



**OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF THE**

**STATES OF DELIBERATION**

**OF THE**

**ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

**HANSARD**

**Royal Court House, Guernsey, Thursday, 17th June 2021**

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

**Volume 10, No. 12**

**ISSN 2049 – 8284**

**Present:**

**Ms J. E. Roland, Deputy Bailiff and Presiding Officer**

**Law Officers**

R. M. Titterington, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller)

**People's Deputies**

S. E. Aldwell	C. J. Le Tissier
C. P. A Blin	J. P. Le Tocq
Y. Burford	M. P. Leadbeater
T. L. Bury	D. J. Mahoney
A. Cameron	A. D. S. Matthews
D. de G. de Lisle	L. J. McKenna
H. L. de Sausmarez	C. P. Meerveld
A. C. Dudley – Owen	N. G. Moakes
J. F. Dyke	V. S. Oliver
S. P. Fairclough	C. N. K. Parkinson
S. J. Falla	R. G. Prow
P. T. R. Ferbrache	L. C. Queripel
A. Gabriel	P. J. Roffey
J. A. B. Gollop	H. J. R. Soulsby
S. P. Haskins	L. S. Trott
M. A. J. Helyar	S. P. J. Vermeulen
N. R. Inder	
A. Kazantseva-Miller	

**Representatives of the Island of Alderney**

Alderney Representatives S. Roberts and E. A. J. Snowdon

**The Clerk to the States of Deliberation**

S. M. D. Ross, Esq. (States' Greffier)

**Absent at the Evocation**

Deputy A. H. Brouard (*relevé à 9h 42*); Deputy R. C. Murray (*indisposé*);  
Deputy G. A. St Pier (*indisposé*); Deputy A. W. Taylor (*relevé à 10h 11*)

## Business transacted

Evocation .....	687
Convocation .....	687
<b>Billet d'État XIII .....</b>	<b>687</b>
14. Freedom of Information Review: Evaluation of the States of Guernsey's Code of Practice on access to public information– Debate continued – Proposition 1(b) carried.....	687
12. Future Harbour Development – Debate commenced .....	690
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.33 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.44 p.m. ....</i>	<i>725</i>
Procedural .....	725
Future Harbour Development – Debate continued .....	726
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.29 p.m. ....</i>	<i>759</i>

*PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK*

# States of Deliberation

*The States met at 9.35 a.m.*

[THE DEPUTY BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

## PRAYERS

*The States' Greffier*

## EVOCAATION

## CONVOCAATION

# Billet d'État XIII

## SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

### 14. Freedom of Information Review:

#### **Evaluation of the States of Guernsey's Code of Practice on access to public information – Debate continued – Proposition 1(b) carried**

**The States' Greffier:** Article 14, Freedom of Information Review, the continuation of the debate.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Is there anybody else who wishes to speak in general debate?

5 In that case, I turn to Deputy Burford to reply.

**Deputy Burford:** Thank you, madam, and thank you to all Members who contributed to the debate.

10 I will begin with Deputy Brouard, who mentioned how onerous the task of responding to API requests is. At around one request a week, spread across the whole of Government, I am afraid I cannot agree with his view, although I concede that numbers may increase. On this point, I agree with Deputy Meerveld's assertion that, regardless, it is a necessary and important function of doing government.

15 Deputy Brouard also said that we should charge for information; I simply do not agree. I do not think barriers or deterrents should be put up that make it more difficult for anyone, including the media, to obtain information that rightly belongs to the public – information that the public have already paid for through their taxes. Of course, if Deputy Brouard feels strongly about that, he could have brought an amendment directing P&R to look into charging, as it is not a matter for the Scrutiny Management Committee. I doubt it would have had much traction, however, and rightly so.

20 I do understand the dilemma Deputy Inder faces between Propositions 1(a) and 1(b) entirely, and it is why I say that if the independent panel does not achieve what Scrutiny hope it will, then we will not hesitate to return with proposals for a full Law.

25 I thank my Vice President for his speech, carefully thought through and well expressed – as, indeed, are all his contributions in Committee; and I agree with him that an independent Appeals Panel is vital. Where I disagree is with his suggestion that a full Law will not cost much more than the current system. The previous Committee never clearly identified a way of administering the Law, largely because it is not straightforward. But one suggestion was for it to sit with the Office of the Data Protection Regulator, and inevitably, that office would not administer it within their existing  
30 resource. Yes, the current API Code has a cost, but there are no dedicated roles assigned to it and it is done within an existing staffing.

Deputy Fairclough is also correct when he says that Laws can be prioritised when we want them to be, but I certainly would not be betting on this one falling into that category. Indeed, my strong instinct is that a vote for 1(a) will see no change to the current system this term. One only has to  
35 note that in this debate, all five Members of P&R have spoken individually, and none of them support a move to a full Law.

For clarity, I should say that P&R being unanimously against something is absolutely no reason whatsoever to also take that position! (*Laughter*) Indeed, on occasion, the opposite may well be true, and we may come to that in the next debate. But I highlight it to underline the level of priority  
40 that that Committee is likely to assign to the bringing back of the policy letter called for in Proposition 1(a).

I think, possibly, Deputy Falla was confusing the number of API requests submitted with representations made to the FOI Review, and I apologise if I have got that wrong. For clarity, there were surprisingly few representations to the Review, which maybe tells us something. The number  
45 of API requests is currently running at around 60 a year. I would also reiterate to Deputy Falla that Scrutiny will set up and administer the Appeals Panel within its existing budget.

Deputy Le Tocq made the important point that an FOI Law is not a *panacea*, and it is important to understand that under a Law, exceptions will necessarily still exist – it is not a free-for-all.

I thank my other Scrutiny colleague, Deputy Dyke, for his contribution. He refers to option 1(b) as a compromise. Actually, I do not see it that way, and those who know me well will know that I  
50 am not a great fan of compromise solutions anyway; all too often, they are the solution that nobody wanted. I see option 1(b) as being a pragmatic solution for a jurisdiction of our size, and I think Deputy Ferbrache and Deputy Soulsby underlined that in their speeches. I also see it as being the art of the possible and a stepping stone, should it be needed.

55 I thank Deputy Kazantseva-Miller for her kind words about the policy letter. She talked of costs and digitisation, and I am glad Deputy Soulsby picked up on the latter point, as again, that is a matter for P&R.

Deputy Queripel brought up culture. I would like to think that an independent Appeals Panel will concentrate Committees' minds somewhat when they are considering applying exceptions to  
60 requests, certainly more so than having to review it themselves with input from the CIO, and that, in itself, should lead to some culture shift.

Deputy Matthews says we should be able to provide information; I agree, and we do. The point has already been made that great swathes of information are provided, both voluntarily and on request, long before it gets to API territory.

65 Deputy Meerveld, it is the Committee's contention that our preferred option can serve the public in the way a Law can, but if it does not we will have the evidence to prove that it is not and to make a stronger case for a Law.

Finally, I would like to pick up on the intervention from Her Majesty's Procureur. It is correct that a complaint regarding the way an API request has been handled by a Committee could be submitted  
70 to the Administrative Decision Panel, and my Committee spent a considerable time considering if this was a way forward, including meeting with the Law Officers. We decided that it was not, not least because we consider that the FOI Appeals Panel calls for the recruiting of a particular skill set, and because we believe it is more appropriate that it sits, technically, under Scrutiny, rather than under Policy & Resources.

75 To sum up, I hope and trust that those Members who do vote for Proposition 1(a) will, if it is defeated, transfer your support to option 1(b). For openness and transparency, may I have a recorded vote on the Propositions, please?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.

*There was a recorded vote.*

Proposition 1(a)

*Not carried – Pour 8, Contre 30, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2*

<b>POUR</b>	<b>CONTRE</b>	<b>NE VOTE PAS</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Deputy Matthews	Deputy Le Tocq	None	Deputy Murray
Deputy McKenna	Deputy Leadbeater		Deputy Taylor
Deputy Meerveld	Deputy Mahoney		
Deputy Queripel	Deputy Moakes		
Deputy Bury	Deputy Oliver		
Deputy Fairclough	Deputy Parkinson		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Prow		
Deputy Le Tissier	Alderney Rep. Roberts		
	Deputy Roffey		
	Alderney Rep. Snowdon		
	Deputy Soulsby		
	Deputy St Pier		
	Deputy Trott		
	Deputy Vermeulen		
	Deputy Aldwell		
	Deputy Blin		
	Deputy Brouard		
	Deputy Burford		
	Deputy Cameron		
	Deputy de Lisle		
	Deputy de Sausmarez		
	Deputy Dudley-Owen		
	Deputy Dyke		
	Deputy Falla		
	Deputy Ferbrache		
	Deputy Gabriel		
	Deputy Haskins		
	Deputy Helyar		
	Deputy Inder		
	Deputy Kazantseva-Miller		

80 **The States' Greffier:** Do you wish me to read that, madam?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes, please.

*The States' Greffier read Proposition 1(b).*

85

*There was a recorded vote.*

Proposition 1(b)

*Carried – Pour 37, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2*

<b>POUR</b>	<b>CONTRE</b>	<b>NE VOTE PAS</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Deputy Le Tocq	Deputy Brouard	None	Deputy Murray
Deputy Leadbeater			Deputy Taylor
Deputy Mahoney			
Deputy Matthews			
Deputy McKenna			

Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Moakes  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Queripel  
Alderney Rep. Roberts  
Deputy Roffey  
Alderney Rep. Snowdon  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Vermeulen  
Deputy Aldwell  
Deputy Blin  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Bury  
Deputy Cameron  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Dyke  
Deputy Fairclough  
Deputy Falla  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Gabriel  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Haskins  
Deputy Helyar  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller  
Deputy Le Tissier

*Nothing is said about the result before moving on to the next Article*

## **STATES' TRADING SUPERVISORY BOARD**

### **12. Future Harbour Development – Debate commenced**

*The States are asked to decide: –*

*Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter entitled 'Future Harbour Development' of the States' Trading Supervisory Board, they are of the opinion: –*

- 1. To approve Combination 5 as the preferred scheme for the future development of Guernsey's harbours i.e. to reconfigure operations in St Peter Port Harbour; construct a new northern port at Longue Hougue South for some freight operations; convert St Sampson's Harbour for leisure use only; improve the leisure sector offering in St Peter Port and carry out essential repairs to the current harbours, as set out in the Policy Letter and in particular in paragraphs 8.13 to 8.17.*
- 2. To approve the Future Harbour Development as a pipeline project in the capital portfolio, for ratification by the States as part of the Government Work Plan and to direct the Policy & Resources Committee through its seafront regeneration subcommittee, in respect of its role for developing the Seafront Enhancement Area, and in consultation with the States' Trading Supervisory Board, to develop more detailed proposals, including the costs and associated*



*benefits, as set out in paragraph 11.14 of this Policy Letter, and submit those proposals to the States for approval, by December 2022.*

- a. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee, through its seafront regeneration subcommittee, in consultation with the Committee for Economic Development, the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure, the marine industry and other relevant stakeholders, to undertake a detailed analysis of economic opportunities from developing an enhanced Blue Economy offering across the Guernsey Seafront Enhancement Area, including but not limited to leisure marinas, super yachts, overwintering, marine service industry, marine tourism and other commercial opportunities and use the findings to develop proposals for such an enhanced Blue Economy offering to be submitted in the form of a Policy Letter and suitable Propositions for the States for approval by the end of December 2022.*
- 3. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee, in consultation with the States' Trading Supervisory Board, to ensure that sufficient space within the existing Longue Hougue Reclamation Site is retained, to maximise the potential for stockpiling of inert waste by ensuring that any new [or renewed] leases entered into for the Longue Hougue Reclamation site from the date of this resolution are capable of termination on 12 months' notice or less. P.2021/45 Propositions (as amended)*
- 4. If proposition 1 is approved, to direct the Development & Planning Authority to take into account the approval of Combination 5 as the preferred scheme for the future development of Guernsey's harbours in the preparation of the Harbour Action Area Local Planning Briefs for St Peter Port and St Sampson's.*
- 5. To direct the States' Trading Supervisory Board to submit by the end of December 2022 a Policy Letter together with suitable Propositions, which provide for a scheme to develop within St Peter Port Harbour a 'Pool Marina' with associated marina facilities and which includes costings and a delivery plan.*
- 6. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to establish a Development and Regeneration Board, as an arm's length body of the States or similar entity, to replace the interim sub-committee established by the Policy & Resources Committee to advise it on the development of the Seafront Enhancement Area.*
- 7. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to develop Propositions and an accompanying Policy Letter, for consideration by the States of Deliberation at the earliest opportunity and not later than December, 2021, which shall include recommendations on:
  - a. the mandate, membership, accountability, funding, and involvement in the preparation of the long-term development strategy for the Seafront Enhancement Area of the Development and Regeneration Board; and*
  - b. a timeline and set of steps to develop the seafront masterplan, which shall include within St Peter Port Harbour a 'Pool Marina' with associated modern marina facilities, by December 2022.**

**The States' Greffier:** Article 12, States' Trading Supervisory Board: Future Harbour Development.

90 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

**Deputy Roffey:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Bailiff and Members.

95 The STSB is not telling the States what to do today; that really is not our role. Indeed, the boot is really on the other foot; it was the States which told the STSB to look into the issue of future port requirements, with a particular emphasis on the possible new deep water facilities that would allow heavy commercial shipping to be taken out of our traditional ports. I think they were right to do so. I know that the Committee – was not on it at the time but – were already thinking along those lines themselves, but it *was* a decision of this Assembly. They voted £800,000 to fund that investigation. All we are doing today is reporting back as ordered; the decision on what to do next will rightly be one for the States to take.

100 That said, we have, of course, come forward with a particular recommendation. We felt it would be pretty feeble, after looking into the matter in depth, if we had not recommended a preferred course of action, but we always recognise the final judgement call is not ours, but rightly, one for the States.

105 Whatever that decision ends up being, we look forward to playing our full part in progressing the next stage of the more detailed work. Of course, that work on the ports would be set within the broader project of the regeneration and enhancement of both towns on Guernsey's east coast. That work is not for the STSB to mastermind – not at all – but we hope to feed into the crucial ports element, which will remain at its heart.

110 One thing that we do desperately hope, though, is that the States does decide to do *something* today, that we do not reinforce our Assembly's hard-earned reputation for fudging and prevarication. We hope that not just because we put so much work into this project – and by the way, I commend the project team who have worked their socks off in bringing forward what I think is an outstanding piece of work, one of the best pieces of work I have seen by a States' working party in my time in this Assembly – but more importantly, we hope to get a positive decision today because it would be perverse to spend £800,000 considering all of the options, and then when presented with all of them, to decide to do nothing at all because it feels safer or maybe less controversial; what a waste of money that would be.

120 Even more importantly, we hope the States take a positive decision today because it – we, the States as an Assembly – have actually known that something along these lines has been needed for several decades. We have commissioned numerous reports on the subject only then to balk at the final hurdle and fail to act on any of them. Those reports are gathering dust, and I hope we do not want to put another expensive report, commissioned by ourselves, on top of that pile.

125 This cannot continue. If a community knows full well that something is right and needs doing, then it needs to show the courage and resolution to take the first step, even if it is difficult, even if the price tag is daunting, even if the journey will be quite a long one. A community which lacks vision lacks a future.

130 But is this the right time? Shouldn't we wait until our finances are in much better shape? Shouldn't we put it off until we have worked through some of the other priorities within our Government Work Plan, launched yesterday? No. No. No. That is exactly what we have been doing for years and years. There is always a good argument why now is not a good time, but when the plan itself is sound, you need the courage to start to implement it. Do not be scared of it just because it is ambitious; throughout our history, Guernsey has never been scared of ambition. If we had been, we would not have prospered in the way that we have done.

135 All of that said, I think I need to make two things clear. The first is that the commercial ports project would be an eight- to 10-year project. Sure, elements of it, depending on which options are selected today, can be done much sooner than that, but the real big works on the commercial ports would tend to be in the second half of this project.

140 So to some extent, it has to sit outside the GWP, which has a four-year horizon. It might, of course – depending on the chosen funding mechanism – limit our successors' choices on what else they want to do within their own GWP or equivalent. But I am afraid, that is simply the nature of major transformational projects; anyway, I suspect the funding mechanism will not simply be the traditional one of money from general revenue.

145 Secondly, the States will not actually be making an irrevocable decision today; rather, it is a decision in principle and releasing the funding – that vital £4 million – to take it forward and work it up in detail. It has to be that way; Members need far more detail before making a final decision on a massive scheme like this.

150 But Madam, it really is chicken and egg. To work out that detail for every possible option would cost an absolute fortune before the States had even indicated a preferred direction of travel. Today, we are asking for that direction of travel, and in 18 months' time a far more detailed set of proposals will come before you, and that is the time when you will be asked to finally commit, and commit to something very big indeed.

155 We hope when that time comes you will commit to do something, because far from being the worst possible time for this sort of investment, madam, it is actually the *best* possible time. I will return to that at the end of my speech, but it is probably time now to look at the options facing the Assembly today.

As those who have read the Billet – which is everybody in this Chamber, I know – will be aware, we are offering seven different combinations of options in the policy letter, and I will go through them in a moment.

160 But those of you who have also read the background papers will know that there were other options identified in the Jacobs Report which did not make any of the shortlisted combinations. We are not hiding that fact; that is all out in the open but our job was to narrow the options down. For example, a deep-water cruise liner berth, costing about £200 million to create, was dismissed because it was clear that any financial returns would have been marginal at best. Likewise, the idea of creating a superyacht marina with berths in Havelet Bay underneath Castle Cornet did not make the cut. But the information is all out there, so if the States – or indeed, others – want to pursue that sort of concept in future, the information is there to allow them to do it. But today's focus should be on the shortlisted seven combinations.

We really hope you do not go for option 1 – the 'do minimum' option – not just because it lacks ambition, but because it actually does not represent good value for money.

170 By contrast, option 2 – the reorganisation of St Peter Port – must be a serious contender; the cost is much less than some of the later options and it does deliver some significant benefits. It is true it does nothing at all for St Sampson, but it allows the existing St Peter Port Harbour to be used more efficiently and it would free up some land around the Harbour for other uses – in particular, the Cambridge berth and, if parking is relocated, which I really hope it will be, the Victoria Pier – or as everybody in Guernsey calls it, the Crown Pier.

175 Option 3 most closely resembles the requête fronted up by the Deputies Paint and Inder, which led to this whole investigation in the first place. It creates a new deep-water harbour outside the existing Victorian St Peter Port Harbour, immediately to the east of it. This does little or nothing for St Sampson, but it does free up a really significant amount of land around the existing St Peter Port Harbour for other uses.

180 I know it remains the favourite option of a few Deputies, but we recommend strongly against it for several reasons. It did not score particularly well on what benefits it could deliver, it is very expensive and its aesthetic impact would, in my view, be truly dreadful; it would be a monstrous carbuncle on what is one of the most attractive approaches to a harbour town that can be found anywhere in the world, bar none. Personally, I think it would be an act of sacrilege, destroying something very special: the old 19th century granite harbour works would completely disappear behind a modern concrete harbour built for utility, and utility alone. Could the appearance of the new harbour be made more traditional? Of course, it could be. Of course, it could be, but only at an eye-watering cost.

190 Those are some of the reasons why the STSB cannot favour option 3, but we accept these things are completely subjective; that is the point of debate. If the States want to go with any option, we will work diligently to make it work. As I said at the start, the choice today is entirely one for this Assembly; we are simply laying out the smorgasbord.

195 Option 4 is the same as option 3, but with a new fuel discharging system based on a buoy situated further north, in the Little Roussel. This scored reasonably well in the assessment, but it is even more expensive. As far as St Sampson's is concerned, while it removes the problem of fuel discharges from vessels that sit on the harbour bed – something we all, surely, must want to see end as soon as practicable – it still does not allow St Sampson's to be turned over for leisure, or for flood defences to be installed at the Harbour mouth – unless, of course, you want to move all the other heavy commercial traffic – like aggregate sand, cement imports, scrap metal exports – move  
200 all of those and switch them to St Peter Port. I suggest that would be a very backwards step for our capital, which is also our key tourist asset.

That, madam, brings us to the area where the STSB had the most difficulty in coming to a preferred option to recommend to the States. Option 5 is the first of the three options which involve  
205 building a new port at Longue Hougue. It would take the load-on/load-off freight out of St Peter Port, which would mean the cranes would go from St Peter Port as well, freeing up that part of the Harbour for the martialling of heavy traffic. As under option 2, it will involve considerable reorganisation of the way that St Peter Port Harbour is used and free up considerable amounts of valuable land. I am not going to go into the details of that now; most of you, I think, have been to  
210 one of our very many presentations.

Most importantly, option 5 is the first of the options to take all of the commercial shipping out of St Sampson's Harbour, and I think that would be a massive gain on all sorts of fronts. Firstly, there would be the obvious benefit of allowing many more leisure moorings to be created there. Secondly, *a lot of* valuable land on both the north and south side would become available: not just  
215 the land actually used by the current commercial port operations, but a lot more which is currently restricted in its use due to the imposition of exclusion zones.

Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, the whole character of St Sampson's Harbour and its environs would be transformed if the port was given over to leisure use from heavy industrial shipping. For a very long time, we have heard from the north of the Island, where a significant part  
220 of our population live, that they feel they have got the short end of States' policies. 'Any heavy industry? Any bad neighbour activity? Stick it up the north, then.' Options 5, 6, and 7 would all see a complete reversal of that historic grievance. Suddenly, we could create a genuine renaissance of Guernsey's second town. To me, that is a huge prize – (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) not mentioning the financial prize that comes with it, which would be very significant; just in itself, what it does for the  
225 community there is a huge prize in its own right.

Madam, outside of pandemics, my big passion in life is travel. I really like islands and coastal regions, and I can attest that there is hardly a coastal community anywhere in the world which is lucky enough to have an historic, characterful, stone-built harbour that has not moved all of the heavy commercial shipping out of that harbour. They may have had to create an out-of-town,  
230 concrete-built commercial port, but they have freed up their historic ports for leisure, and just as importantly, as picturesque centrepieces of their traditional settlements. For those places lucky enough to have tourist industries, those old, stone-built harbours also become one of their biggest and most important assets. While I usually like to see Guernsey as a trendsetter, I have to say, Members, on this one, we are very much behind the curve.

235 The other great benefit of turning over St Sampson for leisure is that it facilitates putting flood defences at the Harbour mouth, thus protecting not just the bridge, but the whole of the Clos du Valle behind, from flooding should sea levels rise; and all of the information coming out in the last few days is suggesting that, actually, that would be greater than previously predicted. Of course, I am not joining in the States pantomime about 'He's behind you!', but I am not blind to the fact that  
240 if you protect St Sampson, there is another weak point at the other end of the Clos du Valle, which is at Grand Havre, but at least we would be halfway there in an area where otherwise we would be spending millions, probably, on bespoke flood defences.

The one real drawback that the new port at Longue Hougue would have is its tidal restrictions. On smaller tides, on neap tides, there would not be a problem, but on bigger tides, ships would not  
245 be able to enter the port for about an hour either side of low tide – or at least, that is what the initial

computer modelling tends to show. For lo-lo and bulk cargo shipping, as envisaged under option 5, that would not be an issue, not an issue at all. Indeed, the bulk cargo ships would be moving out of a port which is far more tidally restricted to move into the new port at Longue Hougue. All they would do is simply time their arrivals to avoid those restricted periods. Ninety percent of the time, they would still be able to get in; they just have to avoid the other 10%. For ro-ro traffic, and particularly, the scheduled ferry service, this is obviously more problematic.

That brings me onto option 6, the one where all heavy commercial shipping, including ro-ro vessels, move to the new port at Longue Hougue. Madam, I have to confess that the STSB wrestled for ages over whether to recommend option 5 or option 6. Both would cost about the same, and in many ways, option 6 delivers much more. It delivers everything for St Sampson which option 5 does, but it also turns St Peter Port pretty much into a leisure port too, freeing up a lot more land for development, particularly with the terminal and the martialling areas all going to the northern port. In the Harbour itself, it would allow the creation of even more leisure berths than we intend to do under option 5.

Of course, the inter-island traffic would still operate out of St Peter Port – we would not move that to Longue Hougue – as would the fishing fleet, but all of the big ships, if I can put it that simply, would vacate the Harbour. Therefore, it would also allow, in theory, tidal defences needed in St Peter Port against rising sea levels to move from the quayside, which is where they are projected to be now, out of the Harbour mouth.

So really big benefits on offer and we were very attracted to it, but we did keep coming back to those tidal restrictions. Could a scheduled passenger ferry operator be expected to operate into a harbour which was closed for four hours every time there was a large tide? Indeed, not just the ferry, but could Just-in-Time freight operations, like fresh food, be expected to operate in that way? They probably could if they were on a multi-destination route where the other port, Jersey, is even more tidally restricted. Once again, Jersey is our problem here.

Of course, it is a matter for judgement and we accept the States' judgements today, but we had to come forward with a recommendation, and on balance, regretfully, we felt we could not recommend option 6, even though it was a close call. What I will say is this: if you vote for option 5, I do not think it rules out option 6 later on. The size of the new northern port is really very similar in both scenarios, and perhaps it is only once the real detailed tidal modelling has been done at Wallingford that that final judgement call could be made.

Vote us the £4 million that we are proposing today, that sort of work will be done, you will be able to make a really informed judgement between 5 and 6. We know there is an amendment going to be placed to try this dual-crack approach, and I have to say, the STSB will not be resisting it.

