



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Wednesday, 30th April 2014

*All published Official Reports can be found on the
official States of Guernsey website www.gov.gg*

Volume 3, No. 9

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

Richard J. Collas, Esq., Bailiff and Presiding Officer

Law Officers

H. E. Roberts Esq., Q.C. (H.M. Procureur)

People's Deputies

St. Peter Port South

Deputies P. A. Harwood, J. Kuttelwascher, B. L. Brehaut,
R. Domaille, 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, E. G. Bebb, L. C. Queripel

St. Sampson

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

The Vale

Deputies M. J. Fallaize, D. B. Jones, L. B. Queripel,
A. R. Le Lièvre, A. Spruce, 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

Deputies R. A. Perrot, A. H. Brouard, 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,
F. W. Quin, M. P. J. Hadley

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representatives L. E. Jean and R. N. Harvey

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

S. M. D. Ross, Esq. (H. M. Senior Deputy Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

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

Deputy M. M. Lowe, (*relevée à 12h 14*)

Deputy M. G. O'Hara, (*absent de l'île*)

Business transacted

Evocation.....	427
Convocation.....	427
Questions for Oral Answer	427
Members' Pay – Government and independent reviews	427
Guernsey Airport Pavements and Rehabilitation Project – Expenditure and environmental impact...	428
Billet d'État IX.....	431
I. The Plant Health (Enabling Provisions) (Guernsey) Law, 2014 – approved	431
II. The States Trading Companies (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2014 – approved	432
III. The Income Tax (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2014 – approved	432
IV. The Electronic Transactions (Obligation to use Electronic Form) (Guernsey) Ordinance, 2014 – approved	433
V. The Severe Disability Benefit and Carer's Allowance (Guernsey) Law, 2013 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2014 – approved.....	433
The Motor Taxation and Licensing (Fees) (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2014; The Liquor Licensing (Fees) Regulations, 2014	434
Billet d'État XI.....	434
I. Scrutiny Committee – Election of a new Member – Debate commenced.....	434
II. States' Assembly and Constitution Committee – Election of new Member – Deputy Harwood elected.....	436
Billet d'État IX.....	437
VI. Guernsey Integrated On-Island Transport Strategy – Debate commenced.....	437
Billet d'État XI.....	439
I. Scrutiny Committee – Election of a new Member – Vote results – Deputy Wilkie elected	439
Billet d'État IX.....	439
VI. Guernsey Integrated On-Island Transport Strategy – Debate continued	439
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.27 p.m. and resumed at 2.30 p.m.</i>	<i>465</i>
Billet d'État IX.....	466
VI. Guernsey Integrated On-Island Transport Strategy – Debate continued	466

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Greffier

EVOCATION

CONVOCATION

The Deputy Greffier: Billet d'État IX. To the Members of the States of the Island of Guernsey, I hereby give notice that a meeting of the States of Deliberation will be held at the Royal Court House on Wednesday, 30th April 2014 at 9.30 a.m. to consider the items contained in this Billet d'État which has been submitted for debate.

5 I also give notice that, pursuant to Rule 1(3)(b) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation, Billet d'État XI is also convened.

Questions for Oral Answer

Members' Pay –

Government and independent reviews

The Bailiff: Members of the States of Deliberation, good morning to you all. Those who wish to do so may remove their jackets.

10 We go straight into Question Time and the first question is to be asked by Deputy Gollop of the Chief Minister. Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I am already up, thank you, sir.

15 My Question is, in view of the issues and embarrassment surrounding the annual uprating of Members' pay this term, and the various anomalies of the current system, will the Policy Council be commissioning a review of Members' pay in good time for the next States and start preparations now for an independent Members' pay review, conducted by corporate public sector and human resources job evaluation professionals, as soon as possible?

20 **The Bailiff:** The Chief Minister will reply. Deputy Le Tocq.

The Chief Minister (Deputy Le Tocq): Mr Bailiff, I should like to thank Deputy Gollop for his question regarding States Members' pay. My response to this will be short and I trust to the point.

25 Deputy Gollop may recall that on 28th February 2008 the States resolved that the remuneration of States Members and non-States Members of Departments, Committees and non-governmental bodies be subject to independent review prior to the 2012 General Election.

Following the establishment of an independent review board in February 2011, in January 2012 the States considered the findings and recommendations of the independent review board and, amongst other things, reached the following decisions and I quote:

'That the basic remuneration and expenses allowance paid to States Members and non-States Members of Departments and Committees, with effect from 1st May 2012, shall remain in force until 30th April 2016... subject to annual review and adjustment in accordance with changes in [Guernsey medium earnings]...'

30 – and –

‘To direct the Policy Council to set up an independent review of the remuneration and expenses allowance to be paid to States Members and non-States Members of Departments and Committees, which shall report [back] in advance of the 2016 General Election.’

Deputy Gollop will be pleased to learn that the Policy Council will be working towards making the necessary arrangements for such an independent review and that this will be completed in good time to enable it to report back to the States before May 2016.

I trust this will address Deputy Gollop’s concerns about how Members’ pay is dealt with in the future.

35

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you, sir, but I have perhaps two brief supplementaries arising out of that.

40 The first is, bearing in mind the assurances the Chief Minister has just given, will the Policy Council attempt to ensure that such a review is put before this House prior to 2016 – in other words during the year of 2015?

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

45 **The Chief Minister:** I think we will do our utmost to ensure that this Assembly has the opportunity in advance to discuss all its concerns with regards to that review and the recommendations of such a review.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

50 **Deputy Gollop:** My second question is: will the Policy Council give serious consideration to putting upon that panel, or system of pay review, people whose particular expertise are in evaluating public sector and parliamentary salaries?

The Bailiff: Chief Minister.

55

The Chief Minister: Sir, we will almost certainly do so.

The Bailiff: Deputy Bebb.

60 **Deputy Bebb:** Thank you, *Monsieur le Bailli*.

Is it possible to ask whether consideration will be given by the Policy Council for maybe asking IPSA who have the competencies in order to understand various difficulties of setting remuneration and to request whether they would be willing to come here and actually evaluate the role against pay?

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

The Chief Minister: I cannot give full assurance, but we will take all things into consideration and that has been noted.

70 **The Bailiff:** Any further supplementaries? No.

We move on to the next question which is to be asked by Deputy de Lisle of the Minister for the Public Services Department.

Guernsey Airport Pavements and Rehabilitation Project – Expenditure and environmental impact

Deputy de Lisle: Thank you, sir.

75 I would like to ask the Minister of Public Services – that is Deputy Paul Luxon – four questions concerning the Guernsey Airport Pavements and Rehabilitation Project, with reference to expenditure and efforts to offset the project’s environmental impact.

The first question is what has been the capital expenditure to date of the Guernsey Airport Pavements and Rehabilitation Project?

80 **The Bailiff:** The Minister for the Public Services Department, Deputy Luxon, will reply.

Deputy Luxon: Mr Bailiff.

Thanks to Deputy David de Lisle for the questions. In answer, the 2013 accounts will detail that up until the end of December the total expenditure to date has been £64.5 million, rounded to the nearest £½ million.

85

The Bailiff: Your supplementary or second question, please, Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: The second question is what estimated further expenditure is required to complete the project, and is the project likely to be completed within budget?

90

The Bailiff: Deputy Luxon.

Deputy Luxon: Mr Bailiff, to answer this important question, we fully expect the project to be completed within the budget of £80.4 million that was agreed by the States. There are still various items for which either payment is outstanding or the work has yet to be completed and, therefore, payment is not yet due.

95

There is also the matter of retention payments to Lagan Construction which are not due until contract completion. Many of these items are contractual matters and may be commercially sensitive. Therefore, to publish the current estimate in itself, may be of interest but not particularly informative as it is still subject to fluctuation.

100

Nevertheless, full details of the final expenditure will be published following project completion.

The Bailiff: Any supplementary questions?

105

Deputy de Lisle: Can I ask a supplementary on that, sir?

The Bailiff: Yes.

110

Deputy de Lisle: Do we know when the project completion is likely and final payments will be paid out to Lagan Construction?

The Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy de Lisle. Deputy Luxon will reply.

115

Deputy Luxon: Sir, because of the wet weather delay over the winter, we still are not completely certain of the exact completion date, but we estimate it should be July or August this year. There are still works outstanding, but we do expect to be able to publish the final accounts not long after that.

The Bailiff: The third question, please, Deputy de Lisle.

120

Deputy de Lisle: What mitigation measures are planned to offset the environmental impact of the project in areas such as noise, pollution and safety due to lower flying aircraft over buildings and major roads in the west, the re-siting of approach lights and the loss of wetland habitat, farmland, fields and earth banks?

125

The Bailiff: Deputy Luxon.

Deputy Luxon: Mr Bailiff, a full environmental statement was submitted as part of the planning application for these works.

130

This set out in detail the comprehensive impact assessment carried out and any proposed mitigation measures. The project team has, throughout the works, been working closely with the Environment Department to ensure all of the conditions of the planning approval arising from this are adequately discharged.

135

By way of example, the project has very successfully restored an area of salt marsh at the L'Éree Nature Reserve to offset the loss of marshy grassland in what is now the western runway and safety area. This work has been highly praised by the Société Guernesaise which manages the nature reserve and in a very short time has re-established the habitat that is now very rare in the Island.

140

We are also in discussion with the Environment Department on a scheme to restore grazing land elsewhere in the Island. This will offset the loss of the former fields at the west of the airfield. The careful planning and preparation of the construction compounds during the works, has ensured that very soon these sites too will be restored to their previous agricultural use.

One point I have to address specifically is where Deputy de Lisle refers to impact on safety of aircraft flying low over properties. Aviation and air travel internationally has one of the most stringent safety regimes, if not the most stringent, of any industry of activity in the world. Guernsey Airport rigorously applies these standards at all times and to suggest that any change to flight patterns has in any way compromised safety is simply wrong and baseless.

The Bailiff: Are there any supplementary questions arising from that answer? Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: A supplementary question, sir. With regard to the mitigation measures, I would like to ask: will the budget of £150,000 be sufficient for those works that have been mentioned?

The Bailiff: Deputy Luxon.

Deputy Luxon: I do not have that immediately to hand, but I believe I can confirm that it will be within that budget. I am very happy to supply Deputy de Lisle with the detail on that subsequent to this meeting, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy de Lisle: I thank the Minister for that, sir.

The Bailiff: The next question.

Deputy de Lisle: The final question, 4.

The risk of flooding was considered negligible in the environmental statement, but recent serious flooding has been a concern on and bordering the RESA and along the streams flowing from the airport property. What additional response and resources are planned to mitigate flooding and are the associated costs within the original budget?

The Bailiff: Deputy Luxon.

Deputy Luxon: Mr Bailiff, the new drainage system is designed to manage rainfall with no flooding up to a one in 30 year event. By way of context, last winter was the wettest since 1877. The airport was not the only area of the Island affected by this rare extreme weather, which saw the rate that water flowed into and around the airfield exceed the design assumptions for the new system.

Nevertheless, the experience gained from this rare event has enabled significant improvements to be made to the original design. For example, a device is being installed currently to limit the water flowing into the western end of the airfield from the Beauvalet stream. This is the main water course that entered the airfield from the south, passing beneath the runway and eventually discharging from the site to the north, at the place often referred to as 'Lover's Leap'. Some of this water, and at times all of this water, is required to feed the Padins stream which rises within the new RESA area. Restricting this flow between the two will significantly reduce the risk of the recent flooding being repeated.

Other measures on the northern perimeter of the airfield are planned to further protect adjoining properties that were at risk from over ground water flow this winter.

The cost of all these works will be met within the project budget. I am also pleased to advise that despite this winter's extreme weather, the performance of the drainage to all the paved areas at the airfield was excellent and all areas remained fully operationally throughout.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle, do you have a supplementary question?

Deputy de Lisle: I do not have a supplementary on that, sir. I am pleased that the drainage works are being looked at in the detail that I note from the Minister. I would like to thank Deputy Luxon for the answers that he has given.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, this relates to the cost of the project but not specifically to the cost of the pavements. Am I permitted to ask that question?

The Bailiff: Well, it does not arise from the last answer given, so strictly not, Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Queripel: Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: I see no-one else rising so we will move on swiftly to legislation.

Billet d'État IX

PROJET DE LOI

I. The Plant Health (Enabling Provisions) (Guernsey) Law, 2014 – approved

Article I.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Projet de Loi entitled 'The Plant Health (Enabling Provisions) (Guernsey) Law, 2014', and to authorise the Bailiff to present a most humble petition to Her Majesty in Council praying for Her Royal Sanction thereto.

205 **The Deputy Greffier:** Billet d'État IX, Article 1: The Plant Health (Enabling Provisions) (Guernsey) Law, 2014.

The Bailiff: This is at pages 1 to 18 of the brochure. Is there any request for any debate or clarification?
Deputy Gollop.

210

Deputy Gollop: Yes, we saw it at Legislation Committee and it was absolutely fine in a technical sense, but it did appear to contain within it draconian powers to prevent small amateur or part-time professional growers sending seeds etc. in certain situations.

215

I would just like to make a plea that the legislation, which is clearly designed for an emergency situation, is utilised in a reasonable Guernsey kind of way rather than in a strict way, because of course it would undermine much of what we are achieving with Floral Guernsey, the horticultural and market and gardening side and the hedge veg, if interpreted in a very strict bureaucratic kind of way.

So I do not know if the Minister for Commerce and Employment or his team have any point on that, but it did arise in discussion.

220

The Bailiff: Well, I think we have some... Deputy Dave Jones – we will hear from him next.

225

Deputy Dave Jones: Yes, sir, a question that was raised at the Douzaine on Monday night was: why we are being asked to inscribe more restrictions on plants and organic produce when we fail to enforce the current laws that we have on things like Japanese knot weed and other things that are supposed to be controlled? There does not seem to be any powers whatsoever from the Parish Constables – and we have got several in here who have served in that role who might be able to help, as to what they can do to enforce some of the present laws – and yet here we are being asked to pass a whole raft of new legislation, bringing in new restrictions, when we do not enforce the ones we already have.

230

The Bailiff: Does anyone else wish to raise any matters on this legislation before the Minister of the Commerce and Employment replies?
Deputy Stewart.

235

Deputy Stewart: Thank you, sir.

Certainly none of those alarm bells rang around the Board of Commerce and Employment. What I would say, is that the officers that deal with plant health do deal on a one-to-one basis with members of the public. I am often at Raymond Falla House seeing people bringing in plants in various states of distress. The officers work with them and I think we have an extremely good relationship, particularly with the growers in the Island.

240

In terms of Deputy Jones, I think what this is, is tidying up. If you look at the repeals on page 16 there are quite a lot of ordinances which are going to be repealed. This is updating the legislation, bringing it for purpose and I am absolutely confident that we will not be dealing with this in a draconian way. But I am happy to answer questions or ask our officers at Plant Health to contact Deputy Gollop if he has any further questions or concerns.

245

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: We go then to the vote on The Plant Health (Enabling Provisions) (Guernsey) Law, 2014. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.

ORDINANCES

II. The States Trading Companies (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2014 – approved

Article II.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled ‘The States Trading Companies (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2014’, and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

The Deputy Greffier: Article II. The States Trading Companies (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2014.

The Bailiff: Is there any debate? No.

We go straight to the vote then. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.

III. The Income Tax (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2014 – approved

Article III.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled ‘The Income Tax (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2014’, and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

The Deputy Greffier: Article III. The Income Tax (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2014.

The Bailiff: The Minister of the Treasury and Resources Department, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, I was not proposing to go into detail but it was just to remind Members that this piece of legislation is effectively the annual tidying up of some technical changes. Clearly if there are any particular issues I will respond to those in debate.

The Bailiff: I see no-one rising to debate them so we go straight to the vote on The Income Tax (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2014. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.

**IV. The Electronic Transactions (Obligation to use Electronic Form)
(Guernsey) Ordinance, 2014 – approved**

Article IV.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled ‘The Electronic Transactions (Obligation to use Electronic Form) (Guernsey) Ordinance, 2014’, and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

The Deputy Greffier: Article IV. The Electronic Transactions (Obligation to use Electronic Form) (Guernsey) Ordinance, 2014

280

The Bailiff: Any requests for debate or clarification? No. We go to the vote then. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

285

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.

**V. The Severe Disability Benefit and Carer’s Allowance (Guernsey) Law, 2013
(Commencement) Ordinance, 2014 – approved**

Article V.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled ‘The Severe Disability Benefit and Carer’s Allowance (Guernsey) Law, 2013 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2014’, and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

The Deputy Greffier: Article V. The Severe Disability Benefit and Carer’s Allowance (Guernsey) Law, 2013 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2014.

290

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

295

Deputy Gollop: Yes, sir, as a person interested in welfare and disability issues and as the Island’s Disabled People’s Champion, I entirely welcome this improvement in Social Security legislation, whereby the old fashioned expressions, I think, of ‘Invalid Care’ and ‘Attendance Allowance’ are replaced with something I think more relevant and more able to be defined eventually as well: ‘Severe Disability and Carer’s Allowance’ and, indeed, I think you will see this is part of a range of measures being done that will improve legislation and clarify the situation and, hopefully, enable genuine claimants to take full advantage of their entitlements. We know the team at Social Security are very good at promoting these benefits and I think we as the States should thoroughly approve of this trend.

300

The Bailiff: Any further debate? Minister, do you wish to reply, Deputy Langlois?

305

Deputy Langlois: Only to say, sir, that if I had a need to reply I would have written Deputy Gollop’s speech for him.

The Bailiff: We go to the vote then on The Severe Disability Benefit and Carer’s Allowance (Guernsey) Law, 2013 (Commencement) Ordinance 2014. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

310

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS LAID BEFORE THE STATES

**The Motor Taxation and Licensing (Fees) (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2014;
The Liquor Licensing (Fees) Regulations, 2014**

The Deputy Greffier: Statutory Instruments laid before the States: The Motor Taxation and Licensing (Fees) (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2014; The Liquor Licensing (Fees) Regulations, 2014.

315

The Bailiff: There has been no notice of any motion to debate either of those, so we progress on to Elections.

Billet d'État XI

ELECTIONS

**I. Scrutiny Committee –
Election of a new Member –
Debate commenced**

Article I.

The States are asked to decide:

To elect a sitting Member of the States as a member of the Scrutiny Committee to complete the unexpired portion of the term of office of Deputy R. A. Jones, who has been elected as Chairman of that Committee, namely to serve until May 2016, in accordance with Rule 7 of the Rules relating to the Constitution and Operation of States Departments and Committees.

The Deputy Greffier: Billet d'État XI, Article I. Scrutiny Committee – Election of a new Member.

320

The Bailiff: Deputy Robert Jones, do you wish to propose someone?

Deputy Robert Jones: Yes, sir, I propose Deputy Arrun Wilkie.

325

The Bailiff: Deputy Wilkie. Do we have a seconder for Deputy Wilkie? Deputy Le Pelley, thank you very much. Do we have any other?

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, I am proposing Deputy Collins.

330

The Bailiff: That is Deputy Fallaize proposing Deputy Collins and do we have a seconder? That is Deputy Dave Jones.

Any other candidates to be proposed? No. Well, the Rules then provide that the proposers may speak for five minutes in favour or in support of their proposed candidate. So Deputy Robert Jones.

335

Deputy Robert Jones: Thank you, sir.

I am pleased to be able to nominate Deputy Arrun Wilkie for the vacant seat on the Scrutiny Committee. Deputy Wilkie has over 20 years' management experience in local business and has served as a Parish Constable and a Douzenier.

340

As we have got to know Deputy Wilkie over the last two years, we are well aware that his contributions to debate are measured and considered. I believe a fundamental requirement in new scrutiny is to leave your individual politics at home and I have no doubt that he can, and will do this when working for scrutiny.

345

I have talked to Deputy Wilkie about his desire to serve as a parliamentarian and his readiness to practice the self-discipline which we believe is required. There will no doubt be a question about Deputy Wilkie's membership on the Home Department Board, both in terms of workload and conflicts. He is a hard worker and conscientious. However, workload must always be a decision for the individual Member and in the case of Deputy Wilkie I am very content that this is so.

In terms of conflict, I consider the membership of the Home Department Board is no bar to the membership of Scrutiny. There should be no bar under the current arrangements. The Committee manages conflicts now and will continue to do so whatever board member sits.

We have sufficient numbers to form panels for a number of separate enquiries, so conflict is not difficult to manage. In addition to which, membership of a board does not give rise to an automatic conflict. I believe – as did our former Chair – that conflict can be over-stated. As a Committee we seek evidence. For example, the techniques for obtaining reliable evidence are different from surprise and ambush and other political manoeuvrings employed on occasion by individual Members of the Assembly.

In my opinion, there are two essential roles for a Member of new scrutiny. There is the panel role, questioning witnesses at public hearings, and the role in Committee meetings in which we review and continue to evaluate our enquiries as yet evidence unfolds.

In his panel role Deputy Wilkie will contribute a clear mind and at meetings he will bring to the Committee his own perspective on matters based on his work, life and Deputy experiences. I understand him to be inquisitive and, whilst it is not always easy to do so, he does not jump to conclusions. He wants to understand what he has been told and at the same time he does recognise there is often no complete or perfect answer.

In my conversations with Deputy Wilkie, it is clear that he believes that transparency in holding Departments to account matters and that is not just to satisfy process or good governance but it really matters, especially given that we are in the service of the Assembly and the public.

I hope I have your support. The Committee and I are taking his nomination as a way to assess the needs for the Committee for the next two years and we have seen how Deputy Wilkie has the skills to address those needs.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Thank you.

Next, Deputy Fallaize will speak in favour of Deputy Collins.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

I am proposing Deputy Collins for three reasons. The first reason is we have a committee system and, although major decisions are made on the floor of the House, we know that the vast bulk of work that is undertaken by Members day to day and week to week is through Membership of States' Committees.

There has long been a convention that in order to play a full role in the States, to which Members have been democratically elected, all Members, or at least all Deputies, should have the opportunity to serve on one or more States' Committee.

At present, Deputy Collins is the only Deputy who is not also a Member of a States' Committee and I hope that when casting their votes in this election, Members will take into account that it is healthy for the States, and for our political system generally, when all Members of the States are sitting on Committees and are not denied the opportunity to play a full role.

Second, although our constitution does not distinguish between the Executive and the Parliament, there are a good number of States' Members who believe that Members of scrutiny committees should not also sit on States' Departments which scrutiny committees may end up scrutinising.

It seems to me that there is merit wherever practicable in electing to the Scrutiny Committee, Members who are never going to find themselves conflicted by trying simultaneously to hold down seats on States Departments, so that must aid in the perception of impartiality and objectivity of the scrutiny process. As I said earlier, Deputy Collins does not sit on a States Department and, if elected today, he would be able to approach the work of scrutiny without any departmental conflict.

Third, during the past couple of years – as tends to be the way when Members are serving the same parish or electoral district – I have had cause to work with Deputy Collins in the representation of certain parochial and parishioners' matters. I have found him to be reliable, engaged, committed and open in his approach to that work and Members can be confident that those are qualities which Deputy Collins would bring to the Scrutiny Committee if they feel able to cast their votes for him today.

In the course of working with Deputy Collins, I have found that in pursuing cases he can be even more persistent and awkward than me. (*Laughter*) This is valuable (*Laughter*) because Members of the Scrutiny Committee do need to be strong and persistent in scrutinising the policies and services of other committees.

Before entering the States, Deputy Collins gained experience working in the public sector and the private sector. I am fully confident that he can park his politics at the door, as it were, if he was elected to the Committee and that he would be able to work well with the other eight Members of the Committee and enjoy working under Deputy Jones' chairmanship.

Deputy Collins wants to be fully engaged in the work of the States. He feels strongly that he can make a valuable contribution to the Scrutiny Committee in particular and, if elected, he will be a committed, conscientious and constructive Member of that Committee. I ask Members to cast their votes for Deputy Collins.

Thank you, sir.

410 **The Bailiff:** Members, while voting slips are handed round, I will just remind you that there are two candidates: Deputy Wilkie, proposed by Deputy Robert Jones, seconded by Deputy Le Pelley and Deputy Collins, proposed by Deputy Fallaize and seconded by Deputy Dave Jones.
There was a recorded vote.

415 Has everyone had a voting slip? Yes, it looks like it. Has everyone returned a completed voting slip? Yes. Fine, thank you. Well, those votes will now be counted and we will move on to the next section Greffier.

**II. States' Assembly and Constitution Committee –
Election of new Member –
Deputy Harwood elected**

Article II.

The States are asked to decide:

To elect a sitting Member of the States as a member of the States Assembly and Constitution Committee to complete the unexpired portion of the term of office of Deputy P. L. Gillson, who has resigned as a member of that Committee, namely to serve until May 2016, in accordance with Rule 7 of the Rules relating to the Constitution and Operation of States Departments and Committees.

The Deputy Greffier: Article II: States' Assembly and Constitution Committee – Election of a new Member.

420 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize, do you wish to propose a candidate?

Deputy Fallaize: Yes, please, sir. I wish to propose Deputy Harwood.

425 **The Bailiff:** Thank you. Do we have a seconder for Deputy Harwood?

Deputy Gillson: Sir, I am pleased to.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gillson, thank you.

430 Do we have any other nominations? No. Well, we go straight to the vote then on the proposal that Deputy Harwood be elected as a Member of the States' Assembly Constitution Committee, proposed by Deputy Fallaize, seconded by Deputy Gillson. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

435 **The Bailiff:** I declare him elected.

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, may I just – because I have not had a chance to speak – place on record the Committee's appreciation of Deputy Gillson?

440 The Policy Council keeps nicking my Vice Chairmen. First of all it was Deputy Dorey, now it is Deputy Gillson. But he has been a much valued and very constructive Member of the Committee and the Members of the Committee would like to place that on record, please, sir. (**Members:** Hear, hear.)

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.

445

Billet d'État IX

ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

VI. Guernsey Integrated On-Island Transport Strategy – Debate commenced

Article VI.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the Report dated 9th February, 2014, of the Environment Department, they are of the opinion:

- 1. To approve the transport strategy vision as set out in section 6.1 and as described in sections 7.1 to 7.13 of that Report.*
- 2. To rescind resolution 9 of Billet D'Etat VII 2006 'To approve the Environment Department's intention to acquire and develop suitable sites that might become available for the construction of off-street residents' parking facilities, as set out in section 4.9.7 of that Report'.*
- 3. To approve the promotion and communication approach in accordance with the general direction set out in section 11.2 I. to VI. of that Report.*
- 4. To approve the promotion of cycling and walking in accordance with the general direction set out in section 11.3 I. to X. of that Report.*
- 5. To approve the promotion of cycling and walking at schools in accordance with the general direction set out in section 11.5 I. to VIII. of that Report.*
- 6. To approve the development of cycling and walking infrastructure in accordance with the general direction set out in section 11.6 I. to X. of that Report.*
- 7. To approve the promotion of bus use in accordance with the general direction set out in section 11.7 I. to XVI. of that Report.*
- 8. To approve facilitating an increase in taxi provision in accordance with the general direction set out in section 11.8 I. and 12.5 X. of that Report.*
- 9. To approve developing enhanced travel options for people with a disability in accordance with the general direction set out in section 11.9 I. to VI. of that Report.*
- 10. To approve the incentivisation of motor cycling in accordance with the general direction set out in section 11.10 I. to IV. of that Report.*
- 11. To approve the promotion of responsible vehicle ownership and driving in accordance with the general direction set out in section 11.12 I. to XIV. of that Report.*
- 12. To direct the Treasury and Resources Department, at the earliest opportunity, to increase the rate of duty on petrol and gas oil (other than fuel used for air or marine navigation) by 5p per litre as set out in section 11.13 I. of that Report.*
- 13. To approve the measures to discourage vehicle use in accordance with the general direction set out in section 11.13 II. to VI. of that Report.*
- 14. To approve the policy to designate additional small car parking spaces in priority parking areas as set out in section 11.14 III. of that Report.*
- 15. To direct, at the earliest opportunity, the introduction of CO₂ duty as set out in paragraph 11.14, 12.2 and 12.3 of that Report.*
- 16. To direct, at the earliest opportunity, the introduction of Width duty as set out in paragraph 11.14, 12.2 and 12.3 of that Report.*
- 17. To direct the Treasury and Resources Department to consult with the Environment Department annually in respect of the bands and rates to be applied to the Width and CO₂ duties.*
- 18. To rationalise the carrying capacities of the various services eligible for licensing under the law as set out in paragraph 12.5 VI of that Report.*
- 19. To enable the authority to include Taxi buses and Dial a ride buses within a single operator contract as set out in paragraph 12.5 VII of that Report.*
- 20. To authorise the Treasury and Resources Department, if required, to approve a transfer from the Budget Reserve of up to £1.65 million to the budget of the Environment Department in 2014 to fund implementation of the strategy and direct the Treasury and Resources Department to take account of the strategy funding requirements, as set out in paragraph 14.2 of that Report, when recommending cash limits and routine capital allocations for the Environment Department for 2015 and subsequent years.*
- 21. To direct the preparation of such legislation as may be necessary to give effect to the above decisions.*

The Deputy Greffier: Billet d'État IX. The Environment Department – Guernsey Integrated On-Island Transport Strategy.

The Bailiff: The debate will be opened by the Minister, Deputy Domaille.

Deputy Domaille: Thank you, sir.

This is the third transport strategy debate in the last 10 years, which is an indication of how difficult previous Assemblies have found it to agree and move forward.

The complexities and consequences of any transport strategy are significant. In recognition of this, the Board decided to start with a clean sheet and early on made a decision to carry out surveys in consultation with numerous groups, to establish the views and concerns of Islanders. It is the findings from this work that has led to the formulation of the strategy we are debating today.

The overall approach is to work with Islanders, not impose behaviour on individual sectors of the community. Rather it is about making it easier and safer to use alternative means of transport where and when it is possible to do so. In this way, we believe we can reduce the dominance of the motor vehicle and the adverse effect on all – that is *all* – road users, without so impacting on people's personal and working lives to the extent that the cure is worse than the illness.

