



**OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF THE**

**STATES OF DELIBERATION**

**OF THE**

**ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

**HANSARD**

**Royal Court House, Guernsey, Thursday, 28th November 2019**

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

**Volume 8, No. 34**

**ISSN 2049-8284**

**Present:**

**Sir Richard J. Collas, Kt, Bailiff and Presiding Officer;**  
**Richard McMahon Esq., Deputy Bailiff**

**Law Officers**

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Procureur)

**People's Deputies**

**St Peter Port South**

Deputies P. T. R. Ferbrache, J. Kuttelwascher,  
D. A. Tindall, B. L. Brehaut

**St Peter Port North**

Deputies J. A. B. Gollop, C. N. K. Parkinson, L. C. Queripel,  
M. P. Leadbeater, J. I. Mooney

**St Sampson**

Deputies L. S. Trott, P. R. Le Pelley, J. S. Merrett, G. A. St Pier,  
T. J. Stephens, C. P. Meerveld

**The Vale**

Deputies M. J. Fallaize, N. R. Inder, M. M. Lowe, L. B. Queripel  
J. C. S. F. Smithies

**The Castel**

Deputies R. Graham L.V.O, M. B. E, C. J. Green,  
B. J. E. Paint, M. H. Dorey

**The West**

Deputies A. H. Brouard, A. C Dudley-Owen  
E. A. McSwiggan, D. de G. de Lisle, S. L. Langlois

**The South-East**

Deputies H. J. R. Soulsby, H. L. de Sausmarez,  
P. J. Roffey, R. G. Prow

**Representatives of the Island of Alderney**

Alderney Representatives S. Roberts, A. Snowdon

**The Clerk to the States of Deliberation**

J. Torode (H.M. Greffier)

**Absent at the Evocation**

R. M. Titterington, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller); Deputies M. K. Le Clerc, V. S. Oliver (indisposée);  
S. T. Hansmann Rouxel (relevée à 9h 33); Deputy R. H. Tooley (relevée à 9h 44);  
Deputy J. P. Le Tocq (relevé à 10h 16)

## Business transacted

Evocation .....	2917
<b>Billet d'État XXIII .....</b>	<b>2917</b>
Requête .....	2917
X. Development of the business case and cost benefit analysis for the extension of the runway at Guernsey Airport to create a 1,700 metre runway – Debate continued.....	2917
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.31 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m. ....</i>	<i>2956</i>
Development of the business case and cost benefit analysis for the extension of the runway at Guernsey Airport to create a 1,700 metre runway – Propositions carried.....	2956
XI. Schedule for future States' business – Approved .....	2970
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 3.35 p.m. ....</i>	<i>2972</i>

*PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK*

# States of Deliberation

*The States met at 9.30 a.m.*

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

## PRAYERS

*The Greffier*

## EVOCATION

# Billet d'État XXIII

## REQUÊTE

**X. Development of the business case and cost benefit analysis for  
the extension of the runway at Guernsey Airport  
to create a 1,700 metre runway –  
Debate continued**

*Article X.*

*YOUR PETITIONERS humbly pray that the States may be pleased to resolve:*

- 1. To direct the Committee for Economic Development to present a business case and cost-benefit analysis for the extension of the runway at Guernsey Airport to achieve a length of at least 1,700m.*
- 2. To agree that this work should be completed by May 2020.*

### Sursis Motivé

*To sursis the Propositions until after the States of Deliberation have considered the report prepared by the Policy & Resources Committee, in consultation with the Committee for Economic Development and the States' Trading Supervisory Board, on a co-ordinated and coherent government framework on air connectivity. This report will consider all aspects of air route operation and support that is under the control or influence of the States of Guernsey and on which they have already made policy decisions, to include the strategic benefits and dis-benefits of extending the runway, as set out in Resolution 38 of P.2019/104 – The States of Guernsey Annual Budget 2020 and approved on 8th November 2019.*

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, do you wish to be relevéd?

**Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** Yes, please, sir.

**The Greffier:** Billet XXIII, Article X, Requête – Development of the business case and cost benefit analysis for the extension of the runway of Guernsey Airport to create a 1,700-metre runway. Continuation of debate on the sursis motivé.

10 **The Bailiff:** Does anybody else wish to speak on the sursis motivé? Deputy Langlois.

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

It is not easy to speak only to a sursis when one thing most in favour of its nature is the proposals it seeks to supplant. I did not count yesterday, but Deputy Ferbrache may well have used the phrase  
15 'cost benefit analysis' as many times as Deputy Kuttelwascher has appended his name to a runway related amendment over the years. *(Laughter)*

How we like phrases such as 'cost benefit analysis'. They make us sound so business-like. But I guarantee that, after spending up to £360,000 on such an analysis, the States will not be presented with the facts to make a straight-forward decision. Far from it. We will receive a document laden  
20 with ifs and buts. That is because such an analysis requires a model and, depending on which of a multitude of externalities one internalises in a model, one will get a different result.

That is only the beginning because how those externalities are integrated and what weights were given to them will affect the results. However, even that complexity would be a better outcome than, having put the externalities in the too-difficult tray, a hopelessly simplistic model results in a  
25 cost benefit analysis and is all but useless as a tool for decision-making.

The approach proposed in the sursis motivé is far more plausible and more likely to present the States with the information needed to make a decision on improving air connectivity, simply because it starts with the objective of looking at the whole picture, for instance market-based solutions, as well as the narrow infrastructure one.

30 Just seven months ago the current and former President of Economic Development jointly failed to persuade the States to hand over £700,000 for a runway extension business case. Yesterday, both spoke against the sursis and in favour of the States handing over a reduced but still very substantial £360,000. This time, not for a business case, but for a cost benefit analysis.

One has to ask, if Economic Development and its predecessor have been receiving copious  
35 benefit analysis from ASN since before this term began and a runway extension is so important to them, why hasn't even a perfunctory case been made during this term? Why, instead, are the requérants having to rely on misplaced faith, hope and the charity of the States, to the tune of several hundred thousand pounds?

Deputy Kuttelwascher's idea of extending the runway within the Airport boundaries proved to  
40 be unviable. The IoD and the Chamber of Commerce's clamour for a service to London City Airport proved to be a commercial disaster. All I am asking is for States' Members to ignore the noise that surrounds debates centred on air links; to think different and to vote for this sursis motivé, rather than add another £360,000 to the taxpayers' money we have already thrown down this particular plughole.

45 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Anyone else? No. In that case, Deputy St Pier will reply.

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, P&R believe that the questions that we and the States should be asking and  
50 answering as part of the response to Resolution 38 of the Budget debate include the following. What are the important routes for Guernsey? What are the routes that should be operated by Aurigny? What are the routes that should and can be operated by the market? How would Aurigny's operating model need to be adapted to align with that? What impact would alternative models have on fleet and other aspects of their operations? What are the financial implications of those  
55 models, both positive and negative?

What market interventions, primarily financial, would be required to develop the market to provide the connectivity that Aurigny would not? What regulatory and existing policy objectives would need to be reconsidered, revised, or reaffirmed to assure that this overall approach works as effectively as possible? What other infrastructure would then be needed, or not, including  
60 consideration of runway options; and what shareholder objectives for Aurigny and investment

objectives for the States would need to be agreed by the States to achieve this and what governance changes might be needed to achieve this?

Deputy Dorey was spot on when he spoke –  
I will give way to Deputy Fallaize.

65

**Deputy Fallaize:** I am very grateful and I apologise to Deputy St Pier for asking him to give way so early in his speech. Could he just clarify one thing for me? Is it his view that effectively the report, or the work, which the States has already commissioned via Proposition whatever it was in the Budget, will make recommendations on all of those things, or is it that it will propose the creation of a framework, which will then allow the States, subsequently, to make decisions about those things?

70

Because I think the wording of the Proposition in the Budget allows room for either interpretation. It talks about the production of a framework to allow the States to consider its future actions but, if it is the former, if the recommendations in that piece of work will deal with all of those issues, then I think that will take the work to a much more advanced stage. So if he could clarify on that point, I would be grateful.

75

Thank you.

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, I think the reality is that, given the number of questions and the complexity of some of those, I envisage it being a mixture of both. There will be some recommendations on which the States will be capable of making a, if you like, final determination in April next year and some on which will be subject of a framework in which further decisions are going to be required in the future.

80

I think, as I was going on to say, Deputy Dorey spoke the most sense yesterday when he spoke and noted that any extension of the runway is merely one part of one of those 11 questions to be considered. The Requête, of course, is only focussing on one of the runway options. In other words, as Deputy Dorey said, the Requête is asking the States to focus resources on one very small part of the overall picture and before there is agreement, and this really plays to Deputy Fallaize's point, on what the overall picture should be. So it is both marginal and premature, given the review.

85

Now Deputy Graham spoke with his characteristic colour and clarity and I think his analogy was a good one. But the implication that we have to pick up the Requête, the battered case for the runway extension, which is going around and around on the carousel, and pick it up simply because we cannot bear to see it again, would, I think, be the wrong response.

90

The States cannot ignore –

I will give way, sir.

95

**Deputy Graham:** I am grateful for Deputy St Pier. He has misinterpreted, really, my view of that metaphor I used. I used it because that battered suitcase could either contain a bag of dirty washing or it could contain a bottle of 12-year-old malt, Port Charlotte whiskey. I would like to take it off the carousel and look to find out which one it is.

100

**Deputy Trott:** It could be both or neither!

**Deputy St Pier:** In answering what may be in the suitcase, the States cannot ignore the work already done and, in particular, the analysis presented in Policy & Resources' April 2019 policy letter, in other words the PwC trilemma that, even if we extend the runway, we will still need to deploy significant route development support, including potentially airport charge reductions, to encourage operators and routes. We have greater flexibility, of course, with route support. But, and this I think is a further response to Deputy Fallaize, the initial work will be focussed on the short and medium term.

105

110

The impact of incompatibility between the States' air links policy framework, which was already approved, through Economic Development's recommendations, in other words *quasi* open skies,

the incompatibility of that and Aurigny shareholder objectives and their operating model and what recommendations need to be made and steps taken, in order to close the gap between both, in order to meet the policy objectives, which of course are economic, environmental and social, and how we address the financial consequences of that reconciliation process; in other words how much public support are we going to provide to Aurigny in that case?

For the medium term and the longer term, the question is what are the infrastructure questions, both physical – in other words the runway, aircraft and technology – that need to be addressed in order to ensure the ongoing alignment between our policy and the investment objectives and this, of course, would need to include considerations on runway length.

So in summary, Policy & Resources' view is that the reference in what is now Resolution 38 of the Budget Resolutions, as picked up by Deputy Prow, when he spoke to balance between investing in the infrastructure, major or otherwise, and subsidies to airline operators, is a clear reference to the PwC trilemma and we cannot properly consider and discharge Resolution 38 without giving some consideration to whether the runway should be longer.

This will not need to be a full business case and cost benefit analysis, as directed by the Requête, but will be a stripped down, strategic business case, of the pros and cons of different options, including extending the runway, which if the States supported such an option would lead to a further work to produce an outline business case and, in due course, a full business case. In short, we hold to the premise underpinning the sursis that this work is going to be done, in discharging Resolution 38, and the Propositions in the Requête are not necessary at this stage and we therefore encourage Members to support the Requête.

**A Member:** The Requête?

**The Bailiff:** There has been a request for a recorded vote, so we will have a recorded vote on the sursis motivé. And Deputy Tooley will be relevé.

**Deputy Tooley:** Thank you.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Sir, just a point of correction. Just now Deputy St Pier was encouraging the Assembly to support the Requête. I think he means the sursis.

**Deputy St Pier:** I meant the sursis. I am grateful for Deputy Kuttelwascher for pointing that out!

**The Bailiff:** So a recorded vote on the sursis motivé, proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Trott.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Not Carried – Pour 18, Contre 20, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2*

**POUR**

Deputy Tindall  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Tooley  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Stephens  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Dudley-Owen

**CONTRE**

Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Mooney  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy Merrett  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Smithies  
Deputy Graham

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Le Tocq

Deputy McSwiggan  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Roffey

Deputy Green  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Oliver (*by proxy*)  
Alderney Rep. Roberts  
Alderney Rep.  
Snowdon

**The Bailiff:** The voting on the sursis motiv   was 18 in favour, with 20 against. I declare it lost. So debate will now open on the Requet   itself and, I think I am right in saying, the next person to speak, if he wishes to do so, will be the President of the Committee *for* Economic Development, Deputy Parkinson.

155

**Deputy Parkinson:** Sir, I think probably in this case, the Vice-President ought to speak on behalf of the Committee, since she represents the majority view.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dudley-Owen, do you wish to speak at this point?

160

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** I reserve my right to speak later.

**The Bailiff:** You will speak later. President of the Committee *for the* Environment and Infrastructure, do you wish to speak now?

165

**Deputy Brehaut:** I do not think so at this stage.

**The Bailiff:** Nothing? The President of the Development & Planning Authority?

170

**Deputy Tindall:** I would like to speak later, thank you.

**The Bailiff:** In that case, debate opens from the floor and the Deputy Bailiff will be here in a moment. Deputy Trott.

175

**Deputy Trott:** Okay to carry on?

**The Bailiff:** Yes, carry on.

180

**Deputy Trott:** In some respects, I am pleased the sursis failed, albeit by the narrowest margins, and I will tell you why. Having done my best to try and speed debate up yesterday, there were some comments made in Deputy Kuttelwascher's opening remarks, when he was presenting the Requet  , which because of the Rules around debate, around the sursis, I was not able to respond to and I now have my opportunity.

185

He said a few things about why I had used some word pictures to describe how significant a sum of money   360,000 worth of expenditure is and I had done it for two reasons. The first was that, like me, Deputy Ferbrache understands the importance of constant reminders to our community on just how expensive public services are and why, wherever possible, we should refrain from spending very significant sums of money on stuff that we can do without.

190

To give you an idea, sir, of just how significant a sum of money is, if a front page of the *Guernsey Press* is to be believed, a few years ago,   360,000 is slightly less than six months' earnings for Deputy Ferbrache. These are very material sums of money indeed. I do not know whether that was true and no doubt my friend Deputy Ferbrache will have an opportunity to confirm or deny the veracity of that number, should he choose to speak.

195 But £360,000, and I confess I was wrong in my press release, I said that it represented maybe the cost of educating 50 children through the secondary system. Of course, it is less than 50, because that quote did not factor in the very significant additional capital cost on top of the revenue costs, because, as we know, it is tanking on for £9,000 for a single child; add in capital and that figure rapidly accelerates towards numbers in excess of £12,000. They are big sums of money.

200 Now, sir, yesterday it was raining and Deputy Le Tocq kindly gave me a lift. I knew it had all the hallmarks of a tedious afternoon, so I nipped down into Smith Street to buy some comfits and, whilst I was exiting that establishment, a gentleman called me to one side. He said, 'In many respects this Requête is nothing but a smoke screen.' I said, 'What do you mean by that?' He said, 'This is being brought forward by Deputies Kuttelwascher and Ferbrache, in particular, to divert attention away from the absolutely enormous losses that Aurigny, which comes under their shareholder

205 stewardship, is accruing.'

Now I have some sympathy with that view, sir, but I was very quick to defend Deputies Kuttelwascher and Ferbrache. I said, 'They cannot be blamed exclusively. Another signatory to the Requête, Deputy Smithies, must also shoulder some of the responsibility!' (*Laughter*) But the point I made in that press release, which was an aspect that Deputy Kuttelwascher conveniently ignored,

210 was I said would it not be better if three of those seven signatories, the aforementioned gentlemen, concentrated on getting the relationship between them, as shareholders' representatives, and Aurigny right, to try and curtail some of these spectacular losses that have so irritated our community?

It was raining and I tried to get my skates on but I made it no further than the Prince of Wales,

215 before a lady stopped me, and she said, 'I just do not get it, Deputy Trott. Why is it that the States persists in irritating the community with tedious repetition, with yo-yo government and with ludicrous proposals to expend vast sums of money on overseas consultants?' Once again, sir, I am always very careful in these events, with these experiences, I said, 'You will just have to ask the signatories to the Requête to that question. I could not possibly wish to speculate on what their motives are, albeit I accept just how irritating it is to most.'

220

Now there are three key points I want to make, to end. The first is the most recent very expensive consultants' report told us three things. There is no shortage of aircraft that can land in Guernsey. There are over 700 aircraft in service and another 50 or so on order in western Europe, that can land on a runway on Guernsey's –

225 I give way to Deputy Parkinson, sir, I have the details in front of me, so this will be interesting.

**Deputy Parkinson:** Yes, sir, but none of those aircraft, 700 aircraft, or 50 on order, are operated by low-cost carriers.

230 **Deputy Trott:** No, and let us talk about low-cost carriers. Let us remind ourselves what low-cost carriers said. Ryanair, probably the most infamous, or certainly the largest of the low-cost carriers, has made it quite clear they would be prepared to consider coming here, if we had a runway of 2,000 metres in length. They also –

235 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Kuttelwascher.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** I need to correct this one. I did not correct Deputy Trott on 12th December when he made a similar erroneous assumption. Ryanair now operate Airbus aircraft. They operate it to Southend, which has a 1,700-metre runway. He is right, if they want to operate the 737s they could not come here, but they could come here with Airbuses. So whatever he is saying is historical and, in December, Ryanair acquired these aircraft, so they could operate to a 1,700-metre runway.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Trott to continue.

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

That is interesting because, of course, that information was drawn directly from the consultant who may or may not be the consultant that is used should this Requête be successful. But they did not stop there. They went on to say that the picture then was not only did Ryanair need 2,000 metres, they would also, and this was referenced in Deputy St Pier's opening speech, need significant subsidies as well.

So the point is that some try to sell a runway extension as a panacea. The truth is it might compound our problems for a variety of reasons, including, of course, significantly diminished frequency; something that is so important to the business community that I remain active in. Deputy Ferbrache, I would be delighted to discuss my CV with you when you have the time.

One of the other things that the most recent consultants said was this: a route to London Heathrow would increase Guernsey's connectivity significantly. Now we have a route to London Heathrow. It is not particularly well utilised and it is an extremely expensive route, bearing in mind the subsidy. But we have it, nonetheless, and it is enabling that connectivity to be provided.

Lastly, and probably the most significantly, this is the urban myth that many in this Assembly seek to embellish, seek to procure, seek to maintain, is that the consultants' report said that, based on the size of our population, we already have very good connectivity. It is a little bit like being a snake oil salesman, saying, 'I only have on policy – and that is the extension of the runway – extend the runway and things will get materially better.' Things will probably not get materially better, sir

–

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Sir, another point of correction, I am afraid. I am not saying that at all.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher, (**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** I am sorry.) you know what you have to do. You stand and say, 'point of correction'; you are then called. So, Deputy Kuttelwascher.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Thank you. I am not suggesting this is a solution. All that is being suggested is that an analysis be done to see if there is a value-for-money case for it to be considered. It is one of any ... I get annoyed when people misconstrue what is being proposed and that has been misconstrued of what is proposed.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Trott to continue.

**Deputy Trott:** Thank you, that leads me on very neatly. I have made the point, sir, that we already have very good connectivity. I have made the point that our consultants have previously told us a route to London Heathrow would significantly increase that connectivity, so we have moved, arguably, from good to very good. I have made the point that there are hundreds of aircraft that can service our existing runway length, which is very pleasing news.

I think, to conclude, there was a reference to Guernsey Finance's £300,000 additional grant to fund the development of green finance initiatives. That £300,000 was dependent on the production

of a business plan. Now I can tell you that Guernsey Finance have put together, the Assembly will not be disappointed or surprised to hear this, an extremely robust business plan.

