



**OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF THE**

**STATES OF DELIBERATION**

**OF THE**

**ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

**HANSARD**

**Royal Court House, Guernsey, Wednesday, 12th February 2014**

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

**Volume 3, No. 3**

**ISSN 2049-8284**

**Present:**

**Richard J. McMahon, Esq., Deputy Bailiff and Deputy Presiding Officer**

**Law Officers**

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

**People's Deputies**

**St. Peter Port South**

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

**St. Peter Port North**

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

**St. Sampson**

Deputies G. A. St Pier, P. R. Le Pelley, S. J. Ogier, L. S. Trott

**The Vale**

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

**The Castel**

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

**The West**

A. M. Wilkie, D. de G. De Lisle, Y. Burford, D. A. Inglis

**The South-East**

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

**The Clerk to the States of Deliberation**

S. M. D. Ross, Esq. (H. M. Senior Deputy Greffier) (Morning)  
A. J. Nicolle, Esq. (H. M. Deputy Greffier) (Afternoon)

**Absent at the Evocation**

H.E. Roberts Esq., Q.C. (H.M. Procureur)  
Deputy J. Kuttelwascher (*absent de l'île*), Deputy R. Domaille (*absent de l'île*),  
Deputy E. G. Bebb (*indisposé*), Deputy K. A. Stewart (*relevé à 14h 31*), Deputy P. L. Gillson (*indisposé*),  
Deputy A. Spruce (*absent de l'île*), Deputy R. A. Perrot (*absent de l'île*),  
Deputy A. H. Brouard (*relevé à 9h 35*), Alderney Representative L. E. Jean (*absent de l'île*)  
Alternate Alderney Representative R. N. Harvey (*absent de l'île*)

## Business transacted

Evocation.....	133
Procedural.....	133
Absence of Alderney Representatives .....	133
Recent storms – Commendation to emergency services – Statement by Minister of the Home Department .....	133
<b>Billet d’État II.....</b>	<b>134</b>
Implementation of the Solid Waste Strategy – Debate commenced.....	134
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.07 p.m. and resumed at 12.18 p.m.....</i>	<i>158</i>
Implementation of the Solid Waste Strategy – Debate continued .....	158
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.30 p.m. and resumed at 2.30 p.m.....</i>	<i>161</i>
Implementation of the Solid Waste Strategy – Debate continued and Propositions carried.....	161
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 4.12 p.m. ....</i>	<i>178</i>

*PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK*

# States of Deliberation

*The States met at 9.30 am in the presence of  
His Excellency Air Marshal Peter Walker C.B., C.B.E.  
Lieutenant-Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Bailiwick of Guernsey*

[THE DEPUTY BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

## PRAYERS

*The Senior Deputy Greffier*

## EVOCATION

### Procedural

#### Absence of Alderney Representatives

**Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, the Alderney Representatives have just asked me to convey their apologies as a result of the conditions at the airport and flight times over the next two days. They are unable to make it to Guernsey.

5

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes, I have been forewarned of –

**Deputy Fallaize:** I just wanted the Minister of the Public Services Department to make another note, sir, (*Laughter*) but they send their apologies anyway.

10

**Deputy Luxon:** Noted, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Luxon, and of course it is now on the record in due course.

#### Recent storms – Commendation to emergency services – Statement by Minister of the Home Department

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, the first matter that we will deal with this morning is that I have given leave for the Minister of the Home Department, Deputy Le Tocq, to make a statement pursuant to Rule 8(c).

15

**Deputy Le Tocq:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

I wish hereby both to commend and thank all who work for our public emergency services – whether Home Department, public sector employees or otherwise – for their tireless, sterling efforts over recent weeks to keep Islanders safe and secure during the multiple storms which have battered our shores. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

20

Some may say that it is all part of the job and an emergency service should expect no special commendation, but I believe we live in a world increasingly quick to criticise and slow to praise and an attitude of gratitude is a healthy antidote which costs little.

25

Indeed, from my privileged standpoint, I am aware that many of our women and men whose service during times like we have experienced recently regularly act in situations one might describe as ‘beyond the call of duty’ and certainly behind the scenes at times when we are less conscious of needing them.

30

I would hope, therefore, in recording our appreciation here, this Assembly will join me in commending Guernsey Water, Guernsey Harbours, the Fire and Rescue Service, the Border Agency, the Police Force, St John Ambulance and rescue staff, States Works, as well as other public service employees, Civil Protection Volunteers and numerous others, many of whom were out all hours in all kinds of weather undertaking

often dangerous and undesirable tasks on behalf of us all and who continue to be vigilant and ready to respond again, should such adverse conditions persist.

35 Thank you all. (*Members: Hear, hear.*) (*Applause*)

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard, do you wish to be *relevé*? We will note your presence. Well, Members of the States, I am sure we all concur with what the Minister of the Home Department has just said. Are there any questions arising out of that statement?

40 Yes, Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Gollop:** In view of the Policy Council and the Home Department's collective support, as we all share, for the many men and women of the emergency services, will the Departments meet to consider both a mop up strategy, in a sense, to see where procedures were excellent and where they could be slightly improved? And the second part of the question is – will additional budgetary resources be needed in view of the extremely unexpected turn of the weather since the New Year?

On a lighter note, will the Ministers be wearing their wellies like their counterparts in the United Kingdom?

50 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Minister, can you reply to those three questions from Deputy Gollop?

**Deputy Le Tocq:** Sir, yes, indeed I can.

I can assure Deputy Gollop and this Assembly that in fact the debrief liaison learning experience is always ongoing and in fact has already started under the Island's Risk Register. In any case, that is part and parcel of what we have to do and are currently undergoing, and certainly, sir, my understanding is that, yes, more expenses, a greater budget will be necessary looking forward into the future in order to deal with what has currently happened and to protect our shores for the future.

With regard to wellington boots, that is a private matter that I will keep to myself! (*Laughter*)

60 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, no one else is rising so, Deputy Greffier, the item of business that is left please.

## Billet d'État II

### PUBLIC SERVICES DEPARTMENT

#### Implementation of the Solid Waste Strategy – Debate commenced

##### *Article I.*

*After consideration of the Report dated 9<sup>th</sup> December, 2013, of the Public Services Department, the States are asked to decide:*

- 1. To rescind Resolution 3 on Article VII of Billet d'État No. IV of 2012.*
- 2. To establish, with effect from 1 January 2014, a 'Solid Waste Trading Account' and for the financial arrangements in relation to solid waste to be managed therefrom, including that currently within Public Services' Revenue Budget.*
- 3. To authorise the Treasury and Resources Department to approve expenditure from the 'Solid Waste Trading Account' necessary to progress development and implementation of the solid Waste Strategy, funding of waste minimisation, and recycling initiatives, including kerbside collections, until such time as a new charging regime is in place.*

##### *Export of Waste*

- 4. To direct the Public Services Department to tender for the construction, or construction and operation, of the Transfer Station as part of the infrastructure necessary for the new Waste Strategy and, following that tender, to recommend a tenderer for the same to the Treasury and Resources Department.*
- 5. To direct the Public Services Department to tender for the transportation and export of residual waste to an off-island energy from waste facility and, following that tender, to recommend a tenderer for the same to the Treasury and Resources Department.*

6. To approve the giving of authority to the Treasury and Resources Department to approve the Public Services Department's recommended tenderers for 4 and 5 above on receipt of a suitable business case and to release the relevant funds for capital costs and for operational costs of the same upon such approval, with the capital costs being funded by way of a loan either from the States General Investment Pool or the external market.

*Other Infrastructure*

7. To direct the Public Services Department to tender for the construction, or construction and operation, of the following:

- Materials Recovery Facility
- In-Vessel Composter
- Civic Amenity Site
- Repair and Reuse Centre
- Kerbside collection vehicles (if required)

and, on receipt of such tenders, to recommend preferred bidders to the Treasury and Resources Department.

8. To approve the giving of authority to the Treasury and Resources Department to approve the Public Services Department's recommended tenderers for 4 and 7 above on receipt of a suitable business cases; and to release the relevant funds for capital costs up to a total sum not to exceed £29.5 million (including capital costs related to export of waste) with the capital costs being funded by way of a loan either from the States General Investment Pool or the external market; and at the same time to approve operational costs associated with those same facilities.

*Legislation and Policy*

9. That certain current controls on licensing of private waste disposal sites, under the Environmental Pollution legislation, be extended to other private facilities which may compete with the Island's key waste infrastructure (as set out in particular in paragraphs 27.1 to 27.4 and 37.1).

10. To amend the Waste Disposal Authority's current duty to make reasonable provision for the disposal of household and commercial waste to cover the making of arrangements for recovery or disposal of such waste and consequently to widen the current powers of the Waste Disposal Authority to impose waste acceptance criteria at public waste disposal sites to all States provided, funded or arranged recovery or disposal facilities (as set out in paragraphs 37.2 to 37.3).

11. That the Douzaines retain their current waste collection functions but that the parochial collection of refuse legislation be amended to:

1. require the Douzaines to:

- make such arrangements as may be necessary to collect the separate waste streams as required by the Waste Disposal Authority;
- Transfer such waste to the waste management facilities as required by the Waste Disposal Authority and not just for final disposal;
- provide the above collection and Transfer service for small businesses opting into the parish collection service; and
- take into account the Waste Disposal Plan in carrying out their functions in relation to parochial collection of waste,

as set out in paragraphs 30.2 to 30.6, 32.5 to 32.6, 37.5 and 37.11,

2. confer on the Douzaines a power to delegate their functions under the Parochial Collection of Refuse Legislation to the Waste Disposal Authority as set out in paragraphs 30.7 to 30.9, and

3. remove the Douzaines current power to impose limitations on the quantity of refuse collected under the Parochial Collection of Refuse Legislation as set out in paragraph 37.26.

12. To introduce a new charging system for waste management services provided to householders (as set out in particular in 31.9 to 31.16 and 37.7-37.10).

13. To amend the Waste Disposal Authority's current gate fee charging powers to include all States provided, funded or arranged recovery or disposal facilities (as set out in particular in paragraphs 31.16 to 31.21, 32.1 to 32.3 and 37.6).

14. That statutory duties be imposed on occupiers of households and small business premises using parish collection services regarding the presentation of household waste and other parochially collected waste put out for collection (as set out in particular in paragraphs 33.1 to 33.7 and 37.12).

15. That a civil fixed penalty scheme be introduced to enforce the statutory requirements outlined in recommendation 14 (as set out in paragraphs 37.13 to 37.24).

16. That any amendments be made consequential to the above policy proposals to the Environmental Pollution Law, and legislation made under it, the Parochial Collection of Refuse Law and other legislation relating to waste and legislation making reference to the same.

17. To direct the Public Services Department and the Commerce and Employment Department to work with the commercial sector to develop and implement voluntary initiatives to prevent or minimise waste both generated by businesses directly and indirectly and through the products and services businesses provide.

18. To direct all States Departments, Committees, and Councils to implement, as far as practicable, such waste prevention and minimisation initiatives as are needed to contribute to the achievement of the States approved recycling targets.

19. To direct all States Departments, Committees and Councils that own or manage land hired out or otherwise used for public events to include, as far as practicable, in terms and conditions of such hire or use, a requirement for organisers to provide recycling facilities.

20. To direct all States Departments, Committees and Councils that own or manage land hired out or otherwise used for public events to include, in terms and conditions of such hire or use, a requirement that, where relevant, only recyclable or reusable tableware and takeaway food and drink containers be used, such conditions to be phased in as soon as practicable but in any event no later than 31 December 2018.

21. To direct the preparation of any legislation necessary to give effect to the proposals recommended in 9 to 20.

**The Deputy Greffier:** Billet d'Etat II of 2014: Public Services Department – Implementation of the Solid Waste Strategy.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I invite the Minister of the Public Services Department, Deputy Luxon, to open debate on this matter.

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

Sir, in February 2010 the Public Services Department were directed to produce proposals for a revised strategy for disposing of solid waste, this having followed the aborted Lurgi and sewage proposals as some considerable cost.

In February 2012 the States approved the revised Waste Strategy which was formulated with the internationally accepted waste hierarchy at its core, focusing on minimisation and recycling of waste up to a recycling rate of 20/25 at 70%, leaving only a small remaining residual fraction to be dealt with.

This report, which we had intended to lay before the States last month, deals with the implementation of the Solid Waste Strategy. It naturally deals with the implementation plans rather than on revisiting the Strategy itself. My Board and Department believe we have listened carefully, consulted widely and adopted appropriate plans to deliver this Strategy. This is not the time to go back and tinker with the range of options exhaustively explored and discounted back two years ago, including landfill as an option.

We hope that this report sets out clearly the detailed plans and provides Members with a clear understanding of our intentions and work streams over the next two years, leading to a full implementation of the new waste management system early in 2016. States Member's briefings over the last month or so will, I hope, have been informative and useful and I thank all Deputies for attending them.

Sir, the report captures four different aspects which I will return to briefly, shortly: the export of residual waste, legislation and policy changes, parochial legislation policy changes within the Policy Council remit and a more general update on the overall Waste Strategy and costings.

I would like to provide an overarching summary in my opening here of our report, which leads to the inter-locking integral 21 Propositions PSD is recommending Members support today, to enable my Department to get on with our busy two-year plan starting later this month. There will be a further report on the detailed charging mechanism and cost to householders, once we have received all of the final tender costings, we hope by December 2014.

Sir, diagram 5.1 on page 70 of the Billet sets out the waste hierarchy illustrating the core principles of our plans, namely prevention, re-use, recycling, recovery and then only finally, disposal. In short, minimising our residual waste and maximising diversion of all materials possible. Members and Islanders can be reassured that our Strategy and implementation plans, absolutely comply fully with this principle.

Diagram 5.2 on page 71 of the Billet, sets out clearly and easily the eight main work streams, those being kerb side collection of dry recyclables and food; food waste processing by IVC – in-vessel composting; a materials recovery facility and a waste transfer station for exporting; a waste export contract; legislation policy and funding; repair and reusing civic amenities facilities and a bring back review; management of Mont Cuét landfill; and finally waste minimisation plans.



Sir, it also sets out the four core objectives to minimise waste, achieve high recycling targets, export residual waste for recovery and minimise landfill. Again, I will point out that each of these objectives and work streams are integral to the entire waste management system we attempt to deliver for Guernsey. Implicit within all of our proposals, we have introduced flexibility to ensure future proofing to enable us to react effectively to any future changes or issues that may emerge over the next few years.

The Policy Council, Treasury and Resources Department, Environment Department and Crown Officers, have all been fully engaged throughout the preparation of this report and we thank them for their input.

Value for money runs at the heart of our thinking as we implement the Strategy. We recognise that the cheaper and unsustainable costs of the previous old fashioned landfill disposal method would inevitably have to increase as we move to this modern, sustainable waste management system. But we are intent on minimising capex and opex costs to minimise the total cost increase for all householders. This is a key goal and it is a prime determination for my Department.

A small example on costs: homes currently generate approximately 4,000 tons of food waste – food that is brought into each home and thrown away at an average cost of £50 per year. A great example of how householders and the people of Guernsey could mitigate some of the increased costs of the waste management system.

Sir, briefly returning to the four core aspects, export first. Section 7 to 20 deals with this part of our Strategy and the good news is that we have received high interest from parties willing to contract with us, with 45 possibilities which we drew down to 18 and then further shortlisted to five.

We would intend to go out to an open tender if Members approve this report today, to ensure best value is achieved. The indicative costs have been much lower than the 2012 assumptions, which has helped balance the higher capex cost from the 2012 report and we will time the awarding of the contract to try and extract the best overall deal possible.

We did explore the option of attempting to buy into the Jersey plant as directed but, as our frozen pond schedule in the report demonstrates, this is simply not a viable or logical option for Guernsey to pursue. Legislation and policy changes are covered on pages 93 to 123 and set out detailed proposals to amend our current laws to facilitate the implementation of the Waste Strategy. Considerable consultations with the Douzaines especially, and under good advice from the Crown Officers, have led us to the raft of changes presented as laid out in the Billet.

Sir, Deputy Jones will reflect briefly on this area when he speaks later, but some of the main items that we have had to look at are: the relationship between the Waste Disposal Authority and the Douzaines, charging mechanisms, responsibilities, licencing of waste sites, waste acceptance criteria, enforcements measures – all of which have been described in detail and, as there is much to be done, we formally requested the Law Officers to prioritise the drafting to tie in with our two-year plan.

Moving on, an update on the overall Strategy and costings. In conjunction with the Treasury and Resources Board, we have included within this report at Section 22 an extensive overview for the benefit of Members. This presents how we see the overall costings using a range of outcomes and including sensible contingencies to provide a clear picture of how the finances will work over the next three years and beyond.

The creation of a solid waste trading account from this year onwards has been agreed with T&R as the best mechanism to ensure full transparency and cost control on the finances of this new Waste Strategy. Going forward the total cost of our waste management system will be covered by the income generated and charges made to households, so ultimately a nil draw on general revenue and expenditure in future.

As mentioned earlier, the capex is higher than was outlined indicatively in the 2012 Billet but does include additional elements of infrastructure to that which was covered then. However, the export costs especially are far lower so overall the full costing to householder, post the full implementation, remains in line with the earlier assumptions and I repeat, my Department has taken care to challenge the modelling and assumptions robustly, and value for money is key to our thinking.

Sir, some further general points to highlight. Within our plans we have prioritised communications highly, as the need for PSD to inform and share details as part of the implementation will be vital if we are fully to capture buy-in from all stakeholders and householders. This comms plan will run throughout the implementation phase and beyond to achieve behavioural change in support of the Strategy objectives. In so doing we will be able to achieve best value for the user.

Sir, we still have some hurdles to cross as we implement the Strategy – all of which have been rigorously assessed – and I do not believe that there are any significant risks to the process that we lay out. The Environment Department have made clear their position on the Waste Disposal Plan (WDP) in their letter of comment attached and we have worked with them to resolve this anomaly. However, PSD has fully complied with the direction of the States in every way and will work with the Environment Department to expedite the completion of the WDP in any way we can. This Strategy is compliant and sustainable and environmentally appropriate and does reflect the draft WDP contained as an appendix within the 2012 States' report, approved by the States.

Finally, sir, environmental impact assessment, traffic assessment, planning approvals, local EHO licensing, Basel Convention obligations, OECD trans-shipments and directives, refuse derived fuel requirements, DEFRA, are all aspects of our implementation plan which we have researched in detail, challenged and investigated by our team and advisors. We are comfortable with all of the indications we have received to date that we have no concerns as to our capability of racing across these hurdles and complying with each requirement. Our work will continue in earnest to progress these matters pending approval today of our report.

Sir, my Department and project team and the Board have endeavoured to capture all of the directions we received from the States in 2012 and believe we present the States today with a sound set of plans to deliver and implement the Solid Waste Strategy and integrated approach.

I look forward to the debate and would ask Members to support all 21 Propositions.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, Minister.

Deputy Laurie Queripel, you have a motion pursuant to Article 7 of the Reform Guernsey Law 1948.

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Yes, thank you, sir.

In order to allow me to place this sursis I first need to lay a procedural motion to suspend Rule 13(2) so that this motion can be debated. So I would like to do that now, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut, do you formally second that?

**Deputy Brehaut:** Yes, I do, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I do not see anyone rising, so I will put the Proposition to you, which is to suspend Paragraph 2 of Rule 13 to enable the sursis to be placed. Those in favour; those against.

*Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I am going to go to an *appel nominal* on that.

*Carried – Pour 22, Contre 14, Abstained 1, Not Present 10*

**POUR**

Deputy Harwood  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Sherbourne  
Deputy Storey  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy David Jones  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Le Lièvre  
Deputy Collins  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Adam  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Wilkie  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Inglis  
Deputy O'Hara

**CONTRE**

Deputy Robert Jones  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Ogier  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Duquemin  
Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy James  
Deputy De Lisle  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Sillars  
Deputy Luxon  
Deputy Quin  
Deputy Hadley

**ABSTAINED**

Deputy Paint

**NOT PRESENT**

Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Domaille  
Deputy Conder  
Deputy Bebb  
Deputy Stewart  
Deputy Gillson  
Deputy Spruce  
Deputy Perrot  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. Harvey

**Deputy Brehaut:** Excuse me, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

**Deputy Brehaut:** Technology being what it is, I have just had a message from Deputy Elis Bebb saying he is unwell and therefore indisposé for this session. Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you for relaying that, Deputy Brehaut.

205 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, on the Proposition to suspend Rule 13(2), there voted in favour, 22; against, 14. There was one abstention and 10 Members were not present at the vote. So I declare the proposition carried.

210 So we will now move, Deputy Laurie Queripel, to the placing of the sursis.

*Sursis:*

*To sursis proposition 4, 5, and 6 and to direct that in advance of the States considering these propositions in respect of the export of waste, the Public Services Department shall report to the States with an assessment comparing the advantages, disadvantages and feasibility of on-island landfill, with the advantages, disadvantages and feasibility of export to an off-island energy from waste facility, as a means of disposing of residual waste.*

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Thank you, sir.

