

I would like to add my support for those who vote against the 'User Pays' proposal. We currently pay for the provision of all of these services through income tax and social security and I am happy to do so.

The nature of this event requires a level of policing that is seemingly beyond what the island is able to deliver and consequently incurs considerable cost. As such, I appreciate that some tax payers may feel disgruntled as they are unable or unwilling to attend and receive no benefit. This view should be considered a minority one until proven otherwise and those who proffer it should be asked to consider the implication of what they are saying.

Firstly, as a payer of tax and social security I pay for a great deal for services many of which I have no need of or am not entitled to use. That is the nature of the system in which we live. One in which we pay according to our income rather than our needs so that services can be provided to those who need them as and when they need them. >From an ideological stand point, 'user pays' goes against the very essence of the social security system.

The consequential alternative would be the introduction of a sliding scale of payment for the use of police time. This would find families of repeat offenders – youth and adult - paying more and those who have required little or no police time paying less. Under this system I would not mind paying for the policing of the festival as I would be saving money on the other 363 day of the year. 363 days of the year when I pay for a service from which I require only a minimum of usage.

Clearly this is administratively and ethically unworkable but the principle is a pertinent extension of your proposal.

Secondly, although this is a profit making enterprise for the organisers, for the actual 'user' this is no different to a great many other events in which we pay for entrance, use of facilities and refreshments etc. whereby the level of involvement is dictated by the ability to pay. Why then, should this event which delivers so much for not only the youth of the island but also for families and visitors alike, be treated any differently from other large scale gathering. Quite apart from the Battle of Britain and the Battle of Flowers festivities, there are many occasions which require marshalling, road closures and police presence. Perhaps those people uninterested in the music festival attend the Hill Climb or Gorey Fete, the likes of which although not on the same scale, require an ongoing drain on police time throughout the year. Personally, I am thankful for all of them whether I choose to partake or not. They add colour and breadth to Jersey life.

To apply 'user pays' to the whole of the Jersey calendar, as suggested for Jersey Live, would mean that those who attend would pay. The result, of course, would be that the smaller and more specialised occasions would disappear.

I hope that you will consider my comments carefully as I feel quite strongly that the argument for the introduction of 'user pays' does not represent the view of the average tax payer. It is essential that this decision is considered, not in isolation, but in the light of the political and ethical values it represents.

Many Thanks

Mrs A Campbell