The fundamental difference is that the requérants cannot put together any form of business plan in support of this red herring of an idea. So, instead, they want £360,000 of our taxpayers' hard-earned money, to fund what is almost certain to be a complete and utter waste of time, for the reasons that Deputy Langlois gave earlier. I wholeheartedly reject this Requête.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, I cannot possibly support what I will be referring to in this speech as an irresponsible Requête. I say that for at least two reasons, both of which are on a professional basis and not on a personal basis, I hasten to add. I think it is absolutely vital we are professional at all times during our debates in this Chamber.

Reason number one is that the States have already had this debate, not once, but twice, and the answer was 'no'. So, what part of the word 'no' do the requérants not understand? Why has this been submitted for debate when we have already had the debate twice? I appreciate it is pantomime season, but if ever there was a prime example of wasting the time of the Assembly, the time of civil servants, the time of Law Officers and taxpayers' money, then surely this is it? Deputy Gollop says it is not. Well, I look forward to his speech. If ever there was a prime example of tedious repetition then, surely, this is it?

That is the first reason, the second reason being that I think it is irresponsible to adopt the 'let us build it and they will come' approach. By doing so, we would be gambling with millions of pounds of taxpayers' money and I do not think we should be doing that. I do not think we should be doing that because where is the guarantee that they will come? There is no such guarantee.

I realise the requérants are asking for a report to be produced, they are not actually asking us to agree to the extension of the runway itself today, but they are asking for up to £360,000 of taxpayers' money to be spent. How many of them voted against up to £250,000 being spent on a comprehensive, no-holds barred review, of the recent top-level appointment at Education, on the grounds that it was going to cost too much money?

So they do not want £250,000 of taxpayers' money to be spent on a comprehensive, no-holds barred review of a States' Committee, which would have told us everything the public have a perfect right to know, but they are all in favour of spending up to £360,000 on a business case that has no value for money guarantee attached to it whatsoever. Surely it does not get more irresponsible than that?

That sort of double standard and when it suits type of approach does nothing except bring the States into disrepute and therefore needs to be eradicated whenever it rears its ugly head. We can do that by rejecting this Requête in front of us today.

As I have already said, I am not in favour of spending £360,000 of taxpayers' money on this report. I am not in favour of the 'build it, they will come', type of approach and, sir, I am sure you will appreciate it is impossible to avoid tedious repetition, seeing as we have already had this debate and the requérants refuse to accept that the answer is 'no'. We are bound to go into tedious repetition because we have been put in a position where we are in fact, now, in the area of tedious repetition.

Assuming the ultimate goal of the requérants is for the runway to be extended, my question to them is who do they think is actually going to come to Guernsey as a result of the runway being extended. It certainly will not be the bucket and spade brigade, because we lost them to places like Spain, Portugal and Italy years ago. We lost them for two reasons. They can spend two weeks in every one of those places for half the cost of coming here, plus the fact they are guaranteed warm weather and sunshine for the majority of those two weeks.

So who do the requérants think is actually going to come to Guernsey as a direct result of the runway being extended? That is a key question because that needs answering in this debate, because surely every single one of the requérants must have an answer to it? If they do not have an

answer to it then why on earth are they asking for up to £360,000 of taxpayers' money to be spent? That is a lot of money to spend on a gamble. Something that has no guarantee whatsoever of success.

345 Where is the evidence that that business case will actually attain a successful outcome? There is no such evidence available – to the requérants or to anyone else, for that matter. All the requérants and anyone else can hope for is that the business case supports their 'build it and they will come' approach. How can that case provide evidence that extending the runway will result in a successful outcome? How can it do that when there is no such evidence available?

350 So not only is this Requête but it is also fundamentally flawed. In the preamble to the Propositions at bullet point five, we are told that in the current circumstances, your petitioners believe there is merit in the Committee *for* Economic Development progressing work to develop a business case for the extension of the runway at Guernsey Airport.

355 But we are not told anywhere in this two-page Requête what exactly those current circumstances actually are and what exactly has changed since the States had the debate on 26th September, a mere two months ago, during which they decided to approve that no further work was carried out to assess the option to extend the runway as set out in bullet point four of this Requête. Yes, as we know, the majority of Members of STSB have all changed their minds since that debate and the figure of £700,000 has now been reduced to £360,000. Well, whoopy-do.

360 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Sir, another point of correction.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Kuttelwascher.

365 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** It was corrected yesterday but I do not suppose Deputy Queripel may have been in the Chamber. Nobody voted not to do any further work on a possible runway extension. The only thing that was voted on is not to do any further work on a possible extension within the current boundary – and that is a significant difference.

370 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel to continue.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** As I said yesterday in response to that correction, the answer was still 'no'. So what part of the word 'no' do the requérants not understand? As I said, the figure of £700,000 has now been reduced to £360,000. Presumably that reduction is supposed to provide Members of the Assembly with some comfort, but sir, it provides me with no comfort whatsoever.

375 It provides me with no comfort whatsoever because, although £360,000 is not as much as £700,000, it is still a lot of taxpayers' money to spend on a business case that provides no value for money guarantee whatsoever. No guarantee that new airline companies using bigger planes are going to come here anyway. So the reality is, surely, that that £360,000 will be money wasted.

380 We have already heard from Deputy Parkinson that the vote to compile that business case is not being done, is not likely to be done, without additional resources. Great, because as a custodian of the public purse, I do not think the work should be done anyway. I am not concerned about what anybody may say in response to what I am saying here. I do not really care, to be honest. I will respect their views, as I ask them to respect mine, but I am not duty bound to take any notice of anyone else's views. I am duty bound to the public to spend their money wisely and ensure value  
385 for money.

390 Flip-flop government is frowned upon by many Members of this Assembly and by many members of our community. We have before us a prime example of flip-flop government. A policy letter was laid in front of the Assembly two months ago, asking the Assembly to support a Proposition to dispense with any further work to assess the option to extend the runway. The majority of this Assembly supported that Proposition. Deputy Kuttelwascher says it is not true, sir. Perhaps he would like me to give way and give him the chance to take the floor?

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** I thank Deputy Lester Queripel for giving way.

395 In the body of the Requête, it states that the Proposition to suspend any further work on the runway was actually defeated and all that was suggested was there could be further work but, at the time, there was no additional funding available so there was no Proposition to suspend any further work. In fact, the Committee *for* Economic Development have done part of the work and they would like to finish the work.

400 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, whatever anyone may say, we are now being asked to do a complete U-turn and we are being asked to vote in favour of this Requête and colleagues can shake their heads and say 'no', but they will have their chance to speak later and I look forward to hearing what they say.

405 When the majority of the Assembly have said 'no' on two occasions, surely the minority should be responsible enough to accept the situation? When Deputies Prow and Soulsby and I laid amendments to restrict the lighting of bonfires, they were defeated. We took 'no' for an answer. We did not lay an amendment to the pollution to the policy letter that we have just debated yesterday, because we had already been told, 'no'.

410 When my brother, Deputy Laurie Queripel, and I laid an amendment that sought to remove the £85 States' charge from the equation, during the waste debate, we were told, 'no'. We accepted it and moved on. We do not waste time and taxpayers' money by laying another amendment because we realise that would have been extremely irresponsible, tedious repetition, old ground.

415 This Requête asks us to do exactly the opposite of what the Assembly have said they do not want done on two occasions. So what has changed? Again I ask that question because I have not heard an answer to it. What has changed in those two months to justify the majority of this Assembly taking a U-turn. The community and the Assembly have every right to hear the answer to that question, so I sincerely hope someone is going to answer it and not avoid answering.

420 Surely they cannot possibly justify adopting the approach taken by Johnny Nash in the 1970's when he is saying *There Are More Questions Than Answers*, because I assume the requérants have all the answers and if they have not then why is this Requête in front of us?

425 Moving towards a close, I do not want precious resources, i.e. civil servants' time, Law Officers' time, politicians' time, hard-earned taxpayers' money, being spent on a business case when there is no guarantee whatsoever of a positive outcome. It would all be speculation. I think that would be an extremely irresponsible approach to take in supporting this Requête. Now, if there was a guarantee of a positive outcome attached to this Requête then I would have no hesitation whatsoever in supporting it.

I apologise, I give way to Deputy Parkinson.

430 **Deputy Parkinson:** Sir if there was a guaranteed outcome there would be no point in doing the research. We would know, before we set off, what the answer was.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, I am wondering if Deputy Le Tocq wants me to give way?

435 **The Deputy Bailiff:** He is not here, yet.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, I can tell everyone what the outcome is and I will move onto that in closing. As I was saying, if there was a guarantee of a positive outcome attached to this Requête then I would have no hesitation whatsoever in supporting it. That is my professional view; I ask colleagues to respect, as I will respect their views – as long as they are professional, of course.

440 The question I think my colleagues need to ask themselves when they come to vote is this: will the Committee *for* Economic Development be coming back to the States with a guarantee, signed by the big airline companies, that they will actually use our extended runway to operate new services to and from the Island, using larger planes, bringing thousands of people here until such time as

their landing fees have covered the cost of the extension? The answer to that question, of course, is no, they will not be coming back with that kind of information.

Therefore, I do not see how any Member of this Assembly can justify supporting this irresponsible Requête and I ask for a recorded vote, sir, when we go to the vote.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq, Deputy Lester Queripel rather gave away that you have arrived! Would you like to be relevé?

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

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Accordingly, your presence is noted. Deputy Roffey.

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

I am not going to do a long speech because I do not think anybody is going to be persuaded here. I think they have probably made up their mind and I suspect the voting will be quite close to a mirror image of the voting on the sursis, although there may be one or two floaters and that vote was quite close.

I do not quite start from the point where Deputy Graham starts from. I am open-minded to the extent that, if it was absolutely vital to our economy I would obviously have to consider an extended runway, but I would prefer not to see one, both for environmental reasons and indeed because I think the model of connectivity based on low-cost airlines with larger aircraft would be far more fragile than what we have at the moment.

Because of that predilection, shared by Deputy Soulsby, the two of us tried, when I think it was Deputy Kuttelwascher and Deputy Ferbrache were involved, when they brought forward a proposal, which was predicated on almost an assumption that a runway extension would be a good thing, we tried to choke that off.

Now those two Deputies did not have the courage of their convictions. Instead of pushing through what they wanted to do, they piled behind an amendment from P&R, which led to a review; an expensive, lengthy review of the options around our runway. I was thinking, 'Okay, well I lost that but at least we are going to come back with a fully informed report, expensive though it was, that will allow us to make an informed judgement on whether or not a runway extension was a good thing.'

What came back was on the one hand this, on the one hand that. So we are basically being asked to spend another tranche of money doing exactly what we thought that that first report was going to do and I think Deputy Langlois is probably right that, unless the people commissioning the report say, 'Oi, boys, this is what we want to see in the outcome,' – which possibly would happen, I do not know, I hope not – then I think what would come back would be something similar.

But even if it was more definitive, it is being sold on, 'Look P&R under Resolution 38 of the Budget are being asked to come back with a comprehensive thing, but at least if it is informed by a cost benefit analysis, we will be able to make a decision at that stage about the runway extension, it would be oven-ready, just need to stick it in the microwave or whatever...' – I think I have been influenced by someone, I do not know!

But it will not be. If they want it to be oven-ready why are they not asking for £300,000 for an environmental impact study? Because that is just as important as the cost benefit analysis when we come to make the decision. So if we are trying to do the prep work, to do the preliminary work, we should be doing it properly, across the board.

I think Deputy Parkinson sort of gave it away when Deputy Trott was going on about how many planes would land here and he intervened and said none of them are owned by low-cost airlines. Now I have got nothing against low-cost airlines, I fly with easyJet quite often, I am going with Edelweiss Air from Zurich to Bandaranaike Airport next month, one of the world's best low-cost airlines. But I think we have to be careful what we wish for here, I really do.

If we are even considering spending this money in order to get a cost benefit analysis, in order to allow low-cost airlines with larger aircraft to service Guernsey, where will that deliver us? Why would they want to come here? They might want to come here to service Gatwick but surely we then have to make a decision about, hopefully, in May, or whenever it is coming, April, on whether we will be able to maintain the exclusion from the open skies for Gatwick, or there are other routes that are likely to actually damage, second-hand, that lifeline route, even though it is not the one itself. Or it will be to fairly minor destinations.

I know in Jersey they have served quite a few different routes, but I have to say the whole thing, the hook that the whole thing was anchored on, was Jersey-Gatwick and from which they have managed to build a model, which actually allowed economies of scale for their Jersey operation. I do not know how many people looked at it, I emailed out a news story about the situation that Newquay find themselves in at the moment.

Okay, they are not really big aircraft, they are actually the sort of aircraft that Flybe are serving Guernsey-Heathrow with, but they got themselves in a situation where they rely on subsidising a private airline in order to buy connectivity. They lost their route, it fell away, the one from Newquay to Gatwick, I understand. But they do now have three times a day Newquay to Heathrow. It is not being advertised beyond February. I do not know what is going on. None of us can, but I can make a pretty shrewd guess. I think Flybe are saying to the Cornish authorities and to Newquay Airport, 'Sorry, your level of support for this link, given the cost of the Heathrow slots and what they can be used for ...'

I give way to Deputy Mooney.

**Deputy Mooney:** Just a point of correction.

The Newquay is a PSO and it is a four-year contract, so it is quite different and ... *[Inaudible]*

**Deputy Roffey:** It may be. The point is, once you become dependent on privately owned aircraft with a level of subsidy and they can turn around and say, 'sorry this does not work for us any more,' you are in hock to those aircraft. If four or five want to come here, and Jersey are in a much stronger position than us for that, because they have got the economies of scale, if there are two or three, you have got a marketplace and you can play off against the other and minimise your subsidy.

But if you have only got one that wants to come and they are saying by that time you have changed your model for Aurigny, the scale went down or even disappeared, and you are reliant on low-cost airlines with big aircraft, you are, to put it crudely, over a barrel. So I do think we have to be careful what we wish for and, honestly, my terminology is fairly crude, but I think in the PwC report, or whatever, that came back, that was actually implied. That was why there was such a trilemma and it was not an easy answer to whether you should or should not extend your airport.

I am slightly confused over two or three things. We are debating whether to give Economic Development up to £360,000. We have a letter of comment from, purportedly the majority view of Economic Development saying, 'No we do not want to do this.' 'Yes, here you are. But we do not want it. But you are going to have it.' It is a very weird situation.

If Economic Development had really wanted to do this, or any of the other Committees really wanted to do this, we have been sitting in here nearly four years. Some people have been passionate about runway extensions. Why have they not prioritised budgets to actually do this sort of work? Having turned down 700 grand for doing it, now it is half of that; if this fails today by one or two votes, will we have another requête in February saying, okay, 200 grand, last offer, let us do it for 200 grand. It really is a fairly odd situation.

To me, having tried to start –

I give way to, yes, Deputy –

**Deputy Merrett:** I thank Deputy Roffey for giving way.

545 I just want to pin down this majority of the Committee, because clearly two of the Committee have signed the Requête, so the majority of the Committee sitting ... (**Several Members:** One.) Oh, one Member, sorry, signed the Requête. Sorry, I really thought Deputy Oliver was on the Committee for a moment. So I am assuming that three of the Committee were sat when it was discussed.

550 I am hopeful that somebody who is relevant can actually give us the indication of who was sat and who agreed what. We know that some of the Committee do want to do it and some of the Committee do not. But what I wanted to come up with before I finish is that if the States give a direction to a Committee to deliver something, a States' Resolution, whether that is delivering a tourism strategy or delivering this, regardless of their personal opinions, a policy direction from this States is deliberate and therefore they should deliver it.

555 Thank you, sir.

**Deputy Roffey:** Two points on that. Firstly, yes of course. The States have asked us and their Committees will do what they are instructed to do. But you would think, if this is all about developing our economy by economic enablement then actually it would be the Committee charged with that that would be passionate and foaming at the mouth to do it

560 Instead, at the very least, there seems to be a really mixed picture inside the Committee about whether or not this is a good exercise to do. I suppose we all have to wait with bated breath to see what Deputy Inder has to say on it to know which way the majority actually lies within the Committee. We know, really, that Deputy Mooney and Deputy Parkinson are in favour, whereas Deputy de Lisle and Deputy Dudley-Owen are not. At the very least, if it is on the knife edge of the Inder judgement then it is not a Committee who has a mandate charged with economic development, that thinks this is so central to our economic development it is something we definitely must do.

570 We have been here nearly four years. It was an issue – I do not know if it was the main issue but it was an issue – at election time, quite a big one. I am waiting for somebody to make a strong, *prima facie* case for the runway extension leading to better connectivity. I have not yet heard it. We have already put one quite big dollop of money into this in order to try and get a more definitive answer to make an informed judgement.

575 I think today we will probably put another big dollop of money in and I agree with Deputy Langlois, I think the chances of us really being much better informed, at the end of the day, are slim, to put it mildly. When we spend money talking about value for money, it is not just value for money, it is almost gambling and what are the odds, is it not? I am not a gambler, but if the odds are so heavily stacked against a definitive black and white answer coming out of this, instead you are going to come down to the judgement of this Assembly.

580 I do not think it is going to really change that much. If it was going to change that much and the definitive answers were there, then PwC would have come back with those answers. So I do not say that £360,000 is huge in the terms of what we are spending on Aurigny, that is quite right. But it is still, you know, call me old-fashioned, quite a big slab of money that cannot be spent on something else and I do not think I can justify it today. So I am going to vote against, but I am pretty sure that

585 it is going to go through by a small majority.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld.

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

590 I would like to start off by addressing some of the comments that Deputy Trott made. Yes, you may want to come back to this! (*Laughter*) Deputy Trott, sir, related the £360k to personal incomes and tried to persuade us that this is a substantial amount of money. And for an individual it is. But we are not functioning at an individual level here.

595 Let us put this in perspective. Earlier this month, we approved a Budget of over £430 million for next year's expenditure for the States. So as a percentage of £430 million, the £360,000 –

**Deputy Trott:** Sir on a point of correction ...

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** The States of Guernsey spends over £2 million a week. Deputy Meerveld's maths is chronically inaccurate.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld to continue.

**Deputy Meerveld:** Sorry, I mentioned £430 million annual Budget we approved earlier this month, not £2 million a month. I did not mention any £2 million. (*Interjection*) Sorry? Anyway let us go back to we have got a Budget of £430 million, so let us look at the £360k as a percentage of that £430 million. It relates to less than one hundredth of a per cent.

To put that in a personal perspective, to bring that down to your average earner in Guernsey, the average income, I think, is about £39,000 a year for an individual. If an individual were purchasing a house, making a major decision such as a house purchase –

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, point of correction.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** A second point of correction, Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** The average earnings are *circa* £33,000 a year.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld to continue.

**Deputy Meerveld:** Okay, I will continue with my example – £33,000, I will use that as an example. If a person earning £33,000 per year were to make a major decision like purchasing a property or doing something else in that order, if they were to spend the same percentage on, say, a property survey, to confirm that the condition of the property was suitable to buy, it would be accordant to spending less than £30 to make an informed decision.

Let us look at another instance of comparison and scale, here. It is quite interesting, in yesterday's debate, a statement from the Alderney Representatives, Deputy Trott went to great lengths to stand up and say that if you took the subsidy per person paid by Guernsey to Alderney to support Alderney and multiplied it up to the population of Guernsey it would be the equivalent to Guernsey running a deficit of some £180 million. Again that is a huge number. He seemed to have missed the irony of the fact that the day before Policy & Resources released a fiscal proposal saying that we need to raise another £132 million in taxes, therefore we are potentially running, in the future, a deficit on those kinds of scales.