Alternatively, if you think our judgement is just wrong and just want to go for option 6 now, then obviously that is your right too, but we would strongly counsel against it because it could be sending us down an expensive cul-de-sac.

Option 7, we believe, is both overkill and far too expensive.

Of course, madam, there are options 8, 9, and 10 as well: option 8 is delay; option 9 is indecision and vacillation; and option 10 is 'do nothing at all because it is all too daunting and difficult'. The whole project team and the whole of the STSB are unanimous in recommending against any of these options, and I am sad that, effectively, that option is going to get laid today, as we found out yesterday – but I will come back to that later.

I will close by saying to States' Members that in the run-up to the debate, ever since we have reached the details, there has understandably been an enormous amount of focus on the costs. Many people have said, 'It is going to cost £360 million to create a new northern port.' Of course, it will not; that is nonsense. That cost includes all of the changes to St Peter Port as well, the repairs, the new terminal, the new underground car park, and lots of other features, so the cost of the new port is actually a lot less than that.

More fundamentally, there has not been nearly enough focus on the other side of the balance sheet, on the cash it will generate for our Island and for our Exchequer, not just in the narrow sense of the valuable real estate – that would be worth many tens of millions of pounds. Just how much

would depend on two things: what planning constraints are put on it, and what we, actually, as a community want to give over to general amenity and what we want to give over to commercial use; that will be a choice for us but if we choose to maximise the return it will generate an enormous amount of money.

More fundamentally, our focus should be on the economic growth which would be stimulated by those developments and the multiplier effect it will have throughout the Guernsey economy. Indeed, madam, over the course of this project, I have not been able to help thinking back, quite sheepishly, to the debate on whether to build what was then called the 'North Beach Marina', now called the QEII Marina. I think that debate was December 1982, anyway I remember taking part in it very well. I confess, I opposed that development; I opposed it both on environmental grounds and on cost grounds. Remember, this was the time when tomato growing, the backbone of Guernsey's economy for decades, was in terminal decline. The States did not have two brass farthings to rub together – sound familiar to anybody? We have been there before. I thought, in those circumstances, splurging many millions on a new marina could not be justified.

Members, I was callow, and I was so wrong. I am so glad that wiser and more experienced Deputies outvoted me. (**Deputy Trott:** Hear, hear!) (*Laughter*) Deputy Trott was not there at the time! (*Laughter*) Goodness knows what age he was in 1982. (**A Member:** Four!) No, a bit older than that.

But I am glad that they outvoted me; it was just the investment which Guernsey needed at that point in our history. At that point when we were on our knees, we needed to show the courage to actually go forward. It was seeding future economic growth. It was showing confidence in ourselves. It was bold, imaginative, and clearly, the right decision to make. I hope this Assembly shows equal wisdom today.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Roffey.  
Deputy Taylor, do you wish to be relevéd?

**Deputy Taylor:** Yes, please, madam. Sorry I am late.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** As Members will be aware, there are a number of amendments in the agenda today. In order that those amendments make the most sense, I have decided that we will deal with amendment 8 first; that is the amendment proposed by Deputy Helyar, seconded by Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Helyar.

[Amendment 8](#)

*To delete and replace all Propositions with the following:*

1. *To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to establish a Development and Regeneration Board, as an arm's length body of the States or similar entity, to replace the interim sub-committee established by the Policy & Resources Committee to advise it on the development of the Seafront Enhancement Area.*
2. *To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to develop Propositions and an accompanying Policy Letter, for consideration by the States of Deliberation at the earliest opportunity and not later than December, 2021, which shall include recommendations on:*
  - A. *the mandate, membership, accountability, funding, and involvement in the preparation of the long-term development strategy for the Seafront Enhancement Area of the Development and Regeneration Board; and*

- B. *a timeline and set of steps to develop the seafront masterplan, which shall include within St Peter Port Harbour a 'Pool Marina' with associated modern marina facilities, by December 2022.*

**Deputy Helyar:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Bailiff.

335 Members of the Assembly, I have been heartened to see so much interest and energy invested in all matters nautical, and in particular, the redevelopment of our harbours and the eastern seaboard over the past few weeks.

340 We have a real opportunity today to focus that energy, working together during this term, to deliver projects which can make a huge difference to public amenity, the economy, our environment and the Bailiwick's connectivity, including to Alderney and Sark, whilst creating investment opportunities and attracting new and sustainable business to our shores. We also have a real opportunity to leverage the considerable expertise in this Island which sits outside Government: infrastructure experts, engineering experts, and investment experts, all of whom are necessary to plan and deliver large projects.

345 The amendment being proposed by myself and Deputy Ferbrache will give us all an opportunity to demonstrate that we are a can-do Government, by enabling those who can do to get on with the job of delivering a master plan for the eastern seaboard, including its harbours.

350 As an active boater – and I did read that back this morning and thought to myself, 'I have put on a fair bit of weight in the second lockdown, it perhaps should say "bloater",' (*Laughter*) but we will keep it at 'boater' – as an active boater and a qualified yacht master, I am passionate about the opportunity for our harbours and the eastern seaboard more generally, and the possibility to grow what has become known as the 'blue economy'.

355 The Bailiff mentioned in our last meeting the anniversary of the appointment of Sir Daniel de Lisle Brock, whose portrait, madam, hangs above your left shoulder. I have spent many happy – and indeed, unhappy – hours pondering it. It is because of his vision and those of other members of the Royal Court in the 19th century and 18th century that such a magnificent Harbour, and many other public buildings we still use today, were built. Our Harbours are the jewel in the Island's crown, and finally, after so many years, our attention today is turning towards them.

360 It is self-evident, Members, from the amendments which have been submitted that there is considerable interest – and indeed, some concern – about the Future Harbours policy letter: the content, and also that we are not all aligned, all unified, except perhaps, to the extent that, I sense, we collectively know that there is a real opportunity in the rejuvenation of our Harbours and the eastern seaboard, that we collectively understand something should be done about it, and urgently, even if that is simply to put right what is broken and needs maintenance in St Peter Port.

365 Madam Deputy Bailiff, unfortunately and through no individual's fault, the sea state in this process has become rather confused, primarily, in my view, because the STSB policy letter on harbour development represents the delivery of a workstream from the last Assembly which now falls between two stools from a governance perspective. Think of it as a relay race, where STSB is arriving with the baton, but there is nobody to take it and run forwards, bringing together all the relevant strands to produce a coherent and co-ordinated battle plan.

370 Although harbour regeneration and development falls within the Government Work Plan, because of elections and subsequent timings, the STSB policy letter has arrived out of phase with the Government Work Plan and the eastern seaboard or Seafront Enhancement Committee activities, and at the same time, it has sailed into a governance vacuum. It is reasonably obvious that the questions of where and how St Peter Port Harbour and St Sampson are regenerated and developed go hand-in-hand with and are directly interrelated with eastern seafront enhancement, and at the same time, contain issues and potential development opportunities which overlap several Committees' mandates and many Members' concerns.

380 It is the Policy & Resources Committee's view that these large, complex and unwieldy issues should be dealt with if we are going to work in a co-ordinated and inclusive way and make measurable progress, by a single entity which can move quickly into a delivery phase.

385 That, Madam Deputy Bailiff, is the fundamental reason for this amendment. The Policy & Resources Committee believes that ideally, all of the eastern seaboard work and this STSB piece in relation to Harbours should be done by the same group, working holistically on all of the potential benefits of redevelopment and regeneration in the area between Vale Castle and the Vallette, bringing together all Members, the public and interest parties to develop a list of development opportunities, to analyse their economic, social and environment benefits using internationally recognised benchmarks, such as the UN Sustainable Development Goals, and then try our best – and it will not be easy – to use all of our creativity to finance some of them.

390 I firmly believe that regeneration, which will enable economic development, including marinas, will be high on the list, because they are amongst the most likely to attract external investment, and thereby, enable other regeneration to happen around them, benefiting the public as a whole. A new, modern marina can be the cornerstone of our community's vision for the seafront (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and a means of enhancing the blue and tourist economies of all Islands of the Bailiwick.

395 Madam Deputy Bailiff, without apology for the nautical analogies, the Policy & Resources Committee believes it would therefore be foolish for us all to set sail in any particular direction set out in the various amendments in the policy letter, and to thereby commit without consensus on the tides, on the priorities, on the possible benefits for our economy, and particularly, having regard to the vagaries of the current financial weather. We believe the best way to achieve this is via a dedicated 'Regeneration and Development Board' to handle all workstreams and help build a consensus view on prioritisation.

400 The Shadow Regeneration Subcommittee, which Deputy Ferbrache has already described in answer to Rule 11 questions yesterday from Deputy Gollop, has been working since shortly after the Election last year to consider a plan for delivering comprehensive proposals to present to the States before the end of 2022. This *ad hoc* Committee has picked up the sea programme work, which is the subject of the STSB policy letter, and has combined it with work on what was previously referred to as the 'Seafront Enhancement Committee', thereby maintaining momentum and collective institutional knowledge about the prior works already conducted – and I agree with Deputy Roffey's comments: it is an excellent report, and it should be acted upon.

410 The proposals for a formal regeneration board to further develop and deliver proposals was due to come before Members anyway in December 2021, but has been delayed by the significant commitment to completion of the Government Work Plan. The Future Harbours policy letter and its several amendments have accelerated the need to lay the groundwork and seek the Assembly's approval today in this amendment for the proposed approach to governance in co-ordinating, planning, and execution – which is, of course, one of Policy & Resources' primary functions.

415 Madam Deputy Bailiff, the Vice President of Policy & Resources recently wrote an excellent newspaper article that drew heavily on analogies from the TV series *Blackadder*, which demonstrated her good taste and wry sense of humour. In the second series of *Blackadder*, Edmund hired Captain Redbeard Rum to take him to the Cape of Good Hope. Once aboard the ship, Blackadder found there was no crew to sail it. Upon questioning, Captain Redbeard advised that there are two schools of thought about the necessity for a crew: the view of every other captain, who all have crews, and the view of Cpt Redbeard Rum, who does not have a crew.

420 Madam Deputy Bailiff, let us not be the Redbeard Rum of regeneration, a jurisdiction which thinks it is the only one which does not need a formal, arms' length expert regeneration board to co-ordinate and drive forward successful long-term infrastructure projects.

425 I am very happy to give an undertaking that all of the several amendments before us today will be considered and discussed with those Members who have brought them so that we can find the right direction and the right answers to the various questions which have been raised by them. But we do need, as an Assembly, to run this process transparently, clearly, and more importantly, in a co-ordinated way. This is too big an opportunity to scupper. The most sensible path is to delegate the ability to deliver a wider, coherent and cogent programme of redevelopment and regeneration to a group tasked with only that responsibility.

430



435 All the members of the *ad hoc* Regeneration Committee are providing their services on a *pro*  
*bono* basis, and they are aware that the application process with the creation of a formal structure  
may mean that they cannot continue to play a part in the process after the end of 2021. That  
440 Regeneration Committee has set out a very ambitious timetable which will identify 25 or so target  
redevelopment and regeneration parcels between the Vale Castle and the Vallette, including spaces  
such as Leale's Yard and the Harbours themselves, and to conduct engagement with individual  
Members, relevant committees, Planning, and the public as a whole, with the aim to bring proposals  
to the States by the end of 2022. This is nothing but ambition writ large. The amendment instructs  
445 the Committee in particular to include proposals for a non-tidal marina scheme in St Peter Port  
Harbour as part of the local planning brief, which will be prepared as part of this process. Plans for  
such a development are already at a reasonably advanced stage.

445 Madam Deputy Bailiff, in short, what the Policy & Resources Committee is asking for is to bring  
all of the energy and creativity encapsulated in the several amendments before us today and to  
enable the creation of a body, which will be able to extend beyond the next Election and further, to  
deliver the priorities which it will set out for us in 2022. I am absolutely committed to working with  
all Members of the House to ensure we include all viewpoints and priorities and examine all ideas;  
the more, in fact, the better. It will be then for Members to agree on the priorities and for us to find  
450 the means of financing their delivery. That, in itself, is a substantial challenge.

450 Madam Deputy Bailiff, through you, I would say to Members, this is perhaps the first real  
opportunity we have had as an Assembly to openly demonstrate to the public an ability and a real  
commitment to work together co-operatively and in a co-ordinated manner. That is not intended  
as a criticism of anyone. All of the amendments arise from legitimate ideas and concerns. But my  
455 proposal is that we work through these concerns, find the best course forwards together, rather  
than in a piecemeal fashion. It will send the strongest positive message to the public, that we intend  
to move quickly and deliver these objectives, if Members pass this amendment and enable the  
Policy & Resources Committee to co-ordinate the wider opportunities which it represents.

455 Madam Deputy Bailiff, I ask for the Assembly's support so that we can formalise these  
governance arrangements and continue the work which has already been commenced.

460 Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.

Deputy Ferbrache, do you formally second that?

465 **Deputy Ferbrache:** I do, madam.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

470 **Deputy Roffey:** May I ask on a ruling whether this goes further than the main Propositions?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** In relation to the first Proposition, I do consider that there is an argument  
that it does go beyond the original Proposition, and therefore are you moving, Deputy Roffey, for  
a motion under 24(6) of the Rules?

475 **Deputy Roffey:** I am indeed.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** For those Members who are new, I shall read the Rule out to you.

An amendment which goes further than the original proposition shall not, on that account, be ruled out of order, but a  
motion that the amendment be not debated and no vote be taken thereon may be laid only immediately after the  
amendment has been proposed and formally seconded ... and shall have effect if supported by a majority of the  
Members voting on the motion.

Deputy Roffey is therefore putting forward a motion that this amendment be not debated.

**Deputy Inder:** Can we have a recorded vote, please, madam?

480

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes.

There is a request for a recorded vote.

The motion is the amendment be *not* debated, so if you do *not* want it to be debated, you need to vote *Pour*.

485

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Not carried – Pour 10, Contre 27, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 2*

**POUR**

Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Bury  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Gabriel  
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller

**CONTRE**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy Mahoney  
Deputy Matthews  
Deputy McKenna  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Moakes  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Queripel  
Alderney Rep. Roberts  
Alderney Rep. Snowdon  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Taylor  
Deputy Vermeulen  
Deputy Aldwell  
Deputy Blin  
Deputy Cameron  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Dyke  
Deputy Fairclough  
Deputy Falla  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Haskins  
Deputy Helyar  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Le Tissier

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Brouard

**ABSENT**

Deputy Murray  
Deputy St Pier

**The Deputy Bailiff:** There voted Pour 10, Contre 27, Je ne vote pas 1, and there are 2 absentees; therefore, I conclude that the motion is defeated, and therefore, the amendment will be debated.

490

**Deputy Leadbeater:** Madam, before we carry on, can I just apologise? I was supposed to call Deputy St Pier absent this morning, and it is not on record. I am supposed to be doing his proxy vote. I did not have his proxy vote for the previous motion, but he was not called, and I just wanted to wonder, is he classed as relevé, so I will be casting his votes going forward?

495

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Proxy votes do not count on procedural motions, Deputy Leadbeater. In relation to his – we do know he is indisposé and also that you have his proxy vote for those formal matters but that are not matters of procedure.

**Deputy Leadbeater:** Thank you.

500

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.  
Deputy Roffey.

**Deputy Roffey:** Well, nobody can say I did not try and save them from another long Roffey speech, but they voted the way they did, so they are going to get one.

505 What to say? What to say, madam, about this extraordinary amendment, this amendment which, at a stroke, deletes every single one of the Propositions which flow from the best part of two years' intensive work by an incredibly focused and energetic group of professionals who really understand our ports?

510 The main part of this amendment is the first few words: "To delete ... all the Propositions". That deletes the £4 million that is needed to take forward the project on our commercial ports, to get the work done at Wallingford to find out whether Longue Hougue is possible for ro-ro traffic or not, whether it is going to have any impact on erosion elsewhere. We will not, if this goes forward, be able to take forward the commercial ports work which this Assembly asked us to do.

515 In opening, Deputy Helyar said he would embrace all of the amendments. I am not surprised about that, because the amendments relate to the blue economy and to leisure facilities and to regeneration. All of that was, quite rightly, intended to be done in the next phase, not by STSB, but by a new body – we can argue about what that body should be, whether it should be an arms' length thing, whether it should be incorporated, whether it should be a States' subcommittee – but that was always going to be done by somebody else. Of course, he is happy to wrap all of that up, but has been left unanswered is the question that has been unanswered now for 30 years, which is: 520 what do we want to do about our commercial ports?

And excuse me for thinking that they are important. They are where all of our food comes in. They are where all of our supplies come in. They are the very lifelines of this community. Of course, STSB wants to build new marinas! Of course, we want to generate extra income! Of course, we want to be commercial in our outlook! Of course, we want the blue economy! Of course, we want the 525 landside regeneration! *But*, you told us, Members of the States, to go and look at the commercial ports, that is what we have done, that work will come to an absolute stop without the funding to take it forward, and that is what this amendment does. Absolutely extraordinary!

530 And I have to say, this amendment was plonked on my desk yesterday afternoon, without any prior notice, without any consultation, without any discussion with STSB, by the Policy & Resources Committee on a day which started off with an 8 a.m. presentation, which included, frankly, quite sanctimonious comments about the need to change Rule 4 to encourage proposers of amendments to always consult with stakeholders first! What double standards – I hesitate to use a stronger phrase. Seemingly, the expectation that when you are going to put a secondary motion, you 535 should –

I give way to Deputy Soulsby.

**Deputy Soulsby:** Thank you. Could Deputy Roffey acknowledge the fact that STSB published their policy letter without telling P&R? 540

**Deputy Roffey:** Yes, that is normal with most policy letters! What is P&R? A Cabinet here? You normally consult with the stakeholders. What I can say is that I went for STSB to meet with P&R very recently, and in that table, every single Member said it was important that this should go forward to this debate in order to get decisions on these keystone decisions about our commercial ports. 545 That was the unanimous view of P&R at that stage.

Anyway. (*Interjection*) Yes, I am a bit vexed, I accept that.

550 Some stakeholders, seemingly, were consulted with. When I asked Deputy Ferbrache yesterday afternoon how on Earth he thought that anybody but the Guernsey Ports were the best people to advance a Pool Marina project in St Peter Port Harbour, I have to say that Deputy Ferbrache was disarmingly honest. He told me it was included in the sursis – and it is really a sursis, let us be honest – to keep Deputy Inder on board. (**Deputy Ferbrache:** I didn't.) Yes, you – Oh, no he said 'Neil', but –

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Can I remind Members you need to go through me?

555 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Point of correction, Madam. I did not say that. I said Deputy Inder was consulted, we had a discussion, and that gave rise to what was a sursis and is now an amendment. I did not say any of those things.

560 **Deputy Roffey:** Well, our recollection is different, but I wish to have confirmed that Deputy Inder was consulted, whereas the STSB were not. *(Interjection)* We were not, despite an amendment coming forward to delete the whole set of proposals from STSB which represent an enormous body of work by an expert, non-political body. I presume that that consultation with Deputy Inder took place a few days ago, hence his rather odd question over whether rejecting all of STSB's proposals would mean we were somehow unable to repair our Harbours. *(Interjection by Deputy Inder)*

565

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Inder, please, can you keep your comments down ...

**Deputy Roffey:** Thank you very much, Madam.

570 So they consulted fully with him over this Exocet of a wrecking amendment, but they had not had the courtesy to even mention it to the sponsoring Committee – and this from Policy & Resources. It really beggars belief!

By the way, they have absolutely sold Deputy Inder a pup here, because I know he, like us, is passionate about getting a Pool Marina in place as soon as possible, and this will inevitably slow it down, because we will not go on to debate Deputy Inder's amendment, which we were going to support, or the technical funding amendment which we told all States' Members we were going to lay if that amendment is successful.

575 Basically, until this report comes back at the end of this year from P&R on how to take this forward, there will be no funding in place in order to allow that work to continue. I really urge Deputy Inder to reflect on that and to vote against this amendment to get his on the table, to get our support for it, to get the funding in place, to crack on with that provision of leisure facilities, because we know it could be an economic enabler, we know there are local people that want berths, but just as importantly, we know there are people who would like to actually moor their significant craft in Guernsey who actually live off-island, and that would not only in the narrow sense be a good little earner for the ports, more importantly, it would be an economic enabler for the Island as a whole. We want to crack on with that. This will slow it down.

580 Do not forget this debate today was not really supposed to be primarily about the regeneration or the blue economy, or even the provision of leisure moorings. All of those are incredibly important, vitally important, but as we make clear at every one of our presentations, they can best be addressed once the States have made that key decision about how to de-conflict the overcrowding in St Peter Port and whether they wish to see a northern port at Longue Hougue, and to turn St Sampson into a leisure port. That was the work this Assembly asked the STSB to do, and we have faithfully done it. Those were very big but effectively quite simple decisions which this Assembly was – or actually, still is – being asked to take today. You will not take them if this amendment goes through; that whole set of questions would be parked yet again.

595 And yet, those are the foundation decisions from which the other important work on the broader regeneration issues can flow. But accept this amendment today and we are no further forward in that respect. You will have given no steer whatsoever on future commercial harbour provision, and as a result, you will have hampered the work of the team – whatever it will look like, the team that will look at seafront enhancement as the next stage of the work – primarily because you will have taken away the funding to progress the commercial ports ... Well, there are two reasons: first of all, you will not have shown a direction of travel; and secondly, you will not have given funding to work that out in further detail. So the commercial ports work would be dead in the water. *(Interjection)* I do not who said, 'Oh, no', but yes, it will be.

600 So much for 'action this day'. So much for 'action this day'. Eight months into a new political term, and the first big decision this Assembly has been asked to make, and P&R effectively want to

sursis it. Seemingly, 'Inaction this day' is to be our new watchword, or maybe it is 'Let us talk about action today'. It is utterly feeble, utterly feeble. And so are P&R's decisions set out in the explanatory note. They say there are a few amendments to this policy letter. Lord's mercy! So what? That is to be expected for any big policy letter! I am sure there will be just as many when P&R report back under the terms of this amendment if it is successful. It is called 'democracy'. This Assembly can handle amendments; at least, I hope it can.

Let us actually take a look at those amendments. Deputy Helyar himself is responsible for two of them – or involved, anyway – so it is a bit rich of him to then use them as an excuse for his eleventh-hour sursis. Two of them, the ones from Deputy St Pier and Deputy Inder, STSB had no objection to, as they did no more than pretty much reflect what we intended to happen anyway.

Several others we opposed: for example, the Deputy Brouard amendment, to take us back to the Inder – Paint proposal to extend St Peter Port Harbour eastwards. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) But, although we opposed that strongly, we 100% defended Deputy Brouard's right to propose it, to put it forward as an idea, and we would have completely respected the outcome. But no; seemingly, the very fact that amendments have been laid is good reason to expunge all of the Propositions which flow from two years of intensive work.

We are warned in the explanatory note that the mere presence of amendments could lead to 'uncoordinated decision-making'. Blimey! Blimey O'Riley! 'Uncoordinated decision-making!' Most big decisions in future that come to the floor of this Assembly will – I hope it is not a rude awakening for Members – they will attract a whole suite of amendments. In fact, STSB were really quite relieved that this one attracted as few as it actually did. That is the nature of politics. It is the nature of seminal decisions to attract different views from Members of this Assembly of independence and for those views to be promoted by amendment. Perhaps, all of those big decisions in future will need to be deferred and given to P&R or to an arms-length body to sort out, to avoid the horrors, the absolute horrors, of uncoordinated decision-making.

Madam, this is not robust democracy; this represents a continuing and, sadly, ever-increasing control-freakery from our senior Committee. Let us not run away from disagreements or different ideas; let us debate them on the floor of this Assembly and let us make decisions! *Make decisions!*

I mentioned earlier that I pointed out to Deputy Ferbrache the nonsense of anyone other than Guernsey Ports working up a Pool Marina scheme, and in that context, let me make clear that I have no arguments whatsoever with a wider regeneration agenda – nothing can be further from the truth – and we have always accepted that it would be taken forward by another body, and it may be the sort of body that Deputy Helyar has promoted this morning – I do not know, I have an open mind on that. But the developments within our commercial harbours have to be ones for Guernsey Ports to consider, and to take it away from them is perverse.

Let me explain why, and in doing so I will use a part, a small part, of the speech I was going to make on the Inder/Vermeulen amendment, because frankly, if this one succeeds, I will never get the opportunity to make it, and I think it is relevant. I was going to say this: we started work quite some time ago on what would be a significant new marina facility within the pool of St Peter Port Harbour. It will not, in itself, provide the several hundreds of extra berths that some have been predicting, because you have to net off the existing berths on the pontoons provided for visiting yachts and for existing swinging moorings in the pool. That said, we should see a net gain of around a hundred berths, depending on the size of the vessels we need to accommodate.

The main gain would be that we would be able to cater for far larger private vessels that we can at the moment, providing all tide access. Not only will it see a good financial return on the estimated £15 million-£20 million price tag, but it will also – or at least, we are confident that the business plan will show that – it will act as a wider economic enabler. On top of that, we are really hopeful that it will allow permanent moorings to be allocated in the Victoria Marina, with vessels being able to over winter there due to the additional shelter the new works will provide.

However, I do need to manage expectations here. I very much doubt it will be completed within less than three years. It uses completely novel technology, where a combination of an underwater sill and a floating wave attenuation pontoon effectively combine to form a single barrier against the

660 waves. This would be both cheaper and less visually intrusive than a new solid breakwater. However,  
it is only fair to say that it will still have a significant visual impact; there will be a line of steel piles  
right across the eastern edge of the new marina. This may not be that intrusive at high tide, but will  
certainly be very visible at low tide, although it is hoped that that might largely blend in with the  
yacht masts in the new marina.