The proposed approach is incremental, whereby measures that are successful will be enhanced and those that are not as successful will be amended. This incremental approach mirrors the successful approach to recycling. Importantly, no one measure is critical to the success of the strategy and in three years' time the States Assembly will review the success, or otherwise, of the strategy and reach its own conclusions on the next steps, according to the circumstances prevailing at the time.

While we are not proposing any draconian measures, there are some sticks and if we are to be successful it is essential the burdens are borne fairly and there are benefits for all.

Not surprisingly, the surveys and findings are in some cases contradictory. Everyone has a different viewpoint. However, there is an overriding message: the majority of people believe the numbers and sizes of vehicles to be unacceptable. This is why we are proposing width and emission charges on larger vehicles with the longer term intention of encouraging smaller and/or more environmentally friendly vehicles. The width and emission charges will only apply to new vehicles and vehicles imported into the Island.

However, these one-off charges do little to discourage unnecessary vehicle use once the charge has been paid. Accordingly we are proposing a fuel duty increase which will affect all existing and new vehicle usage. In this way, the burden is spread evenly and everyone is encouraged to use their vehicle less: not in a draconian way, rather encouraging people to ask if the journey is necessary and, if so is walking, cycling, car sharing or bus use a reasonable alternative. Incentive is an important part of the strategy. A better bus service free to the user, better bus shelters, enhanced routes, dial-a-ride and/or taxi buses – these will all encourage people away from cars and onto buses.

The enhanced cycling pedestrian provisions, including one-way, speed restrictions and contraflows, will all encourage these better, healthier options. They will also make the car option slightly less attractive. Improved motorcycle provisions will encourage people who do not, for whatever reason, cycle, walk or bus, to move away from car use. Improvements to Church Square and The Lower Pollet will all make town more people friendly.

A major area that can be improved for the benefit of all is traffic flows to and from schools. We are all aware of the congestion and knock-on effects of school users during term time. It is perfectly understandable that some parents want to drop their children off at school, particularly when you see the weight of books and equipment that pupils seem to need these days. However, it is the youth that will drive change in the future and if they can be persuaded to walk or cycle more, not only will school congestion be reduced, but they will be fitter, healthier and live longer.

The schools have a significant part to play here. By way of example, provision of individual lockers, large enough to permit pupils to leave equipment on school properties, would undoubtedly help. For our part, making school routes safer and more pleasant for cyclists and pedestrians would also help. Importantly, we are looking to support a cultural change. Just like 'Clunk Click' or 'Drink Drive', bit by bit, we want people to think carefully about the impacts that their motorised vehicle choices have on others and we want to help them to make alternative choices.

Members, we have read the report and I do not intend to list the numerous changes we are seeking to effect. I will, of course, answer any questions Members may have during debate. However, I would draw Members' attention to the rejected options, some of which are the subject of amendments. The reasons for rejection are outlined and I will be happy to expand on the reasons for rejection if clarification is required.

One area that does require highlighting is the funding approach. In broad terms, we estimate we require approximately £2.5 million per annum for an ongoing programme of improvements. The proposed width and emission charges and the fuel duty increase are sufficient to fund the programme and, at the same time, encourage the use of alternatives for the benefit of all. Clearly, the charges will increase costs for

individuals. However, it is within the gift of this Assembly to lower other charges to counter balance these increases – although I doubt it will.

510 I would remind Members of our stated intention to treat environmental issues as being of equal importance to fiscal, economic and social issues. In this regard, our proposals identify funding resources which slightly broaden the States' income base, they bring an improved quality of life together with health and social benefits and I ask Members to support the proposals.

Thank you, sir.

Billet d'État XI

ELECTIONS

I. Scrutiny Committee – Election of a new Member – Vote results – Deputy Wilkie elected

515 **The Bailiff:** Before we move on, I can announce the result of the vote on the election of a Member to the Scrutiny Committee. Deputy Wilkie received 24 votes and Deputy Collins 21 votes. I declare Deputy Wilkie elected. *(Applause)*

Billet d'État IX

ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

VI. Guernsey Integrated On-Island Transport Strategy – Debate continued

The Bailiff: Right, we have now had notice of a sursis, so Deputy Kuttelwascher will open debate on the sursis.

520 **Deputy Gollop:** Sir, can I raise a point of procedure that might be out of order? *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

525 **Deputy Gollop:** Well, I think we are perhaps in uncharted territory here a bit. But some of us would be very impressed and interested to hear Deputy Burford's report as well before we decide whether a sursis would be appropriate to adjudicate on.

The Bailiff: That would mean suspending the Rules. Mr Procureur, do you ...?

530 **The Procureur:** Well, no, I mean the Rules prescribe that once a sursis is moved and seconded, then debate must be just on the sursis. I mean they do not technically preclude you, sir, from deferring the sursis until later in the debate if that is the will of the Assembly. It has always seemed to me very weird that this Assembly has quite protracted debates and then entertains the idea of the sursis but it is precedent (Laughter) if that is really the wish of the Assembly. I presume it is not.

535

The Bailiff: I mean I could put it to Members, if that is the wish of the Assembly, that we hear from Deputy Burford first. I suppose what we would be doing would be opening debate on Deputy Burford's amendment and then placing the sursis. I think that would be the only way of doing it.

540 **The Procureur:** I hate to, in any way, dissent from your view, sir, but I have not ever thought of it like that. It does seem to me that once an amendment has been moved and seconded, it ought to be debated and disposed of one way or another. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: But I do not think that is what Deputy Gollop is proposing (*Laughter*) –

The Procureur: I have actually, in all my time in this Assembly, I do not think I can remember an instance of a sursis being moved in the course of the debate about an amendment.

The Bailiff: Well, I think that is what Deputy Gollop is asking us to do.

The Procureur: Is it?

The Bailiff: Yes.

The Procureur: Well, I am aware of no precedent for that.

The Bailiff: No, well, I think – as he said – we are in uncharted territory. I mean the only other option might be to place the sursis, open debate on the sursis and perhaps to allow Deputy Burford to speak as soon as the sursis has been made if she wishes to do so, and then perhaps to allow her the right to speak at the end of the debate on the sursis – just as the Minister will be allowed to –

The Procureur: What, therefore departing from the Rule that says that debate must be focused strictly on the sursis and not anything else? (*Laughter*)

The Bailiff: Yes, so either way there is no easy option.

The Procureur: Well, there is an easy option which is just to do the sursis first. (*Laughter*)

The Bailiff: What I was going to say... no easy option if – (*Interjection by Deputy Burford*) You support the easy option. Deputy Burford supports the easy option, so we will apply the Rules as they are written and move on.

Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Sursis:

To sursis the Article until the States have considered propositions laid before a Meeting by the Policy Council to approve a Government Service Plan.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Right, no more interruptions.

Sir, Members, we have before us two reports: one presented by three Members of the Environment Department and one presented by the other two Members of the Department. The report satisfies a direction of this Assembly to deliver the same. They both require new funding and suggest a source of funding is required by Rule 15(2). The authors have complied with the Rules of Procedure, so why should these two reports cause me concern? It is the request for immediate new funding that is the issue. There is no obligation to implement either strategy immediately; it is the choice of the authors.

In July 2013, the resolutions of the Government Service Plan included:

‘To approve the development of a Government Service Plan as the corporate mechanism for allocating the resources available to the States in accordance with States strategic aims and objectives and agreed priorities.’

The GSP or Government Service Plan is yet to materialise, so we find ourselves in limbo when it comes to considering new revenue spending.

So why the delay? The reason for the delay is that a resolution to provide funding for the speedy delivery of the Government Service Plan was not approved last July. That was unfortunate and, I believe, a mistake. I am advised by the States’ Treasurer that a report on the Government Service Plan will be submitted towards the end of the year. It might now be a good time for Policy Council to resubmit to this Assembly its request for funding of the GSP plan to expedite delivery of it.

In its comment on the report, T&R state:

‘Whilst recognising that this States Report contains proposals to increase revenue income, the Treasury and Resources Department is concerned that a significant increase in net ongoing revenue expenditure is being proposed in the absence of a prioritisation mechanism.’

Acceptance of this sursis would address that concern. Any new revenue spending would be postponed until delivery of the Government Service Plan. A few words about Rule 15(2): the problem is that it was drafted before the Government Service Plan was proposed. When or if detailed plans on the Government

Service Plan are accepted, it will be necessary, I believe, to amend that Rule. It should require that all new revenue expenditure is processed through the Government Service Plan and all capital expenditure is processed through the Capital Prioritisation Plan.

I do not accept that delivery of a transport strategy is an urgent matter. On page 618, paragraph 14.4 – you do not have to look it up, I will just read it – it acknowledges, ‘an increase in revenue expenditure in 2014’ – that is this year – and ‘that the Transport Strategy may impede the Fiscal Economic Plan policy,’ which we have actually all accepted. That is unwelcome and, to me, unacceptable. On page 621, paragraph 15.7, it states if duties do not raise sufficient funds then ‘it will be necessary to transfer funding from the Budget Reserve’ – that is this year. The budget reserve is already under pressure and we have eight months to go.

The budgets for this year have been set and accepted. We have a forecast deficit of £14 million. We do not yet know how our revenue income is performing; we have not had the report on the first quarter’s performance. Our Capital Reserve was £90 million short at the time of the Budget, based on the indicative estimates of the pipeline projects. In 10 years, we are forecasting a fall in revenue income of £21 million per annum and an increase in demographically driven expenditure of £95 million per annum. We have yet to deliver our FTP savings. We should not approve new revenue expenditure ahead of implementation of the Government Service Plan.

We will also this year have reports on Personal Tax, Benefits and Pension Review; SWBIC; Review of Government; Population Policy; Social Security Department review of Benefits – all these will inform and impact any decision on new revenue spending. It is sensible and prudent to await these reports.

Remember, next month the Education Department will be requesting £1.9 million recurring revenue expenditure. I have to commend them, and I take note of what Deputy Sillars said on the phone-in. They are, as it were, behaving in a more corporate manner; they first of all do not want to impact this year’s Budget and they have not actually suggested any new taxes or charges; they are referring the matter back, as it were, in their second proposition to Treasury and Resources.

But by then, we should have the results of all these various reviews and that, I think, is the difference. But, nonetheless, they will be coming back for a £1.9 million per annum increase in revenue spending and, in fact, I think Deputy Sillars at the time, on the phone-in, actually said he is minded to vote against the Environment Department because they are not being quite so corporate. He is nodding in approval. Thank you.

So what next? We are only five months – or should I say four months? – into the term. What next? Any Department could come forward with a production of a mini budget because of Rule 15(2) to fund anything they want to do and we are in this limbo. Not a good situation. We have a missing piece of the jigsaw which is the Government Service Plan.

Now the Minority Report wishes to include a bus depot. The proposal is to include it in the pipeline project of the States Capital Investment Programme and allocate specific funding. The bus depot has already been rejected as a project for the current Capital Programme. All projects in the skip process have equal priority. This proposal wants to reintroduce it and make it a number one priority because it allocates specific funding. Remember the Capital Reserve was forecast to be £90 million short at the time of the Budget. Other projects may not be funded. This is not corporate behaviour.

I was going to end by stating that this is no time to loosen the purse strings. Well, there is nothing in it except an IOU for £14 million. We must maintain our financial control discipline. Sir, this is no time to wobble. Support the sursis.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dave Jones, do you formally second the sursis? Thank you.

We then open debate and I remind Members that debate must be limited to the sursis.

Deputy Fallaize caught my eye first, then Deputy Lester Queripel and Deputy Laurie Queripel.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

Every time there is a substantial debate before the States, without fail, there is a sursis. I remember debating the Population Report and Deputy Gollop laid a sursis. It is always easier not to make decisions than it is to make decisions and the sursis is the perfect mechanism for States’ Members who do not want to make decisions (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

I think of words which used to be spoken quite frequently in the States by my friend Alderney Representative Arditti. He used to say to the States: recognise the difference between good governance and good Government. It is perfectly possible – as Deputy Kuttelwascher has just done – to make a case for the sursis on the grounds of governance, but to vote for the sursis, I think, would represent bad *Government* and we are here primarily to act as a Government and to make policy decisions for the States. I have said many times, and I think it is applicable to this sursis, that if you try to do everything before you do anything, you will end up doing nothing, and that – Yes, I will give way to Deputy Trott.

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Sir, illuminating words as always from the Chairman of SACC, but does he recall that the very last sursis laid before this Assembly got his support? (*Laughter*)

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Yes, because there are (*Laughter*) occasions when one should support a sursis, particularly when they are laid by Deputy Trott (*Laughter*) and I always follow, strictly, Deputy Trott's advice: I always have (*Laughter*) and I did not want to break with that tradition on that occasion, so I did vote for the sursis, albeit it reluctantly.

But, effectively, Deputy Kuttelwascher is proposing that we do not do anything at all – *ever* – because what his sursis says is that the Article is deferred until after the States have considered the Government Service Plan. What he cannot tell us is when the Government Service Plan will be back before the States. It is alright saying, 'Well, the States Treasurer thinks it might be before the end of the year?' Actually, the Government Service Plan is meant to be a Policy Council initiative, as I understood it. I do not think the Policy Council has a clue when the Government Service Plan is coming back before the States. (*Laughter*) Perhaps they do and perhaps Deputy Kuttelwascher is going to advise us otherwise.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Sir. Interesting. It is a Policy Council responsibility *but* it has been laid at the floor of our Treasury Department and the States Treasury is actually the lead on formulating the policy, if you like, or the report to come back to the States, *but*, because the appropriate funding was not approved last July, that Department and the Treasury Department have got the same restraints as everybody else: they have to prioritise the work they need to do. I did suggest in my speech that it could be expedited if Policy Council would come back and say, 'Look, give us the money and you could have it all by the end of the year.'

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, that is illuminating because there is no direction from the States for T&R to do anything. The direction is for the Policy Council to bring back the Government Service Plan. If it has been passed to T&R I think that probably tells us a story.

Deputy Kuttelwascher's speech was quite a good speech in favour of throwing out the Propositions and all of the amendments. There is absolutely no reason to defer consideration of these Propositions. If Members take the view that it is irresponsible for a Department to come to the States with these proposals and they do not believe that the funding provisions outlined are adequate or they do not believe there has been adequate prioritisation, then just throw it out.

What is the purpose of saying we do not want to debate this report now, please bring back exactly the same report in six months, or in nine months or in 12 months? I suggest that not one single Member's vote would change in six months or 12 months' time than today. I think Members are fairly clear whether they support the Department's report or the Minority Report or whether they are not prepared to favour any of these Propositions, and it is pointless to defer this debate and have exactly the same debate several months hence, with what would be the same outcome. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Rule 15(2) exists for a reason. I have said many times I do not like Rule 15(2). I think it produces perverse consequences, like Departments coming to the States to propose ways of funding their own proposals. It is far better for Departments to come to the States with policy initiatives and then allow T&R to deal with the funding arrangements – which is exactly what the Education Department has done and I am sure that they will have noted the T&R's Deputy Minister's support for their approach. (*Laughter*)

But, nonetheless, 15(2) does exist. The States did want it and the Environment Department and the authors of the Minority Report have complied with it. There is no point having this Rule in place if we say, 'Well, every time the Department comes to the States complying with it, we are not prepared to accept their reasoning.' If we do not like their reasoning then throw out the report, but that is not a reason to defer.

So, sir, I really cannot believe that it would be in the interest of the States and in the interest of the Island and in the interest of good Government, for us to vote for this sursis to put this report and all the amendments on ice and, at some point in the future, after the Government Service Plan returns to the States – we have no idea when that will be – to come back here and debate it on that occasion.

If Members believe that the funding provisions are inadequate or incoherent or incomplete, just vote against the report but for goodness' sake do not leave here today having kicked the can down the road – I

apologise for the cliché but that is what this sursis is. Deputy Kuttelwascher has no idea when this Government Service Plan is coming back to the States, it is purely an attempt to defer debate when there is a very clear choice before the States for the majority report, the Minority Report or for neither and those three options are preferable to this sursis.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, I have considered laying a sursis myself, for similar reasons to Deputy Kuttelwascher laying his, because Deputy Kuttelwascher is asking us to wait until we have considered the Government Service Plan and I can see the merit in that. I did try to voice my concerns at the Frossard House transport strategy presentation. I did not get very far, sir, because everyone walked out when I started to speak. *(Laughter)* So I will try to say now what I wanted to say then, sir.

Two key areas within the Government Service Plan are the issues of future population and the Tax and Benefits Review. In my view, we cannot possibly know how decisions we make during those two future debates will impact on the transport strategy, until we have actually had those debates.

For example, how do we know if we are going to have 80,000, 90,000 or 100,000 people living here in the future? How do we know that? We do not know that. So I do have a concern about that and Deputy Kuttelwascher has already highlighted his concerns about the results of the Tax and Benefits Review, so I do not need to repeat those but I do share his concerns in some aspects.

On the other hand, I have heard the argument from colleagues and fellow Islanders that we should reject this sursis because the results of the debates on future population and the Tax and Benefits Review will have no impact whatsoever on the transport strategy. But the people who have put forward that argument have also said that we need to introduce either the majority or the Minority Report *now*, otherwise we will not be able to change anything during the term of this Assembly.

Well, surely, whatever we decide, that change has to benefit the whole community and I am not convinced that introducing either of the reports on offer will benefit the whole community and I will be speaking against both reports if this sursis fails.

Sir, if we reject this sursis and move into general debate I can also see the merit in that, so I am in dilemma and, if we support this sursis, we simply postpone debate on the strategy until further information is forthcoming. But I do have a real concern about how long it will be before we debate the GSP and it would certainly help me resolve my dilemma if we had a definite date for that debate.

So, in a way, this is rather like Deputies Trott and Lowe when they sursised a debate on Island-wide voting – which they did not need to do – and I was very concerned and disappointed and my fellow requérants caved in – the way that they did, sir, on the day. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Trott: Sir, on a point of correction, technically speaking it was the majority of this Assembly that sursised that debate. Deputy Lowe and myself cannot claim all the credit *(Laughter)* exclusively.

The Bailiff: Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: I will let that one go, sir. *(Laughter)*

So I am undecided regarding this particular sursis and I will listen to the debate with interest and I will vote one way or the other when the time comes to vote *(Laughter)* I think.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Laurie Queripel then Deputy Hadley and Deputy David Jones.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

I am minded to vote for this sursis. I think the reasons given in bringing it by Deputy Kuttelwascher are sound and valid. Sir, although these reports claim to link up to other State strategies and policies, they cannot be fully linked in because there are a number of work streams in motion at the moment, the results of which could significantly reshape the model of States revenue raising and expenditure. It is almost inevitable that the public will be asked, by some means or other, to pay more.

Sir, in addition to that, in less than two years it is likely that household refuse bills will double. The Assembly will be privy to greater detail on that when PSD come back with a further report, but at the moment we just do not know what the increase will be, but it will result in additional cost for Islanders. Sir, there is not a magic bottomless pit that this money is drawn from. It is extracted from the pockets of Islanders, many of whom are hard pressed at the moment and will be for the foreseeable future.

So I think it is unwise to debate a report at the moment and perhaps approve measures that will add yet more cost to Islanders' lives before we have the conclusions and recommendations of these work streams that are in motion at the moment.

Sir, these reports are very detailed in some ways but very light on information in others. There is very little in these reports to convince me that all the proposed measures are necessary and that they will produce the outcomes desired by their authors. I am convinced, however, that in attempting to achieve these outcomes, the cost to many Islanders and to local businesses will be expensive and disproportionate. I do not believe that sufficient analysis has been undertaken to gauge the true cost to Islanders or to local businesses or to gauge whether the objectives can be achieved in any meaningful way. I do not believe the report should be debated on that basis, or policy formed and that is another reason I am considering voting for the sursis.

Sir, I am not convinced by the quality or the breadth of the consultancy contained within these reports. Only since the strategies have been released into the public domain have we heard about how anxious and deeply concerned businesses that rely on vehicles – that are dependent on vehicles, sir, that provide employment, that provide essential services to Islanders – how concerned these businesses are. If the cost of doing business in Guernsey is significantly increased via these strategies – and it will be, sir – the increase will be passed on to Islanders, the effects will be inflationary for everybody. No real mention of that or analysis of that in these reports – another reason to consider supporting the sursis.

Sir, in the Minority Report a free bus service is proposed. That is an illusion because somebody will have to pay for it. *(Interjection)* So more accurately, sir, it is a fare-free or free to the user service. But in the last week or two a very special interest group the Bus Users Group –

Deputy Hadley: A point of order, Mr Bailiff.

The Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Hadley.

Deputy Hadley: On a point of order, isn't Deputy Queripel debating the report rather than the reasons for the sursis? **(Some Members:** Hear, hear)

The Bailiff: He is giving reasons why to vote for the sursis. I think it is a narrow line.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: I appreciate that, sir, but I am trying to give reasons why I think the sursis should be supported. But I will not do too much of that.

The Bailiff: But do make sure you do not go too far into debating the merits of the reports.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: So a very special interest group – the Bus Users Group – have said that they are not in a fare-free bus service. No mention, sir, as far as I can tell, of that opinion in the report. So that opinion was not sought or gleaned. That is a notable exclusion, an important piece of information missing from a document intended to inform policy making –

Deputy Bebb: A point of order.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: I give way to Deputy Bebb sir – my pleasure doing so.

Deputy Bebb: I am sorry I am afraid that I think that Deputy Queripel is misleading the Assembly. The bus user group did not say that they were not in favour of a free bus service, they said that they were in favour of a bus service but the price should not compromise its reliability. That is a different statement to not supporting a free bus service.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Sir, I read in the *Press* that they were not in favour of a free bus service. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Bebb: Deputy Queripel might do well to read from the bus user group and not from a second-hand rag. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Laurie Queripel: I think it is a first-hand rag, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: A further point of order, sir, the Bus Users Group was consulted, their views were sought and they were involved in the consultation.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Well, I have not seen that opinion in the report sir, that the Bus Users Group are not keen on a free bus service.

The Bailiff: Deputy Queripel you are giving a number of reasons why people should support the sursis, but that the Sursis only delays debate until the Government Service Plan has been approved. (**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Yes.) It does not necessarily mean that all these other issues that you are saying are not dealt with in the current reports... that that information will be laid before the States. You are actually giving reasons why people should reject both the majority report and the Minority Report.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Sir, my point is, I think, that the information in the reports is misleading. That information should not be –

The Bailiff: Yes, but the sursis will not correct that. I am sorry, delaying debate until the production of the Government Service Plan will not correct that. I think what you are doing is giving reasons for rejecting and voting against both the report and the Minority Report.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: I accept that, sir, but the point I am making is, as I say, I do not think policy should be made based on reports that are misleading and do not provide sufficient information for policy to be based on them, and that is my point of rejecting it.

The Bailiff: But at the moment we are only debating whether to delay debate until after the Government Service Plan has been approved. I think that is a different point.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir, I will skip... and will save the other bits for general debate if we get to general debate. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Thank you Deputy Queripel.
Deputy Hadley.

Deputy Hadley: Mr Bailiff, I would like to draw us back to the reason why this is being sursised. We are told that, although the reports do comply with the Rules of the Assembly, they ought to be changed and therefore we should wait to debate this until the Rules have been changed. (*Laughter*) It seems to me to be a bit strange.

Also, if we do delay this report until funding is sorted out, this again is one of these chicken and egg situations because it seems to be that he is implying that we should wait and see if there is enough money available. But time and time again we are told that we should be looking at all the issues which we need to fund and then prioritise which ones we should fund. We are tying ourselves up in knots.

In reality, these reports comply with the Rules. They indicate where the money will be spent and Members of the Assembly can decide whether or not to accept one of the reports. If we delay debate on this, we shall just increase the number of people who think that we constantly prevaricate, never reach a meaningful decision (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and kick difficult decisions into the long grass. We must go ahead and debate these reports.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dave Jones, then Deputy Bebb.

Deputy David Jones: Thank you, Mr Bailiff, Members of the States.

I agreed to second this sursis for the reasons that Deputy Kuttelwascher has clearly laid out. This is not only the cart before the horse, but in the back of that cart is the dog's breakfast of the proposed transport strategy along with a big chest asking the people of Guernsey to increase taxes and charges.

We have not had the benefit of the tax review or the Government Service Plan and the problem I have with the reports is the fact that even if you vote for one or other of the reports – one says an increase of 5p on fuel, the other wants to remove the 1½p surcharge that Deputy Brouard and I put through an amendment on... But all of those could be misleading the public, at the end of the day, because the Tax and Benefits Review and even the Government Service Plan may come forward with other proposals to increase those fuel tariffs even further. So I do not see how you can debate that until you have got all the rest of the information that you need. We cannot keep going back to the people saying that we are going to take 1½p off the fuel surcharge to make it more affordable, when a few months later along comes another debate that shows that we are actually going to increase fuel charges and taxation on the people of Guernsey. That is why I call it a dog's breakfast. Sorry, I give way to Deputy Burford.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

900 **Deputy Burford:** Thank you, Deputy Jones.

The 1.2p actually is not being proposed that it is removed to make it more affordable, it is simply that it was put on in lieu of a paid parking clock previously and it is just a fairness measure as I am proposing in paid parking that it is taken off.

905 **Deputy David Jones:** Yes, I accept the detail that it is a balance between paid parking and removing the fuel surcharge, but the point I am trying to make is a valid one, that Deputy Kuttelwascher made – the man with the unpronounceable name – and that is that this sursis is to prevent the accusation that we do not have joined up Government at all. We keep bringing a whole raft of proposals about increasing taxes and charges – which both these reports do in one form or another – whether it is paid parking or fuel taxes, width
910 charges, CO₂ emission taxes or whatever – without knowing what the Tax and Benefit Review, for one, and what the Government Service Plan is going to throw up in terms of what we can provide. But, more important, the amount of money that is going to be available can only come from one source and that is from the people out there who we profess to represent in this Chamber. That is why I agreed to support this. The other thing is that – and Deputy Fallaize is quite right, I suppose – if you want to debate this, at the end
915 of the day, you have the option to throw out both reports, which I am inclined to support, that option.

Bailiff: Deputy Bebb, then Deputy Gollop and Deputy Storey.

Deputy Bebb: Thank you, Monsieur le Bailli.

920 I cannot possibly support this sursis. I think the idea of actually supporting a sursis until after the Government Service Plan is fallacy.

It is very interesting that Deputy Kuttelwascher, I remember nearly two years ago, proclaimed how this Assembly could never be bound by previous decisions and it was something that he was quite proud of – the fact that it was not possible. Well, in equal measure of course today he seems –

925

Deputy Kuttelwascher: A point of order. I really do not remember having ever said that. I know other people have, but I have not.

The Bailiff: Deputy Bebb.

930

Deputy Bebb: I remember a conversation that we had directly after a parish meeting –

The Bailiff: Deputy Bebb, through the Chair, please.

935 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Not here.

Deputy Bebb: Okay, sorry.

Anyway the whole point is that we are able to make decisions one way or another. The idea that we have to wait until something has been laid before we make a decision, well, we can claim that in a whole
940 host of areas. Simply waiting for the Government Service Plan – and I seem to remember how supportive I was of the last one. What would happen if we threw out the next one? Do we then have to suspend the Tax and Benefits Review until we get a Government Service Plan that we support? The whole idea of just delaying things until we finally get consensus is simply madness. We must make decisions that are for the benefit of the Islanders.

945 That leads me to the second reason that I keep hearing about this sursis and why we should probably support it and that is the cost and identifying the cost. That is on the basis of the idea that doing nothing is a zero-cost idea. Currently we are spending huge quantities of money on health care because of our incredibly unattractive, unhealthy choices. Transport is one of the main reasons behind that, we could make big changes. If we do not try and encourage different forms of behaviour then we simply have to accept that
950 what we are also doing is writing a larger cheque to deal with the bigger problem later on.

So, rather than actually grappling with the problem first hand, which is what this sursis is saying – that we should delay it until something else is done, no what we are saying is that we are fine and we are happy to write larger cheques in order to resolve the problems later. Therefore, supporting the sursis is merely suggesting that people are supporting a larger pay cheque towards HSSD and those Departments that deal
955 with it when it is a problem. It is not to do with taxes, because at the moment we are spending that money. This, may I suggest, as a sursis, is a fallacy that we would therefore not be dealing with taxation issues. These reports deal with taxation issues in their own right.

I ask everyone to just throw out the sursis.

Thank you.

960

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you.

I agree with much of what Deputy Bebb has said on the specific point of order, if you like, on the Bus Users Group. The *Press* article only represented, in total, the first two thirds of the meeting, because I remember putting forward an alternative resolution which the Bus Users Group approved, which was focused upon using money for improvements of the service in preference to a free bus service, but not exclusively against a free bus service.

On the sursis, Deputy Fallaize raised my name in connection with the population idea. I would say that that sursis that did not happen was an opportunity missed, because as we subsequently saw there are many workshops, presentations and lobbying by various interested parties for a piece of work that was incomplete. This is a slightly different situation, because we have seen transport strategies for decades and this is really a variation on pre-arranged themes, with a few differences.

I was very tempted to do a sursis and, in fact, I even proposed an early draft in slightly different words to Deputy Kuttelwascher. My thinking was focused on the wider Pensions, Tax and Benefits Review, because I suppose the motoring side of taxation has been put to one side a little bit whilst this debate is in motion and I believe – although perhaps I will keep this for general debate, should we get there – that there are much greater opportunities of looking at what we spend environmentally, as a source of revenue. Therefore, I have issues with both of the reports in the way that they put their Propositions across.

However, having consulted with people who are intimately involved with the disability community and people with special needs, I feel it is my duty and other Deputies interested in those areas, to very much support the measures outlined in both reports, with perhaps a slight preference towards Deputy Burford, for focusing on mobility as a right and requirements – whole journey mobility we need to work on as soon as possible.

I am also concerned that the bus services are still in a state of –

The Bailiff: Are you straying into general debate, Deputy Gollop?

Deputy Gollop: Ah, well not entirely, I will come to that. (*Laughter*) I was going to say – and I am sure Deputy Domaille might not approve of this, but I would wish to say – that, in my personal opinion, the bus services are still in a state of relative crisis and it is touch and go as to how they continue to serve the Island to the best of their abilities, and any support for the sursis makes a difficult situation worse and we cannot afford the risk. So even though I can agree with Deputy Kuttelwascher's political analysis, that both reports are not quite right in terms of corporate governance, I think the needs of the moment and the requirement to support the disabled and other people in the community outweigh the political arguments that have been identified.

