate. Because some Members are inferring that by voting in favour of this amendment, we will be voting in favour of introducing the parking clocks themselves. But that is not the case, because what you will be doing by voting in favour of this amendment is voting for a report to be presented to this Assembly that will contain proposals, and then we will debate those proposals at a future date, and I ask Members to bear that in mind, sir, when they come to vote.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier.

**Deputy Ogier:** Thank you, sir.

For the first time in a couple of decades, maybe longer, in the transport realm we came close to something that will actually make a difference, a well balanced set of proposals that actually stand a chance of delivering some meaningful change. Anything which results in change, however, seems to be beyond the tastes of many States' Members and I find that very sad.

Why vote for a Minority Report vote in the team which brought it and then dismember it? Take out the width, take out the emissions, suspend the Rules of Procedure, amend a Requête, ignore the fail safes which were in place to handle changes in States' income, take out paid parking. Why support a Minority Report and do that? What a waste of States' time! (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

Why vote in the Environment Department Board and do that? What a waste of politicians' time. This carefully thought out, innovative, creative Strategy will have been supported then dismembered, and that sends out a number of unfortunate messages. One, that this Assembly is not in favour of creative, innovative solutions, and prospective political candidates who are observing would now think that they should be very, very careful about pursuing a time in politics if this is the way that policies are treated.

Another more fundamental issue is that the population can never, never be sure of what will come out of a States' debate. As one set of proposals go in on a Wednesday and what comes out on a Friday can have no relationship whatsoever to the position only a few days before.

We have had no consultation with Islanders, this comes out of the blue. It is completely different, it is unexpected, it is unpredictable, it creates uncertainty. That does not build confidence. It harms confidence. It does not build trust. It is inconsistent. It is expedient, and it is last minute Government. This is creating policy on the floor of the Chamber without benefit of due consideration. How do the retailers feel about short term paid parking? How does short term paid parking fit in with retail plans? This amendment brings in short term paid parking in Town, and we have spent the last year saying there is no short term paid parking. How is everyone going to feel if we come out of this Assembly on Friday, blinking into the light, grasping this piece of paper claiming to have short term paid parking in our Town, we will be a laughing stock? There will be uproar.

All the people across the Island parking overnight in disc zones will have to pay whether they park in Town or not, without consideration. I cannot support that.

The arguments we have heard from supporters of this move, say it is unfair for motorists to pay for the buses. Well now it is okay. The sad reality is in this Chamber that most or all of us at one point or another, come to a point of view and then find some theoretical arguments to back up that view. So if we want to change something on the hoof, we say this Assembly needs to be nimble on its feet and able to react to the changing debate so we should be able to do these things on the hoof. But if you are against that particular Proposition, you say ah well, we cannot change things like this on the hoof. The reality is some of us are for paid parking and some are not.

The Chief Minister does buck this trend by being in favour of parking clocks, yet not supporting this because he feels it is done in the wrong way. I am rarely, if ever, happy about setting policy on the floor of this Assembly without the benefit of a States' Report, consultation



and due consideration, and debate, and I feel very uncomfortable about setting this without knowing the full ramifications. In my mind we should not be making policy by piggy backing radically different changes on the back of the nearest available vehicle suspending several Rules of Procedure to do it, without the benefit of States' Report and without due consideration by the public on a matter of interest to the whole Island.

1320

I am not going to emerge out from this debate having supported this.

**A Member:** Hear, hear.

1325

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier and then Deputy Gillson.

**Deputy St Pier:** Thank you, sir.

1330

Sir, I personally supported the entire Minority Report last year, including paid parking. At that time I did also express my concerns about the equity of paid parking and made some comments about benefits in kind at that time. So I have supported the Strategy throughout, but, of course, the Strategy has changed, not least because of the death of the width and emissions charges last month, and I think Deputy Dave Jones is right to point out the Strategy is now different.