I would like to begin by saying that until quite recently my attitude towards the proposed Strategy was fairly ambivalent. I understood the thinking behind the waste hierarchy, so many of the resources we plunder from the earth are not renewable, the take, make and throwaway approach is simply not sustainable. It is in our best interests as a civilisation to reduce the amount of raw materials that we access and those that we do access, to make better use of them and to use them again is the right message. But, as is the Guernsey way, sir, the closer we have come to debate, the more I have been hearing from members of the public expressing real concerns – almost fears – in regard to how much the Strategy might cost the individual and the householder.

These conversations, sir, increased to such a degree that it reached a sort of critical mass for me and I felt that I had to submit questions to PSD, that I had a public duty to do so and, in particular, raising the subject of landfill again as an option.

Sir, rather than being comforted by the replies I received from PSD I was disquieted. They raised a whole series of other questions. There was no acknowledgement that modern methods of managing landfill can largely – via quarry lining, for example – negate the problem of leachate and by treating the waste before it is deposited into landfill, issues with litter and odour are largely eliminated. In all probability this would still be more affordable – less costly than any other waste disposal method.

Sir, although the days of cheap disposal are clearly over – and I think we all understand that – the idea should be to keep the cost increases to a minimum. It is apparent to me that it is the view of many Islanders – not only those that have contacted me, but others besides, sir – that they have heard in broad terms the reasons why PSD are not putting forward landfill as an option, but they are not convinced that they have heard a detailed, evidenced, persuasive explanation as to why it has been ruled out.

Sir, I think the public need to be convinced that it has not been dismissed simply because it is considered to be less than ideal or not appropriate. I think we need to satisfy ourselves as an Assembly, sir, and the people of Guernsey that every option has been explored in detail before we spend millions of pounds on a Strategy that has a number of unknowns, particularly in regard to cost, before we embark on a Strategy that people may not buy into, simply because they are not persuaded that all the options have been explored and suspect that a more affordable alternative *could* have been arrived at.

Sir, as for people's ability to affect their refuse bills, it has to be borne in mind that there will be a limit to the avoidance and minimisation of waste, because as an Island we are so very reliant upon the imported goods – perishable or otherwise – packaging and so on will always be an issue and therefore the ability to reduce what you put onto the kerbside will be limited.

Sir, I turn now if I may to the six page information paper that Public Services kindly provided to Assembly Members at the back end of last week in response to this motion. The paper makes mention that a landfill option – in fact it was Option D on the shortlist of scenarios presented during the workshops – was presented but almost as an academic exercise. In other words, whether it could be accommodated or not. Sir, clearly in the short term it could have been accommodated at Mont Cuét and in the long-term, of course, another site would have needed to be found. That was either quite an irresponsible act on PSD's part or they knew that if push came to shove they could access or acquire another site.

Before I go any further, sir, I have to ask a question of PSD that I am not entirely clear on and I hope one of the Members can answer it for me. In that information paper in response to the motion it stated that the life of Mont Cuét could be extended by seven to eight years if modern landfill methods were employed. As I understand it, the prediction is that Mont Cuét will be full by 2022. Sir, these are under current conditions and, therefore, would employing these modern methods now actually extend the life of Mont Cuét until 2030? In other words, is it still 2022, whether we adopted modern landfill methods now or would it extend the life to something like 2030 if we adopted those methods now or quite soon into the future?

The PSD paper also told us that a survey had been carried out in 2007. A survey of potential sites that could be used for landfill and nine sites had been revealed, excluding a number of other likely sites for

260 various reasons, including future water storage – nine sites, sir! I know that there are about 30 quarries in the Vale alone and if you take the north of the Island as a whole there would be a good deal more than that and some are pretty big.

265 So even though, sir, the PSD paper indicates the criteria that were used, there does not seem to be any mention of the quarries not being used for water storage at the moment being used for such a purpose so that other quarries could be considered for landfill. So I am quite dubious about the fact that this survey made no real mention of possibilities or potential ways around the problems. It seems to be more of a ‘can’t do’ than a ‘can do’.

270 Sir, it is the excluded quarries that most interest me. This is a piece of work to my mind that has not been done. But let us put aside the other excluded quarries for a moment, including the mention of joining two together to create a site, and let us take a look at Les Vardes as an example, reminding ourselves of the words of the motion:

‘An assessment of the advantages, disadvantages and feasibility of on-Island landfill.’

275 Sir, Les Vardes has been excluded because current owners are still working the quarry for stone. The PSD paper tells us something interesting: that the quarry is earmarked for future water storage anyway. If that is the case, I would imagine that some negotiations have already taken place between the States and the quarry owners and some sort of tacit agreement perhaps reached. At the very least, the States have indicated their interest in the site and the quarry owners are aware of it.

280 Sir, I also understand that there have been some discussions about the States facilitating a move to another site for the owners of Les Vardes so that the States can then access Les Vardes quarry. So some exchange has taken place. The subject has been broached.

285 Sir, to further support the sursis motion today I would like to look again at two things. PSD’s answer to my Rule 6 questions and some of the documents associated with the consultation workshop process. In answer to one of my Rule 6 questions, PSD said that Les Vardes would have sufficient capacity at the current rate of landfilling to last for 20 years or more but, to be more precise, it would require a more detailed investigation. Once again, sir, bearing in mind the wording of the sursis, that work has not been done.

290 As for the 20 years or so, sir, I spoke to a chap recently who had worked at Les Vardes for many, many years and he found that figure to be amusing and bemusing. By his conservative estimation, you fit at least two Mont Cuets into Les Vardes quarry so that probably takes us to about 50 years. Bearing in mind the policy will be to reduce over time the amount of residual waste, you could probably add a few more years on top of that.

295 Sir, referring back to the documents that inform the consultation and workshop process, as I stated previously, four scenarios made the options list and the waste hierarchy was a main factor in all of them. Before I go into these details and figures, I am aware they date back a couple of years and things will have changed.

Scenario A, sir, included the waste park and MRF commercial waste materials recovery facility, micro incineration and composting. The indicative cost was £8.5 million per annum.

Scenario B – in essence the Strategy being proposed today, sir – the indicative cost £12 million per annum, dependent on contract negotiations for export.

300 Scenario C included kerbside recycling, composting involving an MBT to produce refuse derived fuel for export: indicative cost, sir, £10 million per annum, dependent on contract negotiations for export.

Scenario D – landfill including kerbside, MBT, composting, indicative cost, sir, £7 million per annum but with a caveat that figure does not include any additional landfill sites.

305 So in my very simple way, sir, I did my own crude calculations. Let us imagine for a minute that the capital cost of acquiring, preparing and facilitating – including infrastructure such as an MBT – a new landfill was £60 million. Bearing in mind that such a site as Les Vardes would probably last 50 or 60 years, so has got a capacity of 50 or 60 years, that would add about £1 million per annum to the cost, taking our £7 million figure to £8 million.

310 Sir, let us allow a bit more headroom and add another quarter of a million pounds per annum. That takes it to £8.25 million per annum. Still the cheapest option and with the inbuilt assurance that we are dealing with our residual waste on-Island by a well proven method, excluding the vagaries and uncertainties of export and being done via a process that is environmentally acceptable, because it will be done in a modern way. Even the so-called green lobby – the local lobby group – sir, agree with that.

315 What about the cost of landfill managed in this way, sir, in a modern way, whilst retaining and improving the bring bank service and not changing to kerbside recycling. I would like to see that scenario costing as part of the piece of work this sursis is calling for.

Again, sir, with the 2007 survey in mind, the information we received from PSD did not mention – and I have not mentioned it yet – the possibilities of more land reclamation projects involving inert waste. This

too could be considered as part of the piece of work that the sursis is calling for. There is mention, sir, of the land reclamation project at Longue Hougue in one of the consultation documents and I will just read that section:

‘According to current calculations, Longue Hougue has an estimated 10 years remaining capacity for the reclamation of land with inert waste. However, forecasting a closure date must be treated with caution as it is dependent on the nature of the construction industry. Therefore planning a follow on site must be informed by ongoing process of site surveys and forecasts of construction sector activity.’

Sir, I am not aware of any forecasts or surveys being done in regard to that site or any other site for reclamation, so that piece of work could be covered as well in the piece of work the sursis is calling for.

Sir, in regard to other quarries, there does not seem to be any mention of the so-called Torrey Canyon quarry and one that was excluded that should be given serious reconsideration is the Longue Hougue quarry. We are told that it is a water storage quarry and yet it is significantly contaminated with salt and sea water. So as a water storage option its value is extremely limited. It is a quarry that it could make good sense to use. It would be adjacent to the other waste related facilities on the Longue Hougue site.

Sir, if you look at the Dyson’s quarry which is located nearby, that was filled and now that reclaimed land is occupied by business and industrial industries. The same could possibly be done with the Longue Hougue quarry and the benefits could therefore be two-fold. There are so many unknowns, including cost unknowns in the proposed Strategy. We do not know where the waste will go yet and at what cost. We do not have any real figures for the infrastructure needed on-Island. We cannot predict the future spare capacities of off-Island incinerators.

Sir, if the EU Landfill Directive – which I will come to in more detail in just a second – eventually takes hold across Europe and becomes more of a diktat there will be pressure from other jurisdictions to access that spare capacity and then the market dynamics change. Supply and demand comes into play. Shipping and transport costs are very likely to increase. We do know that the cost of the proposed Strategy overall has increased over time, so the landfill eliminates so many of these questions, so many of these unknowns.

Sir, now let us come to PSD’s comments that landfill is not an environmentally acceptable way of dealing with residual waste. Sir, I would caution against that opinion because, despite the impression we have been given, landfill is and will be, for the foreseeable future, one of the most common and acceptable forms of dealing with waste.

There are 777 landfill sites alone in the UK – *777 in the UK alone!* This is why, sir, I have, out of public duty, reopened the debate on landfill. It is possible to adhere to the waste hierarchy and still landfill. It is possible for landfill to be environmentally acceptable and I would say to my colleagues, even though it is late in the day, it is never too late to examine more information, never too late to look at other options, never too late to reconsider and make the right decision.

Sir, we do not have to lead the way in anything and we do not have to bend the knee to the EU Landfill Directive. All we have to do is what is acceptable and, even more importantly, what is right and as much as possible, affordable for our people.

I and, as far as I can tell, many members of the public are not convinced that every conceivable aspect of the landfill option has been sufficiently explored. Sir, I do not think we are being made aware of all the possibilities or historic evidence or information. Former Deputy, sir, and still Vale Douzenier, Brian de Jersey, has supplied me with some information that dates back to 1991 when the Board of Administration took some advice from the Environmental Safety Centre in Harwell in regard to improved management of landfill sites, which included pre-treating the waste material before it was deposited into the site.

The States at that time, sir, actually approved of those measures and yet nothing of that has been mentioned and of course nothing implemented. If it had, we may be looking today at a Longue Hougue site that is less than half full.

Sir, I would like to again refer back to PSD’s answers to my Rule 6 questions. They state that even if a site could be acquired, all the necessary planning and permitting issues would have to be dealt with. Also the Director of Environmental Health would have to grab a waste management licence. I get the feeling that neither the Environment Department nor the Director of Environmental Health has been properly engaged by PSD in order to seriously consider these issues.

I do wonder why a waste management licence would not be granted, considering that any new site would be subject to modern management methods, considering, sir, that we already have a landfill site in use and considering the fact that clearly licences have been granted for the 777 landfill sites in operation in the UK. As part of the work this motion calls for these matters will have to be carefully looked at and the relevant parties engaged.

As an aside, sir, in any case, even if the Director of Environmental Health made a decision to refuse a licence, would that decision be in the wider public interest? That decision could result in a greater cost to the public purse and to households when in fact the option of landfill may be acceptable to the majority of Islanders.

Sir, I urge Members to consider supporting this motion. What can be the harm in getting more information and perhaps being able to, in the end, consider an option that we thought was off the list. To give serious consideration to the possibility that you are not being presented here today with the only and most affordable solution. Are you satisfied Members, are you absolutely confident, that this is the best and only solution for Guernsey and our fellow Islanders? Do you honestly feel that all the options and possibilities have been given serious, thorough and forensic examination?

With those questions to Members, sir, I commend this motion to the Assembly.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut do you formally second?

**Deputy Brehaut:** I rise to formally second and reserve my right to speak, thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Paint.

**Deputy Paint:** Sir, and Members of the Assembly, the role of the Environment Department as far as waste is concerned goes beyond the general environmental policy, making the duties set out in its mandate and extends to a specific legal duty set out in the Environment Pollution (Guernsey) Law. The duty requires a Department to draft and present to the States a Waste Disposal Plan which is a plan that all waste operations, including PSD's waste operations, are regulated by.

We have sought advice from the Law Officers in respect of the best way to discharge that duty and we have been advised that we must independently consider the Waste Disposal Plan which is PSD's recommendations. We cannot simply, slavishly follow them. We must turn our minds away from them and satisfy ourselves, or otherwise, that they are using the right approach.

Of course this is if the States support PSD recommendations today. Then the Environment Department will need to have very good reasons not to adopt them when drafting the Waste Disposal Plan, but nevertheless we are obliged to consider them and to satisfy ourselves, or otherwise, of their appropriateness.

This should of course not come as any surprise or news to anyone. We have clearly set out the position in our letter which is attached to PSD's report on page 131 of Volume 2 of the Billet. It is because the Environment Department must exercise an independent role that we must carry out the planning function that Members of the Department have to give very careful consideration as to whether to speak and/or vote on the proposal before us. To do so might, but need not necessarily, create or be perceived to create a pre-determination in advance of us carrying out the statutory consideration of the proposals.

Members of the Environment Department will make their own decision as to whether or not to speak or vote, but for my part I will not be speaking further on the proposals and will not be voting.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you Deputy Paint. Well, of course, the Minister and the Deputy Minister are not present and one of the Members is seconding the sursis so (*Laughter*) but thank you for clarifying your position. (*Laughter*)

Deputy de Lisle.

**Deputy de Lisle:** Sir, I rise just to remind Deputy Queripel that responsible waste management has moved forward in recent years and practices acceptable a few years ago are no longer deemed sustainable and acceptable by international environmental and ecological standards and thinking – thinking driven, sir, by the determination to avoid the mistakes of the past.

There is a new awareness of the dangers to human health of waste landfills. For example, landfills are major producers of methane and leachates and polluters of water tables. The problem of contamination of our ground water supply and the very real threat to precious water supplies on our Island – our small densely populated Island – has to be key in this whole management scenario.

It is worth noting, as one example, that the Swiss today face a huge cost remediation estimated at five billion Swiss Francs, from contamination of ground water directly attributable to landfill sites, where concentrations of substances have leached into the once usable ground water and functional wells. In fact, in Switzerland there are some 50,000 to 60,000 polluted sites to register of which 3,000 to 4,000 are considered to be in need of remediation and thus classified as contaminated sites.

You will realise that Switzerland had no significant mining industry, hardly any heavy industries, no war related contamination and a long tradition though of incineration of urban waste. But the main natural resource affected is therefore often one of public supply of drinking water. I think, like other countries, Switzerland has made mistakes in the past regarding waste management. We have an opportunity here to avoid such mistakes. As a result, Switzerland is paying for its mistakes and for many years the issue was

not as prominent on the political agenda, mainly because Switzerland had no dirty industry, if you like – mining, heavy industry – and few industrial complexes and no war time sites.

So I just bring this up to remind everyone that we have moved forward in recent years in the whole waste management area and that we have to guard, particularly in a small Island of this nature, our very precious water resource for future generations.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier.

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

When I started this speech I saved the file as ‘Waste Speech 2014’ and in my documents folder I saw ‘Waste Speech 2012, Waste Speech 2010, Waste Speech 2008, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004. I was a newcomer in 2004. I read reports from 2003 and 1998. My favourite though was the 1947 report where, effectively, (*Laughter*) we brought a chap over from the UK Government. He spent a weekend here and they drove him around various waste sites. He would suck on his pipe, adjust his hat, sniff a bit and on Sunday evening pronounced, ‘Well, you need an incinerator’ and he got back on the boat on Monday morning and off he went. A few weeks later there is a States’ report advocating an incinerator and away we go. (*Laughter*)

Simpler times and my point of is, of course, is that Guernsey’s waste disposal issue has been the subject of discussion for decades. This Waste Strategy is a difficult problem to put to bed because it takes around six years to agree a policy, then procure and implement it. This means that any strategy will take two Assemblies to solve it. The Members of one Assembly need to keep their resolve and then ensure the following Assembly sees it through. If not, each Assembly will try and come up with something different.

In 2010 when Members were contemplating not going ahead with sewers, I berated them for their inconsistency. They failed to support the export of waste in 2006. They did not support kerbside twice. They failed to support any measures which would lead this Island away from incineration and yet when it came down to it, when they were left with the results of their decisions – which was a smaller incinerator – they could not go through with it.

I told States Members at that time not to unite to throw out one proposal, only to fail to unite when its replacement came back. That is the danger with an alliance against something. You are united against what you do not want, only to fail to agree on a replacement. States Members, however, were united upon the strategy’s return, helped by a thorough and comprehensive public consultation which informed this Assembly’s decision that this waste strategy represents the best way forward. The last Assembly handed it on to us to implement. They said that PSD should bring back a report telling this Assembly how we were getting on and what changes to legislation we would need to make it work. Here we are letting you know how we are getting on.

Now is not the time to say, ‘Hey, stop what you are doing and go and investigate this, please.’ That time has passed. Now is not the time to put the brakes on while we check out something else which has already been looked at. That time has passed. Now is not the time for procrastination. That time is over, if there ever was a time for it.

Each Assembly cannot keep on going over the same ground as the previous one. We have to move forward. It takes two Assemblies to solve this one. We are the second part of the puzzle. With this sursis we are in danger of going down a road so many other Assemblies have travelled. I think part of the dissatisfaction with the previous Assembly and part of the criticism levied against it was that it did not stick to its guns. It did not see things through. It kept on revisiting things endlessly across a broad range of subjects.

This Assembly was supposed to put a stop to that. This new breed of politicians were to put an end to that. Sir, the Members sitting in this Assembly are here to stop these kinds of motions. Let us just concentrate for a moment that this sursis succeeds. The sursis and its author inform us that this will not be derailing the Waste Strategy itself, that it is just unpicking one little part of it. Well, that does not stack up to me.

Instead of exporting our residual waste off-Island, we would have to prepare our residual waste for landfill. We would have to build some sort of plant to process the residual waste into an inert form suitable for landfilling. If you build a plant at around the size of the residual waste we have to handle – which is around 30,000 tonnes – you will have a 30,000-tonne plant handling the waste going into the landfill site.

The rest of the Waste Strategy is all about minimising this amount, bringing it down in volume, diverting it to being reused or recycled. We plan that this amount will reduce from around 30,000 tonnes to around 16,000 tonnes once all the measures are in and running and once we are all recycling. But then you will have a 30,000-tonne plant processing around 16,000 tonnes of material. This is a fairly expensive plant by the way. It is not a simple baling plant we are building to bale the waste. This is a complex plant, a

mechanical biological treatment plant, dealing with many different sorts of waste. If you only have half the throughput it is going to become twice as expensive per tonne to process our residual waste.

500 This is one of the exact mechanisms which made an on-Island incinerator an unattractive option. If you build a fixed plant while your waste is dropping it will become increasingly expensive per tonne to pay for it. If we were tasked to go and find a quarry and build a fixed plant we would have to look at the rest of the Waste Strategy to see how this new Strategy dovetails or does not dovetail. We would have to ask ourselves is it worth taking food waste out if it can be stabilised and put in a landfill? Is it worth having kerbside if we are not taking food waste out? If we are not having kerbside we will not need a material recovery facility. It would be bound to result in a total rethink of the Waste Strategy.

505 A vote to investigate landfill, which we have already investigated and found not to be favourable, which we have already consulted on and found the Guernsey do not want, can only be a vote to delay implementing the Waste Strategy as it is an integrated solution. It is not pick and mix. It all links together. All the different parts hang together in this cohesive Strategy. In order to export across national boundaries, we need to make sure the waste has been pre-sorted and recyclables have been taken out. In order to do that we need kerbside because the bring back sites will not be able to take us any further. They are already groaning at the seams. We struggle to find new sites. We struggle with capacity. In order to ship across frontiers we need to take the food waste out. We need a baling plant that shreds and prepares the waste for export as a fuel. It is a cohesive Strategy.

515 Some people might be tempted to look at one particular stream and say, 'Well, it does not look quite right to me, let us not do that,' but when you pan out to the larger picture we can see that each major activity fits together and acts as an enabler to the next part. Picking out blocks of the cohesive Waste Strategy runs the risk of the whole Waste Strategy collapsing. You cannot look at one block at the bottom and think, 'I know, I will just have that one out'. I will just pick it out, I will just slide that block out and everything is going to be fine. I will just slide another block in – slide it out gently.' To think that is possible misunderstands the cohesiveness of the Waste Strategy and it concerns me that some States Members have failed to grasp the nature of our Strategy despite all the briefings.