The Bailiff: Deputy Storey.

Deputy Storey: Thank you, sir. I have a bit of a dilemma over this sursis myself because my understanding is that this report has been brought to this Assembly for debate by the Environment Department on the instruction of this Assembly, so they are complying with the instruction that they have been given. So, for that purpose, I cannot see any reason why we should not be debating it because that is what we asked for.

The second point, though, is that I have sympathy – a great deal of sympathy – for the point that was raised by Deputy Kuttelwascher in relation to the Government Service Plan because embedded within these reports is a wish to, if you like, jump the gun or get to the head of the queue on allocation of capital sums, which really ought to be subject to a prioritisation debate at a later date. If we are going to agree that there is X amount of money available for capital expenditure then we ought to be having proposals for what that money might be spent on and then to prioritise what that money is spent on.

Now the majority of this document –

The Bailiff: Deputy Hadley is asking you to give way.

Deputy Storey: I will give way to Deputy Hadley.

Deputy Hadley: Mr Bailiff, I would like Deputy Storey to explain how he expects the States to operate, because this means that any Department bringing a report to the States which had a cost to it, could not do it. So people in the future would have to say, 'Well, we intend to bring a report to the States and, if the States pass it, it has this cost so therefore we want you to put a project, which the States has not yet approved of, into the capital programme.' That would be an absolute nonsense.

The Bailiff: Deputy Storey.

Deputy Storey: That is exactly the point I was coming to, Deputy Hadley. (*Laughter*)

1025 The point is that this document represents just one potential proposal for allocation of capital funds. If we had half a dozen or even more applications for allocation of funds, how can we absorb all this amount of information in one go in order to have that debate? What we need to do, it seems to me, is to debate the general policies so that we know what we are talking about when we are going ahead with allocation of funds.

1030 To me, the unfortunate part of these two reports is that we agree to allocate funds in advance of being able to consider alternative areas where we ought to be spending money. I would perhaps ask you, sir, that if... it seems to me the logical thing to do would be to debate these strategies so that we know where we want to go. If we know where we want to go then when it comes to allocation of funds between various projects we are going to make a much more informed decision.

1035 So my own preference on this would be to vote on various parts of these reports and possibly, where the suris comes in or where the delay comes in, if you like, is that we would vote against the automatic allocation of funds, as proposed in individual recommendations in these reports. So that we know where we are going but when it comes to allocation of funds there are certain Departments that have not jumped the gun and jumped up to the front of the queue and taken away the capital that is available to us to spend, without us taking due consideration of the prioritisation.

1040 So I think we should debate these two reports and reach a conclusion on which way we would like to go and then when these strategies are more definitely formulated and money is required then the Department comes forward in the general debate on how we spend our capital funds.

Thank you, sir.

1045

The Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel, you have already spoken.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, I just rise for a point of clarification or a point of correction, sir, if I may?

1050 **The Bailiff:** Yes.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Well, I think Deputy Storey misled the Assembly when he said that this Assembly asked the Environment Department to deliver a transport strategy, because my recollection is that it was a decision made by a previous Assembly, sir, and there are 20 plus new Members in this Assembly. This Assembly surely did not make that request to the Environment Department. Could I have that corrected by someone who could give me that information, please, sir?

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

1060 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Sir, it has been interesting hearing such strong speeches in support of the Government Service Plan (*Laughter and applause*) by those who, less than a year ago, were not very supportive of it. Thereby hangs a tail.

Sir, I would like to wrap this up if I can in some way so that we can hopefully focus on what is in front of us and where we are today.

1065 The proposal to suspend debate on the integrated Island transport strategy until such a time that a GSP is in place obviously has, on the surface, some merits but they are superficial. A GSP would certainly provide the mechanism for allocating the resources available to the States in accordance with States strategic aims, objectives and agreed priorities and with such a plan in place it would be possible to determine whether proposals placed before the States accord with the agreed prioritisation process and decisions could be made within that context – absolute logic.

1070 However, at this time, as has been stated, a GSP is not in place. That was because following a series of States Member workshops in 2012, in July 2013 the GSP States Report was widely criticised in this Assembly for its lack of detail. There was expressed concern how a multi-criteria analysis might be used to evaluate priorities for spending against political objectives that are still quite broad and, as a result, the States declined to resource the GSP process until it was satisfied with the way it is to operate.

1075 As a result of that, the GSP is being prepared but obviously at a much slower rate because there was no resourcing. We chose not to resource it and, to pick up some comments that were made earlier on, it is therefore not surprising that the Chief Executive, in his attempts to make sure that some work is done, has used the staff available at the time and the Treasurer is one of those who obviously reports to T&R but also to Policy Council on certain things and is best placed to help to try and move forward in some way the GSP. But obviously it should have been known to every Member of this Assembly last year that when the £200,000 or so was not given to do this the only way it could be progressed was at a much slower rate.

1080

But even then there is no guarantee – as I think Deputy Bebb pointed out – that were we or if we are able to bring it back to this Assembly at the end of this year, the Assembly will still have some issues with whatever form of analysis, whatever criteria are used in terms of making that prioritisation and may choose to sursis that very debate or put it off in some way or amend it, or just oppose it.

Therefore, in the absence of a GSP, policy is currently being pursued largely on an *ad hoc* basis as the States has been wanting to do in the past, without the discipline or prioritisation with resulting pressure on resources.

However, if this particular States' report were to be sursised on the basis of a lack of the GSP, it would equally and logically need to apply to all other States reports that require prioritisation over other States' business or additional resourcing. If that is the case, we might as well pack up and go home now. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

Therefore, I believe – in picking up Deputy Fallaize's point about good Government – what we are currently doing is certainly not good Government but to do anything but to reject the sursis, would be far worse Government because to sursis these proposals at this juncture would be seen to be regarded as obstructing Government business and so I urge this Assembly to reject the sursis. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you, sir. I will give way to Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, I still have not had a response to my request for clarification ...

The Bailiff: Well, that may get replied to later in the debate, Deputy Lester Queripel, but we cannot have everybody jumping up saying I have a question I would like to have answered immediately. If it is to be replied to it will be done later in the debate.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you very much, Mr Bailiff.

If Members are opposed to either of these reports, there is a mechanism, of course, that departments can use by way of a letter of comment in the Billet and, just listening to Deputy Jones' speech and the opposition and therefore his signature of the sursis on cost grounds, it might just be useful to read from the letter of comment from the Housing Department:

'It agrees that alternative transport options must be available, and incentivised, together with complementary disincentives for private motorised vehicles.'

I think it is important to highlight that.

There will be many longer speeches than mine regarding this sursis that will be more analytical and seek to deconstruct or whatever, but this is a simply compelling argument I will put to you not to support the sursis because timing is everything. If, for example, we have on hearsay from a member of staff, however senior the role, that the GSP will be back with us in late 2014 and it is not, it is early 2015, mid-2015, then do we really want to come back to this Assembly in early to mid to late – well, early to mid, that is the only option – in 2016 prior to an election, to debate a road transport strategy? Clearly there would not be the stomach to do that and people would have a certain date in their mind and decisions would not be made.

If you do not like either of these strategies, throw them out, debate them, put your arguments constructively, concisely and dispose of both reports. But, please, we have far more sophisticated tools in our box than simply delving in for a sursis on occasions such as this.

So, please, Members, vote against this sursis.

Thank you.

Deputy David Jones: A point of information, sir.

The Bailiff: Yes.

Deputy David Jones: The letter of comment in the Billet is the Housing Board's collective majority view on the transport strategy, just as you supported your Department's view on theirs, Deputy Brehaut.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

It is eight years since the Transport Strategy was debated in this Assembly. This new strategy has not been brought on a whim, it has been developed in response to a Resolution of the States. In October 2010 – which I think answers Deputy Queripel's question – Deputy Fallaize laid a successful amendment – supported by three-quarters of the last Assembly – part of which instructed Environment to return to the States with a new, comprehensive, sustainable, integrated transport strategy, to include the method of funding public transport. This is what we have done.

I would argue strongly that even without the Fallaize amendment, it is absolutely the right thing for a modern community to have a sustainable transport policy – one that looks at how we travel around the Island, the impacts that our travel choices have on other Islanders and one that resolves how such travel can be managed to produce the best outcome for all. It affects everyone, every day.

There are numerous requirements within high level strategic documents approved by this Assembly and previous ones that seek to reduce the impact of motor traffic on the community. The following list is far from exhaustive. The Strategic Land Use Plan, which seeks to minimise the negative effects of car parking in the centres and calls for reliable public transport. There is the States Strategic Plan which requires efficient transport systems and wise use of resources. Not forgetting the Environmental Policy Plan which identifies the need for a sustainable use of energy, a reduction in air pollution and a move away from fossil fuels and calls for actions and incentives to reduce traffic pollution, both by encouraging cleaner emissions and by supporting reduced use of motor vehicles.

The Bailiff: Are you straying off the sursis?

Deputy Burford: No, I am getting there. I promise you.

The Bailiff: You are getting there. Thank you. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Burford: Hand in hand with that goes the Energy Resource Plan which notes that fiscal measures on the first purchase of vehicles may need to be considered. From a health point of view, the Obesity Strategy highlights poor provisions for cyclists and pedestrians and the impact of obesity on our society. In 2012 this Assembly noted the Ports Master Plan which calls for an integrated transport and parking strategy. A few months ago, we unanimously approved the Disability and Inclusion Strategy which requires access to transport for disabled people.

But apparently these are not enough – we also need to wait for the Government Service Plan and possibly the Tax and Benefits Review because Deputy Kuttelwascher is concerned about the revenue that the strategy proposes raising to fund the measures it plans to introduce.

Last week we heard confirmation of what we have known for a while – that without some strong action, we are heading towards a significant debt as the population ages. I can see how that news will and should make us question income and expenditure even more closely than we have until now. But, frankly, charging a going rate for parking all day on some of our most valuable land or putting a levy on big new cars is not going to have any effect whatsoever on the difficult decision of whether or not we should all work until we are 70 or more.

A properly effective, sustainable transport policy that brings about a modal shift will reap benefits that prevent people from needing medical intervention, more of which later in the main debate, hopefully.

The Minority Report identifies two sources of income and is fully self-funding. Paid long-stay parking, which makes up around a quarter of the total income, and a first registration charge, which accounts for nearly three quarters, and on the registration charge, we received further information from the Border Agency and the Law Officers, subsequent to the publication of both reports and they advised that the first registration duty referred to in both reports can in fact be treated as a charge and not a tax or duty. So the Minority Report does not now rely on any taxes or duties.

Treasury and Resources agree in their letter of comment that this income could arguably not be introduced except to fund the transport strategy. The research done here in Guernsey and elsewhere, shows strongly that when people can see the money raised from charges on vehicles is being ploughed back into the public transport and other related measures, they are generally accepting of those charges because they perceive them to be fair and beneficial. Even if you never use the bus, your car journey is facilitated by those who do.

The next thing to notice is that the strategy only covers the next three and a half years. The Minority Report is designed to kick start change by raising sufficient funding for various work streams. Some of these things will not be needed in the next iteration of the report and that is the report where it will also fall naturally into the revenue prioritisation cycle.

But before then, we cannot simply put the brakes on every major piece of work that comes before this Assembly in order to wait for the Government Service Plan – whenever that may be. Sustainable transport

practice has been underfunded at best or ignored at worst for years. Too much time has already been wasted and all the while we continue to waste it through inaction. The problems compound and become increasingly entrenched. It is time to get on and make up joined up and forward thinking progress by implementing all of the high level directives I outlined at the beginning of this speech.

I urge you to reject this sursis so that we can start making a meaningful difference now and not at some indeterminate point in the future. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

The Bailiff: Does anyone else wish to speak on the sursis? Deputy Perrot and then Deputy Spruce.

Deputy Perrot: I think, sir, that instinctively you will wish to correct me at the outset here and say that I am not speaking about the sursis, but if you will indulge an old man (*Laughter*) I can assure you that I am.

I just get the teensiest of feelings here that the Department has not covered itself in glory in the way in which this whole subject has been brought before the States.

Minority views are, in my opinion at least, an essential safety valve. But here we have arrived at something which is particularly unattractive politically, when we are asked to vote in favour of an alternative proposition by a sort of cabal within the Department itself.

Other Members may disagree with me but it does seem to me that, if one of the reports, the majority report or the Minority Report is accepted, there are only one or two possible outcomes so far as populating the Board is concerned. If the majority view prevails, the others should resign and if the minority view succeeds, then the Minister and the others should resign.

I hear dissenting murmurs, but why do I say that? Because, whatever the vote may be on either of these reports, the Board, such as it is, will have to work together to carry out whatever is resolved by the States. The States – this Assembly – will always be viewed with displeasure by the electorate, particularly when the local paper only ever publishes knocking copy. That is the way things go. But this division between the political Members of the Board is self-harm of such a type as to call seriously into question our present system of Government and I say: ‘A plague on both their houses’.

I was initially very warm to the idea of the Requête. I have cooled somewhat in the sense that, as Deputy Le Tocq said, there is, I suppose, an argument to the effect that if one puts this to one side because of the non-existent at present Government Service Plan, one might do that for everything. But actually, notwithstanding the cooling of my ardour for Deputy Kuttelwascher’s proposal, I still support it, because I think that, in this particular case, it would be a good idea for there to be a delay so that the Department can have a sort of ‘love-in’ (*Laughter*) and try to restore some sort of unanimity, some sort of unity between its Members in respect of whatever the transport strategy might be. And although technically these reports have come back as they are, it would not be beyond the wit of the Department actually if it agreed on a slightly different move, to come back with a joint proposal.

Therefore, I am going to support this Requête but I do accept that this will be an exception probably which proves the rule.

The Bailiff: Deputy Spruce.

Deputy Spruce: Thank you, sir.

Members, I promise you I will stick to the sursis and I will ask you please to reject this sursis. It is just another delaying measure which will not change anything at all. The last Assembly directed the Environment Department to bring the transport strategy back to this Assembly. This we have done. In fact you are lucky enough to have two. (*Laughter*) No purpose at all can be served by delay. Both reports clearly lay out the funding options. Are we seriously to await the outcome of the Government’s Business Plan, a business plan that has already been far too long in gestation?

If we are, this principle can apply – in my view anyway – to practically every major policy letter brought to this Assembly. In fact, I agree entirely with the Chief Minister: if we have to wait until the Government Service Plan is accepted, we may as well pack up and go home now because nothing will happen for another six to nine months at least. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

I have got nothing much else more to say than please reject this sursis. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Anyone else? No. I see no-one rising. In that case then, Minister, do you wish to exercise your right to speak immediately before Deputy Kuttelwascher replies to the debate?

Deputy Domaille: Yes, please, sir, and I will be very brief and I will speak entirely to the sursis.

I think the Chief Minister – and I think probably for the last time today actually I agree with Deputy Fallaize – has set out the reasons for throwing this sursis out as soon as possible. If we can just please get on with the debate, you have got – I will not say two for one, but you have got – two structures that are

broadly similar in lots of ways and significantly different in others. It is for Members to make their mind up as to whether or not they support either or reject them both. That is for them to do.

I would say though – and Deputy Burford has already clearly said this – the Environment Department has been given a clear instruction by the previous States, Deputy Queripel, to bring back a transport strategy, with public transport at its centre. That is what we have done. Whichever report you look at, that is what we have done. To further delay debate on this is just simply – I have put here in my prepared notes – bad Government. Actually I think it is probably the worst Government I can think of and we cannot wait until this Service Plan has been completed. We have to get on with the job of governing Guernsey. That is what we are here to do.

You have got sufficient information in front of you today, but I am just going to raise one particular concern because it is very important, certainly to the Environment Board, and that concerns the bus contract. If this sursis is successful, tenders for the bus contract will be put at risk. Potential operators may well decide not to tender because of the uncertainty surrounding funding and the States' commitment to the bus service.

I think Deputy Gollop will probably like this comment: nonetheless, if this sursis is carried, the Environment Department has no option but to continue the tendering process and return to this Assembly with the outcome of the tendering process. It is almost certain that we would be asking at that time for more funding. To do otherwise would risk the failure of the service – something the Board is not prepared to do.

So please reject this sursis and let us get on with the debate. Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher will reply to the debate.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Thank you, sir.

A lot of speakers, a lot of opinions, not many questions. So I do not actually have to answer very much.

Several Members have mentioned the fact that the Environment Department have brought this report back at the behest of the previous Assembly, which I acknowledge, but what I did say was that there was no requirement for immediate delivery of what was in that report, that was the choice of the Environment Department of both reports.

It does reflect, to some extent, what Deputy Storey says. I agree with most of what he said because at one point I was thinking of amending the Propositions to make sure that any funding proposals are properly prioritised in due course, but I thought this might be a simpler, more straightforward way of dealing with it.

I perfectly agree with Deputy Fallaize: if you do not like it, vote against it – which is what I and quite a lot of people, I think, will be doing... at least one or other or if not both the strategies. But, in a way, I was trying to avoid that. I thought if there was a proper prioritisation process in place for delivering or using Government revenues, I would be more inclined to support some of this. But there is not at the moment and the tensions and the demands on Government revenue are building at quite an extraordinary rate. My view is that if one or more of these go through or if the sursis fails, the drafting and formulation of the next Budget will be most interesting and I suspect the results will prove to be rather unwelcome.

As for the bus contract, I have no comment on that. I mean that is a possible thing. There are always possible problems. That is life. One of the things that Deputy Burford said, and others have said, is that the transport strategies or the transport proposals have been under-funded. Well, I just want to mention something about the Budget Reserve this year. There is quite a substantial amount in there to cater for what are called timing differences, which is budgets that were underspent by Departments not being given back to them, being put in the Budget Reserves and they can reapply for them if they need it. The Environment Department has got quite a substantial sum in the Budget Reserve under timing differences which they have chosen not to spend and I believe it related to improving cycle paths and some road markings. If this sursis were accepted or, indeed, if the proposals were rejected, they have given notice that they might be calling on this amount so they can progress some –

I know. If it is a point of order I will accept, but I am not giving way.

Deputy Domaille: It is a point of correction, sir, but I can give it at the end. There will be other corrections, no doubt. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: So, if everything was to go out of the window today, the Environment Department do have some funding to progress some issues relating to, I believe, cycle paths and road markings and I do not know what else, but the people in the Department and Members of the Department must know. So it is not as if nothing needs to happen. Nothing has recently happened, awaiting this transport strategy.

As a general point all about good governance and Government, I do not believe that we should encourage a trend where individual Departments try to hypothecate their own taxes to support their own strategies on a peace-meal basis, without the States setting overall priorities having regard to resources available. It is as simple as that.

Our fiscal restraints cannot go away. The economy is not booming. I and a couple of other Members of Treasury on Monday morning went to a presentation given by an actuary, organised by the Chamber of Commerce, and the general view was that our economic growth will be stagnant, if not a decline, for quite a long time, so we are not going to grow ourselves out of our fiscal difficulties, and that for me is another reason why we should be very careful, very wary of just initiating or agreeing, new taxes and initiating both revenue and capital expenditure without proper prioritisation.

Sir, obviously I will ask Members to support the sursis and otherwise, if it fails, I will be taking obviously the advice of Deputy Fallaize and voting against both reports as regards their funding.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Domaille.

Deputy Domaille: Yes, sir. There is only one correction to make. The money that we have not spent, if you like, that Deputy Gollop referred to, that goes back to a 2006, a decision by the States where we were looking to get some extra buses for the school bus service, which we have been unable to do and so therefore we have not spent it. Whichever of these structures are approved – and I hope at least one of them is – then of course these strategies take precedent over that.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Sir, can I ask for a point of correction to the correction? *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: At a recent board meeting – and I do not think that this is in any way confidential, timing differences and we know that the Environment Department have got funds in the timing differences part of the... mention was made in the communication with us of being able to fund, and I remember the note, cycle paths and road markings. There was no mention of buses so I can only go on the information I have seen. Deputy Domaille may be correct, but it does not quite tie up with the information that I have seen.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Sir, can I just ask a question? This unspent allocation – unspent budget – how much does it amount to? I do not know the figure. I have not seen it in the report so ...

The Bailiff: Deputy Domaille.

Deputy Domaille: No, sir, it is not in the report, but I will let you know.

The Bailiff: We go to the vote then on the sursis, proposed by Deputy Kuttelwascher, seconded by Deputy Jones. There is no request for a recorded vote so those in favour; those against.

Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.

The Bailiff: In my view there was a majority against the sursis. So I declare the sursis lost, even though some shouted very loudly for it. *(Laughter)*

We move on then to the amendment proposed by Deputy Burford.

Amendment:

To delete all of the Propositions and replace them as follows:

'1. To agree the Vision as set out in paragraph 5, and the Transport Hierarchy as set out in paragraph 21, of the Minority Report of Deputy Y Burford and Deputy B L Brehaut entitled "INTEGRATED TRANSPORT STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN FOR GUERNSEY", and published in an annexe to that States Report in accordance with Rule 2(4) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation.

2. To rescind resolution 9 of Billet D'Etat VII 2006 "To approve the Environment Department's intention to acquire and develop suitable sites that might become available for the construction of off-street residents' parking facilities, as set out in section 4.9.7 of that Report".
3. To agree that the Department will record data in such a way as to enable meaningful measurements of change in travelling modes to be calculated.
4. To agree that a banded First Registration Duty based on CO₂ emissions and vehicle width shall be introduced as specified Table 1, and as described in paragraphs 29 to 45, of the Minority Report referred to in Proposition 1.
5. To agree that paid parking shall be introduced through:
 - (a) a system of long stay paid parking at the Odeon, the majority of North Beach, Havelet (South Esplanade long stay section), La Vallette, Castle Emplacement, the Salerie and St Julian's Avenue, and in such other on-street long-stay parking places in St Peter Port as shall be identified by Ordinance, (see paragraph 54 i of that Minority Report);
 - (b) a chargeable annual disc parking clock for short stay parking in disc zones of 2.5 hours or less in St. Peter Port, with minor exceptions, and in all disc zones in the rest of the Island, (see paragraph 54 vii of that Minority Report); and
 - (c) the re-designation of certain disc zone areas and spaces into long stay paid parking (see paragraph 54 ii of that Minority Report); and
 - (d) the re-designation of Victoria and Albert Piers and the current 2 hour disc zone at North Beach into 2.5 hour disc zones (see paragraph 54 iii of that Minority Report) .and as described in paragraphs 46 to 63 of that Minority Report.
6. To agree that States Members who wish to avail themselves of parking on any or all States Days at Lukis House shall pay £165 per year commencing 1 November 2014 as described in paragraph 62 of that Minority Report.
7. To agree a decrease of 1.2p per litre in the duty on petrol and gas oil other than fuel used for air or marine navigation with effect from April 2015, as described in paragraph 63 of that Minority Report.
8. To direct the Treasury and Resources Department in conjunction with the Environment Department to investigate the best method of accounting for and taxing the benefit to employees of employer-provided parking, by implementing a benefit-in-kind charge to tax or a workplace parking levy as described in paragraphs 64 to 67 of that Minority Report, and to report back to the States with proposals by January 2015.
9. To approve the intention of the Environment Department to investigate and implement a trial system of Park and Ride, subject to a suitable site being located, as outlined in paragraph 68 of that Minority Report.
10. To approve the intention of the Environment Department to investigate and implement measures to encourage car sharing as outlined in paragraphs 69 to 70 of that Minority Report.
11. To approve the changes applicable to learner drivers as outlined in paragraph 72 of that Minority Report.
12. To agree to the construction of a bus depot, and to direct the Treasury and Resources Department to classify the bus depot as a pipeline project for Capital reserve funding, as detailed in paragraph 82 of that Minority Report.
13. To approve the policy in respect of free bus travel as set out in paragraph 85 of that Minority Report and the implementation of the other improvements to the public bus service as set out in paragraphs 86 to 91 of that Minority Report.
14. To endorse the issuance of up to 8 additional taxi licences in a new category which require vehicles specifically adapted for the needs of disabled people, as set out in paragraph 96 of that Minority Report.
15. To direct the Environment Department to investigate possible improvement to taxi provision in Guernsey and to report back to the States by July 2015 with their proposals (see paragraph 97 of that Minority Report).
16. To approve the measures in relation to motorcycling, as outlined in paragraphs 98 to 100 of that Minority Report.
17. To approve the measures in relation to cycling infrastructure provision, promotion, education and investment, as set out in paragraphs 101 and 114 to 122 of that Minority Report.
18. To approve the intention of the Environment Department to investigate the feasibility of introducing legislation on presumed liability for greater protection of cyclists and pedestrians, as set out in paragraph 123 of that Minority Report.
19. To approve the measures in relation to walking and pedestrian infrastructure provision, promotion and investment, as set out in paragraphs 125 to 130 of that Minority Report.
20. To agree to the promotion and requirements of Travel Plans for businesses, schools and States Departments, as set out in paragraphs 132 and 140 of that Minority Report.

21. To direct the Environment Department in conjunction with the Commerce and Employment Department and the Public Services Department to conduct a review of commercial vehicle activity and circulation with a view to improvements in accordance with the Vision, as set out in paragraph 133 of that Minority Report, and to report back to the States by July 2015 with their proposals.

22. To approve the intention of the Environment Department to review speed limits as described in paragraph 137 of that Minority Report.

23. To approve the proposals in relation to disabled people as set out in paragraphs 143 to 148 and 162 of that Minority Report.

24. To direct the Environment Department to consider the Vision and the recommendations in paragraph 154 of that Minority Report in reviewing the Development Plan.

25. To approve that the Strategy as set out in that Minority Report will be funded by a combination of: a First Registration Duty as set out in paragraphs 29 to 45 of that Minority Report; income from paid parking including parking clocks as set out in paragraphs 46 to 55 and 57 to 63 of that Minority Report.

26. To direct the Treasury and Resources Department to take account of the Strategy funding requirements, as set out in Appendix 6 of that Minority Report, when recommending cash limits and routine capital allocations for the Environment Department for 2015 and subsequent years.

27. To authorise the Treasury and Resources Department, if required, to approve a transfer from the Budget Reserve of up to £835,000 to the budget of the Environment Department in 2014 to fund the implementation of the Strategy.

28. To direct to Environment Department to conduct a review of the Transport Strategy and report back to the States by December 2017 with an analysis of the effectiveness of the measures implemented, and recommendations in relation to changes that may be required in order to continue to deliver the Vision.

29. To direct the preparation of such legislation as may be necessary so as to give effect to their above decisions.'

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

1380 As Members have observed over the last two years, I do not give long speeches. But I suggest you top up your water and get your Werther's Originals at the ready because I am about to make an exception.

1385 The Minority Report comes in at 24,000 words, excluding the appendices. It is by far the longest thing I have ever written and it would take three hours solid to read out to you. All the proposals and arguments are contained therein but I will do my best to *précis* them and present you with a potted summary. Inevitably I will not be able to touch on everything but it is important to note that the whole really is more than the sum of its parts.

So first of all, for anyone feeling a bit apathetic today, let's tackle the fundamental question at the heart of all of this: why bother? Who needs a sustainable transport strategy anyway? I have heard a few Members voice this question recently, so I am going to ask you all to consider this from some viewpoints that are not necessarily your own.

1390 Imagine you are on a low income, reliant on your car to get to work but all too painfully aware of how much it costs you to own and run. Imagine you are a parent always late for work after dropping your kids at school and finding somewhere to park. Imagine you are a 12-year-old keen to assert your independence and make your own way to school but forbidden from doing so by well-meaning parents, fearful for your safety.

1395 Imagine you are a tourist visiting Guernsey for the first time, expecting to explore the Island in the tranquil ways promoted in the *Visit Guernsey* brochure. Imagine you are a town retailer watching your footfall decrease year on year. Imagine you are someone trying to counteract their sedentary lifestyle for the sake of their long-term physical or mental health. Imagine you are one of the 8,000 adults who do not or cannot drive due to age because of a disability or because you simply cannot afford to run a car.

1400 Well, it is worth bothering with a sustainable transport strategy for all of these people and many others. It is worth bothering for the community as a whole. A sustainable transport strategy will not just reduce the negative impacts of our current system, but actually introduce a whole realm of positives into the bargain. Guernsey will be a healthier, happier place.

1405 In my speech against the sursis, I outlined very briefly the various strategic directions to be found in other States' reports and Resolutions which were addressed by this Minority Report and which also go a long way towards answering the question: why bother?

1410 We need a transport strategy to bring together and implement all those policy aims, for otherwise they are fine ideals left to gather dust on the shelf. We need a transport strategy because with no change in policy, no improvement of the alternatives and a slow but steady increase in population, tomorrow will be worse than today. Should we wait until then to start trying to reverse the trend? We need a transport strategy because 98% of respondents to our consultations identified one or more issues that we can improve. We need a transport strategy because we want to make Guernsey a better place for everyone.

Our vision statement of where we want to go is this:

‘To facilitate safe, convenient, accessible and affordable travel options for all of the community, which are time and energy efficient, enhance health and the environment and minimise pollution.’

1415 Just 27 words. But in those 27 words, the vision acknowledges that it is not easy enough at present to make better choices. It acknowledges that some people do not feel safe or do not feel that their children are safe on our roads and footpaths, unless inside the safety cell of a car. It acknowledges that the alternatives often are not convenient enough, because the bus service is sporadic, or there are no cycle facilities at work. It acknowledges that for many people, transport is not sufficiently accessible to them, risking social isolation. It acknowledges that some people cannot actually afford to own and run a car. It acknowledges that time is wasted sitting in traffic, both for individuals and for businesses. It acknowledges that switching some journeys to walking or cycling would have positive health benefits. And finally, it acknowledges that travel choices have an impact on pollution and the wider environment.