1335

There has been much talk of flip-flopping, and sir, I was surprised yesterday that the Treasury & Resources Department's Report on benefit in kind, which had been supported by the Environment Department was not supported by the Environment Department in the vote, so I think we should recognise that there is flip-flopping going on everywhere. I think the reality is that this is an issue which has quite clearly deeply divided the community and we are, of course, a reflection of the community, that is the beauty of democracy. That is why clearly this Assembly is split as it was so evenly 21/21 yesterday.

1340

But for me, sir, and I have said this last month, I said it again yesterday, and indeed this is no surprise given my role as the Treasury & Resources Minister and therefore reflecting also the view of my Board, we have a funding gap in support of the extant Transport Policy that was approved last year. This will, this amendment will, provide that certainty and move us on. Deputy Brehaut quite rightly identified when he spoke earlier, sir, if he was on Treasury & Resources he would support this amendment, and I think that is entirely how the Board feels.

1345

I will give way to Deputy Burford.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

1350

**Deputy Burford:** Can I just say that this amendment merely replaces one source of funding of just over £1 million with another source of funding of just over £1 million. It does not actually take us anywhere further forward.

1355

**Deputy St Pier:** Well, it does, of course, depend on the detail, I guess and the level at which it is set and the number of vehicles which would be charged. But it does move the funding forward.

I have to accept that it will not change behaviour. This is in essence, and I think the Assembly should be in no doubt, by the fact that it is applying in essence to all road vehicles, all cars certainly. I guess there may be some cars that choose not to acquire the requisite disc or clock or however it is to be raised, but the majority will. It is in essence a road tax by another name.

1360

I think that paid parking is in some form completely inevitable. I think if we talk about the redevelopment of the Ports area under the Master Plan, if you talk about the redevelopment of other sites, the only way the economics can be made to work is to ensure that you receive a sensible return on those assets, and so in order to progress those projects in that way paid parking in perhaps a more traditional form is inevitable in time.

1365

I think for those such as Deputy Dorey, who I thought did speak very well and with great force, to describe this as grossly unfair does surprise me, because of course this was a feature of the Minority Report, and I accept that it is returning to what was in the Minority Report but without

the other parts, but none the less if it is unfair now it was unfair then. So I am not sure that that can be a charge that is properly levied at this.

1370 For me, sir, this – I will give way –

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

1375 **Deputy Dorey:** Presumably that is why the Assembly thought it was unfair and that is why they voted 28 to 15 to reject it in May of last year.

**Deputy St Pier:** Well, I am not sure I can speak for all the motives of all the people who chose to reject it at that stage. They may have rejected it for reasons other than fairness.

1380 For me, sir, this charge is preferable as a funding route to fuel duty, which, of course, is the other option which is frequently presented as another, if you like, easy option that is fair, so the argument goes. It is preferable for me, if we consider that the reduction in fuel prices which Deputy Perrot has referred to as a result of the world oil price falling, that represents a £10 million injection into our economy in terms of consumer spending, which is equivalent of a cut of 1p in income tax. So we should not underestimate the significance of that and the inflationary impact, 1385 because of the way we calculate inflation, of tinkering with fuel duty. I do accept that if we raise other charges in other ways it has the same impact on the consumer but it does not have the same impact on inflation and all that flows from that number.

I thought Deputy Ogier's speech was excellent, but for me, this is about pragmatism at this point. As I said in my speech on the amendment that rose such ire for my colleague Deputy Perrot, normally I am a pragmatist, albeit on that issue it was a matter of principle, but for me – I 1390 accept for Deputy Ogier on this issue it is different – I think it is time for pragmatism.

To pick up on the words of Deputy Conder, the Transport Strategy is iterative and I think that one of the attractions for this move is it does accept the principle that parking will be paid for in future. I think that is an important development for those who support paid parking, as indeed I 1395 did, at the Minority Report stage and in light of all of that, sir, I will be supporting this amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gillson.

1400 **Deputy Gillson:** Sir, I am really surprised at some of the speeches which are speaking against this amendment. To listen to some people you would think it is the death of the Strategy. Well it is only removing one element of it, the paid parking. The rest of the Strategy is still there, all the positive things which would be funded by paid parking can still happen. It is not the death of the Strategy. It is just a small part of it.