525 So if you think we should explore landfill and think we might end up landfilling, what you are doing is putting the Waste Strategy – the entire Waste Strategy – on hold while you pursue this and we are way beyond that stage. This is a move to return to 2012 and say, 'Well, yes, we have been progressing one option but let us stop that and take a look at one of the other options from that time, Option D.' An option which did not find favour when consulting with the people of Guernsey. We hear Deputy Queripel has spoken to some people. Well PSD ran a series of public consultations for months, independently verified in which continued landfill in any form did not find favour. It is an option which does not even deal with the practicalities. Our landfill is due to be full in nine years' time at current tipping rates. The next appropriate landfill could not possibly be available for at least 16 years.

530 That is *if* we manage to get an environmental licence to have landfill as our method of disposal. That is *if* we manage to overcome the residents' concerns at the environmental impact stage. Deputy Queripel talks about persuading everyone that every option has been looked at in detail. We did that in 2011 and in 2012. He knows his only hope is to try and sow enough doubts in people's minds, but there is no doubt here. Everything has been gone over in detail. He talks about PSD finding nine sites for landfill when he personally knows of 30. He talks about excluded quarries and wants that work done. It has been done. Deputy Queripel spoke to a worker at the quarry who was bemused at the figures from PSD. This worker at the quarry reckons we can double the figures of landfill at Les Vardes. Is this really the level of debate this Assembly is capable of?

This Assembly has gone through all of this. There is no doubt here. Please do not support the motion.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize, to be followed by Deputy Brouard.

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

I agree with Deputy Queripel, in the sense that I dislike the Department's proposed solution for dealing with residual waste. I dislike the idea of exporting waste. I have listened to people who told me in 2010, and with whom I agreed in 2010, that incineration was a dreadful option. Trying to justify that actually incineration is a perfectly reasonable option so long as it is somebody else's incinerator and not our own – and I disagree with that. I thought in 2010 that incineration was a bad option. I still think it is a bad option. It does not make very much difference whether our waste is incinerated in Guernsey or incinerated in Jersey or incinerated in Belgium or somewhere else in the world, it is still a bad idea in my view.

555 My preference in whichever of Deputy Ogier's listed years it was that PSD came back, I think two occasions ago, was for what I think they referred to as Option D. Option D was stabilising waste and either export or landfill of the stabilised product. That was my preference when I voted against the Suez Plant in 2010. It was my preferred option in 2012. It is still my preferred option. I do not think export of waste is sustainable. I think Option D was cleaner and in the long run is more sustainable.



However, I will heed Deputy Ogier's advice about the dangers of Members who have disparate views, uniting to defeat an option and then failing to remain united when an alternative option is presented at a later date. I think the freedom that we cherish as Members to remain independent and to come to the States laying requêtes and sursis and amendments and not having collective responsibility imposed on us and all that those features that we know of our system... those freedoms do at some point have to be attached with responsibilities (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) And I think at some point one has to accept that one has lost the argument and not to try to revisit the same argument over and over again that one has already lost.

This is a Waste Strategy which gives me everything I wanted when I voted against incineration in 2010, except for the manner of disposing of residual waste. I am prepared to accept what I regard as a sub optimum solution for the disposal of residual waste in order that I can have all of the other features of the Waste Strategy that I wanted when I voted against incineration in 2010. So that is, in a sense, the compromise. If I hold out for the perfect option I will not get it.

Deputy Ogier, I think, is wrong in one sense because the problem of the Waste Strategy or the need to deal with the waste policy will not disappear by voting for the Public Services Department's proposals. The only way that the future challenges of waste will disappear is if the people of Guernsey stop producing waste and the chances of that are quite slim. So it does not get the whole issue off the table. It does not put it to bed – to use Deputy Ogier's words. There will still be problems to deal with waste in the future. Export is not going to be a sustainable option in the very long term. There will still be a need for waste facilities to be modified, for new waste facilities in the future. It might mean that the thing can be put to bed for a few years, but it will eventually have to be dealt with again by the States.

But really the sursis is all about information. Is there enough information available to States Members? I hear what Deputy Queripel says about the need for the public to be reassured but we are here in, if you like, our executive mode today as the States. We are not just having a sort of general debate about our ideas, holding a Department to account, asking them some questions. We are here in executive mode to make a decision about how to dispose of waste and that is the kind of mind set I think we have to have.

The issue is: do the 47 Members – or however many Members are here in the northern hemisphere today – (*Laughter*) have enough information before us to make an informed rational judgement about whether landfill is a sensible option for the next five, 10, 15, 20 years. I think we do. I think I probably – together with the other 46 Members and all the dozens of Members who have been Members of the States during the consideration of solid waste – have enough reports to fill up the Torrey Canyon quarry. I have enough information before me to know that my preferred option is Option D. I think States Members have enough information before them to know whether they are in favour of landfill or not. Because that is the case, the only two sensible ways of acting today are either to accept the Public Services Department's proposals for the disposal of residual waste – and I have said that, somewhat reluctantly, I will accept them – or to say, 'No, we do not like this Strategy. We have considered the information that is before us. We do not want this one, we want to substitute a different strategy – a completely coherent, rational, complete, comprehensive, alternative strategy. But that is not the motion that is before the States. The motion that is before the States is to defer doing anything in respect of the disposal of residual waste and to have another review and I do not think that I can support that. If there had been a motion before the States to replace the Public Services Department strategy with all the work streams necessary to implement my preferred Option D from 2012, I may very well have had to support that. That would have been a more difficult choice. But that is not the motion that is before the States. I think we need to leave here today either having supported the Public Services Department Strategy or having substituted a strategy of our own. And simply to send the Public Services Department off to do another review when we have all the information in front of us to make a sensible judgement today, would be an unnecessary deferral and cannot possibly be in the best interests of the Island.

So I will vote against the sursis.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy David Jones.

**Deputy David Jones:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

I am in full agreement actually with my colleague from the Vale, Deputy Fallaize because even though this sursis motion today is about information, it is also about cost and we know that the costs of lining Chouet quarry, for instance, were hugely expensive. It had to have concrete grout poured into the fissures in order to try and stop leachate into the marine environment. I do not think it was very successful at all. Some say it was, others said it was not.

I also believe, as with Deputy Scott Ogier – and he was a man who came in at 2004 and put a stop to everything in that debate on waste, certainly the first incinerator that was proposed by the then Board of Administration... So I do not blame Deputy Queripel, who joined the States in this last term, for wanting to have a debate on what the alternatives of landfill might be.

However, coming back to cost, it has to be recognised by all Islanders that the days of disposing of our rubbish for £25 a year are over. It is no longer a cheap option and landfill – modern landfill – will not be a cheap option.

Les Vardes came up as one quarry that has been mentioned and I remember the waste water stone document going back some time ago when talks with Ronez about their future quarrying requirements and I think that Les Vardes was always earmarked, because it is in a water catchment area, as the best place for further water storage.

Longue Hougue quarry is an interesting one – and Deputy Queripel is absolutely right about the contamination of water – but we are changing the whole way that we deal with our waste. Even if you had Longue Hougue quarry it would take you a hundred years to fill it up because you have heard from the Deputy Minister of PSD that we are looking to get our residual waste down to roundabout 16,000 tonnes. Hopefully it will drop and the type of waste that we have in the future is not just putrescible waste all thrown in the back of a truck and tipped into a hole in the ground. It will be separated. We want to separate the dry recyclables out of it and if you look at your own black sack at home only about 20% of it is probably putrescible waste, the rest of it is dry recyclables – we just contaminate that sack by throwing food waste and other horrible things on top of it.

If that was separated out you would have a completely different form of waste stream that, in many ways, are turned into pellets and dry recyclables for fuel. I have been reading a report recently about the cement kilns in Germany and the kind of waste that they buy to fuel their kilns and it is mostly made up of dry recyclable pellets that are crushed into pellets.

So the way that we deal with our waste has to change. I am pleased it has. I did not want incineration. It never made any sense to me at all to build two £90 million incinerators 20 miles apart. That was just purely barking mad. And Jersey were clearly much further down the road with mass burn than we were at that stage, which is one of the reasons why I voted against it.

At the same time also, for the very reason that the Deputy Minister of PSD has said today it is senseless building a plant of a certain size of fixture, when your waste arising's are dropping, because the Island has got behind recycling. You have only got to go round the bring banks on a Sunday afternoon – you can barely get anything in them. So the Islanders have taken to recycling and I think we can do a lot more of it. I supported kerbside two of the three times it came. I remember Deputy Parkinson led an amendment on kerbside. Not everybody will want to do it and we accept that. There will always be some people who say, 'No, if you are going to charge me this amount of money I am just going to throw it in a sack,' but we will separate that at a later date. That is inevitable in any society. You will always get a group of people who for one reason or another will not partake in that social experiment.

So I understand fully why Deputy Queripel has brought this. He has not been in the States when landfill has been discussed. He has had the ability to read the documents, which he has done. He has done a lot of research on it, but I cannot support the concept of going through another landfill site when I think the Waste Strategy has been well thought out. We have been working on this for... I have been in the States for 14 years. Through all the 14 years I have been here this debate has come and gone several times and we must now get behind PSD and their Strategy and move this debate forward.

So, unfortunately, I will not be supporting Deputy Queripel's sursis. Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard, to be followed by Deputy Burford, to be followed by Deputy Duquemin.

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

We may well end up in years to come looking for an on-Island solution, but that is not today. Today we are going to export our residual waste. Let's get on and do that.

Deputy Queripel mentioned inert waste. Yes, we do need some of Longue Hougue for inert waste and I see quarrying on the Chouet headland, possibly providing stone for that and a possible new home for quarrying when Les Vardes is exhausted.

One of the most precious resources is water and globally it is causing much strife as our climate continues to change, and it will continue to do so. We speak today with a backdrop of full water storage – hooray! I think in the last 15 years Guernsey Water has been a great success. I think many of us can remember the shortages we had in the 70's. But in 20 or 30 years' time, when we have Sahara summers all year and these monsoon rains are a thing of the past, we will welcome Les Vardes as a substantial future storage for water.

Let us vote today in favour of what we asked PSD to do.

Thank you, sir.

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, can I make a request that you close this debate on the Rule 14(1)?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier is moving a motion pursuant to Rule 14(1) and he has not spoken in debate so he is entitled to do that.

I am going to put it to the vote. It requires two-thirds or more Members voting in support of it for it to be carried, so we will have to have an *appel nominal*.

Deputy Greffier.

*Not carried – Pour 15, Contre 17, Abstained 0, Not Present 15*

POUR	CONTRE	ABSTAINED	NOT PRESENT
Deputy Duquemin	Deputy Green	None	Deputy Paint
Deputy Le Tocq	Deputy Dorey		Deputy James
Deputy Adam	Deputy Brouard		Deputy Perrot
Deputy De Lisle	Deputy Wilkie		Deputy O'Hara
Deputy Inglis	Deputy Burford		Alderney Rep. Jean
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Brehaut		Alderney Rep. Harvey
Deputy Sillars	Deputy Robert Jones		Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Luxon	Deputy Gollop		Deputy Domaille
Deputy Quin	Deputy Sherbourne		Deputy Langlois
Deputy Hadley	Deputy Conder		Deputy Storey
Deputy Harwood	Deputy Lester Queripel		Deputy Bebb
Deputy Le Clerc	Deputy Le Pelley		Deputy Stewart
Deputy St Pier	Deputy Fallaize		Deputy Gillson
Deputy Ogier	Deputy Laurie Queripel		Deputy David Jones
Deputy Trott	Deputy Lowe		Deputy Spruce
	Deputy Le Lièvre		
	Deputy Collins		

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, the vote on the motion pursuant to Rule 14(1) proposed by Deputy St Pier was voted in favour, 15; against, 17. There were 15 Members not present at the vote and 15 is not two-thirds of 32. I might need Deputy Lester Queripel's calculator at this point.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** I left it at home, sir, sorry.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** It is getting more and more complicated  
So debate will continue on the sursis. I remind Members that it is strictly on the sursis.  
Deputy Burford.

**Deputy Burford:** Sir, my preferred option was also Option D but I will be voting against this sursis, not because I am a Member of PSD but because I largely agree with the points that Deputy Fallaize has made. Although when he says that he would support stabilisation and export of waste, I am not sure what he thinks would happen to the exported waste.

Unfortunately, though, given the anecdote and finger in the air capital amortisation in Deputy Queripel's speech, I fear it has more holes in it than the north of the Island (*Laughter*) and I urge Members to vote against this sursis. (*Laughter and applause*)

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Duquemin.

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

Sir, when I was on the stage in the hall of the old Les Beaucamps School in April 2012 for the Castel election hustings I will somewhat modestly admit that I thought my chances of being elected as a Deputy were good. But I thought the odds of me being elected as a Member of the Public Services Department on 11th May 2012 were even slimmer than Jersey winning the Muratti a few days earlier. (*Laughter*) Like the rest of the Guernsey population I had my own opinion on waste but it was always going to be someone else that was going to make it happen or more often than not make it not happen. A seat on PSD was not even on my sat nav. Sir, as expected, Guernsey did win the 2012 Muratti but somehow I was elected onto PSD.

On the stage at the Castel hustings I was sat in alphabetical order next to former Deputy Bernard Floquet who was PSD Minister at the time. I clearly remember glancing across at Bernard and then down at my notes at the bullet point comments that I had prepared and the paragraph or two in my manifesto about waste, in case somebody asked a question about the perennial hot topic of waste – the political football of waste that had been kicked around for a generation. To be honest, I could not remember if anybody did ask a question about waste that evening. My Castel colleague, Deputy Green, reminds me there was one. But my bullet points and my manifesto have proven to be a useful reference to me as I sit at the PSD board table and as I sat down to consider my contribution to this debate.

Referring to February 2012, my Manifesto read,

725

‘I am relieved the States has finally made a positive decision and we are on the road to solving the problem of waste, with a combination of off-Island incineration and kerbside recycling.’

Interestingly, my bullet points read, ‘I hope the new States is not going to change the decision again’ and ‘I will not be signing any requête or amendment that takes us backwards again’.

730 In May 2012, after Deputy Luxon had encouraged me to be part of the PSD team, I became one of the five politicians around the board room table at Brookfield House that was tasked with making it happen – implementing the Waste Strategy.

735 Sir, do I believe, support, agree with every single aspect of the Waste Strategy that was approved by the States of Guernsey on 22nd February 2012? No, I do not. As I said, like the rest of the Guernsey population, I have my own opinion on waste. I still do. Sir, we are in an eclectic board and we could have offered five different waste solutions around that board room table to add into the mix with the other 62,995 views around the coffee tables in every Island home, but we did not.

740 Deputy Fallaize spoke about his perfect waste strategy, but his perfect waste strategy is somebody else’s less than perfect or imperfect waste strategy. We cannot implement 63,000 different waste strategies, we can only implement one and we already have a Waste Strategy that was approved by the States of Guernsey. Here are those resolutions. We just have to get on with the job of implementing it.

745 Mr Deputy Bailiff, that is not to say that we have not questioned every element of this Waste Strategy. Sat at our board table is the complete spectrum of environmental, fiscal, political, legal, practical and emotional persuasions and let me be crystal clear that we have, all five of us, at different times and for different reasons soundly checked the Strategy over and over again.

750 But I am proud that the whole of the PSD Board and the management and project team, have stayed focused and is determined to implement the Waste Strategy that was approved by the States almost exactly two years ago to the day. We parked our own ideas. We are in the same car, we are going in the same direction and we are on the road to solving Guernsey’s waste problem. We do not need, and Guernsey does not need, another States U-turn.

755 Let us not forget that before the States made its decision in February 2012, landfill was considered, it was investigated, and it was signposted as one of the possible routes. PSD, as Deputy Laurie Queripel mentioned, had circulated to Members a detailed response to the sursis. But, sir, I would refer Members to page 592 of the February 2012 Billet. It concludes,

‘Landfill should not be seen as a long-term sustainable solution for the management of residual wastes.’

760 The Billet read in 2012, ‘An additional quarry,’ – Les Vardes – ‘may,’ – I repeat *may* – ‘be suitable as landfill subject to appropriate engineering.’ However, the quarry is still actively producing stone and is likely to continue to do so until 2030. Members in 2012 had this information and they voted accordingly.

765 Sir, they appreciated that even if landfill was a good idea we could not wait until 2030 to even have access to Les Vardes let alone to start filling it and nothing has changed in 2014. We are two years further down the road but we still cannot afford to wait nearly 20 years before we start to fill it. Time is not a luxury we have.

770 Sir, development, approval and implementation of a waste strategy – as Deputy Ogier has explained – is too big for just one States’ term, even if we do take the fastest route. The journey did not start on 1st May 2012, but we – this PSD Board – is determined to finish it by 30th April 2016 at the latest. If we approve the sursis and go back to the route planning stage we will not get to our final destination and, who knows, there might be someone different sitting in Deputy Laurie Queripel’s seat on 1st May 2016, who has got his or her own ideas and wants to start all over again. I repeat, we do not need – and Islanders do not need – another States U-turn.

775 Four out of the five PSD Members experienced a two-day trip to the London area in May 2013, where we witnessed for ourselves first-hand the exact sort of facilities that we would be creating in Guernsey to deliver the Island’s new Waste Strategy. Apologies for the simplistic cliché but clichés are clichés because they are true – it is all about putting the pieces of the jigsaw together. This two-day trip reinforced in my mind, and I am sure others too, that we are talking about an integrated Strategy.

780 Sir, what we must not do and what we have not done as a Board is to try and unpick elements of what is one integrated Strategy, however tempting it is to do. This would be very dangerous, creating policy without due care and attention. Deputy Laurie Queripel did this in his speech. First Deputy Queripel supported the waste hierarchy and then a few moments later he questioned kerbside. It is one integrated Strategy.

785 Deputy Bailiff, the words of the sursis talk about the advantages, disadvantages and feasibility of export. Returning to my 2012 manifesto, it too highlighted what I considered then to be the biggest disadvantage of export. My manifesto read,

‘Working together with Jersey to make best use of their incinerator makes sense to me. Jersey would be foolish not to do it and run their own expensive facility well below capacity.’

But my bullet points for the hustings read, it asked the question, ‘Will we be held to ransom by Jersey?’  
During the 2012 election and prior to being elected onto PSD, I thought that Jersey was the preferred option, maybe even the only option.

The States Resolutions from 2012 even referred to the possibility of buying into the Jersey plant. Are we going to be held to ransom by our neighbours? Sir, I played indoor cricket last night and one of my team mates, knowing we were debating the Waste Strategy, asked the exact same question – were we going to be held to ransom by Jersey? That was his concern and I am sure is the concern of many other Islanders. Perhaps it is this concern that is what attracts people wrongly to the perceived cheaper option of landfill. I was able to reassure my team mate at the indoor cricket centre and now I will try and reassure my team mates here in the States.

Having been immersed in the Waste Strategy since May 2012, I now realise that Jersey is anything but the only option and, at the moment, appears to be an unlikely option. Far from being held to ransom by our neighbours we are in a buyer’s market where supply outstrips demand and this will continue to be the case with increased recycling all over Europe. This Billet – Volumes 1 and 2 – is littered with evidence – if you will forgive the pun – that there are many operators all over Europe that want our rubbish, have large plants that are hungry for our rubbish and are equipped to come and get it from us and take care of everything including the residual ash. This is what they do. This is the service they provide to others already. There is nothing to fear from export and there is no reason to become nostalgic about landfill.

Sir, I never expected to be on PSD and be one of those driving Guernsey’s integrated Waste Strategy forward, but now that I am, I am enjoying the ride, I am contributing and I am more determined than ever to complete the journey. We *are* going in the same direction and we *are* on the road to solving Guernsey’s waste problem, using the route map – the resolutions approved by the States in February 2012. We have treated this quite simply as our ‘to do’ list and we have just got on with the job.

Sir, I am confident that this Assembly will give PSD the green light necessary to make it happen as quickly as possible and complete a journey that for many Islanders has already taken far too long. Do not support the sursis. Let PSD get on with driving the Waste Strategy forward not backwards.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel, to be followed by Deputy Brehaut.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Thank you, sir.

I fully support this sursis and the reason I do is there are far too many unknowns in the PSD proposals and I am certainly not convinced that a case has been made against the use of landfill, particularly modern landfill, and I do not think that the majority of Guernsey people are convinced either, because I have lost count of the conversations I have had with Islanders who ask, ‘Why can we not simply use another quarry’. I know my brother, Deputy Laurie Queripel, has also had several conversations with fellow Islanders about the whole issue.

Sir, I believe the case for an in-depth comprehensive study is fully justified because we need to get it right and in order to be able to get it right we need to be as informed as possible. The fact is we have not been fully informed and I believe the onus is on PSD to prove to the people of Guernsey that on-Island landfill is not an option and the only way they can do that, sir, is to undertake the comprehensive study this sursis is seeking. But the PSD proposals are fundamentally flawed in four major areas and supporting this sursis will ensure that those four major areas are addressed. Those four major areas are: the costs, the practicalities, the logistics and the environmental issue. For PSD to ask us to agree to the proposals when we are so uninformed flies in the face of what is always said in this Chamber – that we need to be as informed as possible in order to make a decision.

