

## **2.11 Deputy G.C.L. Baudains of the Minister for Transport and Technical Services regarding permit parking at Snow Hill for States Members:**

In relation to Snow Hill permit parking, how many spaces were reserved prior to 2005 and who used them? How many States Members' spaces were originally allocated, what were these reduced to and how many are now provided and how many Members requested spaces after the November 2005 election?

### **Deputy G.W.J. de Faye of St. Helier:**

I am grateful to the Deputy for his question as it does underline what useful research department officers' time can be devoted to. **[Laughter]** Prior to States Members being allocated spaces in Snow Hill car park, there were 15 spaces in the permit area which were used by Data Protection, the Law Officers Department, the Viscounts Department, the Bailiff's Secretary and the States Police - all of whom were charged annually at the normal season rate. Additionally, the States Messenger, Jurats, retired Jurats and an Honorary Officer for Overseas Aid were also issued permits to use this area free of charge. When States Members were initially allocated spaces at Snow Hill, an additional 6 spaces were created by removing the motorcycle area opposite the existing spaces - giving a total of 21 spaces - which were for the sole use of States Members. After the 2005 November elections, a total of 24 States Members requested permits for Snow Hill - 16 as a first choice and 8 as a second choice. They are now 8 spaces allocated for use by States Members and 3 for Jurats.

### **2.11.1 The Deputy of St. Martin:**

Will the Minister confirm that the arrangements made by the former Planning and Public Services Committee has now resulted in States Members who voted against free parking places have now parking places of their choice and also Members who were elected in November have places of their choice? However, long-serving Deputies, some of whom voted for free parking, have now lost their parking places to the aforesaid Members. Will the Minister think or agree that this is totally unfair and what action will be taken to address the problem?

### **Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:**

The Minister is aware that there are 2 States Members who have not received the car parking spaces - as it has been put - of their choice. The Minister is aware that under those circumstances the 2 States Members involved have been given passes to the Sands Street car park which allows them to park on any day at any time in any place free of charge. The Minister is satisfied that parking in Sand Street car park constitutes a level walk to the States buildings which - despite the seniority of the States Members - should be regarded as a pleasant amble; **[Laughter]** whereas parking at Snow Hill, while it starts with an initial downhill slope, does mean that the more senior Members are faced with an uphill climb while going home **[Laughter]**. The situation, however, is being kept under review.

### **2.11.2 The Connétable of St. Helier:**

Can I ask 2 questions of the Minister? No, only one, is it not?

### **The Deputy Bailiff:**

Only one, I think.

### **The Connétable of St. Helier:**

Could the Minister confirm whether the whole issue of States Members having free parking, which is still unpopular with the public, is going to be revisited during his time in office?

**Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:**

I regret to say, Sir, the matter of States Members parking appears to be constantly revisited at my department and, as such, it appears it will be kept constantly under review. But I would remind the States Members that States Members' parking is essentially a matter for States Members. It is primarily a decision of the Privileges and Procedures Committee. The Transport and Technical Services Department is merely a facilitator for instructions that are received from the Privileges and Procedures Committee.

**2.11.3 Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

I thank the Minister for his humorous interjection. He might be interested to know that I now actually pay for my parking, despite the fact that Members were supposed to have free parking, on account of the fact that what I am offered is not convenient. But what I would like to ask the Minister, Sir, as he started his answer by suggesting that his department could be doing more useful work - and I totally agree - why has he, since he took on his ministry, been unwilling to sort out this simple problem which should not waste the time of this House, Sir? The reason why this question was asked today is for the last 6 weeks I have been unable to get a sensible response from the Minister. Could he explain that, Sir? Could he explain also why his email apparently does not work and why I cannot make contact with his Assistant Minister who is supposed, as he says in an email: "I imagine she will progress matters". Well, it is difficult, Sir, because she is not on email, as far as I know, and her fax does not work. Could he assure us that there will be better communication in future and that he will address this issue and also that he will take notice of what the Privileges and Procedures Committee has said as opposed to what he thinks they have said?

**Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:**

First of all, can I assure the Deputy and other Members that my email does work. The reason that matters may not have been progressed at the speed the Deputy would like to have seen is that the Assistant Minister at Transport and Technical Services - very early in her term of office - gallantly stepped forward and undertook to relieve me of the burden of administering States Members' car parking and undertook to handle all the liaisons with the Privileges and Procedures Committee, which she has done so diligently. Unfortunately, her hard work in this area has been interrupted by a holiday in Florida which is why matters have not progressed at the speed that the Deputy would wish but I am sure, due to her imminent return this week, there will be progress.