1405 Now Deputy Ogier and others have said this is terrible bringing this in late amendments not researched, etc. Well, as Deputy St Pier said it was in the report. The Environment Department last year recommended this, therefore I am assuming they have done all the work, I am assuming that they have checked out the retail implications of this, because last year they were recommending it. They were recommending it as part of an integrated strategy which they were proposing should 1410 have been taken in total. So last year it was researched. It was seen by people, by the Environment Department, well at least the two authors of the Minority Report, as to be something which would not devastate Town, would not ruin Town, but would be a good thing to have.

So far from bringing something from the left field and changing the Strategy, we are actually putting something back into the Strategy which the authors of the Strategy wanted. So in some 1415 ways it is quite a positive thing.

Now I think I will just comment on something Deputy Dorey said about –  
I will give way.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

1420 **Deputy Burford:** Thank you for giving way, Deputy Gillson.

I just rise because it is the same point that Deputy St Pier made, and I did not want to interrupt him a second time. It is just simply to say, and for Members' benefit, the paid parking clock in the strategy was set at £16 which is a half or a third of what this is. But also it was very much in conjunction, and intended to be in conjunction, before Deputy Dorey's amendment came along to be with long stay parking, recognising that if people were going to pay to park long stay then those paying briefly to park short stay would also be making a contribution. So it was in a holistic sense.

1430 **Deputy Gillson:** My point was that the Department had done all the research to determine that it is not disadvantageous to retail, which was one of the things Deputy Ogier said, because they were saying it was for short term. So presumably they must have determined that it was not disadvantageous for retail.

I comment on something that Deputy Dorey said, that tourists bring their cars over may have to pay it, excellent news. Perhaps Environment could come back with a sort of form of mini-clock for a tourist of £10 that just lasts two weeks. (*Interjections*) That would be great, I think they would welcome it because they are used to paid parking in England and it would be significantly cheaper. So I welcome tourists paying it. I think it is great.

So let's just consider in the Strategy what paid parking was aimed to do. Paid parking had two aims. One to raise funds and the second to change behaviour. Well this raises the funds, so all this will not do is alter behaviour. Now Deputy Brehaut suggested that paid parking would stop people surfing the pavements and make our roads safe. Well let's just see how significant the paid parking changes in behaviour will be. Environment's own figures are that 4% of the driving population park on the Piers, and their own Report says they are aiming for an 85% occupancy, so the sort of modal change Environment in the Minority Report was considering happening is 15% of 4%. It is an incredibly small change. It is not a modal change, there is no way that anyone can suggest 15% of 4% is a massive societal change. If we remove paid parking it will obviously not have a behaviour change, because it will not be there, but that behavioural change is not as significant a change as some people seem to make out: 4% of 15% of drivers is what the change would be.

1450 Sir I urge people to support this amendment, and then the Propositions.

**Then Bailiff:** Deputy Green.

**Deputy Green:** Mr Bailiff, thank you.

1455 A few people have made their fairly predictably points about this amendment. I speak just on the amendment, sir, not on the Requête as such. A number of speakers have made the point, slightly predictably, that this is government on the hoof, last-minute government, a last-minute amendment, but I agree with the sentiments of what the last speaker, Deputy Gillson, said. I do not think we should overdo, or overcook, that argument. I think if a good idea comes up at a late stage then it is still necessarily a good idea and it does merit consideration nonetheless, and as Deputy Gillson also said this is not the first time this idea has been floated and the research has been done,

1465 The main reason why I rose to speak is, I must say from the speeches I have heard this morning there has been three in particular that I – as Deputy Lester Queripel would say – that resonated with me more than other, and they were in order, Deputy Luxon's speech, Deputy Perrot's speech and indeed the Treasury & Resources Minister's speech just a moment ago. Because I think we forget in the context of paid parking we forget that politics is the art of the possible, and in order to drive through any policy you need a broad base of community support. I have made this point in the media about the tax review and about GST and all the rest of it. You cannot hope to effect significant change in this Island unless you take people with you, unless you get a fairly broad base of community support and buy-in behind you.