Also you need to put in perspective with the Aurigny costs and the amount of subsidy that has been provided by this States, either directly or in loan guarantees during our four-year term. It is now running at over £90 million. Deputy Trott criticised Members of the STSB for not having addressed those losses and yet the Members of the STSB, all three of them, are signatories to this Requête and are trying to bring in some research that could help address that issue, would look at the viability of Aurigny and whether or not competitors coming in could help possibly reduce our dependency on Aurigny.

Just going back to criticising Members of the STSB, my fear is that P&R and others are trying to block looking at this question because they want to protect the sacred cow of Aurigny and they do not want to look at information that might lead to a conclusion that actually we should reduce our dependency and reduce our subsidies of that airline.

Moving onto Deputy Lester Queripel, he is saying there is no evidence, there is no successful guarantee that we will get a definitive answer – I think Deputy Roffey mentioned something similar

– out of this research. No, I go back to what Deputy Graham said yesterday about his analogy of the suitcase going around the carousel. This suitcase was on the carousel when we took up our positions at the beginning of this term. It is still on the carousel going around. The business community is almost unanimous in saying that this needs to be done. So if you want to take that back off the carousel –

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, on a point of correction.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** The surveys released by the IoD and the chamber suggested that just under two thirds were supportive of the view, that number is significantly down from previous reviews.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld to continue.

**Deputy Meerveld:** I must say that in my world, two thirds is a majority. Going back –

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, a point of correction.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** Unanimous means 100%, just less than two thirds is 65%. There is a yawning gap. I really do question Deputy Meerveld's mathematics on a number of occasions, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld to continue.

**Deputy Meerveld:** As I do question Deputy Trott's. I said nearly a majority ... anyway I am not going to bother belabouring this point. Yes, so, I have lost my place.

What I am concerned about here is we are proceeding with a piece of work that is meant to be looking at our transportation links holistically and all the different options available to us but by resisting this Requête and the proposals herein, we are doing it in a blinkered way. We do not want to look over there in case we get an answer we do not like.

I am not particularly inclined to extend the runway but I definitely want to see the research done to see whether there is a case for doing so. To make a decision without including that information, Deputy Roffey said there is no *prima facie* case for extending the runway, that is right, we have got to do the research first if it is going to be an issue, whether it should be included in the debate.

I believe that if this Requête is defeated today then I would recommend that the signatories to the sursis motivé, no doubt much to the chagrin of Deputy Lester Queripel, bring a sursis motivé of their own when this report comes back to the States and to delay debate on this report until this additional research is done and then we can debate it in its entirety. I encourage all Members to support this Requête. In the context of what we are discussing, a £90 million subsidy to Aurigny in the last four years, directly or indirectly, a £430 million Budget, we are not looking at a significant amount of money to make a proper, informed decision.

This decision is not whether or not to extend the runway. This decision is whether or not to do the business case to see whether it should be considered in the round with all the other options and I encourage all Members to support this Requête and move on.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Prow.

**Deputy Prow:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

Sir, I rise to support the three prayers contained in the Requête and I hope to explain why. I will start by referring to the Policy & Resources' letter of comment. I accept that the States has debated

700 the issue of extending the runway in two debates, one in 2018 and one in 2019. That is a fair point and I agree with them on this. I further respect the views of those Deputies who have spoken against the States making progress by developing a business case and a cost benefit analysis, that this Requête prays for.

705 In saying that, I listened very carefully to the speech, made by Deputy Lester Queripel. I can assure him I hold him in high regard. I do listen to what he says. But on his point about what part of 'no' do you not understand, I do not think it is as black and white as that. I think on one of the debates it was lost by one vote, 20-19, and Deputy Roffey, in what I thought was a very measured speech said this indicated this matter is, I think his term was, 'on a knife edge'.

710 Indeed, when you look at Economic Development there is obviously a divided view. I think this States is divided on this issue and I think what the Requête wants to do is to move this forward and Deputy Kuttelwascher and Deputy Meerveld have made the point very loud and clear that this is about a cost benefit analysis and that will inform the decisions of the relevant Committees and this States.

715 I also agree, returning to the letter of comment, that this Assembly is looking for a co-ordinated. Sir, I do not argue with any of this. But where I do part company with the P&R letter, I submit that P&R, who have majorly contributed to the lack of a coherent Government consideration, which has continually been a theme of this term, it is clear to me that P&R do not want to consider the investment in our Airport infrastructure. No tangible initiatives by P&R have led to the Committees responsible and STSB resolving the lack of strategic direction and air connectivity. We seem to be  
720 in the same place, or some might say worse, than we were at the start of this term.

I believe, if you go back to 2018, this is why they have dismissed the findings of the review that they commissioned, which was completed by PricewaterhouseCoopers, to undertake a study of air and sea links. P&R actually praised PwC in paragraph 1.3 of that report, describing this report as 'high quality', but interestingly ignored the Airport infrastructure content.

725 I believe a case has been made out to move to a cost benefit analysis and I think P&R are actually fearful of this. This is why they attempted the sursis motivé, to try and kick this into touch and off our agendas. P&R talk in terms of a direct conflict and, as the sursis has teased out, Proposition 37 of the Budget we agreed on Bonfire Night, upon which they heavily rely, is actually not primarily about infrastructure at all. The only mention of infrastructure in the Proposition is to measure it  
730 against subsidies. How can you undertake such a comparison unless you have an infrastructure business case and a cost analysis, as recommended in the Requête?

Back in April and, actually, recently in their responses, unlike P&R, the Chamber, IoD, and GIBA and others have talked in terms of solutions and social and financial benefits. They look to the future, improving our tourism offer, looking after the interests of the finance industry and growing  
735 the economy. They talk of aircraft operated by low cost and other airlines who cannot operate their fleets into Guernsey, constrained by a smaller runway. They explain that a 1,700-metre runway will enable direct flights to a greater range of destinations. This is what the PwC report tells us.

Sir, this is about investing in infrastructure for the future. When we trundle along to our stand at Gatwick Airport, how many other ATRs do you see? In fact, how many Embraers sit alongside the  
740 airbuses and 727s? This States has been repeatedly criticised by Government-sponsored reports for failing to adequately invest in infrastructure. A 1,700-metre runway, as described in the appendix of the policy letter we considered back in April, is about investing for the next four decades, around how aviation will develop. It will enable us to compete with our competitive jurisdictions, who also have finance industries and a hospitality sector.

745 Importantly, PwC tells us that the extension of at least 1,700 metres would enable us to upgrade Guernsey's land-based instrument landing system. The ILS systems are described as the most robust and the main technological solution for mitigating the impact of bad weather. We are told on page 20 of the appendix of that report that a CAT-3 ILS upgrade is, given Guernsey's specific circumstances, the most sensible land-based option.

750 This is a significant factor. Sir, I ask how restricting and limiting will our current ILS system prove to be as time marches on. We have procrastinated too long. I thank the requérants for bringing this to the Assembly and I support the prayers.

Thank you, sir.

755 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

**Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

A number of Members have spoken about the benefit to the business community. Well I would like to quote some of the points, which are made in the PwC report and also in the Nyras report.  
760 On page 66 of the report, it says:

Low-cost carriers ...

And if we are going to extend the runway there is no point doing it unless we are going to bring in low-cost carriers.

... would likely operate fewer flights, potentially at less convenient times, which would harm frequency and connectivity. This will have a particular negative impact on the business community, which is known to favour frequency over low-cost tickets.

The Nyras report says the easyJet/BA point also highlights something else, that bigger aircraft do not mean more flights. In fact, it is often the reverse and at undesirable times of day. That is two  
765 separate consultants have said we are likely to get less frequency and not so good times.

These are the comments of the business community in the PwC report. It says:

The production of larger aircraft will mean rationing of flight times, which will affect business travellers, who tend to be particularly sensitive to the convenience of flight times.

I go on, from the PwC report:

Low-cost carriers expect significant market support in order to base aircraft and grow route networks.

And most importantly, in comparison to one of the other Crown Dependencies, it says:

Additionally, the Isle of Man is an example of any airport where the introduction of a low-cost carrier, in the case of easyJet, has had a negative on scheduling.

770 So we have got evidence of what has happened in a similar community to ours. It goes on to say on page eight:

Business travellers value connectivity and frequency highly and particularly value reliability. Early morning, late evening flights tend to enable business trips and efficient use of time.

On reliability it quotes morning and evening fog are most common, which coincides with the busiest operational times of the day. That is when we are likely to have the delays. One of the advantages that we have, currently, unlike Jersey, in relation to easyJet, we have a plane based in Guernsey, which means that, no matter what the weather is, almost, the flight can leave Guernsey if  
775 we get fog in the morning. But in Jersey, easyJet cannot get in because of the fog. On page 14:

There is no guarantee that airlines can provide additional capacity without significant financial and commercial support.

So even if we did get easyJet in, they are likely to want additional money. Those are all quotes from the PwC and Nyras reports. So our business route is Gatwick and there is no point extending the runway without allowing a low-cost carrier in Gatwick. It would be pointless. We could not justify the cost.

780 This will effectively destroy Aurigny. We saw what happened when we had two airlines in competition on the Gatwick route, which was –

**Deputy Graham:** Point of order, sir.

785 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of order, Deputy Graham.

**Deputy Graham:** Mr Deputy Bailiff, I know this is a very difficult area, but we have had a succession of speeches on the Requête, which are essentially from people arguing against the case for extending the runway. In my view, that is not really the essence of the Requête. We have had a  
790 speech from Deputy Roffey, we are now getting one from Deputy Dorey, which is at great length articulating the case for not extending the runway. Those of us who are neutral on this matter would actually welcome a concentration of the debate on the Requête, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Graham, I hear what you say and you are invoking Rule 17(6) about  
795 the relevance of the debate to the matter before the meeting as being the provision that is not being complied with by Deputy Dorey. It strikes me that one of the reasons for voting against the Propositions will be, 'I do not support the extension of the runway', and therefore that is an element of the debate that is potentially relevant. But there does not need to be tedious repetition of other people's argument. Deputy Dorey has simply drawn attention, as I understand what he has been  
800 saying, to some matters that have previously been before the States but reminding people of the content of those. So please do continue, Deputy Dorey.

**Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

So it would effectively destroy Aurigny and we would lose our slots. There would be less  
805 frequency, because of bigger planes, exactly what has happened in the Isle of Man. As in Jersey, as I say easyJet do not base a plane in Jersey overnight, so we would have the problems with fog in the morning.

I certainly have enough information, which is my point, to reject the Requête. There is not a case to spend any money on a business case. A business case is an extensive piece of work. There is no  
810 new information from the April debate that was rejected. It is not just the money on the business case and the cost benefit analysis, people forget it is a business case, which is an extensive case. It is also, if you get any consultants to do any work, there needs to be considerable work by a Committee to support those consultants and work with them on the project.

The one thing that we do not have at this point in time, in relation to the extensive workload we  
815 have from the Policy & Resource Plan, is resources available. We should be directing our resources to commit and fulfil what we have committed to and the Policy & Resource Plan, not to do other tasks, which have already been rejected.

The right way forward is to wait for the framework, which we have agreed, and to support that, and then we would have the sufficient information to make a decision whether we want to go ahead  
820 with developing a business case. This is a wrong time to do it. Wait until we have the framework and that is the right time to do it. So I ask Members to reject this Requête.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Graham.

825 **Deputy Graham:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

Just to repeat, I am neutral on this. I suspect I am probably in the company of 10 or a dozen other Members of the Assembly. I think for the other two thirds, they divide up into a fairly eclectic bunch, who I will not name, who are, in their own minds, absolutely certain that it is in the interests  
830 of the Bailiwick to extend the runway here in Guernsey.

A more easily identifiable bunch entertain not a scintilla of doubt that it would be a waste of time and money and they are more easily identifiable. They are either Members of the P&R Committee or they might have been elected in the Western electoral district. But I would say to them –

835 I will give way to Deputy Dudley-Owen, rather predictably, I think. (*Laughter*)

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you, sir, and I think Deputy Graham says that in order to get me to my feet very quickly. I would like at this juncture – I am currently putting some notes together for a speech, as I am listening to people's comments, that I will deliver later on – but I would like to say now, please, those of you in this Chamber who think that I personally hold a view against a runway extension because I live in Western parishes, please dispel yourself of that myth. That is absolutely not the case and I really will take issue with anybody who continues to repeat that because it is false and inaccurate.

840 Thank you.

845

**Deputy Graham:** I am grateful for the intervention, because it gives me the opportunity to say that, by making that remark, I was in no way questioning the integrity of those people who hold the belief to which I was alluding. I have to say it is a little bit of a coincidence that, with the Assembly split roughly 50-50 on this issue, that all five Members who were elected in the Western district happened to be of one voice on this. But I do accept, without question, the integrity of those who come to their view for different reasons.

850 The message I give to those two opposing groups in the Assembly is that, when it comes to deciding whether extending the runway would be a golden opportunity for Guernsey, or a total disaster and a waste of money that would be counter-productive, I do not trust either of them, anything that they might say or produce, in order to make my decision as to where the balance should lie.

I do take the point that a cost benefit analysis, a business case, call it what you want, may in itself not be totally decisive. But in my view it will be a better bunch of evidence than anything that those two opposing groups might say to me. When it comes to the P&R report that we were expecting in April 2020, to me, a report that is predicated on an evaluation of our optimum air links, predicated on only one length of runway, is less convincing than one that might be predicated on more than one option for the length of our runway.

860 If we lived in Gibraltar, it is no problem, you do not even have to worry about a RESA there. The runway begins and ends at the sea. Although you possibly could have the option of extending into the sea, but then there would be problems with Spain and so on. Here in Guernsey we do have the option.

865 Before I decide in a vote, and I hope we get the opportunity before this political term ends, before I decide to vote one way or the other, I have to say again, with the greatest respect to both those two opposing groups, I do not trust your judgement on this one and I need an independent judgement really. That independent judgement may in itself not be totally decisive.

870 I would say to those who have not a scintilla of doubt that there is no case for extending the runway, what do they have to fear? Any objective cost-effective analysis will show there is no case for extending the runway. The worst outcome for that would have been that we would have spent £350,000 on getting that answer. But I think so key is the decision that that is potentially money well spent and, if it is not spent in this Assembly, it will be spent in the next one. Believe you me.

875

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

**Deputy Brehaut:** Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

880 I know there are always, are there not, letters of comment appended, I just wanted to read directly from the letter from Environment & Infrastructure because there has been, for understandable reasons, focus on the business case. It says – areas of consideration:

A project of this size would have significant impact on the surrounding area and therefore any work to assess the cost benefits and dis-benefits –

– whatever dis-benefits means, by the way, to different groups –

– it would be a huge undertaking. The cost of the potential extension of the runway must not only be measured in terms of construction costs. A study on the expansion of the runway would need to include an evaluation of the potential impact on all of the following areas of importance to the Committee –

– my Committee, that is –

– these include the impact on the environment, biodiversity, agricultural land –

885 – the potential loss of, that is –

– farming, climate change, including potential increase in carbon emissions, energy policy, including future energy source for aviation, the road network, the Transport Strategy, water reserves –

Bearing in mind some of the comments from Deputy de Lisle yesterday, with regard to land loss and run-off certain potential pollutants, that should not be disregarded.

– pollution, including noise, light and air pollution, and the security of supply of essential commodities.

890 There is this idea, I suppose in listening to what Deputy Meerveld was saying, which is – and he has touched on it directly before and I understand why – this idea that we subsidise Aurigny, we are blindsided on Aurigny, we have got so much invested in it. Why would we want to, then, subsidise or invest in airlines that are in someone else's ownership? I think that is the risk that we run, that we have a begrudging degree of control, but we should not underestimate the nature of the control that we have, potentially.

895 Also to bear in mind the negative impact of any of these areas would need to be accounted for by any study and must be included in any cost benefit analysis. As an example, a loss of biodiversity could be measured by using eco-systems accounting. That is new to Guernsey. This is something we are looking to do by, is it May 2020? You can make a business case but you just cannot do the rest of it in the timeframe that is being specified.

It should also be borne in mind that on 28th June the States' resolved –

– that is if Resolutions mean anything –

– that all Committees of the States of Deliberation –

900 – I appreciate this is a requête –

– when laying policy letters before the Assembly should assess therein any consequential impact on climate change of their proposals, together with, where appropriate, their adaption and mitigating actions.

So who is going to do that piece of work, because the Requête in itself is quite superficial? But who is going to do the whole body of work, the depth of work that sits beneath that? It will be a States' department and their staff.

Any costs in these areas would need to be evaluated, together with the cost of any potential offsetting or mitigation measures and included in any business case presented to the States ...

– which I have just touched on.

905 I think the timeframe is completely unrealistic, even for those people who are supporting. If I can just observe the exchange between Deputy Graham and Deputy Dudley-Owen, why should not representatives of certain parts of the Island identify with a group of people who feel they have been disadvantaged or will be by the potential expansion?

I will just remark, I will not name names but I will just refer to a water cooler moment when I came in this morning, which was a Deputy saying to another Deputy, 'You are standing for election, what are you going to say to members of the IoD?' Well, the community have a voice in here too and we should not forget that. There will be, as any Member of E&I will tell you, significant pushback from elements of the community who feel they are, quite rightly, disadvantaged.

One point, I think, that we need to really think and begin to understand, is the high cost of low-cost airlines. We have lifeline routes that come at a real cost to us and we know, as I have said before, we begrudge that. But when you aim to have potentially larger aircraft, not fully laden, burning tonnes of air fuel, that will not be sustainable for these low-cost airlines. So we know what will happen. There will be the cherry picking of the summer routes and then it will be more difficult for people to travel during the winter months, which our business community operates around the clock, 365 days of the year. So why would we want to impede movement?

Members, I cannot support this Requête. I will observe also that there are more flip-flops in this Assembly than you are going to find on Bondi Beach. It seems, despite many manifesto commitments, that this States' Assembly needs to make a decision, decide and move on. In light, I have to say, of a requête that I received this morning in another area, when are we going to let go, when are we going to make decisions –

**A Member:** When we make the right decision.

**Deputy Brehaut:** – and move on and respect the decisions already taken by this Assembly?

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Tooley.

**Deputy Smithies:** Thank you very much, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Tooley! *(Laughter)*

**Deputy Smithies:** Not the first time that has happened, I apologise!

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Tooley.

**Deputy Smithies:** Sorry, about that.

**Deputy Tooley:** That is okay. Thank you, sir.

I am not going to say a great deal but I do think this is a very unusual debate. It is a really irregular debate, because we are being asked, laying aside the fact that it is a debate that I feel like I am caught in Groundhog Day, and I felt even more like that by the end of last night, but we are being asked, as a States, to deliberate whether or not we should provide a sum of money, quite a large sum of money to my mind, to a Committee, to do some investigatory work around the runway.

What we do not know, really, is how that Committee feels about this and it is really unusual that we can get to this point in the debate without having an answer to that question. We can make guesses about how that Committee feels about it and we can make relatively educated guesses. We can assume that Deputy Mooney is supportive, because he signed the Requête. Comments that Deputy Parkinson made earlier suggest that he is at least agnostic about the result of such a review. The letter of comment we saw, which was signed by Deputy Dudley-Owen, suggests that both she and Deputy de Lisle are against the idea that there is any real point in investigating an extension of the runway when an extension of the runway is not something they think they would support for a whole host of other reasons, which are varied between the two of them.

We do not know how the swing voter on this subject, as it is, within Economic Development feels about this and, actually, without that information, it is really hard to deliberate any part of this and

yet we have been, for the last hour and a half, holding a debate about whether or not we should give people money to do something that we do not know whether they want to do and where I said that we can make an educated guess over this is the fact that the Committee have not prioritised this. Because if they did collectively want to do this, I have to assume, and I am making  
965 a guess, that they would have put it in their list of priorities for the P&R Plan and the Budget, and they have not.