665 The next part is particular important and why it has to be Guernsey Ports driving this project. I  
mentioned that the technology is new; in fact, Guernsey is likely to be the first place in the world to  
deploy it, so we have to be 100% sure that it will be effective first. We also need studies, careful  
studies, to assure ourselves that the new marina will not reflect or refract waves in such a way as to  
make other parts of St Peter Port Harbour unusable. That is absolutely crucial, because if it starts  
making the ro-ro ramps unusable because of the way it refracts waves, then we will really have  
670 caught a crab.

Lastly and most importantly, we will certainly need to dredge. How much dredging will be  
required we cannot say until a seabed survey has been completed, so there is lots of technical work  
to do before we can bring the business case back to the States and ask permission to borrow the  
money to build the marina. Can all this research be done by the end of next year? Maybe, but it will  
675 be very tight and we accept the challenge laid out in this amendment.

The main point is that it is not a thing in itself; it is interconnected with the rest of the harbour  
and will have impacts on the rest of the harbour. We are sure that can be accommodated, but the  
idea of giving it over to another body to work on other than Guernsey Ports is clearly – I will not  
use the word ‘insane’; that would be rude – but it clearly would be a very foolish decision.

680 Members can see not only that this scheme is well into the development phase, but it is a highly  
technical project and it really has to be Guernsey Ports that take it forward.

Giving it – and this amendment does give it – it asks P&R to look at the project, look at the  
timelines, in order to produce a plan to have a marina inside the Pool. It makes no sense, but it  
keeps Deputy Inder on board, so I suppose that is okay.

685 Some of my colleagues, I have to say, asked me last night if I saw this as a vote of no confidence  
in the STSB. I said I did not think it was intended as such but that I could be wrong. I hope I am not,  
because I think my Committee is doing extremely good work on multiple fronts, but I am aware  
that those of us outside the governing Van Party–Guernsey Party coalition can at times be treated  
with suspicion, and I am none of those things, because I believe in a traditional, independent  
690 approach to politics. Nor am I attacking those inside the Guernsey Party or the Van Party; I believe  
in working with everybody equally across this Assembly. But I do begin to feel at times that that is  
not fully reciprocated. I have to say, it is on the STSB; I and Deputy Moakes, as a member of the  
Guernsey Party, work incredibly well together and exchange ideas. We met this morning on the  
Cambridge Berth to decide what to do about this amendment; we were unanimous in saying that it  
695 ought to be thrown out.

I do not see this as an intentional vote of no confidence in either the STSB or myself – maybe I  
am being naive. I will tell you what it is, though, Members: it is a vote of no confidence in Committee  
government. It is a vote of no confidence in one of the finest pieces of work I have ever seen by a  
non-political working party acting at the behest of this Assembly. It is a vote of no confidence in  
700 their expert findings. It is a vote of no confidence in the whole increasingly hollow sounding mantra  
of ‘Action this day’. It is a vote of no confidence in cracking on with economic recovery with self-  
assurance. It is a slap in the face for the overwhelmingly positive public reaction that we have had  
to these proposals. It is a rejection of the wishes of several Douzaines and others who desperately  
want to see the momentum maintained on the commercial ports project – not just on the  
705 regeneration that follows it, but on the commercial ports project that facilitates it. It is a vote in  
favour of centralisation and control-freakery.

Frankly, it is a measure that if any top Committee during my time in politics – that would have  
been Advisory & Finance or the Policy Council or P&R – had tried before the days of *quasi* party  
politics, it would have seen them torn apart from the floor of this Assembly from ordinary Members  
710 who were determined to make their role and their responsibilities and their powers. Let me ask the

new Members of this Assembly: I know it is not you at the receiving end today, but do you want to lay the groundwork for being in the States but not in Government, for being a scrutineer but no more? Apologies to Deputy Burford for using her – but I think outside the Scrutiny Committee, we should be more than scrutineers. I hope not, but if you do not, you simply must reject this amendment.

715

Let me finish by reiterating the fact that the STSB has no quarrel at all with the broader regeneration agenda being taken forward by a new body. But just as Stuart Falla kept reiterating at all of our many presentations – and I wish more members of P&R had come – the decision about our commercial ports provision was always going to be a keystone, a keystone which the rest of that regeneration can be designed around. But it is important in its own right; our harbours are the lifeblood of this Island. It is a vital first step to allow all of the other strategic decisions to flow from, and if Members want to release that economic potential in a timely way, then we need to take that in-principle decision on the ports today – or tomorrow, but at this meeting – and the right body to guide that discrete part, that discrete part of the bigger project is, indeed, the expert working party which the STSB set up and which has done such an outstanding job; to suggest otherwise is nonsense. How can a new body advise on regeneration of our eastern seaboard within 18 months without any steer at all of what we want to do with our ports? Good luck to them, good luck to them!

720

725

Members, do not confuse two issues. There are two issues that are being conflated here: there is the reorganisation of the ports, and there is the additional opportunities that provides. Those two pieces of work need completely different skill sets, totally different ones. With our harbours being our complete lifelines for Guernsey's community, the ports bit needs to be informed by people who really understand port operations upside down and back-to-front, not by generalist business gurus, however talented or however wealthy. Harbours are just too important for that; they are amongst our most crucial pieces of infrastructure.

730

735

Members, please vote against this wrecking amendment for all sorts of reasons. You told us to look at future ports provisions, we have spent the best part of £1 million doing so, we put a top team in place to carry out that work, that team gave their time freely. They only wanted one thing in return, one thing: they wanted us to actually make a decision on the question that they have been asked to examine, a question we all know needs answering, a question that has sparked multiple reports over the decades which are now gathering dust. The one thing that every one of that dedicated team wanted was their report not to be added to the top of that pile, for a decision to be taken and a sense of direction given. Very sadly, it seems that was asking too much for some.

740

If you vote for this amendment brought out of a hat at the eleventh hour, then what? Look carefully at the wording. I have already said that the real wording is the first few words: 'To remove all of the existing Propositions.' That removes the capital to allow the commercial ports to go forward. But it does more than that. You will get a report back on the issue of setting up a new arms-length Development & Regeneration Board by the end of this year, but where is the proposal to report back to this Assembly by the end of 2022 with the findings of that exercise? No requirement to report back. In the Billet, it comes back before you in 18 months to decide what to do next; under this amendment, you set up the new arms-length body and there is no obligation to report back here at all. Members are being taken almost entirely out of the equation.

745

750

I have to ask Members: what are you? What are you? People's Deputies here to represent the public, or nodding Myrmidons? I hope it is the former, and if it is, you will reject this amendment.

755

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Thank you, madam.

Members, I was quite astonished to receive the amendment yesterday; in fact, I thought it was in relation to a policy I was not aware about, because the policy I was laying, myself, amendments on and that we were going to debate was on the Future Harbour Development, and it is an STSB Supervisory Board policy paper. This amendment asks us to delete all of the Propositions developed

760

by that policy paper and let us proceed with setting up an arms-length body. This has nothing to do with the core of what the Future Harbours policy is about.

765 Perhaps, let me remind Members about the timeline of events in relation to the requête that  
Deputies Inder and Paint originally led, and actually, Deputy Ferbrache's very effective role, while  
he was on the STSB Board and Chairman of the Courts, to bring forward an amendment that focused  
the Assembly's efforts – I repeat, focussed the Assembly's efforts – on investigating the commercial  
770 harbours' requirements which has led to this policy, this policy that Deputy Roffey has just referred  
to, this very comprehensive piece of work. But no, let us just delete all of that, let P&R parachute in,  
let us save the day, because all of that work is useless. Perhaps because Deputy Ferbrache has  
changed the Committees and the power where he is sitting right now, perhaps it is more  
appropriate to have the power there. But this is not alright with me.

775 We have consistently heard about the need to collaborate, to work together. STSB has not been  
consulted. I brought three amendments to this policy paper; I have not been consulted. My  
amendments have not been included in this amendment, number 8, but Deputy Inder's has – and  
indeed, why would such a small, little project, a Pool Marina, be added in this overall wrecking  
amendment? Again, I agree with Deputy Roffey: it is to keep Deputy Inder and his associates on –  
board.

780 This amendment has no Rule 4(3); there is no information about what the cost implications of  
this are – absolutely none.

Let us talk in terms of governance. We know there is a subcommittee, a P&R subcommittee, that  
has been working. Members have not heard about how this Committee came about. Yesterday,  
thanks to the response of Deputy Ferbrache to Rule 11 questions, we heard about the composition  
785 of some of those members. Where is the transparency? Where is the open process in selecting that  
Committee? I understand – I am sure, individually, all of those members are very qualified, but one  
of them is a former *FT* journalist; please assure me, how is that relating to regeneration? I think  
there is also a judge; again, please assure me, how does that relate to regeneration infrastructure?

Another person, I believe, is the Chairman of the RED Fund, which is what the Guernsey  
790 Investment Fund is investing in, which will have – and I understand Deputy Helyar is very keen for  
the Guernsey Investment Fund to fund everything on this Island. I am sorry, there is direct conflict  
of interest, potentially. Where is the openness and transparency in this process in selecting this  
subcommittee that will drive, that is wrecking the Future Harbours policy, and is bringing forward  
these Propositions? I am sorry, I do not see any governance that Deputy Helyar was talking about  
795 previously.

This will delay the work that has been underway. This gives no instructions on what is going to  
be happening to the commercial harbours. This is really wrecking the work that has been  
undergoing for two years. This is not allowing myself, today, for example, to bring forward the  
discussion in a democratic way around the three amendments that I wanted to propose. As Deputy  
800 Roffey was asking all of us today, 'What is the role of us today as Deputies, as scrutineers?', let us  
look at ourselves, let us look in the mirror, and let us be honest with ourselves.

This is very disappointing. When there is always the call for collaboration, working together, and  
how, as an Assembly, we have to work together, this Proposition says exactly the opposite; it says,  
'We have no confidence in you working together; we need a separate body, which we will, as P&R,  
805 drive. We will drive the appointment of those members, we have driven the appointments of them.  
They will decide what happens. There is no trust in you, as Committee members, to work together.'  
This is extremely disappointing.

I urge colleagues to throw this specific amendment as far away as possible and engage in proper  
debate around the few amendments to this policy that exist, so we do give a direction in terms of,  
810 specifically, the commercial harbours, and hopefully in addition, confirm some of the next steps that  
some of the other amendments are trying to lay as well. Please, Members, throw away this  
amendment.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.



815 **Deputy Inder:** Madam, I will try to ignore most of Deputy Roffey's personality politics in his response to the laying of the amendment, but what I will say is that he just cannot be allowed to use his version of party politics, what he says in his opinion columns, and concentrate on people or personalities to make his argument. It is not right, it is not fair. I have seen this time and time again: you never go for the policy, you always go for the people. Get the people first, and then you get  
820 the policy. I have seen this far too many times for such a substantial decision that we may or may not have to make today.

Now, I have had some interest in this development, as it is the requête, led, along with other signatories – most of whom I think are still in the Assembly; I think Deputy Trott was one of them, Deputy Soulsby – sorry, how could I forget? – Deputy Le Tocq, and of course, it was then amended  
825 by Deputy Ferbrache, but I think it was Deputy Prow with the signature. Anyway, most of us, a lot of people in the Assembly, remember how we go to this point.

Members, without responding to everything that Deputy Roffey has said – because I can bite as soon as he fishes, and I am going to choose not to today – let us deal with some facts, let us deal with some real facts. There is a cultural problem at STSB, and I think it is very similar to the old PSD,  
830 and that has not changed: it seems to live on its own little island. When I was appointed to the presidency, one of my main concerns – because I knew this was coming down the tracks; it was supposed to have come at the end of last year; accepting that we were in the middle of COVID – and I think, at the time, the Committee accepted there was going to be a bit of a delay, elections turned up, and we are here talking about it, effectively, eight or nine months later, which I accept.

I got silence from STSB when I was asking the question. I wrote to Deputy Roffey on the matter asking when CfED would be included in this process, because I knew how important this job was for what we are talking about – the blue economy, economic enabling – and my fear was that it was going to be just a civil engineering project, and my fear has basically come true; it is effectively a civil engineering project. Irrespective of what Deputy Roffey has been saying – that he is going to  
840 do this, he is going to do that – it is effectively a civil engineering project, and exactly what I predicted has happened.

When I wrote to the Deputy, he was fairly curt to me. He told me that one of our officers was already on the Board. Well, we do not have any officers on his Board; what he was referring to was one of the Strategic Leads. When his Committee, led by him – £360 million job that we are heading  
845 towards – he came into our Committee, we had seven members of STSB, they did the presentation that we have seen time and time again. Deputy Roffey's response, while introducing the team, was, 'Thank you very much,' – and his words – 'Talk amongst yourselves,' as he walked out the door. He walked out the door of the Committee for Economic Development and told us to talk amongst ourselves, and he gave a little 'Cheerio!' as he flew out the door.

850 Now, do not start, I would respectfully request – there are always two sides to a story, and that is why I lack some confidence in whether Deputy Roffey really is taking this seriously as a job; I have got real concerns about this.

I am not giving way.

855 But anyway, that is my response to Deputy Roffey's personality politics. A £360 million job – when he was presenting it to Economic Development, he introduced his officers – and I will repeat again – stood up, waved goodbye, and said, 'Talk amongst yourselves.' You need to think about that. But anyway, let us get to the amendment –

I am not giving way.

860 **Deputy Roffey:** Point of correction?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

865 **Deputy Roffey:** That is totally misconstruing what happened. The presentation was being led by Stuart Falla. I had been asked to pop in to do a brief introduction. I was on a limited-parking

area, and my presence, actually, had not been important; I was simply there to say, 'Here is the team to make a presentation to you.'

870 **Deputy Inder:** Well, as, I suppose, the quasi-President of the Committee – and if he has, indeed, handed it over to his non-voting members, that is a problem in itself.

Anyway, peppered through the Future Development policy letter is reference to a Pool Marina; I am going to now talk about the amendment itself, and it gives me some opportunity to talk about what may or may not be the future amendment.

875 The Marina project's technical document entitled 'Technical Note: Guernsey Waterfront – Marine Leisure/Superyacht Opportunities' was published in April this year, and the company was appointed by STSB, and I quote, 'to provide the States of Guernsey with an informed overview of the marine leisure/superyacht opportunities in St Peter Port, in relation to a study on the Future Port options that might present opportunities'. Not necessarily attached to this policy letter, it was a separate document commissioned by STSB.

880 The document informs States' Members:

Whilst there is extensive marina berthing provision in St Peter Port and a facility at St. Sampson's, and these are over prescribed, facilities are old, dated and fall well short of a modern leisure marina. The shortcomings include:

- Majority of berths are for smaller leisure vessels up to 12m in length.
- Limited services and dated facilities.
- The vast majority of berths are tidally restricted to a great extent with a lack of full tidal access facility.

885 The opportunity is in a separate report, but is not included in the current policy letter. The current policy letter, by direction, makes allusion to 'Some time in the future, we could do this.' What you have actually got, if you read the document, is just an ellipse: 'Around here, we could do something with the marina.'

890 Under any of the options, this could already have been done. Neither the 5, 6, or 'Do nothing' option, or 3 or 4, actually stopped STSB from getting on the work. That is not from the 'amateurs', Deputy Roffey, as he has mentioned in a previous opinion column; that is from the professionals. The professionals that we have communicated with have told us that under any of the options, we could have developed the Pool Marina. The struggle I had to get that kind of information out of one of the officers, until I found the right officer, was difficult, indeed – and still, I have not had an email response from that officer. I have still not had one.

895 Now, the company conducted analysis of the superyacht fleet activity and made the following observations on the expansion of the superyacht market and how it could be an attractive stopover, St Peter Port, in Northern Europe. Of course, Members, I have had a letter from members of the Guernsey Marina Trade Association and the GPA that has highlighted the struggles the local industry have in what is a dilapidated St Peter Port. It has not got a great name in the visitor marina space – sorry? Sorry, I just heard Deputy Roffey commenting, but there you go. Sorry, another comment?

900

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Please, can we stop the side comments? I am addressing that to Deputy Roffey.

905 **Deputy Inder:** It has not got a great name as a visitor marina.

Irrespective of whatever decision is made today, the opportunity arises today, and that opportunity would direct STSB to come back with a States' plan, with a policy letter, which they say they are already considering. The problem with that – I have heard this time and time again, and the older Members will have heard this before – a Committee might say, 'We are going to do something, you do not need to direct us.' That is what they are saying. Guess what? It never happens. It never happens!

910

Referring to the amendment itself, which is what we are talking about, it actually does say – hold on, excuse me, madam:

... a timeline and set of steps to develop the seafront masterplan, which shall include within St Peter Port Harbour a 'Pool Marina' with associated modern marina facilities, by December 2022.

915 Great news: that is not a problem, and I have got every confidence, because as we spoke about the Dairy yesterday – and it is true, there is an awful lot of talent within the ports – but I genuinely think it is their culture that stops driving them. You have got bits of paper on different people's desks and they never get around to actually doing anything because there is something wrong with the culture.

920 Hopefully, Deputy Helyar, when he responds to the amendment, will give us some assurance that if we have got a proper commercial board that can get on and do things – and hopefully, Deputy Roffey, as well – it might be able to – rather than just throwing the toys out of the cot and saying, 'Everything stops tomorrow' – that board can use that talent within the Civil Service to drive us to appoint, hopefully, before December 2022. Because I can tell you now, if I was running that  
925 harbour – it was my pool, my facilities, my marina – I would not take 18 months. The only reason I put December 2022 was because, when I spoke to the professionals, they asked us not to use June 2022 because they needed more time because they had other jobs to do with other organisations, so they asked me to add another six months, which gave us December 2022.

I need some assurance from Deputy Helyar that when that policy letter comes quickly, one of  
930 the first jobs will be to take the information, work with STSB, and demand that they work with this new board – demand it; we will not get into a situation where the President is unhappy and decides to withdraw all resources from the board because he does not particularly agree with it – and I want assurance from Deputy Helyar that one of the first jobs when that board is put together will be a team that can deliver on that important amendment, which has support from the whole of the  
935 marine industry and would normally ... if we get to the policy letter tomorrow; as I understand, it is probably going to get through anyway.

Now, the GMTA wrote to Members recently. This is the support, this is what we do. Our job, as part of Economic Development, is to listen to the industry. Actually, in some way, I am kind of grateful for this policy letter, which I have got a strong suspicion if this amendment does not work,  
940 I am not entirely sure any of the Proposition 1's are going to get through the Assembly today. That is Deputy Roffey's real problem, that if Proposition 1 loses – whatever version it be, Proposition 5 or option 5 or 6 – I think STSB is in genuine trouble. I am not getting any indication that option 5 or 6 will get through the Assembly at the moment, and we may end up being left – which is not, potentially, a bad thing: we get a fixed harbour; we get a commitment to looking at Guernsey as a  
945 leisure port, which may be no bad thing. I am not going to go into the reasons why I have got problems with option 5, because this is not the point of the debate; the point is to talk to the amendment. If it goes further, I will have my say again.

What they told us, the GMTA told us a new marina in the port area will achieve the following: a non-tidal, restricted marina following 24-hour yacht entry and exit – fantastic stuff; additional new  
950 moorings for local boats – I accept, and I did write – I do not entirely understand why we need to try and embarrass people who are working on information coming to Committees by presidential speeches to make their arguments. I wrote to Members when the GMTA came up with the 412 berths and I explained to them and Members that they were working on information that they had seen across the desk. The schematic in what would be the amendment is the Royal Haskoning  
955 amount of 153 berths – that is what it says, '153 berths' – and of course, if Members cannot see it, there is a block area where the yacht club might end up floating on the side of the pontoon.

When the GMTA came to us, and the GBA – people who have had combined thousands and thousands of years worth of knowledge around – they were talking about the Careening Hard, they were talking about further northwest, they were talking about losing the whole of the Pool, so it is  
960 slightly sad that that has been used, as has already been explained, by the GMTA – the sensible marine industry. Those people who are running our marine industry are made embarrassed through the President's response because it suits. That was not their intention; their intention was on what they could see in a comparison with North Beach. I have written back to them and told them as

965 much, that the figures are slightly out based on what we have got. We have got the Royal Haskoning schematic; they had what looks like a pool area and see what they could do in that area.

970 What I will accept, actually, is what Deputy Roffey says: I was not actually entirely aware of the wave attenuator new technology – I was not particularly aware of that. But it is the case that some work will need to be done. For those who do not know an awful lot about St Peter Port Harbour, we have got something called a ‘spending beach’ – that is mainly a beach meant to take some of the inertia, some of the weight, out of the waves, depending on the salt, and I do not know whether a Pool Marina would have any effect on the spending beach. It is true, as Deputy Roffey said, that wave refraction may affect ro-ro ramps – that is all possible. I do accept that.

975 But that is not a reason not to do anything; that is a reason to try and stop something. We are not in that business any more of finding ways to say ‘no’; we are in the business of finding ways to say ‘yes’. Our job, as Members of the Assembly, is to tie the Committee to a date. Now, the current amendment ties them to a date, so I am fairly comfortable with that – a date to return to the States with a plan – not another strategy; a plan.

980 Deputy Roffey did say, now, that his Committee would have been happy to accept myself and Deputy Vermeulen’s amendment 2, and I can only agree that that is the case, because they have actually created another amendment so if it was successful as such ... But when I actually asked Deputy Roffey, I got one of those ‘Well, you should know. Those who have communicated with us’ – I mean, it is not an unreasonable request to ask the Committee after a couple of days whether they had a meeting and which of the amendments they agree with and disagree with. But of course, I got a *bit* of a response, which is not what I would expect from a President. It did not clearly tell any  
985 of those people who were working all night on their amendments – 1, 2, 3, all the way through to – I am not giving way. So –

**Deputy Roffey:** Point of correction?

990 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

**Deputy Roffey:** As soon as I had seen the amendment from Deputy Inder asking that question, I went back and said that amendments 1 and 2, which were the St Pier/Inder amendments, would be supported by the STSB.

995 **Deputy Inder:** I was not – Okay, I will accept that, but I did not receive that email. (*Interjection by Deputy Kazantseva-Miller*) I did not receive that email, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

1000 So anyway, here we are. Talking to the amendment itself: what I will do is pick up on something Deputy Kazantseva-Miller said yesterday when we spoke in private. What worries me only a tiny bit about this amendment is that we have got a tendency in Guernsey to find the same people doing the same things all the time and nothing ever changes. Governance issues around this – if we are to support this, I need to know that we are going to do something different. I do not want to see the same people turning up with the same ... I can almost guarantee which five or six names are going to turn up, and in fact many of them actually have done some work on the shadow board at  
1005 the moment.

I want to see new talent in a new industry to make this leisure port something really special; I do not want to see the same old names. I need to be assured, Deputy Helyar, that if we are to support this amendment, it is going to be young, it is going to be good, it is going to be virile, it is not just going to be full of accountants and ex-builders and the usual suspects, men of a certain age – thank  
1010 God I am not there yet; I have only got a few years to get away from that! (*Laughter*) – men of a certain age, people who really care about the leisure industry; proper talent, I want to see in it. It cannot be done within the Committee, it will not be done within the Committee. The structure within the Committee will not allow it to happen. It will not happen. So Deputy Helyar, for support of this amendment, there is a couple of things I need to know: I need to know –

1015

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Inder, can I just remind you –?

1020 **Deputy Inder:** Through you, madam – Deputy Helyar – through you, madam – what I really need to know is that it is going to be a real, open recruitment process, that if Deputy Helyar is going to run this, along with Deputy Ferbrache, I want real openness and honesty, real talent. It is not always in Guernsey, some of it, I am afraid, I am going to have to say ... and we have met some of them, we know the types of people we could use in there. I want to see those kinds of people at the centre to drive this.

1025 Secondly, my other demand is absolute assurance that Deputy Helyar and whatever board that comes back, their priority one will be to work towards the marinisation of St Peter Port and working towards a December 2022 deadline, which is part of amendment 2, from Vermeulen and myself, Inder.

Thank you.

1030 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Inder.  
Deputy Queripel.

**Deputy Queripel:** Thank you, madam.

1035 Madam, I will be talking in general debate, as well as on this amendment at the same time.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Sorry, Deputy Queripel, it is important you stick to the *amendment* at this moment, not in relation to the general debate? Did you just say you were going to speak at both times? I am sorry.

1040 **Deputy Queripel:** The Rules do allow both. The Rules do allow you to speak in general debate and on the amendment.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Oh, sorry, I thought you said you were going to talk to both, but of course, you can speak in both amendments and in the general debate. I am sorry, I misheard.

1045 **Deputy Queripel:** Madam, there is an old Chinese proverb that goes like this: 'There are those who build walls when the wind blows, and there are those who build windmills.' With that thought uppermost in my mind, I find myself in dilemma as to which way to vote on this amendment and in which way to vote on this whole 'redevelopment of the harbours' issue. I say that because I am a great believer in building walls when it has been proven that walls are needed, but I am also a great believer in building windmills if it has been proven that windmills are needed.