1425 Sir, before highlighting some of the ways that this Minority Report delivers on those high level policies and delivers on the wider evidence base and delivers on the results of our surveys and consultations, I would like to respond to some of the comments that have been raised in the public arena since the publication of this report. The first one is: there is no problem because congestion is only 20 minutes twice a day. Well, leaving aside the numerous other times of the day when the sea front is extremely slow moving, this comment makes the very mistaken assumption that a transport strategy is all about congestion. 1430 Congestion is but a very small part of the strategy. However, it is worth considering for a few moments.

In Jersey, it was discovered that during the school holidays the number of vehicles on the road fell by 15% but congestion fell by 50%. This general principle about congestion not being linear is an important one because it works both ways. The rewards that we could obtain by a reduction of 10% or 15% in peak time traffic are significant. But, if that peak time traffic increases by just a few percentage points, the effects 1435 will also be marked. Even if congestion adds only 10 or 15 minutes to a journey – a journey which perhaps should have only have been 10 or 15 minutes in the first place, in percentage terms, in our small Island, that is not insignificant when the effect is multiplied by the number of vehicles, in terms of lost time, wasted fuel and unnecessary pollution.

The next comment – a favourite of mine – is that you will never get a Guernseyman out of his car. I am 1440 not too sure what the old adage has to say about Guernsey women (*Laughter*) or non-Guernsey people, come to that, but I digress. What we found when we asked is that many people do want to walk and cycle but do not do so due to safety concerns. One pedestrian related a story of having been hit by the wing mirror of a passing vehicle. It is true that some people are perfectly confident to walk or cycle and if you are, it is sometimes hard to imagine that not everyone is.

1445 We also found that many people would use the bus if it was reliable, frequent and inexpensive. While people do love their cars, and the convenience they afford, particularly for convoluted journeys, or apparently for carrying coal, they do not all necessary want to drive into town an hour or more before starting to work, to sit in the car eating cornflakes. This is another reason we need a transport strategy.

The third comment centres on the figure of 80,000 cars. In fact the report says 80,000 vehicles which 1450 includes commercial vehicles and motorbikes and the report also acknowledges that not all the cars are in use, as some will have been broken up or otherwise abandoned or exported. Nevertheless, the people responding to our consultations were not telling us that there are too many cars based on some data file at Bulwer Avenue; they were telling us that there were too many cars based on their day-to-day experience out and about in the Island.

1455 It is also abundantly clear that many comments in the lead-up to this debate were not based on what is actually being proposed. Many people seem to think that paid parking was for short stay as well as long stay. One person wrote to me complaining about paid parking, suggesting that a better scheme would be to have free short-stay parking on the small piers and paid long-stay elsewhere, which is of course precisely what we are proposing.

1460 Finally, this Minority Report – that is not finally for the whole speech, that is just for this section (*Laughter*) – has been called radical and not necessarily in a complementary way. But I am sorry to disappoint but this is not radical. A radical transport strategy would look very different to this. It would do things like remove half the parking in town, ban cars over a certain size, give free bicycles to every child and replace the entire bus service with a modern electric fleet. (*Interjection and laughter*) It would also 1465 have no chance of being passed by this Assembly. (*Laughter*)

Believe me, after around 500 hours and more of interviewing, studying, researching and drafting, I am convinced that this strategy is the minimum we need to do to effect change and to start to reap the benefits. If the road to hell is paved with good intentions, then the road to many a failed transport strategy has been paved with wishful thinking. The Minority Report does not rely on wishful thinking.

1470 Turning now to some of the specific proposals in the report. In order to address the widespread concerns about the size of vehicles, we propose to introduce a width charge. A bit like a filter in turn, this is a

bespoke Guernsey solution. There was much to recommend the historic Guernsey solution of charging an annual motor tax based on weight which was possibly equally unique, but the width charge acknowledges that our roads are narrow and the width of vehicles is the main cause of pavement surfing, not to mention tyre and wing mirror damage.

There can easily be over a foot difference in width between an average five-door family car and a large sports utility vehicle and the charging scale is designed to encourage and incentivise better purchasing decisions that will benefit all road users. Criticism of the likely effectiveness of this charge has come in two forms. The first is the assertion that it will not make any difference as people will simply pay the money and have the vehicle they want. The second assertion is that it will not raise any money because people will all stop people buying big cars.

Well, presumably there is some truth in both assertions and we have calculated the revenue based on what charges would have raised in 2013, less 30% for behavioural change. The main report uses a figure of what the charges would have raised in 2013, less 10% – a difference that takes into account the likely effectiveness of the scales of charges in each report. To put it in the context of our consultations, three-quarters of respondents said we should discourage large vehicles by means of taxation, with many specifically mentioning the width of vehicles. The width charge is one part of a two-part matrix – the other being an emissions charge as found in many jurisdictions.

It has been claimed that the Minority Report is more aggressive in its charges than the main report. It is definitely more progressive and it will be more effective, but it still allows a path that avoids the charges for the majority of those who wish to take it.

The Minority Report proposes subsidies for very low emission and narrow vehicles and it also has a charging scale that levies no charge whatsoever on vehicles with emissions below 120 grams per kilometre or a width below 1,750 mm.

Further, there is a subsidy to start the ball rolling on encouraging electric vehicles, which the States' Energy Policy Advisor acknowledges are ideal for Guernsey because they work very well for low speed, short range, stop/start journeys. So for anyone purchasing a small to average car, there would either be a subsidy or no change to the purchase price, around half of all cars will not be affected by the width and emissions charge at all.

Detailed discussion of numbers in a speech never works well so I will refrain from that, but I would just like to make a couple of real world comparisons about the effects of the first registration charge and the changes in fuel duty proposed between the two reports. Let's assume the life of the car to be 10 years and spread the first registration charge over that period and let's assume the average annual mileage to be 6,000 miles. A couple buying a Fiat 500 would be £64 a year better off under the Minority Report. A family buying a Honda Jazz would be £34 a year better off under the Minority Report. However, if someone wishes to buy a Range Rover 3, which is over a foot wider than the Fiat and produces twice the emissions, then they would pay £62 a year more under our proposals and that is because those are the types of vehicles we are seeking to discourage.

Commercial vehicles also fare better under the Minority Report as we propose a cap on the first registration charge and there is a net difference of 6.2 pence per litre between the two reports, which means that fuel costs for a large commercial vehicle will be around £124 a year less under our proposal, based on 6,000 miles. It is only fair to say that under the Minority Report someone may be paying to park and of course the figures I just quoted do not include that because they are about the three charges of width, emissions and fuel common to both reports and while 99.9% of cars need to use fuel, only 4% of cars use long-stay parking.

Which brings us neatly to paid parking. First of all it is worth pointing out that of course parking is not actually free from a funding point of view, it is just free at the point of use. What this means is that all Guernsey taxpayers, regardless of income and regardless of whether they own or use a car or not, fully subsidise parking for those that choose to use it. What we are proposing is to simply apply the user pays principle to long-stay parking – something supported by the majority of respondents to our consultations. Even though it would be more accurately described as 'user pays parking', the phrase 'paid parking', complete with all its associated stigma, is a phrase that has stuck.

From day one, we were aware of the risks of all aspects of the transport strategy being over-shadowed by paid parking. Indeed, it was one of the differences on Environment that led to the creation of this Minority Report. But, in the event, since the publication of the strategies, it really has not caused the stir many predicted. On the Sunday phone-in that Deputy Brehaut and I attended, it was by no means a major topic of interest. At the public presentation, kindly hosted by the St. Peter Port Douzaine, where I was rather expecting a robust challenge, it did not happen. My mailbox has had nowhere near the level of correspondence that I received on the school closures issue and much of what I did receive was either in support of paid parking or not related to it.

For those who were unable to attend one of the Minority Report presentations – and thank you to the 35 or so Deputies who did, and for the wider audience – I would like to address the myths about paid parking.

The first one is that paid parking affects the poorest most. What actually affects those on low incomes is poor public transport that leads to people being forced to run a car if there is no viable alternatives for them to get around. The cost of running a car has a disproportionate effect on the budgets of low income families and on that point, I would say to those considering supporting the amendment for vehicle safety checks, that it is the vehicles that belong to those on low incomes which are most likely to be taken off the roads, because the cost of maintaining a car has to compete with essentials like food and clothing. That certainly is not an argument for allowing potentially unsafe vehicles to circulate, but it is definitely an argument for a top notch public transportation system and safer roads and footpaths, so that people do not feel obliged to own a car to participate in society.

The second myth is that paid parking will kill town. The things that have negatively affected town in recent years are the recession, the move to out-of-town shopping, and the internet. However, evidence from other places shows that reducing the dominance of the car on town centres actually enhances town and increases sales. Shared spaces and pedestrian areas in other towns bring people in.

The third myth is that it will cost too much to set up, collect and police. A proposal approved by a previous Assembly was not taken any further due to the economics and practicalities involved in that particular scheme, which proposed a rate of 15p per hour. However, the research and design of this scheme before you today will cost between 15 and 20% of the revenue to administer, leaving at least 80% of the revenue for reinvestment in sustainable transport.

The fourth myth is that, because paid parking has not worked in Jersey, it will not work here. The single most important difference in Jersey is that the stick of paid parking was not paired with any carrots. So, faced with no better alternatives, people simply grumbled and paid. A car can park in St. Helier all day for around a fiver: to make that return journey by bus is £3.60. The incentive to switch is marginal. And where there are two people in the car then the car becomes the cheaper option.

Evidence shows that people simply do not take vehicle wear and tear into account, and even fuel use is largely ignored when weighing up the options. The lack of sufficient incentives to make the switch has meant that the people simply have not. There has been effectively no reduction in peak time traffic into St Helier. The Minority Report provides the carrot of a free at the point of use reliable bus service, with increased frequency and routes to make it a viable alternative.

In order to prevent commuters parking in residential areas of town, the Department will shortly be bringing a States' report to propose a significant extension to the residents parking scheme, which permits town residents to park for 23 hours in disc zones that are otherwise limited to two hours.

So, to summarise on paid parking – or, more accurately, user pays parking – the proposals are for the main long-stay parking areas in St Peter Port to be charged at 60p per hour, with preferential parking for small cars, preferential rates for very low emission vehicles.

Additionally there is a proposal for a £16 annual parking clock as many respondents to our consultations felt that everyone who parked in any disc zone anywhere on the Island should also make a contribution if paid parking is introduced. Finally, we propose reducing fuel duty by 1.2p per litre which was added in 2009 in lieu of a £26 paid parking clock.

I do not propose to read out the four or five pages of details on parking that can be found on page 732 onwards in the report, as I am sure Members will have studied it, but if any Member has a query I will of course be happy to reply in my summing up on this amendment.

Three-quarters of respondents to our consultation said that the supply of town parking should either be reduced or stay the same. Only a quarter called for increased parking and I think that is because many people realise that parking does blight the attractiveness of town.

While only a minority of respondents mentioned building a multi-storey car park, I will take a moment to address that point. Current building costs for multi-storeys are in the region of £40,000 per space. At that price, for an investor to recoup their money, let alone make a profit, they would need to be able to charge parking out at £2 an hour, and that does not take into account maintenance or depreciation. But this is a good thing, because what is absolutely certain – as proved by an overwhelming body of evidence – is that increasing the supply of parking increases the demand for it – compounding all the existing problems. Rather than accommodating the demand, we need to address it, which is what our integrated approach is carefully designed to do.

I know a number of people in this Assembly have stated they will not support paid parking – simple as that. Strong convictions are a commendable quality in a politician. They are after all why many of us do this job in the first place. Having strong convictions, however, is actually the easy bit. What is far less easy and, ultimately, far more commendable, is having the courage to challenge them, to lay them open to proper scrutiny and, in the light of compelling logic and evidence, to be open to the possibility of change.

I have no doubt that Deputies opposed to paid parking have good reasons for being so, underscored by good intentions. That view will not have been arrived at lightly. Decisions will have been taken into account of opinions expressed by parishioners, as well as taking personal intuition and judgement into the equation of course. But how many, hand on heart, arrived at those conclusions or remain wedded to those

1595 conclusions having looked at the issue as an integral part of a much bigger picture and having researched the vast body of evidence on the matter? Anyone who has taken the time to read the respected Institute for Transportation and Development Policy publication Europe's Parking U-Turn: From Accommodation to Regulation would undoubtedly draw the same conclusion that, and I quote:

'The ample provision of parking, especially free parking, contributes to excess car use by making driving the most convenient... travel option.'

1600 Every car journey begins and ends with a parking space, which is why parking is the key to addressing car use and congestion.

Several members of the public have explained how their previously entrenched opinions on the topic have changed since researching paid parking in detail, and I hope that those who may be considering not supporting these measures, purely because of paid parking, will be similarly open-minded.

1605 Moving now to the buses. In order for a bus service to be used, it must have certain attributes. It must be reliable. This is the single most important factor, but of course it is not enough on its own. Reliability is achieved by having a robust timetable, sufficient back-up capacity and a happy work force, amongst other things. It must operate a high frequency timetable; a service every two hours is next to useless. Half-hourly services are a minimum requirement. It must be pleasant to use, clean and comfortable buses with friendly and helpful staff who are doing the job because they enjoy it. It must be accessible. While we recognise the issues faced by those who need a door to door solution to transport needs, for some people seats at bus stops and low floor buses make the service viable. Buses need to be able to accommodate wheelchairs and buggies and people going to the airport with luggage, and this will be a top priority in the purchase of new vehicles.

1610 On the subject of new vehicles, we will be looking for smaller and cleaner vehicles more suited to our Island roads. (A Member: Hear, hear.) The bus service must be promoted. A consultation respondent quoted in the report said:

'People worry about change. They think their journey is unique but once we experiment we often find convenient alternatives.'

1620 I know that last point to be true. When my son was very small he hated his car seat with a passion, so much that I dreaded going out in the car. So, forced by circumstance, I tried the bus one day in order to meet some friends at Vazon. A five-minute walk with my son in the buggy to the bus stop, wheeling the buggy straight on to the bus – no lifting in or out or buggy origami to get it into the boot of the car – chatting and playing with my child during the journey and pointing things out, and the best thing of all was that on the way home all the sand was left in the bus and not in my car. (Laughter) After that we regularly used the bus with our 20p Ormer card. But had something not forced my hands, I never would have tried it.

1625 Modern technology, in the way of real time information and mobile phone apps, is also proposed to give people confidence that the bus is on the way. It must be affordable. At present with the £1 fare a parent travelling from St. Sampson's to town and back with two children will pay £6. Where is the incentive to use the bus? Of course, there are multi-journey cards which would bring the cost down to £3.60 in this instance, but it is the case that the people who would benefit most from discounted travel are generally those who cannot afford the £30 up front for cheaper tickets.

1630 It was clear to us that the fares on the buses needed to be reduced. There is evidence of price elasticity with passenger numbers falling as fares have risen. There were various reasons why, in the end, we settled on a free at the point of use service: once fares are reduced below a certain point, the benefits gained from not having to actually collect them outweigh the value, boarding is quicker with less traffic holdups and overall journey times are reduced and, of course, when you have no fares it is much more difficult to succumb to the temptation of increasing them and thus ending up where we are today, with fares that have risen out of all proportion to inflation and have contributed to falling passenger numbers.

1640 Hopping off the bus now, we also propose to encourage car sharing through a local easy to use website and through travel plans. Travel plans are a well-established concept. They are a package of actions designed by a workplace, school or other organisation to encourage, safe, healthy and sustainable travel options to and from that organisation, by all who use it. By reducing car travel – particularly single occupancy car travel – travel plans can improve health and wellbeing, free up car parking space – sometimes for other uses – and they can make a positive contribution to the community and the environment. Every travel plan is different, but most successful plans follow a structured process in their development. Businesses that do not already operate a travel plan will be encouraged and assisted in their creation.

1650 Research in the UK shows that travel plans increase car multi-occupancy rates by 21%. Evidence shows that, left to themselves, people are unlikely to initiate shared journeys, despite being happy to do so, as part of a workplace scheme. The Department will provide free advice and assistance to help set up schemes.

Active travel leads to increased productivity and alertness as well as fewer days lost to sickness. States Departments should lead by example and it is proposed that all States Departments should have a comprehensive travel plan in place by the end of 2016. The Department's staff will work with other Departments to achieve this.

We are also proposing a trial park and ride, with a view to expanding the scheme if successful. Park and ride schemes work when you have paid parking and, if provided with bike shelters, they are also useful to new cyclists who might not want to make the whole journey, including the last mile, but are happy to cycle part of the way. A park and ride would be integrated with a scheduled frequent bus service, and one bus has the potential to take 40 cars out of the peak-time traffic. Motorcycling will be encouraged as two wheels generally taking up less space, on the roads and when parked, than four – as well as generally using less fuel. E-cycles or battery assisted bicycles are another great way to get away, as demonstrated by my fellow Western Deputy.

Which brings us to the most efficient form of transport the humble bicycle which, hand in hand with walking, forms the part of the strategy we are calling 'Active Travel'.

The Obesity Strategy says that if current trends continue then in the next 30 years or so over half the population of this Island will be obese. The UK estimates that the cost to society in the UK will be £45 billion a year – equivalent to £45 million in the Guernsey context. Scary stuff indeed, even if the projection is only half right.

An interesting study in the academic journal *Transport* correlated the increase in obesity to the increase in car use. It concluded that policy makers have not focused as aggressively as they should on the car as a culprit of obesity and if we want to address obesity we absolutely have to re-think car use.

We currently have a culture where the accepted way of travel is by car and it is largely not questioned. Cycling is generally seen as some kind of lycra-clad sub-culture but not as a way for a business person in a suit or a parent with a child to get around. We can invest in all the cycling infrastructure we want but, without addressing the cultural issues, it will not be enough. The Minority Report understands this.

A report last year on *BBC Newsnight* highlighted the sort of measures and mindset that are needed to foster and normalise cycling culture. The overriding message is that results come from making a decisive choice at political level and then prioritising the actions needed to achieve it. The Dutch Government spends £30 per head per annum on cycling, whilst the British Government spends £2 per head across the UK. The Mayor's vision for cycling in London published in March 2013 made a commitment to spend £18 per head each year. In Guernsey our Minority Report proposes to invest a figure of £7 per head per annum, to fund the cycling improvement and promotion measures outlined in this section and to kick-start a culture change.

An academic review into policies to increase cycling found that, in almost all cases comprehensive packages of interventions led to large increases in the numbers of people cycling and the frequency of trips they made. The report however underlined the crucial importance of public policy in achieving this increase, showing that many different and complimentary interventions are required, including infrastructure provision, pro-bicycle programmes and supportive land use planning.

We also understand that people have busy lives and this is all the more reason to integrate cycling and walking into the daily commute, or even somewhat ironically the trip to the gym.

In the course of my research, I learned about someone who had been suffering from depression. Included in the doctor's advice was 20 minutes of brisk walking each day, as exercise is known to release endorphins which can help. So this person started going for a brisk 20-minute walk each morning before going to work and, indeed, found it more effective than medication in tackling his depression. After a while it occurred to him that instead of getting up earlier and going for a walk before driving the mile or so into work, it made more sense simply to leave the car at home and walk to work. This might seem painfully obvious when related as a story, but in truth we simply jump into our car as the default mode of transport.

We do not have the resources to conduct numerous long-term academic studies into the effects of a more active lifestyle in Guernsey, so have to rely to some extent on what has been discovered elsewhere. And while Guernsey might be different in some aspects, what is found time and again is that a culture of car dependency is expensive. It is expensive in terms of pollution, wasted time, congestion, accidents, infrastructure, and most importantly health.

Motorists pay fuel duty, but fuel duty does not cover all the costs of the private motor vehicle. Many of them are externalised on to society. In Copenhagen it was found that for every kilometre cycled society overall benefited by 21 cents. Out of every kilometre driven in a private car society lost 12 cents. For anyone thinking that a sustainable transport policy that drives real change is a luxury we cannot afford, I would strongly argue that we cannot afford not to do it.

The Minority Report gives some 10 pages of evidence, policy, and detailed action plans to effectively make the shift to a more active society. I do not propose to go into the micro detail here. Suffice to say that we understand that mere encouragement is not enough.

There is absolutely no point producing and approving a transport strategy if there are no resources to effectively implement it. The report proposes four new staff, two of whom will be active travel officers to drive forward the various work streams in this action plan in order to deliver the strategy. There will also be a road safety officer whose responsibilities will include working with the Police, local businesses, and the communities, schools and the media, and who will spearhead safety education campaigns. This was one of the principal recommendations made by Guernsey Police in their submission to the working group.

Finally, we propose appointing an enforcement officer with powers limited to issuing fixed penalty tickets. This would allow the Department to enforce specific issues of importance to the transport strategy, which may not be a priority for the Police at that time.

The 20/20 Vision identifies the need for the States to champion the removal of structural disadvantages, such as poor transport infrastructure, which means that some people who are disabled or in poor health suffer or are socially excluded for avoidable reasons. Guided by the Disability and Inclusion Strategy and by local disability charities, the report makes various proposals. Amongst other measures we propose a programme of disability equality training for bus and taxi drivers, and to ensure that all new buses are accessible. All disabled parking will remain free and disabled badge holders will be able to obtain a parking clock free of charge. We will work with the Disability and Inclusion Strategy Implementation Group and local disability organisations to endeavour to enhance transport options for those people with disabilities who cannot avail themselves of public or private transport. Funding provision of £150,000 has been identified in this strategy to progress work streams related to disability issues.

The Department will continue with its existing programme of installing drop kerbs, audible and blister markings for crossings, resized parking bays and other similar measures. We will investigate and implement a shop mobility system.

Turning now to the promotion of our Island beyond these shores. Initiatives in this action plan that we believe will be attractive to tourists include buses free at the point of use, attractive pedestrian and cycling priority routes in rural areas, an improved public realm in St Peter Port to enjoy the attractiveness of town and harbour, as well as improved access for disabled tourists.

The next aspect I would like to discuss is the various individual States' Departments responses to the draft main strategy. I have been through the responses and identified some concerns raised by some Departments, and I would like to explain the way the Minority Report deals with them.

The Home Department expressed concern about the effect of the width duty on fire appliances and specialist equipment. The Minority Report specifically exempts emergency vehicles from these charges.

The Housing Department was supportive of incentivised alternative transport options, complete with disincentives for private motorised vehicles – which fits in with the proposals in the Minority Report.

HSSD supported the need for high quality affordable public transport, as well as acknowledging the vital importance of increased participation in walking and cycling, which it states can make a major contribution to improved health and wellbeing, and thereby reduce expenditure on preventable health problems. They particularly supported the use of NICE guidelines on walking and cycling, which have been used as part of the evidence base in paragraph 104 of the Minority Report.

Public Services – of which I am a Member – support the concept of an integrated transport strategy. They note that under the main report the fuel duty will cost States works between £28,000 and £41,000 a year. Of course, under the Minority Report costs will fall.

PSD are not supportive of width taxes for commercial vehicles and, should the Soulsby amendment be successful, they will be removed. However, the Department is supportive of the emissions duty for environmental reasons. PSD point out that North Beach represents a key component of modernisation and expansion of the commercial port and the Minority Report acknowledges this in its parking proposals.

Finally, they stress the need for the maintenance of new infrastructure created under this report not to fall on their Departments and paragraph 107 of the Minority Report specifically states that the transport strategy funding will be available for such maintenance.

Education state that cycling to school can be impractical when there are books and sports clothes to carry, but those Members who saw the video in the Minority Report presentation showing what it is actually possible to carry on a bike might disagree. The most memorable being a woman transporting a full size gas cooker six kilometres by bicycle. Surely we should be trying to overcome such obstacles rather than just throwing up our hands in defeat at the first mooted hurdle. However, one of the most important points I should make in response to Education's comments is, yes, the Minority Report assumes that the cost of funding all the active travel measures for schools will be borne by the transport strategy funding.

While I am on the subject of education, with some 7,000 or so people attending education and school each day, travel to and from school is an important aspect of the strategy. Evidence shows that when children walk or bike to school instead of being driven in a car they concentrate much better. This is one of the main conclusions of a Danish study of over 19,000 school children aged between five and 19. There is consistent evidence in studies of a significant positive relationship between physical activity and cognitive

function. So the benefits of active travel to school are at least three-fold: educational outcomes, physical health and putting in place good lifetime habits.

We welcome the desire of the Education Department to work with Environment in respect of the travel arrangements of its staff, students and community users. A simple survey provided to the working group by the Education Department showing the breakdown of how children travel to school and what measures schools have in place to promote active and sustainable travel revealed widely differing percentages and approaches. Whilst catchment boundaries and age ranges account for some of these, it is clear that there is much potential for improvement. Schools will be assisted in implementing travel plans and creating safe walking and cycling routes and improved facilities for cycling. Numerous initiatives are possible including cycling clubs, loan schemes and practical cycle maintenance sessions. It is proposed to progressively extend the type of traffic management that exists around St Sampson's High and Le Murier schools to other schools on the Island, where appropriate.

In accordance with the response to our consultation from Education, we propose a review of the school bus service with a view to extending the current provision and ensuring that general scheduled improvements fully take into account school timings and routes.

Land use policy is also a vital factor in the prevalence of walking and cycling. The role that transport plays in planning policy will be considered as part of the current development plan review. This will include maximum parking standards for new developments, minimum standards of cycle parking provision in new developments and investigation into ways of promoting town as a place to live and work without the reliance on private motor vehicles. The enhancement of the public realm is important for the vibrancy of our centres and accords with the visions for the Town and The Bridge.

I would now like to look at the financial aspects of this Minority Report. One particularly important point I would like to clarify, over which there seems to have been some misunderstanding, is the replacement of the FTP cut to the buses. What we are saying is that, after the money was taken out of the buses as part of Environment's FTP target, it became evident that it was not possible to run a good bus service for what was left. So in order to effectively take us back to that point, which we know is robust, we are raising funds through the strategy. We can then add in the costs of additional vehicles, drivers, routes and infrastructure. It does not affect the FTP in any way and the 2012 saving is banked and will stay that way.

The Minority Report provides funding for a bus depot, which the Department's submission to the capital prioritisation process identified as essential for the operation of a modern and effective bus service. The main report relies on T&R finding this funding from general revenue and suggests a bus service operator could build the depot as part of its contract. However, the unsuccessful capital bid acknowledged that such a move would not only tie the States into a single operator for 20 years, but that operator would probably factor in significant risk costs and a higher interest rate. By retaining ownership of the buses and the depot, the States is not vulnerable in the same way to a defaulting operator, nor does it need to tie itself in to a very long-term contract. So, not only does the Minority Report identify funding for the depot, rather than leaving it to chance that an extra million pounds plus a year can be discovered somewhere else, it also retains significant flexibility in the depot's procurement and ownership.

Still on funding, I have already mentioned the 30% allowance that has been made for a shift in vehicle purchasing habits and indeed all the figures in the report have erred on the conservative side. Realising that a strategy that is effective in reducing the number of journeys by motor vehicles and encouraging cleaner cars means that we will use less fuel and, by extension, collect less fuel duty. The report also makes provision for that fall by allowing 7% in the first full year, increasing by 1% per annum in subsequent years.

On the subject of fuel, I would like to explain why we are not proposing an increase in fuel duty as a method of funding the strategy. Administratively, it would be the easiest way to do it. However, it will have very little effect in changing behaviour. The price of petrol is generally acknowledged to be relatively inelastic and therefore the effect on reducing the number of journeys is likely to be limited. Evidence shows that although increased duty will result in a small decrease in demand for fuel, much of the decrease is due to switching to more efficient vehicles and more efficient driving techniques, rather than reducing the number of journeys made by car.

The Policy Research Unit prepared a paper for the Department to try and establish the effect that raising fuel duty has had on fuel consumption since around 2008. However, due to an insufficient time run or a lack of availability of local data they did not include the likely effects of the recession. They only based their research on petrol figures, ignoring diesel, and most crucially they did not allow for the increase in vehicle efficiency, which in the UK was 23% over the last decade and there is no reason to think Guernsey is markedly different. This is not a criticism of the Policy Research Unit. They point out all these factors in their report, but the absence of these factors means that no firm reliance whatsoever can be placed on the suggested degree of correlation between fuel price and consumption.

To get a clearer picture on the likely effects, I turned to a Metro Analysis of 69 studies on road traffic and fuel price elasticity, which showed that a 4% increase in the price of fuel, as proposed by the main report, would only have the effect of reducing traffic by 0.4% in the short run and 1.2% in the long run.

1835 The implementation time scale for the Minority Report can be summed up as carrot before stick. Although the first registration charge will be introduced expeditiously – mainly to prevent people rushing out to buy large cars ahead of the charge and to establish funding – we propose to bring about many of the improvements to the bus service as soon as possible and ahead of introducing user pays parking.

1840 Members will be aware that a number of amendments have been circulated in respect of the Minority Report. It may assist them in their deliberation to know that the only amendments we will be opposing are those to introduce bus fares.

1845 So, to finish – as some Members' sweet supplies look dangerously close to drying up – you have today the opportunity to take decisive, significant and long-lasting action to make Guernsey a better place to live for everyone. You can do this simply by putting in place an effective, forward-looking sustainable transport strategy – one that uses a carefully balanced and truly integrated approach to deliver meaningful change. The Minority Report delivers on this Government's high level objectives. It will have a positive and long lasting social outcome, environmental outcome and economic outcome.

1850 To say now is the time to take this action is not quite accurate. These changes are long overdue, the Minority Report is, of course, informed by detailed research, analysis and insights from many other jurisdictions. But, remember, this strategy is also based on a significant body of evidence from the Guernsey people, addressing the issues that they themselves identify. They identify a clear need for change to make Guernsey a better place to live. You can deliver that change today. (*Applause*)

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe, you wish to be relevée?

1855 **Deputy Lowe:** Yes, please, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut, do you formally second the amendment?

1860 **Deputy Brehaut:** Yes, sir, I formally second. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Thank you. Does anybody wish to speak? Yes, Deputy Hadley.

1865 **Deputy Hadley:** I think one might think the Deputy has beaten us into submission. (*Laughter*) The truth is the... An excellent speech. I have never listened to a 50-minute speech before. I usually switch off after about 10 or 20 minutes. And it mirrors the excellent presentation that the Deputy also gave to those at the Aero Club.