So my guess is – I will give way in a minute – that they did not. But it is a guess and I genuinely do not see how we can go any further in this debate or even, to be honest, how we have got to this point in the debate, without the Members of Economic Development telling us what they think  
970 about the Requête. Because what I am seeing, as Deputy Graham said, is a group of people who have an opinion that we should definitely do something about extending the runway and I have full respect for that. I am not sure how I feel about extending the runway, but I have full respect for the fact that they are absolutely of the opinion that we have got to, at the very least, investigate this.

We have got another group of people that are absolutely of the opinion that, for a whole host of reasons, it will be a very bad idea to extend the runway and that, actually, even if there were great economic advantages they would not necessarily outweigh the detrimental effects that that would have.  
975

Then we have got people who, and I have to say it, are trying to build a fence that they can sit on because, heaven forbid there is an election happening next year, so they are, it would appear to me, making speeches which say, 'I am on your side and I am also on your side. I just need the chance  
980 to be able to say that I am not ruling it in or out.' I do not for one minute think why that is why this Requête is here. I absolutely believe that certainly the prime requérant and almost certainly the others, genuinely believe this is the right thing.

But the vast majority of the speeches I have heard in support of the Requête, not necessarily in support of the runway extension, feel to me as though what they are doing is making a plea for votes that they would not necessarily have had in their electoral district and that is a plea I heard on a different subject from somebody last week, or the week before, and a plea I think I am hearing increasingly in matters that are being brought to this States from outside the Committees responsible for those areas.  
985

I am absolutely certain it is something I heard last night, something that dropped into my email inbox. There are people who have started electioneering and they are using the States of Deliberation to do it and I do not think that that is how we should be behaving. I do not think this debate can continue, for me, without hearing from Economic Development.  
990

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I will call Deputy Smithies, so he does not try and speak another time! Deputy Fallaize will follow.  
995

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

I have now adjusted my hearing aid so I can hear clearly.  
1000

I have no firm view on the runway extension because I do not have the facts, I have only opinions. I think the Assembly should owe a debt of thanks to Deputy Graham, because he has made my speech for me, so I can therefore be very brief.

Decisions based wholly on belief, opinion and external influence may have their place in romantic fiction, but in the real world facts are needed and facts are needed in this case urgently and this Requête hopefully will result in a report giving us those facts.  
1005

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.  
1010

I think I feel a bit like Deputy Graham, because I think I am entering into a debate where most of the States have very strong and quite principled views on this matter and I do not. I think this is

a quite technocratic, functional issue. I do not think there is any great political principle at stake in whether our runway should be 1,500 metres or 1,700 metres or 2,000 metres or whatever it should be. It is a very functional issue.

I am coming at the Requête from that perspective. The problem I have with the Requête is not about the principle but about the technical issue of what happens in the event that the Requête is approved. I think what will happen is that, clearly the Committee for Economic Development will have to commission the work that will be set out in Proposition 1, even though I think a majority of that Committee is opposed to carrying out the work, or we are about to find out – I do not know – or we will later in this debate, but nevertheless whether they are or they are not, they will; in good faith, if they are directed to carry out the work they will carry it out.

Then it says, 'direct the Committee to present a business case,' but it does not say to whom they are going to be presenting it. Normally business cases are presented to the Policy & Resources Committee. There is not much point doing that because we know what the view of the Policy & Resources Committee is. So maybe it means, although it does not say this in the Proposition, to present the business case to the States.

But irrespective of to whom they are meant to be presenting this business case, what will happen, I am quite sure, is that to whomever they present it, the people receiving it – and let us assume it is the States – will say, 'Okay, it is now April or it is May, 2020.' That is the last meeting of the States before the Election and all it is going to be is a business case. It is not going to be anything other than that.

It is not something on which the States would be able to reach any firm conclusions. So what happens then? At the very most, the States will say, 'Okay, so this is interesting. So let us commission somebody –' a Committee, presumably – 'to do some further work and report to the next States.'

I guarantee that if that is what happens the next States, when they receive the work, will say, 'Okay, but this report was commissioned by the previous States. What we really need now is an independent cost benefit analysis, or a business case of some description, so that we can examine whether the runway should be lengthened or not.' I think we will end up with two reports: one commissioned by this States and one commissioned by the next States – effectively doing exactly the same thing.

I think it would be better for those Members who want to have a business case – and I am not quite sure what that even is in the context of this debate, because the States have not yet decided whether there is a *prima facie* case to extend the runway but let us just park that for one minute. If there is going to be a business case, I think it would be better for the States to direct that it is presented to the next States. I cannot see any value at all in the current States receiving a business case in May 2020.

I will give way to Deputy Kuttelwascher.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** I thank Deputy Fallaize.

What I had in mind, when I was drafting this Requête and discussing it with the, I will call it the office of Economic Development staff therein, was that May is too late for this States to actually do anything about it. However, I would expect this then to become an election issue and candidates standing for election could decide whether or not they are impressed by the business case or not and it would be for the next States, depending on its make-up, to decide whether to progress it or not. That is really my point. I would not expect, because of the timeline, that anything would happen as regards putting anything into effect during this Assembly's tenure, if you like.

**Deputy Fallaize:** But the problem is, as Deputy Langlois has explained, the business case is not going to produce a black-and-white answer to the issue of whether the runway should be lengthened. I do accept Deputy Graham's argument that it is possible that the business case will provide more information than is available at the present time. But I do not think the difference will be so material that it will shape anybody's view, definitively, one way or the other, going into or

during the election campaign. And, then, there is this problem, I think, of the next States wanting to commission a replica report.

So I just do not understand why the Proposition in the Requête is not to direct that the next Committee *for* Economic Development, relatively early in the next term of the States, comes back to the States, let us say in the first six months of the term, having carried out any of the reports or technical analysis, which they consider necessary to support their policy letter at that time.

If that was the Proposition it would have two advantages. The first is it would reduce, I think eliminate, but certainly significantly reduce the possibility of the work being done twice and the money being spent twice. It would also mean that the work could be commissioned after the report has been produced, in April, about the whole strategic issue about what to do with air links.

We are now in November. If the work can be commissioned in November and produced in May, then the work, presumably, could be commissioned in April or May and be produced by the end of the year. That, to me, seems to be a much more coherent solution. That is not the *sursis* because what the *sursis* was, was simply to –

I will give way to Deputy Merrett.

**Deputy Merrett:** I thank Deputy Fallaize for doing that. I agree to a certain degree, it is an absolute shame that we are in 2019 and we still have not had this information we need to make an informed decision before us, because in 2016, there was a pipeline project put in by Economic Development to extend the runway, and that was withdrawn and replaced with a complete review of air and sea links, that one Member has said, we will have that by December 2016. We did not have that by December 2016, we have now agreed to have this all-encompassing report now, by May 2020, Proposition 38.

I am not convinced at this juncture that we will still have that information that we need regarding what the Requête is asking for at that juncture either. We are three-and-a-half years into the political term, we still have not got that information. So therefore what this Requête is asking for is, please, can we have that information?

Lastly, sir, we are sitting until 30th June at midnight, or whatever such time. We are responsible and accountable until the dates that we are either replaced in our seats or not. So I intend working up to the deadline and if I retain my seat, and I am not going to say well, it is by April/May so it is too late, pass it onto somebody else.

Thank you.

**Deputy Fallaize:** I am not suggesting that. The problem, the reason that it has not been possible to drive the preparatory work necessary to extend the runway, is because the States have not elected the Committees who believe that work should be carried out. It is very difficult to drive very major projects like this from the floor of the Assembly. It has got to be done from Committees.

You can drive shifts in policy at a high level, from the floor of the Assembly, but you cannot drive the implementation of the policy unless you can get a Committee, which is working in that area, to want to pick it up. The situation is that neither the Committee *for* Economic Development, albeit by a majority, nor the Policy & Resources Committee, believes at the moment that there is a *prima facie* case for extending the runway. That is why this work has not been driven in the way that Deputy Merrett might wish it had been, over the last three-and-a-half years.

But none of that changes the fact that we cannot just turn up here and say, 'Well, I think there might be a case for extending the runway, so I will vote for a proposition, which speaks to that,' and somebody else turns up and says, 'I am not convinced there is a case for lengthening the runway, so I will vote against the proposition that speaks to that.' We have to give some consideration as to how this thing is actually going to work in practice.

I just fear that, in practice, if the Requête is approved, a business case and a cost benefit analysis will be developed, which will be presented to the States in its dying days and which the present States will not be able to do anything constructive with and the matter will be handed over to the next States, but I do not think the next States – (*Interjection*) – no, I do not know, but I fear this is

what will happen. I think this is what will happen: the next States will receive the report and will want to have its own report.

It just seems to me better to direct the Committee *for* Economic Development, the present one, to commission a report, set out the terms of reference, engage with whoever is going to carry out the review and to get it reported to the next term of the States. It would be better, I think, if the States established that direction to the Committee *for* Economic Development unless, in the meantime, the States decides on the production of this strategic report, which we know is coming in April; unless the States decides to rule out the possibility of a runway extension, after reading the strategic report, they reach the view that it is completely unnecessary.

My sense here is that there should be a presumption in favour of carrying out the work that is set out in Deputy Kuttelwascher's *Requête*, but because I do not want to risk the money being spent twice, I think that it would be better to resolve that the report comes back to the States in the first six months of the next term and that actually fits in very well with the strategic review, which the States has already voted for.

Now I do not expect Deputy Kuttelwascher to accept this invitation, but if he wants to lay an amendment to his own *Requête* to change the timeline, I will happily vote for it and vote for the amended *Requête*. But in its present form –

I will give way to Deputy Kuttelwascher.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** I thank Deputy Fallaize for giving way and I understand exactly what he is saying. I wonder if he would accept, if it is possible, an undertaking from the President of Economic Development that he would undertake what he was suggesting? One of the problems I have is trying to direct what a new Committee does after an election, which might be totally different, is not the best way forward. But that is all.

**Deputy Fallaize:** The answer is personally I would accept an undertaking from the President of the Committee, because I think he would give it honourably and I would accept it. I am not suggesting that the current States directs the next Committee, I am suggesting the current States directs the present Committee to commission a report, which would be made available to the next term of the States.

I just think that would actually improve the decision-making process in all of this, because the way the *Requête* is constructed at the moment, I think the most likely outcome is that there will end up having to be two reviews, at double the expenditure, and I do not think it will produce an informed debate. I just think what will happen in May is there will be a debate where the States will not be able to make any decision, because there will have to be further work commissioned, and I think that would be better dealt with by the Committee early in the life of the next States.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dudley-Owen.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you, sir.

Speaking as the Vice-President of the Committee *for* Economic Development, this matter is clearly divisive and we, like the States, the Committee, have differing views on the direction that we should take. After having acknowledged that *prima facie* a runway extension may or not be feasible or desirable.

Some in this Chamber and in the community believe that the matter needs to be proved or disproved via a business case and cost benefit analysis, but there is another view amongst us and that is that the *prima facie* case is actually detailed enough, supported by enough research and analysis from years and years of reports.

Deputy Tooley, today, has correctly assumed that the Committee has not prioritised the matter and that we have made no attempt to include this matter in the Budget. We have felt, as a Committee, that work is ongoing in this area, and the focus has been forced on this matter by numerous *requêtes* and amendments, not from the Committee.

As a Member of the Committee *for* Economic Development, since being elected, I have spent nearly four years up close to this matter and have been lucky enough to be well-informed by many, including impartial advisers, professionals from the Guernsey business community and incumbent aircraft operators, etc.

So maybe I have been lucky enough to be party to more information than certain Members of the Chamber. However, I do feel that there is enough work out there, there is enough research that Members really, those who are pressing for this case, are not saying clearly what it is they feel that they want to know from a business case.

What information is missing that is going to convince the 10 or so who are on the fence? I am not quite sure. No one has said yet. Deputy Graham has stood up; others have stood up and said they sit on the fence on this matter, they are waiting to be convinced. Well what element, what information, what detail do you need in order to be convinced, because it would be really good to know, because that information might already be in existence. Principles have been outlined, policy direction has been determined, details in terms of facts, figures and statistics, are renewed constantly.

We know the market information, what is going on in the sector? What other information is required by people sitting on the fence in order for them to make up their mind that requires us to reprioritise officers' time and also spend hundreds of thousands of pounds on this information, which we are in danger of duplicating in the next term?

We know that we have debated this matter before and I presented my views in detail on 26th April, 2019, and as reminded by the Deputy Bailiff today, I want to avoid repeating those views verbatim. They have been reported on *Hansard*, for those who are sufficiently interested to read them.

I have been consistent in my approach in opposing the extension of the Airport runway length, outside the perimeter fence. I do not think the concept stands up to scrutiny and nothing that anybody has said, so far, has changed my view. Clearly demonstrated by voting records, where myself and Deputy de Lisle have consistently voted against this matter and I have already had to jump up today once, to dispel the myth about the Nimby view of the Deputies from the West. Maybe you might consider the other side of the coin to that. Maybe we know our area so well, the topography, the geography, the risks, the disbenefits of extending into that area, maybe that is the reason why –

**Deputy Merrett:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Merrett.

**Deputy Merrett:** Deputy Dudley-Owen said she has been consistent with this matter but, however, in 2016, the Committee *for* Economic Development, which Deputy Dudley-Owen sat on, was unanimous in having it as a pipeline project for the runway extension. That was a unanimous decision of that Committee, therefore I challenge that it has been a consistent view.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dudley-Owen.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Fallaize:** That definitely is not true. I was voting in support of putting it in as a pipeline project at the same time that Members of the Committee *for* Economic Development were agreeing with an amendment from P&R to take it out.

1220 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dudley-Owen to continue. Before you do, strictly speaking, of course, Deputy Fallaize, you are correcting something that is wrong in the Member who is speaking, not the point of correction. Just for future reference.  
Deputy Dudley-Owen to continue.

1225 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you.

Deputy Mooney has consistently been very much in favour of the runway extension, and might even go ahead tomorrow to build it, along with other enthusiastic supporters, he has been without a business case. Deputy Parkinson and Inder look to be decided about the matter, though Deputy Inder has voted against the Proposition in April for P&R to do the work on the business case and I think this was due to the price tag attached.

1230 So there is our position as a Committee. Disparate, varying views. We have not prioritised the matter, we have not sought, ourselves, as a Committee, to make any amendments to the Budget and Members can read into that what they will. The situation surrounding the letter that I wrote, Deputy Parkinson was absent from the Island, so therefore I was in the chair, as Vice-President, Deputy Inder was taken away on States' business for the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee. Clearly Deputy Mooney had to be recused from the meeting because he is a requérant and Deputy de Lisle and I made our views known on the matter. So not the greatest letter in the history of letters of comment but that is the truth behind it.

Thank you very much.

1240

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

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

I rise because I think my colleague, Deputy Fallaize, made some very good points and one issue I do disagree with and it is not just he who made it, is to tar P&R with all the same brush. I do not go so far as to describe myself as being neutral on this matter, as Deputy Graham said in terms of his own position, because I think neutrality is a myth, generally speaking.

1250 But I do think that circumstances change and I accept that at certain times it may be appropriate to do what the requérants want. However, my main reason for not supporting the Requête is that I do not believe this is the right time to be spending hundreds of thousands of pounds on something that, sir, I have grave fears will be produced, whether it is to this Assembly or the next Assembly, and the answer may well not suit those who wanted the particular consultants' report to bring back.

1255 It may not suit them and so they will want another report in some form, until they get the answer that they want. I have seen these things come, over many years, before the Assembly, and that is why it is not good to do this sort of thing on the floor of the Assembly. If we have a Committee that is tasked with doing this, that cannot agree amongst themselves – Economic Development, obviously, I am talking about – cannot agree how to prioritise it, then if it is that important to Members of the Assembly, make sure that people are on that Committee, that populate that Committee that do agree with that, if it is the overriding thing that we think we should be doing.

1260 But we should not be trying to run this Assembly like a Committee and trying to get into the details of things that clearly – and this issue is a good example of it – cannot and should not be taken in isolation from other factors that come into play. But, as I said earlier, my main reason for not supporting it is I can think of many dozens of other things where, if we had this sort of money floating around and available, that I would prioritise before this.

1265

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

1270 **Deputy Inder:** I must have come of age. For the first time in my life, both Deputies Roffey, Deputy Tooley and Deputy Fallaize actually want to hear from me. Only briefly! I am trying to cast my mind back to the original April Requête and I think the figure was £700,000. In that debate, I voted against it, the reasons at the time were probably, as usual, out of some form of irritation. I

believe at the time Tourism was not doing its job properly, if I remember correctly. I think I am the only person who brought in the passenger figures over the last 15 years and had seen an effective collapse of the passenger figures in the airports.

1275 I remember specifically Deputy Parkinson was saying, 'It is saying £700,000 but I do not think it is going to be.' What I do remember correctly, I wrote to Deputy Parkinson over that evening and said, 'If you can reduce it to around £250,000, you would get my vote.' Now that amendment never came. So the winning or the losing of that Requête, at the time, was in Deputy Parkinson's hands, and he elected not to bring in an amendment not to get it down to £250,000.

1280 If you remember correctly, Deputy Kuttelwascher was up on his feet saying, 'We kind of know the direction, all we need is a bit of money to put it together.' Deputy Parkinson said, 'I do not think it is going to be £700,000. We think we are going to have the money. We think it is going to be X, X and X.' But what he did not do is bring that amendment back to give him my vote.

1285 Having said that, I would not get too excited because I am still not entirely sure where I am on this at the moment, because the two most convincing arguments so far have come from Deputy Richard Graham – I think he is quite correct that any report that comes out of any future air links policy probably has to have options on two lengths of runway, the 1,500-metre and the current 1,700-metre – and I think he is absolutely correct, for us to get to that point, we have to throw some money at it.

1290 My other fear of it – I will not be giving way, Deputy Tindall – my other fear of this is ultimately how we have got to this point. Not so long ago, this Assembly elected to buy three ATRs. Now I will almost guarantee that the other predication in that air links policy is the fact that ... Sorry, we did not buy three ATRs, I beg your pardon, we guaranteed the loan to purchase three ATRs. Now I voted against that for this reason, because any future air links policy almost certainly will be predicated  
1295 on the fact that this Government is effectively supporting an airline which is now heading towards £10 million worth of losses.

We are down 9,000 passenger figures in the harbour at the moment and the only show in town seems to be look at ... I am less concerned about people getting cheap flights to Barcelona; what I am hugely concerned with is whether we get a tourism industry that can actually bring people to  
1300 the Island, because as we know, flying into Guernsey is a heck of a lot cheaper than flying out of Guernsey. Guernsey has always been the captive market.

What I have not heard in this debate at all and I am surprised from Deputy Kuttelwascher, I think I mentioned it this time, and possibly from Deputy Dudley-Owen, all this debate is about cheap flights away or off the Island. I am not hearing what I understand to be is bigger aircraft bringing  
1305 passengers into the Island, affecting our balance of payments, because everyone who spends money in this Island and spends a week, is spending about 1,500 quid.

Now I do not know if that is worth the 30 million quid for the extra five flights a year, but I am not hearing this. This all seems to be about Ryanair, easyJet. None of this debate has been about bringing tourists into this Island.

1310 The other concern I have, and this is more about Deputy Fallaize, and I think he is absolutely correct, is that one of the reasons I am uncomfortable with it is because I do not think there is a substantial number in this Assembly who believe in growing the tourism economy. They talk about sustainability. We hear about aircraft flying around the skies and the cost on the environment. I think there is an element of this States that just does not want any growth at all and I am actually  
1315 not one of those people.