It always concerns me when I read sentences like the sentence at the bottom of paragraph 1.4 on page 65 of the Billet. The sentence reads as follows,

‘Public Services is following States direction to go about implementing the previously agreed waste strategy.’

Sir, what that means is a previous Assembly made a decision and this Assembly has had very little opportunity to express our concerns or voice our opinions until now. Actually, sir, I will clarify that because I did express my concerns at a PSD presentation recently, but the two Members of the Board who were present at the time were not listening to what I was saying and spent the whole time telling me I was wrong and they were right.

So what do you do when a Department is not listening? Well, you lay a requête or a sursis or whatever it takes to get the issue debated, which is exactly what two of our colleagues have done today. I am not going

to sink to the levels of personality conflict, sir, because that is the lowest common denominator as far as I am concerned, but I think Deputy Laurie Queripel and Deputy Brehaut should be given credit for laying this motion before us today and certainly should not be unjustifiably ridiculed, especially in the case of Deputy Laurie Queripel who was elected at the last election and was not able to have any political input in the previous debates and he is not convinced that PSD have got it right when they say that landfill is no longer an option.

So what is he supposed to do? Is he supposed to ignore those concerns? He has been out in the community talking to Islanders who are also expressing their concerns. Sir, he felt we needed to revisit this whole issue and I resonate with his approach completely and Deputy Brehaut, a very experienced Member of this Assembly, also felt the need to revisit the whole issue.

As we all know, sir, I was elected at the last election and I never had the opportunity to have any political input until now, and the way that I see it is that I have been elected to express my opinions and voice my concerns and relay the concerns of my fellow Islanders. I take that responsibility very seriously indeed. I have not been elected to merely rubber stamp strategies that were decided by previous Assemblies. Part of my job is to question those strategies, which is exactly what I am doing by supporting this sursis.

As I said earlier, if this sursis is successful it will then mean that the four major fundamental flaws in the PSD proposals will have to be addressed. I want to spend a moment sir, focusing on those flaws, if I may, in an attempt to explain to my colleagues why I think it is important that we support this Sursis. If Members turn to page 66, in Volume 1 of the Billet, they will see that paragraph 1.12 tells us although PSD were instructed in 2012 to report back to the States with full costings for the export of waste, they have not actually done so. Why have they not done so? Well, we are told they have not done so because definitive costings will only be determined through a formal tendering exercise.

Well, that is exactly what they were instructed to do – to undertake a formal tendering exercise. And here they are telling us they have not undertaken a formal tendering exercise because it would mean they would have to undertake a formal tendering exercise. Sir, the whole thing is a nonsense and supporting the sursis will dispense with that nonsensical approach. Later on in the same paragraph we are told that it is considered entirely possible that gate fees at receiving plants could fall. Well, what kind of business case is that? Gate fees could just as easily increase. A business case should not be based on ifs, buts and maybes. A business case needs to be based on a fixed cost. So again, sir, supporting the sursis will dispense with that nonsensical approach.

Later on in the paragraph, we are told that PSD came to an agreement with the States' Corporate Procurement Team to source information from plant operators in a targeted marketed review exercise. Fancy terminology, sir, which actually means very little because we still are not told the actual costs involved. Yet another example of where supporting the sursis will dispense with that kind of nonsensical approach.

It has been said that the whole waste issue has been debated for 20 years and it really is time a decision was made, but surely, sir, that decision has to be the right decision for the good of the Island. It would be irresponsible of us to make a decision simply because we felt pressurised into making it. We do not have all the information about landfill and we could lock ourselves into a 10 or 20-year contract to export our waste when we do not really need to.

What I find quite extraordinary is, in reply to one of the Rule 6 questions Deputy Laurie Queripel recently submitted, PSD stated,

'Exporting our waste has the advantage that if a technology emerges that is truly better and sustainable for use on Island, then it would be relatively easy to switch to that option.'

Well, I may be missing the fundamental point somewhere, sir, but how can we switch to another option if we are only 10 years into a 20-year contract to export our waste? Plus PSD were telling us that, even though millions of pounds of taxpayer's money would have been spent on setting up the infrastructure to export our waste, they would be quite happy to write off that investment and spend even more money on a new option, the costs for both of which are unknown. Yet another example of why we need to support this sursis.

We are told in paragraph 5.4 of the PSD response to the sursis, as Deputy Laurie Queripel alluded to earlier, that they identified nine possible quarries with a capacity between four months and five years. They then focused on three of those quarries, only telling us where one of them actually was, and gave us no information at all about the remaining six. Why were they wasting Department time and taxpayer's money considering a quarry that had an estimated lifespan of four months anyway? Surely that in itself is proof enough that what is needed now is a serious in-depth, comprehensive and detailed study. How much more proof do we need than that, that we need to support this sursis?

I want to conclude, sir, by saying that I am not at all comfortable with the fact that we would be shipping our waste to someone else to burn. In other words, it is okay to pollute their air because it will not really matter to us. Well, it matters to me and it should matter to all of us, because polluting the environment anywhere in the world is simply not acceptable. So adopting an ‘I am all right, Jack’ approach does not sit at all well with me and therefore I think it would be irresponsible of us to export our waste, unless it has been proven that we have no other option and supporting the sursis, of course, will determine that.

Plus we already rely on other jurisdictions far too much as it is. We import the majority of our food. We have 252 disused vineries in the Island. We import electricity from France via Jersey and we all know the problems that can cause. Now we are on the verge of exporting our waste to another jurisdiction. My great concern, sir, is that one day we will reach the point where other jurisdictions do everything for us and we will be incapable of doing anything for ourselves.

My conscience will not allow me to support any proposal that does not have a fixed cost attached to it and my conscience will not allow me to support any proposal that is devoid of detail, consequently then, of course, devoid of a proper business case. So it is absolutely vital that PSD undertake this comprehensive in-depth study of all the quarries in the Island and report back to this Assembly, with justifiable reasons why we can or we cannot continue with landfill. Supporting this sursis will ensure that they do that. Therefore, sir, I urge my colleagues to support it.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut, followed by Deputy Green.

**Deputy Brehaut:** Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Bailiff. There are so many empty seats it feels like a dress rehearsal but I will still give it a go. *(Laughter)*

There is, as ever when we revisit waste, this issue with procrastination, that procrastination as others have said is the art of keeping up with yesterday, but we just have to be careful about that because what the other Members appear to be saying to us is, ‘I turn when I want to but you are not for turning.’ It is interesting seeing Deputy Scott Ogier take his seat. He arrived in this Assembly and was responsible for a significant intervention that addressed the way then that we tackled the waste issue, and it is an important issue. We live in a democracy. This is not the Ukraine. There are processes in place and I thank Members for supporting the motion to debate and at least having this discussion which a number of the members of our community would like us to have.

Guernsey prides itself on being stubbornly independent. We pride ourselves on that. We like to think that we are self-reliant but in exporting our waste we become reliant, we become dependent on others. The whims of industrial action in other ports. In this port potentially. And what a gift to another community from the Island that, as Deputy Lester Queripel has said, is accustomed to exporting flowers and tomatoes... Our gift now to the broader community is dioxins money says Deputy Duquemin I think – but our gift to another community are dioxins and ash and our rubbish.

There were an estimated 600 people on the steps of the Royal Court when we debated incineration for the 400th time or whatever it was at that time. Incineration was bad. People did not want it. They were concerned. They were accused of ‘nimbyism’ and they resented that because it was not just about in their backyard, it was the principle of incineration for a large number of them. But we are still incinerating. We are still burning. It is out of sight, it is out of mind. And the language we use has to change when we want to burn our rubbish somewhere else. It becomes a refuse derived fuel and incinerators then, with the wave of a wand, stop being incinerators, they become waste to energy plants because that is morally seemingly more defensive.

But in shorthand when you are asked, ‘What do you do with your waste?’ ‘Oh, well, we burn our rubbish somewhere else and the bonus is they take the ash too.’ In the letter from PSD, that we have had or in an e-mail form anyway, I think they said that landfill came 18th out of a potential 22 options. Well, why was that? What do we know about landfill? What do we know about Mont Cuet? Well, it has been at times – if it is not still – vermin infested. It leaches toxins into the environment. It catches alight, it burns, so we have to pump in water, that water then leaches out with more toxins into the immediate environment. Everything from carcasses to mattresses has gone into it. It is dirty, it is smelly and it has been, sadly, over the years, more mismanaged than managed. That is why it came 18 out of 22 because it is the worst example of a landfill site you could ever find. It is a terrible example of a landfill site.

If we take, looking at Bordeaux Tip and Mont Cuet, we could easily forget that in-between Bordeaux and Mont Cuet – in-between in the sense that we did not go straight from Bordeaux to Mont Cuet, we went to St Germain. I went there within a few days of it being opened. St Germain is a huge quarry – well, relatively large in Guernsey terms – and has been filled to the brim. And what is it? It has become a nature reserve, it has become planted. Obviously there are land managements around that but it is, as with Bordeaux, they are not ideal facilities they are of their time but if you invest in them after the event, the community can use these areas. You see people walking on Bordeaux now. You see children being taken to

960 St Germain because it has become something of a nature reserve. Again, the Bordeaux and St Germain were – I was going to say the technology of the day but it was really the absence of technology of the day, I suppose that has made them what they are.

Deputy David de Lisle is right to point out that water is precious and the water table must not be polluted. I think therefore he is right and I think that the onus is therefore on PSD to look at what private  
965 quarries – what effectively are now private reservoirs – are out there and how can they be taken into States' ownership? And we heard a reference earlier to, if you like, old school global warming. I mean climate change is the issue where it is not just getting hotter, it is changing. I mean you tell people at the Somerset levels that they are experiencing global warming. Climate *change* is what people talked about and the uncertainty or the likelihood is of prolonged storms and inclement weather rather than extremely warm  
970 weather.

Thirty of desktop research will tell you... well, will certainly leave you better informed regarding modern landfill and I am thinking particularly of Perth, Western Australia, and I commend my Minister for taking the time out to do such thorough research. (*Laughter*) Perth in Australia has something we do not have; they have the thing called the outback. They have the outback but Australia, of all countries, is the  
975 country that prides itself on the manner in which it deals with its waste and in Perth, Western Australia, they manage very well, sites that would be viewed... they have to manage the waste that goes into them. They do it extremely well. Their environmental standards are very high. Modern landfill is different to the examples that we have on Guernsey which has informed every previous decision that we have taken.

I view landfill – and even when you say landfill it sounds so last century, but I believe landfill can be  
980 the result of a successful waste management programme, with falling waste levels, with high levels of recycling and what will the waste profile look like in 20 years? What will we have? That has turned on its head and people say, 'Well then, you won't need Les Vardes, will you?' Well, maybe we do not, maybe we could potentially use a smaller quarry somewhere.

Reference was made to it being cheaper and that is obviously one important consideration but actually  
985 my viewpoint is we have a moral obligation to deal with the waste that we create on this Island and I will remind Members that this week, especially Guernsey, at least, the ferry service has been cut off from France because of industrial action and when the storm closed ports, when there is industrial action on Guernsey or some other place, when the waste piles up on the piers, when the HGVs cross the bridge heavily laden, does that feel like money well spent and does it feel like the waste initiative you were  
990 looking for?

Members, I sense there is clearly more support to the debate than there is to support the sursis. Thankfully because of Deputy Lester Queripel's speech, I know we can guarantee three votes for the sursis, but Members, it is important that we discuss the issue. I am disappointed that there has not been the wealth of information that would have better informed the PSD report and I think that both Deputy Laurie Queripel  
995 and myself speak on behalf of a large number of members of our community. I think when I looked at an on-line poll – and, yes, I know on-line polls can be misused as well as used, but – at one stage within the community there was a 60/40 then a 50/50 feel for this. So there is a group of people out there, I am sure, who share the concerns – hence the reason for the laying of the sursis.

I urge you to support it, sir, but I sense that we are somewhat swimming against the tide today. Thank  
1000 you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Green, to be followed by Deputy Gollop.

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

1005 I absolutely respect Deputy Laurie Queripel's right to bring this sursis, I consider him to be a man of conscience and it is absolutely clear to me that this is brought in absolutely good faith, with the best of intentions. I think the concerns that he has spoken about, in terms of cost issues, are valid and this Assembly is, first and foremost a debating Chamber and we are here to debate. Whether you like it or not, members of the public – including many parishioners in Castel – do have anxieties about some aspects of  
1010 the Waste Strategy, including the cost.

However, I do not believe that this sursis should be supported. I do think it is needless procrastination. I am persuaded that PSD have looked thoroughly at landfill and, indeed, so called modern landfill as well. It might be that if you look again at the four options that were at the final public consultation, in some ways, landfill may have a superficial attractiveness to it, due to it being a seemingly at a lower cost, but of course  
1015 that did not include the additional cost of acquiring and engineering a new landfill site.

Deputy Queripel spoke about modern landfill and modern landfill, so called, is perceived by some to be a rather more benign version than its traditional form but, of course, that would also require extensive free treatment and screening of the waste in question which would undoubtedly be necessary, so I think it is probably quite easy to exaggerate the cost advantages of modern landfill too.



1020 So I am not going to support this sursis. I do think it is procrastination *par excellence* but Deputy Queripel absolutely has the right to make this case. It is not a case that I believe in, or particularly empathise with, but I totally defend his right to bring this sursis and I was disappointed that quite a few Members voted not to debate this and to guillotine it. I think that was disappointing (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) to me. But I simply do not want to de-rail the Waste Strategy at the eleventh hour.

1025 I would like to just ask Deputy Laurie Queripel a question if I may, with regard to the document that PSD has circulated, which is entitled 'Implementation of the Solid Waste Strategy'... Deputy Laurie Queripel's sursis responds to paragraph 4.14, if I may just briefly quote from that,

'Although the concept of modern landfill offers the prospect of a more benign form of disposal than traditional landfill, there is a very real risk that any perceived cost benefits are, at best, exaggerated and more likely marginal or non-existent. Any attempts to maximise the financial attraction by avoiding extensive treatment requirements, simply leads to traditional landfill with all its negative impacts, even then the cost would be very significant.'

1030 I would like to know how Deputy Laurie Queripel would specifically address that view, which has been put in that report.

Thank you very much.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

1035

**Deputy Gollop:** Sir, Deputy Fallaize earlier said that we had a lot of information from the Public Services Department and so on. I would say that, in a way, we have not. We did indeed have the presentations that we went to, but the presentations were more of a question and answer session than a day-long workshop and it also has to be said that there are so many issues here, from the kerb side recycling of glass to the relationships with the parishes, and I do not believe that the issue that Deputy Laurie Queripel has highlighted was discussed in any depth.

1040

It is also true that Deputy Laurie Queripel and Deputy Brehaut are making the case for landfill being reconsidered as an environmental option. I have been a Member of the States long enough to have heard many arguments, dating back to the time of Conseiller Roger Berry and the Board of Administration, that landfill was something we had to replace, that it was unacceptable for the future. I think the environmental attitude from groups like Friends of the Earth – and we had some Friends of the Earth people in the States at that time – was very much along those lines and I dismissed landfill from the start, although I do know that Deputy Domaille and others used to want it reconsidered and possibly even scrutiny to have looked at it.

1045

Two or three speakers today have made the case that landfill has changed, that landfill is a better option. I do not have enough knowledge to know whether that is correct or not and indeed nothing that the Public Services Department has done has really produced evidence one way or the other. Mention has been made of the Environment Department. Deputy Paint made a statement on behalf of the Department, more or less based on what was in our Billet. I find all of that very confusing, apart from the obvious political reality that the Minister and Deputy Minister are not here and that at least one of the Members of the Board has a different outlook on one issue. The problem is, if the Environment Department are given the management of waste policy I think it goes wider than just overseeing the work of the environmental waste regulator and, of course, finding sites for waste, which itself is a potential conflict of interest in one respect, because surely waste policy, by its very nature, looks at the pros and cons of every aspect of waste, from the costs that have been identified to the environmental and ecological benefits both locally and globally. I feel to a certain extent, the Environment Department have not done their job in a proactive way here.

1050

1055

1060

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop how is that relevant to the debate on the sursis?

**Deputy Gollop:** I think many Members have strayed off the point this morning. I am the first to be challenged. (*Laughter*)

1065

**The Deputy Bailiff:** That was perhaps a step too far. That was all. (*Laughter*)

**Deputy Gollop:** Yes. Moving back to the specifics (*Laughter*) on this matter, we turn to page 77, the Public Services Department and the point is made about their options for export of waste. Paragraph 11.3 says,

1070

'Although Jersey did not score highly, it was retained as an option owing to its proximity and because of the willingness and commitment of the Governments of Guernsey and Jersey to work together.'

That is a bit confusing because we were given the impression that Jersey was unlikely to be chosen. Then we have on 11.4 the shortlist of sites: Belgium, Channel Islands – I do not know if that includes

1075

Alderney or Sark – Holland too and Sweden. We are given no further details, we are given no costs and we are given little likelihood of the nature of the contracts. I think that is a great uncertainty and Deputy Lester Queripel has already drawn attention to the 10-year and the 20-year marks.

I suppose my personal view on this is two-fold. Firstly, that we have got to the point, after more than 10 years of this, as Deputy Darren Duquemin and others have said, we have to make a decision and we have gone down a route that we have supported, and I suspect many of Deputy Queripel's followers are keen on this sursis because it potentially blocks what is perceived to be a costly endeavour, as Deputy James reminded us.

But the reality is the States voted implicitly for an increase in the cost and I think we have to accept that and the public perhaps, as in other areas – population might be one example – do not always wake up to the consequences of the issues put before them and decisions made in this Chamber. This is a peculiar example of a policy that was more or less approved by the previous Assembly and has not really been debated in this term. But I think reluctantly we have to support the Propositions in front of us because there is not enough evidence to change course, nor does time, in terms of Mont Cuet and the decisions that have already been made, favour us. As Deputy Ogier has pointed out, there could be consequences to the rest of the Waste Strategy.

But I would not like to close the door on this entirely. I think Deputy Laurie Queripel may be a lone voice but I think it is important the Environment Department – who after all have a mandate for waste policy – the Policy Council and Public Services Department look – as Deputy Brouard implied – to the longer term for the potential of landfill in conjunction with the stone issues, as I think it is a possible option for the next generation and should not be thrown away entirely. It has to be looked at too, in the context of land reclamation so that we can potentially extend our land area in one direction or another, should we need to.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, nobody else is rising so I turn to the Minister of the Public Services Department, Deputy Luxon, to reply on the sursis.

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

Sir, as with Deputy Green, I fully respect Deputy Laurie Queripel's democratic right to want to bring an issue to the States and debate, but I have to say, with all due respect, that there is a nature of whim about the way the sursis has been brought. The very fact that we had to consider a motion to suspend the Rules to allow it to happen indicates how very late and, in response to Deputy Queripel, would say 40 or 50 parishioners, their indications that perhaps they preferred the idea of landfill. Well, sir, I could not tell you how many hundreds of people have been behesting the Public Services Department through our consultation process, to get on with delivering the Waste Strategy. But, nevertheless, we are here and it has been interesting to hear Members' comments.

Deputy Laurie Queripel – I think, at the heart of the motivation for his sursis, it was about cost. Certainly when we spoke to him that is where it started, so I will try and deal with that very clearly later on. Some of the speech moved into many different areas. But, sir, when we received the Rule 6 questions we did respond to those very extensively and completely, we did invite Deputy Queripel to come into the Department so we could give him the information he needed to cascade back to those parishioners that had raised the issue with him. So we were slightly disappointed that the sursis was laid in the end.

It does absolutely possibly implicate the Waste Strategy being kicked down the road and it unravelling and I will remind Members that there is already a £12 million aborted write-off cost from the Lurgi and Suez project that this Island and its taxpayers have had to fund and if we do consider passing this sursis, and we do indeed slow down the Waste Strategy or unravel it, we will add to that £12 million by several million more, and still be no further forward. So if cost is at the heart of the issue, one of the implications, the unintended consequences, will be adding further wasted aborted costs.

We have tried, in the paper that was sent out on Friday and laid on Members' desks today, to summarise all of the information that clarifies that the intent within the sursis had been achieved back in 2011 and 2012, through one of the most extensive and detailed consultative processes that I think the States of Guernsey has ever undertaken. So we have tried to summarise it. If Members look back to the Billet of February 2012 they will see further information there.

Several Members have made the point that they do not think there has been sufficient information. I think Deputy Fallaize very adequately and clearly explained why that is not the case and I thank him for his comments.

Sir, just in relation to some of the specific points that Deputy Queripel raised, would commencing additional treatment now extend the life of Mont Cuet? Well back in 2011, yes, if we had gone with a more modern process of landfill and, yes, it was possible to extend the life of Mont Cuet from 2022 by seven or eight years. But of course we are now three years on and it would take another couple of years before we could actually get into a position of treating landfill with the more modern technology. So the answer to his

question is, no, the extension of Mont Cuet would not be – as he believed it would be – back on the estimate back in 2011, it would be much shorter.