1470

Clearly I think what this amendment represents is a compromise which will not be perfect, but as Deputy Luxon said this morning, it will resolve the funding issue. It does get around the unfairness issue by being broad based and I think we disregard, or we downplay, or we marginalise, the unfairness point at our peril. It is true, and I think we should be honest about this, I do think it is fair to accept to some degree that this modified adapted form of paid parking would perhaps not have the behavioural change that the other original more traditional variety of paid parking would have. I think we should accept that, but I think we also have to accept the political reality of community feeling in this Island.

So there are certain advantages that I can see in this amendment. I will listen to the rest of the debate and clearly take other views into account, but at this stage I am minded to support the amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Clerc.

**Deputy Le Clerc:** Thank you, sir.

I have heard comments about amendments on the hoof, and I just thought bearing in mind next month's debate on the Personal Tax and Benefit Review, I am sure we are going to have a stampede of amendments, (*Laughter*) so just sort of to warn people that have complained about amendments on the hoof today.

Deputy Perrot is a very wise man, and I listen to Deputy Perrot (*Interjections and laughter*) and for me now that the benefit in kind is sort of a dead duck, I feel that this is a pragmatic way forward. I did explain to Deputy Burford when we first received the Report that if the benefit in kind was a nonstarter then I felt that I could not support the paid parking in the format that has been proposed.

So I will, like Deputy Green, continue to listen to the debate but at the moment I am inclined to vote for this amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

**Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, I personally think this amendment makes perfect sense. I disagree with Deputy Dorey when he says this is a desperate amendment, far from it. I totally agree with Deputies Le Clerc and Perrot here. This makes perfect pragmatic sense. It spreads the load amongst all motorist.

Deputy Brehaut says the poor will be affected. Well not as much as £1,200 a year if they have to park at North Beach. This represents the cost of a tankful of petrol. I think that is fairer than sieving out a relatively small number of people, so small that as Deputy Gillson just mentioned, will hardly have influenced behaviours right across the Island. The fact that a benefit in kind will not now be investigated really concerns me. A small number of people will be inordinately hit whereas those actually causing what congestion we have driving through the Town to their parking spaces in Admiral Park will not. This will not cause a lot of bureaucracy, at least no more than paid parking, and I am sure Deputy Stewart will agree with me that I am sure there is an online solution there somewhere.

I do think it is funny, Deputy Ogier says it comes out of no consultation when we have been debating the pros, cons, merits or otherwise of every single method of paying for this Strategy *ad nauseam* for months. This option makes more sense to me now than paid parking. This will provide a guaranteed income, something that cannot be said for paid parking, certainly if it is meant to influence behaviours, which is meant to have been an intention of bringing it in. If it is not then the Environment Department should not object to this amendment. It is not like yesterday debating about whether or not to throw out paid parking. This is a positive amendment, and I support it wholeheartedly.

**A Member:** Hear, hear.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

1525

**Deputy Brouard:** Thank you, sir.

It is rather strange really, because the amendment was borne partly out of what Deputy Gollop was saying earlier this morning, and he was saying looking for that compromise, looking for that area where we can give ground. He gives no ground, he gives no quarter any more, he still carried on, but I am prepared to give ground. I do not like paid parking. I am not particular overly keen on parking clocks either, but as Deputy Dorey said, you think about what the infrastructure that is going to have to come in for paid parking. The metres, the machines, the printing, the apps, the this that and the other. That is not the simple thing to do either. I think as Deputy Soulsby said very well, to Deputy Ogier – *(Laughter)*

1530

1535

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Hadley.

**Deputy Hadley:** I would just like to ask Deputy Brouard at this particular point: if these paid parking clocks are introduced, it is not in any way going to reduce the demand for parking, and at the moment people drive around for ages looking for a parking space, where is he suggesting the States gets the money from to create the parking spaces that will be required at £30,000 to £50,000 a shot.