1050 Now, one thing I have never seen myself as is a Luddite. One thing I am extremely concerned about is the huge amounts of money involved in this whole harbour redevelopment issue, money that we simply have not got. Not only that, but we are also being asked to spend millions of pounds on reports being collated and compiled for projects that may or may not happen. As I pointed out in my speech on the States' accounts yesterday, over £7 million was spent on plans being drawn up for projects that may or may not happen, and I do not think we should be spending taxpayers' money in that way. During my speech, I asked Deputy Helyar if he shared my concerns, and he said he did. In fact, it was Deputy Helyar who referred to the States as a 'Jurassic States' recently, and I have the *Press* front page if any of my colleagues missed it. (**Deputy Trott:** That is old news.) It may be 'old news', Deputy Trott, but it is relevant to this debate. Deputy Helyar said finances are extremely tight and we must look very carefully indeed at the way in which we spend taxpayers' money, because there is only a finite amount available to us.

1060 I would remind colleagues of that – through you, madam – and I ask them to have that thought uppermost in their minds when they come to vote – especially colleagues who voted against Proposition 1(a) of the Scrutiny policy paper on freedom of information, because colleagues who spoke against and voted against Proposition 1(a) said they were doing so because we could not

1070 afford to spend the money needed to progress the Proposition, the sums involved being up to  
£900,000 per annum to operate and up to £2.68 million to set up. On that basis, if they think that  
was too much money to spend, and that was the reason they voted against the Proposition, then  
what about the amount of money we are being asked to spend here on plans and reports being  
drawn up for projects that may or may not ever happen? Surely, you cannot say one thing on one  
issue and then change your whole approach on another issue without risking being labelled a  
hypocrite.

1075 Where is the evidence that any of these projects are going to pay off, anyway? You will not see  
the evidence in the report; what you will see is estimates, so the end result, of course, is that you  
live in hope.

1080 Having said all of that, as I said earlier, I am also a great believer in building windmills if the  
evidence is there that windmills are needed. The States should have bought the bowling alley when  
it was for sale; that would have been a windmill worth building. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) It had a  
guaranteed income stream. The States should have turned the old HMV building in Market Square  
into a multi-functional arts centre which could have housed a permanent Victor Hugo exhibition,  
but they did not. I did suggest they do both of those at that time, but my suggestions fell on deaf  
ears, unfortunately. Two windmills that were not built: in their place, walls were built. The evidence  
1085 was there that both of those initiatives would have paid off. The general opinion from most of the  
States at the time was 'Forget it, it is a non-starter'. The evidence was there.

Where is the evidence here? Where is the evidence that any of these projects is going to pay  
off? Where is it? You are not going to see it in reports; all you are going to see is estimates. That  
comes to the costs, of course, as well; costs are just estimates, costs can escalate.

1090 Hence, my dilemma. I do want us to enhance all we have to offer, but the initiatives and the  
projects need to be evidence-based. I am all in favour of essential maintenance and repairs being  
done; the States actually have quite a woeful record of maintaining and repairing things in the past,  
but we are where we do not want to be. I am all in favour – I always have been – of essential  
maintenance and repairs being done, but I remain to be convinced about all of this in front of us,  
1095 so I will listen to the rest of debate on this amendment and hope I can hear something that enables  
me to make up my mind which way to vote.

In closing, madam, the good news for my colleagues is I have laid out my stall, I need not speak  
on any other amendment or in general debate.

1100 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.

**Deputy Leadbeater:** May I try a Rule 26(1), please, madam?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Rule 26(1)?

1105 **Deputy Leadbeater:** Yes, please.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** This is the guillotine Rule.

Will those people who intend to speak on this matter, please stand in their place?

1110 Do you still wish to continue, Deputy Leadbeater?

**Deputy Leadbeater:** Please, madam.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Having indicated that he still wishes to proceed, effectively, there is now a  
1115 motion that the debate should be closed. If you consider that the – sorry, Deputy Queripel.

**Deputy Queripel:** Can I have a recorded vote, madam, please?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes.

1120 If you consider that debate *should* be closed, you should vote *for* the amendment; if you think it should *continue*, you need to vote *against* the amendment. There is a request for a recorded vote.

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Madam Deputy Bailiff, can I just clarify? I think you mentioned, 'if you are voting for the *amendment*, you have to vote for'.

1125

**The Deputy Bailiff:** For the *motion*, sorry, for the *motion*.

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** It is for the *motion*, just to clarify? If you could clarify again what we are doing, that would be hopeful.

1130

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you very much for clarifying that.

If you are voting for the *motion* that the debate should be closed, then you need to vote *Pour*; if you are voting *against* the motion that the debate should be closed, you vote *Contre*.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Not carried – Pour 3, Contre 31, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 5*

**POUR**

Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Cameron  
Deputy Le Tissier

**CONTRE**

Deputy Mahoney  
Deputy Matthews  
Deputy McKenna  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Moakes  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Prow  
Alderney Rep. Roberts  
Deputy Roffey  
Alderney Rep. Snowdon  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Taylor  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Vermeulen  
Deputy Blin  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Bury  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Dyke  
Deputy Fairclough  
Deputy Falla  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Gabriel  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Haskins  
Deputy Helyar  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Queripel

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy Murray  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Aldwell

1135

**The Deputy Bailiff:** There voted Pour 3, Contre 31, there was 1 Je ne vote pas, and there were 5 absentees at the time of the vote. Therefore, the motion is dismissed; we will continue with the debate on the amendment.

Deputy Meerveld.

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

1140 I do not know if everybody shares my impression, but I got the distinct idea that Deputy Roffey did not like this amendment very much. (*Laughter*) However, I will be supporting it. I will go on to explain why in a second, but first of all, I would just like to address the type of amendment it is, because much has been made of what it is and how it has been laid.

1145 I see this as a wrapping-up amendment. It really does not, say, go beyond amendments that have already been laid, but what it does do is bring them into one amendment that, if debated and passed, would expedite this debate. In that sense, I appreciate the amendment. I do regret it is laid late and without consultation with the Committee, but that is the difficulty with wrapping-up amendments: they can only be laid once all the other amendments are laid.

1150 Going onto the reasons I will be supporting this amendment. In Deputy Roffey's speech, he kept on mentioning the words 'commercial ports' – I am sorry, I will not be giving way. To me, the clue is in the name: it is a *commercial port* – where is the commercial involvement in this process? Now, I know there are some Deputies in this Assembly who seem to have an unhealthy disrespect for businesspeople and commercial companies, but the fact is our economy runs on them and they utilise these ports and they are the ones generating the revenue that pays the taxes that maintains our Island, directly or indirectly, through the salaries they pay or the commercial profits tax they pay when they declare dividends.

1155 I would like to see – and I would like to see this across the board – whenever we, the Government, the States of Guernsey, is implementing a project that has significant commercial implications, I want to see those commercial interests brought to the table and involved in the process. Deputy Roffey seemed to think that Guernsey Ports is the only organisation that can possibly implement or oversee or make recommendations on this kind of project. Why? It is a Civil Service function, it is a part of our Government. Where is the commercial interest, the commercial oversight, the commercial input? I do not dream for a minute that if this recommendation for an independent panel or group goes ahead, that Guernsey Ports will not be directly involved in that, that their expertise will not be included, their views will not be taken into account; of course they will. But I would like that overlay of business people coming in, the people who utilise these ports, the people who have an understanding on our economy also taking a view on this.

1160 These are also the people with the commercial background, who have some idea where their business interests are going, where things might develop. For instance, the demand for fossil fuels, how that might change with the introduction of electric cars and other mechanisms. They are likely to have views that will not necessarily be prevalent in the Civil Service or within a specialist organisation, like Guernsey Ports. So I do welcome that.

1175 I also share Deputy Inder's concern that this has the danger of becoming a civil engineering project. In Deputy Roffey's speech, again, he spoke about wonderful new technology – a tidal barrier or wave barrier, as opposed to a breakwater. That is great, but again, I would rather have commercial minds looking at that, looking at the risks involved in new technology. What happens if it does not work? What is the cost? What is the risk and reward on it? I would rather have commercial minds making a SWOT analysis, reinforcing the analysis that can be brought forward by the Guernsey Ports, and I do not want to see this become a civil engineering project, where people are getting invested in wonderful new ways of doing things, rather than looking at the end objective of delivering the functions we need for our commercial industries.

1180 Deputy Roffey also made much of 'uncoordinated decision-making' and this being the 'first major decision of this States'. Well, prior to this debate today, several Deputies have had conversations with me where they expressed concern that this decision was being made outside of the Government Work Plan. Why wasn't this included in the Government Work Plan as part of that debate? As Deputy Lester Queripel pointed out, a few hours ago, we decided not to spend money on the full implementation of an Information Act that would give people access to information, and yet, here, we are being asked to commit £4 million now, today, outside of consideration of the greater grand scheme of the Government Work Plan, which effectively leads you on a pathway to a commitment of a minimum of £360 million. How does that fit into the Government Work Plan? When we start having to make difficult decisions, which we will do in the next few weeks, about the



trade-offs – what has to be done today? What can be deferred? What do we really need to spend money on? What do we want to target? What is going to give us the best return to help stimulate our economy? – all of these issues have got to be put in the balance when we make decisions on how we allocate capital.

1195

There is a danger, if we make this decision today – well, there is not a danger; we will have made a commitment to a £4 million expenditure which will put us on a pathway to a minimum of a £360 million expenditure without balancing that against the other needs that we are going to have to make tough decisions on. So whilst I can understand Deputy Roffey's frustration at this, I welcome the idea of – which, again, was in subsequent amendments; not just 8, but was also proposed in other amendments – of the idea of a body bringing those commercial minds to the table to take a look at this.

1200

The other Propositions as well: I will be supporting all the Propositions here, and I encourage others Members to do so. Thank you.

1205

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Madam, let me get the nonsense out of the way first, and the nonsense was not engendered by me or Deputy Helyar or anybody else; the nonsense was engendered by, sadly, a very experienced politician who refers back to his membership of the States, I think, going back as far as 1982. It was full of righteousness and indignation, and he had no right to be righteous, and he had no right to be indignant. Just because somebody disagrees with him or does not do things in the way that he thinks they should be done does not mean that they are acting in a way that enables him to adopt both of those adjectives.

1210

For the last eight months, I have suppressed my own natural inclination. Those that know me well know that I tend to walk towards an argument – and perhaps, sometimes, cause one – rather than walk away and turn the other cheek – perhaps a failing of mine, but nevertheless it is a characteristic of mine and it has taken me to wherever I may have got today. But when I hear – and I have heard enough now, I have heard enough now from Deputy Roffey, with his self-imposed ideological viewpoints of things, whereby if you disagree with him and he does not like you, you are a devil incarnate; if you do not agree with him, then you have got some ulterior motive.

1215

1220

We have heard reference today to the Van Party; what on Earth the Van Party has to do with the debate on the harbour is beyond me – also not actually correct, but never mind, when you are filled with bile and when you are filled with anger and when you are filled with unrighteous indignation, that does not preclude you saying what you want to say. There is no such thing as a 'Van Party'. There were the people who had their pictures on a van who all now hold senior presidencies, but they are not a political party.

1225

Unlike Deputy Roffey and Deputy St Pier, the other 36 Members – I am not talking about my two colleagues, my two able colleagues from Alderney – the other 36 States' Deputies do not have the opportunity of having periodic columns in the *Guernsey Press*. Deputy Roffey does, and he uses that with his usual considerable ability with words to put forward his own views, and he puts them forward and he keeps repeating them. It is a bit like the socialist-communist diktat: 'You keep repeating them, and it is then the truth' – *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, 'It is then the truth'.

1230

Deputy Helyar talked about the man from the second series of *Blackadder*. Deputy Roffey sometimes reminds me – he has not got the red beard, but he has got a beard; it was black at one time, it is a different colour now – of the person who has this mantra and keeps repeating it and keeps repeating it, and if you dare to disagree with him, you are terrible.

1235

One of these things that he has put forward in one of his very many columns that goes in the *Guernsey Press*, he and Deputy St Pier – the other 36 Members, the States' Deputies, do not have the opportunity to put forward, but nevertheless, that is the decision of the *Guernsey Press*; they are not obliged to be unbiased, they are not obliged to be – I am not giving way – they are not obliged to be fair and balanced, they can be as left-wing, right-wing or centrist as they want to be.

1240

1245 In one of his columns, he did not like a decision that P&R were concerned about in relation to  
the STSB, because what we did not feel we could sanction was the replacement of a £115,000–  
£125,000 civil servant; we did not see that we could justify it. That was a ‘power grab’, that was  
‘power to the centre’, ‘power to P&R’. He had never seen that before, in all his considerable  
experience. It was terrible, it was awful, it was wrong! I appreciate he was not in the States from  
1997-2000, but I was and I was a member of Advisory & Finance, which was then the senior  
Committee. We made many decisions like that in that particular period. Perhaps at that time,  
1250 because I think Deputy Roffey may have been a reporter on the *Guernsey Press*, he may have missed  
that, because we did not associate with emails and social media as we do today.

What we want to do, and what Deputy Helyar, in a truly excellent speech, outlined when he  
outlined this amendment, was to say, we want to actually get on with things because what we have  
got at the moment is – and Deputy Kazantseva-Miller has just resent the Deputy Roffey email  
yesterday, whenever it was, which says that, of the seven amendments which there were then, STSB  
1255 were going to support two, and the other five were at large; some they were going to oppose, some  
they were not going to vote on, they were leaving it to individuals. Therefore, of the seven  
amendments, only two were going to be favoured by STSB: the first two, numbers 1 and 2.

Now, where there this an apology owed – and I made it to him yesterday, and I repeat it publicly –  
1260 is that this was a last-minute thing. The reason for that is that – there is not any machinations; one  
can see Machiavellian intrigues if you want to; ‘There is a conspiracy’, ‘It is all the Freemasons, all  
the Socialist Workers’ Party, it is all that kind of thing’. We have heard that so many times in life,  
when more often that not, it is a load of blinking nonsense.

What happened: Deputy Roffey was in wearing his other hat with his Committee members – or  
1265 three of his Committee members because one was already engaged in another important piece of  
States’ work – at the P&R meeting this week, and he left about nine o’clock, or just thereafter, after  
we discussed the matters with Employment & Social Security. Then in our agenda, we came to a  
heading – because just before the States’ meeting we discuss the items that are going to come up  
in the States’ meeting, and the harbour matter, clearly, was one of those items, and we discussed it.  
1270 I led the initial comments saying I was concerned with the amendments – not with the right to bring  
them because that is the democratic process, but with the way it was going off at various tangents.

As Deputy Kazantseva-Miller reminded the States earlier when she made her speech 30, 40  
minutes ago, I was the President of the States’ Trading Supervisory Board when this proposal first  
was born. I was the one that brought it to the States by way of an amendment, and it was passed  
1275 by the States, and I was the one that led it. Now, we have heard a description several times, because  
Deputy Roffey likes to emphasise his points – and he emphasised that things would be moving  
slowly, and he spoke slowly to emphasise his points; very good advocacy, I commend it, and I may  
take it on board in due course, when I make another speech. In relation to all that, the point is that,  
as regards those proposals that came before us, the work that has been produced, as Deputy Roffey  
1280 has said, is outstanding; as Deputy Helyar has said, is excellent. The work done by the working group  
is truly excellent, but it has laid a foundation.

Who does not want to see our harbours developed? I remember Deputy Le Tocq, some time  
previously, not in relation to this debate, made a speech about how when Guernsey was effectively  
bankrupt in the Napoleonic times, the States of Guernsey – and I cannot remember the figures;  
1285 Deputy Le Tocq gave the figures at the time, but I would probably have got them wrong –  
Guernsey’s gross national product, I think, at the time, or whatever the equivalent was, was  
something like – I cannot remember – £18,000 per annum, or something like that, and it had debts  
of £3,000; that is the equivalent of £3 billion and £18 billion.

What did they do? They did not have vast tax-gathering initiatives like we have got now; people  
1290 paid a bit of tax here and a bit of tax there, but it was not really paid. So what did they do? They did  
not go down and borrow down a black hole. They decided to build a harbour. They decided to build  
the Market. One building was completed in 1822, if I remember; the other was completed in 1830.  
They decided not to go for broke, but to really be expansionist. Again, if I remember Deputy Le  
Tocq’s speech, just about the time of the First World War and that catastrophe, those debts were

1295 paid off. They took a 100-year view in times when they did not have the almost-guaranteed revenues that we have today.

Now, what I want – I, Peter Ferbrache, who is an old man, older than Deputy Inder, as he made that point very politely earlier – I want for the future of Guernsey for us to reinvigorate our harbours. I would like to see – and this is without casting any doubts on the work that is going to be done by anybody, whatever the result of this States’ debate – I would like to see St Peter Port almost as a leisure harbour, because it is such a beautiful harbour, it is one of the greatest harbours, we have got the greatest harbour in the world; you are proud to be a Guernsey person when you approach that harbour.

1300 St Sampson’s needs to be reconfigured, because sadly, St Sampson’s has fallen behind St Peter Port in relation to its regeneration. I like St Sampson’s, but when you drive past or walk past or spend time in St Sampson’s, it needs some oomph, it needs some money, it needs some regeneration. I would like to see proposals whereby St Sampson’s – again, a bit like was mentioned by Deputy Roffey – that it becomes more of a leisure activity, etc. – I am not going to repeat all the points that he did, in that part of his speech, ably make.

1310 In relation to all of that, I think we probably will need a third harbour, I think that is probably the conclusion that will be reached. But we have got to look at it much wider than that, because of one of the points that Deputy Inder made: our marinas, which were – it was a wonderful decision by the States in the early 1980s to make, and it was a great decision; it has been a great earner, it has been a great addition – they are now a bit tired, they need some work. We need to do something that is more expansive than is already there. If I recall from my time in STSB – and again, it is referred to – just to get St Peter Port Harbour up to a reasonable state of repair is going to cost over £30 million. That is a heck of a lot of money by Guernsey standards. That needs to be done, but just doing that will do – it is something we have to do, but it is almost a do-nothing option, because that is just going to repair; it is not going to improve, and I would like to repair and I would like to improve.

1320 Now, the amendment – and we wanted it to be a sursis, but we were advised that it could not be a sursis, and we accepted the advice that we were given – it is quite clear in its terms, and I compare that with Proposition 2 in the policy letter, because Proposition 2 talks about approving:

... Future Harbour Development as a pipeline project in the capital portfolio ... and submit those proposals to the States for approval, by December 2022.

1325 ‘There is a delay, terrible delay! We are going to stop all the work. We have lost two years’ work. We have lost all the money and effort that has been put into it by these various people,’ says Deputy Roffey. Rot, rot, rot. Wrong, wrong, wrong.

If he looks at part 2 of the amendment, it says – you have got the exact words, so if I skip over them, you have got them before you:

1330 To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to develop Propositions and an accompanying Policy Letter, for consideration by the States of Deliberation at the earliest opportunity and not later than December, 2021, which shall include recommendations on ...

Now, B has to be read in its proper terms –

a timeline and set of steps to develop the seafront masterplan,

1335 I will come back to the next bit, which I have omitted – ‘by December 2022’. What that paragraph says, in general terms and in specific terms as well, is that there will have to be steps to develop the seafront master plan, and they have to come back by December of next year. The words I missed out were but they have to:

... include within St Peter Port Harbour a ‘Pool Marina’ with associated modern marina facilities.

1340 Therefore, you include that as well, but that is not all; it is looking at everything, it is looking at the whole kaboodle.

We looked at it, we thought – Deputy Roffey said that this might be a vote of no confidence in STSB; again, what rot, what rot. I have got confidence in STSB. I was President, and pleased to President, of STSB until October of last year, I worked closely with the officers there, I have got  
1345 considerable respect for all the officers, they are all very able people. I was a member of the Ports Board with Deputy ‘Casanova-Miller’, as she was then, the Member, and we worked very closely together, it was a very productive board. I worked closely with the two non-States’ members who are still there, and I am sure I would have worked closely with the two States’ Members who replaced the two States’ Members that were there when I was not there.

1350 And Deputy Roffey, I worked closely with Deputy Roffey, because he was on that board for about seven or eight months or whatever it may have been when I was there, a very productive board. So I have got every confidence in them, the three political members, the two non-political members, and the officers; they are good people doing a good job. Just because you disagree with somebody does not mean you have got no confidence in them; it just means you have the right, because this  
1355 is a democracy, to take a different view, and you do not have to take the statist view that Deputy Roffey has put forward, the righteous indignation, or unrighteous indignation, just because you disagree with him.

When you read the policy letter, the content of the material is good, but if you look at what Deputy Roffey ... when I say would not support – because he made it clear in that email that  
1360 individual members of STSB, some might vote for certain amendments, some might not vote for certain amendments. But let us look at the amendments that we have currently got at 1–7. STSB would be in favour of what was amendment 1, Helyar/St Pier:

To agree the preferred scheme for future development of Guernsey’s harbours is to include:

- carrying out essential repairs ...
- constructing a new northern port ...

1365 They would be in favour of Deputies Inder and Vermeulen’s one: ‘To direct the States’ Trading Supervisory Board by the end of 2022 to come back with suitable provisions, which should include a ‘Pool Marina’ – but not sure in favour of – ‘no comment’, if I can use that – of the two amendments brought by Deputies Kazantseva-Miller and Haskins, which, to me, seem to have credibility, because they talk about the blue economy and they talk about developing ‘but not limited to’ whereby you  
1370 can provide facilities for ‘super yachts, over-wintering, marine service industry,’ etc.

The second amendment of those two Deputies was to direct the Policy & Resources through the seafront regeneration committee, come back with commercial opportunities for St Sampson’s by the end of 2022. Again, apparently, STSB are not in favour of it; they will vote individually on that. They are also not in favour – they may vote individually or may vote against it, I know not –  
1375 amendment 5, Deputies Helyar and Inder:

To agree, in principle, the formation of an arm’s length development and regeneration board ...

Again, I think he said they were against – I think there was no equivocation in relation to that – the Deputies Brouard and Prow one, which was for looking at everything in St Peter Port and  
1380 spending \$406 million, or whatever the figure was, in relation to that. Also, as far as I am aware, they are not in favour of the amendment, again, brought by Deputy Kazantseva-Miller and seconded by Deputy Trott:

To instruct the Policy and Resources Committee to report to the States by the end of March 2022 with proposals on what they consider to be the right delivery vehicle for the seafront enhancement programme ...

1385 For some reason, they are not in favour; at least, they do not accept that.

1390 So where are we? I do not mean it in any way. Deputy Helyar used a maritime analogy about boats sailing in separate directions but we have got these amendments, all of which have credibility – none of them are silly; whether they should be accepted or not is a different matter – but they are boats sailing in different directions; some are going to Herm and some are going to Sark. What we want to concentrate on is what is going to happen along the east front.

1395 Those of us that were in the States last term, we were aware of the seafront enhancement project. It got absolutely nowhere in five years. Nothing happened. There were a few fruitless, pointless, ‘achievableless’ – that is probably not a word, but never mind, I have made it up – meetings which got absolutely nowhere. What Deputy Helyar wants to achieve, and I support him fully, is something that will actually get things done. We have had enough talking shops.

1400 I can remember when I came back in the States last time: we all went off to Beau Séjour, and we had three sessions – and I did not go to the third one, because I found the first two so frustrating – about what was going to be the key words. I cannot even remember the terminology. We had experts come in and sit down with us as though we were children, and we had to come up with key words about what we were going to do. Deputy Dudley-Owen remembers the words. What a waste of time. That set the agenda, really, for that following four and a half years. We are trying to set the agenda whereby we actually do something – we *do* something.

1405 The Helyar amendment, if I can call it that – but I am very pleased to be seconding it – is a way for achieving something. It does not need pomposity, it does not need righteous indignance, it does not need somebody getting angry just because somebody has the audacity not to agree with a politician of nearly 40 years’ standing.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Falla.

1410 **Deputy Falla:** Thank you, madam.

1415 Is the policy letter just a civil engineering project? I have heard a couple of Members refer to it as that this morning. I do not think it is, and we have heard that STSB would use, perhaps, a civil engineering project as the foundation of what they are looking to achieve, but then would build on that, and that would be the next phase: to build further commercial considerations, etc. In any event, even if it is just a civil engineering project, the amendments, up until amendment 8 yesterday, allowed us to bolt on additional important elements, such as the consideration of the eastern seaboard.

1420 I really like healthy debate, but I have kind of come to the conclusion that the honeymoon might be over on this new Assembly. I felt a little like a child listening to my parents arguing in the room next door. It does not feel like cohesion. It does not feel like ‘Action today’. It does not feel like a decisive States, and this is the first big issue we have talked about.

1425 The marine business – and I am dubbed ‘Government Business Lead’, a title of which I am proud – are telling us they are on hold until we do something about the harbour. They want us to act now. I am not sure I can support amendment 8.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dyke.

**Deputy Dyke:** Thank you, madam.

1430 I would first comment to Deputy Roffey that I, personally, am coming at this without any party politics involved; the suggestion was that we were thinking along those lines, which is completely wrong. I have been stressing over this decision for the last few nights, worrying, ‘What is the right way forward for our country?’ I have been struggling between Proposition 2, on the basis that it was obviously affordable, and number 5, from the technical report, on the basis that that was more exciting or interesting, would probably in the future have more commercial success. What was missing and what left me at a loss was, from what I would call an excellent technical report, the commercial side I did not see was there, and therefore I was heading towards voting for the straightforward option of 2, which was the £35 million one.

I feel now that amendment 8 is now a way forward. I feel the proposals in there will bring in the commercials, which are probably the missing piece of the puzzle, as the documentation now stands. I am now convinced that I will vote for amendment number 8. I would particularly associate myself with the view of Deputy Inder regarding the staffing thereof; that does need to be got completely right, so that we look at the whole thing from all angles, including the vital commercial aspects that we have to worry about.