I think sustainability, even though I believe – I am not sure if it is the IoD debate, Deputy St Pier might be able to help me out here – there was a presentation he did recently where a lot of business types put up their hands and said they preferred sustainability against growth. Well, I am not one of those people because I do believe in growth – especially on small islands like this.

1320 So where am I now? Really what is being asked, Deputy Tooley effectively said what might help a vote is if she has some confidence that Economic Development, by a majority, were going to support the business case. I think I am going to have to put my hat in the ring. The reason I voted against it last time was for the reasons I have already mentioned.

1325 A very bad decision was supporting Aurigny in the purchase of the ATRs – without a shadow of a doubt that was probably one of the worst decisions we made. That company is, I am afraid, well I will not say it, because I will only get Deputy Peter Ferbrache standing up and telling me to mention it outside of the States, I have no confidence in that company.

1330 It is now running at £4 million or £5 million losses, probably going to be £10 million loss; and the only show in town, I am afraid, is to effectively look at growing our economy in any way and bringing more passengers for the tourism industry, with Deputy Mooney, Deputy de Lisle, Deputy Dudley-Owen and Deputy Parkinson supposedly supporting, and I have got to put my hat in the ring for the tourism industry.

1335 So to that end and to help Deputy Tooley, if that helps her vote, I will be the third Member of the Committee that will effectively support looking at the extension of the runway, for the reasons mentioned in the main by Deputy Richard Graham but I do agree with Deputy Fallaize that we are far too far towards the end of effectively a dying Assembly, but that is not my fault.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Mooney.

1340 **Deputy Mooney:** Sir, I signed the Requête, and I fully support it. In our tourism strategy we have a blocker and we need this information from the cost benefit analysis.

**Deputy Tindall:** Point of correction, sir.

1345 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Tindall.

**Deputy Tindall:** There is no tourism strategy that has been approved by the States, it is only a strategic plan.

1350 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Mooney to continue.

**Deputy Mooney:** That is correct, sir, that is why we have not got one, because we need all the information to complete the strategy. That is why it is important that we do this cost benefit analysis and I will be supporting it.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy de Lisle.

1360 **Deputy de Lisle:** Sir, a few points that I would like to bring up as a result of the challenge from Deputy Roffey and Deputy Tooley. I voted against the sursis because I felt that the sursis would curtail debate on something that many of the public and business people wanted debated. But in looking at the situation at the time, with regard to the sursis there was much there, particularly in terms of looking at air connectivity in the round, that was well-stated and well-formulated and required support.

1365 In terms of my view, I was very disappointed that we had not gone ahead with the extension to 1,570 metres within the Airport boundary itself and that I supported on the eastern end, to have that change done. If you remember, if you recall, the States supported the Requête to investigate the potential to extend the runway within the existing Airport boundaries and that was specifically  
1370 to re-designate a part of the RESA on the eastern end, to form part of the declared landing distance of useable runway for aircraft take-offs and landings.

Now this would have extended the declared landing distance from the current 1,463 metres to 1,570 metres, and if you recall the States had extended the runway in the west, the tarmac runway in the west, by 120 metres in 2009, when taking land also for a 240-metre RESA in the west, during  
1375 the Guernsey Airport pavements project, for £80 million, at the time.

Now that enabled the 90-metre RESA at the eastern end to be increased to 198 metres to a 198-metre RESA. So it was all about, from my point of view, in utilising initiative that had been conducted, which I fought very strongly against, actually, because in doing all that, it actually took away 11 fields from the west of the Airport. It took a road out and it took a mile of earth banks out. So it was quite a destructive force in the environmental side, if you like, at the western end of the runway.

Of course I see, to some degree, the same happening on the eastern side if this extension outside the boundary of the airport was to go on, so therefore it does colour my judgement to some degree. However, as you know, the DCA could not support those proposals, although I asked for advice at the time, before making my support for that extension for 1,463 metres to 1,570 metres within the boundary from ESCO EMAS Max, the lead company fitting aircraft arresting systems worldwide and particularly in the United States but now in the UK as well.

The fact is there that ignorance of facts, paralleled over expertise in that particular area because they said it could be done. ESCO said that was a possibility and it could be done and it was difficult to understand why we would want to keep the current non-compliant RESA, which is 198 metres instead of 240 metres on the eastern end, instead of a reliable, fully compliant solution, which also allows for a runway extension.

That was the comment of the company, having taken a look at what could be done on the eastern end at that particular time. However the DCA, of course, took a different position, in terms of risk and not wanting to sanction any erosion in the available safety margins for purely commercial reasons.

Getting to the situation currently, my feeling is that it is essentially a matter of time, it is a matter of cost and it is a matter of resources, with respect to what is being proposed in this particular Requête. I have to say that I have some experience, as well, with respect to cost benefit analysis, because I have spent a few years on developing cost benefit analysis for Transport Canada in the renewal of the air navigation systems throughout that country and I was even given the project by the Deputy Minister of Transport Canada, to develop a short form of benefit-cost analysis for Transport Canada, at the time, to be actually tabled before ICAO in a conference and that was done.

So I do know what a short-form can look like and what that might cost and I know what the long-form would cost and certainly I believe that it will cost a lot more than £360,000 to do a decent cost benefit analysis that is required in this particular case, closer to the £700,000 that was allotted in the previous debate.

So that is one thing that concerns me, to do a proper job requires resources, it requires time. Do we have the resources anyway, at the current time, to do this? I am against spending more money by Government. We have been committing, in a large number of areas that I have voted against recently, and to be quite honest I am not sure that this would be a sensible thing to do given the amount of resources that are being tabled for it. But the time to do it by, just in a few months, again requires cutting back on the resource and the work that might actually be done to a minimum and I am not sure that would be to the benefit of the States to have a rushed piece of work, which was not thoroughly financed, if you like.

The other point, looking ahead, is the resources that could be taken up on the eastern end, having seen what happened on the western end, the land resources and capital resources required on the eastern end to actually provide such an extension, when I know that we could do a lot within the perimeter itself.

That really disturbs me that we would be committing all those resources, the land resources and the capital resources outside the perimeter fence, rather than concentrating within the perimeter fence and using modern technology. This is what I wanted to do on the western end to start with, was to use EMAS on that end, but also now to use EMAS on the eastern end in order to circumvent the extension onto new land and new resources in an Island that has limited space and limited resources. Guernsey has not been quick to adopt technology and we have to, in this particular case, utilise the technology that is out there to avoid extending on the resource base.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Stephens.

1430 **Deputy Stephens:** Thank you, sir. I would like to invoke Rule 26(1) please, close the debate.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.

1435 The first thing I need to do, Members of the States, as Deputy Stephens has raised Rule 26(1) is to ask those people who are still eligible to speak in this debate – and that does not include those in the wind-up, because the wind-up will happen anyway, so the Presidents of the relevant Committees do not have to worry about that if they want to speak at that point – to stand in their places. Who still wishes to speak? Deputy Stephens, having seen that indication, do you still wish to invoke Rule 26(1)?

1440 **Deputy Stephens:** I do, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** In that case, I will put the motion to you –

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, could we have a recorded vote, please?

1445 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I will put the motion to you, Members of the States, and there will be a recorded vote as it has been requested by Deputy Lester Queripel, that the debate on this matter, the Propositions relating to the Requête be closed. It does mean that we would go into the ordinary wind-up under Rule 28(3). Greffier, recorded vote, please.

1450 *(After Deputy Paint votes)* Just a minute, I am not going to accept that because Deputy Paint is not in his seat. If he wants to move, quickly, you can call him again. It is important, there is a Rule that says you can only vote from your seat. Greffier, can you call Deputy Paint again? *(Deputy Paint votes from seat)*

Madam Oliver does not get a proxy vote because it is not covered by the proxy vote.

1455 *There was a recorded vote.*

*Not Carried – Pour 6, Contre 29, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 5*

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Trott	Deputy Ferbrache	None	Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy St Pier	Deputy Kuttelwascher		Deputy Inder
Deputy Stephens	Deputy Tindall		Deputy Green
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel	Deputy Brehaut		Deputy McSwiggan
Deputy Le Tocq	Deputy Tooley		Deputy Oliver
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Gollop		
	Deputy Parkinson		
	Deputy Lester Queripel		
	Deputy Leadbeater		
	Deputy Mooney		
	Deputy Le Pelley		
	Deputy Merrett		
	Deputy Meerveld		
	Deputy Fallaize		
	Deputy Lowe		
	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
	Deputy Smithies		
	Deputy Graham		
	Deputy Paint		
	Deputy Dorey		
	Deputy Brouard		
	Deputy Dudley-Owen		
	Deputy de Lisle		
	Deputy Langlois		

Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Prow  
Alderney Rep. Roberts  
Alderney Rep. Snowdon

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, that motion to cease debate, pursuant to Rule 26(1) has clearly been lost. The result of the motion pursuant to Rule 26(1), proposed by Deputy Stephens. There voted Pour, 6, Contre, 29, 5 absentees and that is why the motion was lost.

Who wants to speak next? Deputy Ferbrache.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, Deputy Roffey and I clearly are on opposites in relation to the Requête and that is fair enough. Our views are well known and they have been documented over a long period of time. Where I disagree with him is in relation to the conclusion because, although I clearly will vote in favour of the Requête, I believe the Requête will be lost by a reasonably slim majority because it is clear that, I will just use this for example, Deputy de Lisle voted against the sursis but I anticipate will vote against the Requête. That will switch it in itself and Deputy Le Tocq, I do not think, was in the Assembly when that vote was taken.

But that is by the by. It still does not matter because, in relation to the Requête, the point is that what we need, whether it is April or May, and it is our responsibility because we are elected representatives for the States of Guernsey until 30th June of next year, is to make a decision. We made a decision recently, by what I thought was an excellent Proposition, Proposition 38, or Resolution 38, whatever it is called, to have a proper debate, in the spring of 2020, concerning air connectivity, because there are different views in connection with air connectivity.

I also thought what was a very good speech by Deputy Brehaut, when commented on the letter from his Committee, he said it is not just taking into account economic factors, you have got to take into account environment issues and I fully accept that will be the view put forward because you cannot just say we are going to build another 200 metres runway, whatever it may be, and destroy the environment. That is a factor that would have to be considered in among. So again a point well made.

Of course I believe that, in relation to that, you can construct, because of the knowledge that I have gained over the last three-and-a-half years or so, you can construct a reasonable extension to our runway length without doing any real adverse damage to the environment. Of course there is going to be some, because you are going to take land that otherwise would not have concrete or tarmac poured upon it. So there will be some of that.

Deputy de Lisle made a point, he said look at technology, we are slow to take up technology and of course Deputy de Lisle is absolutely right when he says that. But the various reports that we have seen say that if you have a runway extension along the lines that are being talked about, possibly, if the cost benefit analysis, and done and now, on balance, because it would never be absolutely black and white, says that there is economic merit in considering the runway extension, but you are still going to be in a position whereby the situation will be an issue to consider.

But you have to consider all the issues if we are going to have a meaningful debate in April or May or next year. I can see the logic of what Deputy Fallaize says, but in my view it fell short of a compelling logic because what he was effectively saying, in a constructive way is this really should be an issue, give a diktat now if you are wanting to amend the Requête or whatever, but leave it for the next Assembly because otherwise you could end up with two reports, because the new Assembly may say, 'We are not happy with the report, so we will re-commission.'

I do not see why that should be the case because what is being asked for is a proper cost benefit analysis in connection with whether or not there should be a runway extension. In respect of when the Deputy Bailiff ruled earlier this morning, when Deputy Graham interjected in relation to the speech of Deputy Dorey and the Deputy Bailiff said, look, one of the things that people are entitled to take into account when they are deciding to vote for or against the Requête is whether or not

they are in favour of the runway. Well, let's have no ... I am in favour of the runway. Whatever happens I am in favour of the runway.

I am in favour of the runway because (a) our runway is too short, by any modern standards it is far too short; (b) we have taken advice – Deputy de Lisle dealt with that very well earlier in his speech. We have taken advice in relation to the previous Kuttelwascher requête, as to whether we could extend within the perimeters of the current Airport boundaries and we have really been told, effectively, that we cannot, and also we have to look at the fact that the point that was being made about – I cannot remember which speaker it was now, I think it may have been Deputy Prow – said how many ATRs do you see at Gatwick?

How many planes that were used to service our Gatwick route, which is our lifeline route, do you see of that nature when you land or take off at Gatwick, or you are just hanging around for a cup of tea and you look out over the runway, you do not see too many ATRs coming in. Of course some people will be saying, how is it that Ferbrache as President of the STSB led the charge, which I did, on behalf of Aurigny, as the States' representative shareholder for Aurigny, to have new ATRs recently?

Deputy Inder says it was a terrible decision, well it was a terrible decision taken by the majority of the States. The reason I brought that proposal forward, and I believe it was the right proposal and I believe the States made the right decision, was because nothing happens very quickly in the aircraft industry.

They have been talking about Heathrow and the extension of another runway in connection with Heathrow for the proverbial donkeys' years. There is now the talk about Gatwick by taking away, Gatwick will have an extra 'runway', because the safety area is now going to be de-safety-ed, whatever the proper phrase is. So there will be opportunities then but they are not going to happen tomorrow, they are not going to happen for the next several years and we need an efficient fleet of aircraft to service our airline industry needs for that period of time.

Deputy Trott said, 'Oh well, Ferbrache, Smithies and Kuttelwascher should be concentrating their efforts on Aurigny.' Well I think, and I am sure he did, because he is a conscientious Member of the States of Guernsey, that whatshisname again, Deputy Trott would have read the very detailed answers given to Deputy Inder's Rule 14 questions, which showed the considerable efforts that we have been making over, now, a long period of time, to address the issues of Aurigny.

But Deputy Trott also, as a conscientious Member of the States of Guernsey, will have read the recent Nyrras report, commissioned by STSB and Scrutiny, where Nyrras said, in short form, that Aurigny is well-run, it is well-managed, it does a good job. We and our predecessors have asked Aurigny to do the impossible and that is why these losses are built up, that is why they are in the position that they are in.

But that is an issue that has got to be addressed and I anticipate that that issue will be addressed if we have a meaningful debate in the spring of next year. I anticipate we will also debate, because we will know then, by next April or May, we will know whether it is proposed by Economic Development, whether they will be seeking an extension of the subsidy beyond the end of late March of the Heathrow rotation, because that runs out, I believe, late March.

So Deputy Parkinson and his Committee will be saying, 'We should extend it.' 'We should not extend it.' Or, 'We are going to seek to extend it on these terms.' We will know then. I am absolutely in favour, but I bow to the knowledge of the five able Members of that Committee, but my view at the moment, which can be changed, on information, is that we should be continuing that beyond the end of next April. That is a decision to be taken at the end of next month. But that is a decision to be taken in the round rather than in isolation and that is the point I am seeking to make.

Deputy Lester Queripel said you have got to have an absolute guarantee. You cannot have an absolute guarantee in relation to any of these things. That is an absolute impossibility. All that the cost benefit analysis will say is more likely than not there is not an economic case, a business case, for this development or there is an economic case for business development. That is all it will say. It will say there will be yesses here and noes there.

1555 What we need to consider in relation to the Requête is that we have got to have that information. Now whether we argue that £360,000 is or is not a lot of money, compared with the £430 million, £440 million, £450 million Budget that we recently approved, it still is a lot of money; £360,000 – and Deputy Trott and I regularly have this conversation in the States – is a lot of money because the average taxpayer, it would take a lot of average taxpayers' contributions, both direct and  
1560 indirect, without in any way denigrating from those contributions, to accumulate the £360,000.

If we do not have that information, I cannot see how we can have a really meaningful debate in the spring of next year, because how are we going to consider whether we need a runway extension or not? What I can see happening is that in five or 10 years' time, and time periods get extended in relation to such matters because of actions taken by jurisdictions outside of our control, but our  
1565 fleet of aircraft will be priced out of our main London airport, which is still, more likely than not, to be Gatwick.

It will be priced out of, or the rules will be changed, or it will be practically impossible for us to fly our ATRs into Gatwick. That will not come upon us imminently but it will come upon us in a situation whereby we will be in a position then, where we will be looking at Luton, or Stansted or  
1570 Southend, as our link into the South-East of England.

That will be an absolute disaster because Deputy Trott made another good point, and I fully accept that point, that for an Island of 63,000, 64,000 people we have, whether it is good or very good connectivity, we have connectivity that lots of areas and lots of other jurisdictions would snap your hand off, they would break your arm to get that kind of connectivity. But where I digress or  
1575 disagree with Deputy Trott is that our neighbours and our competitors, just 20-odd miles that way, southerly, Jersey, are seen to have much better connectivity.

I give way to Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** I am delighted that my friend was able to give way because of course it is a perfect  
1580 opportunity for us to make the point that we in Guernsey connect into Heathrow, our friends in Jersey do not. It is also an ideal opportunity to repeat what the consultants told us and that is on a *per capita* basis, our connectivity as an Island is equivalent to Jersey's.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** I fully accept both of those points, because that is quoting from information  
1585 that is in the public domain. But perception, I speak, in the course of my professional and personal life, to lots of people. I appreciate both of Deputy Trott's supporters grabbed him on his way back to the States yesterday, I am very grateful that both of his supporters were there to give the benefit of their wisdom. (*Laughter*)

But I speak to people who may take different views and the view that I have consistently heard  
1590 is that forget the statistics, which Deputy Trott has quoted correctly, we are seen by people wanting to bring finance centre business over to this part of the world, as falling down in relation to our connectivity compared with Jersey. Whether that is fair or reasonable is irrelevant, because that is the view that people take. I personally know of two/two-and-a-half large institutions that have centred their business in Jersey because they believe that Guernsey's connectivity is not good  
1595 enough.

Now, for all the reasons that Deputy Trott has said, or for both the reasons Deputy Trott has said, that is probably wrong. But it does not matter. Their decisions are not taken listening to Deputy  
Trott or Deputy Ferbrache, their decisions are taken in Frankfurt, in London, in Bermuda. They are taken elsewhere, or Switzerland. That is the view that they take.

1600 So we have to have regard to the fact that there are lots of aircraft, I cannot remember the figures, 700, 750, whatever the figures were given by Deputy Trott, another 50 being ordered. There are 30 million motor vehicles in England that could quite happily come across on the ferry and drive around our roads. It would be a bit crowded if they all did. There are quite a few vehicles that could come from France, via the continent, and drive around our roads and they would be perfectly able  
1605 to do so. But they are not going to do so. Now that 700, 750 aircraft are not going to come here.

Where I agree with everybody who has made the point in relation to low-cost airlines is that they are only in it for themselves. Why should they not be? They came into business because the British Airways and the other types of companies were seen to be old and antiquated and outmoded in relation to their business practice. So they came in and they undercut them. But they do not give the level of service, on a consistent basis they do not fly into the venues that British Airways do. They do not fly into areas that Emirates do.

But we have got to live with them and Jersey attracted easyJet and they attracted easyJet by heavy subsidies over a period of time. It cost them a lot of money. But easyJet stayed. What I would not want to do, and this is part of the April/May debate, what I would not want to do is do what the Isle of Man did, which is to allow the decimation of their own locally based airlines and, as a result, they have got slots in various other jurisdictions, which nobody else wants, and it does not encourage their business community.

But we have to promote economic activity and I think that Deputy Inder hit the nail on the head when he said, because Deputy Kuttelwascher is concerned about people leaving the Island. I fully accept that, so am I. But we need to attract people into the Island. We need to attract people to come and spend money here. We need to attract people to have businesses here. We need to do all of those things and, if we think with a 1,400-metre and whatever it is runway we are going to do that, we are whistling in the wind. It is just not going to happen.