1540

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

1545

**Deputy Brouard:** The vulture rises again. *(Interjections)* I do not understand what Deputy Hadley is questioning there. The idea of this amendment is it is a compromise, it will not tick everybody's box, but I am really pleased that some senior Members, especially my colleague, we are on the same page with. *(Interjection)* It is a compromise.

1550

I think Deputy Lester Queripel made a very good point as well. We are not giving the details today, and that takes away a little bit from what Deputy Ogier was saying, 'Oh it is on the hoof, it is now, it is immediate.' No, we have given a very good direction of travel by looking at parking clocks. Environment will have the hands, and they have done the research already to come back exactly how that is going to come forward.

1555

I have very little else to say, but I would commend Members, this is a compromise, please grasp it. It ticks so many of the boxes, and it just puts paid parking away, but it gives you the revenue that you need for all the rest of the strategy.

Thank you, sir.

1560

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, I have little else to add, apart from the fact that we are advised on the overleaf of the amendment that this amendment would not rescind the resolution that requires States' Members to pay £165 per year, although it will be revisited at budget time. That is a very good idea and I would recommend that all Members who do utilise Lukis House make three parking clocks available so that they can be used by the most needy in our community –

1565

**Deputy St Pier:** I thank Deputy Trott for giving way, I just wish to deal with the point about Lukis House because I did omit that in my speech. I referred to it yesterday, sir. The Treasury & Resources Department has no intention of dealing with that issue through the budget. It is not a budget issue.

1570

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

1575 **Deputy Trott:** Sir, it would be open to Members to bring an amendment should they consider it of value, sir.

The only other point that I would make is that those like Deputy Green who have referred to the pragmatism of politics do so wisely. We are where we are today because the Road Transport Strategy is deeply unpopular with a very significant number of our constituents, and it is deeply  
1580 unpopular with a very significant number of this Assembly. Over the years whenever compromises such as this are offered the States usually, and usually sensibly, adopts them, and that would be my advice to this Assembly today.

With that in mind, it is my intention to listen to the wise words of the Treasury & Resources Minister in particular and support this amendment.

1585 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Sherbourne.

**Deputy Sherbourne:** Thank you, sir, fellow Members.

1590 I am a pragmatist, always have been all my life. I do have to compromise from time to time on things to achieve progress, and this actually is superficially for me a very attractive amendment, because I have been a supporter of the clock approach for some time. However, I feel that the direction of travel this morning has been one born out of tiredness. I feel that people are tired of the debate, and the pragmatic solution may well be extremely appealing.

1595 I suppose my main concern is the source of the amendment. The people that have actually been applauded by the public for their anti paid parking stance. Those of us that indulge in social media are very much aware of the sort of personal attacks that our Minister of the Environment has come under. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) We are also aware of the adulation shown towards other Members who do tend to appeal to a populace view. My concern is that the public will be  
1600 totally confused about this amendment. It is coming from two people who have been anti paid parking, and yet actually accepts the concept of paid parking through a charge on clocks.

As I said at the outset, I actually find that quite appealing. What I would hope that comes out of this morning, is that the Environment Board can go back and get on with the job that they have to do, with regard to closing that gap as a result of the withdrawal of width and emissions tax.  
1605 That was enough of a challenge for them itself. But, I am sure that creative thinking, by that Board and I have full confidence in them. It will enable them to come back with proposals, I believe in May is the intention. They will have to do that anyway because of that funding gap. I think they should take note of the comments that have been made today, and consider that in the report that they bring back to us. Therefore I will not be supporting the amendment at this time, but will  
1610 offer my full confidence in the ability of the Environment Board to bring back sensible funding options to us later in the year.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak? No.

1615 Deputy Burford.

**Deputy Burford:** Thank you, sir.

I do not object in principle of a small charge on a parking clock. It was part of the Strategy as I said, and I have just recently explained the context in which it was in the Strategy. But, it does not  
1620 change any behaviour, it is purely a fund raising measure and no more.