1140 Sir, some of the specific points that Deputy Queripel made really did have holes in them like a colander. Longue Hougue quarry? Longue Hougue quarry is *absolutely* vital to the water position in Guernsey. We spent not so long ago £5 million on a water treatment plant there and it is a third bigger than the St Saviours reservoir. Longue Hougue quarry is not full of contaminated water. It would not make a good site for landfill. It would be a completely inappropriate option. Again, it captures why, to a degree, some of the arguments that have been laid today are relatively last minute and fully researched in the sense that they  
1145 simply are not valid or viable.

There are 465 landfill sites in the UK at the moment that are compliant, but 812 have actually ceased from 2001. Landfill is not an option, as Deputy Brehaut mentioned, that is regarded as being the best means of dealing with waste that is available. Certainly, the Guernsey Waste Strategy and indeed the EHO have made it very clear that they would see that to be the case.

1150 Torrey Canyon quarry was in the review of the quarries in the nine months we looked at. It only had capacity for six months. We looked at nine quarries in total.

Sir, if I just look at the moment, in terms of incinerators elsewhere, the intention of the Department when we looked at export was absolutely to give the Island of Guernsey future proofing and flexibility. By exporting our residual waste it allowed us to continue with the core project of the Waste Management  
1155 Strategy which is to minimise. By exporting, should we get to a point where we reach the lowest level of residual waste at some point in the future, then it may well be that we can look at other alternative options for what we do with our residual waste as technology develops, but modern landfill technology, although better than before, is very much more expensive.

Sir, looking at costs specifically, if Deputy Queripel's intentions were achieved, we would be able to reduce several million pounds from the £29 million in the capital expenditure that we have set for the Waste Strategy; we would be able to remove the cost of the transfer station. But to replace that to look at landfill we would need to acquire and then prepare a site for landfill and, as Deputy David Jones mentioned back in 2007, the Mont Cuet was estimated to have cost £7 million in terms of the cost of it with then the treatment  
1160 to allow to make it ready for use for landfill. Sorry, that was 20 years ago, not in 2007 – 20 years ago.

1165 If we extended that and looked at the £12.8 million for the treatment plant that would be necessary we would be saving ourselves a few million and we would be adding – *adding* – a £20 million capex to a capital expenditure proposal that we all know we want to see maintained and reduced to the lowest level possible. So in wanting to try and listen to parishioners' views about the cost element, first of all, on the capital expenditure, we would see a massive increase if we pursued this landfill option, even though it was  
1170 not found in favour through the wide consultation back in 2011-2012, even though it failed to hit the criteria that moved it above 18 in a list of 27, in terms of preferred options. It would be absolutely insane to want to change the Waste Strategy course that we have at the moment for this option. It would add *significant* capital cost and that capital cost would deny then other projects that States Members have already approved in the capital prioritisation process that are very important.

1175 In terms of operating costs, again when looked at in terms of Option D the actual operating costs of landfill would not be significantly cheaper than the options of export. When you look at them, the costs are very minimal either way. So when Deputy Queripel is wanting to look at this sursis principally to make sure he is minimising costs for the householders of Guernsey he would not be successful, he would be increasing the cost, aborted costs of the work that we have done so far to date, delaying costs by having to start again  
1180 and then indeed increased capital costs.

Sir, I cannot possibly support this sursis, I respect Deputy Queripel's right to bring it and his motivation, although I would say it is very late in the day. This States' report was never about the options of our Waste Strategy. That was decided in an extensive debate in 2012. This report was about letting Members know about the implementation of the Waste Strategy, about the export process and indicative costs, about the  
1185 legislation policy. So, when Deputy Lester Queripel makes his point about us not dealing with the landfill issue, we were never meant to deal with the landfill issue, those decisions had already been made after *extensive* consultation and analysis which proved that landfill failed badly in terms of being the preferred option for the States of Guernsey to approve.

Sir, I would ask Members to not support this sursis. Thank you.

1190

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

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, a point of order, please. Can I possibly ask the Minister, through you, to answer that question I posed about how we possibly can get out of a 20-year contract to export waste if we  
1195 are only 10 years into it, to go for the alternative option that PSD stated in the literature we were supplied with recently?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes, well that is not a point of order because the Minister is not obliged to answer any question that is posed during the course of debate but, Deputy Luxon, Deputy Lester Queripel is asking whether you do have an answer to that question or not.

**Deputy Luxon:** I would be very pleased to answer it, Deputy Bailiff. Thank you.

In terms of the length of contract, we do not have to tie ourselves into a long-term contract – 10 or 20 years – we could be looking for a deal that could be potentially continued for the longer term but with appropriate break points. During the negotiations on the final tendering process we will make decisions about the length of time to commit to, based on the best deal that we can get for the Island.

So this is a matter that can be picked up during the negotiation stage. So, no, we will tie in to a length of term of deal that makes most sense but of course the only need to break would be if we wanted to change our mind and move to landfill. But the Waste Strategy very much is about using export over the long term while we maximise the minimisation of residual waste.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Laurie Queripel then to reply to the debate on the sursis moved by him and Deputy Brehaut.

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Thank you, sir.

That is an interesting point that Deputy Luxon made at the end there – that we could have these break points – but it does not change the fact that we will have built all the infrastructure to accommodate the export of waste. What happens to that infrastructure? What about the return on all the capital expenditure when equipment could be – and infrastructure could be – curtailed half way through its life, or its expected life? I do not see that as being a very strong business case at all.

Deputy Luxon said that this sursis was brought on a whim. It was not brought on a whim, sir. When was I meant to bring it? In November or December? We were not discussing or debating the Waste Strategy until this time, so I could only bring it when we were going to discuss the Waste Strategy so I brought it at the correct time, this motion.

Deputy Luxon spoke about being contacted by 50 or 60 parishioners or people, I do not know how many I have spoken to, sir, over the last few weeks, how many e-mails, how many calls I have had. I know that yesterday I had several calls from people from across the Island – not just my parishioners, from across the Island – all supporting the direction that the sursis was calling for. So I have spoken to many people, I cannot pin it down to 50 or 60 and from across the Island, sir. So it is all about one's perception of public opinion, I suppose. Deputy Luxon will have his perception and I will have mine.

Sir, I did go to speak to staff Members actually at Brickfield House and, of course, I have read the paper that has been supplied by PSD and that is why I brought the sursis, because I was not convinced by the information I have been supplied with and I was not convinced by the conversation I had at Brickfield House. So I gave the Department every chance to counter my concerns.

Deputy Luxon spoke then again, sir, about the capex cost and adding to the capex cost but the point is that if we could access a quarry that had long life in it – whether it be Longue Hougue or Les Vardes – of course those costs would dissipate because you are looking then at a very long-term solution – as I said when I spoke earlier, perhaps 50 or 60 years, perhaps more. So the initial extra capex cost would dissipate and would even out by the fact that we would have a very long-term strategy to counter that.

I will just make a few comments on the points that I have heard, sir. I am not going to take too long to do this. Deputy Duquemin spoke about a U-turn but, of course, you can turn in the right direction and it is possible to continue to travel in the wrong direction actually. And why shouldn't landfill be seen as a long-term solution for us. As I say, we are not obliged to follow the EU Landfill Directive. Why shouldn't it be seen as a long-term solution for us and, as I say, if you employ modern management methods for landfill it is far more environmentally acceptable – certainly as acceptable as incineration and polluting the air with the micro toxins.

We would not have to wait. Once again speaking in regard to Les Vardes – and Longue Hougue to a certain extent but Les Vardes in particular – we would not have to wait. If this sursis is voted through, sir, the negotiations and exploration could begin immediately with Ronez. Clearly there has been some discussion with Ronez in the past or else we would not be looking at it as a water storage area. So clearly there has been some discussion with them. So those discussions could be intensified and then we could consider the idea of using that quarry for landfill instead of water storage and the negotiations can be done in that manner rather than in the manner of looking at it for water storage.

Sir, something else that Deputy Duquemin said – I cannot remember exactly what he said but my reply is: Guernsey conditions will only allow for limited affordable adherence to the waste hierarchy; we cannot recycle at all costs because it is the public that pays every time.

I will just move on to some comments made by Deputy Green, sir. He asked me – and this applies to Deputy Burford as well to a certain extent – how I arrived at my costs and how I would arrive at my cost. Well that is why I am putting the sursis forward because I do not know. I have come up with my own figures, sir, and I based my capital costs on £60 million say for Les Vardes, for example, over 50 or 60 years and adding a bit to that. I know it is a very ‘back of the fag packet’ sort of calculation, sir, and that is my point, that is why I placed the sursis, that is why I am asking for a more thorough report, that is why I am asking for greater detail because I do not know what to base my costs on.

I based them on the options that were put forward, the shortlist of options in the workshop. I based them on that and I have compared them to the other three options, A, B and C, and I arrived at my calculations via that, sir. So it has all been guesswork and calculations as best as I could make them. But, of course, I have not got the actual figures. That work has not been done. That is why I am asking for the sursis to be approved, sir – so that work can be done and we can know exactly what it would cost to prepare a quarry like Les Vardes, for example, and exactly what it would cost to have an MBT facility in place and exactly what it would cost to run such a facility. So that is why I am calling for this piece of work to be done, because I do not know. I have based it as best I can on the figures and the information that is available to me.

Sir, Deputy Ogier spoke about building an MBT facility to cope with 30,000 tonnes worth of waste and what about if we reduce that to 16,000 or 18,000 tonnes over the years, sir, but I do not know about these things. That is why I am asking for this report to be done. Is it possible to have an MBT facility that is modular? It is certainly possible to have incinerators that are modular that deal with different tonnage of wastage. I do not know that information. I need that information from PSD.

Deputy Ogier also spoke, sir, about what about if we get to the point where we have got a 30,000 tonne MBT plant and we are only processing 16,000 tonnes? Well, the same could be said for the idea of building infrastructure and signing a 20-year contract for exportation and then stopping it after 10 years and still having the infrastructure and the transfer station there doing nothing. That does not make a great deal of practical or economic sense to me.

Deputy Dave Jones, sir, although he is not going to support the sursis, I appreciate his very balanced comments. As I do, Deputy Green, sir. He made some very balanced comments and I appreciate that. But I think I have allowed as best I can for the preparation of quarries and the infrastructure and all that kind of thing in my calculations, and I think I have played that all into the calculations that I have made and, to me, it still comes out that it would be cheaper to landfill in a modern way with a quarry that has got a 50 or 60-year capacity, sir.

Deputy Brouard – I think there are plenty of water storage options and I think Deputy Brehaut addressed that. There are so many quarries, particularly in the north of the Island. I do not think it is beyond the wit of man to sort out some other locations for water storage. Sir I feel I have made the case for the sursis. And the few Members who have spoken in favour of it, I think they made the case too. They made some very good points. I think I have made the case in regard to the work that I am calling for. I have heard nothing to persuade me otherwise, sir.

I think we can pick and choose to create a Strategy that is a Guernsey fit. I do not think serious investigation of the quarries that could possibly be used has been undertaken. I do not think that the relevant parties have been engaged. Nobody seems to have refuted that point, sir, and I do not think the paperwork from PSD refutes that at all – that the relevant parties have been properly and seriously engaged.

Sir, some of my colleagues may consider that I have been irresponsible in bringing this motion and taking this approach. So be it. Ultimately the electorate will be my judge. I do not consider myself to be a career politician. While I am here I will act and speak according to my conscience and try always to do what I feel is right for the people of Guernsey and attempt to reflect and address their views and concerns.

Sir, I say to Members now, if you are confident that you are in full possession of the facts, if you are confident that the landfill option has been exhaustively explored, if you are assured that the Strategy that PSD is being forward is resilient, cost-wise and in a practical and a logistical sense, if you are confident that the people of Guernsey are convinced by and are on board with the Strategy, then vote against the sursis. On the other hand, sir, if you have any serious doubts in any of these areas please give weighty consideration to supporting this Strategy.

How silly might we look, sir, and what a disservice to the people of Guernsey if perhaps the cost of the Strategy inflates significantly in the coming years, perhaps through rising shipping or transport costs or perhaps through the spare capacity of an incinerator we wish to access, reducing markedly due to pressure to access and from other jurisdictions? How silly might we look and what a disservice to the people of Guernsey if we have not explored every conceivable aspect in relation to an alternative, in this case, landfill?

So this is a huge issue, a once in a lifetime issue. It deserves proper political and public consideration. I am not going to just usher through something that could have a profound effect on people’s lives and their pockets, without subjecting it to severe and thorough testing. So I say to Members, please do not sleepwalk,

do not be becalmed, do not give into topic fatigue, because this is one of the biggest strategic decisions that any States will have to make.

Please support the sursis. Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, Members, if we go to the vote on the sursis proposed by Deputy Laurie Queripel –

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** A recorded vote, please, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** – seconded by Deputy Brehaut and we will have an *appel nominal* which has been requested by Deputy Queripel.

*There was a recorded vote.*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, we will declare the official result in due course, but that looks as though it was lost to me. So we will now go into general debate on –

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Sorry, sir, although Deputy Gillson is not here – he is indisposed at the moment – I would like to lay the amendment that he had initially intended to lay, if that is possible, sir. I think we might need to distribute the copies of it.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Is somebody going to second that?

**Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, if Deputy Gillson is indisposed – and I know he was disappointed that he did not have the chance to lay it – and if the seconder is prepared to lay it – given that it was circulated in accordance with the rules originally – I think it should be debated. So I am happy to second it.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Fallaize. On that basis do Members have copies in front of them? It had been circulated prior to the meeting starting two weeks ago. Is anyone asking that we take a short break so that copies can be provided?

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Yes, please, sir. If we could take a short recess.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** All right, well, we will take five minutes now for copies to be provided to everyone and we will be back at just gone ten past twelve.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.07 p.m.  
and resumed at 12.18 p.m.*

### **Implementation of the Solid Waste Strategy – Debate continued**

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, I hope you have all now got a copy of the amendment that is now to be proposed by Deputy Laurie Queripel and I invite Deputy Laurie Queripel to move it.

*Amendment:*

*To renumber Proposition 21 as Proposition 23 and to insert new Propositions 21 and 22 as follows:*

*‘21. That the recycling targets approved by the States of Deliberation on 22nd February 2012 (Billet d’Etat No IV) should be interpreted as an expected ‘direction of travel’ rather than targets which must be achieved.*

*22. To direct that when considering the export of recyclates the Public Services Department shall have regard to the relative costs of export for recycling and export for disposal.’*

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Thank you, sir.

Members will know that this is very much Deputy Gillson’s amendment and he was very keen to place it but, as we know, he is indisposed and I am sure we all wish him well.

As the original seconder, I feel it falls upon me to place the amendment and I thank Deputy Fallaize very much, sir, for stepping into the breach and stepping up to second this amendment. I am sure Deputy

Gillson will feel very confident bearing in mind my incredible success record in regard to amendments and (Laughter) sursis and motions! I am sure he is at ease at the moment.

Before I focus on the amendment, sir, perhaps I can take a moment to explain my view of recycling and the circumstances when we should recycle. We should recycle materials when there is a good reason to do so. In general terms, these reasons can be when there is an environmental benefit in recycling the particular materials or where a cost saving is achieved as a result of recycling, or preferably a combination of both.

I do not support recycling just to hit a specific target or just to be high in the world ranking. Sir this is a simple amendment which does two things. Firstly, it offers clarity over the interpretation of the existing States Resolution relating to the targets. Secondly, it explicitly includes cost as a factor which PSD can include in its considerations relating to the treatment of recyclates – something which is very much in line with the results of the extensive consultation process which led to the current Strategy.

Sir, as for the first part of the amendment, the current Strategy is defined by the States' Resolution of 2012 which was to approve targets to be achieved by specific dates. This Assembly has not put forward an opinion on how to interpret that Resolution. Should the Resolution be interpreted as a direction of travel and aim or should it be interpreted as definite targets which PSD is expected to achieve? Sir, prior to this Strategy, PSD was given a target of achieving a recycling rate of 50% and they very nearly achieved it. I seem to recall the Minister having to explain to the Assembly why the target was not achieved and if my memory serves me correctly and I believe I was sitting in the Public Gallery at the time, he was given a bit of a hard time by some Members for not having achieved the target of 50%.

Sir, what the first part of this amendment does is to provide clarity of interpretation. By approving this amendment we as an Assembly are confirming our interpretation of the existing Resolution and Strategy, confirming that we do expect PSD to continue to bring forward measures to improve recycling to head towards the achieving of those targets, but not in such a way that they will be hauled over the coals if they miss the targets.

Sir, the second part of the amendment relates to cost, that when PSD are considering the treatment of recyclates they explicitly be able to include costs into those considerations. This, I believe, is in accordance with the results of the quite extensive consultations, but is completely missing from the existing Resolutions which define the current Strategy.

Sir, I have spoken at length to Deputy Gillson about this. As I say, he was unfortunately indisposed today. During the last Assembly Deputy Gillson was a non-voting Member of the Waste Disposal Panel. He was also a member of the panel which monitored the consultation process. As such, he attended each and all of the consultation workshops and I too, sir, attended many of those workshops.

The result of the consultation workshop was a hierarchy of the factors the consultees thought important in developing a solid waste strategy. The most important consideration was that the solution should be sustainable. The second most important consideration, as determined by the extensive consultation process, was in relation to costs – that the containing of costs is second only to sustainability. But, sir, the Resolutions which underpin the current Strategy make no mention of cost being a factor to be considered. It is a *major* omission for the Strategy not to have the consideration of cost to be explicitly included within it. I am not suggesting that cost be an overriding consideration. I accept that there will be situations where recycling will be more expensive than disposal and that recycling could still be the most appropriate course of action.

So this amendment is not designed to change the Strategy, it is designed to explicitly bring the Strategy in line with the results of the consultation.

Sir, I urge Members to support this amendment.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize, do you formally second it?

**Deputy Fallaize:** I do, sir, yes. Thank you.

**Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, I would like to invoke Rule 13(6). I believe it goes beyond the Proposition.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Madam Comptroller, your advice, please, on whether or not these two (Laughter) inserted Propositions go further than the original Proposition.

**The Comptroller:** Sir, thank you.

On a straightforward reading of 13(6), we are effectively inserting two new Propositions. I think the question as to whether it goes further is very much here as regards the content of what the States are being asked to look at. Here they are being to determine whether what has already been expressed in a previous Resolution, as a target, must be reinforced as a direction of travel. So there is an argument as to whether that really changes what has already been decided in an existing States' Resolution.

1425 Nonetheless, at face value we are being asked to vote on two new Propositions, though whether the Minister himself wishes to comment as to whether that will change the current policy might be useful for the States to have a view on that. But strictly under the Rules it is asking for two new Propositions, but it is a slightly unusual one because the States have already voted on a target so it is not new in the sense of a new Proposition that we would normally be looking at.

1430 **The Deputy Bailiff:** So if I were to read all 23 Propositions – if these two are inserted – as a whole, do these take the other 21 Propositions further than the original 21 Propositions? Because that is how I would read Rule 13(6).

1435 **The Comptroller:** Sir, yes. That is the question that needs to be –

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Is your advice, Madam Comptroller, that they do?

1440 **The Comptroller:** Well, it is only really asking them to reiterate a target which has already been expressed and then to have regard to relative costs of export. It is not actually asking them to do something entirely different in the context of all these new 21 Propositions, in my view.

**Deputy Soulsby:** Is it not just a –

1445 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Just a minute, Deputy Soulsby, I will ask you to speak if I want you to speak.

**Several Members:** Hear, hear.

1450 **The Comptroller:** It is simply asking the Department to have regard to costs in Proposition 22 and to reiterate that a target, which they have already approved, is a target. So on one analysis, it does not change anything that is already there and in principle with these Propositions.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** How about the inserted Proposition 22 then ?

1455 **The Comptroller:** Sorry, sir?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** The inserted Proposition 22? Because that is a direction to have regard to something specific.

1460 **The Comptroller:** Sir, absolutely, and it would go further were the Public Services Department not going to be considering the relative cost of export for recycling and export, and that is why it might be of use just to hear from the Minister on that as to whether he feels that would materially add to what these overall Propositions are seeking to do.

1465 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, Madam Comptroller.  
Deputy Luxon, Minister of the Department

**Deputy Luxon:** I thank you very much.

1470 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Can you assist me very briefly?

1475 **Deputy Luxon:** Sir, what would happen if this amendment was passed is that it would affect the Strategy in the sense that at the moment there is a direction to achieve the recycling levels in 2018 of 60% and 2025 of 70%. What this amendment does is to soften that position. So whether that means it goes further or whether it weakens it, I will leave Madam Comptroller to make that decision, but the reality is that neither of these amendments actually do anything at all to enhance the position, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** The only thing I quibble with is that it is going to be my decision, not Madam Comptroller's decision. (*Laughter*)

1480 What I will do, Members of the States, is I will declare the formal result (*Laughter*) on the sursis.



*Not carried – Pour 4, Contre 33, Abstained 1, Not Present 9*

**POUR**

Deputy Adam  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Laurie Queripel

**CONTRE**

Deputy Duquemin  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy James  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Wilkie  
Deputy De Lisle  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Inglis  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Sillars  
Deputy Luxon  
Deputy O'Hara  
Deputy Quin  
Deputy Hadley  
Deputy Harwood  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Robert Jones  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Sherbourne  
Deputy Conder  
Deputy Storey  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy Ogier  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy David Jones  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Le Lièvre  
Deputy Collins

**ABSTAINED**

Deputy Paint

**NOT PRESENT**

Deputy Perrot  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. Harvey  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Domaille  
Deputy Bebb  
Deputy Stewart  
Deputy Gillson  
Deputy Spruce

1485 **The Deputy Bailiff:** There voted in favour, 4; there voted against, 33. There was one abstention and nine Members were not present. Therefore I declare the sursis formally lost.