I, therefore, will vote for amendment 8. Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

**Deputy Burford:** Thank you, madam.

I am following on, really, from Deputy Ferbrache's speech. I am not a Freemason, I am not a Socialist Worker – none of this should come as any surprise to you – I am not a conspiracy theorist, and I do not have a column in the *Guernsey Press*, and like the other 35 unpublished Members in this Assembly who do not, that is probably because I have never asked for one.

There is a long trail of evidence that this States is extremely poor at master plans, which is a word that is used in this Assembly, even when contracted out to third parties. It is the old argument that we should not do anything until we can do everything, and we risk ending up doing nothing.

I also believe that there is significant public support for the harbour proposals for the regeneration, but I do not think there is anywhere near as much support for a wider seafront development scheme, particularly if Belle Greve is involved in any way, as I believe it will be. I am not saying whether that is right or wrong, but I think that we really need to be mindful of the public reaction that will come much later in the process if this is wrapped up with the wider seafront scheme, and it does risk sinking the harbour work, which I think could go ahead if we leave it with STSB.

But this is not just about harbours; this is also about how Members want this Assembly to function for the remainder of the term. Deputy Inder says we are in the business of saying yes, and I agree, and I believe continuing with STSB is the quickest way of saying yes to moving forward on the harbours and the Pool Marina. Deputy Inder does not want to see the same old names, and I agree with that too, but what control does he have over that once power is ceded to P&R on this?

I cannot support this sursis-in-disguise, and I urge Members to dismiss it and allow STSB to get on with the Harbour's regeneration. Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson.

**Deputy Parkinson:** Thank you, madam.

This amendment effectively brings us to paralysis by process. It sets out a mechanism for delivering a future harbour project, and it says that the States will set up this independent body that will do that, but it does not give any direction – either to that future body, in terms of where the Assembly wants the development of Guernsey's commercial ports to go, or to STSB now – and that direction is important to everyday decisions that the Ports Board are making today. It therefore is a recipe for further delay, and it will undoubtedly result in slowing down the process. This is not 'Action this day'; this is 'Action some time in the future, with no deadline.'

Yes, in response to those who support the amendment, the ports do form a key part of the wider eastern seaboard work. But the tail cannot wag the dog: the priority must be to decide what commercial port facilities the Island needs, and then to see what commercial opportunities and wider economic benefits may arise from that decision, not the other way around.

We are not asking the States to make that key decision today; we are asking the States to decide to reduce the number of options under serious consideration, effectively, to two, because we have indicated we will support amendment number 1, so that further work can be undertaken on that more narrow field of enquiry, and we have also, of course, crucially, asked for the money to undertake that further work. We have explicitly said, and Deputy Roffey has said in his opening

1490 speech, that we will come back to the Assembly at the end of next year when the further research  
has been undertaken – for example, on tidal restrictions on any port facilities south of Longue  
Hougue – and the States will then be able to make fully informed decisions on the way forward. We  
want this States today to narrow down the options so that we are not chasing wild rabbits all over  
1495 the Island and we are not wasting money preparing reports or doing research on projects that will  
not command support in this Assembly.

Why does the decision on that direction affect what happens in the ports today? Well, the  
proposal to build a marina in the Pool is a very clear example of that. It would be very helpful to  
know – we all agree a marina in the Pool would be a great idea – (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) but it  
would be very helpful to know the full extent of the area available, and that may depend on what  
1500 commercial operations remain in St Peter Port. If all of the larger ship operations are moved out of  
St Peter Port, the commercial opportunities around a marina in the Pool will become much greater.

Also, to provide always-afloat walk-ashore moorings in the Pool, it will be helpful to know  
whether the Cambridge Berth is going to be released for other development in future, as that might  
be the best place to bring the pontoon islands ashore. If the Cambridge Berth is required in any  
1505 new commercial port configuration for the work of the port, then the pontoons need to come  
ashore on either the Crown Pier or the Albert Pier.

Having some indication from the States today of the direction of travel, which options they  
would like the STSB and its capable consultants to do work on, would tell us what area of the Pool  
is likely to be available and where it would be possible to bring the people on the pontoons ashore.  
1510 That is all we are really asking the States to do, is just narrow the options, then to give us some  
money to do the further work, not to decide what the solutions are, but to prepare for an informed  
debate on the general policies at the end of next year.

Of course, I think many people in the Assembly believe that the delivery vehicle for the  
realignment of the ports, the whole eastern seaboard project, will have to be something very  
1515 different. That will not be STSB, it will not be the Ports Board; it will have to be a much wider body,  
probably with a life far longer than the life of the political cycle. Personally, I strongly believe that  
there needs to be a 'Redevelopment Project Board' which is owned by or controlled by the States  
but which is quasi-autonomous and which takes on the project which, when it is finally decided  
what that project will be, will be a 10-year, perhaps 10-year-plus, project. There is no argument  
1520 about the need to set up a delivery vehicle that is appropriate to the scale of the task.

But before that delivery vehicle is created, the States needs to take one or two fundamental  
decisions that are keystones – to use former Deputy Stuart Falla's word – keystones to the whole  
eastern seaboard project. They are not the eastern seaboard projects, and no one is claiming that  
they would be, but those preliminary decisions, the dog that will wag the tail, have to be taken up  
1525 front so that the potential of the rest of the eastern seaboard can be realised.

I think the States just needs to have a bit of vision and a bit of courage here. I actually said to  
somebody when we were evacuating the building yesterday, in the sunken gardens, I said, 'If the  
States have got the guts to take a decision on this, I will be very surprised,' and I fear that my  
cynicism is likely to be justified. This decision requires Members to have a bit of courage, to have  
1530 some confidence in STSB working up the proposals to bring to the Assembly at the end of next  
year, to allow us to spend some money to do it, and to therefore prepare the ground for what will  
be a momentous decision, and one that will shape Guernsey's economic and commercial future,  
possibly, for centuries.

Deputy Ferbrache in his speech referred to the last expansion of St Peter Port during the  
1535 Victorian era. He actually got the dates of it wrong: the construction of the large outer harbour  
began somewhere around 1851 and continued until about 1870. In 1869, the States voted the  
princely sum of £15,500 to build the north arm of the new harbour. Those people had vision and  
they had some courage, and those proposals at that time were not free of controversy. The voices  
that we have heard in the States this morning urging caution, urging more process, steps towards  
1540 the ultimate goal – those voices were heard loud and clear back in the Victorian era, but at the end  
of the day, the States did make a decision, they made, for them, a very bold decision – £15,500 to

do the north arm of the harbour was a lot of money and of course, there was no certainty there would be a return on it. All those arguments that have been rehearsed in the Assembly this morning were uttered in this Assembly, this Chamber, in the 1850s and 1860s.

1545 But at the end of the day, the Members of that States had the courage to actually take that first step, and all progress depends on making that first step; without it, nothing will happen, and this, far from being a States of action, will just become another States of prevarication, which frankly, would be distressing, but would not be in any way surprising, on past form.

1550 I would urge Members to just have a little bit of courage here. You are being asked to commit to spend £4 million on developing the plans for two options in the commercial port area, those key pieces of infrastructure which will allow the development of the eastern seaboard and which will, to some extent, shape the development of the eastern seaboard, because they will open the opportunities, for example, in St Sampson's Harbour, which we all see as a major prize out of this process. What will happen then is, the STSB will come back to the States at the end of next year  
1555 with two worked-up options and a recommendation about which one to proceed with, and Members will have the opportunity at that time to debate the options, to introduce amendments if you do not like the options, and to allow the whole process to keep moving forward.

1560 This amendment 8 does not do that; it stops development in its tracks. It not only means that we would certainly not make an end of December 2022 deadline for a decision to go forward; it also means we cannot do much with the assets now. We do not know what assets are required for the new commercial port facilities.

I would urge Members to ignore the Siren voices and have some courage and just make a sensible decision to make the next step forward.

1565 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

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

1570 So far, this debate has reminded me, certainly in its early stages, of some sort of combination between *Groundhog Day* and a *Monty Python* sketch: *Groundhog Day* because, well, I have not been in politics as long as Deputy Roffey, but I have been around long enough to know that I have debated similar things under different titles, in different ways, for many years.

1575 In fact, while I was doing some research on something else, I came across a reference that I made back in 2013 in the debate on the Ports Master Plan, back then. I made the point – and I will make it again now, because I think it is a relevant one – that Guernsey, and St Peter Port particularly, has been recognised for many years as a good harbour – but not only that, an attractive harbour, and with that, it is not just the fact that we have harbour facilities, but it is the town and the whole environment. In fact, you could include the crescent that St Peter Port and St Sampson's brings together. But also, I discovered – 20 years ago, in fact, while on holiday in Skiathos – that in the guidebook we had there, Skiathos Town was described as 'the St Peter Port of the Aegean'. Can you  
1580 believe it? (*Interjection and laughter*) Anyway, that is how it was described in there.

So there is a sense in my mind that we are in *Groundhog Day*, because I had great hopes back in 2013 – and in fact, in debates before then – that we would see some action, and what I fear is that we are just going to put our trust, again, in our ability as politicians to move things forward swiftly.

1585 The reason I believe – and it is an interpretation, I accept – that our forefathers managed to get further forward with the Harbour and do some quite radical things for their generation – and I am grateful to Deputy Parkinson for mentioning the dates and the circumstances of the time. There were controversies, if you read back to the middle of the 19th century – indeed, like there was with the building of the new jetty – there were naysayers at the time. But the reason that I believe they managed to do it fairly quickly and swiftly at the time is that they did not delegate the work; whilst  
1590 they made the decision about the financial support necessary, they delegated it to a largely unelected group of people to actually do the job.



1595 Therefore, in terms of cynicism – and Deputy Parkinson mentioned cynicism – I am a cynic, now, that we will see anything but more reports and more options before us. The policy letter before us gives us options, and Deputy Roffey described them as a ‘smorgasbord’ of options. But then I think, a little bit like – I had an aunt who was a bit like this, who brought in offers to the table, and then pointed out the ones that she considered to be absolutely disgusting – he then went on to say he did not like this and he did not like that, which was going from the objective to the subjective immediately.

1600 We all have likes and dislikes here, and I am sure I would agree ... when the amendments came through, there were many of them that I liked, but the danger with that is that we end up designing things by a Committee of 40. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I do believe – as, I think, Deputy Burford said in a different debate yesterday – that sometimes, a compromise – not always, but sometimes – is that we put together – particularly when we are dealing with commercial things, when we are  
1605 dealing with things that have a bearing on other decisions that need to be made, they are actually the decisions that no one would have wanted and look like some sort of strange design, with ‘bolt-ons’ – somebody used that phrase earlier.

I was reminded earlier in the debate of the *Monty Python* sketch – I do not know if there is a title to the sketch but it is a couple in a restaurant who are having a romantic meal, and one of them  
1610 complains about a dirty knife, and one-by-one – all they want is a clean knife – but the waiter comes in and apologises ridiculously profusely, and then it gets to the sous chef, and the chef and the manager come in, and eventually, the last one to come in comes in saying it is the end of his life and commits suicide on the table with a cleaver in the middle of his chest. And the punch line is, ‘Lucky I didn’t tell him about the dirty fork!’ (*Laughter*)

1615 But it seems to me, whilst these are important matters, I do not think we should turn it into some sort of major scrap – Deputy Falla described it like hearing your parents – or a schoolyard. I think all the things that have been said here are genuine things that would be reflected in our society.

But if we want to see some action, I believe we need to support amendment 8, which, I have to confess, I would call a *sursis motivé*. I am starting to feel guilty, but I will make a confession here: I  
1620 suggested it yesterday in P&R – Tuesday in P&R – because it seems to me, when the circumstances happen that more and more amendments come in with a great idea, but an idea that would conflict with another one and could potentially put all sorts of difficulties if one was taken and the other one was not taken and all those sorts of things – and there were some late amendments coming in, so this is in good company with those.

1625 My suggestion was that we have a *sursis motivé* which effectively says, ‘Stop work on that, put them all together until we have something in place’ – and I am talking about governance here – and that, for me, is the key thing. The governance needs to be right, and we need to therefore give this arms-length body, I think, a chance to bring in all those partners that we need to see, working with us in Government, so that we can decide how we can make the right steps. Otherwise, my fear  
1630 is that we will be going round in more circles.

And it will cost us, because we have already spent huge amounts of money. I mentioned the Ports Master Plan; that cost a huge amount. We are not actually seeing action. I am not suggesting that by supporting this amendment itself, you will see action, but I do not think we will see it either if we go into debate on the amendments, that we leave it within just political hands to see the thing  
1635 move forward.

I do understand the strong feelings that we have got in this Assembly today, madam, but I do feel that this way forward will give us the best opportunity of seeing all the options that we want to see properly taken forward with the right sort of investment from us and the buy-in that we need to see from other partners overall. That is why I will be supporting amendment 8.

1640

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Vermeulen.

**Deputy Vermeulen:** Thank you, madam.

1645 We are more or less in a win-win situation here today. I think everybody that I have spoken to or heard from is in support of a Pool Marina. So what is the quickest way of bringing this about? I have wondered how it has come to be that the harbours are in such disrepair and that this has not been done many years ago; maybe the current management has not quite had the foresight.

To cut things very short, I am going to be supporting amendment 8, because I think it is the quickest way of us getting there, both with the Pool Marina – and I also think that that is never going to be the end of the development for the harbours, just one marina utilising the pool area. I think with a longer bit of foresight, you should perhaps use that as phase 1 of the development, and phase 2 and phase 3 could be decided in the future by other people.

I would urge other Members to follow me and support amendment 8.

1655 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you, madam.

1660 I think much of this amendment could – and indeed, possibly, should – have been brought some considerable time earlier. I remember Deputy Helyar mentioning this idea of an arms-length regeneration board, I think, before even Committees constituted it; it was that early in the political term. I think I responded something along the lines of, ‘Well, better bring a policy letter soon.’

1665 Obviously, there is the extant resolution – and it remains extant – for an SEA Committee that was due to meet on 12th January, but within a few days of that meeting date, it was disbanded, and we were promised that Propositions would be brought back to this Assembly to decide on what should replace that. If that was considered not to be the most appropriate vehicle – and I agree there was a conversation to be had around that – then it was up to this Assembly to put in place the governance around how it should be taken forward. So I was a little surprised to hear Deputy Helyar, in his opening speech on this amendment, refer to a governance vacuum, because I have asked question after question after question on what is happening with this, and had absolutely – well, very little response until earlier in this States’ meeting, in fact, and it has been incredibly frustrating.

1670 Also, it is not very confidence-inspiring that P&R committed to action and has sat on this for so long and not brought anything to replace the resolutions that they think are no longer relevant, so we have not been able to see what was going on. I understand there has been some work, but it is not something that anyone in this Assembly as a whole has been able to have any kind of input into or oversight of. It is important work. I think it is important that there is democratic accountability, and I am sorry that it has taken this long and it has been this last-minute to see something of this nature from Policy & Resources.

1680 However, I think that this amendment, its fatal flaw is that it is deleting the Propositions in front of us, because I think whatever is to happen with the regeneration board – if it is to be an arms-length body, etc. – that definitely needs to happen; as I am sure anyone who has ever spoken to me on this topic or anything similar will know, I am very keen on seeing a holistic approach to the regeneration, it is an absolutely critical aspect of this. The STSB is quite right, for reasons that Deputy Roffey articulated in his speech, but actually Deputy Parkinson put some very useful meat on the bones when he spoke: it does need to be done in the right order. I think deciding on the operational function of the ports is the correct order in which to make these decisions. Deputy Vermeulen is saying that his motivation is the quickest way to the Pool Marina; well, I think that is by rejecting this amendment, frankly, and I will expand on that a little bit later.

1690 I do not think there is any question – I think we can put people’s minds at rest – there is absolutely no suggestion that the regeneration, in its broader context, will not be a huge, major part of this going forward; it is just about the phasing of the work and the practicalities involved with that. Deputy Parkinson explained how even progressing the Pool Marina without an understanding of what the Assembly’s direction is going to be, it cannot progress, or cannot progress in any way as quickly as it can if this Assembly does its job and actually just makes a decision to give that strategic direction. I do not think Deputy Inder needs to worry about this

1695 becoming 'just a civil engineering project', not at all; it is just about the order in which these aspects need to take place, these different components.

Deputy Meerveld talked about the importance of commercial know-how and the relevant experience, etc. guiding this, but of course, this has been led not by politicians, but by people. Actually, I think the political board of STSB does have an admirable commercial experience in its own right, but of course this project has been led by, very much, a commercial team, so it is not that that is lacking at the moment, and they have taken a very commercial approach to it.

1700 In fact, we have had an email on this subject from a former harbourmaster and captain of commercial shipping, a leisure user and currently the captain of a very large luxury yacht, who has emailed us this morning – and I am saying it because I know that not all Members have got access to emails during States' meetings – to urge us to reject this amendment because we need to act now to develop our harbours, and we should not delay any further.

1705 I think someone earlier described this as a step forward; to me, this is a step backward. I cannot see how this is anything other than delay – at the very least, six months' delay, but actually, I think, given what Deputy Parkinson described, potentially, significantly more than that. To my mind, this is a can-kicking, action-dodging, delay-inducing amendment, and I really think we need to reject it and move on to make the decisions that will result in actual action. This is the first proper, substantive decision this Assembly is being asked to make, it is a really important one, and I would really like to get on and do that.

1715 **The Deputy Bailiff:** States' Greffier, it is time to adjourn for the lunch break, so we will stand adjourned now.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.33 p.m.  
and resumed its sitting at 2.44 p.m.*

### **Procedural**

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, as you all realise, the systems are down, so we will carry on as well as we can. It may be that we will have to suspend if things become impossible, but at the moment, we are able to record, so we will carry on.

1720

**Future Harbour Development –  
Debate continued**

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache.

1725 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Thank you, madam, and I am grateful for the indulgence, because we have come in late because I specifically asked if we could come in late.

1730 There have been discussions between the States' Trading Supervisory Board and Policy & Resources which have resulted in – there will be, with your leave, an amendment laid, amendment 9, which will be proposed by Deputy Helyar and seconded by Deputy Roffey, and – again, with your leave – what we would like is for this amendment to be inserted, now; debate on amendment 8 be suspended; there would be a debate and a vote taken on this amendment; and then, dependent on what happens on this amendment, we reconsider amendment 8. I see Deputy Roffey nodding in the affirmative.

1735 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Ferbrache.  
Yes, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller?

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Bailiff. Could I clarify: if we suspend debate on number 8, can we bring it back later on?

1740 **The Deputy Bailiff:** What will happen is that amendment 9 is passed, the intention is that amendment 8 will be withdrawn, so amendment 9 will replace, in effect. So amendment 8 will fall away and debate will never continue.

1745 There is not a specific provision with this under the Rules; one option is that I suspend the Rules to allow this to happen, but on balance, I consider this is within my power as Presiding Officer, as I get to decide the order and how the amendments should be dealt with. So, in these circumstances, particularly where, in effect, we have the proposer of the original Proposition, Deputy Roffey, seconding amendment 9, and the proposer of the amendment, Deputy Helyar, being the proposer of amendment 9, I do think this is an appropriate action to take.

1750 In that regard, I will now turn to Deputy Helyar, in relation to amendment 9.

[Amendment 9](#)

*To insert the following propositions:*

5. *To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to establish a Development and Regeneration Board, as an arm's length body of the States or similar entity, to replace the interim sub-committee established by the Policy & Resources Committee to advise it on the development of the Seafront Enhancement Area.*
6. *To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to develop Propositions and an accompanying Policy Letter, for consideration by the States of Deliberation at the earliest opportunity and not later than December, 2021, which shall include recommendations on:*
  - A. *the mandate, membership, accountability, funding, and involvement in the preparation of the long-term development strategy for the Seafront Enhancement Area of the Development and Regeneration Board; and*
  - B. *a timeline and set of steps to develop the seafront masterplan, which shall include within St Peter Port Harbour a 'Pool Marina' with associated modern marina facilities, by December 2022.*

**Deputy Helyar:** Madam, Deputy Bailiff, thank you for your indulgence in allowing us time to discuss these matters over the lunchtime. It has been quite disruptive, the fact that we have not

been able to access IT systems and so on, so apologies to Members that they have not been able to be kept up to speed on things; communications have been rather difficult.

1755 Much of the debate this morning centred on Proposition 8, centred around delay. The intention of the amendment to which I was the proposer, number 8, and Deputy Ferbrache the seconder was not to impose delay; it was to do two things at the same time, if possible, in order to reduce delay because the perception is that if we ... A £350 million project – the first thing is, speaking as  
1760 Treasurer, we do not have £350 million to spend. My view, and the view of P&R, is that it was too early in the process to stick a tail on a £350 million donkey and say, 'We want to do this particular thing,' without it being joined up with regeneration opportunities because it is not the role of STSB to make policy, and a £350 million harbour project is itself, because of its size and because of the changes of all the processes and all other things we do in the Island – our food, our tourist economy, and everything else that goes with it – this is a piece of policy in itself, because it is a big civil  
1765 engineering project, it will change all sorts of things that need to be taken into consideration.

The planning for it – and this is my honestly held view – needs to be done in a joined-up way with all of the Committees that have an interest in doing it. When the policy indications come back from doing the work that is required to get to whatever chosen output we have happen, we need to make sure that we have adequate – it is very possible, for example, that STSB came back, they  
1770 have done the Wallingford trials, item 5 was the perfect answer, so item 5 comes back. Then we have questions about fuel storage, we have questions about traffic management, we have questions about housing, we have questions about transport of dangerous goods. It alters the way – and Deputy Parkinson spoke eloquently on this earlier – in which you may be able to use St Peter Port according to how much of it is being used by commercial traffic. That is a clear issue in respect of  
1775 this.

It was never the intention of amendment 8 to stop the work of STSB happening, but the paradox that we have come across in trying to find a compromise over the lunch break is that STSB needs some guidance as to which direction States' Members want it to go. They need you to say yes or no to 5, 6, 3 – whatever it might be, whatever combination of those – because Wallingford cannot  
1780 accurately do its work and properly fund it – and Deputy Queripel, again, mentioned the cost – it would be silly for us to go and investigate something we are never going to do. I think Deputy Roffey's point is that his Committee requires a clear steer in what to investigate.

The compromise we have come up with – and I spoke to a number of Members, and I know a number of you are not happy about this, which is why we are going to vote on it first, and if we do not get anywhere with this compromise position ... It is an important thing for us to do as an  
1785 Assembly, to realise when things are out of step with one another and to bring them together. The public are desperate to see us take immediate action. I think, if we had an STSB investigation in isolation from all of the other regeneration opportunities that we have, we will end up making mistakes again, we will end up not proceeding, because we will say, 'We are not going to spend  
1790 £350 million here when we could be spending it on this or on that. What is the opportunity for the other things that are going on?'

So I think, in the spirit of genuinely trying to show that the Assembly can work together co-operatively, in the spirit of co-operation and moving forward together, to be able to do two things in the same track, effectively, we have reached this view that this amendment is the right way to do  
1795 it. We are taking the proposals that were in amendment 8 and effectively transferring them into the Propositions in the original policy letter. What that does is it just adds to the ones that were already there, so it makes a 5 and a 6.

I think that, in super-summary, is the position that we have reached. We think it is the right thing to do, as a compromise and to make sure that all the workstreams keep happening at the right pace  
1800 and to bring everybody on board. I would ask Members of the Assembly to support this compromise position. Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey, do you formally second this?

1805 **Deputy Roffey:** I do, madam.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

**Deputy Brouard:** Thank you.

1810 I am slightly confused by this amendment and what it is going to do. Can Deputy Helyar give me some steer as to who is going to have the decision of what is investigated in? My fear is that we are going to have an arms-length body that is going to come back with proposals, and then at that point, we will have a *fait accompli* put in front of us, we will have no chance to influence it, we will have no chance to do anything, and then we are going to be trying to pick it apart here, in the States. Whether my public like it or not, they put me forward to be their representative. I have got a view that I wish to put forward on their behalf. Hopefully, most of them will like it; some of them will not. But I think it is for us, as the States, to be able to give that steer.

1820 We had quite a very strong speech this morning from Deputy Roffey about democracy happening in this place and us being in charge; then suddenly, by the afternoon, that seems to have disappeared, and now it is the arms-length body who is now going to be doing the decision-making, coming up with the plans, and then we are just here as some sort of nodding part at the very end of the process. No, I would very much like us, as a States, to be very much involved at the beginning of the process and influence how we want our Island to look for the future. That is why we are here, as representatives, not some arms-length body which will be its own quango, in my view.

1825 I would be grateful to understand exactly where States' Members will influence and can affect how this goes forward. I am a little bit disappointed, because I would have liked to have carried on with the debate and give the steer as to how we want to have the Island looking in the future.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

1830 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you, madam.

I think it is worth just clarifying for anyone who is, perhaps, less familiar with how these things work exactly what we will be voting on in terms of amendment 9. It is a totally different kettle of fish to amendment 8 – I think, in all the right ways – because rather than deleting and replacing the original Propositions, this is inserting. So the effect of this amendment will be to *insert* the following Propositions.

1840 So really, from a technical point of view, this could be a very short debate on amendment 9, because there is really nothing to lose. If you like the Propositions you vote for this amendment and they are inserted, and then you go on to vote on them when they are substantive Propositions; if you do not like them, there is still not much skin off your nose; or if you like some but not others, you could still vote to insert them and not necessarily vote in favour of all of them when they become substantive Propositions. So I think, from a technical perspective, this is a completely uncontentious amendment and I plan to support it. I think it is a very good compromise.