I do not want to see Guernsey, which has been so beneficial to me and my generation, I do not want Guernsey to be seen on a decline. I do not want us to be the Gilmours or the Carlises or the young Macmillans of the late 1970's, I want us to be the Margaret Thatchers of the late 1970's. Not a Tory, never have been, but say the future is better, the future will be better than the present. The present is undoubtedly better than the past. Whatever we say, it is, because it has given Guernsey the opportunities. So we need to be able to grasp it. This is the first step in so doing and I urge people to vote for the Requête.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Gollop:** Yes, sir. I have a lot of common ground with what Deputy Ferbrache was saying. For people who like 1980's, 1970's Tory history, Sir Ian Gilmour and James Prior and others were well-regarded politicians through the 1960's and 1970's and early 1980's, but they were figures who believed you could manage capitalism and corporatism and you could manage decline as well. That is perhaps where we have been for some of the last 20 years with tourism and with passenger numbers.

One area that I might quibble with Deputy Ferbrache on was everybody has been talking about the Isle of Man. I have been to the Isle of Man a few times, I have been very grateful to go with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association on occasions. But, weirdly enough, although they have seen a precipitous decline in tourism over many years from the good old times of Victorian seaside resorts, if you actually look at their website, the government website, they were jogging along with figures in 2013, 2014, with sort of 700,000 passengers a year and now they are more like 850,000. They have been experiencing a degree of growth in their air traffic. Their ferries have been flatlining.

Now Deputy Ferbrache has had the honour, for the first time probably since Deputy Berry in the good old Board of Administration era I alluded to yesterday, of seeing passenger numbers at the Airport rise. That is commendable and it is a promising sign, albeit its contribution has been probably open skies competition, the Heathrow link and so on.

Now my point about the Isle of Man is, when you look at the choice of air routes, they do not seem to have Heathrow in the winter months but they do serve London City, which was an airport Deputy Trott at one point was very keen to see continue and I and others have personal reasons why. The Isle of Man benefits at this very moment from three flights a day to London City, by British Airways, no less, a global airline, and two flights a day to Gatwick, albeit at unattractive slots. But their key connectivity is to Liverpool and Manchester, which partly reflects their business and geographical base.

I mention that because I think, in a manner of speaking, the Isle of Man of course has a longer runway and a greater access by easyJet and others, has, despite less attractions than Guernsey – worse climate, worse location, poor connectivity with London, not owning an airline perhaps – seen greater growth than Guernsey has. That is certainly one reason to want a greater awareness of what we are seeing in the Requête today.

Deputy Trott ...

**Deputy Trott:** I am grateful once again to my friend for giving way because I think he raises two very interesting points. The first, with regard to London City. The industry, the financial services industry in particular, was certain that London City would see very high levels of usage, very high capacity in the 1990's or thereabouts, and a number of people threw their weight behind it. It turned out that those numbers were ludicrously excessive and the London City route was removed because it simply could not be justified.

I make that point because, on occasions my friends at GIBA and the IoD are not always accurate in their predictions. The second point I make, with regard to the Isle of Man, is, the PwC report made clear that the Isle of Man very much regretted the introduction of low-cost carriers because it had significantly distorted the marketplace in a way that they concluded was not in either their short, medium or long-term benefits.

I am grateful to my friend for giving way.

**Deputy Gollop:** I will give way to Deputy Mooney, if I am allowed.

**Deputy Mooney:** Yes, sir, it is just in relation to a comment from Deputy Trott. The Isle of Man had reviewed on four occasions, open skies, and have still stuck with it and do not regret their decision.

**Deputy Gollop:** Anyway, with regard to the time and I am sure the Deputy Bailiff, yourself, sir, will stop me if I go too much onto the issues of airports and not enough on the reasons to support the Requête and the Requête is very much focussed on going back to a real analysis and development of the core strategic objectives and the critical success factors. I think we never had that report.

Deputy Lester Queripel twice in the last two days has made the point, as did certain members of the public online or at other meetings, that we have debated this. Well we have not, actually, because the debate we had in September was on a different length of the runway, first point, 1,570 metres, rather than 1,700 metres. Secondly, it was influenced heavily, I did not agree with the advice but who am I to disagree with professional advice, by the advice of the regulator about the need for safety at the Airport.

The States' Trading Supervisory Board, understandably, honoured that professional advice and accepted it in the context of moving from 1,463 metres to 1,570 metres. This is for 1,700 metres and is not about using the RESAs, this is specifically on the overall argument from the start and, basically, is to look at the commercial, economic and other factors of improving and optimising our connectivity by looking at the runway as an option. As I said yesterday –

Oh, hold on.

**Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, Deputy Gollop, for giving way.

People have not been comparing it with the September debate, it is to the April debate, when the Proposition was to do a business case for looking at 1,700 metres-1,800 metres. So we have debated it before but it was not in September it was in April.

**Deputy Gollop:** Deputy Dorey's reference to the April debate, of course, was superseded by the motion that took us down the runway end safety area, the RESA debate. Circumstances change. Deputy Tooley and other Members, and quite a few people online, to be fair, have suggested that

1710 Deputies are a little bit electioneering at present, perhaps influenced by their cousins across the water and so on.

1715 Actually, the problem with being a bit of an electioneer who likes to track what is going on is that you do not necessarily know where public opinion is. I remember a very memorable moment a year or two ago, Deputy Ferbrache was at an IoD breakfast gathering, I think Deputy Dudley-Owen was there as well, and a vote was called for by the Institute of Directors, Deputy Brehaut was there at that august organisation, as to whether they wanted a runway extension or not. I think at the breakfast meeting at St James, 40% said yes and 60% said no. I remember Deputy Ferbrache saying, 'You are perfectly entitled to your vote, I do not mind being in a minority if I am right ...' or something along those lines. (*Laughter*)

1720 Now the reference here is at the time there was a lot of speculation in the viable alternative to the runway extension idea, which frankly was subsidisation of airlines. Now we have seen that directly, through Economic Development's initiative at Heathrow. We have seen it indirectly with the financial performance that was unexpected of Aurigny, and actually now, when I turn on Facebook and Twitter, I get too addicted to it, all the people are saying, 'Get rid of Aurigny, stop Aurigny. We do not want to waste this money.' Suddenly the public voice seems to have gone against connectivity.

1725 Well we have to be beyond that. Deputy Inder was spot on when he said this is not just about granny going away on a cheaper holiday, or a cheaper break, or even the business community having better access and better fares to London or anywhere else, it is about strengthening tourism, Locate Guernsey, connectivity and our visitor economy.

I will give way to Deputy Kuttelwascher.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Sir, I thank Deputy Gollop for giving way.

1735 I think, although there has been mention of increasing the availability of economical fares for Islanders, it is true that, since the introduction our *quasi*-open skies policy, it has been measured, there has been an increase in visitors, particularly from those areas where the fares are highly affordable, like Southend and now Southampton. So there has been an increase in that direction. Whether you argue that you should increase benefits to the Island, because to me, if you do that, it is going to make it 100% more likely you will get more visitors. But, you know.

1740 Thank you, sir.

**Deputy Gollop:** I thank Deputy Kuttelwascher and I would say, about what Deputy Fallaize said, yes he had some points, because it is always difficult when the States is in a handover mode, but the thing is he, or anyone else, cannot predict the make-up of the next States. What we certainly can do is to realise that, although the runway and the operation of the Airport is a highly technical and operational matter, it is also of a significant strategic policy importance and that applies, actually, whether you are an ardent no-growth or sustainable person or an environmentalist or an economic grower.

1750 I will give way to Deputy Dudley-Owen.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** I am very grateful to Deputy Gollop for giving way. Thank you.

1755 It ties into something that Deputy Inder was saying before, and I feel that there could be a little bit of a ripple here between those in the States who are business-friendly, growth friendly, and looking for success for the Island and those who are not, those who are inverted, those who want to reduce the tourism industry.

1760 That is not the case. My personal view, and I know that others in the Chamber – I think Deputy de Sausmarez, I have got Deputy Tooley and Deputy Tindall nodding as well – it is not just about growth, it is about the type of people and the type of value that are coming to the Island and is it not better to have one person spending £1,000 in a day than 10 people spending £10 in a day? Sustainability, there is a link to economic growth but it does not have to be a growth in passenger

numbers in order to achieve that. It is about value that each one of those passengers is giving to the Island when they actually arrive.

Thank you.

1765 **Deputy Gollop:** I entirely agree with Deputy Dudley-Owen that quality always beats quantity, although, with air passenger numbers sometimes you do need quantity. Of course, if we want to talk environmentalism, with tourism ...

1770 **Deputy Merrett:** I appreciate Deputy Gollop giving way and I apologise because he is trying to make headway on his speech, but I just need to, through you sir, the people that visit our Island, I want my friends and my family to visit the Island and I also want to be able to have my friends and family leave the Island. The friends and family may not be able to do that if they cannot afford the ticket price.

1775 So, whereas bringing into our economy will benefit our economy and benefit our community in the longer term, I understand that there has got to be a balance between those that can actually afford to fly and actually, to be honest, my friends and family cannot afford to fly into Guernsey as it currently stands. We use the ferry because it is cheaper. Less convenient but it is cheaper. I have to counter-argue, through you sir, some of the comments Deputy Dudley-Owen made.

1780 **Deputy Gollop:** Thanks to all the Members who are helping me with my speeches, but never mind! Making three quick points, if we want to start analysing our ecological transport issues, we would have to look at the car ferry issue and we would also have to look at the cruise liners, so I think we need a broader based analysis before we get into that kind of question.

1785 What I hope a business case, cost benefit analysis would have, is real comparisons with communities of a similar nature, it might be the Scilly Isles to a certain extent, the Isle of Man, Jersey and many other parts of Europe, to see what the issues are and to evaluate the potential benefits that Deputy Merrett and others have outlined.

1790 Going back to the Isle of Man figures, interestingly, they have gone from 741,000 air passengers in 2014, to 847,000 last year. So, despite them having a hiccup, which I accept, they did lose out for a while. The long-term trajectory has been towards a growth and their tourist industry, actually, is quite niche. It is very much focussed on views, on trains, on trams, on heritage and great big wheels. So perhaps they go to another point.

1795 Deputy Kuttelwascher could have mentioned but he did not, but I think we have seen this year, for the first time in an era, a slight if not insignificant uplift in Open Market house prices and interest. Some might say that is linked to Brexit or political developments in the UK. I would say greater connectivity to areas like Heathrow is part of it and the better the branding, the bigger the airline, the more it is able to market itself, is a factor.

1800 I thought to myself at one point earlier in the debate, if a spaceman came down to Guernsey and said, 'Take me to your leader ...' – I could be like ET here – they would be amazed to realise that we actually own an airline and yet we are worried about whether we would have planes of the right capacity. We can lease airplanes ourselves if we have to.

1805 So, for all these reasons, I want the work to continue. I think it answers the question, even if you accept that only a minority of the population are keen on an extended runway, I think we still need, as Deputy Graham says, to get more facts and more information.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** On the basis that no one else is standing to speak in the debate I will now turn to the President of the ... You will have to be a bit quicker off the mark, Deputy Langlois, but I will call you. Deputy Langlois.

1810 **Deputy Langlois:** Yes, sir. Old age, I was dithering a bit, I think.

I just thought it was worth mentioning that a few years ago the Scrutiny Committee held extensive hearings in preparation for their report on our air links and I am surprised nobody has touched on that because the hearings were a mine of information.

1815 Deputy Parkinson was not a States' Member in those days, but he did speak at the hearing and I do not think this Assembly would be surprised to know that he used to make a lot of sense back then! (*Laughter*)

**Deputy Parkinson:** At least I am consistent, sir.

1820 **Deputy Langlois:** He said to the hearing:

Commerce & Employment went out to consultation about whether a longer runway was needed and they engaged outside consultants to look at that and the message that came back there was nobody out there who wanted a longer runway.

He went on to conclude:

Unless someone can talk to route operators who would like to bring large planes to Guernsey, I do not think the case for expensively extending the runway can be made.

1825 What Deputy Parkinson said then is as true today. It would not have cost much to talk and then to offer the States something, anything, that would justify the expenditure on a cost benefit analysis for a runway extension. That is what is missing from this Requête: any preparation or substance at all. Several Deputies have mentioned that, the lack of a *prima facie* case for spending this huge sum of money on a cost benefit analysis.

Basically, people have been simply lazy. Actually, in fact, at least one route operator had been talked to. The Scrutiny Panel asked the Airport Director for his understanding of the reason why easyJet did not pursue operating the Guernsey-Gatwick route. The Airport Director replied:

EasyJet submitted a route licence application to run the Gatwick route. The reason they withdrew, I think, related to concerns which were flagged at a very late stage for easyJet, in respect of the potential for the States to look at putting a Solus agreement, effectively a preferred operator, on the Gatwick route. As soon as easyJet were made aware of that, as far as they were concerned, that created a degree of uncertainty for them and they decided to withdraw from their route licence application.

1830 From that statement, it does not appear that runway length was the primary reason easyJet failed to complete their licence application. It was the fact that we were protecting our Gatwick slots through our ownership of Aurigny. The question that has to be asked is would we be willing to contemplate losing those slots, with or without a runway extension. If not, you can forget about easyJet.

1835 That is exactly the kind of question people are not asking. It is alright for Deputy Smithies and Deputy Graham to say they want the facts before they make up their mind, but there are already a lot of facts out there, which should be influencing their opinion and, as I said in my speech on the sursis motivé, this idea that this cost benefit analysis, at whatever cost, is somehow going to give them the facts or a range of facts for them to be able to make up their mind, they are just simply deluding themselves if they think the decision is going to be any easier than it would be today.

1840 I will be voting against this Requête, simply because I think it has been going on for so long, the runway extension debate, and people will just not come to terms with the fact that we own an airline and will do irreparable damage to that airline if we extend the runway and allow low-cost carriers into the Island.

1845 There is no guarantee whatsoever that, having spent the money, those low-cost carriers would come in or for what time they would come in, or what service they would give us. It is just entirely delusional and a foolish idea. I am hoping this Requête will lose today, because we will be wasting an awful lot of money pursuing this dream some Deputies appear to have.

Thank you.

1850

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

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

1855 I want to add my support to the Requête because I think it is long overdue. We do need that whole picture of what is going to happen or not going to happen and at the moment we have not got that. Until we have got all the appropriate costings for a longer runway I think it is important we have that to complete the picture.

1860 I think Deputy Graham's speech before was absolutely excellent and it is also about competition. If we have got that longer runway, I have no doubt we will get that competition coming in to Guernsey. We have got a crazy situation. I have just looked up a flight. If I want to go on Monday, 2nd December to Gatwick, if I was going from Jersey, on easyJet, it would cost me £62 return, going on the Monday, coming back on the Tuesday. If I go on Aurigny, same dates, going Monday, coming back Tuesday, it is going to cost me £205.

1865 I have just done some of the other airports as well, just to compare it, and it is interesting, where there is competition on the Jersey routes going to various places – there is a whole list of airports here where there is competition –

I will give way to Deputy Dorey.

**Deputy Dorey:** Thank you.

1870 But easyJet are such a commercial organisation. When the BA pilots were on strike in Jersey, they were charging £1,000 return on Jersey-Gatwick. If easyJet come in they will destroy Aurigny. We will just have easyJet and they will be charging £1,000 a day.

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

1875 I am not even suggesting that we actually get rid of Aurigny on the Gatwick route. (*Laughter*) All I am saying – I gave way before I actually finished – if you look at all the other airports, whether that is Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, Edinburgh, many of these, we fly to Exeter, etc., Manchester, where easyJet and another airline actually flies there, sometimes it is Flybe and easyJet, the competition and the prices, there is a huge difference, and we are not in that position to do that.

1880 The short-sightedness, I think, of actually making sure that we do not do whatever we can to get as many here on this Island with the larger flights that are able to come in, as you witness when you go to Jersey, the size of the planes that go into Jersey and the tourism, we should be biting our hand off to do what we can do to actually get tourism here.

1885 I just think sometimes that the States will say, yes, we support tourism, but actually I do not think we do, because we do very little to do whatever we can to ensure that we can get as many people into this Island as possible and it has been proven, by just on the fares alone, that if you have got the longer runway and you have got the bigger planes, you will get people in. That is all I want to add, sir.

1890 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, we will now adjourn until 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.31 p.m.  
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

**Development of the business case and cost benefit analysis for  
the extension of the runway at Guernsey Airport  
to create a 1,700 metre runway –  
Propositions carried**

**The Greffier:** Article X, Airport runway extension – continuation of debate.

1895 **The Deputy Bailiff:** As no one is rising to speak, we will move to the wind-up section on the debate in accordance with Rule 28(3), and therefore I invite Deputy Tindall, as the President of the Development & Planning Authority, to make any comments she wishes on behalf of the Authority in closing.

1900 **Deputy Tindall:** Sir, for clarity, just to say I have a few comments to make on behalf of the Development & Planning Authority, but predominantly, obviously, most of the speech will be about my personal views.

Sir, there seems to be a rumbling that I do not have that ability. I do not have the ability to make two speeches, so for me that seems logical. (*Interjection*)

No. I will continue.

1905 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I will call you then to speak in your personal capacity if you do not want to move straight into the reply that you are entitled to on behalf of the Authority.

**Deputy Tindall:** Are you confirming that I get two bites of the cherry then, sir?

1910 **The Deputy Bailiff:** You will have the ability to speak at the end, just as any of the Presidents would, because this is a requête.

**A Member:** So you can speak in your personal capacity now.

1915 **Deputy Tindall:** Is it possible I can combine the two?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** If you want to, yes –

1920 **Deputy Tindall:** I will do so then.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** – and then you can forego your ability to speak later.

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

1925 As the President of the Development & Planning Authority, I start by referring to our contribution to P&R's letter of comment. It sets out the information on how the Island Development Plan (IDP) has catered for strategic development, such as an extension to the runway, and what area has been safeguarded. The purpose for such safeguarding being to protect the area identified from any development that may compromise its possible future use for a runway extension. Proposals for extension of the runway will also require a development framework and, as Deputy Roffey  
1930 mentioned, an environmental impact assessment. If the work is outside the safeguarded area, a public inquiry is also needed.

I quote one paragraph from the IDP, which is also mentioned in this letter of comment; 20.64 of the IDP says:

Ensuring that Guernsey Airport is able to meet transport needs in the future is essential to the co-ordinated and cost effective delivery of a key public service for Islanders and visitors and is also vital to the local economy. The Strategic Land Use Plan requires provision to be made in the Island Development Plan to ensure that Guernsey Airport is able to meet modern operational standards and respond to opportunities to strengthen its contribution to the economy ... While there is no current evidence that an extension to the length of the airport runway is required to meet economic or operational needs and while advances in aircraft technology might reduce the need for a longer runway in the future, this is something beyond local control. It is also possible that other external factors, such as United Kingdom hub airports not accepting smaller regional aircraft, may trigger the consideration of a runway extension sometime in the future.

1935 At this point I wish to make further comments and I have just seen my battery is about to die –  
(*Laughter*) So typical! I make further comments at this point, not as the President of the DPA, but in  
fact comment, perhaps as is more appropriate, as an ex-Member of the Committee *for* Economic  
Development. I thank my colleague Deputy Tooley for plugging me in! (*Laughter*)

So for me the point in the paragraph I have just right now which is relevant is the need for the  
Airport to:

respond to opportunities to strengthen its contribution to the economy

1940 For me that question is, whether the evidence exists that a runway extension will strengthen our  
economy, and therefore, if it does, the question is then what length and whether the cost is  
worthwhile?

I have seen that evidence and in April 2019 I felt there was sufficient for me to support the  
Proposition which said to approve:

further work on the technical, regulatory, environmental and economic business case for the extension of the airport  
runway

1945 However, the States rejected it, albeit by one vote. The reasons given can be summed up by  
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel in the April debate:

Nowhere has someone sat down and said what is the overarching policy here, where are the gaps?