**2.11.4 Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

It is correct I am not satisfied with the speed, Sir. I was under the impression that ministerial government was going to speed up answers. Could perhaps the Minister explain why since the elections in November no progress has been made?

**Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:**

Yes, I am very happy to explain that. That is because a procedure had been put in place by the former President, Environment and Public Services and the Committee,

as agreed with the Privileges and Procedures Committee, and all that the Transport and Technical Services Department is currently doing is administering the rules as laid down and as currently enforced.

**2.11.5 Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:**

I am not aware that there is any Standing Order which prevents me asking questions, Sir, so I will ask. Will the Minister say whether or not he can confirm the names of the 2 members that have not received their preference? Secondly, does he not think that after the lengthy debates and discussions that were held in this Assembly on this matter last year that this matter has now been resolved and he would not keep it under further review, and could we move on rather than playing with it like a football?

**Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:**

The names of the 2 Members in question are the Deputy of St. Martin and Deputy Baudains of St. Clement. **[Laughter]** I agree with my fellow Minister that we have expended an inordinate amount of time on a relatively minor topic. However, this Minister is a broad-minded and open-minded Minister and I am happy to continue to consider the 2 Deputies' complaints.

**2.11.6 Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

I wonder if the Minister would confirm that this whole issue has arisen out of the complete shambles made by the previous administration of Public Services. **[Laughter]**

**Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:**

I cannot confirm or deny that suggestion. **[Laughter]**

**The Deputy Bailiff:**

Very well, that completes all the questions on notice.

### **2.12 Senator P.F.C. Ozouf (point of order):**

I would wish to raise a point of order if I may? You cut me off in asking a supplementary in respect of Deputy of St. Martin. There was an important issue I was trying to raise there and perhaps I could raise it under point of order? I am aware that there was mention of the Animal Shelter in the answer given by the Minister of Home Affairs. I am just concerned that the Deputy is given the opportunity of confirming whether or not he holds any position in the Animal Shelter as I would have thought that a ruling from the Chair about whether it is appropriate that a Member may ask questions in this Assembly when he is a member of a body that could be in receipt of financial remuneration or some sort of tendering arrangement that was clearly implicit in the Minister's question. May I ask for a ruling, Sir, first of all to clarify whether or not there is an issue? I am aware that there was a report associating the Deputy of St. Martin with the Animal Shelter. I do not know whether or not he is a member. Secondly, whether or not, in your view, Sir, whether there is any inappropriate position has been taken this morning?

#### **The Deputy Bailiff:**

Deputy, do you want to deal with that?

#### **2.12.1 The Deputy of St. Martin:**

I had received a note here which says: "Are you a member of the board of the Animal Shelter? Thanks. Phillip". I have been waiting to get the usher to give you the answer. The answer is "No". It might be helpful for us to have a chat about the Animal Shelter but I am not a member of the board. The reason I asked the question was simply because I was concerned about where police dogs were going and the fact that they do not go to the Animal Shelter in Jersey was of concern to me.

#### **The Deputy Bailiff:**

Very well. We come then to questions to Ministers without notice. The first...  
[Interruption].

**2.13 Deputy G.P. Southern (request for clarification):**

May I ask for a clarification from the Chair, Sir? A point of clarification, I think it is? It appears to me that last session we did not allow any supplementaries to this questioning session. It occurs to me that the result was some very bland and holding answers which were not investigated. Would the Chair be prepared to offer supplementaries this time around and avoid the sort of 'scatter-gun - everybody ask one question and no supplementaries' approach which produced a level of debate which was not, I do not believe, satisfactory. I have contacted the Privileges and Procedures Committee on this matter and I wondered if you would, in this session, be prepared to allow supplementaries?

**The Deputy Bailiff:**

Very well. Well this is clearly a new area and we all have to feel our way as we go and clearly the Chair will try to accord with what it sees might be the position of Members. Having said that, this is a very limited period - it is only 15 minutes. So far about 9 questions have been asked during each 15 minutes question. If one then allows each person to ask a supplementary that means only about 4 to 5 Members will be able to ask questions. That seems, to the Chair, to be unsatisfactory. This is meant to be for Members as a whole and with the best will in the world there are some Members who are more vocal than others; it seems right that there should be a fair spread as far as possible. Any Member who wishes to ask a question of a Minister should be able to. At the moment, I propose to continue with the same policy as previously. Clearly this is a matter which can be kept under review as one proceeds. But, for the moment, given the short time, that is a policy I propose to follow. Deputy, you have your light on, have you got a point you want to raise?

**Deputy J.A. Hilton of St. Helier:**

No, I am waiting to ask a question, Sir. **[Laughter]**