1845 But because Deputy Helyar will be replying to this debate on this amendment, I think it is an opportunity to ask questions specifically relating to the Propositions. I will just make clear that I will be supporting this amendment, and I would encourage others to do the same.

Following on from Deputy Brouard's questions, I also would welcome a bit more detail about exactly how Deputy Helyar sees the arms-length body setting out its stall. Particularly, 6B talks about Policy & Resources Committee coming back to the States no later than December this year with 'recommendations on: ... B. a timeline and set of steps to develop the seafront masterplan ...'

1850 I am particularly interested – I know it is quite a small detail – but I am quite interested to understand whether that will give this Assembly an opportunity to have some input into that master plan – that kind of detail. I would really appreciate, when Deputy Helyar replies to debate, whether he could address those points. Thank you.

1855 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Thank you, madam.

1860 Members, I am encouraged to hear the spirit of how this amendment came about, which I think is really great, that both Deputy Roffey, Deputy Helyar, and others perhaps, worked on this amendment together.

1865 However, I am a little bit confused by this amendment, because in my humble view, basically this amendment tries to bring together two amendments which are already in play in the list of amendments: amendment 5, by Deputies Helyar and Inder, which is all about bringing forward the development corporation; and – what is the other one? – the Pool Marina amendment, which amendment 2, Deputy Inder and Deputy Vermeulen. To some extent, this is just, in a sense, summarising two amendments which are in play without bringing too much else forward. But if that helps to stop amendment 8, I guess, there is obviously value in that in itself, because I think approving amendment 8 without the direction of the rest of the policy letter would be quite disastrous.

1870 The problem is the amendments that are currently in play, as I mentioned, amendments 5 and 2, if they were proposed in here, this would give us the chance to actually debate them a bit more; right now, I feel what I am debating is ‘What are the virtues of amendment 9 versus 8?’, without actually going into the discussion of ‘What could this arms-length body look like? What the process could be?’ and stuff like that. So I feel I do not have the space right now. This amendment is actually  
1875 not allowing me to debate what is being proposed.

The only thing I can comment right now is the value of this amendment versus amendment 8. I feel there is a limited value in terms of – because it is just an amalgamation of other existing amendments. But there is a value that if it can stop amendment 8, I guess I will be supportive, but I am just not sure actually I can see the value; I would rather Deputy Helyar just withdraws  
1880 amendment 8 full stop, and we can go into debating the rest of the amendments if we want to lay them, in the spirit of democracy.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

1885 **Deputy Roffey:** I hope I can help with some of the questions that have been raised, and I promise to be extremely calm. *(Laughter)*

1890 The problem that the STSB had with amendment 8 was not – let me step back a bit. There are two work tracks here, isn’t there? We were sent away a couple of years ago to decide what you want to do with your commercial ports, how the commercial ports would be organised, particularly where the big ships go. As an adjunct to that, obviously, that was going to free up all sorts of opportunities, both for leisure, boating, and for on-shore regeneration. We did that work on where the big ships should go. We have come back, we have asked for a decision to be made so that we could take that forward to the next stage and we could do the in-depth work that would be needed before it is finally signed off.

1895 So our real objection to amendment 8 was not the fact that it introduced new bodies or that it asked for marinas or any of that stuff; it was that it took away – and some Members may feel this was a good thing about amendment 8, if they wanted to dock the issue but – it took away the request to ask this Assembly to give us a steer about what we should be doing next about the commercial shipping.

1900 When I raised that and said, ‘Look, this is going to cause delay. It is going to leave work that has been done over the last two years aborted,’ both Deputy Ferbrache and Deputy Helyar, in fairness, said, ‘No, if you want to take that forward, if you want to go off to Wallingford and do the tank testing or whatever, we will provide the money, as P&R, to do that,’ to which my answer was, ‘What on Earth are they going to be testing?’ Because we do not know. We do not know whether it is  
1905 option 5 or option 6, or the option 3 that Deputy Brouard wants to put forward, that we take forward. We cannot possibly go forward not knowing what you want us to take forward.

So I think we are almost in a false argument about ... because let me make clear, there has been a narrative that has been developed that somehow STSB has to be led kicking and screaming to

1910 provide a marina space. Quite the opposite! That is absolutely core to what we want to do, and we are champing at the bit. Although, Deputy Parkinson was quite right: in a way, we need some in-principle decisions on the commercial stock in order to do that in the best possible way.

For example, in this amendment, as in 8, it mentions the Pool Marina – which, as I said, we are very keen to do. Those berths will be the only all-tide marina berths that we have anywhere in St Peter Port – in Guernsey, actually – and we see that as attracting a really high-premium cost. Sorry, boat owners of Guernsey, but we do. (**A Member:** Yes.) And we think that those boat owners, ideally, would like to be able to drive up, where they possibly can, close to the marina and actually drop their gear. When we decide – hopefully, later today – what proposals to take forward on the commercial shipping, we will know whether that is likely to be able to be done on the Cambridge Berth or not, because that is actually a much better berth to do it than on the Victoria Berth.

1920 So the main difference between this and 8 – and I say this particularly for Deputy Brouard – is it does not stop the discussion today on what we want to do with our commercial harbours; it would allow Deputy Brouard to say, ‘Do not do it at Longue Hougue; do it east of St Peter Port.’ I hope he loses when that happens, but it would give him a fair crack of the whip at doing that. If we had gone away after passing 8, we would have had no steer at all from this Assembly about what they wanted to do with the two years’ work that we have done so far. So I think that this is incredibly sensible, because to do otherwise – there is no two ways about it – it would have made a major delay over deciding what to do with our commercial ports, and the knock-on effect, I am afraid, would also have been delays for the work on regeneration.

1930 So Deputy Helyar is quite right: it needs to be twin-track. I quite accept we are not going to find £360 million from – paid parking, even, probably would not do that! (*Laughter*) We are not going to find that sort of money down the back of the sofa; we are going to have to marry this to an entrepreneurial, enterprising spirit about what we do with the commercial opportunities it throws up in order to realise it. But the two need to go forward in tandem. We were being stopped dead in our tracks as far as the commercial ports were concerned. It does not matter how much money you give us; we cannot investigate something if you have not told us your preferred options to take forward. Maybe amendment 8 was quite attractive in that way to some people, because they do not want to make an indication of whether they want a harbour at Longue Hougue or whether they want to go east of St Peter Port. But really, I do appeal – and I do it calmly – but I do appeal with all the passion that I can muster: do not stop that bit of work, otherwise you will be throwing away £800,000 and two years of work.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

**Deputy Inder:** I will try and be a bit calmer, but then again ...

1945 Deputy Kazantseva-Miller said she liked amendment 9 because it defeats amendment 8, so it is a lesser of the two evils; strangely enough, I like amendment 8 because it defeats Proposition 1.

Deputy Roffey said – and there is also this other line, that if the States does not make a decision which is likely to include £4 million plus £360 million, we are somehow the wrong people, we are the wrong States, we are not making the right decisions, and therefore if we are not seen to do something which is different to what we are doing now it is in some way bad. Actually, by voting for Proposition 8, it could be argued – which is in the Jacobs Report – that the commercial facilities in the port could be maintained as they are, because they have been for years.

1955 By voting for Proposition 8, what the States could be saying is they are not giving the STSB direction, because they actually believe that you can carry on maintaining the harbour as it is, you could spend £35 million there – because, as has been explained, it is a superfluous part of Proposition 1; you could carry on with the marina, and you could create the Regeneration Board; that, of course, would have all of that talent that we spoke about before, so you could carry on. So defeating Proposition 9 would mean Proposition 8 stays in play. I think the reality is, if you vote for Proposition 8, you are actually defeating Proposition 1. That would allow the STSB to carry on and do –



I will give way.

**Deputy Le Tocq:** I thank Deputy Inder for giving way.

1965 He is sort of correct, but it is not the complete truth. That is that if amendment 9 is passed, the Assembly will still have an opportunity to vote against Proposition 1, which I will be doing.

1970 **Deputy Inder:** I am not entirely sure what Deputy Le Tocq corrected there, because what I was saying is, if Proposition 8 – I may well have carried on – if Proposition 8 stays in play and then is adopted, Proposition 1 is effectively defeated, which is what I was saying. That is the point I was actually trying to make.

However, this is a bit difficult for me because I genuinely do not think 5 or 6 is going anywhere and that debate should be had. But I do not think I am in a position to cynically use the defeat of Proposition 9 ... 5 or 6 –

1975 **Deputy Soulsby:** I thank Deputy Inder. Could he give clarification of what he means by '5 or 6', because we have got options 5 and 6, we have got amendments 5 and 6, we have got lots of 5's and 6's.

1980 **Deputy Inder:** Oh, sorry, I beg your pardon. I am not talking about amendment 6 – *options* 5 and 6, which is option 5, as is the preferred option in Policy & Resources' policy letter, and 5 and 6, as per the St Pier and Helyar other amendment, which I will assume will then be adopted, because both Policy & Resources and STSB agree that is the way to go.

I have slightly lost my train of thought. (*Laughter*) (**A Member:** Not for the first time!) Not for the first time? Yeah, right. I do the jokes!

1985 Like Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, I am tempted to defeat 9 for different reasons, because actually, I am a fan of option 8, which in itself, defeats Proposition 1; that is effectively what we are doing. I am not entirely sure –

I will give way.

1990 **Deputy Leadbeater:** I thank Deputy Inder for giving way. I think when he says 'option 8', do you mean amendment 8? (*Laughter*)

**Deputy Inder:** No, I am talking about harbour option 1 – sorry, *Proposition 1. Proposition 1!* (*Laughter*) I will get to the punchline immediately. (*Laughter*)

1995 The democrat in me thinks – because it is such a substantial project, even though I am unlikely to vote for Proposition 1 as it is or the Propositions as amended, I think I am on some kind of obligation to let this Assembly have its say on all of the Propositions. The cynic in me would like Proposition 8 to stay in play, but the democrat in me is going to give Proposition 9 a chance, to allow all of the other –

2000 I will give way; God, I was nearly finished.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Queripel.

**Deputy Queripel:** I thank Deputy Inder for giving way.

2005 I think the confusion is arising – in my mind, anyway – in his referring to amendments as 'Propositions': he refers to amendments 8 and 9 as 'Propositions 8 and 9', but they are actually *Amendments* 8 and 9. I think it would make it much more understandable if he refers to the amendment as an amendment.

Thank you.

2010

**Deputy Inder:** Thanks for the comment. For those who do understand me, what I was actually saying is that, effectively, I think I am under obligation, for a £4 million bill, a £360 million price tag,

to allow this Assembly to have its voice on the matter. To that end, I will vote for *Amendment 9*, not *Proposition 9*. (Laughter)

2015 Thank you, madam. You are right.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache.

2020 **Deputy Ferbrache:** I would also ask people to vote for Proposition 9 – (*Interjections*) (**Deputy Soulsby:** Amendment 9!) I have caught the Inder sickness! I would ask people to vote for *amendment 9*. It is not for me to predict anything when you have not got the votes and the horse has not arrived at the finishing post, but I believe if there was a vote, amendment 8 would have succeeded.

2025 But the point was, there was not discussion between the Committees, the States' Trading Supervisory Board and the Policy & Resources Committee. It would have been helpful – that is no criticism of anybody; it is just the way that these things have developed – if we would have had time to have that more detailed discussion. We did not.

2030 Over the lunch period, amongst others – particularly, two members of Policy & Resources were in a Civil Contingencies Authority meeting all lunchtime, until about 2.28 – matters have been discussed between Deputy Helyar and Deputy Roffey. The upshot of it is that this is a compromise that I believe is a successful and achievable compromise. It shows that Committees can work together, it shows that the States can come together.

2035 The basis of this is that it allows – because what Deputy Roffey said to me, he said – and I will quote accurately what he said to me – he said, 'Are you in favour of it?' I said, 'No' – this is 9, because I had not seen it, because I had been involved in another meeting. I said, 'We, as far as we can,' – P&R – 'we have said you can have the £4 million to get on with the work.' He very rightly said, 'Well, what work? What do we spend that £4 million on? What are we investing it in? What type of work are we carrying out?'

2040 That was not our intent, as Deputy Helyar has explained, to stop anything; we just wanted a more expansive view of the harbour, the £350 million/£360 million project. It is such a massive project, I actually think it should proceed in some form, but in a wider form, a more expansive form, than the narrow visions brought – and I do not mean criticism by that – brought by the STSB. Because all the other points – and it is the amendments that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, Deputy Haskins etc. all of those other considerations come into these kinds of discussions going forward.

2045 So that is the reason and I would ask, therefore, those that were going to support amendment 8 to vote for amendment 9.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

2050 **Deputy Gollop:** Oh, Deputy Oliver can come next. Although I should not go before Deputy Oliver, in a way, I was disappointed I lost the chance to speak in the earlier debate, on the now postponed amendment 8.

2055 In a way, I am the proverbial character Deputy Roffey could have been referring to who wants to kick the can down the road. I just feel that we are not in a good place at the moment, personally or politically, to really move forward with this project. We had splendid presentations from the very distinguished Mr Stuart Falla CBE and members of the STSB, but that in itself, despite the power of the presentation and the vision, is not sufficient, really, for us to be in a collective position to move on this. If I can offer a minor piece of, I suppose, criticism on what was a kind of P&R amendment we had earlier, it was an example perhaps of insufficient preparation. As Deputy Ferbrache has  
2060 rightly reminded us, it probably was not the intention of P&R to stop all work; it was just the way it was phrased, it came out as a sursis. That actually built strength to what Deputy Meerveld has told me on SACC, that Members should be a little bit more disciplined in asking questions and preparing amendments and all the rest of it.

2065 Sometimes my questions have a point. My questions to Deputy Ferbrache, which he answered  
very well, also had a point yesterday; Deputy Helyar alluded to them earlier in his speech. The point  
of them, to me, was – it is actually a Rule in the Assembly and I certainly sailed close to the wind  
with those questions, as it turned out – that you cannot discuss in Question Time a matter that is  
before the States of Deliberation at the same meeting. Of course, it was a discrete issue, because  
2070 the life and adventures of the Seafront Enhancement Area is a different issue from the STSB's  
responsibility for the harbour. But in my mind, they are linked, a little bit like in Deputy Lester  
Queripel's point about other arts activities across the Island. It might not be windmills of my mind,  
exactly, but to me there is a linkage and that is why I asked the questions, actually.

2075 A senior figure from the Chamber of Commerce, who I believe are actually having a gathering  
tonight, raised on the radio, as I was getting late for the Government Business Plan talk yesterday,  
some very interesting insights into the seafront enhancement. The point that was being made was  
that, for some reason – maybe a lack of resources, maybe a lack of money, maybe a lack of  
direction – there was not as much progress as there could have been on the Seafront Enhancement  
Areas. Sadly, we have proved Deputy Inder's prediction a little too accurately when he said there  
2080 would not be a spade in the ground anywhere by the end of the term. Although we had an extended  
term, that, unfortunately, proved to be pretty near the mark.

2085 Where I am coming from is, to my mind, committing £100 million to the ports, let alone  
£330 million, is an unwise thing to do until you are in full possession of not only a commercial vision  
and a team to take things forward, but a clear direction of travel, more importantly, interlinked with  
the Seafront Enhancement Area, with transport and environmental policies – and there, I think I  
share common ground with Environment & Infrastructure – with tax and spend – because whether  
you borrow or tax people more or reorganise taxation, it is bound to be linked with investment and  
infrastructure. This debate, really, should come after the Government Business Plan; perhaps,  
education and health; and definitely, taxation and expenditure.

2090 I am uncomfortable in going for any of the models today. I am actually most attracted, without  
having had sufficient expertise, to the Deputy Prow/Deputy Brouard amendment, because I think  
that that conforms with the Deputy Paint/Deputy Inder vision and, I think, resolves problems. The  
problem with 5 and 6 is one of them is really just a huge engineering project with only partial  
benefits; for example, the idea of creating more parks for the North Beach is an interesting thing,  
but it does not solve other problems. Deputy Roffey, in his earlier speech, said he was wrong on the  
2095 North Beach and he realises now the vision of the senior figures of the past. I would say to that, yes,  
it had huge benefits for the marine community, for the finance sector, and for the unemployed at  
the time, but there was a downside, and the downside was it caused the collapse of commercial bus  
operations on the Island – or at least it was a factor. So we have to think holistically. But also it  
moved Town's retail from the south of Town to the north of Town. It had a knock-on effect on the  
2100 Woolworth's and the Market.

2105 We have to think of this as a collective project. So I am happier with the sursis arrangements of  
the now-amended 8 so I am reluctant to vote for amendment 9, because although it is a peace  
offering and moves the story forward, I think there are other ways of doing that. I think we could  
instil in STSB some additional monies and impetus to come back without necessarily going through  
the motions of having to vote in Propositions 1 to 6. Because we will end up with a debate that,  
possibly, we will not finish this week, because presumably every amendment relating to the harbour,  
from the Pool harbour idea, to the blue economy, to the Bridge, will all have to be included if we  
go for 9, and we may end up with a very confused melee. So actually, I thought there was common  
sense in going for 8 and for P&R, in conjunction with STSB, to come back as soon as possible with  
2110 a super-team who would, hopefully, be inclusive – not necessarily exclusively high-level commercial  
people – but would actually deliver a better vision.

So I am clear now as to where I go, because if the Assembly goes for amendment 9, there is no  
guarantee that we will come to a coherent outcome with all the other Propositions.

2115 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dyke.

**Deputy Leadbeater:** Can I try another 26(1), please, madam?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Sorry, I did not quite catch that.

2120 **Deputy Leadbeater:** Can I try another 26(1), please?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Would those who wish to continue to debate stand in their place?  
Do you still wish for this to go to a vote?

2125 **Deputy Leadbeater:** No.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dyke, carry on.

**Deputy Dyke:** Thank you, madam.

2130 I tend to agree with the analysis of Deputy Gollop, and I thought I had agreed with the analysis of Deputy Inder, but I think he may have confused, respectfully, what he intended to vote for. Can I give you my analysis?

I still agree with what I said this morning, amazingly! (*Laughter*) I had planned to vote in favour of amendment 8, and still think that is a good option, therefore I would vote against amendment 9, which I think is a hurried compromise and possibly not the best one. The reason I was going to vote in favour of amendment 8 was to avoid taking a decision on a particular harbour option today, because I do not think we have the commercial input that Deputy Helyar was suggesting that we need – and indeed, we do need – in order to take one of the big decisions. I was leaning to harbour options 5 and 6, but I do not think today I could possibly vote for those without the commercial knowledge that I need. So if I am forced to vote today on an option for the harbours, I could not vote for 5 or 6; I would have to vote against that, and possibly for one of the others.

2140 I think that amendment 8 was the right one, amendment 9 is the wrong one, and we should vote against amendment 9. Thank you.

2145 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld.

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

I agree with John's excellent speech – *Deputy Gollop's* excellent speech, my apologies – and Deputy Dyke as well.

2150 I want to see amendment 8 – must not call it an option. Amendment 8, for me, addressed the issues I raised this morning. Two main things: commercial ports – I want commercial input, I want commercial people looking over the work that has been done to date and helping to advise on that. Amendment 8 puts in place that group and has them involved in actually coming back to this Assembly and helping to advise us on what port options we should be selecting.

2155 Also, the Government Work Plan: we are being asked to commit to £4 million now to continue a workstream, to initiate a workstream, with a £360 million-plus price tag at the other end. We are being pointed down a pathway of initiating that in isolation from all the other priorities and considerations of the Government Work Plan, and the compromises and the trade-offs and the prioritisations we have to go through.

2160 For both those reasons, amendment 8 – which was also called a sursis, or referred to as a sursis – which, effectively, does delay the decision but brings in a group of external people to help oversee that process and to advise on it, is the one I support. I will be voting against amendment 9, and I want to vote in favour of amendment 8.

Thank you.

2165

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Oliver.

**Deputy Oliver:** Thank you.

I am a little bit confused – amendment 8, amendment 9, and the Propositions.

2170 For a start, I am going to go backwards just a little bit to get onto amendment 9, if you allow me. With amendment 8, I was very worried, because it said a very short timescale with the Pool, but it did not say about the – in the main Propositions, Proposition 4: to direct the Development & Planning Authority to look at the Local Planning Briefs. Without the Local Planning Briefs, you cannot do the marina pools, because it is part of the Harbour Action Area.

2175 So I was worried about amendment 8 in that respect. But then going to amendment 9, I am worried that we are actually tying ourselves into just one scheme to go forward, without actually looking more at the economic drivers as to actually how to pay for this scheme. I understand you need to start somewhere, and to be honest I think that this report is probably a good foundation of how to build.

2180 I do not like the way that we have actually conducted ourselves today. I think we have been very ‘macho man’, rather than actually thinking about things in more detail. For me – this is my personal view, rather than looking at the DPA’s – I think we do need more of a direction of what the States actually want to do. I get what Deputy Gollop says, ‘Should we be making this decision now?’ But we are going to have to make the decision at some point, and I think it is probably better to make  
2185 it sooner rather than later, before we have actually spent more money on this.

I was on the seafront enhancement last term, and we did absolutely nothing apart from tinkering with six sites, which I think only one actually come to fruition. The main problem with the Seafront Enhancement Area was that it had no governing body; really, it had no proper structure; and the biggest thing was it had no money. Amendment 8 did not really say anything about the financials; I do not know if it had any financials attached to it or what, but at least with 9 it has got some  
2190 financials. I hope the whole lot of money will not be spent and I hope P&R will keep a very close track on what is being spent on it, to make sure money is not wasted.

But I think, overall, as much as I do not really like it, I will be voting for amendment 9.

2195 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Leadbeater.

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

I get what Deputy Oliver is saying about Proposition 4, but as I see it, Proposition 4 is only required if Proposition 1 is successful, and under amendment 8, there will be no Proposition 1, so  
2200 Proposition 4 is not needed. Is that right? Yeah? Okay.

I started in the same camp as Deputy Inder when I listened to the start of his speech, but he talked himself into supporting amendment 9 over amendment 8. I agree exactly with Deputy Gollop, Deputy Dyke, Deputy Meerveld. I understand the trade-off compromise with amendment 9, but I still think amendment 8 is better, and I have not heard anything in debate to convince me otherwise.  
2205 So I will be voting against amendment 9, hoping to vote for amendment 8.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Gabriel.

2210 **Deputy Gabriel:** Thank you, madam.

To me, this is a compromise, but is it the best of both options or is it the worst of both options – be it that amendment 8 and 9.

To me, there is an elephant in the room, that we have had a hasty decision over lunch time and have STSB and P&R become absolute bed-fellows? To me, what has changed – albeit perhaps a  
2215 good change in a short period of lunch time, compared to the atmosphere in the Assembly this morning? Have STSB rolled over? Will P&R be the big brother? Will they be flexing their muscles over STSB? That is one of my concerns.

For me, is this not just another delaying motion or amendment? Let us not forget that it has taken two years for STSB to get this far, and in various iterations – there has been the Ports Master

2220 Plan – and we are still no further ahead, in my eyes; our ports are still sub-optimal in many areas, and we know that they need a significant amount of millions' spending on them just to stand still on where we are.

If we go down the road of an Eastern Seaboard Regeneration Board, where does that stop? The eastern seaboard, for me, is that Saint Martin's Point up to *[inaudible]* and everything in between?  
2225 Again, more delays. We know we need action this day. As I said before, our harbours are in definitely a sub-optimal state. I am hoping Deputy Helyar, as the proposer of the amendment, can give me some sort of reassurances that this compromise is the best of both worlds. Really, some catalyst has to happen. We know we are always going to need a port at St Peter Port, and it is the jewel in our crown. So why does the eastern seaboard regeneration have to take everything into account around  
2230 that? Why can't the catalyst be 'Do something with our harbours, do it now and let us have some regeneration around that.'

We are always asking for a direction and 'Action this day', but is amendment 9 – and for that matter, amendment 8 – more a direction to delay? For me, I think we need action this day, and unfortunately, I cannot support amendment 9 *and* amendment 8, because I do believe they are  
2235 delaying the inevitable, and we do need to move forward with regenerating our ports. I welcome debate on the future harbour development.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Fairclough.

2240 **Deputy Fairclough:** Thank you, madam.

I think I understand what this amendment number 9 is trying to achieve now; thank you to those Members who have spoken and tried to elaborate on what we are trying to achieve here.

But picking up on a point from Deputy Oliver, I would be grateful when he is summing up on  
2245 this part of the debate if Deputy Helyar could explain the figure of £975,000, where that figure has come from and what, indeed, we will get for it.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Moakes.

2250 **Deputy Moakes:** Thank you, madam.

This morning, we heard a number of highly charged and highly emotional speeches. These were all made by people who have Guernsey's best interests at heart. The main cause of the disagreement, I think, was a misunderstanding on both sides. Over lunch, a new amendment,  
2255 number 9, was put together, initially to remove this misunderstanding. I do not think either side has rolled over; I think both sides have got together and come up with a good compromise. I will certainly be voting for amendment number 9.

Thank you.

2260 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy de Lisle.

**Deputy de Lisle:** Madam, I am very uncomfortable with what I have been hearing from the Assembly. I think many people out there, listening in, will be actually frightened. We are talking big money, here: £4 million of investment in further studies; £360 million. As Deputy Helyar has been  
2265 stating, we are not ready for numbers like that, given our current state of deficit and so on and so forth, and the uncertainty in the economy generally.