So when Deputy Kuttelwascher said things have changed, this is what has changed for me. The  
States rejected virtually the same proposition.

1950 Or are we being asked that there is a difference between the two reports? There is no explanation  
other than the difference in cost – one is £700,000, and this one, £360,000. Or is it in the description  
of the type of report? One is a business case and cost benefit analysis and another, a technical,  
regulatory, environmental and economic business case. As Deputy Fallaize seemed to imply, the  
nature of the report is one which begs the question what is going to be produced? And also,  
whether the Members of the Committee *for* Economic Development, who are to produce the report,  
1955 can agree on what it should contain?

I have an old-fashioned computer which does not scroll down so ...

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel referred to two gaps, climate change and the lack of tourism strategy  
in the April debate, and concluded with:

I urge Members to think about this holistically

1960 Through my interjection to Deputy Mooney, he clarified that they need this business case and cost benefit analysis to complete the tourism strategy. This is something which is good to know, but even better if it was produced before quarter 2 2020 to inform the DPA in its five-year review. (A Member: Hear, hear.) Ironical, considering it was a Proposition agreed in 2016, Island Development Plan debate.

1965 It is also interesting that it is needed, as I understood that the tourism strategy pace was awaiting the States' direction. The question, as I understood it, was: do we do a strategy for the Island on the basis of the current runway or do we do it on the basis of an extended runway? On this we needed States' direction.

1970 The States rejected the Proposition and I for one accept that. As I say, I supported the previous Proposition, and as a Member of ED at that time, and in the light of comments by our President – Deputy Parkinson – after the April debate, the extension was dead. For me, the tourism strategy was therefore going to progress on the understanding that the runway was not going to be lengthened or just that the Proposition for a tourism strategy was rescinded. But if it was not and if Economic Development now considers this business case was needed to fulfil an outstanding resolution, then I would have thought Economic Development should have amended the budget and asked for funds to undertake the work in completing one of the outstanding resolutions in the tourism strategy.

1980 So another question I have to ask myself is how long will such a report take? I think it was alluded to in a couple of speeches. Also, I recall when we were told in the recent debate by Deputy Kuttelwascher with regard to Proposition 1 of the recent requête, that it could be determined within weeks or before Christmas depending on how quickly the response is coming. Now obviously we know that it took far longer than that.

1985 With regard to Deputy Dudley-Owen, I completely agree with her. I was lucky enough to be on the Committee for Economic Development when a great deal of this information was available to us all. It was available not only to us, but to States' Trading and Supervisory Board and P&R. It is obvious that having read this information we do take different views on what it says, but more to the point this is what I feel very strongly about: the information is there and needs to be collated and put out in the public domain so we can all talk about it and we can all make our own decisions on that. We do not have to spend any more money, we just have to wait for this governance framework – Proposition 38 – and I believe very strongly that that will help and provide all the information we need.

1990 I spoke to someone this morning who when I first spoke to him, said, 'I am very keen on the runway extension.' But when I talked him through, he was totally unaware of the topography and all the problems and the costs in relation to an extension. He was also unaware of other options. I was trying to be as objective as possible, as I try usually to be, but it was quite clear there was information that he was unaware about. And he kept saying, 'But I wish you'd tell the public, I wish you could keep them informed'. And my problem, which I explained to him, was I think there is far too much information and it needs collating.

2000 It needs to be able to be put out there – to have all of this in a balanced and proportionate way, and that was what amended Proposition 38 was aimed at. Not to spend £360,000, or even less, and I am pleased to say that I was persuasive enough that he agreed with me by the end of the 20-minute conversation.

2005 Now, Deputy Inder also said that he felt a report on two lengths was necessary, 1,500 metres or so, and 1,700 metres. But of course, this requête does not cover this length, and that is another reason I cannot support this Requête. Even if I could accept it from Government, it excludes work within the Airport boundary less than 1,700 metres, which may assist in the overall framework for air-routes, something which the earlier defeated Proposition included.

Now Deputy Kuttelwascher and I had quite a few emails, conversations in debate and bits and bobs about this particular scenario. As I say, I understand that the PwC report which identified this

not only was available to Economic Development, but was also available to Deputy Kuttelwascher on STSB. Not only that is, looking back on the debate, Deputy Kuttelwascher said in the RESA debate, quote:

When you look at what PwC want to do

– i.e., what I was referring to –

they want to look at possibly using this whole 1,583 m that we have got up there and commissioning it. You would have to build a runway end safety of 240 m and the rest of it, you would be going over La Villiaze Road, you can move the ILS, you can move the approach. Expense on your project: £20 million maybe. To me, that would be extremely poor value for money and I would not want to support that because, just for a little extra money, you could have maybe 1,750 m and the benefit would be a multiple of what it would have been before for maybe a small percentage increase in costs.

That is what PwC are looking at, and that is not what he was looking at. That is my point.

I do not want to go into the whys and wherefores. As I mentioned in the sursis debate, the point was there are other options. I cannot support a requête that does not include the possibility, whether or not it has been dismissed or whether or not a longer runway is better, I do not want to dismiss options before they are fully considered. So a minor point, but one of the reasons why I cannot support this Requête.

Since then of course, and this I think also is very important in the chain of events, there has been the Aurigny report, the Budget debate, and, as I mentioned, amended Proposition 38, and reports and comments which keep asking for a strategic consideration of the issues and not just look at one singular issue costing up to £360,000.

Deputy Lowe mentions the fact about cheap flights, but what would be the cost of the infrastructure, the cost to the environment and the cost of the subsidies that will be needed to provide those cheap flights? To me, supporting tourism should not cost that much, and is it what businesses and what residents want? We have had those debates, and again, that is what is being collated and put out there, not just for Members here, but also for the public, because I do think there is more to be done on the communication piece to try and appreciate what exactly this conversation is about. It is not just a piece of tarmac.

So Deputy Prow says, 'Let's move this forward!' I would have agreed, as I say, in April, because things then were different and things have changed. I think we do need the policy letter, more particularly described by Deputy St Pier earlier today. I hope that it takes account for the terms of reference that were set out in the amendment, as I believe it will draw out these points. It will publish reports and collate the information for Members and the public. This Requête does not take us forward. It clogs up the Government arteries and overloads the work we need to do before June, and will not be the *panacea* for the solution.

I want the information several of us have seen so that an informed discussion can be made before on the framework – the strategy. This States rejected the extension as the arguments were not there. Let's get that information and get that document so that we can do what we really should be doing in here and not supporting re-election.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Leadbeater

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

Deputy Tindall just talked about not dismissing options at this stage, but I think we are dismissing the option of extending the runway at this stage if we are not going to do a cost benefit analysis on it.

So far I have just heard conflicting stuff from the speeches against this Requête. We heard from Deputy Trott that the work the Requête asked for will be done within the framework as set out in Resolution 38 and then we hear from the President of Economic Development that is not the case. We hear people say, 'and we do not need a runway because low-cost carriers will not come here

even if we have one.' Then they say it will cause irreparable damage to Aurigny if they come. Are they coming or not? It is all conflicting. I have not heard any kind of proper argument against this Requête which stacks up in every single way.

So I will leave it there, sir, thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut, you have already spoken in the debate. Is there anything you want to add on behalf of the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure?

**Deputy Brehaut:** No, I do not think so, sir. The Vice-President has covered the Requête in some detail, as did Deputy Shane Langlois, a Member of E&I. So I think my Committee have contributed fully to this debate.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** In that case I will call Deputy Parkinson as the President of the Committee for Economic Development to see if he has anything he wants to say in the debate.

**Deputy Parkinson:** Yes, sir, I do. And I should explain to Members that by agreement with Deputy Dudley-Owen, I am responding to the debate for the Committee because during the debate Deputy Inder advised the Assembly that he will be supporting the Requête. So there is now a majority of the Committee for Economic Development in support of the Requête. (**Deputy Inder:** You are welcome.)

Thank you, Deputy Inder, yes.

However, I will try not to speak for too long. I think it is pretty clear that most Members have made up their minds and that everybody knows which way they are going to vote. But nevertheless, there were a few points that arose in debate which I think I should try and respond to.

I think the main issue was raised in effect by Deputy Roffey, who said he had not yet seen a *prima facie* case for doing this work. I would put to him that actually there are examples of other communities comparable to Guernsey which have longer runways and which seem to have been doing better in terms of passenger numbers.

A strong example would be the Isle of Man which extended its runway in 2009, has adopted the 'open skies' policy and since then – as I think Deputy Mooney pointed out, or was it Deputy Gollop – the numbers travelling to and from the Isle of Man have increased significantly during a period when the passenger numbers at Guernsey Airport have been falling.

I think that, in and of itself, begs the question: does this not need looking into? There must be some explanation why Guernsey Airport has been losing passengers and yet the Isle of Man Airport with a now extended runway has been increasing the number of passengers. All the Requête is asking to have done is some work to see if there is a business case. I think that raises the *prima facie* question of could this actually benefit Guernsey? And I am not postulating an answer here, I just think we would be foolish not to answer that question.

That of course is not proof that a runway extension would benefit Guernsey in the same way, but we, as I mentioned earlier in my speech on the sursis, engage regularly with a firm of consultants called ASM who advise us on a range of matters to do with market research and where passengers are coming from and where they are going to. Incidentally, in passing, they are looking into the effects of 'open skies' and specifically the question, in the cannibalisation of the Gatwick route, where have all the passengers gone to? I have seen some preliminary results from that research which I think are very interesting and which I will be happy to pass on to P&R when we complete our work on that area.

But the ASM analysis concludes – this is in draft form at the moment so I have not got a report put in front of you – but some of the basic conclusions they are reaching are, firstly, there is a significant opportunity for demand stimulation if the runway is extended to between 1,700 metres and 1,800 metres. Secondly, analysis shows that recent competitive pricing has stimulated appreciable volume increases but it is only the lower cost carriers that can realistically stimulate

2105 such growth and sustain such competitive pricing levels in the long term. And thirdly, that the low-cost carriers offer the greatest opportunity for new demand stimulation. That is what our consultants are telling us. So I think the *prima facie* case that Deputy Roffey is calling for is there. It begs the question and it requires us to do some research and find out the answers.

2110 Now, Deputy Dorey raised what I regard as some old red herrings, principally that he thinks the purpose of a runway extension would be to replace Aurigny on the Gatwick route – probably by easyJet. Can I just say I do not think it is helpful in this debate to characterise the supporters of the Requête as opponents of Aurigny. Indeed three of the signatories to the Requête are members of STSB, the shareholders on behalf of the States in Aurigny, who have been quite vocal, in fact, in defending Aurigny in recent days against various attacks.

2115 I think in fact the main benefit of a runway extension is more likely to be in terms of better and cheaper regional connections than in terms of Gatwick. The history of easyJet in Jersey is quite instructive. EasyJet's first involvement in Jersey was not predicated on Gatwick, as I think Deputy Langlois suggested. The first easyJet service to Jersey was from Liverpool and they now have about 10 routes to Jersey, obviously mainly from regional airports – although, no doubt, their Gatwick service is a popular and commercially successful one.

2120 But extending the runway would have other benefits beyond making the Island accessible to low-cost carriers. I think it is worth reminding Members that the Nyras report, commissioned by STSB and the Scrutiny Committee, commented that Gatwick seems to be trying to price out the regional routes in the summer months. This is an observation which has largely gone unremarked, but I think it is an important one. It means that it is possible that in future, in order for Aurigny to continue to serve the Island from Gatwick and to offer competitive fares from Gatwick against a background of very steeply rising airport charges, they may have to move to a pattern of bigger planes and fewer rotations.

2130 So this is not necessarily something that will be done to Aurigny or the Island by easyJet, this is something Aurigny itself will have to consider doing. It has already been mentioned, I think by Deputy Ferbrache, that another benefit of bringing in larger planes would be better instrument landing systems and therefore to an extent fog-proofing or weather-proofing the operations at Guernsey Airport, which would also be a significant benefit to the community.

2135 Members have made much fuss over the fact that larger planes mean fewer rotations – which is undoubtedly true. But it is interesting, I think, to note that in the recent survey by the business associations of the business community in Guernsey, I am told, that a majority of members expressed a wish or a willingness to tolerate a reduction in the number of rotations to Gatwick to, say, four a day, if it meant that prices could be kept down to more like easyJet levels. So I do not think the six rotations a day to Gatwick should be regarded as sacrosanct. That should all form part of the review which P&R are going to lead into the wider issues of Guernsey's connectivity. Perhaps that review will come up with recommendations as to how the Gatwick operation should be managed going forward.

2140 So if there were any other points that were raised that I should have covered, I apologise. One or two matters that were not germane to the debate were raised which I thought I should perhaps mention. Flybe are in discussion with Virgin and other airline partners regarding caretaker slots at Heathrow for next summer. We have no news to announce at this stage as to whether the Heathrow service could be continued or not. But those discussions are ongoing and I am hopeful the opportunity will still be there.

2150 Deputy Ferbrache yesterday in the last debate raised the question of what was happening with the PSO. I can advise him that Economic Development wrote to P&R last week with our conclusions at the end of the PSO process and that that ball is now in the P&R court.

2155 People questioned whether Flybe was still going to be operating Newquay. Our information is that Flybe still intends to operate the Newquay PSO until the end of the contract in 2022. They have not published their schedules for next summer yet, which I think has given the public some cause for concern or at least speculation. But I do not think too much should be read into that.

And then finally, in response to ... I think Deputy Langlois reminded the Assembly of some words I said back in, whenever – 2014, was it? I do not know, some time ago anyway – where I said we need some evidence that low-cost carriers actually want to come and operate here and at that time I was not a States' Member and I was not aware of any such evidence. But I now know from inside Economic Development that actually we have an active dialogue with easyJet in particular and they have repeatedly said they would be happy to consider operating to Guernsey if we had a runway that they could operate with a full payload.

Somebody else was demanding that I give cast-iron guarantees that an easyJet would come here if we extended the runway. Of course, I am not going to be able to do that. But what I can say is that everything that I hear and I am involved in encourages me to think that actually there would be opportunities for Guernsey with low-cost carriers if we had a runway that they could operate off.

But as I have repeatedly said, I am sitting on the fence. I cannot remember who raised the topic of Members sitting on the fence, was it Deputy Tooley? (**A Member:** Indeed.) Yes. Oh well, Deputy Gollop of course, but no – (*Laughter*) Actually, I am proud to be sat on that fence, Deputy Tooley. I believe in evidence-based decision-making and I would repeat, in effect, words I uttered that Deputy Langlois quoted from me back in 2014, or whenever it was, that I want to see the evidence. I am prepared to believe that there is a case for a runway extension or I would not be standing here telling you I am going to support the Requête. But I am also prepared for that business case to be unproven.

If we do the work and it reaches the conclusion that the investment required to extend the runway could not be justified on a risk-adjusted basis by the economic returns from the extension, then I will not be supporting a runway extension. So yes, I am, if you like, sitting on the fence. I am strongly in favour –

Oh, Deputy Tooley, I give way.

**Deputy Tooley:** Thank you.

I possibly was not clear enough that my issue is not with Members sitting on the fence. I am quite prepared to accept the agnostic view that actually until we have the evidence we cannot make a decision. It was the sense that there were individuals creating a fence from which they could be seen to be sitting. (*Interjection*)

**Deputy Parkinson:** Well, I actually did not support Deputy Tooley's inference that there are Members of the Assembly who are taking positions in this debate depending on where they think electoral advantage might lie. Perhaps I am just not as cynical as Deputy Tooley (*Laughter*) but I am prepared to accept that Members of the Assembly are speaking their minds in this debate and that they have been true to their own views.

I would say that those who are opposed to the runway extension, and I understand that point of view, who are then saying, 'So we should not look into it at all', I find that position quite troubling. As someone else said, I think it was Deputy Graham, if Members are so sure that there is not a business case then why not support doing the work to prove that they are right?

But anyway, I think that is all I need say. Members will undoubtedly vote the way they intended to vote when they came here this morning (*Laughter*) and I just hope that some of them, enough of us, will have the sense to say we should be looking into this.

Deputy Kuttelwascher, I give way.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** I thank Deputy Parkinson for giving way.

It is just the point that was made by Deputy Fallaize about what happens after this (**Deputy Parkinson:** Good point.) report is produced: can you give any sort of undertaking relating to that which could satisfy his wish?

2205 **Deputy Parkinson:** Yes, I am indebted to Deputy Kuttelwascher for reminding me of Deputy Fallaize's contribution.

I had a certain amount of sympathy with his point of view, which, as I understand it, was that any report produced as a result of a successful requête which came back before the end of this term of Government would be potentially reopened in the next term of Government and the work would be done again. But my reason for thinking that is actually probably not a sound argument – is that what we are being asked to do in this requête is effectively to gather evidence and to produce a report based on that evidence which, if you like, would end up as being an appendix to someone else's policy letter. We are not being asked to produce a piece of policy here, we are just being asked to produce the business case.

2215 Now that will be largely factual, and the next States may disagree with it, but it will be the facts as our independent consultants perceive them to be. I think that that evidence should survive the change of Government. The next Government may draw different inferences from it and come up with different policies, reach different conclusions – of course they are entitled to do that. But I think what in terms of an evidence gathering exercise, which is very much how I see what we are being asked to do in this Requête, I do not see that being spoiled by the General Election.

I give way to Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Fallaize:** I am grateful to Deputy Parkinson.

2225 Can he advise us, if Proposition 1 is approved and his Committee is directed to present a business case, to whom does he imagine presenting it? Is it to the States, but in the absence of a policy letter, or is it to the Policy & Resources Committee? I do not think it is clear but I would be interested to know what his interpretation is of the actual effect of Proposition 1.

2230 **Deputy Parkinson:** Well, I interpret that in the context of Proposition 38 of the Budget debate. There is this ongoing wider review of air connectivity strategy and I agree with the business associations that the examination of the case for a runway extension ought to be part of that. It is not a substitute, it is not a distinct piece of work, it is within that programme. So personally, I think my Committee would use its best endeavours to get back to P&R and the wider States, but in good time for the debate in April or May with the evidence that we have managed to adduce and the inferences we have derived from that.

2235 I have, incidentally, more confidence that we could now do that work since Deputy Inder expressed his position. Members will have detected in earlier speeches that I was hesitant about saying that Economic Development could do anything in this area, because clearly there was not a majority on the Committee – or there was not a majority I knew of – in favour of doing the work, never mind getting the budget. So I think against the new background, if the States direct us to do this work I now speak with some confidence that the Committee will get on and do it. I am sure, as good democrats, Deputies Dudley-Owen and de Lisle would support doing the work if the States direct the Committee to do the work anyway.

2240 So I do not any longer have the concerns I once had about whether we could get the work done and if we are given the budget as a result of this requête then frankly it will be full steam ahead and we will do our level best to produce something in good time for the debate in April or May. So I think that would be the best course of Government. That would give rise to the best opportunity for the States to make an informed decision and it would be my sincere intention to try and deliver to that timescale.

2250 Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I invite the President of the Policy & Resources Committee, Deputy St Pier, to speak in reply to the debate.

2255 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, I will not detain the Assembly for long. As Deputy Parkinson said, Members having debated this matter twice during this term are likely to know exactly which way they are going to vote when it comes to voting.

2260 As Deputy Tindall also said, really nothing of significance has changed since the last time this was debated. Deputy Kuttelwascher now has a style of delivery, both in committee and in this Assembly, which is he presents most issues as really being quite easily resolvable, and we had the RESA requête, which of course was going to be dealt with really quite simply and quite quickly, and of course it was delayed, it took longer than was expected and, of course, produced the result which many said it would produce.