Deputy Luxon said that this will resolve the issue of funding. Well it does not. It is swapping one funding for another. It is swapping long stay parking for short stay parking really in broad terms of long stay parking for a paid parking clock. So if we lose £1 million on one we gain it on the other. It does not do anything to plug the funding gap which Deputy Sherbourne has  
1625 identified from the width and emissions duty. I do not know why Deputy Luxon is perhaps he can enlighten me as to –

I will give way.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

1630

**Deputy Luxon:** By my calculations at £50, I believe approximately £3 million will be raised. That was the point I was trying to make.

1635

**Deputy Burford:** Well, £3 million – quick maths, that would be based on 60,000 parking clocks. Certainly when we have done research that would not be anywhere near the amount of parking clocks that would actually be sold. We are looking at figures between 35,000 and 40,000. So you can get Deputy Queripel's calculator out, but also, of course, it also says £30 to £50, so...

1640

Compromise is often said to be the solution that nobody wanted, and I really rather fear that that may be true in this case, particularly Deputy Brouard who seconded this amendment and also seconded Deputy Dorey's amendment to get rid of the paid parking clock last time.

1645

What is the risk? When Environment come back to this Assembly in two or three months' time having worked up this amendment, that all of a sudden those people who actually said, 'Well you know what, I was never in favour of paid parking and I am not going to support it now', this is nothing that is in the bag? We have no guarantees that that will not be the case, and indeed the history of these debates makes me really rather fear that will exactly be the case.

1650

Moving on to some comments by Deputy Stewart that I really cannot leave unanswered: he is calling our bus service a damaged brand. Now I understand that CT Plus have had problems in the past, but I really wonder to what extent when we have senior Ministers in Government constantly harping on about this whether that really delays the possibility under a new contract that has gone through a comprehensive States' procurement procedure that that delays that ability to move towards that new brand in that field, and I really think it is deeply unhelpful. I am sorry. **(Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

1655

I have picked up on the point about the incentive within the contract and that is in the e-mail that we have sent to you Deputy Stewart, so I am sure you can have a look at that when you have time.

1660

There is a few things about the amendment that are uncertain. One of the things is, and maybe in her summing up Deputy Lowe can explain, how she considers that this may dovetail with the resident's parking scheme element of the Strategy. Because that was something that was very much linked in to the paid parking on the Piers. It is a workstream that is currently with the Law Officers ready to come as a States' Report to this Assembly.

1665

So those are the dangers of... I do not want to use the phrase 'amendment on the hoof'. I think Deputy Le Clerc is right, there is a time and a place to lay amendments, and I do not have a problem *per se* in this being laid for that reason. But it does impinge on other things.

1670

The benefit in kind yesterday, there was a feeling from half of this Assembly certainly, and from Deputy Le Clerc and Deputy Bebb in particular, that there was merit in a simplified version of that, and I had rather left thinking last night, as I also mentioned in my speech and the reason that Environment changed their stance on it, that when we come back with a funding package in a couple of months there was a possibility for that to be included, so that was where I believed it to have been left. But clearly it is inequitable to charge a benefit in kind if you can park for nothing on the Piers, perhaps.

1675

Deputy Dorey, it is very interesting to hear if that number 3,905 replies with 55% in favour of long term parking. Interestingly in all of the survey that we did when it came to just long stay parking, and not paid parking in general including short stay, those were about the figures we were getting. I think it is pretty constant. I think it has been seen in this Assembly time and again with votes split down the middle that it is pretty much a 50/50 decision. So it is quite clear that there is a lot of misunderstanding where people even one of I think one of the broadcaster was tweeting that it was £3,000 and it is short stay as well. It clearly is not. So there is misunderstanding but for pure long stay parking 55% is the number that we were finding as well.