In terms of this amendment, 8 and 9, I think I am afraid of a development and regeneration board, to start with, bringing in outside experts without local knowledge of priorities for traders, for workers and residents living and working within the Town centre. There is also the importance of  
2270 the quay through-flow to traffic and the harbour parking – so essential to town traders; to office, retail, hospitality workers; and residents. All this is meddling with the situation that we have at the

moment. The danger is bringing in people that are going to, perhaps, muddy waters and provide plans that are totally strange to the Guernsey psyche.

2275 I am very nervous about this. I will not be approving any of this. I think that the debate really has unsettled, I am sure, a lot of people and certainly myself.

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

2280 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Yes, Madam, thank you. I was not intending to speak, but given that this is such a large-ticket item, we all should really give a view on this.

I think it is really regrettable the way that this debate has played out today. I really hope that this is not a sign of things to come. We have got the education debate coming up in a few weeks, and I implore every single Member of this Assembly to take a collegiate, collaborative, and mature approach to all our debating going here on in. **(Two Members:** Hear, hear.) I think that it has bruised quite a lot of people coming into the Assembly today, having this first experience, something that we had many times in the last term. It is unedifying. It does not do anybody any good. So that would be my first plea.

2290 I have really taken an awful lot of steer from what Deputy Gollop has said, and Deputy Oliver, Deputy Leadbeater, Deputy Dyke, Deputy Meerveld. For me, I think this has been extremely confusing, insofar as we have not had this higher strategic view of exactly what it is we are trying to aim for. This has been done in a rather piecemeal fashion. But I do not think this is the fault of STSB; I do think that this – I do not want to lay blame, actually, at anybody's door – I think that this has been the evolution of this particular project with the inertia of the Seafront Enhancement Committee, area – whatever it was called – that Deputy Oliver sat on last term that actually did not really do anything – not through any fault of her own, or anyone else's fault; it just did not go anywhere.

2295 I am loathe to support amendment 9, but actually I feel compelled to because I dislike combination 5 so much that I really would like to keep it in play in order that I can vote against it, and I hope that everyone else does as well. For many reasons. I do like the Brouard/Prow amendment. So whilst wanting to instinctively almost go back to the drawing board, to a degree, and get some governance over the top of this to start sorting it out – which I think is a bit of a messy situation; amendment 8 offers that – but then not wanting to lose a lot of the good work that has been done by STSB, but also wanting to knock out that combination 5 and Proposition 1, I will be voting, reluctantly, for amendment 9.

2305 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Haskins.

**Deputy Haskins:** Thank you, madam.

2310 If amendment 8 was going to go ahead after amendment 9, then I would vote for this amendment; however, as the intention is to retract amendment 8, I am afraid I will not support it. You heard the intention of amendment 8 is not to pause the work, but to join it up with other work-streams, be a little bit more holistic, and attach it to the eastern regeneration, and have a look at all the other opportunities that it can bring. I agree with Deputies Gollop, Dyke, Meerveld, Leadbeater, and some parts of various other Members, such as Dudley-Owen, Inder and Oliver – the way we have conducted ourselves has not been, in my view, great.

2315 Proposition 1 of the policy letter is not ambitious enough for me. If we are going to spend this sort of money, there is so much that we can gain from it, why don't we reach for the stars?

If amendment 9 is passed and 8 is withdrawn, I am minded to vote against Proposition 1 of the policy letter.

2320 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

Just so that Members are aware, the IT is now back working.  
Deputy Trott.

2325 **Deputy Trott:** Madam, I should be brief, because one of the things I have learnt during my time in this Assembly is that when the opportunity for compromise and consensus is presented over conflict, one should grab it, and grab it with both hands, and that is precisely what the Policy & Resources, in conjunction with their colleagues on the STSB, has done.

I could use a whole load of analogies, but this morning, I thought, 'Here is a group of people in a punt, rowing to Herm, whereas we have got the potential to all jump on the Trident. Not only will we get there quicker, but there is much more likelihood that there will be plenty of us on-board.' So whenever I see Committees like this come together, I am attracted to that consensus approach.

2335 Interestingly and skilfully, amendment 8 sought to delete a whole load of Propositions and create some new ones. Yet interestingly, this has been so skilfully developed that these additional Propositions – i.e. Proposition 9 – can be added on to the existing Propositions almost seamlessly, despite the fact that Proposition 2 in the STSB report refers to a date of December 2022, and Amendment 9 refers to a date of December 2021. Having looked closely at those dates, it seems to me that there is nothing –

I gladly give way to my friend, Deputy Roffey.

2340 **Deputy Roffey:** I would like to point out that I think they are talking about different things. I think the 'December 2021' in amendment 9, as proposed by P&R, is actually proposals to set up this body; the 'December 2022' is to actually bring something back about what the conclusions may be.

2345 **Deputy Trott:** Through you, madam, Deputy Roffey is quite right. That was to be my point: there is no issue as regards the dates.

So I shall unreservedly support amendment 9, and I very much hope it is successful.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson.

2350 **Deputy Parkinson:** Thank you, madam.

What the STSB wants to get out of today's debate, when they finally conclude, is: firstly, some direction from this Assembly as to what options they want us to look into, because we need to narrow the list down – there are too many options on the table at the moment for it to be sensible to investigate and evaluate them all; and secondly, of course, we would like some money to help us do the work.

2360 The options which have been presented to the Assembly have been developed and evaluated by our harbour professionals with professional advice from outside the Island. They are options which can address the technical requirements of our commercial ports. This has to be the keystone of the seafront area proposals that may come forward for the wider development of the whole of the eastern seaboard.

2365 But the commercial ports, fundamentally, have to work. These are the lifeline ports through which all of our food, many of our other products, etc., come to the Island, along with many passengers. Fundamentally, any scheme that this Assembly may come up with – and I really hope the Assembly will not try designing harbours – any scheme that it may come up with which does not actually, technically deliver that fundamental functionality of workable ports is going to be flawed from the outset, and ultimately, will cause a lot of damage to this Island.

2370 So we have presented the Assembly with a bunch of options which could technically work. They have very different price tags, there are a lot of other environmental and aesthetic considerations to be taken into account, not just price, but they all potentially could deliver workable commercial ports. All we need this Assembly to do is to say, 'We do not like four or five of these. Can you take those off the table and concentrate the work that you are doing now on the remaining one or two?'

2375 Carrying amendment 8 will effectively stop the work on the development of the ports, for the reasons I gave this morning. First of all, in deleting all of the Propositions, which is what amendment 8 does, STSB will be given no steer at all on where the Assembly wants to go, and of course it will



be given no money. So it will have no direction and no funding; it will effectively have to stop work. I mentioned that this should be of particular concern, for example, to people who want to build a marina in the Pool, because until we know what commercial activities are retained in St Peter Port, for example, we do not know what areas of the harbour have to be left clear for the manoeuvring of, for example, Condor vessels. I will not repeat myself on that. Essentially, just take it as a sort of general comment: if amendment 8 is carried, work on the commercial harbours in Guernsey will effectively stop.

2380

That may be what some Members want. I sense in the speeches of some of the Members – Deputy Gollop, for example – that they do not want to make a decision – that they want to ‘kick the can down the road’, I think, was his words. I do not know why they think the decisions will be any easier in a year’s time, but they do not want to make a decision now. I have heard arguments this morning that we should wait until the Government Work Plan has been approved and, I do not know, the public finances are a bit more secure or whatever. There may be reasons for kicking the can down the road; I do not think they are very creditable reasons. Ultimately, Guernsey needs to have functioning commercial ports. This is a key part of our infrastructure; these are not optional extras. These are absolutely the lifelines that keep our economy and this Island alive, going.

2385

2390

I think the decisions need to be taken sooner rather than later. Clearly, eventually, whatever plans are approved, they are likely to cost a lot of money, but the States is not actually being asked to spend £360 million today; it is being asked to commit to spending £4 million to discover what can work. Because despite all of the research done by very capable people on the technical options available to us, there are still things we do not know about some of these projects. As Deputy Roffey mentioned this morning, we do not know how much water there would be in a harbour south of Longue Hougue at low spring tides, and a piece of work needs to be done to discover the answer to that question. Then we need to think about, do any restrictions that that might impose interact with restrictions that affect the ferry routes in Jersey in such a way that it would make life very difficult for Condor and any other shipping company to operate into Guernsey? The fundamental criteria, as I say, must be that at the end of the day our lifeline ports are able to operate.

2395

2400

I am obviously going to support amendment 9. I think it is a sensible compromise. Effectively, the key thing from our point of view is it keeps Propositions 1 to 4 on the table. Those may be struck out later in debate. I have heard what Deputy Inder and others have said about not liking Proposition 1. Clearly, there is an amendment, the St Pier/Helyar Amendment, to change the scope of what remains within the review. I think all of those debates will be healthy and can be conducted productively to eventually, hopefully, at the end of the day, arrive at something the Assembly can agree on as being what we should leave in scope at this stage of the process.

2405

I think the only credible reason for supporting amendment 8 over amendment 9 is, effectively, if you want to stop the STSB doing any more work, you want to wait until some new body, as yet un-constituted, has been set up by the end of this year; and you want that new body, effectively, to take over the process of developing plans for new commercial port facilities.

2410

Fine, if that is the view of the Assembly and you want work on this project to stop, you want to wait until some other group of people have been put together by P&R to carry on with the work, then that work will restart whenever that group gets into a position where it is able to start bringing Propositions forward to the Assembly. If that group is constituted by the end of 2021, then it might be reasonable to assume that they may start coming back to the Assembly by the end of 2022 – that is just a date I am pulling out of the air. But, eventually, somebody will come back to the Assembly with a range of proposals to address the issues around our commercial port facilities and Members will get a fresh chance to discuss what the options are and to decide which ones you want to pursue.

2415

2420

But I go back to my speech this morning: the most important step on the journey is the first step, and we are asking this Assembly to take that first step, to give us some direction, to let us get on with refining the options that, technically, can address the Island’s needs, and to come back to the Assembly in due course with a fully worked up business case, which of course, will include the many wider issues around the existence of the ports which we can put forward. But they will just

2425

clearly be recommendations that at least satisfy Guernsey's technical requirements for commercial port facilities. This is key infrastructure.

2430 I sense there is a big tendency at the moment in the Assembly – I do not know why – just to duck issues and kick cans down the road and to delay. This is not the first Assembly where that tendency has been in evidence. I used the phrase this morning 'States of Prevarication'. I think the previous States that I have been in have often been accused of being the 'States of Prevarication';  
2435 sadly, I think the culture remains pretty much the same, and all the rhetoric about 'Action today' has fundamentally gone out the window. We are being asked to delay action to some time in the indefinite future, where some, as yet, undefined group of people will help us to make our minds up.

Really, we were elected to make decisions on behalf of the population of Guernsey; I think they have a right to expect us to use our judgement and to show some leadership. But if people just want to kick the can down the road and hope someone else will address the problem and some  
2440 other group of people will get together and come and tell us what to do, then that of course is the prerogative of the Assembly.

I very much hope that Members will support option 9 and will not support amendment 8.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Taylor.

2445 **Deputy Taylor:** Thank you, madam. I have not really prepared any speech, here, and I want to be careful not to drift into the general debate.

But I feel very strongly against Proposition 1 in the original policy letter. I think it is a really rubbish suggestion. I do not think it really achieves what we are trying to do, which is why I really  
2450 strongly wanted to support amendment number 8.

It is very interesting listening to Deputy Parkinson there talking about kicking the can down the road; I think that is quite an unfair judgement. I do not feel like I am kicking the can down the road because I disagree with the suggestion that is put forward. I can see that a whole menu of options has been put together, and I would not have voted for any one of them. That does not mean that I  
2455 am kicking the can down the road; it just means I disagree with the suggestion.

We are talking about a very substantial amount of money; even before we get to the stage of building, we are talking about £4 million. If I do not like the proposal, I am not going to pledge money towards furthering it. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Just because we have spent £800,000 developing these proposals so far, does that really mean anything? Yes, it is a lot of money and it  
2460 is wasted, but what is that saying about good money after bad? Just because we have spent £800,000, if we come up with something terrible, I do not see the point.

If I were to use an analogy, like Deputy Trott, if I was sat in a restaurant, I have ordered a gin and tonic, it is pretty nice, but then I look at the menu and think, 'Blimey! That is all expensive stuff, and I do not really like any of it,' do I go through with the meal? Do I then order something I do not  
2465 like? Do I sit there not enjoying it and then have a massive bill at the end? Or do I just finish my gin and tonic and go?' I tell you what, I would just finish my gin and tonic and go. (*Laughter*) I would hope everyone else would do the same with their gin and tonic. I will hope they will throw out amendment 9 –

Go on, then, I will give way to Deputy Roffey.

2470 **Deputy Roffey:** Can I just say to the Deputy? If he does not like any of the drinks on my drinks menu, vote Contre, Contre, Contre, Contre. That will be a decision.

**Deputy Taylor:** Yes, I am grateful to Deputy Roffey for the advice, and my intention was to vote  
2475 Pour for amendment 8 and then to go Contre for the whole thing.

But otherwise, if we are going to have to sit through a whole load of amendments that all, basically, work around that same Proposition 1 – bar the exception of Deputy Brouard and Deputy Prow for their easterly arm amendment – I do not see the point in sitting through that. I just think it is a waste of time.

2480 There are some good amendments that I fully support – Deputy Kazantseva-Miller and Deputy  
Haskins – for looking at the bigger picture, people wanting to explore the proper commercial  
opportunities that we have, instead of just saying, ‘But if we do this then we can regenerate St Peter  
Port or we can regenerate St Sampson’s. We will lose all the fuel tankers,’ and all this stuff. It is all  
hypothetical; there is no solid evidence to say that we will do that. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) If we  
2485 just kept going as we are, we are seeing a downward trend in fuel anyway, we are seeing an upward  
trend in electric vehicles. We will probably lose – (*Interjection by Deputy Trott*) Sorry, I missed that  
from Deputy Trott – (**Deputy Trott:** And milk!) Yes! We might need a harbour to import some more  
quantities of milk.

2490 So I am very grateful to see all the amendments that have come forward from various Deputies,  
but as they all hinge around that same Proposition 1 – bar Prow and Brouard, and Deputy Inder –  
I will give way to him.

**Deputy Inder:** Thank you, Deputy Taylor. I am just hoping Deputy Taylor is not thinking that if  
he, when we come to a final vote – whatever that means, and it might be a mixture of Proposition  
2495 1 as it is or as amended or as inserted amendments – I hope he understands that, by defeating  
Proposition 1, it does not mean that the harbour will not get fixed, the marina would not be  
submitted for planning by December 2022, and if any of the other amendments are inserted in and  
successful, they would still happen. What slightly worries me – through you, madam – is that Deputy  
Taylor might be thinking that defeat of Proposition 1 means nothing happens at all, because that  
2500 could not be further from the truth.

**Deputy Taylor:** Thank you to Deputy Inder, there. To clarify, no, I do not want to see nothing  
happening in the harbour; what I would like to see is the STSB not to keep kicking the can down  
the road and actually maintain the harbour, (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) (*Interjections*) because  
2505 we have some good facilities. I would happily ... You did not put that forward – through you,  
madam – Deputy Roffey did not put that forward as his preferred option, to get that going. I would  
like to see the harbour fully repaired. It seems to be working now – I will just sum up and then you  
can stand up, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

I would urge Members to chuck out amendment 9 so we can vote on amendment 8, and  
2510 hopefully, we can put this whole thing to bed and just get the harbour fixed as it is.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Taylor.  
Deputy Helyar, your reply.

2515 **Deputy Helyar:** Madam Deputy Bailiff, I think it is probably fair to say that most Members appear  
to be entrenched in their positions one way or the other, so I will not spend a great deal of time  
summing up. I think people have expressed a view one way or another.

2520 There have been some comments which require a response. In connection with the £975,000  
which Deputy Fairclough raised, my understanding – and I do not wish to mislead the Assembly,  
but I have not got the detail to confirm it – but I understand that is a previous vote associated with  
eastern seaboard work. If I am wrong, I hope he will not punish me for it. I am very happy to go  
away and make sure that I have got my detail right. Unfortunately, this was drafted, as you will  
understand, in great haste at lunch time whilst the computer system was not working, so we were  
2525 exchanging photos via WhatsApp at one stage.

Deputy de Sausmarez asked for some reassurance about membership, etc. – effectively, the  
constitution of what is recommended by P&R in terms of the Regeneration Board. What is 6A under  
this amendment propositions indicates that: the Policy & Resources will report back with the ‘the  
mandate, membership, accountability’ etc. of that group. At the moment, it is a subcommittee of  
2530 P&R and P&R is fully entitled to select whomsoever it wishes in that regard.

2535 One of the things which was said quite strongly this morning was about lack of continuity and so on. Certain comments – *regrettable* comments, I would have to say – were made about conflicts of interest and so on. Two members of STSB, the non-voting members, are on the P&R subcommittee, and the whole purpose of that was to create continuity; it was not to create conflicts of interest.

**Deputy Roffey:** Point of correction: they are both *voting* members.

2540 **Deputy Helyar:** They are both voting members, I do apologise.  
 Deputy Parkinson, again, made some very excellent and salient points. It was never the intention of Item 8 to cause a suspension in the work of STSB. It is vital – as he said, again, and reinforced – in terms of resolving the commercial port element is vital to finding out where the other parts fit together with it, and I completely agree with that. What we are trying to do is get these two Items working together at the same time so that we do not reach a point in two years’ time where  
 2545 Wallingford has done all its excellent work and we find Deputies will not make a decision on that because they have not seen the wider issues that are associated with it.

I am grateful for the comments of support. I was concerned this morning at some of what I would describe as false narratives about P&R – taking over and power-grabs and so on. I understand some of the language was unfortunate and some of the Members associated with that have  
 2550 apologised since then. What I would say is that this amendment should be obviously demonstrable as a P&R which is willing to compromise and to sit down and discuss things with Committees and not try to bully things through or to force ideas which Members do not want to see. But we do have a role – it is a delegated role; I only have one vote, same as every other Members in here – we do have a role to lead and we do have a role to bring policy together and make sure it is done in a co-ordinated way, and that was the basic idea and premise behind amendment 8.  
 2555

As I said, Members have decided, probably, one way or the other how they are going to vote on this so I would just say, thank you very much for the debate, and let us hope we can be a bit more positive and work together more collaboratively going forward.

Thank you.

2560

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Right, is there any request for a recorded vote?

**A Member:** Yes, please, madam.

2565

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 23, Contre 15, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 1*

**POUR**

Deputy Le Tocq  
 Deputy Matthews  
 Deputy Moakes  
 Deputy Oliver  
 Deputy Parkinson  
 Deputy Prow  
 Alderney Rep. Roberts  
 Deputy Roffey  
 Deputy Soulsby  
 Deputy Trott  
 Deputy Vermeulen  
 Deputy Blin  
 Deputy Brouard

**CONTRE**

Deputy Leadbeater  
 Deputy Mahoney  
 Deputy McKenna  
 Deputy Meerveld  
 Deputy Queripel  
 Deputy St Pier  
 Deputy Taylor  
 Deputy Aldwell  
 Deputy Burford  
 Deputy de Lisle  
 Deputy Dyke  
 Deputy Gabriel  
 Deputy Gollop

**NE VOTE PAS**

Alderney Rep.  
 Snowdon

**ABSENT**

Deputy Murray

Deputy Bury  
Deputy Cameron  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Fairclough  
Deputy Falla  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Helyar  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller

Deputy Haskins  
Deputy Le Tissier

**The Deputy Bailiff:** In relation to amendment 9, there voted Pour 23, Contre 15, 1 Je ne vote pas, and 1 absentee. Therefore, it is passed.

Deputy Helyar, do you wish to withdraw amendment 8?

2570

**Deputy Helyar:** Yes, please, madam.

[Amendment 6](#)

*To delete proposition 1 and proposition 4 and replace with the following:*

- 1. To approve Combination 3 as the preferred scheme for the future development of Guernsey's harbours i.e. to construct a new port east of the QEII Marina, primarily for international passengers and unitised freight, freeing up space within the existing St Peter Port harbour. Improve the leisure offering in St Peter Port and carry out essential repairs to the current harbours, as set out in the Policy Letter and in particular in paragraphs 6.17 and 6.18.*
- 4. If proposition 1 is approved, to direct the Development & Planning Authority to take into account the approval of Combination 3 as the preferred scheme for the future development of Guernsey's harbours in the preparation of the Harbour Action Area Local Planning Briefs for St Peter Port and St Sampson's.*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I now propose we deal with amendment 6. Deputy Brouard.

2575

**Deputy Brouard:** Thank you. Can I ask for it be read, if that would be possible?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Pardon?

**Deputy Brouard:** May I ask for it be read?

2580

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes.

States' Greffier, would you mind reading amendment 6?

*The States' Greffier read Amendment 6.*

2585

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

**Deputy Brouard:** Thank you very much.

2590

Just a couple of points to start with. I think Deputy Parkinson made an extremely good point earlier on: this is just to give that initial steer of where we would like to see our ports go.

As part of the regeneration of the whole of the east coast, if we want to do anything, the first thing we want to do is find out where our shipping is going to go. Do we want it in St Peter Port? Do we want it in Havelet Bay? Do we want it to go to St Sampson's? Do we want to build a new port at Longue Hougue? But we need to make those decisions first; then we can decide what we are going to do with the other items, because that is where 98% of our goods come in, by the sea, by

2595

ships. We need to find the right place for them first, and then we can build around. To do it the other way around, I think, becomes more difficult.

2600 Also, just picking up a very good point from Deputy Inder: it is where we want the big ships to go. We need to find out that part first, and then we can look at how we move our other infrastructure around. But we need to ensure that we can have our imports, not only for the next 30 years, but from my point of view, for the next 100.

2605 I would also like to thank STSB for their show of options and all the work that Jacobs has done, because that has given us a really good, firm background. We have the information in front of us; it is now for us as politicians to weigh up the different elements and where we think we can use those elements to the advantage of the Island. I also thank them for their briefings and the engagements that we have had with members of their staff in preparing this.

We are only going to have this once in my lifetime, and I think we all deserve to take the time to get it right.

2610 There is lots I do not know. I am not a mariner, although my father was a boater and a fisherman all his life; he even went fishing out of St Peter Port during the War carrying a German guard on-board so that they did not do a runner and to ensure all the fish were accounted for, (*Laughter*) except for those that were quickly and silently slipped under deck to the bilge to be taken for tea later.

2615 But I do know that Jersey's St Helier is basically built on a beach and is tidal. I know that building a harbour at Longue Hougue will also be built on a beach and is tidal. However, St Peter Port is a natural harbour and has been used as such since at least Roman times; even Asterix was using it. It will not be tidal for shipping or for ferries.

2620 My preference, and that of Deputy Prow, is to expand and enhance St Peter Port. The design work that will come from our proposing this option which was in there will come later. The actual shape of the port and whether it is 10 knots this way or four metres the other way, that will all come later. We have got some designs that are in the papers and I will refer to them in a few minutes. But all that detailed design work is what we then need to move up on. Exactly the configuration of the ro-ro ramps, the exact length of quays – all that comes later.

2625 I will also give some of our thoughts for the future of St Sampson's and how, in due course, that area can still be released to the leisure industry, as all freight and passengers can be accommodated at St Peter Port.

2630 The energy market is going through substantial changes. As we de-carbon our economy in the next 20 or 30 years, or the next 10 to 20 years' time, we will not be seeing just the odd few electric vans, but electric lorries, maybe even ships, which is a game-changer with regard to the importation of hydrocarbons, and also how we move bulk freight around the Island.

2635 We also need to look at other future opportunities across Belle Grève Bay. With rising sea levels, a 2-metre wall built along Les Banques may not be pleasant, but it may prove essential. Not that I am advocating it, but maybe, in years to come, a tidal lagoon generating electricity may solve several problems: protecting the east coast, generating electricity, and creating a safe – or at least, safer – body of water for leisure. But that is for another day; what we have in front of us now is to do those first steps to make sure that we have a port fit for purpose for the next 100 years.

2640 The options in front of us today – and it has been put forward by the combinations that STSB has put – are compromises. There are trade-offs. A tidal port may be a bit cheaper to build. Maybe we might have better facilities at another place. Maybe something will be more expensive. There are trade-offs in all of our decisions that we are going to be making. We are on the cusp of making a large strategic decision, and in some ways the size and scale of the proposals – whether that be combination 5 or combination 3, as proposed by myself and Deputy Prow – are fairly modest to what our ancestors drew up in the 1800s.

2645 There was a fascinating article in the *Press* back in May 2012 by Rob Batiste outlining how the States finally, after some 22 years of discussions, gave the final go-ahead in 1851 for the development of the quays and also the wider harbour. If anybody wants to see some photographs

of the construction, I have actually got a copy of the *Press* and some of the pictures that they had back there of how the quays were done.

2650 So do not be too hard on yourselves if we take a little time to ensure we have the right combination, not only for ourselves and our generation but well into the future. As mentioned in paragraph 1.4, we are looking 30 years ahead as the States, but I think, myself and Deputy Prow, we want to look forward for the next 100 years, as our forefathers did. It is such a big investment, we need to get it right, and we need to get it right first time.

2655 I think I should also make it clear that with combination 3, as well as the other combinations, they all include the maintenance of the harbour, which I understand from the Billet is estimated at about £35 million. I am somewhat disappointed and probably ashamed as well that the maintenance has not been done. I am just as guilty as anyone else, although I write every now and then to the harbour masters to say, 'This needs fixing' or 'That needs fixing'. But it has not been done on my watch so far, and it is very important that we do maintain what we have.