It is now (*Laughter*) as close as maybe to 12.30 p.m. so what I am going to do is I am going to go away and have a think about what Deputy Soulsby has raised, because I had not had any forewarning that a Rule 13(6) might be raised and I doubt that Madam Comptroller had any forewarning either. It is quite carefully nuanced as to whether it does go further or not, and I will tell you whether or not I am going to put Rule 13(6) to you at 2.30 p.m.

We will adjourn until 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.30 p.m.  
and resumed at 2.30 p.m.*

**Implementation of the Solid Waste Strategy –  
Debate continued and Propositions carried**

**The Deputy Greffier:** Billet II: continuation of debate.

1495 **Deputy Stewart:** [*Inaudible*]... pleasure, sir. Thank you

**The Deputy Bailiff:** [*Not recorded*]... in particular because when I look at inserted Proposition 22 I am satisfied that that covers matters that are outwith anything mentioned in the original Propositions and, if carried, would result in a direction to the Public Services Department to do something further than what they are proposing the States direct them to do. In those circumstances, Rule 13(6) can properly be invoked.

Deputy Soulsby, are you invoking it so that the amendment be not debated and no vote taken thereon or that debate on the amendment be postponed?

**Deputy Soulsby:** Be not debated, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, and can I also say if I was a bit abrupt to you earlier today I apologise. The reason I did it, of course, is that Rule 12(2) requires that a Member who wishes to speak stand and wait to be invited to speak, rather than just launching in.

So the Proposition is – (*Interjections and laughter*) Members of the States, the Proposition from Deputy Soulsby is that the amendment be not debated, and no vote taken thereon. I will put that to you. It needs to be supported by a majority to carry. Those in favour; those against.

*Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I will go to an *appel nominal* again because people are speaking with about equal voices.

Deputy Greffier.

*Carried – Pour 20, Contre 17, Abstained 0, Not Present 10*

**POUR**

Deputy Duquemin  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy James  
Deputy De Lisle  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Inglis  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Sillars  
Deputy Luxon  
Deputy Quin  
Deputy Hadley  
Deputy Harwood  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Robert Jones  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Stewart  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy Ogier

**CONTRE**

Deputy Green  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Adam  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Wilkie  
Deputy O'Hara  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Sherbourne  
Deputy Conder  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy David Jones  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Le Lièvre  
Deputy Collins

**ABSTAINED**

None

**NOT PRESENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy Perrot  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. Harvey  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Domaille  
Deputy Storey  
Deputy Bebb  
Deputy Gillson  
Deputy Spruce

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, on the Proposition made pursuant to Rule 13(6) by Deputy Soulsby there voted in favour 20; against, 17; 10 Members not being present. I therefore declare the Proposition carried. The amendment cannot be debated and we will move into general debate now.

Deputy Duquemin, to be followed by Deputy Robert Jones.

**Deputy Duquemin:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff. I will be brief because I made many of the points that I wanted to make today earlier this morning. I just have a couple of extra themes that I wanted to share with colleagues.

In my speech on the sursis I made reference to a two-day trip to the London area in May 2013 where the PSD Board and project team witnessed for ourselves first-hand the exact sort of facilities that we would be creating in Guernsey to deliver the Island's new Waste Strategy.

What this short trip taught me, aside from how difficult it is to find the Premier Inn in Reading – Lennie Henry would have had a really good giggle at us that night – but, seriously – and it is a serious point – what this short trip taught me is that waste is not rocket science. We are not trying to send somebody to the moon here. To borrow the famous advertising slogan, other places 'Just Do It'.

Standing in the middle of a MRF as it automatically sorts, separates all of Berkshire's recyclates collected at the kerbside into neat little piles, watching a refuse truck empty its black bag waste without any fuss at a transfer station in South London, or seeing an in-vessel composter do its natural thing in North London makes you realise that, far from being mission impossible, this is mission 'let us just get on with the job and make it happen now' possible.

Likewise, I will also return back to my manifesto and hustings notes to make a couple of extra points. My manifesto read:

'A frustrating part of the debate was the apparent disregard that PSD had for suggestions put forward by others. Government must never think that it has a monopoly on good ideas.'

My bullet points on my notes for the hustings read:

‘Ideas? Pay for labelled sacks so we pay for how much we put out.

This time PSD has listened to suggestions that have been put forward by others. I know I am not the only person in Guernsey who is in favour of an element of Pay As You Throw (PAYT) and the Billet makes reference on page 105 to support for the PAYT charging model at focus groups conducted by Island Analysis in 2012. Pay as You Throw has been included and it is likely to be the very simple, Guernsey-friendly solution of colour-coded refuse sacks.

I remember a Castel parishioner bringing a cutting from the *Daily Mail* to one of our Saturday morning surgeries at the Castel Douzaine Room. It was a picture of an attractive row of houses in the UK blighted with a plethora of wheelie bins in every colour of the rainbow lined up in front. We do not want that here was the parishioner’s plea to me – and he is right. I shared the cutting with the rest of the PSD Board at our next meeting.

Others say coloured bags will not work. Well, we saw them working in the streets of one London Borough during our visit. Black bags went into one half of the split loading refuse truck and orange sacks – if memory serves me right on the colour – went into the other half. The orange sacks with all the recyclates were unloaded into a MRF for sorting and the black sacks were unloaded into a pit of residual waste in the transfer station before being sent off elsewhere. It works in the UK so there is no reason why it cannot work here. But, sir, I do not want States Members or members of the public to think that PSD consultation with the parishes was limited to the views of just one Castel parishioner or that we are going to blindly follow everything they do in the UK.

Page 100 onwards in the Billet – particularly Sections 28 and 29 – document a very healthy consultation; a conversation between PSD and all 10 of the Island’s Douzaines. As 28.3 in the Billet says, there are two options for arranging household waste collections in the future and, cutting to the chase, I will put it even more succinctly than the Billet did: one was the Douzaines and one was without. We have talked to the Douzaines. We have talked to their contractors, the bin-men. We have held numerous meetings, one-to-one sessions with parishes and joint workshops where there were a number of different options on the table. And we have reached a positive conclusion that is right for the Island.

One of the onscreen presentations I remember had the words, ‘Talking, listening, working together’ emblazoned across the bottom of each and every slide. This was not just PowerPoint puff or, as some suspected at the time, a hollow promise. No, PSD and the Douzaines have both talked, importantly, both listened and are now working together.

Paragraph 29.4 in the Billet says, ‘What is proposed represents a compromise.’ I would say that what is proposed represents a sensible Guernsey-friendly solution. Paragraph 29.5 is right when it says:

‘PSD is very encouraged by the engagement seen to date and looks forward to a positive working relationship with the Douzaines as part of the successful delivery of the Waste Strategy.’

Sir, in summary, it is not rocket science, the Douzaines still have an important role to play and I will repeat exactly what I said this morning: I am confident that this Assembly will give PSD the green light necessary, so we can get the job done and deliver the Waste Strategy as quickly as possible.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Burford. If you stood up a bit quicker Deputy Jones I would call you. Deputy Burford.

**Deputy Burford:** Sir, I would like to concentrate for a moment on the word ‘waste’. Leaving aside legal definitions, it can be most simply defined as unwanted material for which one has no further use. And each year every household on this Island – all 26,000 of them – manage to produce an average of half a tonne of it, to add to that produced by commercial and industrial operations.

Even taking into account our current recycling rate, it is still the case that around 80% of what remains in a household black bag is recyclable or re-usable. In other words, it does not need to be there. The books clothes and toys which can be taken to a charity shop or for recycling or re-use. The food that makes up a third of the average bin. The things that we readily recognise as recycling such as glass, paper, card and cartons and plastic. And other recyclable bits that perhaps we do not recognise so easily, like batteries, metal, polystyrene, polythene, CDs, carrier bags, oils, old mobile phones, aerosol cans, and much more. None of this needs to find its way to the tip or to an overseas incinerator.

Professor Paul Collett, who came to Guernsey in 2009 to lecture on Zero Waste, said that in his considerable experience people are not the problem. With this Strategy this Government is not going to be the problem either. We are going to make it easy for people to do the right thing. We are going to inform, educate, facilitate and incentivise. We are going to engender a culture where we look at waste differently.

And facilitated by Government we all need to take individual responsibility. We need to remember, when talking about the waste that businesses produce, that businesses are made up of people. It is all too easy to read media scare stories about how materials for recycling end up in landfill or shipped half way across the world to China.

PSD monitors where your recycling goes. Our bring bank scheme has been successful in creating high grade recyclates with a very low rejection rate. What causes bales of recycling to be rejected and sent to landfill is contamination with other materials. If we all work to keep contamination rates low then the rejection rates will be low. Good quality recyclables are a valuable resource, and are not landfilled with all the associated costs for no good reason. Some of the recyclable material collected on Island, such as rigid plastics, is indeed presently sent to China for reprocessing but sea travel in surplus-capacity ships is a relatively efficient way of transporting material and the carbon footprint is still much lower than making new plastic from oil. Furthermore, China is the biggest manufacturer of plastic products and either needs to import the recyclable feed stock or make new plastic.

There is UK, domestic and European plastic recycling capacity and as it expands it will increasingly be used. It is preferable to shipping to China in a lifecycle analysis but both are better than producing virgin plastic. Of the other local recycling streams, paper, card, steel tins, aluminium tins, household plastic, packaging and bottles and tetra packs are all recycled in the UK.

We need to reduce, re-use, and recycle because if we all do it – at home, at work and at leisure – we will reduce the financial and environmental impact for everyone. We will set an example as a responsible community.

To make it easier to do this we are introducing kerbside collections of recyclables. For those who might have reservations about kerbside collections, imagine for a moment that kerbside collection of recycling was already in place and this Department proposed that we were going to stop collecting it and, instead, we were going to ask people to drive their individual recycling to windswept coastal car parks where they would need to stuff it into different bins. How popular would that be?

Sir, what about the report that is before us today? Has it taken too long to get to this point? Yes, undoubtedly. Deputy De Lisle was advocating this kind of progressive approach years ago. Was it worth waiting for? Definitely, the money lost from abandoned schemes is as nothing compared to what they would have cost us in the long run, environmentally and economically, had we proceeded with them. Is the new system perfect? Of course not, but it has the potential to evolve and adapt. The capital commitments are a fraction of previous schemes and do not require constant volumes, allowing us to keep reducing our waste.

Like Deputy Duquemin, I too am not happy with every single aspect. It would not be my ideal solution. There are things that I think could be better. For example, an anaerobic digester for food would allow us, in these energy conscious times, to generate enough renewable energy for over 300 homes. But instead we have opted for an in-vessel composter. That was the majority decision.

We still have to fully resolve glass collections, but we are working on that.

The inclusion of green waste figures – that is garden clippings to you and me – in our headline recycling figure distorts and exaggerates the true picture of our achievement, in my view. But we do it because UK Councils do it and we want like-for-like comparisons, and they do it because it makes things look better. But the green waste issue highlights another crucial point. When we do attain 70% recycling around 10% to 15% of that will be green waste, so in fact our true target is more like 60% to be achieved in the next 11 years. Somewhat underwhelming and the truth is we can do much better.

It is not denied that in this report we are looking at some big financial numbers for dealing with our waste. However, this time we have a Strategy which gives us a measure of control over our costs.

People say we should deal with our waste on Island and not export it for someone else to deal with. Well, a quarter of what goes into Mont Cuét is food waste. We will deal with food waste on Island. Another quarter is everyday recyclable material such as tins, bottles, plastics and cartons. With the exception of glass these things cannot be recycled on the Island but we have established schemes to process them, mostly in the UK. Another fifth is other recyclable material. The remaining 20% or so is truly residual waste.

So, as you can see, if we really all pull together very little waste indeed will be sent off-Island to an incinerator and getting it down to that figure is up to each and every one of us. Just like a weed is simply a plant in the wrong place, waste is simply a resource in the wrong place. This report is the next step towards putting it all in the right place.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Robert Jones. *(Laughter)*

**Deputy Robert Jones:** As the Minister has already stated in his speech, pages 98 to 123 set out our detailed proposals to amend our Laws to facilitate the implementation of the Waste Strategy. What is

important to this Strategy is that, as a result of considerable consultation with the Douzaines and good advice from the Crown Officers, we have the raft of changes that are presented in that report.

The Minister has also highlighted in his opening speech that there is much drafting to be done, which is why we formally requested that the Law Officers prioritise the drafting to tie in with the two-year plan.

So why is there a need for a change to the current legal framework? Well, two key elements of the Waste Strategy – the charging mechanism and the collection arrangements – are both tied up in legislation. In developing the Waste Strategy, it was identified that the system of charges is an important mechanism to promote positive behaviour and discourage non-participation by providing the direct financial incentive.

It was also identified that the arrangements for household collections need to change. Instead of the easiest option being to throw everything into a black bag, recycling will be easier and more convenient for households and will overcome the barriers that currently prevent many from doing so.

In respect of both key elements, the current legislation is inflexible and very restrictive. It stipulates parishes should charge by households according to TRP – a very unpopular method. There is at least one instance in the past where a parish – I think it was St Martin’s – has attempted to change this so that households would only be able to be charged according to the amount they produced. However, they were prevented from doing so by the current Law.

Some of the parishes also reported no mandate to organise separate collections of recyclables, for instance, as Laws stipulated that they arrange waste collections.

The Law is also updated. The current legislation dates back around 50 years and requirements of waste management are now very different. For example, there is a rather restrictive choice of containers that should be used, dating back to 1964, and this does not include black plastic bags. And, as we know, these restrictions are largely ignored.

As Deputy Duquemin has mentioned, fundamental to this process of change is the relationship between the Douzaines and the WDA. It is a key element of the implementation of the Waste Strategy. The Waste Strategy Report debated by the States in 2012 acknowledged that the Parochial Collection of Refuse (Guernsey) Law might need to be amended to take into consideration the co-ordination required to collect both black bag waste and recyclables. As Deputy Duquemin has outlined, we have engaged with the Douzaines throughout the development of the Waste Strategy following its adoption in 2012.

Whilst the decision to retain the Douzaines’ involvement means that we *may* require more complicated legal amendments and it *may* lead to a more complex charges system, the proposed legal framework will be fit for purpose and will give forward flexibility to manage the Island’s waste system more effectively.

So, what does the new framework propose? Well, as we said, it retains the role of the Douzaines in arranging waste collections, it extends this to kerbside collections of separate recyclables and food waste. It introduces a duty where none currently exists for the Douzaines to have regard to the Island’s Waste Strategy, as will be set out in the Waste Disposal Plan. It gives the Waste Disposal Authority (WDA) responsibility for stipulating the facilities where the various materials should be delivered and the method by which the collection charges should be passed on to households. It would enable many of the Island’s small businesses to opt in to the parish collections and benefit from economies of scale. It provides a more flexible charging mechanism which can be linked to the amount of waste people produce. It introduces a method by which non-compliance with the arrangements for waste and recycling collections are set up by the WDA can be addressed by way of a penalty. What should be noted is that this is not intended to be a heavy handed approach and is seen very much as a last resort. It is hoped that charging incentives and education will provide sufficient encouragement for Islanders to comply with any requirements for setting out of waste collection. An extensive communication programme will be implemented prior to any such requirements coming into force, so that Islanders understand the purpose of waste separation guidelines and the importance to the Island’s Waste Strategy.

That said, it is essential that we have some form of redress to prevent people from deliberately trying to avoid the measures designed to impose fair charges for waste services.

It also gives parishes the option to delegate the function to the WDA if they find the new arrangements prove to be too onerous. This would allow some flexibility for different parishes to take different approaches in relation to their widened functions, bearing in mind the potential impact on resources and following a practical experience with the proposed interim scheme.

Sir, in conclusion, it could be argued that by retaining the current role of the Douzaines and at the same time introducing appropriate legislation that can support the objectives of the Waste Strategy is more complicated than if the States simply centralised and took responsibility for all of the waste services. However, it is my view and the view of the Board that the proposals provide a sensible and pragmatic approach which retains what is good and popular in the current system but addresses the shortcomings of the current legislative framework. Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop, to be followed by Deputy Lester Queripel.

1725 **Deputy Gollop:** Sir, in broad terms I support this Waste Strategy, even if in a way I suspect our decision today is irrelevant because the machine of Public Services Department has already mobilised its troops in a sense. Certainly I have heard in the media of all the work that has been done to get things moving.

1730 I felt a bit harsh in not voting for the amendment to be debated, but I think we really do have to maintain the targets and the continual push towards recycling and going along the lines Deputy Bebb had mentioned about Professor Collett and so on, because we need division and there is a cost to it – I will come on to that in a minute – but, I also had sympathy with what Deputy Burford said about the need to look again at the glass issue, and the anaerobic digester. But this is a good, solid start and Deputy Luxon and the team need to be commended for the way they have got the parishes to work together and accept the inevitable.

1735 Do I have a few reservations? Yes. I think for the more built up areas of the Island – especially where there are flats, apartments, terraces and so on – there are still problems, and not just of mobilising utility vehicles to collect the recyclables. There are just not enough bring banks in those areas and they are the areas of highest population and I would speculate the lowest user-ship.

1740 I think to a degree, without being too specific, the recycling enthusiasm from the community has been particularly strong in detached family homes in the more comfy parishes and has been less strongly realised in other areas.

1745 Deputy Laurie Queripel and others have identified the cost as a factor, and I am concerned that we are perhaps moving by default to a kind of poll tax whereby, instead of income derived from rates based upon wealth and the size of your property, we are moving towards a polluter pays, consumer pays. That sounds good, it sounds green and we use it in other areas, but how fair is that to the least affluent in society? And from a disability point of view there must be many people with disabilities or impairments who could struggle with the new arrangements, either logistically or financially, and I hope the team bears that in mind. I think you could end up with a situation where prosperous people who were careful to mind their resources came out of this as net winners and people in socially disadvantageous situations would have higher charges.

1750 As it is, the Billet seems to imply that there will be a double whammy in charges because parish rates will continue but they will also be not just charging for bags but an annual levy payable on houses for final disposal.

1755 With those reservations in mind, we are where we are and we have to have the vision, as a community, to recycle, to minimise waste, to implement the waste hierarchy and certainly move the agenda forward. So I think now is the time to support this stage of the Waste Strategy.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel to be followed by Deputy De Lisle.

1760 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Thank you, sir.

1765 I rise merely to ask two questions of the Minister. The first one focuses on kerbside recycling. The intention, as we all know, is to run a two-year trial period and that at the end of that two-year trial period presumably the results will be considered and a decision will be made whether or not the trial period has been successful. Can the Minister tell me, please, how do we actually determine whether the trial has been successful or not? Will we simply be looking at the figures from the trial period itself and comparing them with the previous recycling figures?

1770 My second question is a two-part question. I apologise if I should know the answer but my two part question arises from my reading a sentence at the bottom of paragraph 10.1 on page 76 of Volume I of the Billet. That sentence tells us that some hazardous or controlled waste will continue to be disposed of on-Island either in a specially-engineered cell at Mont Cuét or in small incinerators like that used for clinical waste.

1775 I appreciate I might be missing a fundamental point somewhere, sir, but when Mont Cuét is full where will this specially engineered cell actually be sited? And the second part of the question is will the condition of the cell be monitored on a regular basis?

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy De Lisle, then Deputy Storey.

1780 **Deputy De Lisle:** Thank you, sir.

The revised Solid Waste Strategy that we have in front of us with its emphasis on waste prevention and minimisation and participation in recycling schemes with export of residual waste, is commendable and a breath of fresh air.

1785 I have been a proponent of many aspects of this report for some years because it reflects the thrust of minority reports that were placed to the States in the solid waste debates of January and November 2007, six or seven years ago.

Those minority reports stressed the need to channel energies into waste prevention, resource recovery, waste segregation, recycling and composting, procurement of a permanent materials recycling facility and an in-vessel composting plant, provision of civic amenity sites, kerb side collections of wet and dry recyclables, an Island-wide commercial collection of recyclables, together with regulatory control to

1790

minimise or reduce the waste generated in the first place, and greater public participation, education and promotion in waste planning.

While recycling is gradually increasing, there is still much to do in this Island. The 50% household recycling target set by the States in February 2007 has still to be achieved and the commissioned PSD 2009 report on kerbside recycling revealed that kerbside recycling would increase our recycling rate to 61% and

1795

save thousands of tonnes of residual waste from entering landfill.