2265 I was also amused to see Deputy Kuttelwascher's what has been described as the first party political broadcast and –

**A Member:** Oh, I am not so sure about that!

2270 **Deputy St Pier:** – it took me to the website of Deputy Kuttelwascher's party and the very first bullet point is:

We aim to: ... avoid procrastination and habitual recourse to expensive consultants ...

*(Laughter)* So, it's going well then!

2275 Deputy Langlois and Deputy Tindall really have said it all. This Requête will not provide the answers. I am afraid when Deputy Graham's battered case is unpacked, it will be found to unsatisfactorily contain rather a lot of dirty laundry, rather than fine brandy! *(Interjection and laughter)*

The Policy & Resources Committee cannot support the requête.

2280 **The Deputy Bailiff:** So I turn finally to the leading requérant, Deputy Kuttelwascher, to reply to the debate.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Sir, may I –

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I do not know why you are standing, Deputy Dudley-Owen.

2285 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** It is out of Rules, but I need to ask, may I clarify a point that I made earlier, where I misled the Assembly, I am afraid?

2290 **The Deputy Bailiff:** If you wish to clarify something which you think has been misleading, then I will give you that permission, before calling Deputy Kuttelwascher.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you. I am very grateful for that.

2295 I stated earlier that at a meeting that we had of the Committee *for* Economic Development I was in the chair and that only myself and Deputy de Lisle were present. That was incorrect. At that meeting, myself, Deputy Parkinson and Deputy de Lisle were present. It was subsequently, when I was asked to sign the letter, that Parkinson was out of the Island, hence the letter as his Vice-President.

So we were in fact quorate at that meeting and I just needed to correct that misunderstanding that I had actually given to the Assembly.

Sir, thank you.

2300 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you very much.  
Deputy Kuttelwascher then, please.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

2305 I will be as brief as I possibly can be, because I do not want to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. (*Laughter*) Deputy Trott, in his usual amusing way, I was talking to a gentleman who was talking about smokescreen and then went to attack STSB for the Aurigny woes, but that has been dealt with by Deputy Ferbrache. Then he spoke to a lady who was talking about yo-yo Government. No, this is not yo-yo Government, this is trying to progress to a conclusion – nothing to do with yo-yos. He may like to know that I spoke to Mrs Le Page from Torteval, and she does support the Requête (*Laughter*) along with a few other people.

2310 Deputy Trott implied that this money will be spent on overseas consultants. Nothing could be further from the truth. A small amount might be, a lot of the work has already been done in-house, a lot more work will be done in-house and I suspect the only expenditure might be for some sort of assurance report on the work that is done in-house.

2315 He said this requête was irritating to most – well I just move in different circles. It is certainly not irritating to some professional organisations, so I am not sure who the ‘most’ are. Yes, there is no shortage of aircraft, but a lot of them are in Africa and America and everywhere else in the world. They are not coming here. The PwC report today is way out of date. Things have happened. There was the interesting thing about Ryanair requiring subsidies and frequency etc., but I think that has been addressed to some extent. I think the Heathrow route is well utilised, it is growing in numbers and it is popular.

2320 Whenever connectivity is mentioned – we have got good connectivity. We can go to lots of places but depending where you go it can be very expensive. So it is the cost of connectivity which for most Islanders in particular, and visitors, is an issue. Now the thing is, can that cost be reduced? That is what it is all about and that is something that a benefit analysis could determine.

2325 Deputy Queripel says, ‘What has changed?’ Well, I started yesterday and listed what has changed. First of all, the amount that is being requested. The cap is practically halved. Well, that is a change. Proposition 38 has appeared, which was not there before. The 1,570-metre option, where a change in attitude towards regulation was not forthcoming, has effectively been binned. So one of the options of PwC has been binned, so one less thing to worry about – that is gone. Although I think Deputy de Lisle seems to think it can come back, along with some other people, I am not quite sure how. You would have to have a change of DCA if you wanted to come back.

2330 I am only considering one option and I have mentioned why: to stay within the Code 3 runway boundaries, because, were it to go any further, it would cause ever-increasing regulatory issues and more cost. What has also materialised, and it did not materialise until late in the day, but then the sursis was late in the day, was the support of three rather large professional organisations on the Island.

I am not giving way, sorry.

2340 And then Deputy Lester Queripel said, we are going from the point of view of ‘Let’s build it, they will come.’ Nobody is saying, ‘Let’s build it’. All that is being asked for is to look at the case and is it a value-for-money option – and it may not be! I agree with Deputy Parkinson: if the business evaluation – the cost benefit evaluation – shows that it is not value for money, it will not happen and it will go away for another decade. That’s fine! I do not know where this attitude of let’s build it and they will ... It does not mean anything to me.

2345 When you say the runway extension, who will come? Well, the only thing that will attract people – twofold: one is the cost and pure tourists will be any attractions here. There is a new hotel on the horizon – the Premier Inn – which will be ready in 2022, I believe, and lower fares have already been proved, as a result of open skies, to attract new visitors. It has also attracted more locals to travel more often – there is evidence for that – and we could go a lot further. I think Deputy Lester Queripel’s questions could all be answered if we go down the route of doing a proper benefit analysis.

2350 One other point: he was asking for guarantees. There is no business case that has ever come up with a guaranteed outcome – ever – including the business case that Deputy Trott will produce for his Green Finance Initiative. They are going to spend money on promoting it, whether any benefits

will materialise from that, we do not know. In fact, the problem with Green Finance is ... No, we will not go into that. That is another thing.

2360 I think somehow I got the impression that Deputy Queripel was taking on the mantle of Nostradamus, because he seemed to know what was going to happen. Well, I don't. I don't. And I am on the same side as Deputy Parkinson. Whatever comes out of this process, if it happens, we will accept. I do not know what the outcome will be.

There you are, I just had a call ... Deputy Lester Queripel just said, 'I do', so he has taken on the mantle of Nostradamus.

2365 Deputy Roffey said, is it vital to the economy? Well historically, over the last 20-odd years, we have been very reactive in air transport policy. It started with AirUK. One day they said, 'We are not pulling out of Heathrow', the next day they were done. Then we had the issue with British Airways at Gatwick – and we were very fortunate and lucky to be given the slots which resulted in the purchase of Aurigny so that we could have the slots. No problem with that, but it was reactive. What happened then? You look at Flybe pulling out of Gatwick, and we were again very lucky, because 2370 they gave us about a year's notice. If they had given us the AirUK notice of a day, we would have been up the swanny, because Gatwick would have been off the map until we found an aircraft to service it.

The aircraft, ATR Embraer 195 was bought purely because with four rotations, which is four slots we had at the time, it was the only aircraft that could have satisfied the existing demands. So if we 2375 had had anything smaller, like an ATR, passenger travel on that route would have been rationed and I can guarantee it would have been done by the cost of the fares.

Again, we were very lucky, and since then several things have happened. I do not know if you remember, but Air Berlin stopped coming here because they were re-equipping with Airbus A320s, and why were they not coming here? Because of the plane. Fortunately we managed to get 2380 somebody else to pick up these charters – and this is the problem. Our runway limits our options. Now, whether it is worth doing something about it or not is what this cost benefit analysis is all about. I think it needs to be done because being reactive is not a good situation.

If tomorrow Gatwick was to say, 'We are not accepting ATRs, because they take up two slots', which is what they effectively do, they are so slow – the only way around that might be to go and 2385 buy Q400s. They are acceptable because they fly at the speed of jets in the local area. That is why they let them into Heathrow. They are quick. But how quickly could you get those planes? I am not saying this is going to happen, but it could. Gatwick is still a single runway slot constrained airport. There is a risk there and if the only way out is to extend the runway, well there is going to be what? A three/four year delay before ... You cannot just build a runway. So another strategic thing is, if 2390 you had an appropriate runway it would future-proof us against other negative policy decisions by UK airports.

You mentioned an environmental impact study. When we were looking at the Airport, and I was on the Airport project board for five years, the cost of an environmental impact assessment then was assessed to be about £50,000, and that was part of looking at the possibility of what an 2395 extension might cost because the report at the time did give an indicative cost of an extension.

A lot of the low-cost carrier comments that have been made are on pure speculation. Nobody is suggesting that low-cost carriers replace everything. They will be additional, and you will be surprised how much one Airbus A319 a day could do for the economy. You will be surprised, it is an awful lot.

2400 I thank Deputies Meerveld and Prow for their positive comments. Deputy Laurie, well, I could guess what he was going to say, but no one is trying to get rid of Aurigny. Do not forget, if we had the capacity to accommodate Airbus aircraft, flip me, Aurigny could fly them! And believe or not, Airbus A319 is 20% less costly to operate than an Embraer 195.

2405 A lot of comparison has been made with the Isle of Man. But the problem with the Isle of Man is several things. It is very difficult to compare to the Isle of Man. Firstly, they have got a much longer runway – more than 1,800 m, it is longer than Jersey. They do not have any slots anywhere and they do not have an airline. But they are doing very well, thank you. Jersey does not have an airline or

any slots, but they are doing very well thank you. What they have got in common is a 1,700 or greater metre runway. We have to have the airline and the slots because the runway takes it – simple as that.

A couple of comments: I thank Deputy Graham for his well-considered, neutral comments. I think a lot of us are in the same boat as he is.

Deputy Brehaut was mentioning the lowering of carbon emissions. Well, part of the process will be to look at improved instrument landing systems for what I call Cat IIIA approaches – that is landing in 200 metres – which all the Airbuses and that are equipped for. But the problem is the runway is too short for it to do it. So even if they can put in the instrument landing system, you could not utilise it. The Embraer 195 could have Cat IIIA equipment to land in 200 m, but we do not have it. But it needs 680 metres to utilise it because when you are landing with autoland, you actually need about 15% more runway because of the way the automatic landing is programmed.

As far as lowering carbon emissions, one of the problems we have got with fog is something like the Embraer, when we bought it, was bought because it could have a full load of passengers and an hour's holding fuel in case it is a bit murky and foggy, and it could still land, even with the full fuel level. How many times have we heard of planes coming here, holding for an hour, and then going back to Gatwick? You think of the emissions – waste of time emissions. A return flight plus an hour's ... Wouldn't it be nice to stop that? So I think if you had the ability to land in these properly foggy conditions it could actually reduce emissions.

Offsetting: a lot of offsetting was done when the Airport rehabilitation was done. *(Interjection)* Well, it was. Well, enough. It was enough to satisfy planning. *(Interjection)* And the timeframe, these were my discussions with officers in the Committee for Economic Development, I actually wanted it sooner, but they said, 'No, let's make it a time frame that we can accommodate', and the timeframe to come back by May is what they suggested would be doable. So it rests with them to deliver on that and I think they can.

Deputy Tooley asked how the Committee feels. Well, we now know that a majority are supporting the Requête. It might be worth noting that all of STSB are supporting the Requête. So two Committees, by a majority, are supporting the Requête. The only one that is out of kilter is P&R, but there they go.

I thank Deputy Smithies for his comment.

Deputy Fallaize raises interesting points and at one point I was looking at a possible amendment and he kindly suggested drafting one. But I thought it would be better just to revert to something else he said. He might be sympathetic if he got an appropriate statement from the President of the Committee for Economic Development and assurance of what would happen. I think what is now planned to happen is that if this work is done, it will be part of Proposition 38 because I think that work needs to be done for Proposition 38 to be properly evaluated. As has been said by a few people in the private world, you cannot half do that job. You must consider what the options are with your current runway length and you compare it with what might be available if you had the slightly longer runway.

Incidentally, the extra runway, say to 1,700 metres – and I know it says at least, because you might be able to get a little bit more depending on the geography – but it is only 117 metres to bring it up to 1,700 metres. That actual runway would still be up to the chain-link fence. What would have to change is the runway end safety area and you actually need 300 metres beyond there. You need 60 metres of what they call runway spit, 240 metres of grass which can slope at five degrees. So there would be a re-profiling of the land and La Villiaze Road you could go over the top, you could bring in tunnel liners and go over the top, or you could fill it in. They are both possible and it has happened elsewhere. *(Interjection)*

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** No, I am not giving way. If you want to correct me, you can.

**Deputy Tindall:** Point of correction sir.

2460 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Tindall.

**Deputy Tindall:** The Requête does not say that this report is in relation to an airport runway extension within the boundary of the Airport or the safeguarded area; it just says, 'at least 1,700 m'. So the correction is that Deputy Kuttelwascher is implying the Requête says something different.

2465

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher to continue, please.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Yes, I do not understand any of that. But never mind, I will carry on. No.

I think that is all I have to say about Deputy Fallaize and what will happen next. I think Deputy Parkinson has said that, and I think that is quite accepted. It will all go back into this Proposition 38 and the report from that will be produced. So P&R will produce something. But because it is so close to an election, I do not think anybody is going to be a position to come up with a policy letter to either press a green button to say go or stop. It is going to be handed over to the next cohort of Deputies.

2470  
2475 Deputy Le Tocq's comments were interesting, that he is somehow saying this is the wrong way to do things – but I just do not see it. I do not think it is at all, this is a perfectly reasonable way to do things, and purely because they have been the changes I mentioned at the beginning, it is a different environment.

I am pleased that Deputy Inder is supportive of the Propositions.

2480 The comments made by Deputy Tindall. As I said, the timeline was supplied by Economic Development. She was somewhat concerned about it. Timelines are always subject to possible delay, but that is as P&R know themselves. As for the person she spoke to who had an interest in topography, well, that is not a problem. Collation of all the information that she is wanting is a function of the cost benefit analysis. It requires time and effort, and it needs resource. The  
2485 1,570 metres for now has been dismissed. The only way you could extend anything within the Airport boundary is for the utilisation of engineering material, a RESA system, and the DCA is not interested in that. That is not going to happen.

I received a note saying that members of the DPA, except maybe Deputy ... support the Requête. Just one passing line about larger planes –

2490

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Point of correction.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Lester Queripel.

2495 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, I am a member of the DPA, I do not support the requête.

**Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher to continue.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** I think the other three do.

2500 There is a mention of larger planes. I thought I would make the point, did you know the Airbus 399 is about three metres shorter than the Embraer 195? So when you say larger, what do you mean? Well, why can it carry more passengers? It has actually got a bulbous fuselage. It is six abreast seating instead of four abreast. So they are actually smaller. I do not know if you have ever seen an Airbus A391 – there was one parked here when easyJet were looking at this some time ago – it looks tiny!

2505

Comment of St Pier – that is alright, I can live with that.

I have nothing else to say, but I do think it is time, if possible, for this Assembly to do the business and support the Requête and a recorded vote has already been requested.

Thank you, sir.

2510

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Hon. Members of the States, there are three Propositions. You will find them in the prayer on page 2 of the Requête. Is there any request that I put Proposition 1, 2 or 3 distinctly, or will you vote the same way on all of them?

In that case, I will put the three Propositions to you. There has been a request for a recorded vote.

Greffier, please.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 20, Contre 19, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1*

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Ferbrache	Deputy Tindall	None	Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Kuttelwascher	Deputy Brehaut		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Tooley		
Deputy Parkinson	Deputy Lester Queripel		
Deputy Leadbeater	Deputy Trott		
Deputy Mooney	Deputy St Pier		
Deputy Le Pelley	Deputy Stephens		
Deputy Merrett	Deputy Fallaize		
Deputy Meerveld	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
Deputy Inder	Deputy Dorey		
Deputy Lowe	Deputy Le Tocq		
Deputy Smithies	Deputy Brouard		
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel	Deputy Dudley-Owen		
Deputy Graham	Deputy McSwiggan		
Deputy Green	Deputy de Lisle		
Deputy Paint	Deputy Langlois		
Deputy Prow	Deputy Soulsby		
Deputy Oliver	Deputy de Sausmarez		
Alderney Rep. Roberts	Deputy Roffey		
Alderney Rep. Snowdon			

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, the voting in respect of the three Propositions in the Requête led by Deputy Kuttelwascher, was: there voted *Pour* 20, *Contre* 19, one absentee, and therefore I declare all three Propositions carried. *(Applause)*

## POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

### XI. Schedule for future States' business – Approved

*Article XI.*

*Whether, after consideration of the attached Schedule for future States' business, which sets out items for consideration at the Meeting of the 11th December 2019 and subsequent States' Meetings, they are of the opinion to approve the Schedule.*

*Items for Ordinary Meeting of the States commencing on the 11th December, 2019*

*(a) communications by the Presiding Officer including in memoriam tributes;*

*(b) statements;*

*(c) questions;*

*(d) elections and appointments;*

*P.2019/118 – Independent Monitoring Panel – Appointment of Members*

*P.2019/119 – Election of Baroness Couttie as an Ordinary Member of the Guernsey Financial Services Commission*

*(e) motions to debate an appendix report (1st stage);*

*(f) articles adjourned or deferred from previous Meetings of the States;*

*(g) all other types of business not otherwise named;*

*No. 105 of 2019 - The Legal Aid (Guernsey and Alderney) Rules, 2019*

*No. 106 of 2019 - The Health Service (Benefit) (Limited List) (Pharmaceutical Benefit) (Amendment No. 6) Regulations, 2019*

*No. 108 of 2019 - The States Reform (Performance of Functions) (Public Transport) Regulations, 2019*

*P.2019/121 - The Income Tax (Guernsey) (Amendment) (No.2) Ordinance, 2019\**

*P.2019/122 - The Income Tax (Zero 10) (Company Higher Rate) (Amendment) (Guernsey) Ordinance, 2019\**

*P.2019/123 - The Income Tax (Zero 10) (Company Intermediate Rate) (Amendment) (Guernsey) Ordinance, 2019\**

*P.2019/124 - The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (Privileges and Immunities) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Ordinance, 2019\**

*P.2019/126 - The Criminal Justice (International Co-operation) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2019\**

*P.2019/127 - The Drug Trafficking (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2019\**

*P.2019/128 - The Criminal Justice (Proceeds of Crime) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2019\**

*P.2019/129 - The Disclosure (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2019\**

*P.2019/130 - The Terrorism and Crime (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2019\**

*P.2019/132 – States' Assembly & Constitution Committee – General Election 2020 – Second Policy Letter\**

*P.2019/120 - Committee for Economic Development – Proposed Amendments to the Guernsey Competition and Regulatory Authority Ordinance, 2012 and Appointment of the Chairman\**

*P.2019/117 – States' Trading Supervisory Board - Guernsey Post Limited – Annual Report and Accounts\**

*P.2019/125 – States' Trading Supervisory Board - Guernsey Electricity Limited – Annual Report and Accounts\**

*P.2019/131 – Policy & Resources Committee – International Tax Measures – Miscellaneous Amendments to the Income Tax Legislation\**

*P.2019/133 – Committee for Home Affairs – Bailiwick Security Policy\**

*P.2019/134 – Committee for Home Affairs – Telecommunications Supply Chain Security Framework\**

*(h) motions to debate an appendix report (2nd stage);*

*(i) Schedule for future States' business.*

*Amendments to the proposed meeting dates and order are permitted only for those items marked with an \*.*

*Items for Ordinary Meeting of the States commencing on the 26th February, 2020*

*(N.B. A meeting of the States of Election will be convened for this date prior to the meeting of the States of Deliberation.)*

*Item for Special Meeting of the States commencing on the 21st April, 2020*

*P. 2019/xx Policy & Resource Plan (End of Term)*

**The Greffier:** Article XI, Schedule for future States' business.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier, is there anything to say about this?

**Deputy St Pier:** No, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, I simply put to you the Proposition, whether you are minded to approve the schedule for the meeting on 11th December 2019 as set out therein.

*Members voted Pour.*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I declare that Proposition duly carried.

That concludes the business for this meeting of the States of Deliberation, and therefore we will close this meeting please, Greffier.

*The Assembly adjourned at 3.35 p.m.*