I draw Members' attention to what the Department's report says. It says – and this is the main report – that the strategy:

'Seeks to address the adverse impact of all vehicles,
Seeks to support and incentivise transport alternatives,
Seeks to reduce the dominance of the private motor vehicle....'

1870 Well, I would suggest that it does not do what it says on the tin. The majority report does not do any of those things, in contrast with the Minority Report. The Minority Report says it aims:

'To facilitate safe, convenient, accessible and affordable travel options for all the community, which are time and energy efficient, enhance health and the environment and minimise pollution.'

1875 – and it does just that. We have an excellent Minority Report.

So I will not say much more than to urge Members of the Assembly to vote for the amendment which is important to make sure that we get rid of the majority report.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

1880 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Thank you, sir.

1885 I want to go back to this business of financing the bus depot. I have already, in the sursis debate, mentioned the problems I have with that about it being put into the skip processes and effectively prioritised by specific funding. On page 774, basically, paid parking, long stay is seen to raise £1.15 million and to build a bus depot is £1.15 million, so you can obviously see that that particular sum is being hypothecated to funding the bus depot. Fine. At the presentation –

Deputy Burford: Point of correction, sir.

1890 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Sorry?

Deputy Burford: Point of correction.

1895 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Those two figures are the same but that is not necessarily saying that is where it would come from. It could come from any of the funding that is raised. So it is not necessarily from paid parking. The paid parking is also a charge, so it is not necessarily a hypothecation.

1900 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Fine. An interesting co-incidence, but never mind.

The point I wish to make was, going back to the presentation that was organised by the St Peter Port Douzaine, one of the members of the audience asked a very interesting question of both presenters of the two reports which was: how do you measure the success of your policy? There were really no satisfactory answers. I think Deputy Domaille said, 'Oh, we will review it after three years', but did not answer what they would be reviewing.

1905 What is interesting is, I believe, the number of parking spaces that will be subject to long-term paid parking is about 1,400 – that is the figure I remember. If this report, if this strategy, is deemed to be 100% successful in stopping or convincing people they should not come into town long term, they would all be empty. I mean, that sounds a bit dramatic, but if that was the purpose of the exercise – to change the culture so people do not come in and park long term – the 1,400 places – if it was a perfect solution – would be empty and suddenly you are £1.15 million short. I know that is not going to happen, but you could have something in between.

1910 So one of the issues with this is that, although the funding arrangements look good on paper, in reality they may not materialise, and that for me is a problem. It is the only issue I will focus on for now. For me, any sort of funding which is not guaranteed is not acceptable. So I will be opposing this report.

1915 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy De Lisle.

1920 **Deputy De Lisle:** Sir, I just want to make the point that the Minority Report will charge long-stay paid parking at £1,300 a year to town workers. It will also charge for short-term parking in town. It will re-designate disc zone areas and spaces into long-stay paid parking – for example, St Julian's Avenue. It will tax employer-provided parking and subject more Town streets to resident parking fees. Paid parking charges will not be introduced outside the town.

1925 These measures are likely to shift businesses and their employees out of town and quite contrary to the States Strategic Plan, which is to encourage revitalisation of Town. Paid parking works against the Strategic Plan and stops the growth of town and encourages growth out of town. It will also add to the growth of Civil Service, with four new civil servants to be added to the Environment Department, contrary to the policy of controlling the growth of the Civil Service and doing more with less.

1930 Sir, I wanted to just make the point as well that many town centres in England are suffering and are now lifting paid parking and placing hoods over the meters. They do that at Christmas time in most and they are doing it more and more as it is recognised that paid parking is encouraging shopping outside of these centres into the suburban malls where parking is free.

1935 So I think we have got to really think very carefully before we subject this Island to paid parking, which is considered to be an advantage for Guernsey business with respect to, certainly, Jersey visitors coming to Guernsey. They actually remark on that particular fact.

We have got to look at the business implications and it is all very well to have people talking in this Assembly about wishful thinking, but the fact is the practicalities of running business in town is hard enough now without imposing further difficulties on the traders.

1940 Thank you, sir. (**Several Members:** hear, hear.)

The Bailiff: Does anyone else wish to speak? Deputy Paint.

Deputy Paint: Sir, I do want to speak but my speech will be about 15 minutes.

1945 **The Bailiff:** Right, well, in that case, does anybody else have a speech? Any speeches of not more than about 10 minutes in duration? Deputy Jones.

Deputy David Jones: I just want to say something about the paid parking. It is in my speech on the main report, but one of the reasons I am totally opposed to it is because Governments have shown that they cannot be trusted with this kind of revenue raising power. We say, 'Well, at the moment, it will only apply to certain spaces in town.' You wait till you get it. Before long it will be right across the Island and the parking charges will go up year on year as the motorist is treated as a convenient cash cow to fund all kinds of other creative things that will happen as far as the future transport strategy. That is the problem. And I also have the same problem with GST – it will be exactly the same. And the fact of the matter is that you will end up with paid parking as some sort of motoring apartheid, as those who can afford to pay it will still use their cars and they will still pay it; the people who cannot afford it so much will be forced to pay it and it will affect their other forms of expenditure.

Sir, that is one of the major problems I have with it. I mean I hear what Deputy Burford says about the 20/80% split between the collection of the revenue and the expenditure, but you watch the shift on that as time goes by. We are already seeing – as Deputy De Lisle has just pointed out – an increase in staff numbers, at a time when we have got FTP savings going through the States when we are trying to reduce the amount of people that we employ in the Civil Service. We are trying to cut back on Government bureaucracy and expenditure, and here we are with this particular policy saying, 'Well, of course, we will need more people and that will include salaries, pensions and all kinds of other things.' Paid parking is not worth that, in my view and the idea that because it is a user pays... Who do you think paid for them in the first place? Who do you think paid for all these car parks in the first place? The people of Guernsey paid for them. They did not magic out of thin air. They have already paid for them and they pay for them in parking fines in many ways, and vehicle registration fees and then there is the issue of the fuel costs.

We have no idea what the fuel costs are going to be in the future. You can pass anything you like in here today, but I suspect that Treasury are going to be looking at all that in the future again and we already have – as we found out at the Vale Douzaine on Saturday morning – some of the most expensive fuel in Europe now. Nobody bothers to fill up their cars any more going to France because it is cheaper at the fuel stations in France and (*Interjection*) well, I blame the EU of course. (*Laughter*)

As far as the buses go, I want a public transport system that works for Guernsey but, as I said in the speech on the sursis, this is the cart before the horse – we do not have that and we are going to punish people by taxation? That is immoral in my view. That is immoral to punish people by taxation to try and force them to change their behaviour on to a public transport system that is rubbish. Let's get the public transport... Because the other thing is the chicken and the egg syndrome which is: 'Well, of course we need to raise all this money so that we can have a decent bus service.' I am so angry when I hear Deputies say that. We have had £33 million over 11 years, roughly, thrown at those buses and you still have a rubbish bus service. We should be ashamed. Everybody who had anything to do with the buses should be sacked. It is such a rubbish service, after throwing millions at it. On top of that you have had fuel surcharges that have brought in many tens of thousands – hundreds of thousands – that have gone to waste.

So please do not tell me we need to do this in order to get money to get a decent bus service. The States of Guernsey and the Departments responsible for this mess should be ashamed of themselves. The amount of money that has been poured in to this bus service and it is still a rubbish bus service – it does not do what it says on the tin; it does not serve the people, and – (**Deputy Gollop:** Could I...?) No, you may not. (*Laughter*)

Deputy Gollop: Would the Minister give way?

Deputy David Jones: I am in the middle of a rant and it is (*Laughter*) and in any event –

Deputy Fallaize: We had not noticed!

Deputy David Jones: – it is lunchtime. I think I will leave it there. (*Laughter*)

The Bailiff: Does anyone else have a short speech they would like to deliver before lunch time? No. In that case I suggest we rise and return at 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.27 p.m.
and resumed at 2.30 p.m.*

Billet d'État IX

ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

VI. Guernsey Integrated On-Island Transport Strategy – Debate continued

The Deputy Greffier: Billet IX, Article VI. Environment Department – Guernsey Integrated on Island Transport Strategy, continuation.

2005 **The Bailiff:** We are continuing the debate on the amendment proposed by Deputy Burford seconded by Deputy Brehaut.
Deputy Paint, do you wish to be the first to speak?

2010 **Deputy Paint:** There are certain Members of the Assembly... First of all, I would like to say that I will be speaking on the Minority Report, but I also speak a little bit on the history of what has happened in the last few years through the Environment Department.

2015 First of all, what should be borne in mind is the actual culprit of the problems we have been subjected to over public transport over two or three years... The FTP team working under the instruction of the States, instructed the Environment Department to cut the bus subsidy by £300,000 a year or two ago, without an audit or any evaluation of any sort to see what consequences this cut would have on the bus services. The Department's staff argued strongly, with the Board's support, with them to not impose this cut because we all knew it would have impacts of the quality of service – I am sorry to say to no avail. The Environment Department was then forced to implement these cuts, having no funds available to do otherwise if we were to meet the targets.

2020 The consequence of this was that Island Coachways, who ran a reasonable service, gave notice of termination of the contract stating that the bus service could not be maintained without a full subsidy of £2,500,000. How right they were. After asking the operators for a contract with CT Plus because it was the best option, so they were appointed as contractor... I do not have to explain the problems Environment and the Island have had to overcome since that time. CT Plus, at times, was haemorrhaging money hand over fist and Environment could do little else but to put the cost of fares up to ensure that the Island could retain a bus service.

2025 This must be one of the worst examples of the FTP supposed savings scheme and that was forced on any Department at any time, so I would like to thank the FTP consultants for the problems you have caused the Environment Department and the people of this Island, claiming such costs as were achieved, and I hope that you enjoy your 6% of the cost you have received.

2030 Moving to the Minority Report –

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, may I please... A point of order or point of correction, or whatever it is, please, sir?

2035 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

2040 **Deputy Fallaize:** Deputy Paint is misleading the States and I was prepared to allow him to mislead the States, but I am not prepared to allow him to impugn the work that has been done by the FTP partners or whatever they are called.

2045 The consultants engaged by the States have no right at all or there is no possibility they can force States Departments into doing anything. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) The decisions about how to manage Departments' budgets are down to the elected Members of those Departments. The decision to cut the subsidy was made by the Environment Department, not by the FTP Consultants and to pass the responsibility on to the FTP Consultants, in my view, is not only misleading, but completely irresponsible. I would ask Deputy Paint to withdraw his remarks about the FTP consultants and to take responsibility for the decisions that were made by the previous Environment Department to cut the subsidy. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

2050 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Paint.

Deputy Paint: Thank you, sir.

Well, I have to disagree strongly with Deputy Fallaize. The point is, if we had not done it, the money would not have been given to us anyway. We would have had to find funds from somewhere else and we lost CT Plus because of it. We were trying to work corporately and, if you are not prepared to accept that there is nothing I can do.

May I continue, sir?

The Bailiff: Yes.

Deputy Paint: I would like now to give credit where it is due and say that the Minority Report has been well reported by the two Deputies and well put together. But I am sorry to say that is all I can say for it. *(Laughter)*

The main aim, in my view... It is just trying to unfairly force the general public to pay more for their motoring. There is no doubt that it is trying to influence this Assembly around to a particular way of thinking on all kinds of green issues, but sadly it has very little to do with the reality of life or what most people want, what they can afford or the requirements of their everyday lives.

Again, let us look at a little bit of history on this. The Island's people have contributed towards a bus service for years – both in general taxes and the 1.2p additional fuel tax over those few years. The odd thing is that that particular tax was never given to the Environment Department for that particular purpose. All the strategy works is that the Department has been able to deliver from other funds, so what has happened to that 1.2p? My guess is it has disappeared into the black hole we hear so much about.

We are all aware that the States is struggling to find money to do things throughout the Island. Many Deputies seem to forget that a lot of the general public are also having difficulty to make ends meet, and all the Minority Report is doing is stretching those people's finances to the limit, and some beyond that limit.

But the problem I have always had in sitting on the Environment Board is that I have never believed that there is a massive traffic problem that merits such drastic measures proposed in this amendment. It is true that at certain times of the day on certain main routes into St Peter Port there is some congestion – actually in the mornings along the roads leading to town, at times particularly when children are attending school, but not so bad that we have continual gridlock or that we choke on the fumes.

So now let us move on to paid parking. The idea of paid parking has been raised in this Chamber several times over a number of years. It is something else that I have continually opposed around the Environment Board table. The public do not want this and the town can certainly manage without it.

It is a shame that some Deputies are so obsessed with paid parking and continue to bring it up every four years or so. There has not been an economical impact study or assessment on the effect paid parking would have on the town traders or the businesses or workers in low paid jobs in the town area. I repeat there has not been an impact study or assessment. Therefore the only conclusion that one can come to is that it has been worked out by a guess, a whim or an ideal that few people wish to see, regardless of the effects it might have on others. What could happen if this paid parking was introduced is that many town workers, including some of those who may be on better pay, might not be able to afford to work in the town anymore.

So what will happen to these people? They will try to find work outside the town in the countryside – and many will not find it, so they will find themselves on benefits, adding further to SSD's already pressing resources.

The town traders and businesses that will survive will have to find workers from somewhere, so that can only be imported labour. Do we want to see even more local jobs being filled by guest workers when there are perfectly able people in the Island to do the work but cannot afford to do it because there are paying too much to stay in employment in the town area?

The introduction of paid parking only in St Peter Port must add to the businesses' and the individuals' costs and make it uncompetitive with other locations in the Island. And in some cases businesses may even have to leave the Island. Paid parking in areas... in any of its forms is likely to damage St Peter Port as a shopping and business destination.

Not only the low paid will suffer. Some of the middle earners who have large mortgages will also be affected as more and more of their disposable income goes towards this paid parking, which is only being introduced in order to bully them out of their cars into other forms of transport that they do not wish to use.

With regard to some of the alleged support to these proposals, it has been said that the Chamber of Commerce supports the Minority Report. Well, I doubt it is correct at all because I have spoken to – *(Interjection)* I doubt this is correct at all because I have spoken to several Members of the Chamber and I know that they are completely against paid parking in any of its forms.

The Guernsey Motor Traders Association attended the Environment meeting on 22nd April and expressed their views, both on the minority and majority reports. I asked them if any of them were Members of the Chamber of Commerce and they all expressed that they were. I then asked them how it was

that they agreed with the consultation letter sent to Environment by the Chamber of Commerce, when it was clear from their conversation at that meeting they did not agree with most of it. In reply, one said that he had read the letter but only after it had been sent and that they had not been consulted or had any input into it at all.

What I and others understand has happened is that the transport group of the Chamber of Commerce put forward this letter to the Environment consultation process without consulting the Chamber of Commerce, particularly those in the motor trade. It does not take too much imagination to see that if the right people are put in any one of these groups then the conclusion one gets comes from a very small committee rather than from the full membership of the Chamber of Commerce, who some of their members are fiercely against... opposed to this report.

It is also clear from the *Guernsey Press* that a number of town retailers and businesses do not want paid parking in any of its forms and they believe it will destroy the town. Although the letter was received from the Chamber of Commerce on this matter it is doubtful that it reflects the Chamber's majority view and must therefore remain questionable.

I for one am not prepared to take a chance and risk putting the trading viability of St Peter Port, the livelihoods of some of the town businesses and the employment of their staff, to justify the ideals of a few eco pirates who clearly have their own agenda and rely on the half-truth spin and illusion assisting them in forming this Minority Report. I am also not prepared to condone and support the views of a few people's dreams that will not doubt turn out to be everybody's nightmare.

So let us look at what happens if the Minority Report is successful. If most people who drive larger cars buy a smaller car to avoid paying the draconian duties proposed and the assumed money intake to finance the free bus service is no longer available, who or what will be taxed next to fill that shortfall? I am sorry to say that the proposers of the Minority Report are living in a dream world that assumes that their proposal will fix all. The rest of us, living in the real world, know that it will not and it will be much dearer for all of us to live.

The reduction of 1.2p a litre in fuel is a sprat to catch a mackerel, which cuts the cake really. The total cost of the Minority Report is £3.65 million, at least, and £2.55 million to the majority report. If the majority report is adopted many of the town workers will be charged more than £1,300 per annum, plus the parking charges and could be around 5% of their salary.

All of us have to live in the world we have today and recognise that the car is an essential part of modern life. It is not for Government to try to create some sort of inward looking environment by taxing people to death to make the daily lives of our people miserable because our Government cannot see the reality of personal car use.

Finally, we have to look forward to the future with reasonable adjustment for the times we live in. We have to recognise the car is here to stay and we have to learn to accommodate it and all other road users for the better, not only for those who want to try to create some sort of utopia which is unachievable.

Advocate Peter Ferbrache described both reports as a form of social engineering, recently on the radio. I could not agree with him more in the case regarding the Minority Report. I will be voting against it, as you might have gathered, (*Laughter*) and thank you for letting me speak.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize, then Deputy Le Clerc and Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

We have before us the Department's report, the 'Majority Report', if that is what we are going to call it, and this very substantial Minority Report from two Members of that Department. The Department is laying before the States 29 recommendations and the proposers of this amendment are asking the States to delete all of those 29 recommendations and substitute 29 others.

In total, the number of amendments circulated for debate, I think, at the last count is 13, although I understand there could be some others circulated during the course of debate. We have already had a sursis. I know that some of the amendments are in the alternative. But the biggest risk to the States today... because of the nature of this debate, because of the composite amendment to substitute 29 Propositions and the 13 amendments, the greatest danger is that we leave here today with a dog's breakfast.

I think that in voting against the sursis, the States have avoided risk number one, which was to leave here without having made a positive decision, and to appear to be unable to govern effectively, for want of a better phrase. But the second risk – and in some ways an even bigger risk – is that we leave here with a patchwork of proposals that is a dog's breakfast that will not hang together properly.

Sir, the best way of ensuring that we leave here with a dog's breakfast is to start with a dog's breakfast and this is where I think this amendment comes in. I am going to appeal to the States – because we are not very far into debate on this amendment – to foreshorten debate on this amendment, and to make a decisive choice between the Department's Propositions and the Propositions in the Minority Report.

In my view, that is a fairly straight forward binary choice. Either we prefer to use the Department's Propositions as the basis for debate or we prefer to use the recommendations in the Minority Report as the basis for debate. It is absolutely pointless to spend hours and hours debating Deputy Burford's amendment, then potentially approve it, then debate 13 other amendments, and then in general debate go back to Deputy Burford's amendment and spend several more hours dissecting paid parking and fuel duties and price elasticity of this and that and width duties and fuel CO₂ duties. That is completely pointless.

So I think the choice before the States at this stage of the debate is simply which set of Propositions do we want to start with. Which set of Propositions do we think are the most coherent basis for us to have a sensible debate? Once we have made that decision, then we can go through the amendments one by one and we can decide which of the amendments we prefer or which of the amendments we want to throw out. I do not support everything in the Minority Report. I oppose some of it and I will be voting for some of the amendments, but I do think we have to make this straightforward binary choice of which set of Propositions we start with, because if we get that decision wrong we are absolutely certain to leave here with a dog's breakfast.

That leads me to asking the States to vote for the amendment that is before them for three reasons.

First of all, one of conviction. I genuinely do not believe – with the possible exception of the Minister – that the other Members of the Environment Department are absolutely passionately behind their proposals. I have heard noises saying, 'Well, we were told to come back to the States. There was a States' Resolution so we did not have any choice.' Deputy Burford, on the other hand, and Deputy Brehaut clearly believe passionately in what they are putting together. I have been in the position where Deputy Burford is – well, not exactly... not as the author of a Minority Report but – trying to lay this type of wholesale amendment to a Department's report, and it takes a great deal of work. And far from having Deputy Burford and Deputy Brehaut attacked in the States this afternoon – which was perhaps the flavour of the most recent speech – I think they should be applauded, because they have clearly put in... I suspect that Deputy Burford has spent literally hundreds of hours of time researching and preparing her Minority Report. I thought her speech was very comprehensive and very compelling, and she has a right to bring this amendment to the States. It is clearly something she believes in.

Deputy Paint said, 'Oh, people keep bringing paid parking back to the States'. Well, I do not think one can blame Deputy Burford. She stood on a manifesto at the last Election which said, 'If I am elected I favour paid parking' and she unseated two sitting Members of the States. So to suggest that somehow she is in the wrong because she is laying this amendment and it includes paid parking, I think is sort of a reversal of democracy.

So I think that her – I do not agree with all of her proposals and I know some Members violently disagree with them, but even if one disagrees with them I think one has to see that she is putting hers forward with greater conviction than are the other Members of the Environment Department, putting forward the Majority Report.

The second reason I think to prefer her Propositions as the basis for debate is to do with funding. Some of the funding proposals in Deputy Burford's amendment are not favoured by Members of the States – and there are issues of affordability and there are issues of resource prioritisation, if I can put it that way; I accept all of that – but her package is a complete funding package. The Department's package is not. The Department is actually proposing things implicitly, if not explicitly, which are not funded. It leaves things hanging. It hopes that there might be some money made available for certain measures at some point in the future. But Deputy Burford's proposals are a complete funding package.

The biggest reason to prefer Deputy Burford's amendment over the Department's Proposition is the question of coherence. The Department's proposals are not coherent because in order to achieve what they want to achieve they rely on nothing other than wishful thinking. Deputy Hadley alluded to this earlier.

I quite like the objectives and the vision in the Environment Department's report – I think it makes quite a lot of sense – and I quite like the objectives and the vision in Deputy Burford's Minority Report, but the difference is one proposes the measures to achieve the objectives, and the other does not propose the measures to achieve their objectives.

The Environment Department want us to believe that their ambitious transport strategy will be realised by increasing duty on fuel by 5p. That is the one single real measure with any teeth which is included in their report. There is a whole load of wishful thinking, and motherhood and apple pie, and trying to incentivise people to do this, that and the other, but the one measure with real teeth is to increase fuel duty by 5p. Nobody is not going to buy a car because of width duty or CO₂ duty. It might alter the type of car they purchase but it is not going to reduce the number of journeys they make. In fact it might increase them because people will do what they did with car insurance and what they did with motor tax and say, 'Well, now I have paid duty on this thing I might as well use it.' So the one measure with any kind of teeth, potentially, is 5p duty on fuel. I do not believe that will have any effect, whatsoever. I think Deputy Burford's Minority Report presents a complete compelling destruction of this suggestion that duty on fuel has some effect on the quantities of fuel purchased at the pump. I just do not accept that that is true at all.

The Environment Department's report does not include any material disincentives and without disincentives there is not going to be any kind of modal shift in behaviour, and yet both reports represent, or they have this objective of modal shift. Both of the reports want to persuade people to make fewer journeys using private motor cars. They both share that objective. But Deputy Burford includes some measures which would give us a chance of realising the objective. The Department's report will simply take millions of pounds out of people's pockets and will achieve absolutely nothing.

So I think, sir, that the sensible thing to do is to say, if we are going to have a debate about anything, we ought to be debating the Propositions or the recommendations that are attached to the Minority Report. We may choose at the end of the debate to throw them out. It might be that Members will say actually we prefer the *status quo* to Deputy Burford's report. It may be that we have amendments, as Deputy Storey, I think it was – perhaps Deputy Kuttelwascher; Deputy Kuttelwascher actually I think it was – was talking about his thought about trying to amend some of the Propositions so that there was no immediate commitment of funding. He suggested when he spoke that that was an option –

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Sir, a point of correction. It is something I thought about before going down the sursis route, but it is not something I am proposing at the present time.

Deputy Fallaize: Yes, but he suggested that it was an option.

The States can consider all of the amendments and can decide which bits they want to insert, which bits of the Propositions they want to leave in, and can then take a rational objective view at the end of the debate about whether to vote for the whole thing as a package or not. But we have got to start with a set of Propositions which are at least coherent, and the only way we can do that is by voting for this amendment. So, even for those Members who want to chuck out everything at the end, I would implore them, for the sake of having a logical coherent debate, please vote in favour of this amendment and substitute the Propositions in the amendment for the Department's Propositions. Then we can get on with a material debate about the merits or demerits of the various measures proposed in what is at least a coherent Minority Report.

The Bailiff: There are several people waiting to speak. I will call Deputy Le Clerc, Deputy Brouard and Deputy Stewart.

Deputy Le Clerc: Sir, it is always difficult following Deputy Fallaize. Really I agree with him on all the points that he has made and I have written down some notes here.

I do support the Minority Report. It has not quite got all the aspects that I can go along with and I am hoping that, if it does get approved, some of the amendments proposed will get passed and I think this strategy offers a great deal more opportunity for Guernsey to move forward with its transport strategy.

I would just like to pick up on a point that Deputy Paint made about paid parking and people going to jobs outside of town. I just do not think that those jobs would be available outside of St Peter Port and they would not end up on supplementary benefit, because they would become job seekers and there are certain rules around them obtaining work, so I do not feel that we would have a huge burden on our Social Security Department because of that.

As a St Peter Port Deputy, I did ask the St Peter Port Douzaine and Constables to put on a debate because I was very interested to hear from St Peter Port residents. I was interested to hear from commuters into St Peter Port. I was interested to hear from the retailers in St Peter Port, as to their views on both of the strategies. And it was an excellent evening, with Deputy Domaille and Deputy Burford presenting. What was actually disappointing was the lack of people that actually turned up to that meeting and what I feel is going to happen is, whatever the outcome of today is, that we will have people – as they did with the population debate – who only moan afterwards. You can lead a horse to water but, yes, very disappointed. And actually I think some of the emails and people who have bothered to contact me have been very much more supportive of the Minority Report.

I would have liked more information on the residents parking scheme because I do think, if we have the Minority Report and we have paid parking, the impact on the residents is the thing that is of greater concern to me, because when I was, two years ago, walking around the streets canvassing for votes, the residents did say to me that that was a real issue – about parking outside of their houses – when they had visitors coming along, that commuters were spreading out and out.

I think if you go to the Foulon Cemetery now you would think there were probably 10 funerals going on at the Foulon, because the whole of that road has got back-to-back parking and you will find that there is actually no-one in the Cemetery and it is people who either walk in or catch the bus from outside St Stephen's Church.

I will be supporting the Minority Report. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

2295

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

The problem with this debate is where to begin really and, as Oscar Wilde said, ‘the pure and simple truth is rarely pure and never simple’.

2300 There is so much one can bring out in this debate and both proposals have some good initiatives, but they are round the edges. Of the main issues which remain, they are today, and will be tomorrow, unfair, unacceptable and fundamentally flawed.

2305 I advised the consultation that I was not in favour of paid parking – Deputy Jones and myself leading that proposal being thrown out in the 2009 debate, which was seeking the funding for the then 2006 Road Transport Strategy. We added 1.2p on fuel which was to raise sufficient funding for the Strategy as an alternative to paid parking receipts – and I will come back to that – and it is a real shame that we are once again looking to penalise the motorist for existing.

As I said earlier, both proposals have merits and the encouragement of walking or other modes, other than private cars, are to be commended and most of these are little money. Bike racks, 20 mile-an-hour around schools, school cycle clubs, both strategies have improved pavement provision.

2310 I just want to step to one side for a minute because we want to encourage walking and cycling, so why do we have the world’s supply of potholes? If there was a world demand for them we could clean up. Surely not conducive to cycling. The race to save costs is not without its pitfalls. So can PSD please get a grip on this as I am saddened we now need someone to come over and tell us which are the biggest ones? *(Laughter)*

2315 I personally think it is our duty of care to ensure our roads are well maintained and if there is a budget issue then you need to bring it to the States. I am not the only one who reports them because they are there for months. We seem almost to leave them so everyone has a chance to complain. *(Laughter)*

2320 It is the same with leaves and detritus on the pavements. I know I happen to be out west, but it is unacceptable to have weeds on the edges of pavements four feet tall. Last autumn the pavements were impassable with wet leaves and yet we want to encourage walking.

I am happy to rewrite the basic transport strategy as I add my comments to the debate. So here is point one: the state of the roads. Point two: pavements need to be clear of leaves. We have an opportunity with some of the longer-term unemployed Islanders who are looking for work. As part of an initiative we started at SSD, we need to use that labour for the good of our community and there is an opportunity there.

2325 One thing I have learnt over time is just how important reflection is. Some, I am sure, have an issue with traffic in the Island, and the media will grant a stage and allow a performance greater sometimes than the actual demand or actual issue. One person’s crisis – that it takes 10 minutes to get to the Grange at peak time, probably in a car – is someone else’s mild annoyance. But what is the alternative and is it preferable? But if – and this is where I struggle – those people are having problems today due to congestion then the option to walk, cycle, public transport or car share is available now. So it is not preferable.

2330 So in the new world when these strategies are passed – which I hope they are not – will it become suddenly more preferable to use other methods? I do not think it will because the cure of a few extra buses will not even dent the movement of people to St Peter Port at the start of the day – if you feel that the congestion is the problem. There are 2,460 private business car parking places that will still be used today and tomorrow.

2335 I feel both strategies are very blunt instruments to attempt to fix relatively minor problems, and even then the fix cannot possibly work. The mass, with 6,500 coming into St Peter Port by car, at 34 seating in a bus, you would need nearly 200 buses. And before someone gets up and says, ‘Well, it may be more comfortable in that new world to walk or cycle’, but have you ever been passed by a bus when walking or on a bicycle? That is also not without its concerns. And to me that is the crux of this debate. What are we trying to fix? It seems to me the cure is going to kill the patient.

2345 We also seem to slip in and out of whether this is a new service or an enhancement of a previous service. And we have the request for 5p on fuel to be taken into account, when T&R eventually do the Environment’s budget. But on another day we are proclaiming no new taxes, but surely a big uplift on duty or the new width tax or CO₂ duties all must fall on that score. One day it is this, one day it is something else. It just depends who has got ink in their pencil at the time.

2350 The real problem for me is that we as the States and the Islanders have funded more than that. It was fully funded and that was the request from Environment in 2006 to have the equivalent of £353,000 to buy 19 buses and really get to grips with the school run. The hope then was to double the school passengers from 1,400 to 2,800. An interesting point. The goal of the Majority Report is to increase bus use by 30%, yet when the school holidays are on traffic in the Grange falls by 30%.