The recommendations in the report in front of us today include kerbside recycling, a materials recycling facility, an in-vessel composting plant, civic amenity sites and a regulatory framework and, in all, provides a mix of incentives and requirements to help maximise waste prevention and minimisation, and encourages participation in recycling schemes and I commend the new Public Services Department for bringing them

1800

forward.

Sir, some of the leadership being given by the private sector is exemplary and needs to be encouraged, Marks & Spencer, for example, a few years back announced a £200 million eco plan which will have an impact on every part of their operation. This company has pledged to become carbon neutral. Island Waste locally has shown that we can achieve a tremendous 75% reduction in the commercial sector. Businesses

1805

can save money by managing their waste properly. Simple business economics should be the driver towards managing this resource effectively. Mercury – another local company – reduced its waste bill from £4,000 to £350 and is now recycling 95% of its rubbish, and this recycling scheme took only three full days to set into operation.

With these initiatives we are well on our way, we just need to get everyone else on board. These

1810

companies set realistic practical targets and they have been economical and successful. It is an approach that needs to be adopted by others and it can be done. We need to see the enthusiasm in household breakout into the commercial sector and throughout the community.

Sir, over the past few years Guernsey has successfully reduced the amount of waste going to landfill and the Public Services Department and the Environment Department in the past have been regularly caught out

1815

by the enthusiasm with which Islanders have adopted new recycling initiatives, the desire of the public to do more and the call for short-term interim measures and trials to be replaced by a commitment to recycling.

We need to build on the success of the past and continue along the road to reduce, re-use, recycle as an alternative waste strategy to landfill and incineration. At the same time we need to emphasise strengthening producer and supplier responsibility to ensure all packaging is recyclable and build on efforts to minimise waste and maximise recovery, thereby changing our ways so that we produce far less waste in the first place and make a major shift from disposal to re-use and recovery.

1820

It would mean that in a few years most of our waste would be recycled, re-used and composted. And shipping residual waste off-Island on an interim basis would give time to reduce our waste stream even further to proactively promote on-Island separation, recycling and composting and evaluate the longer term.

1825

Let us build on the success in recycling and begin to eliminate waste at source and progress along the path towards a truly sustainable goal of zero waste. Let us lead by example and give our children a heritage in sound economic and environmental management and let us leave something that they can truly build on so that they inherit the very best of what we have to offer today for an even better tomorrow.

1830

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Storey, followed by Deputy Green.

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

1835

First of all, I would say that I voted against the Suez proposal. I voted against it because of the enormous cost – capital cost – that was going to be involved in building the incinerator – likely to cost overall in the region of £80 million – but also because we would be investing in an asset – if you can call it that – which is going to become less and less efficient and less and less effective as we increased our recycling abilities. I accept the way forward that has been outlined in this report – and I have to say that I think it is a very well set out report and easy to read, and I found that very helpful – is not all that I wanted, in the same way as some other Members of this Assembly, but let's face it there is no viable alternative that has been suggested by anybody else who is opposed to this way forward and I accept that this is most probably, at the end of the day, the most appropriate way to tackle what seemed at one stage to be quite an intractable problem.

1840

I agree that we should not become part-owner of the Jersey incinerator. I think that is the right decision because we would be just getting back to the same situation we had with Suez we would end up part-owner

1845

of an installation which was going to become less efficient as time went on and would effectively be running at a loss and therefore a loss that we would share in.

To my mind exporting our residual waste gives us a lot more flexibility because at the moment there are quite a few plants operating in the UK and in Europe that are under capacity and, with the EU moves on recycling, there are going to be more and their under-capacity is going to be greater. And an incinerator that is operating at under capacity is inefficient so, therefore, I am quite sure that as time goes on the market for the waste that we have will be quite a competitive market and, therefore, I think shipping our waste to an alternative plant somewhere else is the right answer, albeit that we minimise that amount of waste as much as we can by recycling and composting.

I am also convinced, sir, that the hole in the ground is not the answer. The biggest problem we have with holes in the ground is leaching of foul substances from these holes which get into the water table and from the water table into our water courses and from our water courses into our reservoirs. And that just makes life an awful lot more difficult for Guernsey Water in treating our drinking water.

So, all in all, I will be supporting these proposals. There are four points that perhaps the Minister might think about. I quite appreciate he might not have answers when he responds to this debate, but they are points I would like him to consider.

The first one struck me when I was reading paragraph 37.26 which is that the proposal is to have a user pays charge per bag for recyclates as well as the residual waste. To me, that suggests that that will be an incentive for more people to actually take their recyclates to the bring banks and thus to avoid those charges. But we have already been told that the bring banks are already operating at capacity. They are struggling to cope with the recycling that the Island's population is bringing to them at present. And there is no mention in this report that satisfies me that the bring banks will be organised so as to cope with these additional recyclates that they are going to be asked to cope with.

The second: because I am a representative of the population in St Peter Port, I would like to make the point that a large proportion of the population in St Peter Port live in flats, and a lot of the flats are extremely small. In fact a lot of the flats find difficulty in finding room for one black bin bag at present, and in the future we are going to be asking them to make room for three receptacles, one for recyclates, one for household waste and one for the rubbish, if you like. A lot of people do not have room in their dwellings for that sort of activity, so I am wondering whether the Minister might consider, in certain areas, having community containers rather than expecting everybody to cope with three containers in their own flat. And to, in fact, levy the charge on the block of flats rather than on the individuals accordingly.

While I am talking about that matter, I appreciate that the Minister is not present, but I think it is incumbent on the Planning Department to try to ensure that where new flats are built that adequate provision is made within them – either within the flat itself or within the curtilage of the building – to provide space for this activity, because it is essential for everybody who lives to get rid of their rubbish and if we are now insisting that they should be getting rid of their rubbish in three streams then I think it is incumbent on us to try and assist in that activity.

I also have a concern about glass, which is recyclable but is specifically excluded from the processes that are described in this report, and I think we ought to be able to cater for glass in our recycling activities.

Finally, sir, I appreciate that the stage we are at is such that it is not possible to give accurate costings in respect of all the activities that are being considered, but I think nor has the report gone into the detail in some areas of how these operations will actually be conducted, and I think it would be appropriate for the Minister or the Department to come back to this Assembly with those details at some stage in the future.

I appreciate there are problems with commerciality in relation to individual bids, but nevertheless it should be quite possible to lump two or three parts of the operation together in order to outline a detailed costing of the overall operation, without disclosing anything that is commercially sensitive. Because there are a large number of steps involved in this process and I do not think it is appropriate for this process to go into its final stage without Members of this Assembly understanding the details relating to the costings, because at the end of the day we are going to get questions from the public relating to these costs and how they have been arrived at, and I think it is incumbent on the Department to provide us with that information so that we can be able to answer the questions that are put to us by our constituents.

Overall, I think this is a very good report and a very good way forward, and I look for the detail in the future.

Thank you.

**Deputy Ogier:** Point of order, sir. May I correct –

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of order.

**Deputy Ogier:** – a misleading statement by another Member?



**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction then, yes.

1910 **Deputy Ogier:** Thank you, sir.

Deputy Storey indicated that Guernsey Water spends resources in taking leachate out of the drinking water but, of course, landfill sites on this Island have been in non-water catchment areas and so leachate does not interfere with the ground water. That would not be the case for Les Vardes but it is the case for the land sites we currently use.

1915

**Deputy Storey:** Sorry, sir, if I... *[Inaudible]* my concern was in relation to the potential for additional holes in the ground in the future... *[Inaudible]*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Storey.

1920 Deputy Green, to be followed by Deputy Adam to be followed by Deputy Trott.

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

I do support the Waste Strategy and its implementation. I entirely echo the point that Deputy Storey made just a moment ago about the costings and the fact that we – representatives in this Assembly who are not on PSD – are going to be asked these perfectly legitimate questions about cost and we need to know with some real clarity what the answers to those questions are. I will return to that issue in a moment.

1925 As I say, I do support the Waste Strategy and its implementation. I do not want the States to shilly shally around with solid waste as some of our predecessors have done, I want this Government to get on with the successful implementation of this Strategy that we now have, even though it may not be perfect, even though it may not be ideal in every respect. We will never ever get a perfect system and a few Members of the Board of PSD have said that today and I think that is absolutely right. But we have to make it work and, in particular, what PSD together with the whole States have got to do is make this Strategy work in an affordable way, insofar as we are able to do so.

1935 As I say, I am broadly supportive of the Strategy because it is based on sound principles of environmental sustainability and it does condemn to the past the somewhat defunct, somewhat lazy option of landfill, which is increasingly being phased out, as we know, from the EU Directive on Landfill.

Understandably enough, moving from an entirely unsophisticated and cheap landfill policy to a highly sophisticated and socially and environmentally progressive model like this Strategy was never going to be a low cost process. Nevertheless I do remain very concerned about the costs under this Strategy.

1940 We can see now that the overall cost has gone up because of soaring costs for all of the capital infrastructure that will have to be constructed to export waste and, in particular, I am very concerned about the future costs to householders on this. I have had a number of queries from constituents of mine on this particular matter.

1945 We know from the report that the likely costs to households will be higher in the future and the range, which is quoted as the average range per year, will be between £195 per year and £298 per year... is quoted as the average figure, which is up from an average of £108 per annum now. I know that some, maybe many, parishioners in my parish of the Castel are concerned and anxious about that. We know the problems with the cost of living in Guernsey. We know it is very high. We know that there are many hard working families who are suffered of late in the economic circumstances that we are in.

1950 It is not going to be the wealthy who are going to be hit by increased charges in this area. It will be ordinary families who are, in general terms, looking to this Government to get the cost of living *down* not to increase it, not to pile on the extra costs and fees and charges *ad nauseam*. So we should not ignore how this Strategy will impact on people's already squeezed living standards and if costs can be mitigated they must be. I have confidence that this Board will endeavour to do that but, of course, these added costs cannot be seen in isolation. So, I do hope the Department will remain especially sensitive to the potential financial impact on people and try to keep those costs down.

1960 The only other point that I wanted to touch on was about the involvement of the Douzaines. If one took an uncharitable view, you could say that the Public Services Department has climbed down on the original plan for the centralisation and clearly the view now is that the Douzaines now will maintain their involvement in the arrangements of collection of household waste and I think that was probably the right judgement, actually. I fully understand why that decision was made. I think it was probably done in the interests of political diplomacy, if nothing else, and it does show that the Department was listening.

1965 But the question I have got to the Minister – and I would be grateful if he could respond to this – is: could it be argued that the Department has potentially thrown away the benefits of economies of scale and greater control for an easier life by extending the or continuing with the involvement of the Douzaines? In other words, was the decision to maintain Douzaine involvement motivated more out of political convenience than the economics of the Strategy?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Adam.

1970

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

The last two speakers have actually covered some of the points I wished to make. (*Interjection*) Thank you. (*Laughter*)

1975

First of all, they did not make this point because they do not sit on T&R but this document was actually delayed partly because of the costings in it and it went back to PSD to try to see if they could give any greater detail, and one of my concerns is that the Strategy is progressing but appears to take little or no notice of the costs.

1980

There are two aspects of recycling. One is the cost of what you have to pay to send things off-Island, in financial pounds, shillings and pence, or pounds and pence. The second is – what is the cost of the carbon footprint? In other words, what is the carbon footprint of collecting it, packing it, putting it on a ship and sending it up to Sweden and then burning it for the waste? I once asked that question to the then Deputy Bill Bell who was PSD President at that time, and I got no satisfactory answer. It still concerns me that we are recycling and recycling from an Island and we have to ship it off at considerable cost of fuel and other carbon waste being produced.

1985

That does not mean to say I do not think that the efforts of PSD are not aimed at making sure that everything is done as cost effectively as possible. It is not a direct criticism of PSD, it is simply saying – how do we control costs? How do we stop this Strategy from being a blank cheque – which is a term we used at one of the meetings of T&R?

1990

The problem is too few areas are under the control of PSD. You cannot control how much it is going to cost to recycle something. At the present time it is: paper, £50 or £60; aluminium, you actually might get some money for. Therefore it depends on the cost of market forces. Are recycled goods being used or has the economy gone down and they do not want waste metal, they do not want waste aluminium? Likewise, the cost of sending for incineration. Yes, you can have a contract but again that has a risk factor depending on market forces.

1995

Deputy Green has just said ‘what is the cost to the individual?’. We hope what is suggested it may only double – it may only double – but hit everyone in Guernsey. And, yes, we all know that recycling waste disposal, no matter how you do it, is going to go up in price. But how do we contain it?

2000

The other point is legislation and pay as you go. We are going to bring legislation in so if you do not recycle we are going to find out and we are going to charge you. But how are you going to enforce that? I am not too sure.

2005

Unfortunately, what I have said I do not expect any answers whatsoever because there are no answers. (*Laughter*) There is no way of controlling the cost etc. You just try and contain it as much as possible. But it is a concern of mine and certainly when we go to Douzaine meetings in the Castel it is a concern of our Douzeniers. I would say a good number of them are totally against this because of that risk factor and I would like to see PSD trying to address it. Although, as I said at the meeting I did attend, I did not think it was possible for them to do any more than they have achieved in this report, as far as costings. But when you accept this Strategy please remember what you are accepting. You are accepting, no matter what the cost, it will be recycled. It does not matter how much it is going to cost us to recycle we are going to recycle. And it is the people of Guernsey who are going to have to pay for that decision you are about to make.

2010

Thank you, sir.

2015

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Trott, and then I have had an indication from Deputy Soulsby, Deputy O’Hara and then Deputy Hadley.

2020

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, listening to my friend Deputy Green and others in this Assembly talk about the concerns of their parishioners, imagine how we feel down in St Sampson’s because, if my understanding is correct, St Sampson’s has been singled out for some rather unpleasant individual treatment. My understanding is that *all* of the parishes which currently have one collection of black sack waste will have an additional collection for recyclates, paid for by PSD.

2025

Sir, St Peter Port – like St Sampson’s – has two collections paid by parishioners and St Peter Port will also have a third collection paid for by PSD. But St Sampson’s, which currently has two collections of general waste, will have one collection of general waste and one collection of recyclates, both paid for by the parishioners of St Sampson’s. So my question is this, sir: would the Minister of PSD understand and agree with me that it appears unfair to a large number of my constituents that they will be the only parishioners paying for the weekly collection of recyclates?

Sir, the PSD have been saying publicly that they – PSD – will fund the collection of recyclates. So can the Minister please give my constituents an undertaking that his Department will indeed honour that pledge and fund the collection of recyclates for *all* in our community?

Sir, I can help the Minister by telling him that I calculate the cost of that undertaking will be somewhere between £30,000 and £40,000 per annum, but I do believe it is important that this matter is resolved this afternoon, otherwise this Assembly might approve provisions that discriminate against many thousands of citizens who just so happen to be my constituents. (*Laughter*)

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

**Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, before launching in I would like to say that I will be speaking, firstly, on behalf of the Public Accounts Committee and then from a personal perspective.

The Committee has reviewed the report from the Public Services Department and there are a few observations regarding the content, in so far as it concerns financial management and value for money.

Firstly, the Committee welcomes the creation of a solid waste trading account that brings together the financial reporting for all waste trading management activities. If appropriately implemented this should increase transparency as well as assisting in maintaining effective financial control. You would expect these benefits to outweigh the implemental cost in terms of both administration and the additional work required by the States' auditors.

Secondly, whilst the cost of delivering the Strategy to 2016 now appears clearer, it is disappointing that despite the fact that it has been two years since the then States passed a Resolution to have PSD report back with full costings to, and I quote, 'give maximum effect to waste prevention and minimisation measures', several significant costs are still estimates.

Indeed, whilst the Department seeks to assure Members that it is confident costs will not exceed £29.5 million, the Committee is concerned that the estimates contain so many contingencies that the actual figures do not reflect realistic and achievable costings from a value for money perspective.

Thirdly, the Committee considers that the adoption of a charging mechanism to pay for ongoing costs, which incorporates both fixed and variable elements, will act as an incentive to ongoing waste reduction, prevent opting out and provide some certainty of income. However, getting the balance right will not be an easy task and the Committee will be interested in reviewing the States' report on this aspect when it is published.

Finally, it is evident to the Committee that the entire Strategy has many complex aspects to it. Aside from the construction of waste management facilities, a whole new set of processes needs to be implemented. There are therefore significant risks in undertaking this Strategy which need to be managed effectively. Effective project management is therefore critical for successful delivery of the Strategy which, apart from ensuring those with the necessary technical expertise are employed, means effective political oversight throughout the project life, both from PSD and Treasury and Resources.

Speaking personally, I think all the talk of how we deal with our waste is a distraction. Whether we should or should not have had an Energy from Waste plant, whether we should or should not export our waste, whether or not we should stick it all in a hole. That debate should finish. The biggest waste in all this is the waste of time and money from prolonged debate. We cannot afford that any longer.

We need to focus on the most important part of this Strategy – the part of the Strategy that will really save money and is something that we are all responsible for and that is waste minimisation. Each and every one of us has a responsibility to minimise household waste. This is not something we can delegate to Government. I think it is therefore important to have some focus on this aspect today.

Worldwide about a third of all food produced – equivalent to 1.3 billion tonnes – gets lost or wasted in the food production and consumption systems, according to data released by Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations. And locally we needlessly throw away thousands of tonnes of food a year. This is at a time when others world-wide, living in extreme poverty, are starving and back home some in our community are struggling to put food on the table, with food banks witnessing more demand than ever before. This is an appalling state of affairs. It has been calculated that wasting this food costs the average household in the UK £470 per year, rising to £700 for a family with children. Given the higher than average costs of groceries in Guernsey – evidenced in CICRA's recent report – it is likely to be even worse here.

Best before dates on everything have a lot to answer for. On a recent *Radio 4* programme a representative from Lee & Perrins said that if stored properly a bottle of their world famous Worcestershire sauce would never spoil and the only reason for a sell by date on it was because it was legally required. Well, I have to say I found that quite comforting when I looked at the bottle in my cupboard and found (*Laughter*) it has a best before date of March 2010. (*Laughter and interjections*) I would be delighted if we banned the printing of best before dates here, but appreciate this would not be practical for the supermarkets.

We therefore need to educate people of what they mean, to understand food. We need to increase awareness about the cost of food waste and educate people on how they can minimise what they throw

away. I support the Love Food Hate Waste campaign brought over from the UK and complemented by local initiatives, but bring it home to people here how it directly affects them.

On an associated point, I fully understand the reasons behind not wanting to impose charges or legislative requirements on businesses. However, it does concern me that under these proposals households will have to pay more for unnecessary packaging and, in particular, black plastic which cannot be recycled. As a Member of the Commerce and Employment Board, I therefore look forward to working with PSD and the commercial sector to develop workable voluntary initiatives. I would like to see the end of buy one get one free and similar multi buy offers on perishable goods here. Tesco have stopped this in the UK to tackle food waste and I would like to see pressure put on the local supermarkets to do likewise here.

Whilst I have focused on waste minimisation, I would just like to comment on a few matters relating to recycling. I fully endorse recommendations 19 and 20 that require event organisers to provide, where practical, recycling facilities as well as the phasing in of the requirement for States' entities when contracting with event organisers to ensure that recyclable or compostable food and drink containers are used at events on States-owned land.

Already, there are event organisers who do take the impact on the environment seriously, including Vale Earth Fair and other charitable organisations, in particular. I should, in fact, declare an interest as my business has been selling recyclable and compostable tableware for such events for several years. *(Laughter)* However, there is a long way to go, and I believe it is right that Government leads by example in this area.

As someone whose garage ends up looking like a full bring bank site at the end of the month, kerbside recycling cannot come soon enough for me. **(A Deputy: Hear, hear.)** I look forward to the trial starting in St Martins in March and hope it goes well. I am also pleased to see that small businesses will be allowed to participate in the scheme. However, I think the amount of recycling may become an issue for the collectors as just because a business is small it does not necessarily translate into small amounts of recycling. I will be interested to see the outcome.

There is still much to do but I support the Department in progressing the Strategy as set out in this report and encourage other Members to support its proposals.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy O'Hara.

**Deputy O'Hara:** Thank you, sir.

I thought that I really could not let this debate go on without talking about the Douzaines generally. As Members will know, I am the Chairman of the Douzaine Liaison Group and we discuss many subjects and of course this has been very high on the agenda.

I can say quite specifically that the Douzaine Liaison Group – where most members of the Douzaines were present – were particularly thankful of the efforts that the PSD Minister and officers gave in their many consultation presentations and, in particular, one particular day where they went out of their way and met the whole group and that group left the meeting feeling pretty satisfied as to what was in the report. Of course, there were one or two problems but nothing of any major problem. And I have been asked to – as I have just done it already – thank PSD for their efforts.

I believe that PSD have done a really good job here. They have produced consultation beyond belief. I compliment the Minister and his staff on that basis. It has been truly a really good consultation progress.

Personally, I have been involved with waste and the problems of getting rid of our waste, right back to the mid and late 90's with the great and late David Fisher, who was quite instrumental in the early days in trying to resolve and find a solution. Personally, I am glad that we are now at this stage, it looks like we have made real progress and I will be supporting this wholeheartedly.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Hadley, to be followed by Deputy Conder.