1680 The idea that will just expand and creep and then go on to short stay parking is an absolute nonsense. I am sorry, it was quite... I will put my cards on the table – I would support paying for short term parking, but I am in a minority of probably – in a moment perhaps – of probably three or four. I actually think bringing something to this Assembly to request short stay parking would be even less popular than Deputy St Pier and Deputy Le Tocq's amendment on PERRC. It just would not stand an earthly –

1685 **Deputy David Jones:** I am grateful to the Minister.

Unfortunately the record of the States for making promises and then reneging on them is long and hard. You go back to the market and the traders – where are they now? I have a whole list of them at home. You may not have any plans Environment at this stage to introduce this further, but that does not mean to say that a future Environment Department will not, and I do not want to give them that opportunity.

1695 **Deputy Burford:** Well, I am quite sure that if they decide that in years to come they can still come forward with it, and whether or not we have long stay paid parking in place now it really will not make any difference.

I think it is obvious where this amendment is going, but I would just like to sort of make these final points. Deputy Dorey quite correctly said that there was a reduction in the proposals for long stay parking to £600 for low emission vehicles, so another encouragement for people to switch to better kind of vehicles, and indeed you could have a low emission vehicle car share with you neighbour and find you are only paying £300. So these aspects of it seem to have been lost.

1700 Paid parking does cause people to switch to other modes of transport. It is a fact it is shown in numerous places round the world. It does encourage modal shift.

To call it punishment taxes is absolutely emotive, it is like suggesting that it would be a punishment tax to pay to put a planning application in. (*Interjection and laughter*) Yes for your own betterment, yes

1705 Please be clear, I mean this amendment it is clear will go through, but this Assembly has emasculated this Strategy to make it as bland and anodyne as every one that has come over the last 20 years. (*Interjections*) It will now change little. There is still work we can do, there are still things we can do, but in terms of change you will not really see very much. Without the drivers to get people on to the bus service from paid parking, I do not know if enough people will get on to sustain the new routes and services that we are offering, and that is something that may have to subsequently be reviewed.

1710 This amendment to me represents the defining point at which this Assembly decided to go with the *status quo* of the traffic situation and saturation on this Island. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) This Assembly has confirmed its desire, in accepting this amendment, to do nothing whatsoever at all about it. What a lack of vision! (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) If politics is the art of the possible, then this shows how little is possible.

Thank you. (*Applause*)

1720 **The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak in this debate on the amendment?  
I propose that we continue beyond 12.30. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

1725 **The Bailiff:** We will continue, Deputy Lowe will sum up.

**Deputy Lowe:** Thank you, sir.

About 30 seconds is all I need. I thank everybody for their speeches. We will go straight to the vote.



1730        The only thing I want to reiterate that it is very clear on the amendment is to approve the introduction of chargeable annual disc parking. So we will be agreeing that we will be supporting this when it comes back Deputy Burford, and I would be very disappointed if anybody who supports this today when it comes back they will be rejecting it. So I ask Members to go straight to the vote, and could I have a recorded vote please, sir?

1735

**The Bailiff:** Members, we are being asked for a recorded vote on the amendment proposed by Deputy Lowe, seconded by Deputy Brouard.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 28, Contre 16, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3*

<b>POUR</b>	<b>CONTRE</b>	<b>NE VOTE PAS</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Deputy Le Clerc	Deputy Gollop	None	Deputy Storey
Deputy Lester Queripel	Deputy Sherbourne		Deputy Fallaize
Deputy St Pier	Deputy Conder		Deputy Domaille
Deputy Stewart	Deputy Bebb		
Deputy Gillson	Deputy Ogier		
Deputy Le Pelley	Deputy Le Lièvre		
Deputy Trott	Deputy Duquemin		
Deputy David Jones	Deputy Dorey		
Deputy Laurie Queripel	Deputy Le Tocq		
Deputy Lowe	Deputy James		
Deputy Spruce	Deputy Burford		
Deputy Collins	Deputy Quin		
Deputy Green	Deputy Hadley		
Deputy Paint	Deputy Harwood		
Deputy Adam	Deputy Brehaut		
Deputy Perrot	Deputy Robert Jones		
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Wilkie			
Deputy De Lisle			
Deputy Inglis			
Deputy Soulsby			
Deputy Sillars			
Deputy Luxon			
Deputy O'Hara			
Alderney Rep. Jean			
Alderney Rep. McKinley			
Deputy Kuttelwascher			
Deputy Langlois			

1740        **The Bailiff:** Well Members, the result of the vote on the Deputy Lowe/Deputy Brouard amendment was 28 votes in favour, 16 against. I declare the amendment carried, which means that we could come back to general debate if anybody – ?