Furthermore, when the recent review of the circuit along the coast was that when the school holidays are on traffic moves 66% faster than it does the rest of the time... Deputy Burford, in her presentation, was saying in Jersey when the schools are out – 15% less traffic and 50% less congestion. So there we are.

2355 Environment identified the problem in 2006. So now we also gave them the funds to sort it out and T&R was not actually advised, they were directed to pay over to Environment £300,000, because I think the debate was in February, which was the amount for that time, and also then to take into account at the end of the year when they did the accounts.

2360 I am not so naive not to appreciate that paid parking may incentivise some to seek alternative methods of transport, but the 1.2p on fuel gave the funding to do all the good bits of that strategy and in particular the substantial increase in the school bus provision. So it is a real shame that that big tenet of the previous transport strategy has been left undone by the Environment, despite Islanders paying every day for those promised buses to sort out the only real issue which we have, which is some congestion at peak periods around town, especially in the morning during term time. If you want to read it, it is page 579 – 2.3 and 2.6.

2365 The irony is I am being forced by the Majority Report to pay an extra 5p for a service they failed to deliver last time round, and there is five multiples of £400,000 a year since 2009 going to T&R, no doubt as a general revenue saving lost in FTP or somewhere else. And it gets worse, because the Minority Report will now punish Islanders yet further with paid parking, again to sort out a problem they identified in 2006 to be fixed by 19 school buses. They received the funds for it but chose not to put those buses in place, which is what they wanted and what they promised, left the funds with Treasury and now they want paid parking instead. You could not make it up.

2370 Today we are advised by Environment that the £300 savings which they took off the bus company, they now want back again to pay back to the bus company. Again, I just do not believe it. Had Environment done what they wanted to do in 2009 and bring in the extra buses, which we paid for, we would not have the continuing congestion and a transport strategy now trying to fix the problem. (A Member: Hear, hear.)

2375 As for the new penalties for having a large car, they again are unreasonable. The rich will have no problem but middle Guernsey will pay. When was the last time you saw a Smart car towing a horse box or will someone who uses a large car be forced by the environment police to buy two cars? Surely, it is a greater utilisation of world resources than having the right car for you and your family. So it is a 'no' from me to the width tax and CO₂. (A Member: Hear, hear.)

2380 If only it were so simple, but it is not, it gets worse. Just talking about the congestion, the Majority Report will fix the congestion by an extra three buses – not the 19 they needed five years ago which was for the peak school traffic, but three – because we are advised that the free service should increase that demand for buses by 30%. And with the existing unused capacity, which is enough so that will equate to an extra 2385 150 or so more bus seats or 150 less cars. But the previous strategy was to tackle the schools. If you double the number of students going by bus instead of cars – which was the plan – that would be an additional 700 journeys not made to school – nearly four times the number of cars off the road. That is something worth getting hold of.

2390 So if the Minority Report is successful and they encourage an extra 30% to go by free bus, that is 150 extra car places but leaves the remaining 1,400 town commuters picking up the tab, and of course the £16 annual parking clock. As if we do not have enough faff in our lives already, we want to get 30,000 Islanders to get a clock each year. Again, the incentive is to do what? Fixing what problem? My clock is a bit faded now but it does not need a new one. So that is 30,000 clocks going to landfill every year.

2395 But, you know, I sometimes feel we want it all and really, compared to many places, if we just stood back and reflected we probably just about have it all. Yes, who would not like our roads a little less busy, especially when we are driving on them? Buses are not the answer for everyone. I have tried cycling. It is about 45 minutes to town. No matter how sedately I try, I am still hot and sweaty at the other end and unless we can come to some understanding as to how tolerant we are over the person dripping next to you, it is just not going to work. (Laughter) I rest my case, sir.

2400 I did say when I mentioned one point of my strategy was to fix the roads so you can cycle, point two was to clean the pavement, now point three of my strategy: put in place the extra buses as originally envisaged to deal with the school run. You have the funding now. You have five years of £400,000. That is already £2 million of Islanders' money collected. So let's give that part of the strategy a chance to work first.

2405 Point four of my strategy is to change the emphasis, not as we are asked by the Majority Report to make the change of travel habits such that the motor vehicle is not always the primary choice of travel, or the modal shift to reduce the number of miles travelled with a motor vehicle as the Minority Report. My point four would be to encourage smaller cars, which would be more efficient. If you really want to consider burning a fossil fuel make them electric. No stick, just gradual change. I do not know why but that is where 2410 the two strategies fall apart. They just simply do not identify the problem they are trying to fix, and then the fix is worse than any perceived problem in the first place and that is not good for our community.

2415 But it seems to me encouraging smaller cars and making them green – and that is not for everybody – is probably the way to go, and let's start at our home. I like my truck. It is the office commute for me. It is the motorway king. It carries fellow States Members who want a lift – usually the environmental ones. I mean in 2013 it went through the snow. But let's start with a States electric transport group. Let's start by creating

some electric-only car parking places. We have got the tools. We have got 5,000 staff. Why don't we start putting something forward ourselves before we impose it on everybody else? (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I like the car. It is a brilliant tool – the flexibility, the convenience. We are a busy Island and I enjoy the freedom it gives me and so do other Islanders. So let's accept it and make the other offers more tempting and minimise the car impact where we can.

Here are some of those tempting: my point five is picking over the carcasses of the two reports for the good bits – that could take a while, but anyway. Taxi buses – great idea, must do the car sharing, better info on public transport, cycling clubs and, point five, all the other good ideas that are in there, which is fine. And point six: no more cost. We must make a charge for using the bus and the fare has to be the same for visitors and local, even if it is free. As Deputy Burford said, the parking for cars is not free on the Crown but neither is it free to go on the bus – someone else is picking up the tab.

I think the buses have a good future, but be realistic. As I said, you would need a couple of hundred to do the St Peter Port commuter run and most carry fresh air around the Island, which makes the opportunities for taxi buses or partial replacements so appealing.

Paid parking. It was interesting, I picked up something new, I had not realised that, from the inference from Deputy Burford's speech, really the only saving grace was that the idea was that with paid parking you would always find a place. I do not know quite how that worked but the idea was you would be able to get a place because there would be less people parking. But of course now we hear today actually as the places become available – of course they will not, but if they ever did – they are going to be taken by the Harbour Authority anyway to increase the Port and handling facilities. So all those people who are paying do not think you will have an easy job to find that place because just as you think one is there suddenly a container will be put on it, (*Laughter*) and that is the end of that idea.

Paid parking will be a tragedy for the Island. You will just penalise the town workers while you sit in your car and tootle off to Frossard House or Education in the Grange, and yet the managers will drive unaffected to the corporate garage. If you want to make more of a divide just push that button.

So no to paid parking, no more fuel duty, no free bus service. And I am glad we have a system where Deputies on a Department can be honest and I have no difficulty with two Members of a Department or three doing one thing. I like the honesty. Let us choose here in the States and that is how it should be. (**Members:** Hear, hear.)

Deputy Fallaize fears a muddle will come out. I do not think so; I think we can pick over these both. And even if we have a bit of a breakfast that is not particularly good at the end of it, Environment can still take that away and come back with any amendments that they need to do. So I do not have any fear on that degree.

I have given you my view. It is a *précis* of what I would like to say: sort out the pavements, sort out the roads, put extra school buses on – which we have already paid for and should be there now, encourage smaller cars, pick the bones over the good bits, have a reasonable bus fare, no paid parking or additional fuel taxes or CO₂ or CO₃ or width tax or parking clock or any other mad cap ideas.

Finally – this is very sad really – most of what is proposed could be done now by Environment, if it so chose. Yet today they are going to do everything tomorrow, yet they could have done it all yesterday, sir.

Thank you very much. (*Applause*)

The Bailiff: Deputy Storey.

Deputy Storey: (*Inaudible*)

The Bailiff: Can you put your microphone on?

Deputy Storey: When I look at point 19 on the agenda, we are now debating the amendment (**The Bailiff:** Yes.) to a substantive motion. But if that is passed it becomes a substantive motion. (**The Bailiff:** It does.) So can we speak on the amendment now and then, when it becomes the substantive motion later, in general debate?

The Bailiff: That is the point that Deputy Fallaize was making earlier, that, yes, that will be the effect. If the amendment is adopted then the Propositions set out in the amendment become the substantive Propositions and there will then be further debate.

Deputy Storey: And then we start from scratch?

The Bailiff: I would encourage Members not to repeat themselves.

Deputy Storey: Thanks. Yes.

The Bailiff: Deputy Stewart and then Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Stewart: Mr Bailiff, firstly I would like to say I am a bit grumpy with Deputy Lester Queripel's quest for no colour, because that has meant that all of the pie charts from page 631 onwards are totally unintelligible and I was going to make a joke about 50 shades of grey and then I thought better of it. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Jones said we have spent something like £33 million on the buses so far, and there is no doubt it has been a money pit, but I think at some point you have to draw a line on that.

I think at the heart of this is getting a bus service right and I have to fully support that. What I will say is that, reading through both the reports, it has been a very difficult read and I have had an awful lot of mail as well, as we all have, trying to get to where I think I am – and I am not even sure exactly where I am at the moment, but I do applaud Deputy Burford and Deputy Brehaut for the work they have put in. It was clear at the presentation I went to that Deputy Burford has absolutely lived and breathed this, and put a huge amount of work into it, and I applaud her for that.

I think we do have to say that, if we are going to have any form of public transport strategy, we have got to have a good bus service at the heart of that and that will mean definitely a new fleet. I think certainly from the point of view of tourism and the feedback that we have had at Commerce and Employment from the tourists on this £2/£1 charge, and the mailbag has been enormous at Commerce and Employment, that really needs to be addressed. Whether it is a free bus service or, in my mind, whether there should be a nominal fare of say 50p, I am a little undecided at the moment, but I am going to listen to the rest of the debate.

But it is clear we need a modern fleet of buses that can work the main routes around the Island and they need to be regular, on time and, as Deputy Burford has said, we need modern apps, we need to be able to see where those buses are, be able to access that via our mobile devices. This is what most people do nowadays and also have real time information on bus shelters where people can actually shelter from the elements as they are waiting for their bus.

One of the things I did raise with Deputy Burford – and I would like her to maybe when she sums up is to... and she said they were going to have further thoughts on this – was on those interim or, if you like, inter-Island routes that are not on the main highways to look at a taxi-bus system. I know of several systems and one in the town of Maldon in Essex, which actually has a population of 63,000, where a private operator set up a taxi-bus service and it works hugely successfully. I think the fare is about £3 and you can actually either dial it or you can call it up on an app and it will tell you when it will then come off its main route and just visit you. I think something like that to infill the Island will be extremely useful, with the main buses running round on the major routes.

In terms of which report I am likely to support, I am erring towards the Minority Report. I think it has been better written. I think it has been better thought through. There are quite a few elements though you would not be surprised that I am not agreeing with.

I struggle with a benefit-in-kind parking tax because there are some people who have to park at their place of work. I will give you a couple of examples. If, for example, you are a worker at the Belarus Hotel, if you cannot park in the hotel car park where are you going to park? And then should you be taxed for parking at your place of work? Another place, for example, would be if you are a worker at Marks and Spencer's, the old St David's up in The Vale. There is nowhere else to park apart from at Marks and Spencer's. So I think there is going to be a huge amount of difficulty in trying to work through a benefit-in-kind tax that will apply to all and apply to all fairly on that.

In terms of paid parking, I have always felt I have been 100% against it. Though, talking with Deputy Burford, reading through these reports, to have longer short-term parking of 2½ hours will no doubt benefit retail because people... particularly if they have hair appointments or something like that, it will give them more time in town – 2½ hours. Often I seem to be caught just on the 2-hour and run to 2 hours and 15 minutes and that is exactly the time when a parking attendant comes round. *(Laughter)* So often I get it wrong and park in the 2-hour rather than the 3-hour.

However, I do have a lot of sympathy for paid parking for 10 hours, particularly though that should not be brought in until such time that we have a bus service which absolutely is efficient. I would hate to think that the 10 hour paid parking could be brought in but we still do not have a good bus service. I think the bus service has to be there first, then we could apply, and I would be happy to vote in favour of, paid long term parking.

I think in terms of cycling it is very difficult because again we have to understand where we are as an Island and I love cycling and I have been to lots of holidays in Holland where it is great – you have got a cycle path and then you have got a great big lump of pavement between you and the articulated lorries that are speeding along.

It does concern me about how we are going to manage cycle lanes in Guernsey. I have heard all the opinions on the radio, 'Well, we could make this road one way, that road one way,' but I do not think we

understand enough in this Island about how our traffic works. We have not computer modelled our main routes. I would be in favour of trying to create a better environment for cyclists and I do enjoy cycling. Frankly, I really do not feel safe on most of our roads, even on the cycle lanes along the sea front where it merges into a bus lane at one point, and we do know the dangers of that. And that is why my children have not had motorbikes because I am absolutely not convinced of the safety. But I do applaud the work that they are starting to do in that and if they can explore it and can make some more cycle friendly roads then I think that would be worthwhile.

The Bus Depot is a real problem. I cannot for the life of me see how we are going to attain that and I would urge them to look at commercial sites and see whether something could not be managed without spending £20 million. But, I do applaud the direction that they have moved with the Minority Report. I think they have been a lot more innovative. I will not be supporting the width tax for commercial vehicles. I will be supporting the amendment from Deputy Soulsby and Deputy Le Clerc because I do not want to see, at this point in time – and I have to be consistent with everything I have said in this States – any more cost for business.

At this point in time I think I will be supporting the Minority Report but picking out the bits I do not like at the moment. But at least it will mean that we will start to move towards a bus service that is fit for purpose and I think that is what we really do need to have at the core of our transport strategy.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel and then Deputy Perrot.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you, sir.

The fundamental question I find myself asking is: do we even need an on Island transport strategy? Isn't this strategy actually superfluous to requirements? Especially when several of the recommendations seem to be asking us to give our permission to do what the Environment Department are already mandated to do, as highlighted by Deputy Brouard.

We often hear that we should not micro manage Departments, but it seems to me that the Environment Department are actually asking us to do just that.

I thank Deputy Burford for responding to my requests for clarification, if I may sir, through the Chair, regarding Deputy Storey saying that this Assembly asked the Environment Department to compile a transport strategy when actually it was a previous Assembly. I know Deputy Ogier did his best to convince me that Deputy Storey meant this *Assembly* and not *this* Assembly (*Laughter*) I was not falling for that one, sir, (**Deputy Ogier:** I tried.) (*Laughter*) because it was enough for me to hear Deputy Storey utter the words 'this Assembly'. It was irrelevant to me on which word the emphasis lay because I believe I am right in saying, sir, there are 23 new Members now in this Assembly, and being one of those –

Deputy Trott: Is that this Assembly?

Deputy Lester Queripel: – new Members – this Assembly – (*Laughter*) I am not at all comfortable being associated with a decision made by a previous Assembly, to compile a transport strategy in the first place.

The reason I am not at all comfortable with that is because I am not convinced we even need a transport strategy. I cannot see why every Department needs more and more strategies to do the things that were once considered to be the day job (*Interjection*) and I would not be at all surprised (*Laughter*) if, at some stage in the future, we are in this Chamber debating a strategy and an approach to the way we compile and debate strategies. That is how ridiculous it is all getting. We are awash with strategies, plans and visions, and it seems to me that we are in danger of being bogged down by bureaucracy. But as they say, sir, we are where we are. And here we are debating that strategy.

Some of the recommendations in both of these reports are questionable in my view and I will give some examples of what I mean.

The Minority Report's recommendation 3, which reads:

'To agree that the Department will record data in such a way as to enable meaningful measurements of change in travelling modes to be calculated.'

But surely that is operational? Surely they should be doing that already?
Recommendation 9:

'To approve the intention of the... Department to investigate and implement a trial system of Park and Ride...'

Well, we have already had park and ride and anyway is that not an operational issue?
Recommendation 10:

‘To approve the intention of the Environment Department to investigate and implement measures to encourage car sharing...’

Recommendation 21:

‘To [approve] the... Department in conjunction with [C&E] and [PSD] to conduct a review of commercial vehicle activity...’

But surely that is a simply survey and isn’t that just part of the day job? Couldn’t they just go ahead and do that? Isn’t that an operational issue?

The Majority Report, recommendations 8 and 9. Number 8, to:

‘Approve facilitating an increase in taxi provision in accordance with the general direction....’

Recommendation 9, to:

‘Approve developing enhanced travel options for people with a disability...’

Recommendations 18 and 19:

‘To rationalise the carrying capacities of the various services eligible for licensing under the law...’

– and 19,

‘To enable the authority to include taxi buses and [dial-a-line] buses within a single operator contract...’

Well, I am amazed, sir, because surely they are already responsible for those areas within their own mandate on an operational basis. So I would question why these recommendations are here in the first place.

It does concern me that responsibility for an area that should be part of a Department’s day job is included in a strategy, because there are two parts to the mandate of the Environment Department. The first part instructs ‘to advise’ and the second part instructs ‘to be responsible for’. Well, the dictionary definition of the word ‘advise’ is ‘to make recommendations’, which is what the Department have presented us with here today. The dictionary definition of the word ‘responsible’, is ‘to deserve blame or credit and be liable to be called to answer’, which clearly implies a response to an action that has already been taken.

So it certainly seems to me, sir, that the Department are asking us to agree to recommendations for areas they are already obliged to be responsible for. Why are they doing that? Well, perhaps they do not even recognise what they are supposed to be doing in their own mandate, or perhaps they have failed to comply with their own mandate. Now we are being asked to agree to recommendations that actually are already included in their own mandate, which I find completely extraordinary. I might be totally wrong, sir, but I would like to hear the views of Deputy Burford when she responds to that point.

We are told in this report of the intention to provide more cycle lanes and improve access for our disabled Islanders. But the Department already have an obligation to do both of those.

Paragraph 147 on page 765 tells us that the Department will continue with its existing programme of drop kerbs and other similar measures. Well, I do not see a lot of evidence where kerbs have been dropped in our town in recent years, and it saddens me to say that.

Not so long ago, sir, 20 or so of my colleagues and I were invited to experience what it is like for a disabled person to negotiate all the obstacles in our town. The initiative was staged by Mr Aindre Reece-Sherrin who provided us all with walking sticks and darkened glasses, wheelchairs and all sorts of aids disabled people use and then he asked us to find our way around town. I think I can safely say that we all learnt a valuable lesson that day. At one stage I was actually quite frightened, trying to find my way around town in darkened glasses, tripping over loose paving and kerbstones, trying to negotiate steps with no clear indication where the edge of the step was. It is only when you are put in that situation that you realise all the problems and all the difficulties that disabled people have to deal with every day of their lives.

So what has been down since then? Bearing in mind that the Department were already mandated to make improvements, not a great deal as far as I can see. And what have I tried to do about it? While I was surprised to find out that once a wheelchair user is in Town Church Square they cannot actually get off the pavement safely because the pavement is too high. So I contacted the Environment Department and I asked if it would be possible to lower a kerbstone, paint a metre square grid on the road to stop cars parking across the dropped kerbstone. I was told there is already a dropped kerbstone, to which I replied, ‘Yes, there is a dropped kerbstone but it is not dropped enough. It is still too high and cars park across it as it is. I was then told that the Department were reluctant to paint a metre square grid because it would result in the loss

of a car parking space. And that is the kind of response you always get when you deal with the Environment Department, unfortunately.

2655 To conclude on that particular point, sir, I believe I am right in saying – I am sure someone will correct me if I am wrong – that ex-St Peter Port douzenier, Richard Cann, campaigned for 10 years to get the new granite ramp installed by the Town Church. The reason he was forced to campaign for 10 years was not because of a lack of funding but because Planning kept objecting to it.

The Bailiff: Are you still debating the amendment, Deputy Queripel? (*Laughter*)

2660 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, I am trying to emphasise and relay my concerns about the amendment and everything associated with the strategy, sir.

The Bailiff: Well, we are strictly on the amendment at the moment. (*Interjection*)

2665 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Is it not possible for me to talk on both at the same time, sir?

The Bailiff: You can do, but it means you will have no right to speak in general debate later, even if the amendment is not accepted.

2670 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Well, I think I will be saying everything I need to say in this speech, sir. I am sure my colleagues will be relieved to hear that.

Sir, I would make a plea to the Environment Department that if this strategy is rejected they raise it again and do whatever they need to do to improve the quality of life for our disabled Islanders, and if the strategy is passed today then please get on and do what you say you are going to do.

2675 I believe I am right in saying that the Department are telling us the reason we do not have enough bus shelters is due to lack of funds. Yet approximately £12,000 was spent on two shelters for bicycles in our town. That was a complete waste of taxpayers' money in my opinion, because bicycles are built to withstand the weather. So bicycles, which do not need to be under cover, are under cover and people are made to stand in the rain. This report is telling us that once the Department have the money they will be providing even more bicycle shelters. Well, I would ask the Department to save money on the bicycle
2680 shelters and spend more money on the bus shelters. I am a cyclist, sir, and I accept my bike is going to get wet in the rain. If I go along to my bike and the seat is wet, I take a tissue out of my bag or my pocket and I wipe the seat (*Laughter*) and I had to laugh recently – as my colleagues have just done – when I asked the question, 'Why do we need bicycle shelters?' and I was told because cyclists do not like their seats to get
2685 wet. (*Laughter*) Well, I find that quite extraordinary. I will not embarrass my colleague by revealing their name, sir. I appreciate it might not be trendy to be logical, sir, but that is the logical answer to me – to take a tissue out of my pocket or the bag and wipe the seat. Surely £12,000 spent on two bicycles shelters would have been better spent on bus shelters for people.

The fact that the Environment Department have not replaced the bus shelter on the Grange, which was
2690 demolished by a bus several months ago now – (*Laughter*) for the second time, Deputy Storey informs me – is another example of where the Department have failed to comply with their own mandate. And ironically paragraph 90 on page 749 tells us that bus shelters will be implemented wherever possible. Well, I take no comfort from that at all, sir, because even with the funds being available the Planning Division will have the final say (*Laughter*) whether or not bus shelters are placed where they are needed.

2695 Sir, if we strip out all recommendations in this report that the Department are already responsible for, what are we left with and what are the problems? Well, sir, I was told by an Islander recently that I need to get out and about more (*Laughter*) and see the traffic problems for myself. Sir, like the majority of my colleagues I spend a lot of time out in the community, talking to my fellow Islanders and listening to their concerns. In fact, if I spent any more time out in the community (*Laughter*) I may as well relinquish my flat
2700 and save money on the rent. (*Interjection*) I am out in the community seven days a week, I am a people person. I love being out in the community, talking to my fellow Islanders. Five hours a day gawking open mouthed at a screen is enough for me. (*Laughter*) After that I want to be out talking to real people.

2705 So what are my fellow Islanders telling me are the problems? Well, first and foremost they are telling me that they are struggling financially, that they are demoralised and that they are extremely disappointed in this Assembly because all we ever seem to do is cut services and increase costs. I know that is not strictly true, sir, because I know there is a lot of hard work going on in Departments to address all the problems we face, but it does seem to me that the easy option is to cut services and increase costs. And here we are once again, being asked to increase costs for our fellow Islanders. Actually I need to clarify that, sir, because what we are really being asked to do is approve the increase in cost for motorists. The motorist is being
2710 asked to pay for the whole of the transport strategy and in my view that is discrimination. In fact, if that is not a prime example of discrimination, I do not know what is.

Now we are told the bus service will be free, although the bus user will need to pay £8 for a swipe card. There is a slight contradiction there somewhere. Plus, of course, nothing is ever free – somebody somewhere always has to pay for it and in this case it is the motorist. And, as I say, I believe that is discrimination against the motorist and I am not going to vote in favour of any recommendation that discriminates against anybody.

So what else are Islanders telling me, that I should know? Well, they are telling me some things that I already know, they are telling me there is congestion during the rush hour, but it is all over within an hour. They are telling me it takes at least 20 minutes to drive to the Bridge from Town, and *vice versa*, at any time of the day – and I have experienced that myself on several occasions. Well, introducing a transport strategy is not going to resolve that problem. That is one we have got to live with, I am afraid. And they are telling me that we have some – not many, but some – irresponsible motorists on our roads, and they would like to see a clampdown on irresponsible drivers. Well, so would I, but that is a policing issue. The transport strategy is not going to resolve that.

Islanders are telling me we have an appalling bus service and I agree 100% with that, but the Environment Department could and should have resolved that issue. We know we need a bus depot. Well, I always understood that was part of the capital prioritisation programme.

They are telling me the roads are full of potholes, which I often cycle into and over, and as a cyclist I am only too aware of the dangers potholes represent. But that is an issue for PSD to address under their mandate and introducing a transport strategy will not resolve that issue.

In the Minority Report they are telling me they do not want paid parking. Well, I am totally opposed to paid parking because the motorist is already paying to park.

So having dealt with all of those, sir, I would like to spend a moment or two to focus on the issue of surveys. In the report we are told that 545 people were selected at random and asked to give their views. So that is 545 people out of an apparent population of 63,000. In my opinion there are more like 70,000 people in Guernsey at the moment, so if we discount, for arguments sake, the under-threes – there is a real possibility with the greatest respect they probably will not have a view – (*Laughter*) and if we discount the other people who are perhaps too demoralised to respond, we are probably left with 50,000 people who could have responded, so we have got the views in this report of 545 people out of 50,000. In my humble opinion, sir, that is not very convincing.

Personally, I do not have a great deal of faith in surveys and I will give an example why. In a *Guernsey Press* survey some time ago, a *Guernsey Press* reporter stood outside Candie Cash Stores and asked customers who were supposed to be St Peter Port North residents what their Deputies looked like. Out of 30 people who were asked and shown photographs as well, several of them did not even know what Deputy Le Clerc looked like – (*Laughter and interjections*)

Deputy Trott: They have no idea what they are missing. (*Laughter*)

Deputy Lester Queripel: – which is extraordinary when you bear in mind she is the only female Deputy in St Peter Port North and she topped the poll.

Deputy Brehaut: And the three-year-olds did speak to her face to face. (*Laughter*)

Deputy Lester Queripel: As well as that, two out of the 30 people did not even know what Deputy Gollop looked like. (*Interjections*) Who in this island does not know what Deputy Gollop looks like? (*Interjections and laughter*) Two out of 30, obviously. Deputy Gollop is everywhere. You cannot fail to notice him and, let's be honest, you do not even have to have an interest in local politics to know what Deputy Gollop looks like.

Just in case any of my colleagues need any further proof that you cannot rely on surveys, the *Press* also invited four businesses in St Peter Port and asked them the same question and showed them photographs. Bearing in mind, sir, that this was supposed to be a survey of St Peter Port North residents, two out of the four businesses complained bitterly that they never even saw their Deputies because their Deputies never, ever visited them. It is hardly surprising, sir, because two of those businesses are not even in St Peter Port North. (*Interjection and laughter*)

The Bailiff: Are you going to return to the transport strategy in a moment, Deputy Queripel?

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, we are being asked to take a great deal of note of the survey in the report and I am just relaying my concerns that surely we cannot rely on surveys.

The Bailiff: I think you have made that point, Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: To conclude, sir, we live in the modern world and the modern world is motorised. It is motorised for convenience. People need their cars. Cars are not luxuries, they are necessities – especially for people with young families.

So I ask that we please get real. Introducing this strategy will cost the motorist millions of pounds and I suspect – I have no proof – it will result in getting a few people out of their cars and that is going to be a very expensive exercise to be reviewed in a few years' time.

To be perfectly honest, sir, if they really wanted to, they could get out of their cars now. They have a choice. The majority of them are responsible people. They know what they are doing. I agree with the intentions of the strategy to make the roads safer for everyone and I appreciate a lot of hard work has gone into compiling this strategy but a lot of the recommendations focus on things and issues that the Department should already be doing, and why haven't they done them and why aren't they doing them?

Therefore, I think the best thing I can do is vote against the whole thing and make a plea to the Environment Department: please, please, please, for the sake of our fellow Islanders, raise the game and do the day job a lot more efficiently than you are doing it now.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Perrot. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Perrot: Well, all very jolly. *(Laughter)* I had hoped to have a quiet sleep this afternoon, but that has really gingered me up some. *(Laughter and interjection)*

In rising to speak, I am speaking on the minority amendment. I do not propose speaking again unless someone is a bit cruel to me during the latter part of this debate.

Perhaps I can just touch on one of the points made by Deputy Lester Queripel, who is out in the community seven days a week, 24 hours a day. *(Laughter)* Well, as everybody knows I am out eight days a week *(Laughter)* for 25 hours a day. *(Laughter)* But the point is this: I mean, we all hear what we want to hear and Deputy Lester Queripel is saying he is told by absolutely everybody in his personal survey that everybody is against paid parking. That is his survey. But then he says he does not trust surveys. *(Laughter)* I am not sure that I take all he says about that at face value.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, a point of correction, a point of order. It is a personal survey. It is one that I undertook. I did not read it in some report that was prepared and collated by somebody else. That is the point I was making.

Deputy Perrot: If that was a survey carried out by him during his continued work of seven days a week 24 hours a day, well, then perhaps he is just not getting out enough. *(Laughter and applause)* I do not know whether I can go on really. *(Interjections)*

I am going to vote for this amendment – and then vote against pretty well all of its provisions. *(Laughter)* The reason for that is that it does not seem that there is really a stomach today to reject both proposals, notwithstanding what I say is a very poor showing on the part of the Department as a whole.

Incidentally, when I spoke this morning in respect of the sursis I should have said that I was echoing very much what the Forest Douzaine said. I was the duty Deputy there on Monday and they were not terribly impressed at the way in which the Environment Department had approached this. So I do not think there is an appetite to reject both of these reports. I am fortified in that remark, as Deputy Lester Queripel is going to vote against them both, so I imagine that no-one else will. *(Laughter)*

The reason why I want to vote for the Minority Report is that the one thing which I wish to see come out of this is paid parking. I note the nomenclature perhaps is not terribly appropriate because the Island has built all of these parking places anyway. But that is the point. It is called paid parking. Let's have that as shorthand.