**Deputy Hadley:** Mr Deputy Bailiff, I share some of the reservations that Deputy Adam expressed when he spoke. I look forward to a day when this Assembly, and indeed the Island, have as much enthusiasm for the reduction in energy use and reducing our carbon footprint as they have for some aspects of recycling, and then we might make our small contribution to the reduction of global warming and extreme weather.

It certainly does not seem to me to be awfully sensible to pay a penny to have a milk carton shipped to England and then the continent when they make such excellent firelighters **(A Deputy: Hear, hear.)** *(Laughter)*

I am also moved to comment on Deputy Soulsby's speech. As the more knowledgeable Members of the Assembly will no doubt know, Lee & Perrins sauce was developed by a chemist in Worcester – which, unfortunately, is under water today. I knew the production manager very well and he assured me that the

only sensible thing with Lee & Perrins sauce is to buy it and stick it in the larder for 12 years before you open it. And indeed if she saw my Lee & Perrins sauce she would see it expired 15 years ago. (*Laughter*)

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Conder.

2155

**Deputy Conder:** Thank you, sir, fellow States Members.

I would like to add my voice to those of so many colleagues who have congratulated the Minister and his team on an excellent report and what I believe is truly epoch-making, in terms of the way this Island will address its waste strategy in the future, and I think they deserve our and the Island as a whole's appreciation.

2160

Sir, my observations are in the form of questions to the Minister which I would just be grateful to him if he could address in his summing up. Indeed, he has already addressed them with us through the meetings his Department and he arranged for States Members but I think it would be worthwhile putting them on the record in his reply if he would not mind.

2165

Sir, first of all in terms of kerbside collection, I am sure many colleagues who have experienced kerbside collection in the United Kingdom are familiar with the enormous bins of a variety of sizes and colours and shapes that are left out on the roads, probably for 24 hours, push children who are going to school off the pavement into the road and elderly people as well. I know there is no intention in the current programme to impose such abominations upon this Island and indeed the Minister has addressed that, but I would be very grateful if he would just reassure us in his summing up. Because they are a real problem and I think small country towns in the United Kingdom started off perhaps in the way that way we intended to and very quickly moved to those unsightly and inefficient bins for recycling.

2170

Secondly, under Proposition 15, again reflecting on the United Kingdom experience, I know particularly for some elderly constituents and, I have to say, my own dad in the UK, the idea of a fixed penalty scheme to enforce statutory requirements as detailed in Proposition 15 really is very worrying... to, in particular, some of our elderly citizens. They do not wish to feel that they are going to be in trouble and going to be fined if they breach the regulations and there have been well recorded examples of draconian attitudes again in the United Kingdom experience which is the only one I can refer to. Perhaps again the Minister would be kind enough to give us some reassurance for those people listening as I know he has already said in the meetings he had with us, that a light touch will be used in imposing Proposition 15.

2175

2180

Finally, sir, I think all of us recognise the value of bring banks and again if the Minister could reassure us that they will continue to be a key and integral part of our Waste Strategy and will not be – as I know some are worried – progressively phased out. I think that would give reassurance to many of our Islanders.

So, in conclusion, sir, congratulations to the Minister and his excellent team. As I said at the beginning of my few words, I think this is epoch-making. I think history will show that this Island will owe a debt of gratitude to this PSD team. I congratulate them and urge colleagues to vote in favour of all Propositions.

2185

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Laurie Queripel.

2190

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Thank you, sir.

First, I rise just to address something that Deputy Green and Deputy Gollop touched on – the relationship between PSD and the Douzaines.

PSD, sir, did not get the parishes together. The parishes approached PSD, reasoning that they had been involved in refuse collection for many years, had good professional relationships with local contractors and it would make eminent sense to utilise that, and PSD eventually agreed and the partnership was formed.

2195

If that partnership had not been formed and if the work had been centralised, sir, we would have faced the spectre of perhaps a half a dozen local businesses being put out of business and perhaps 20 or 30 people being made unemployed. So I think that was the right move to make.

2200

Sir, I stand as a disappointed Member of this Assembly this afternoon, because on this occasion this Assembly did not believe in debate, did not allow an amendment that would introduced a legitimate element of cost control in regard to recycling, a States' authorised mechanism that PSD could activate that would allow them to compare costs with targets, with this Assembly's blessing, and I am disappointed about that, sir. (*Interjection and laughter*)

2205

Sir, at the question time at the Vale Douzaine Room a few weeks ago there was a mention – more accurately, it was sort of a headline comment really – of a disconnect between Government and the people – that Government sits on a lofty perch making decisions that have all sorts of consequences, costs or otherwise for the public, that idealism and high level strategy and thinking seems to trump pragmatism, that practical considerations and solutions are put to one side. I am not saying that is reality, sir, but it is a perception and that perception will only be strengthened if control of costs is not a factor in this Strategy.

2210

I would just like to ask the Minister, sir, once the interim kerbside recycling scheme is completed, and if kerbside becomes a permanent element of the Strategy, how will the cost of the recycling bags be controlled? In other words, if PSD need more revenue to support the Strategy, can they simply increase the price of the bags as they please? I just wonder if the Minister could answer that question, sir.

I have spoken with pensioners and people on low and fixed incomes, had many conversations of that type over the last few weeks, and it may be inconceivable to us, sir, but even a doubling – and perhaps it could be trebling – of some people's refuse bills will represent or present a major financial problem. That is how minuscule their – and it might be an unfortunate term in this context, but how minimal their – disposable incomes are.

Sir, I acknowledge the noble intent of this Strategy but I and some members of the public fear its price tag.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, there being no further debate, I will turn to the Minister of the Department to reply to the debate.

Deputy Luxon.

**Deputy Luxon:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff, and thanks to all Members for their contributions, especially to those Members who have been able to support wholeheartedly the entire 21 Propositions. I will try and deal with the questions and points that were raised, if I may.

I think Deputy Duquemin did a very good job in explaining how the whole Waste Strategy is an interlocking series of work streams and indeed how partnerships, not just with the Douzaines but with other stakeholders, is going to be key.

I would make the point – and I will come back to it later – about when we talk about the value for money. It is PSD's absolute intent – and we clarify it in the report and in fact the T&R Minister's letter of comment on behalf of his Board makes it clear – that the delegated authority that Treasury and Resources will use, subject to this report being approved, will mean that PSD will go back to T&R with very detailed business cases on each of the elements of expenditure. So Members can be appeased that approving this report still puts us under scrutiny to deliver good value.

Sir, Deputy Burford said we can do much better and, of course, we can do and the point is that 63,000 people generate the waste, and 63,000 of us will be part of the solution. Many Members have expressed ways in which the costs can be decreased and the increased costs of moving to a more sustainable and appropriate waste management system can be mitigated if we all do more to manage the amount of waste that we allow to generate through our own activities.

I thank Deputy Rob Jones who gave a really good sketch through the complexity of the legislation changes, which again are set out in the report very well, I think.

Deputy Gollop talked about many things and I think if I could give an example – I think he was very supportive – (*Laughter*) he talked about built-up areas in town and it is fair to say that every environment does have this problem of built-up areas within town areas. Nobody has got the absolute proper answer to the problems but we have been to see how different councils and boroughs in the UK deal with it. We obviously have specific problems within St Peter Port and with multi-occupancy residences, and that is part of the learning, of the process that we will take forward. We are not intimidated by those challenges and there are practices that we have seen that can work to help, but we have got to get into that detail.

Deputy Gollop also made the point that many of those people living in flats in town probably are very low users in terms of recycling, low buying. What that does is that indicates to us that there are very high opportunities for increasing the recycling rate because there are a significant amount of our population who currently do not engage in recycling. All of that will help with final cost.

He also talked about the difficulties for those who are disabled and perhaps people on lower incomes, and, yes, of course, those are issues that we will need to consider.

Deputy Lester Queripel asked three questions – or two questions, one with two parts, which might be four questions. The trial for two years – how would we evaluate it? It is not a trial, it is an interim scheme. It will apply for the next two years and then it will move into a full scheme. It is an intrinsic part of the Waste Strategy and goes forward. The reason that we call it an interim scheme is that we obviously need to learn from it to make sure that over the next two years before we get into full implementation of the entire Waste Strategy any learning that we can take from it that we will have learnt. So it is not a trial for two years, it is an interim scheme which leads into the full scheme into the future.

In terms of Mont Cuet, he asked about hazardous waste and small incinerators. Well, at the Hospital there is a small incinerator that deals with the Hospital toxic waste and that will carry on. The intention, as laid out in the report, is that Mont Cuet will still be used. Protected cells in small areas of Mont Cuet will be used for hazardous waste such as asbestos. That is the intention of the Department and, in terms of how

long could that last, we believe that those protected cell opportunities would last up to 50 years or so and, yes, of course they would be monitored regularly because they will be being managed regularly.

2275 Deputy De Lisle – I thank him. He did make the point about the issue about water on our Island which, of course, is a well-made point. Also I would reiterate again within the report and in my opening speech I talked about the communication plan. There is an awful lot of communication information we have got to convey to members of the community, both through this two-year phase and then into the full implementation for 2016, and we have a very detailed commitment to communicating those plans and getting buy-in in behavioural change where we can.

2280 Deputy Storey, I think gave me rousing support, although it is not always easy to tell from Deputy Storey, but nevertheless I thank him. Yes, we dismissed the Jersey plant buy-in for all the reasons he explained and again in the report I think we make it clear that we did look at it as directed.

2285 Charge for both bags and, indeed, the bring banks – yes, there will be a charge for both bags. When we come back with a States' report by the end of this year – by December – it is at that point that we will need to be very clear about what the charges will be for householders, and we will be very clear about the differential between the charge for the residual waste bag, the general rubbish bag and, indeed, the recycling bag, and we will talk about a fixed charge. So those details will come back in a States' report by the end of this year.

He also mentioned about flats and the relatively small space. It is a very fair point but, of course, all of the waste that is generated is brought into each household. So householders are doing the shopping, they are bringing goods back so they find space to store the goods with the packaging around them. Yes, it may well be that there is going to be some changed management rather than just dump it all into a black bag, but we know that many people living in small flats now are avid recyclers and they are managing. So, what we would say is there is going to be some behavioural change. There is going to be some learning and my Department's staff recognise that they are going to be needing to help with information leaflets and the like.

2295 Glass is not excluded. It is fair to say that glass in the interim scheme will not be part of all the rounds. We are very keen that we want to see glass included in the scheme. The only reason for any reticence about it – and you will have heard me say before – is the risk of glass contaminating the other recyclates so – paper and cardboard – means that we could get a less good price when we actually sell for processing. So to actually collect glass but then achieve lower income on our recyclates would not make sense. We are determined to trial glass collection during this interim scheme. It is one of the big learnings that we hope to find and, of course, I hope we will be successful in having glass permanently into the rounds beyond that.

2300 Also mentioned about bringing back to the States, we will – through the delegated authority T&R will have – have to deliver absolute business cases through the gateway processes that T&R have described and for each of the business cases, for each of the investments that we wish to make. And, as I say, we will bring back a very detailed charging report to the States when again we can look at those costings.

2305 I reiterate that point, in terms of what Deputy Green asked for. He also talked about affordability and, yes, those increased costs to householders. We have all recognised that many Members have done a very good job in seeing that our previous very basic landfill has been relatively inexpensive. What we are moving to is an integrated solution for waste management into the future which will be sustainable and that is going to cost more money.

2310 Whenever you look at an increased cost you need to look at the quantum of the increase as well as the percentage increase and, as we said in the 2012 report and as I have said through the briefings last year, it is fair to say that on average we estimate that the cost of an average householder at about £108 will double – therefore just over £200 – and within the 2012 report it talked about that kind of area of increase. What we say in this report is that all of costing, all of our modelling, even the capital expenditure of the £29.5 million, topside, still we are comfortable that we will hit within that level. Yes, it is more than it has been but we will be dealing with our waste in a sustainable way and, frankly, landfill simply was not an option, as we heard earlier on today when we debated the sursis.

2320 Deputy Adam, I think, asked several questions then said there was no point in me trying to answer them because there was no answer. So I will take his very sage advice (*Laughter*) but what I would say is PSD does not have an open cheque outlook in terms of the costs. It is fair to say my Department looked at the whole costing assumptions back last year when we brought to Members the reality that capital expenditure had increased from the indicative costs in the 2012 report. That forced us to sit and challenge very hard. I am very comfortable, on behalf of my Board and the team, that we believe that the capital prioritisation – the £29 million estimate – really is very much an upside and we believe that we will deliver the implementation of this over the next two years through the T&R scrutiny process, which is absolutely right, at values much lower than that.

2330 We have built in contingencies. The Guernsey uplift and optimism bias that was not applied sufficiently in the 2012 report has been done. And there is a 10% contingency on the estimated export costs and we believe we have been very robust to make sure that Members can have a very good idea about what the costs will be.

Deputy Trott – well, I think this was a narrow single issue speech that Deputy Trott gave. What I will do is compliment St Sampson's. It was actually St Sampson's bin man or waste contractor who brought the challenge to PSD. Deputy Queripel said that PSD did not go to the Douzaines, the Douzaines came to PSD. It does not really matter which way round it was, but I do remember the dialogue in consultation with the Douzaines going on way before my involvement and throughout my involvement. But, nevertheless, at a meeting with the contractors he did challenge us that he could deliver the kerbside recycling on behalf of his parish and in conjunction with the Douzaine for no extra cost, and it was that – going back to Deputy Green's point – that made us very comfortable because we thought if the parishes, the Douzaines and their contractors were able to partner with us on delivering kerbside recycling at such a low cost – i.e. not very much at all or none – then, of course, we should look at that very seriously.

Deputy Trott mentioned that he thought it was unfair. Well, PSD have met with the St Sampson's Constables and members of the Douzaine when an issue was raised. We had agreed an arrangement with them that they were very happy with, that they had requested, and we had given an undertaking that we would be there to support them if there was an issue in terms of the costing proposals. So all I would say to him is I believe we have already done what it was that he wants us to do and we will continue to work with St Sampson's Douzaine as we will with the other nine.

Deputy Soulsby (*Interjection*), on behalf of PAC and herself –

**Deputy Trott:** A point of clarification, if I may, sir?

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

**Deputy Trott:** Thank you.

The Minister may be correct. He may have already answered the question but I am not sure I grasped it. Is he confirming that St Sampson's will, in fact, be the only parish that ends up paying for the collection of its recyclates? I am not interested in apportioning blame, I would just like an undertaking that or confirmation that is, indeed, the case and a further undertaking that he will attempt to remedy that situation if that is, in fact, the case.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

**Deputy Luxon:** What I am confirming is that PSD and St Sampson's – the Constables – have agreed the arrangements for the interim system that we are operating over the next two years and PSD has agreed to underwrite the difference of the cost if St Sampson's is not able to deliver that themselves through charging to their parishioners. You sit two seats away from one of the St Sampson's Constables –

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon, it is not a direct conversation between you and Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Luxon:** I apologise, sir. My apologies.

So the answer is we believe that we have supported St Sampson's with the cost of the interim kerbside recycling scheme.

**Deputy Trott:** I am sorry, sir, but I did not get the answer.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Trott, on what basis are you standing?

**Deputy Trott:** Further clarification, sir, because the question was not answered.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Further point of clarification from Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** My apologies for my enthusiasm, sir. (*Laughter*) Will the parishioners of St Sampson's be paying more than other parishioners for the collection of their recyclates? Yes or no?

**Deputy Luxon:** I do not believe so, sir.

**Deputy Trott:** Then that was the answer I was hoping for. Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

**Deputy Luxon:** Deputy O'Hara talked about the Douzaine Liaison Group and, yes, we have tried to work with the Douzaines throughout and we will continue to do so.



I also missed earlier a point: did I feel that we had acceded to political expedience by going with the arrangement that we have? The answer is, no, the parishes were very clear that they felt their involvement would add real value, they had the expertise and knowledge with their contractors and that they believed they would be able to deliver the kerbside scheme at a lower price than a centralised scheme. We analysed that and we believe that there is no additional on cost – or if there is, marginal – in terms of us going with that option.

I totally accept Deputy Hadley's point. We need to do more in terms of energy reduction and, indeed, without carbon footprint responsibilities.

Deputy Conder asked about kerbside bins. The proliferation of bins throughout the UK is an ugly eyesore which many people do not like and, no, that is not the intention. We are not talking about issuing bins, that is why we are using bags that can be disposed of in the way that we do currently.

Yes, it would be a light touch in terms of the legislation. Many people think that we should have made things mandatory, that we should actually have gone with a tougher approach. What we have said in the legislation aspect of the report is that if we see that there is dysfunctional reaction to any parts of the Strategy as it rolls out then we will come back and look to toughen up the legislation. But, no, it will be applied in a light touch way using the Douzaines in terms of their responsibilities.

In terms of the bring banks, the bring banks will be reviewed. It is very clear that as part of the Waste Strategy we want to review the bring banks. Does that mean we will reduce some of the bring banks? Yes, it might do. Might we actually go with fewer but bigger super sites? But what we are not going to do is we are not going to do anything that is going to affect the recycling levels – so take away the bring banks, introduce kerbside recycling and not then achieve the increased rate would not be sensible. So we will be looking at that very carefully. But, of course, it is also about value for money. Many Members have talked about the need to reduce the increased cost as much as possible to impact as little on the householders' extra charges as possible. Operating bring banks added kerbside recycling scheme is not the ideal, so we need a balance and it will be reviewed as we go through.

Deputy Laurie Queripel made a point about the Douzaines which I think I have answered. At no time did we believe half a dozen businesses would be likely to be put out of business. The whole idea back at that stage of the process was that we would be engaging with and hoping that they would have perhaps tendered for being involved as part of the kerbside recycling. But, nevertheless, we accept it could have been an outcome.

What will happen in terms of after the interim, in terms of the cost of bags to recover costs? Well, the report is very clear that what we are saying is the new Waste Strategy, whatever costs are to deliver that Waste Strategy that that needs to be covered by the income from the different charging mechanisms. The Waste Strategy will not be a draw on general revenue going forward, so it does need to be a net income versus the charges. So, in terms of the cost of the bags, when we come back by December with the final charging we will be able to clarify this, but between the parish charge of the collection cost – which will need to continue but at a lower rate – we talk about a fixed charge to make sure there is a certain level of income and then a higher cost for the black bag, a lower cost for the recyclable bag. It is a combination, it is a formula and that is what the Department is doing some modelling on and the costs will be the costs and they will come back as proposals in December.

Deputy Queripel also often talks – or has talked the last couple of weeks – about trebling of costs – doubling or trebling. Well, trebling is a lot more than doubling. On average the modelling that we have looked at does say that from the current low benign rates of dealing with waste through landfill at circa £108 for the average household across our 26,100 householders, that that would double to around about just over £200. If you look at the range of options within our report, in terms of the export costs and the assumptions we make, we believe that the costs to householders will stay within that range as indicated back in 2012.

Sir, I think I have dealt with all of the questions. I thank all Members for their cont... – I am happy to give way, sir.

**Deputy Storey:** A point of clarification, sir –

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of clarification.

**Deputy Storey:** – if I may.

I did ask the Minister the question of whether or not he would be in a position to increase the capacity of the bin bags if, as a result of the charges, the incentive was for people to avoid charges for their recyclates being collected and actually deliver them to the bring banks. If he could answer that as well. And there is another point of information, sir. I thought I did say in my speech that I was fully supportive of the proposals in his report, it is just that I have one or two questions that I thought needed clarification.

Thank you, sir.

2455       **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon are you able to assist Deputy Storey on that point?

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

2460       Yes, if the cost of recyclable bags is too high then that could trigger people to decide to use the bring banks more. That is the point I was just trying to make now – it is the balance. What my Department is doing at the moment is trying to get that, work through the modelling and the balance of what the right charges should be. Behaviour so far tells us that the high degree of recycling buy-in from half the members of the community has been excellent. It is the other half that we need to try to encourage. So it is a balance between the two.

2465       Sir, I commend the report and indeed the 21 Propositions. This is – as Deputy Duquemin made the point earlier – a Waste Strategy that has interlocking work streams and my Department is committed to now driving through over the next two years. We have said by the end of the first quarter of 2016 we would hope that the entire Waste Strategy implementation is fully in place and we have a lot to do between now and then.

2470       Again I am sorry that we were not able to bring the report in December, but the report is now a fuller report and I think Members will appreciate the increased detail of costings which we have tried to put in there. Sir, I ask Members to support the report.

          Thank you, sir.

2475       **The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, there are 21 Propositions. You will find them at pages 309 to 311 inclusive. Unless anyone requests any Propositions to be put separately, I was going to put them to you as a whole. In that case, all those in favour; all those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

2480       **The Deputy Bailiff:** I declare all 21 Propositions carried.

          That concludes the business of the January meeting, Members of the States.

2485       In the light of your overwhelming support for the latest version of the Waste Strategy and its implementation, can I encourage you to take away with you everything you have brought into the Chamber today, so that you re-use it or recycle it or indeed dispose of it as you see fit? *(Laughter)* Thank you all very much.

*The Assembly adjourned at 4.12 p.m.*