

3.2 Deputy G.C.L. Baudains of the Chairman of the Environment Scrutiny Panel regarding the numbering sequence of Minutes of the Panel dated 16th February 2007:

Would the Chairman explain why the minutes of the meeting held on 16th February 2007 carry the unusual sequence of 40a and would he further explain why a meeting was called for a single item?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel of St. Saviour (Chairman of the Environment Scrutiny Panel):

This meeting was held at the conclusion of a public hearing that took place on 16th February and took advantage of all the Panel members being present to deal with the specific issue, which was time-sensitive. The meeting was called after the circulation of the agenda of meeting 41 that was held on 22nd February and therefore came out of numerical sequence. For the sake of expedience, it was numbered as 40a. I am therefore able to reassure Deputy Baudains that the numbering of the minute does not imply any greater additional administration being undertaken to record this simple item. I can further confirm, Sir, that my Scrutiny Officers are fully engaged in the final stages of 2 major reports, both of which are due to be published within the next 4 weeks and that the Environment Scrutiny Panel strives to keep the bureaucracy to a minimum.

3.2.1 Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Would the Chairman confirm what the item in contention was under 40a? Was it, in fact, the payment of a sum of money towards a gift for people who had organised a trip for the Panel?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

The questioner is correct. It was seeking an authorisation for that. In actual fact, the Panel having decided that it was in order to select appropriate gifts for those persons who had assisted in the fact-finding visit that the Panel undertook to Vienna, subsequently took a further decision and no moneys were, in fact, spent.

3.2.2 Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Even though money was not spent, could the Chairman confirm that the Panel agreed to the sum of £250 for the payment of gifts?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

No, Sir, I cannot agree that because the minute says appropriate gifts not exceeding a total of £240 for both. [Laughter]

3.2.3 Deputy G.P. Southern:

Could the Chairman indicate whether this practice of revisiting decisions - yes, we will, no, we will not - is common practice in his Panel?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

I do not think it is but for those Members of the House who do us the invaluable service of reading our minutes perhaps they would like to draw attention to the cases, the instances, upon which it has occurred.