Deputy Jones, for example, is quite vigorously opposed to that as he regards it as a tax. I do not regard it as a tax, I regard it as a charge and it is certainly something which formed a common theme at the time when the States debated the building of, for example, the QEII Marina, when one of the payback systems proposed at that time was in fact paid parking. So I do regard it as a charge. I did not stand on a point of order against Deputy Jones because I am observing the old rule that you never heckle a working comedian. *(Laughter)*

I suppose the point is, if there is going to be paid parking then the *quid pro quo* has got to be that there is a first class public transport system (**Members:** Hear, hear.) in this Island. Actually, not just for those of us who live in this Island but for tourists who come to the Island and we have read an awful lot over the last couple of years by disaffected tourists. The point is, if there is this balance – if there is both paid parking and a first class public service – then we will all have the choice. We will have the choice of driving if we wish to. I do not wish to see drivers being bullied if they really do wish to use their own car. But then other people will have a choice of using buses and then, notwithstanding the slightly snide remark of one of my

favourite colleagues here, who thinks I am sweaty when I come in on my bicycle (*Laughter*) from St Saviour. We will have a change of using bicycles as well. Certainly the use of bicycles is very much on the up. Well, I look forward to the day when we see the Bailiff riding in to work, fully ermined and robed on his bicycle – perhaps registration number 1, who knows. (*Laughter*) But the point is we will have a choice.

So I think it is not appropriate, it is not fair, to say that people are going to be adversely affected and this is going to affect one element of society rather than another. We do have choice.

One of the problems, of course, of owning a car is that with a car goes certain financial responsibility. You never know when fuel is going to go up – not because of taxes locally, but because of outside events. You never know when insurance premiums are going to go up. In fact you never know when the cost of new motor cars is going to go up. So, I am not sure that it is at all right. I think it is quite misleading to say that the town is going to suffer if we have a balance of both paid parking and a first class public transport.

One of the problems of course on policy letters such as this – both of them, the majority and minority – is that there is a great raft of Propositions and so when you tinker with one, you might well affect something somewhere else. There are all sorts of interstices between the various Propositions and certainly it seems to me that a proposal of this sort – and admirable as may have been the work of Deputy Burford – I do not think it is appropriate for a policy letter such as this to be bringing into the Chamber any debate on import duties or taxes – raising taxes, lowering taxes. I think that these things have got to be considered by Treasury and Resources, and indeed by this Chamber ultimately, when we know what we want to do.

So, although it may be a bit of a dog's breakfast, what is left for presumably a changed Environment Department to be looking at when it carries out the mandate left with it today... I hope that the Environment Department will work closely with Treasury and Resources to work out the funding solution required.

I would say one thing more, and it is a comment which was made during the meeting of the St Saviour's Douzaine on Monday – there we are, I bet Deputy Lester Queripel did not go to two Douzaine meetings on Monday morning, as I did – and one of the Douzeniers said this: that the problem does not seem to be defined – and I think that is actually a very good point. All sorts of worthy things have been proposed by Deputy Burford, but actually I am not quite sure that we have really defined the problem. I see paid parking as being a natural consequence of events of the 80's. I see it as a resource as well, so I think that it sits on its own. That is why I want to support it.

The Bailiff: Deputy Duquemin, Deputy Green, Deputy Harwood.

Deputy Duquemin: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

During her speech to introduce her amendment, Deputy Burford spoke about the danger of quoting too many figures during a speech. I am probably going to do something a little but different and try and make you imagine – this is probably even harder – a flow chart, and what that might look like.

I might say something very similar to Deputy Fallaize. Deputy Fallaize uses words – some I even understand – I use pictures and see things very visually. We have all seen them. These are the sort of decision-making process flow charts with circles and squares and arrows, and if you imagine one with a 'yes' and one with a 'no'. Literally the first circle at the top says, 'Is there a problem, yes or no?' and if you answer 'yes' you then move on to another square which says, 'Which offers the most likely solution, Minority Report or Majority Report?' As Deputy Fallaize says, in a way now, all we are talking about is that second question. We are talking about which offers the most likely solution. And that is the only one that we need to answer.

There has been a lot of praise for the work of Deputy Burford, also supported by Deputy Brehaut. One thing I would say, where Deputy Burford is concerned, is we do not always agree. Sometimes when occasionally around the PSD boardroom table, we are in a minority of two, Deputy Burford says, 'God, what have I missed? I must have missed something to agree with Darren.' (*Laughter*) But let me tell you, in this instance it was going to be very interesting when we found out what the Minority Report looked like.

So, in answering the question 'Minority or Majority?' what I will refer back to is, not only the excellent speech this morning, not only the excellent written document that was in the Billet, but also the presentation which briefed States Members. What I must say is, I left that meeting both informed but also inspired – and I genuinely mean that. It was I think it was a fantastic presentation.

By contrast, the presentation in the Policy Council Room at Sir Charles Frossard House of the Majority Report – I was left confused and, dare I say it, deflated and – to borrow Deputy Paint's phrase – that is all I can say.

The important thing will be, in an integrated strategy, that we do not dis-integrate it, and I think – picking up on Deputy Perrot's point that he has just made – the danger is when it comes as a whole there will be issues of picking it to pieces. But, in many ways, I think that is something that will follow.

In many ways, in talking about the amendment, sir, and whether to go with the Majority or Minority, the important thing is to talk about the differences between the two. I thought what was a fantastic document was the Environment Department's assessment of the Department's report on the Minority Report and, in a

2895 way, what that has proved is that there is an awful lot of common ground, and probably the biggest difference really is the question of the fuel charge or the paid parking.

One thing that I did do in terms of the fuel is I did keep my latest receipt from the garage when I filled up with petrol last time, in my Honda Jazz – let me tell Deputy Burford – and I filled up apparently 35.18 litres, so 35 litres would have been an extra £1.75. It is always around £40 that I pay. If I am running on vapours then it is probably a little bit higher and if I am actually a little but conservative and top up early it might be a little bit less. But it is £40. As Deputy Fallaize pointed out and other people have said, it is going to make absolutely no difference whatsoever to affect my charges – whether it is £41.75 or it is £39 one week. It is absolutely the most – I am trying to think of a word that describes it – ineffective policy, that I cannot believe.

2905 By contrast, paid parking... If this was a receipt that said £5 to park on the North Beach for 10 hours then that is very powerful. I was only reading one of my tweets from, would you believe, 470 days ago, when this debate was first starting, I said I am not sure petrol tax increase would impact as much on people's sub-conscious. Paid parking and free buses is a powerful contrast. So to that I am very supportive of the amendment.

2910 I did say in another quote there that it was time for a grown up discussion and I do hope we are grown up about it and I do hope – to develop one of Deputy Burford's themes from her speech this morning – that we are open minded and look at the facts.

There are, I think, a number of issues that, like I say, will be debated when we get through to general debate, but I do not know if Members do remember the transport strategy document, when it sought consultancy. There was a big picture of a road sign on the front and it did say 'a fresh start' and that was the thing, and basically different sort of motorway signs and a fork in the road. At the moment what we are deciding is which side, which fork in the road we want to take – whether it be the left or right, Majority or Minority. If we then carry on for the full journey that will be decided by the debate.

2920 But I do urge Members... I said I was informed and inspired by the Minority Report and I think the majority of us in conversations were, and I do hope that Members will support those amended Propositions that we can then have a debate on.

2925 It would be wrong to sit down without mentioning... I am quite proud actually, because – I cannot remember the exact phrase that Deputy Burford used in her speech, but – sir, I have become one of those lycra loonies because I am doing the 30/30 Bike Challenge and, let me tell you, it is quite fun riding around dressed in lycra, giving everyone (*Laughter*) a sight for sore eyes (*Interjections*) in the morning. But, like I say, we are at that thing. The only decision we need to make is Minority or Majority and for me there is only one answer and it certainly is Minority.

Thank you, sir.

2930 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Green.

Deputy De Lisle: Mr Chairman, I did not want to interrupt the Member but I think he is misleading the Assembly, in that the Members do not have to go one way or the other, they can in fact opt to go neither way.

2935 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: I said I would call Deputy Green next then Deputy Harwood.

Deputy Green: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

2940 I too would like to congratulate Deputy Burford for the speech she made this morning. I thought it was absolutely excellent. In particular, it was excellent because of the systematic way that she debunked many of the myths, I think, about paid parking in particular.

2945 Sir and Members, I should declare an interest because first of all I will personally be inconvenienced by long-term paid parking, although on the other hand I would actually benefit from a discounted rate for a green vehicle, which I have recently purchased.

2950 I quite agree that we do have transport and traffic problems in this Island. I think anybody who is in denial about this problem is living in cloud-cuckoo land. Just to pick up something that Deputy Perrot said a moment ago, I do not think it is so much a question of being able to categorise and identify what the problem is. I think it is quite easy to categorise and identify what the problems are. I think the real problematic issue here is how you are actually going to measure the success of which ever transport strategy you choose, but anyway...

2955 First and foremost, I think there are clear identifiable problems. The current state of the bus service is an absolute disgrace. We absolutely must get to grips with that grossly inadequate service, together with the congestion, which admittedly is limited and restricted to specific times and specific locations, but none the less it is a problem, You have got too many cars, you have got too many vehicles on the road and we do

dedicate far too much of the public realm to cars basically sat there all day doing nothing, and it is not a good use of public land or public realm. It is in effect worshipping the car and the combustion engine far too much. Sir, I always know when I am making a reasonably good point, because I hear Deputy Jones in the background (*Laughter*) and I see it is no different on this occasion.

2960 What the Minority Report does well, sir, is to propose a package of measures – and Deputy Fallaize made this point very well – that might actually help to mitigate some of the problems identified and that is in contrast with the main report that we have got.

I think the problem with the main Environment report is that it is trying to crack a nut with fresh air. (*Laughter*) There are not really any strong disincentives in the main Environment report and I consider –
2965 and many others will consider – it to be insufficient overall to the job at hand.

On the other hand, the Minority Report, I think, is a credible coherent document, well-researched, which does actually focus proper solutions on the main issues at hand. It actually has imagination. I think that is what was really struck me about the Minority Report. It demonstrates some actual political imagination in terms of dealing with these problems to make the Island a more pleasant place, to make it a less congested place,
2970 a less polluted community – all things that I would have thought most of us could sign up to. But probably the best thing about it is the fact that it offers political leadership.

I agree with Deputy Burford in the sense that in some ways the Minority Report is not a politically radical option, but there is a perfectly good argument for saying if we want to do something about these problems with overuse of cars you actually reduce the amount of car parking. So actually in some ways this is a very pragmatic document, and I certainly agree that it is not a particularly radical document in reality.
2975

But I started, sir, by saying I was going to be personally inconvenienced by paid parking and I mean, like many Guernsey-born folk, I long felt for many years that paid parking was actually some kind of, or would be, some kind of unreasonable intervention in my life, and that somehow I have a human right to park for free and that should always persist and subsist for the rest of my life. I held that view very genuinely.
2980

However, when I first read the Minority Report, I tried to approach this whole issue of paid parking, user-paid parking – whatever you want to call it, with a reasonably open mind and with fresh thinking – I tried to put my own interest to one side and I sought to actually try to be objective rather than just resort and revert back to my long held views. And actually – again to use the phrase that Deputy Burford used – I tried
2985 to scrutinise my own convictions and I found them wanting, and what I found, I thought, in the Minority Report, was a pretty persuasive case for me to change some of my long held and perhaps badly thought out views. As Deputy Burford makes the point, parking in Guernsey is only free at the point of use. It is not strictly free because all taxpayers in effect subsidise it.

I particularly liked in the report the carve-out for short-term users and for shoppers and also the 1.2 pence per litre cut in fuel duty. I think that is both thoughtful and politically astute.
2990

I think the other point that perhaps has not been made particular well so far is the fact that we have to accept that not everybody is going to be able to use the bus or to walk or to cycle in the future, but of course we must remind ourselves that is not actually the intention of the Minority Report – there will always be people with complicated lives and with complicated journeys that will require their cars. Nothing in the
2995 Minority Report is telling those people what they can and cannot do.

But we surely must try to deal with the many journeys that are made by sole users of cars – myself included – by providing those people with reasonable and realistic alternatives, so they do have a proper choice. This is all about creating better alternatives to ensure that some motorists, on some occasions, will use alternatives that are available. That to me is actually simple common sense. And if we can invest more money in a decent reliable bus service and provide a better network of routes with a varied fleet, together with some real disincentives to car use, then maybe we will start to achieve some kind of behavioural change in the Island. Not behavioural change for its own sake. I mean that is pointless, but change in order to make Guernsey a better place to live and to enjoy, and for the tourists who come to this Island – with less congestion and better use of these big chunks of prime public real estate that we have.
3000

I think that the Minority Report is very appealing in that prospect, and it is only the Minority Report that will get anywhere achieving a better use of the public realm, in my view.
3005

I do have some concerns about the Minority Report and, bearing in mind some of the amendments that are coming up, I will not go into great detail about those at this stage. But, in truth, I do not think those are red lines for me. I commend the Minority Report. I think it is something that has the courage of its convictions, as well as being a very well-researched document. I think the best thing about it is it does not seek to simply stick its head in the sand and pretend that there are no problems and that there are no solutions, and I feel that is what some people would like us to do.
3010

There has been quite a lot of hyperbole in this debate so far about social engineering and about motoring apartheid, but actually I think we should put those kind of phrases to one side. Support this amendment because it is a *bone fide* attempt to improve the alternative transport possibilities and to make Guernsey a better place.
3015

The Bailiff: Deputy Harwood.

Deputy Harwood: Thank you, sir.

3020 I speak in support of the Minority Report and therefore the strategy contained in that Minority Report. May I first congratulate Deputies Burford and Brehaut for having the guts to tackle the thorny and knotty problem of bringing forward a viable alternative transport strategy? I use those words advisedly, sir, knowing full well that, whatever the outcome of this debate, there will be a large section of our community that will not be satisfied. There will be a curse on all our houses.

3025 I would however urge this Assembly to act decisively, not to procrastinate, not to be feint hearted, not to shilly shally on the subject like our predecessors, but to embrace the opportunity to endorse a transport strategy that is right for this Island and for our community – a strategy that looks at and addresses the whole issue of transport on this, our overcrowded Island, rather than attempt to deal with this matter on a piece meal basis as has unfortunately been the tendency in the past.

3030 There are a few siren voices – and we have heard one today – out there who would have us believe that there is no need for a transport strategy, that there is no problem. What arrant nonsense. Just read the many e-mails that we as Deputies have received over the last few days from our fellow Islanders, sir. Especially that from Lindsay Anderson, which was addressed to Deputy Lester Queripel, but copied to all Deputies. There is a problem. We are not the only small Jurisdiction to have to face the issue, as evidenced by the brief survey report carried out in the *Guernsey Press* early this week. We may however be one of the last to face up to our responsibilities in this regard. But, having waited for a long time for a transport strategy, rather like London buses, two have suddenly come along at the same time. (*Laughter*) Accepting, as I believe that we must, the need for a transport strategy, the question that remains for this Assembly is which of the two strategies is the one that we should adopt.

3040 As I stated earlier, I would encourage you all to support the strategy that is contained in the Minority Report. Why? Because I believe that the stick and carrot approach adopted by that strategy will stand the greatest chance of changing people's attitudes and approach to the use of the motor vehicle in this Island.

3045 Either strategy has to be paid for and one of the key differences between the strategies is how best to provide the funding to support an improved bus service which has to be at the heart of an improved transport strategy.

The strategy of the Minority Report does not seek to dehumanise the motor vehicle or to force the driver off the road. It recognises that the vast majority of Islanders have and will continue to use motor vehicles where necessary, myself included.

3050 It does not seek, as does the strategy of the Majority Report, to impose an unfair burden upon those for whom the use of a private motor vehicle is necessary, by an arbitrary increase in fuel duty; where such an arbitrary increase would hit in particular those in our community least able to afford such an increase; where such an arbitrary increase would add to the operating cost of many of our local businesses and where such an arbitrary increase would no doubt impact upon local inflation.

3055 Certainly the strategy of the Minority Report will introduce an element of long-term paid parking, but rather than the alternative of the arbitrary fuel duty increase proposed in the Majority Report. Combined with the improved and cheaper, or hopefully free, bus service, use of long-term parking would become a matter of personal choice, for those who presently use their cars to journey relatively short distances to St Peter Port only to leave the car parked for upwards of eight hours. A charge for long-term parking would be a fairer burden than the alternative that would be achieved by imposing an arbitrary increase in fuel duty.

3060 To paraphrase one of my parishioners, why should the majority of vehicle users, including the commercial sector, subsidise through an increase in fuel duty that of the minority of vehicle users who want to park all day for free.

3065 And to those who claim that every Guernsey man or woman has an inalienable right to park for free in St Peter Port, I would ask them to cast their minds back some 30 years to a pre-North Beach, Salerie Corner era, when parking in St Peter Port was considerably more restricted and when it was quite the norm to pay for the privilege of parking in St Peter Port, as evidenced at the old Royal Hotel site and at the Bordage site.

3070 As the People's Deputy for St Peter Port, I recognise the inevitability of introducing long-term paid parking in the Parish. There are, however, two key arguments which are put forward by many of my parishioners against the introduction of paid parking. Firstly, they would argue the impact upon the vibrancy of the retail and commercial activities within St Peter Port. There are two responses to this argument. The strategy within the Minority Report recognises the importance of maintaining unpaid short-term parking, up to two and one half hours, and that the current free regime encourages many long-stay commuters cynically to clog up those short-term disc areas that are meant to be kept available for those wishing to use the retail facilities of the town area.

The second response is to recognise that an improved and cheaper bus service will encourage visitors and local alike to travel into the town area without the frustration of having to find parking places, i.e. the proposal for the bus service offers the potential to increase the footfall in the town area.

I would also encourage Members to note in particular paragraphs 55 and 60 of the Minority Report for further support in that response.

The second argument raised by my parishioners raised the likelihood that commuters will avoid the cost of paying for long-term parking by parking up in various residential streets within St Peter Port to the disadvantage of local residents. The Minority Report recognises and addresses this issue in paragraph 56. and I take comfort from the fact that the Environment Department is apparently at an advanced stage in the preparation of a report on the expansion of the St Peter Port's residents parking scheme. I would urge the Department, sir, to bring forward proposals to create designated residential parking zones that are prohibited to non-residents. I would also urge the Department to drop the current requirement for a resident to change his or her parking space every 23 hours. Surely we should be discouraging unnecessary car journeys.

Sir, I believe that this Island needs a transport strategy. I believe that the strategy should seek to encourage forms of transport that are alternative to the use of the private motor vehicle and that such alternative forms of transport should recognise and make adequate provision for the pedestrian and for the cycle user.

I share the concerns expressed in the Minority Report concerning the size of vehicles and CO₂ emissions and I endorse the proposal for the banning of first registration charges proposed in the Minority Report, including the cap for commercial vehicles.

I also, sir, agree with the views of the Minority Report that an essential element of a transport strategy must be the use of suitable sticks and carrots to drive changes and attitudes and that the stick proposed in the Minority Report for the introduction of paid parking is more appropriate and fairer than the introduction of an arbitrary increase in fuel duty, as proposed in the Majority Report. The carrot of an improved and cheaper bus service, that is proposed in both reports, is an essential and necessary part of any transport strategy for this Island.

In summary, sir, I believe the strategy contained in the Minority Report is better placed to achieve the desired outcome, reducing the dependency on the motor vehicle by reducing the miles of travel undertaken in private motor vehicles. I would urge Members to support the Minority Report by voting in favour of the amendment proposed by Deputies Burford and Brehaut.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Next I call Deputy Conder, to be followed by Deputy Laurie Queripel and Deputy Spruce.

Deputy Lowe: Could I just ask for –

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: – a point of clarification, sir, through you for Deputy Harwood? Because he indicated about the Royal site being paid parking and he mentioned the Bordage as well, and the two, if I remember rightly, were certainly not the same. The Bordage – any member of the public could go and buy a parking space for an hour. The Royal Hotel site was corporate annually which most of the advocate practices and businesses around here were using rather than individuals going in for an hour.

The Bailiff: Deputy Harwood.

Deputy Harwood: I was merely making the point that people have in the past paid for the privilege of parking in St Peter Port.

The Bailiff: Deputy Conder.

Deputy Conder: Thank you, sir, colleagues.

I, like so many of us, attended all the presentations prior to this States meeting and would like to express my appreciation to the authors of the Minority Report for the excellence of those presentations, which certainly shaped my thinking and changed my thinking and in particular, like so many of us, I would like to congratulate Deputy Burford on her excellent speech in introducing this Minority Report, which again I am sure shaped opinions and changed minds.

Sir, paradoxically, before I started to engage with these issues, I was one of those people who thought that we did not really have a traffic problem and did not need a traffic management scheme. I based that really on my experiences in the UK where they manifestly do have very significant traffic problems in large

towns and cities. Again, I reflect on my experience over 20 or 30 years of travelling to Bournemouth from North Dorset, which over a decade went up from about half an hour travelling time to – if I wanted to travel at normal starting time – an hour and a half and I found myself in the end, in order to get to the University, leaving home at about quarter past six. I think that is really why I feel we do need a traffic strategy. Because I do not want this Island to become, in terms of traffic, like Bournemouth or Southampton.

Again, those of us who perhaps occasionally travel over to South England on red eye flights and have to go on the M27 at 7 o'clock or 8 o'clock in the morning, see the extraordinary volumes of traffic going down the M27, either east or west, and what it means for those people who themselves are trying to get to their place of work or get their children to school. I just do not want that for this Island. I think at the moment it is in some ways self-managing, but I just do not believe that we can go on like this.

So, sir, I will now enthusiastically endorse the traffic management strategy as embodied in the Minority Report. I do believe there have to be carrots and sticks and I think the Minority Report includes appropriate checks and balances. I think it is interesting in many areas in terms of taxes and indeed benefits there is a dual objective. One of course is to raise revenue, but another one is to change behaviour. Earlier today we heard the suggestion that you cannot simply say, if you put this amount on petrol or if the introduce car parking charges for long-term stay, it will generate this amount of income because you will change behaviours and therefore you might not get the income stream in to address the policy. Well, actually that applies to things like tobacco, taxes which have the object of raising tax and reducing tobacco consumption, alcohol, indeed tax on petrol. So there is never any certainty as to how much you will actually generate. What you are trying to do is two things: change behaviour and, yes, general revenue. And I think I feel quite relaxed about the fact that, if we introduce car parking charges for long-stay car parking, it might leave some car parking spaces less used – good. It might generate less income because of less use – that is okay because it has generated, in my opinion, the outcome we want: less dependence on the car.

I would like to pick up the point that Deputy Harwood mentioned just now. We need to remind ourselves when we become too exercised about the car parking charge proposals. This Minority Report has a very well thought through strategy. This is not a blanket car parking charge; this is a targeted car parking charge for long term car parking. It is mitigated by an extension of free car parking time for two and a half hours for those who quite understandably want to get in a do a bit of shopping and bring children in for appointments, go in for appointments themselves. So we fall into the danger, when we talk about the very serious problems of potentially introducing blanket car parking charges, to believe that is what the Minority Report includes. It does not. It is simply trying to stop or reduce the number of cars that come in a mile and a half from whichever part of the Island and sit in one of our car parks all day.

I would just like to raise one specific point and would ask Deputy Burford if she would be so kind just to respond to it in some way, in her response. I am a lifelong cyclist. I love cycling both as a sport and as a means of transport, but I do not cycle in Guernsey – a bit like Deputy Stewart. There are very serious dangers actually in all cities and built up areas for cyclists now, but mostly they are associated with not being able to see the cyclist and mostly they are associated with left hand turns, and you can imagine it – the cyclist against a lorry on the left hand side or against a van or even a large vehicle, you just cannot see them. I know that as a driver, I know it for sure as a cyclist.

So I am loath to get on my bike and cycle in Guernsey because I do not feel safe. The way that that is dealt with by motorists in the UK is to pull out to the right to give the cyclist on the left enough room. You cannot do that in Guernsey. Those of you who are perhaps aware of a campaign in London, actually being run by *The Times* newspaper, to reduce the deaths of cyclists they are highlighting the dangers of left hand turns by large vehicles and crushing cyclists because they simply do not know they are there.

So I wonder if Deputy Burford could say something a bit more about her vision and her plans, and her and Deputy Brehaut's plans, for both encouraging cycling and making cycling manifestly safe on the Island. Because if you knew you could get on your bike and get to where you want to be in reasonable safety, I think that would make a dramatic change on those numbers of people. Even those who are recently passed a significant age and probably would be more reluctant to get on their bike now because they are not as fit as they were... I think would encourage more of us to get on our bikes.

At the presentation by the authors of the Minority Report, I saw a remarkable video. I think it was based in Amsterdam – and Deputy Burford will correct me if I am wrong – of the extraordinary number of people who are able to use cycles of all sorts and types and the difference it made to transport strategies within an environment like, as I say, I think Amsterdam.

So, in closing, sir, having made the point about cycling – which I am sure Deputy Burford will respond to and I will be very interested in her response I will say that I think this has been an excellent debate. It has helped and shifted my thinking. I will vote for the Minority Report.

I would applaud Deputy Burford and Deputy Brehaut again for the quality, the coherence and just their sheer passion. It is rare we see that and one cannot help but be moved by that passion and by that commitment, and I urge colleagues to support the Minority Report.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Laurie Queripel, then Deputy Spruce and then Alderney Representative Harvey.

3200 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Thank you, sir.

I would just like to start by making a correction again, Deputy Harwood again said that we have two choices but, just like Goldilocks, sir, we have three choices and one will be just right for Members of the Assembly. So there are three choices, sir: Minority Report, Majority Report and you can vote against both if you wish, you can reject both of them.

3205 I was going to start, sir, by saying that it is a very rare thing that I disagree with Deputy Fallaize, but it seems to becoming more common as the months and the years go on – but I still think he is a good-un and he will get my vote at the next election, same as he did at the last one. But, sir, I am more than happy to agree that Deputy Burford made an excellent and very impressive speech this morning, in promoting the virtues and the prose of the Minority Report. I do take on board the prospective environmental and health
3210 benefits that she put forward. But, of course, sir, I think that everyone will agree there are always two sides to every story. I think we need to consider some of the consequences and the implications of the report's recommendations.

So it has been a well-worn subject today but I will start with paid parking, sir, because Deputy De Lisle said something very pertinent. The Minority Report extolls the virtues of paid parking and it cites some
3215 very favourable examples to back up its recommendations but, as Deputy De Lisle said, there are some regions in the UK that are withdrawing or taking away paid parking. In some cases it is permanent in other cases it is trial periods, it is an experiment. But in those areas, in those town centres, those town centres have been revitalised. That is a result of that decision, of that action. There has been heavier footfall: there has been more retail activity. So proving the benefits of not having paid parking – it depends on what facts
3220 or statistics you use – in this case these reports or these actions taken by these town councils have proved the benefits of not having paid parking and it has revitalised town centres.

I know that there is the tiny carrot of this two and a half hour free parking offer, but what we want to do, as far as I am concerned, in regard to the retail strategy that C&E have been involved in, is encourage
3225 people to stay in town for long periods – to shop at their leisure, to make use of the retail outlets to stay there for lunch perhaps and meet their friends to socialise. If they are fighting against the clock, thinking that after two and a half hours they have to jump back to their car and move it, they will not do that, they will just do what they have got to do in a rush and go back to their cars and they will not stay in town. They will not linger. They will not window shop. They will not do all the things that you would do if you stayed there, sir.

3230 Also I do not quite understand how long-term paid parking and free paid parking of up to two and a half hours will alleviate the problem of people going out parking in short-term spaces and going out and changing their clocks and going back into work again. They will still do that anyway. It is not policed now, so who is going to police the two and a half hours zones any more than they police the short term zones now? I think that problem will still remain.

3235 Finally, in regard to paid parking – something I have first-hand experience of – what about tradesmen? When I worked within the construction trade, sir, it was not unusual for me to spend 20 weeks of my year working in town, in banks or office refurbishments or in large retail outlets. So for 20 weeks of the year I would have to access a long-term parking space. I think we all know that tradesmen need their vans as nearby as possible when they are doing these jobs. They have materials in their vans; they have tools in
3240 their vans. So they use their vans really as workshops and places to keep materials. So, if you worked it out, in that year, when I spent 20 weeks working in town, at £6 an hour that is £6 a day, over the course of a year that is £720 a year, to add to the cost of that tradesman's business.

That is inflationary because the tradesman will not be able to bear that cost, that cost will be passed on to the service users, to the consumers of those businesses. So that is the inflationary effect of paid parking. I
3245 do not think enough analysis has been done in regard to the effects of paid parking on businesses and tradesmen who need to work in town, sir. That is just one example of a substantial increase in the cost of doing business.

The user pays principle – something that I thought was very much in vogue and being encouraged in modern Governments. This report, sir, has largely discarded the user pays principle. It is only the motorist
3250 that pays for everything apparently. So we have a free fare bus service, we have enhanced facilities and infrastructure for cyclists, we have super-duper bike sheds, special lanes for cyclists and, yes, of course I want to see those who can and wish to cycle...to see them cycle in a safe environment. I do not even mind if the motorist has to make a financial contribution to make that happen, but the cyclist gets all this for free. But the motorist, as far as I can tell, already contributes financially in three different ways to the States' coffer.
3255 He or she pays their Income Tax, they pay the annual hike that T&R put on fuel and also they have been paying the 1.2p that was added to a litre of fuel in 2009, which has never been accessed or used, apparently.

Sir, the Minority Report tells us that some cyclists spend hundreds, if not thousands of pounds, on their machines. Clearly they are keen, that they are prepared to make a substantial investment in their pushbikes, in their cycles. Back in the day, sir – and younger Members of the Assembly will not remember this – we used to pay a cycle tax. I think it was 2/6d or 10/6d or it might have been a penny farthing. *(Laughter)* I go back far enough perhaps to remember a penny farthing. But we used to pay a cycle tax and we thought nothing of it. We did it without a second thought because we acknowledged, we understood that we used the infrastructure as well. We were road users, we were service users. Also, sir, we were not road users or service users of specialist infrastructure, we used the ordinary roads that cars and motorbikes and lorries and buses drove on, so we did not have the luxury or the treat of a special infrastructure.