Deputy Kuttelwascher.

1745        **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Yes, since the amendment is in fact the Requête now, I would like to propose a guillotine motion under Rule 13(2).

**A Member:** Hear, hear.

1750        **The Bailiff:** The alternative is that we just go to... Does anybody wish to say anything further that has not already been – ?

**A Member:** A very brief one.

1755     **The Bailiff:** Well in that case, a guillotine motion has been proposed, we will go to the guillotine motion. I have been asked to put the guillotine motion so I am required to do so. So, what I am putting to you is that we close the debate. Those in favour, please say aye; against, no.; those against.

1760     *Members voted Pour.*

**The Bailiff:** I am satisfied that is a two-thirds majority.  
Because we are closing the debate, those who spoke, as of right, are entitled to speak if they wish to do so.

1765     Deputy St Pier, do you wish to say anything further in closure?

**Deputy St Pier:** Nothing further to say, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford, do you wish to say anything further?

1770     **Deputy Burford:** No, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Chief Minister?

1775     **The Chief Minister:** No.

**The Bailiff:** No. Deputy Brouard then, do you wish to reply to the debate?

**Deputy Brouard:** Yes, sir. Just 10 seconds, if I may, sir.

1780     I would just like to thank again the requérants Collins, Domaille, Jones, Queripel, Spruce and Stewart, and their stand-ins for the opportunity to resolve this. And also to Deputy Le Pelley whose idea it partly was at the very beginning.

          I think Deputy Perrot summed it up, we were having a real debate today and I thank all of the Members on both sides of the argument for their courage, their argument today, and I think we have done right by the Island.

1785     Thank you all very much.

**The Bailiff:** Well, we vote then on the Requête as amended. Those in favour?

1790     *Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.*

**The Bailiff:** I think that was won, but it is such a controversial subject that I am not prepared to call it, we will have a recorded vote. I know sometimes on the radio these votes come across very differently to how they do in the Assembly. I would not want any suggestion that I had miscalculated it, so we will go to a recorded vote.

1795     So I remind you, you are voting on the Requête as amended by the successful amendment.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 28, Contre 16, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3*

**POUR**

Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Stewart  
Deputy Gillson  
Deputy Le Pelley

**CONTRE**

Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Sherbourne  
Deputy Conder  
Deputy Bebb  
Deputy Ogier  
Deputy Le Lièvre

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Deputy Storey  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Domaille

Deputy Trott	Deputy Duquemin
Deputy David Jones	Deputy Dorey
Deputy Laurie Queripel	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Lowe	Deputy James
Deputy Spruce	Deputy Burford
Deputy Collins	Deputy Quin
Deputy Green	Deputy Hadley
Deputy Paint	Deputy Harwood
Deputy Adam	Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Perrot	Deputy Robert Jones
Deputy Brouard	
Deputy Wilkie	
Deputy De Lisle	
Deputy Inglis	
Deputy Soulsby	
Deputy Sillars	
Deputy Luxon	
Deputy O'Hara	
Alderney Rep. Jean	
Alderney Rep. McKinley	
Deputy Kuttelwascher	
Deputy Langlois	

**The Bailiff:** Well, Members if I could just have your attention. I am about to be handed the voting slip and I can announce the result of the voting on the Requête as amended, 28 votes in favour, 16 against. I declare the Requête carried.

That concludes the business for this meeting of the States of Deliberation.

Thank you.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.42 p.m.*