Yes, as I say, I do not have a problem with the motorist making a contribution towards that, but I think it would be reasonable to expect cyclists, if they are going to get all these extra facilities and this extra infrastructure, to make some sort of contribution towards it. I do not understand why the report does not at least make mention of re-introducing a cycle tax. Because once again it ticks the box of the user pays principle and they will be using some very specialist infrastructure. It happened for many years. It really did and I had no problem paying it.

In fact, if we read the email that was sent to all Members, I think, from the Guernsey Bicycle Group, the membership of that Group has grown from just over 30 members to nearly 400 in the last year. So I think they are doing quite well on their own without too much assistance from us. But, yes, we should encourage them and we should facilitate them, but not entirely for free. It should not be the motorist who exclusively picks up the tab.

So, sir, also I think the Minority Report... I will acknowledge I disagree with some Members that have said that there are not some problems. I think there are some problems that need to be addressed, but I think the Minority Report misrepresents the size of the problem. I will acknowledge that there are one or two problems that should be addressed.

I have in my own mind devised my own mini transport strategy, and that would come at a very modest price tag. I think, yes, we do need to at least return the quality of the bus service back to the pre-CT Plus era. I think that Deputy Brouard is right, sir, that when the schools are on holiday and the children are not going to school it is startling, the difference is absolutely startling. I think that is something that should be addressed as well so that would need some investment. And I do want to see enhanced and very tailored transport facilities and transport provisions for disabled peoples. So those are the three things I think would tick the box of my transport strategy, sir.

But this report, sir, in my opinion, ventures into the territory of perceived problems. Some of this is proposed policy based on ideals, rather than what is necessary or required. It is trying to make us grasp a bull by the horns. Whereas in fact if you take that analogy further the size of the problem you are probably looking at is a goat rather than a bull. I do not think the report is entirely factually based. It is something of a wish list. It has tried to create a transport utopia, and utopia does not exist for very good reasons.

So I think the recommendations, sir, if they are *all* taken on board, if they are all approved, could result in some very unrealistic and incredibly costly policy, and policy that is not fully informed.

As I said at the start, sir, I disagree with Deputy Fallaize when he said that it is very simple – we have a binary choice, we should just choose between one report and the other and get on with it. That is not true, sir. I think this debate is valuable because I think something a Member might say just might change the mind of another Member who is not quite sure about which way to go so I think this debate has proved to be valuable.

Sir, I will not be voting for the Minority Report. I will not be voting for the Majority Report. I will be rejecting both reports, for the reasons I have given. But, as I say, I do acknowledge there are one or two problems and if neither report gets through we have to remember, of course, that we do still have a transport strategy in place. It was approved in 2006. It is not like we will have nothing at all. But I will be happy if that is the case, if we were left with the 2006 strategy and feel that we need to upgrade it or... I actually think that some very intelligent and very targeted tinkering will actually solve the problems we have. I do not agree that we need this all-encompassing integrated strategy. I think that just a bit of intelligent tinkering would sort the problems out. But I would be happy to feed those ideas into Environment should both reports be rejected.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Spruce.

Deputy Spruce: Mr Bailiff, thank you.

Members, this has been a fascinating debate so far. We have, in this Assembly, in my view, a surprisingly wide mix of opinions on how best to improve the Island's transport situation. In fact, we probably have 47 different views on how to fix the problem.

In my opinion, the Department's report offers a moderate and pragmatic way forward. However, the Minority Report proposes a far more aggressive set of measures. In fact in some ways they are quite draconian. They are a set of proposals which, in my view, go way too far. There can be no doubt that some people will find a free bus service attractive enough to leave their car at home, and I would agree with that. But there seems to be no appreciation of the impact that paid parking will have on those who work in St Peter Port or any recognition that for many people a direct ride from home to work and back is just not possible. People have busy lives with numerous matters to deal with on the way to and from work, children to drop off at nursery or school, shopping to do, people to meet, etc. So a direct bus ride both ways is just not a realistic option.

The Minority Report seeks a modal shift away from car use, irrespective of the impact that this shift will have on people's lives. Significant disincentives are to be levied in order to alter the traveling public's behaviour.

Let us take the main differences between the Minority Report and the Department's report, one by one, and I would ask you to take note of the figures I will highlight.

First registration width charges. If we take a typical family car – let us say a Vauxhall Astra – this will have a first registration width charge of £1,200 in the Minority Report and £250 in the Department report.

Now the first registration emission charge. The first registration emission charge for that same car will be £400 in the Minority Report, and £100 in the Majority Report.

Taken together, the combined first registration width and emission charges of a typical – and I say typical – family car will be £1,600 in the Minority Report versus £350 in the Department's proposals.

The Minority Report also proposes duty subsidies of up to £1,600 for anyone purchasing an electric vehicle. So anyone who can afford a small electric car will be subsidised by the family car user. That just cannot be fair.

Finally on this point, it is worth noting that in both strategies people will be able to avoid first registration width and emission charges by purchasing second hand vehicles, or reduce these costs impacts by purchasing a smaller vehicle.

Also highlighted within the Minority Report is a proposal to introduce benefit in kind taxes on those employees who have access to off street parking as part of their employment package. Surely we should be encouraging employers to provide their own staff parking spaces, not penalising their employees.

Then, of course, there is the major and very significant impact that paid parking will have on all long stay parkers in St Peter Port. I ask you, can it be reasonable to charge those employed within town 60p per hour for long-stay parking? A charge of 60p per hour for long-stay parking would represent an annual cost to those employees circa £1,300 per year, if they worked a typical seven and a half hour day. To me, that is a huge annual cost in anyone's language and one that would be levied unfairly, in my opinion, on only long-stay parkers unfortunate enough to live and work in St Peter Port. The income raised from that small group of people will be used to part fund an entire integrated road transport strategy – an integrated road transport strategy which will benefit the entire Island's travelling public.

Also, in addition, everyone will have to purchase a parking clock at a cost of £16 a year. It should also be recognised that the introduction of paid parking in long-stay parking areas in St Peter Port will create major problems in all the streets not covered by the charging regime. Do not underestimate the problem that the search for free parking will create in all surrounding streets. Also how could one justify the current residents on-street parking permit system in many parts of Town when those who work in Town have to pay £1,300 a year for the privilege.

In my opinion, this paid parking principle will be the thin end of the wedge. You have to ask yourself – why are other areas not covered by this major plank of the Minority Report strategy? What about all the other work places and long-stay parking areas around the Island, like St Sampson's and St Martin's? What about Frossard House, La Couperderie, the Hospital, the schools? Why should civil servants park for free whilst those who work in Town have to pay a small annual fortune? SSD employees and Income Tax employees will have to pay parking charges. I doubt that they will be satisfied to pay £1,300 a year while all their colleagues pay nothing.

There can be no doubt that this level of charging will seriously affect people's travel habits and after all that is exactly what the Minority Report's authors want. I have got no problem with that – it is their right to give their own opinion, but these charges will seriously affect people – many ordinary people, many of which will have limited ability to pay their parking bill.

A final point worth noting is that this Minority Report seeks to raise funds specifically to build a purpose-made bus garage, thereby circumnavigating the capital prioritisation process. Given that a new bus garage failed to achieve pipeline project status in the recent capital prioritisation debate, can it really be correct to jump the queue in this way?

To conclude, I know that some people are saying that the Department's report may be proposing lower width and emission duties but it is imposing an increase in fuel duty of 5p a litre. Well, that may be the

case, but this integrated road transport strategy is just that. It is integrated and one that will benefit all transport users.

3380 It is our view that a 5p a litre fuel duty increase, that would be about £1 or £1.50 a week, depending on usage and a typical car – is a fair price to pay by all road users for implementing all the elements of the strategy – benefits that will make the strategy full integrated. It is our view that this will be a fairer way of raising the funds required, rather than burden town workers with the huge cost of paid parking, and also all new car purchases with much higher first registration width and emission duties.

3385 I ask you therefore to reject the Minority Report.
Thank you.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Harvey, then Deputy Ogier, followed by Deputy Bebb.

3390 **Alderney Representative Harvey:** Thank you, sir.

It is with some trepidation I enter this debate. I feel rather like I have stumbled into a private wake, but as I see that a couple of the comedy uncles have done their act now and lightened the mood, it is probably about time to make some intervention. I am particularly indebted to Deputy Lester Queripel for the perils of cycling. I have realised that sideswiping potholes are a danger, but pneumonia of the nether regions from a wet saddle was a new one on me. *(Laughter)*

3395 I have read the items with great care. They are about a serious problem here in Guernsey and, understandably, there is no mention of Alderney. But I have to say, from a parochial point of view, we do not have a parking problem and we really do not need an extra fuel duty on top of our existing burden of taxes, and with the fragile state of our economy.

3400 There was a Treasury report issued in the last couple of weeks which stated that – this was HM Treasury – reductions in fuel duty have had a major positive impact on the economy, raising the UK's GDP by around half a percent. So there is no question about it – it is a different situation, a different environment, but additional fuel duty will have one effect only and that is to make people poorer – both in Alderney and in Guernsey – and, for that reason, I would prefer that we really did not go down that route.

3405 Obviously the issue of paid parking, particularly long-term parking, has been one that this Assembly has debated for quite a long time. I am sure the view is held by many that Guernsey is special and Guernsey is different and of course it is, it is unique but unfortunately the laws of physics still apply. Too many cars, too narrow roads, the fortune or misfortune to have 180° of your horizon filled by the Little Russel rather than by concrete – all of these things suggest that paid parking has an inevitability about it. It does not need to deter from the attractions of the town. In fact, many cities have found that limiting the access of large numbers of cars for a whole day improves the retail aspects of the town.

3410 I think, of course, any change bears hard on certain parts of the population. Many people in the UK and I hate to mention their experience, it is not a good one necessarily, but it is fact – are faced with taxation on car parking spaces, on benefit in kind. They are sad effects of the fact that too many people want to be in the same place, for whatever reason, at the same time.

3415 So, sad though it is, I think these things have almost an inevitability about them and any attempts to avoid those essentially fairly simple solutions are going to lead to more and more complications.

I commend Deputy Burford's report. I think it has a lot of good sense in it. I think the fact that the Department's report has led to so many amendments suggests perhaps some slight problems over consultation or consensus. But I do support the Minority Report and that seems a much preferred way forward.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ogier.

3425 **Deputy Ogier:** Thank you, sir.

As many speakers have said today, the Minority Report is a well written, coherent piece of policy formulation, for which its authors have my thanks.

3430 If you are looking for a policy which fits into the larger States' policies, which meets the aims of say the Energy Resource Plan or the Environmental Plan, the Minority Report is the strategy.

All of those words in all the plans which quite often sit on a shelf mouldering away in some vault somewhere, many of them are brought out of those reports and into this strategy. Here we see some very good policy development which fits in with many of the corporate aims of the States of Guernsey, that have so far been passed as corporate aims but not actually implemented.

3435 Actually I am not sure it is a Minority Report, because it appears to me that we could well be discussing two Minority Reports, both with the support of two Members of the Environment Department.

We do not see many reports of this quality coming along very often. Vision – true vision – and a route map to implement the vision and starting almost immediately. It is a noteworthy piece of work to be applauded.

The Minority Report is a finely balanced series of nudges and the integration of the sticks and carrots in the Minority Report hang together like a well-balanced collection of incentives and disincentives should. The big prize an improved provision of public transport, free, with smaller buses, improved routes, improved service, disincentives towards the purchase of larger cars and incentives towards the purchase of smaller cars, disincentives towards commuting and parking in long stay, and incentives towards taking the bus – true, real incentives and disincentives, integrated and comprehensive and not really like anything that we see very often in here.

Designs to improve social outcomes for the immobile, for those without cars, for those less well off, a reduction in fuel duty which would benefit those on tighter budgets, free mass transport for those on a tight budget, this Minority Report actually advantages the more vulnerable in our society. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

The view of the St Sampson's Douzaine was interesting. Some members did not want a free bus, some did. Some members thought paid parking was a good measure, others hated it. Some members felt neither report went far enough, that the visions were not sufficiently radical. And some thought there was not a problem at all. A lively discussion ensued, in true St Sampson's style, and I am told some of the bruising is already going down. (*Laughter*)

Transport strategies are another one of those perennial divisive issues every States term has to wrestle with. The previous two terms have and I recall before that too. All of us are not going to find everything that we all want in one report – it simply is not possible. We were unable to in past strategies either. This is another work stream which just drags on year after year, States term after States term. As Deputy Domaille reminded us this morning, this is the third strategy in the past few years alone. We are not all going to find a system that suits us all. We are going to have to make some compromises somewhere and this is another one of those subjects which divides the Assembly and the population, where we find it easy to unite to throw something out but we cannot unite to support the replacement. We need to stop the prevarication and get on with something – which I know is easier said than done.

There is a risk of doing nothing – supporting neither and throwing out both reports, wasting another few years of development and departmental time and leaving the Environment Department really with nowhere else to go. What sort of gits – (*Laughter*) What sort of GITS – or Guernsey Integrated Island Transport Strategy – (*Laughter*) could they possibly come up with that has not been looked at already?

In recognition of the difficulty in the past in finding a compromise solution, the last transport strategy brought forward by the last Environment Department was mainly a list of choices for States Members to make. This was due to the difficulty in finding a strategy we could all support. The thinking was, if Members could choose what they want from a number of options, we could have arrived at something we could all agree on. But that was not guaranteed to all work together. It was not guaranteed to be coherent, integrated – a systemic balance of carrots and sticks.

If we throw out these two current reports we will be left with little hope of finding anything else as most approaches already have been tried. In my view we do need a strategy because simply going on the way we are is not in our best interests. And it is not just about congestion, it is about health, it is about reducing emissions; it is about us providing a £100 million-plus of valuable land in the centre of town which could be used to achieve a much better outcome for the community. That is an expensive and valuable chunk of land which 63,000 of us choose to give over to 1,400 people to park on for eight hours. That is a subsidy worth millions of pounds in lost revenue to this community. And it is about reducing traffic volumes, it is about reclaiming our town, it is about better choices of transport and it is about changing behaviour.

Throwing out both reports would fail to deal with many of the issues we should address, and we should not wander into territory many of the new Members of this term felt was the problem with the previous term – failing to reach consensus, failing to drive issues forward and failing to resolve.

The States of Guernsey have been trying to get a strategy in for a couple of decades now and I think these two reports represent the last possible configuration for transport strategies. If it is not these, it will not be any, in my view. Environment do not have anywhere else to go. So these two strategies – both funded in the main by charges on the emissions and width of vehicles with a kicker of fuel duty for one, and the other paid parking – out of the two, I prefer the Minority Report. I feel the nudges, sticks and carrots are more likely to result in beneficial outcomes. I feel the Minority Report is more likely to achieve its desired outcomes than the majority report. It hangs together, it is cohesive and it is integrated – something this Assembly resolved had to be brought back. And I will support the amendment and it seems to me from the flavour of today that most States' Members will also do likewise.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Bebb and then Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Bebb: Thank you, Monsieur le Bailli.

Whilst listening to some of this debate, I considered the phrase that it is if far too convenient and far easier to preside over an inefficient *status quo* than it is to grasp the problem and to actually embrace radical change. The only question that I would say is that people really should not imagine that this Minority Report is a radical change. This is, in my opinion, a modest change, I am very disappointed to hear people talk as though this were radical in any way, when I fear that if the Minority Report – which I do believe is far more likely to achieve its aims than the Department’s report... My fear is what it will engender in change will not be sufficiently beneficial in the areas that we really need to tackle.

Currently, if you look at the Guernsey and Alderney Health Report that was published a couple of weeks ago, you will notice that some of the greatest causes of early death, some of the greatest causes of years of working life lost – and therefore it is a loss to our economy – are from those issues of health that could be dealt with: cardiovascular diseases, diabetes, obesity problems which are compounding themselves within our society. We are making very little inroads in to any of these problems. We seem to think it is perfectly acceptable that we just write another cheque in order to actually pay for another person to go and receive yet more therapy from PEH in order to deal with their diabetic problems in order to deal with their cardiovascular problems, and indeed we need to employ more people in order to do more hip and knee replacements these days than you can possibly imagine. This is not sustainable. When people talk of the user-pays principle, at that moment that is just not being adhered to in any way, shape nor form. We live a very sedentary life and those people who are paying most are the taxpayers for very unhealthy choices that we make as a society.

In order to try and encourage people to get on to their bike, to walk, in order to use the bus then we really have to start using sticks and carrots. I believe that the Minority Report has more of those and therefore is more likely to achieve that aim.

We are talking also of the cost associated – and I hear people complaining about the cost of paid parking – I have to say that when we look at paid parking – and if it really is a burden – we also have to consider the great benefit for the vast majority of a free bus service. I think that that could be, for the people on the lower income, truly transformational, and I think that both reports are actually visionary in the fact that they would propose such a thing.

I recently had cause to call in on the Environment Department – and I thank them for their time – and I pointed out that in Victorian times town planners had a greater effect on public health than any doctors. We forget the great leaps and bounds that were made by public health through environmental planning, and I think that here today we have the chance to take that similar leap in relation to our transport strategy. We have the opportunity to try and encourage people to take different forms of transport.

When I was looking at the bus usage I was challenged as to how on earth bus usage increases physical activity. I was even told by someone recently that bus usage must surely lead to obesity, which I could not possibly understand. But I can tell people that I was reading the document that I circulated last night, which was from the Mayor of London’s Office – who have made quite serious research into the modes of transport used in London – and on average people spend 19 minutes a day walking to and from the bus, in London. I do not imagine that people would spend that much time in Guernsey. So, even if we half that to 10 minutes, then we are talking of 10 minutes per day that they would walk to and from the bus. The startling fact that was made in that report from the Mayor of London – and I think that we can agree that it is probably true here in Guernsey – is that that constitutes the major form of exercise most people take – 10 minutes’ walk.

There is no point in saying, ‘Oh, people should be encouraged in order to take extra activities in their leisure time.’ They do not. The vast majority of people will actually go home and sit in front of the television, and there is no point in us imagining that the world is some different type of place where, with a little bit of ‘Oh, please would you’ and ‘Oh, would you possibly’ they will suddenly start jumping into their cars in order to go to the gym. They will not. Human behaviour is such that they are likely not to. But what we can encourage is that people, instead of doing that, take that 10-minute walk. It does not sound like a lot but it does have the beneficial effect required.

In Guernsey, when we look at the rates of anxiety here and we look at the rates of depression, we have staggering figures. They are really not good in relation to anxiety – especially among men. It is very strange that in Guernsey we have equal rates of anxiety and depression between females and males. Anywhere else in the world it is generally females that are much higher. Exercise is known to reduce the prevalence of mental illness of anxiety and depression. So we supported a mental health strategy that came with no money attached to it. We all thought that that was great, that we would actually have something for nothing. Well, no, it did not come for nothing, it required different forms of behaviour, and here we have the opportunity to encourage people to take different forms of behaviour.

If we do not support these strategies, we really are looking at accepting the *status quo*; we really are flying in the face of the mental health strategy, the obesity strategy and a whole raft of other strategies that

have been mentioned. These are avoidable health costs in many respects and the long term costs will be substantial, and we really do need to start to think differently.

For those people who say that you will never get a person out of their car, I have to say I was very much one of those people who used to sit in traffic and think that it was perfectly acceptable to listen to yet more radio on my way to work because, you know it is quite pleasant, no problem. However, I recently since then spent a year living in Amsterdam and if anybody thinks that cycling in Amsterdam is easy then they are very sorely mistaken. Your first trip out is quite scary, because you are surrounded by a whole host of cyclists and you have no idea what on earth you are doing compared to everyone else. Then you find out that it just takes a little bit of *chutzpah* in order to finally just really go for it. And so you realise that is exactly what everybody else does.

To increase our rates of cycling what we need are more cyclists. How do you achieve more cyclists? Well, strangely enough you do not achieve more cyclists by adhering to the idea that everybody will stay in their car. The more cyclists you have on the road, the more likely you are to encourage other people to cycle. People do not feel safe on the roads over here. They do not feel that comfortable in asking their children to cycle to school because of too many cars. Well, how do you reduce cars? If you get more people on to bikes, that will happen. It is something that will breed good behaviour. That is something that I welcome within the reports.

But realistically, when I also look at the costs incurred, I hear about the charge of paid parking and how detrimental that would be. I have been to so many places – I cannot even count them – where paid parking is the norm. It has caused no effect to my knowledge on those areas. I see Deputy Laurie Queripel taking a deep breath inwards and I would challenge him to come up with the evidence that it is, because I have not seen that evidence. What I see are people who are willing to pay if they want to park, and I would suggest that the free bus service is equally attractive. At the moment on a Saturday there is no way that I would actually drive in to town, there is no where I can find a parking space. It is very unattractive. The free bus service does make it far more attractive in order to achieve that journey.

When I was actually doing some further research, the idea of this simply being a health issue as well – it is not one. The discussion with regard to the transport issue just being on certain areas – the transport issue is a question that needs to be resolved. I believe that it is an attractive option and I think that it is detrimental towards our Island economy, in terms of for the attractive sight of the Island, in terms of tourism. Everyone comments on how unpleasant it is to drive on the roads because of the sheer number and the narrow roads and all the problems that it causes.

Overall, I do not think either report goes far enough. I do honestly believe that there is much more that we will need to do in order to try and address the very serious problems that we will face in the long term. But, of the two reports that we are presented with, I think that the Minority one is the only one that will cause any form of change. I think that it is essential that we embrace that today, with the hope of expanding it and actually undertaking even more measures as and when we notice what works, in order to develop this further. Therefore I would ask everybody to support the Minority Report.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Thank you. Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you very much, sir. I will be brief because no speech made today or for the next 10 years..., that speech made by Deputy Burford, can be bettered, in my view. But I will just pick out a couple of things.

I think it is important to go back to square one. When we were in this Assembly some two years ago and we elected Ministers to Departments, the Minister of the Environment Department gave a commitment to you to come back with a road transport strategy. That was the commitment given to this Assembly – to come back with a road transport strategy – and that is what the Minister has done.

As I said, I think, in an interview fairly recently, even before we get to this Assembly we have given commitments in other places regarding what our views are. We know that GST and paid parking – people are very firmly either in or outside of both of those tents. So in the decision we made, you made, to elect certain Members to the Environment Department from the very off, from the very beginning, there were people elected who were clearly not supportive of paid parking and others who were more supportive of paid parking.

That really – despite the other 20 or 29 Propositions or whatever – is where the debate is hinged, because that is where there is the rub – if I can put it that way. Then of course when you consolidate that, distil it down into taking all those views on board and formulating a policy, then if you have not got paid parking what mechanism do you have? And you say, ‘Well, we have to have a disincentive,’ and the main report acknowledges that. It says there must be a disincentive. But the disincentive of 5p is not enough of a disincentive. So it is well intentioned but it is simply not enough of a disincentive. It is sort of saying, ‘We know there is a problem. We do not want to ruffle any feathers. Bear with us because over time we just

might sort this problem out? And, sadly, with the problem we are facing with on Island transport, it is a significant problem, it is an issue and it does need to be addressed.

Can I just thank Deputy Christopher Green – is it only somebody with the surname Green, by the way, that gets the exemption or does it have to be a green car or just owned by the family? (*Laughter*) But for talking about the public realm, because we have a great town, we have a great Island that the Georgians, the Victorians, left us with, but the town is blighted by the car.

The Promenade along the Vallette from the aquarium is a car park. Outside the former brewery is a car park. I was stopped some time ago and asked by a French tourist, ‘how do I find Hauteville House?’. I said, ‘follow the cars up the road’. Everywhere you go within St Peter Port, cars are parked. You do not get an appreciation of the public realm and we know that our planners tell us constantly what the benefit of the community, the benefit of architecture and – to use an expression I have used before – we do get effectively snow blindness with regard to cars, we simply stop seeing them and we do not appreciate... especially for people who visit the Island, it really does come as quite a shock because none of the brochures they receive really give a flavour of the volume of cars that are on the Island.

Deputy De Lisle, some time ago in debate, spoke of the town dying and paid parking will kill the town. I do not see that argument and I think comparisons to the UK might be flawed because in the UK, local councils are really under pressure, they are squeezed from Central Government – they cut the funds. What local government then does, it wants the easiest revenue – how do we get money in? – and they tend to have punitive rates of parking. We do not have anyone, I do not think, sir, on the Island that does private parking, that would clamp your car, that would tow your car away, that would put it in the compound, that would charge you £150. We do not have that. Those small communities in the UK that have made that mistake are realising that actually, when you do have such punitive sanctions against the motorist, there is a backlash and that communities may suffer. But these are not punitive sanctions that the Minority Report is trying to impose on the community.

Both Deputy Lester Queripel and Deputy Conder spoke of cycling. I am a keen cyclist. This little device here tells me that over the past 55 hours and 43 minutes I have ridden 718 miles. That is interesting because that is not a huge amount of cycling if you are a keen cyclist. It is the perception that cycling is a particularly peculiar thing to do, when it is not. Many people on the Island cycle much more than me, and touching on the point raised by Deputy Queripel who I think said the Guernsey Bicycle Group are doing very well, I understand they have 400 members. Well, we spoke to the Guernsey Bicycle Group during the survey. They were representing 400 other people. So if that one group has a very strong membership with a base of 400 people. So I think the survey did connect with more people than perhaps people believe it may have done.

Also with cycling, Deputy Conder, the report talks about the presumption of liability and, if you want to get cycling considered to be a legitimate, worthy, accepted form of transport then, for example, if you have the presumption of liability, if a cyclist runs into a pedestrian the presumption is with the cyclist. If a car runs into a cyclist then I think that type of understanding that appreciation does assist with cycle safety.

How many times – whether it has been on social forums, whether it has been on conversations – is this said: people will say – and it is genuinely meant – did you hear about the tragic death of that cyclist? The next thing somebody will then say, ‘It is absolutely wretched, but you have to feel for the driver.’ But I can guarantee the next thing that will be said was what on earth was the cyclist doing there in the first place? And I think sometimes there is that lack of appreciation and understanding for exactly how vulnerable cyclists can be, and we certainly know that in London.

I like cars – I am a motorist – and I also like bikes, and sometimes during these debates we tend to talk about the motorist and we talk about the cyclist, but of course the people paying the parking clock, the people even perhaps paying to park their car, will also be cyclist at one point or another.

Deputy Paint made the point about fees, charges and taxes – as others have done – but remember this is not a tax within the Minority Report, because when you walk into a showroom you can behave in a way which ensures that there are no fees or charges or duties levelled against you, or in fact you may actually get a rebate. So you can opt out of these fees or charges. Therefore, they are not taxes imposed on you by Government because they are designed to influence your behaviour and to try in some way to attempt to manage the volume of cars on the Island.

Just with regard to the motorist more generally – that the motorist is getting hammered, we always look to the motorist – Guernsey is actually relatively inexpensive. It is relatively inexpensive to own a car on Guernsey. But if we look what motorists of their own choosing opt to do... because when the Environment Department sells registration plates, people are queuing up at the door to buy registration plates, and it is not the people that you may think that want a three-digit or a four-digit number. It is people of, at times, relatively modest income who have spotted their date of birth on the number plate, it might be their telephone number, but they pay huge sums of money for registration plates, from time to time. So the motorist does opt to pay these types of revenues that the Environment Department benefit from.

On page 648 of the main report, there is a graph in there that has perhaps been overlooked because, when asked whether people favour a type of paid parking, 53% of people said 'yes' and 47% of people said 'no' because this idea of blanket paid parking... People do not want to pay parking throughout St Peter Port but they are not opposed to paid parking in certain places – and that was represented, I think, in that pie chart.

Deputy Brouard and others, sir, do not see that is a problem. I see that as a problem and I am perplexed that people do not see that the volume of traffic on the Island is a problem, specifically with congestion. We frequently talk about the Banques but if we talk about the coming in through Grande Rue in St Martin's, through Fort Road, through the Val des Terres, the whole of St Martin's comes to a halt. If we look at the Couture, if we look at the Fosse André, Coronation Road, everything grinds to a halt, with people moving. I know people say – and I think Deputy Brouard said – that actually during school time that is much easier. Then you referred to the school bus services. But, of course, it is not just the schools because parents are not at work, children are not at school. So it is not just the schools, it is a bit more than that. It is about public holidays, Easter holidays and people not being on the Island. It is simply not the case of it is just the schools being out.

If ever we wanted perhaps an illustration of how the car has become so indelible in this community, I was struck with an interview given by a student who said on *Radio Guernsey* 'I have to leave home early to get to school, otherwise I will have nowhere to park.' So at the age of 17 you drive to school and already you are griping that, 'Where the heck do I park around here?' You are not in traffic – you are the traffic. Get on a bus because we have given them free for you.

Just very quickly, on the challenge that Deputy Darren Duquemin and I are doing – and I think this will be most people's experience when they are doing cycling on a daily basis over the next 30 days – they will start off being very nervous and being very timid and cars will be quite accepting because they will recognise that. When they have been out for two weeks, three weeks, four weeks, they will be accomplished, assertive cyclists. And I have to tell you potentially... and that is when you come into conflict with the motorist, because you say, 'Actually I have every right to be next in this filtering turn. I have every right to be in the middle of the road. I have every right to stick my hand out to make a right turn without you trying to overtake me,' and the relationship will change and they will have an appreciation of the issues that the car does bring to the community.

Sir, just in closing, when it dawned on me that I could not support the Majority Report, I realised I did not have the ability – if I can put it that way – or the application to produce a report of the likes of Deputy Burford, and I cannot commend her enough for the work that she has put in. She has the energy of a Tasmanian Devil, (*Laughter*) the tenacity of an insurance salesman – or is that salesperson – and she has the intellect of Einstein. So can I once more commend her and thank the people of the West for having the good sense to elect Deputy Burford to this Assembly, sir?

Thank you. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

The Bailiff: Well, Members, we will rise in a moment and return tomorrow at 9.30 a.m. Can I just remind you, some of you are attending a launch event for the guide to the criminal justice system for victims and witnesses that is about to be produced. That will be starting shortly in the Grand Hall.

Greffier can we please have the closing prayer?

The House adjourned at 5.38 p.m.