2660 With the ports operating as commercial businesses, perhaps our import tariffs need to be reflective of the cost not only of the operation of the ports, but also the maintenance. It would be a shame if many millions are spent on big problems which were only small problems yesterday. But that genie has left the bottle, and we have the opportunity to correct this state of affairs.

2665 As with any combination that is chosen, there will be ongoing maintenance, as well as the backlog, as well as continuing to maintain the two original ports. So St Peter Port will still need to be maintained. Even after we have spent £35 million maintaining St Peter Port and St Sampson's, maintenance work will still then also need to be done in the future.

2670 I think we are being too complacent. Over many years, I have been advised that the size of ferries is increasing, making them more viable, and smaller vessels, such as that Condor use, are in short supply. We have them because they are the only ones that fit into our infrastructure. We have the opportunity to increase the size of our infrastructure to help future-proof ourselves – and when I say 'ourselves', I am meaning the Bailiwick of Guernsey; I am not necessarily looking to future-proof Jersey. This gives us more of an opportunity to add new routes. A 200-metre ferry going from the UK to France could call in at Guernsey; it cannot now. But most of the work in the harbour plans are all based around 135-metre ferries, which is roughly the size of the ferries we have now, and I think that is an opportunity we are missing. I think we should future-proof our ports, looking at the market going ahead.

2675 It is much like the position we find ourselves in with tank ships in St Sampson's harbour, where the harbour dictates the size of the ship it can accommodate, which is around 80 metres. We now, in option 5, are working, as I said, around ship sizes of 135 metres-140 metres.

2680 Although this is the present position, it is also dictated by the size of shipping St Helier can take. Ferries have been increasing in size, and I believe we should be planning for ferries of over 200 metres. Even if the quay is 200 metres, it can still take smaller ferries. But the reverse is not true: if the quay is 135 metres, you cannot get a 200-metre ferry alongside. I have spent many hours in meetings with advisors who advise our facilities are constrained. What are we proposing to do but perpetuate that particular position? We need to plan for larger ferries, just as our forefathers did when they built a harbour far bigger than they needed, and we have benefited ever since, for the best part of 120 years, to use up the space that they gave us.

2685 The real Achilles' heel in option 5 is that we are moving one tidal harbour, St Sampson's, to another harbour, Longue Hougue, and I am struggling to understand why we would do this. Again, having been in so many meetings where we have commented on the tidal nature of St Helier, and yet we are going to be putting our freight there. But possibly, if I read the runes correctly, eventually passengers – our port will also be tidal, because if you read 1.14 – I will actually just do that because it is quite an important paragraph:

2690 As with our current ports, any new development would represent a long-term investment to meet the island's requirements for generations. Just as our existing harbours have adapted and evolved over decades to meet the island's changing needs, so too would any new facility. Therefore while the STSB proposes to take forward Combination 5, the design of a new northern port could be such that it can be equipped at a later date to accommodate all commercial

freight and international passenger activities currently located at St Peter Port Harbour. This would provide the flexibility and adaptability for any developments in, say, vessel design which may make this a more favourable option in the future.

I read that as there is a plan in place, I think, eventually, or thought, that we would use Longue Hougue as our main port for visitors and for freight. I have concerns about that.

2700 I disagree with the last sentence of that paragraph, because that needs to be contrasted with paragraph 7.25 in the report, which is the elephant in the room – or rather, the whale – which is not even mentioned in the executive summary: Longue Hougue is a tidal beach – shallow water, strong currents. Described in 7.25: ‘for a quarter of the year – 93 days – there will be access issues due to the tidal stream.’ That is not accounting for normal bad weather or winds of over 30 knots, because with winds over 30 knots the big ships cannot get into St Peter Port. We are going to have those  
2705 same issues with big ships not being able to get into Longue Hougue even if the tide is right, which renders access to port prohibited, either at Longue Hougue or St Peter Port, or just general storms, or even breakdowns.

I appreciate we say that it is not a problem for freights; they can quite happily wait until the tides turn, where they sit out at anchor or burn fuel holding their position, or they will just schedule that timing. But it is hardly an ideal start for a problem that we already know we have got. As I mentioned, if I read the runes correctly, there is a strong possibility we will seek to move our passenger ferries also to Longue Hougue. It is bad enough, in my opinion, to have St Helier tidally constrained, and we already dance around their schedules. But if we are also constrained, I am sure that passengers would not be happy with disruptive timetables or waiting offshore for their ship to come in. I just  
2710 think the opportunity to get our ports right – at this time, this just looks like a backwards step, and is, for me, a real game-changer for option 5.

I am also not convinced, as a ferry passenger, I wish to disembark at Longue Hougue, next to the waste transfer station and the cattle incinerator. It would also mean that most of the passengers in cars will then set off along The Banks to St Peter Port. I make this point now because I will be  
2720 using that argument the other way around in a minute. It is just that there will be traffic along The Banks one way or the other. There will also be some movement of commercial vehicles from St Peter Port to St Sampson’s if option 3 is taken forward. As I said at the beginning, there are compromises and trade-offs with all the options.

One problem I do have in offering combination 3 – and this is only at the moment, because we have just got the indicative costs – is that it is more expensive, so I just want to touch on the costs. Although the headline figure is £460 million, this includes a 66% optimism bias, as detailed in 6.2. Without this figure, the cost reduces to some £250 million; adding back the £35 million maintenance and the cruise pontoons puts the figure at some £287 million; deducting the 66% optimism bias from option 5, and you have £180 million; add back the £35 million for the repairs, plus £25 million  
2730 for the car park, and it is £242 million.

The difference when you take away the optimism bias, which is the point I am getting to, is about £40 million, whereas with the optimism bias added in, it is about £100 million. It just shows how you can play with figures when you multiply things up. The two are a lot closer than it would at first  
2735 glance seem.

There are also some options for income in combination 3 which are not touched in the paper and which you do not get with combination 5, and these income streams can be extremely important.

Another issue is the bulk fuel, or the hydrocarbon import, as we have, basically, three options, as outlined in 4.17: 1, always stay afloat; 2, we can use a buoy or a dolphin and pipe ashore, as highlighted in combination 4, or we can use ISO containers. But there is also option 4, and even  
2740 option 5, which are not mentioned: ‘always afloat’ could be at Longue Hougue, in the new harbour; or it could be at St Peter Port. The pipe for the fuel from St Peter Port to tanks at St Sampson’s is a possibility. The buoy is an expensive option, as I think circumstances will overtake its use – the buoy idea is you have a buoy somewhere off Longue Hougue and ships will then tie up to it, and then



2745 there will be a fixed pipeline from there to the tanks at Longue Hougue, or even you may have to pass them across the bridge to north side, to the tanks there.

But as we de-carbonise, we will have less reliance on petrol and diesel, whether that is the heating or transport, so the option to use ISO containers becomes a strong possibility. I have an idea: our tank ships will last another 10 years, so why not continue to use them for 10 years, using  
2750 St Sampson's as now? When the ships reach the end of their lives, we will be in a far more electric world, and we can then bring in what we need in liquid fuels in ISO containers via St Peter Port. We can also continue to bring in sand and aggregate via St Sampson's in the same timescale. Of course, just in this timescale, we will be doing major work on the harbours to build the harbours in the first place, where we can bring in the materials through St Sampson's. After 10 years, we can then look  
2755 at converting St Sampson's to a leisure port, so all the benefits in option 5, which has been put forward to STSB, are still there, but they are available in 10 years' time, rather than sooner.

St Peter Port, in my view, will then handle – this is 10 years' time – the ISO containers, and also the extra land and space that is created at St Peter Port will be where we can bring on-board or on  
2760 land sand and aggregate. There will be trucks moving north, just as we will have passengers moving south if we decide to put our ferries there as well. There would also be some goods that would be delivered to Longue Hougue which would have to go south anyway. But of course, it will be not as we know it. In 10 years' time, 15 years' time, there will not be heavy diesel lorries, but silent, clean electric ones. That is a complete game-changer.

One thought which I think has already been mentioned is, 'You are going to spoil St Peter Port.'  
2765 For some of you who have sat with me through harbour plans, Harbour Action Plans, and just ordinary plans, you will know that I am one of the biggest advocates of not spoiling our waterfront. If you want to see how not do it, you do not need to go far: 20 miles to the south. Yes, it will need a longer breakwater on the castle side – although earlier plans, the modelling did not have one. But approaching from the sea will not be much different to the QEII Marina. When you are at Herm and  
2770 you are looking towards Guernsey, what do you see? You see the wall of the QEII Marina and the wall of the harbour arm. You see the Castle. Nothing of that will change. The fact that the wall may be another 300 metres towards Herm will make no difference; the wall will look just like the wall does now. It will not be higher – maybe a metre, which you would hardly even notice at those sort of distances. I think we have to be a bit careful of what we are saying here.

2775 The main view that we have from here is looking down over St Peter Port as a harbour, and we see Herm and Jethou in the distance; that will not change. The view looking the other way will not change; you will just see the harbour wall and the cranes, just as you do now, but the real beauty of our place is the vista looking up the hillside, it is the rolling hills and the valleys and the houses there; that does not change.

2780 The other thing is, again, 'You are going to spoil it', but okay, how many people have I had contact me in the last 16 years to say, 'What a real mess you made of it by doing the QEII Marina?' One page I will be asking you to look at at some stage – you might as well look at it now; it is as good as any – is 24, if you have got that in front of you. If you look at the size of what we have built with the QEII Marina on page 24, the size of the area that we are looking at expanding is, basically,  
2785 a little bit bigger than that out the east. No one has come back and complained that building the QEII Marina has really, completely spoiled St Peter Port. Nobody has said the view from Castle Carey looking down is completely spoiled by the Marina. No one standing on Herm beach has said, looking at St Peter Port, 'God, isn't it ugly now that you have built the QEII Marina?' You can hardly notice it. It is just a line of wall a few metres above the top of high water. So I think those arguments,  
2790 although they sound plausible at first, with the reality they are not.

Yesterday – luckily, I can drive today; I have been given permission by the doctor, so I can drive – but yesterday, I was on a bus and I was at St Peter Port, at the bus terminus. I am quite high up in a bus, it is quite a high vehicle. I could hardly see where the end of the harbour was, because there were so many different buildings in place. It will not spoil any of that view.

2795 One of the problems I mentioned earlier was that of maintenance, and that is closely linked to revenue. Combination 3 will give you all the options for marinas in the harbour pool for leisure on

the vacated quays, you will have new land, you will be able to rent land to hauliers far in excess of what we have now.

2800 This is where I come back to page 24, if you do have a chance to look at it, otherwise it is difficult to try and explain. On page 24, you have the two combinations: you have the combination 3, which is basically, at the bottom of the page, the addition to the QEII Marina going eastward, and you also have a mock-up of what the harbour at Longue Hougue would look like.

2805 One of the interesting points on the one for the option 3, although there is some cross-hatching, which is basically the hard standing, there is also some very large white area, literally directly to the east of the QEII. That white area, which is about the size of the QEII, just a little bit smaller than the QEII, has many possibilities. As it stands in this design, it is water. There is a couple of things we can do with water. If it is not filled in, it is a lagoon. It could be a safe place to learn to sail. It could be a tidal lagoon to generate electricity.

2810 It may be a marina. Marinas have traditionally been good cash-generating machines, and we were just talking about how big a marina could be in the Pool area of St Peter Port Harbour. If you look at the size of the QEII Marina and you look at the size of that white area which is open water, you are looking at a substantial marina. The QEII has 766 moorings; by my calculations, the size of this area of new water would bring in about another 600 moorings. I have not had the chance to check the receipts for the QEII, but if demand was there, it would make a substantial return to the harbour, and you have not fettered or compromised any of the advantages to St Peter Port of combination 5. In fact, combination 3, as we proposed, allows the ferries to stay at St Peter Port, but you can still have all the advantages of all the extra land that you create by the new enclosure.

2815 2820 There are also many common features between 5 and 3, outlined in 6.13: you still have the maintenance of the harbour; you still have the cruise pontoons; you still have warehousing, shops, the new terminal. But the fundamental difference between St Peter Port and Longue Hougue is one is a harbour and the other is a beach with a quay. But how do we mark and weigh these combinations? The evaluation on page 49, 8.4: combination 3 had 65% of the vote of whoever was voting, and combination 5, 78%. They are pretty close – I appreciate one is further ahead than the other – but that all depends on how you scored the points, and that applied weighting is discussed in 8.2.

2825 2830 The bit that troubles me is, if you turn to page 37 and table 6, where you start to compare the different attributes – and there are about 20 different attributes – it lists all the combinations: combination 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. So I have been comparing combination 3 with combination 5. At first glance, combination 5 gets more ticks. But it does not! When you start to really analyse them, it does not.

2835 One of the places where combination 3 only gets a partial tick is it is 'not tidally restricted for a freight service, partially'. Actually, it is *wholly* not restricted. The new harbour off the east arm here will not be tidally restricted, so what is a partial tick, actually, is a full tick. That is another thing that changes.

2840 It says here that combination 3 would not 'accommodate >80m bulk vessels'; of course it is going to accommodate 80-metre bulk vessels! Hopefully, if I had my way, it will be able to accommodate vessels up to 200 metres. So that is completely wrong, because the extension to the east arm will be able to accommodate bulk vessels of 80 metres or more.

2845 Then, when you go to another one where you do not get a tick, it says here, 'Avoids Hydrocarbon delivery by Not Always Afloat But Safely Aground'. It does not allow that, but you can bring ... There are two arguments there: (1) you could bring hydrocarbons always afloat to St Peter Port Harbour and pump it to St Sampson's; it is not the end of the world. I think that during the War they had pipelines done in England that went hundreds of miles, that took fuel from the coasts of England right up through to halfway up the country to be able to fuel the aircraft who were then going on bombing raids. So we can, if we had to, put a pipeline in. But you do not even need to do that, because by this time – it is going to take us quite a few years to get this done, but in 10 years' time, we will be using ISO containers. So that is another tick in the box.

2850 Once you start looking at how you scored these items, you start getting a different outcome. In my opinion, if you get the wrong data in you start to get the wrong answers out. What I am saying is if you start to score, on page 37, things differently, then you start to get different combinations that become much more viable.

2855 I have just got a small rant here, it says, *(Laughter)* 'Beware of private finance initiatives. Just watch what happened in the UK.' I am very nervous about private finance initiatives. I think they have a part to play, and there may be some hotels or land or something that we can rent out and get returns on – or rent out land and then we own the building that they build – but I am just a little bit nervous, sometimes, in some of these opportunities, that we get a little bit carried away.

2860 What we are proposing is a new lease of life for St Peter Port, not just for 30 years, but for the next 100; able to deal with a variety of shipping; releasing much of the existing harbour for leisure; able to continue to handle passengers and freight in a different world; the ability, in years to come, to release St Sampson's harbour for leisure, just as it does with combination 5; but with the robustness of a harbour in deep water, rather than quays on a beach subject to some strong tides.

2865 There is the ability to de-conflict leisure and freight in St Peter Port, and notwithstanding all the opportunities, there is also the option for a major new marina, or energy-creating lagoon. Even then, if you do not like that, in the fullness of time, that land can also be reclaimed if more space is needed. St Peter Port will still look just as attractive from the sea, and the walls will be no different to those that are already there now, just a bigger arm out to the east. Coming from the sea, the walls will be no higher, and you will hardly notice any difference from that point of view.

2870 These are high-level proposals, but be firm in where you want to go. I am lucky, and every now and then, you, as States' Members, will be lucky. What I mean by this is sometimes when proposals come along, you have a clear position where you are, whether in favour or against. Sometimes, you have held a particular position for a long time and you are very comfortable with it and it will take more than Deputy Roffey on a good day to persuade you otherwise. That is where I am. I will not vote for Longue Hougue to be another port. It is tidal and it is not something I will vote for. But not all of you will be so firm. You will have leanings, but are just not convinced either this way or that, or for another combination.

2880 I feel for you, and that is where it is hard. The decisions made on the margins, no matter how big or small, are always hard. Today, on this position, I am lucky: I know where I am. I hope, whichever way you vote, you are lucky, because if we bounce from year to year, chopping and changing, I can predict that it will be expensive, number 1; number 2, it will be expensive; and number 3, it will be expensive!

Think about the future. Which options are ambitious but attainable? Which gives us greater resilience as an island? Think of the harbour in Jersey, think about Longue Hougue, and think about St Peter Port, where big ships should go.

Thank you.

2885

**Deputy Leadbeater:** Madam, I am not rising to talk. I just want to say that, for those of us without paper copies, following this electronically, it is quite difficult at the moment, when those talking refer to certain chapters in the policy letter. Could we at least have the amendments circulated, printed copies of the amendments, please? I have not even got access to a copy of amendment 6 at this point.

2890

**The Deputy Bailiff:** The States' Greffier will do what he can to arrange that.

2895 Before we go on to actually deal with the amendment – I should have interrupted you, really, Deputy Brouard – but first, we need to vote on the motion to suspend Rule 1 of the Reform Law. A number of people noticed, actually; probably, I should have noticed beforehand.

You are proposing the motion, and Deputy Prow, you are seconding it, aren't you?

**Deputy Prow:** Yes, madam.

2900 **The Deputy Bailiff:** The motion is to suspend –  
Deputy Queripel.

**Deputy Queripel:** Could I have a recorded vote on this, please, madam?

2905 **The Deputy Bailiff:** In relation to the motion to suspend?

**Deputy Queripel:** Yes, please, madam.

2910 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes, Deputy Queripel.  
The motion is:

To suspend the Rules of Procedure to the extent necessary to permit the Proposition set out below to be considered.

The reason why this is needed to be sought was the date at which the amendment was filed, which was outwith the normal time limits and because it has financial implications.

2915 **Deputy Brouard:** My apologies to the States for it. The Billet arrived on the same day by post – because I am still on the dinosaur level – that amendments had to be in.

2920 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.  
States' Greffier, the recorded vote, please.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 21, Contre 3, Ne vote pas 7, Absent 9*

**POUR**

Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Matthews  
Deputy McKenna  
Deputy Moakes  
Deputy Prow  
Alderney Rep. Roberts  
Deputy Roffey  
Alderney Rep. Snowdon  
Deputy Vermeulen  
Deputy Aldwell  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Fairclough  
Deputy Falla  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Gabriel  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Helyar  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller

**CONTRE**

Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Queripel  
Deputy Cameron

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Dyke  
Deputy Haskins

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy Mahoney  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Murray  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Taylor  
Deputy Blin  
Deputy Bury  
Deputy Le Tissier

**The Deputy Bailiff:** There voted Pour 21, Contre 3, 7 Je ne vote pas, there were 9 absentees. So the motion to suspend the Rules is passed.

Deputy Prow, do you want to formally second the amendment, now?

2925 **Deputy Prow:** Yes, please.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.

Deputy Inder.

2930

**Deputy Inder:** Madam, thank you very much.

Again, I do not want to bore people too much with some of the history here. I do remember when Deputy Paint and myself were putting the requête together, which was actually based on what we thought, at the time, was to use more sensibly inert waste to create, effectively, something that looked similar to this.

2935

I must remind people who have not the experience of Government figures: having been on a number of Committees – some less successful than, potentially, this one – I remember back in 2017 – and I think new Members need to listen to this – we were presented with a policy letter that told us that Longue Hougue South and the build of it would be in the regions of £30 million. As Members of this Assembly, we are given policy letters with figures attached, and whether we like it or not, there are things that look good to us and things that look bad to us. Something with £30 million attached to it – which was the then Longue Hougue South – looked reasonable because the arguments were made along the lines that inert waste could go into Longue Hougue South at, I am going to say, around £19–£20 a ton. With the cost of inert waste over, I think it was, 15 years, going at £19 a ton, all the figures matched up. That was voted on and that went through the Assembly.

2940

2945

Seven months later, we were told it was £45 million – £45 million! It had gone up almost two-thirds in seven months. When I questioned Environment & Infrastructure at the time, the response I got – and I am going to slightly misquote it, but I am not far off – they took the last job – I am sure Deputy Trott will remember this – the response was, in one fairly curt paragraph: ‘We took the last job, added RPI, and added then 50%.’ That is the quality of the QS-ing that we get out of the States sometimes.

2950

You multiply this by the £360 million which you have got on the table now, this is likely to get a hell of a lot – sorry, madam – an *awful* lot worse. Whatever figures that you have got in front of you now, almost certainly, they will be wrong, and I can double guarantee that they will not be getting any cheaper. As sure as night follows day, the sun will not start rising in the west tomorrow, because that never happens; it will certainly get more expensive. Almost after two years from now, whatever option you choose today, it will be more expensive.

2955

As a consequence of that, the requête turned up. Deputy Paint’s, having an awful lot more experience than me – and I was, effectively, assisting and channelling information coming from the harbours, information coming from the pilots – the arguments – of which STSB addressed in some ways – were effectively, the RZ area, the Restricted Zone, they needed more martialling yards, effectively, for want of a better word. There were concerns within, I believe, the Home Department at the time about securities, and effectively, it was a very squeezed area east of North Beach car park, and I think Harbours had grabbed some of the car parking.

2960

2965

That was where we got to. Our argument was, effectively, Longue Hougue South, as it was, had gone up to £65 million. That was a year-and-a-half ago; gosh knows what it might be today. It almost certainly will be around £80 million, £90 million. Every time you mention inert waste, it goes through the roof.

2970

So Members, seriously, joking aside, be very careful about the figures that you get in front you, especially when they have got such a long horizon. Do not make your judgements based on this, because almost certainly, they will be wrong.

I am going to support Deputy Brouard and Deputy Prow on this, because this is where we started. I will give a number of reasons, most of which have been explained by Deputy Brouard, so hopefully, I will not take too much time.

2975

There was some mention before we got to this part of the amendment that Guernsey, at some point when it had no money, it just decided to build a harbour when it had no money, for no apparent reason; that is not strictly true. At the time, we had reasons to export. If we flip this, this is not about export; this about import. As a trading nation in the middle of the Hovering Act, when we had British custom boats off our roads making sure that we were not running cognac from

2980

France to Guernsey and back up to *Poldark* country, Guernsey was under an awful lot of pressure when we looked at expanding our harbours.

2985 It is not true to say that when we started looking at our harbours, we did it because it was just a bit of laugh and we had a couple of Governors who wrapped themselves in the red, white, and blue and just told us that we could get on and start building harbours. We had a burgeoning vine industry, tomatoes were starting, stone quarrying was starting, the codfish were restarting, and brandy was being served like something out of *Whisky Galore!* all over the Island. We did not make that decision just because we had some visionary idea; we did it because we were Guernseymen, because there was an opportunity to make some cash. That is what islands do: islands that are  
2990 attached to large countries, they do not have big Dagenham parts and large factories. We are opportunists, and Guernsey has always been opportunist.

So when we are told that there is a comparison, that we have to make this decision today and make, potentially, the wrong decision, because our forefathers did, we are not doing it because we are exporting; perversely, we are effectively doing this on a diminishing market. We are effectively  
2995 chasing zero. Only – what are we up to? – six ships a month at the moment, something like that? Deputy Brouard has explained to us that as we transition to a cleaner, greener future, we are going to have less hydrocarbons, less diesel, less petrol, less central heating, less kerosene, and all the other wet stuff that comes through. We can also get into something called ‘parcel shipping’ as well.

He did make mention that we could carry on working under NAABSA lines. Irrespective of what the policy letter says, no country in the world is going to stop us from depositing boats on a hard surface with no underkeel clearance. There is no rule, no diktat coming out of Europe, there is nothing from any fuel farms.  
3000

We had this conversation at the hydrocarbon debate – Deputy Brouard may remember. We were told, effectively, everything was going to go to Hell in a handcart, you would never be able to  
3005 purchase a NAABSA boat again, but when we started looking for where the information came from, it did not exist. It was one of those Guernsey things that, politically, if you repeat something three times, it suddenly becomes truth. A bit like us needing 300 houses before the KPMG report: once it gets repeated – the fact that we need 500 a year is completely different but once you repeat something it ends up embedding itself in the DPA, then becomes policy, and you never go back and find out where the information came from. Most of it is a myth.  
3010

Only – I think it was last week, or two weeks – I was with Deputy Falla and possibly Deputy Moakes actually. It was Sustainable Finance Week. What was really quite interesting – we had an incredible meeting at – and I am not a big fan of the ‘sit round, eat sandwiches, and listen to people via Zoom or Teams or whatever it is,’ but actually, that was one of the few I actually found  
3015 interesting – you had some very intelligent people working in investments, they were talking about green finance and the opportunities for Guernsey.

What was interesting was they talked about *authenticity*. There is no point in us setting ourselves as a green finance centre when we are going to destroy our own environment. Effectively, through that, the argument was – and hopefully, I would like to hear from E&I on this – was that if we start heading for something called ‘5 and 6’ – being made aware that what we do at Longue Hougue South will mean the loss of 10% of our eelgrass. As part of infrastructure development, we would have to offset or deal with that in some way if there was a strong argument.  
3020

At the moment, there is no argument for 5 and 6. This is why option 3 is better; ‘5 and 6’ is just an expensive quay in a diminishing market. We may find out that as we head for the 12-year build, we will find that the liquids are going down, we are not even too sure if we will be importing  
3025 aggregate down, and we cannot even get into it. For 93 days of the year, on two tides each day, it is dry. What on Earth would our predecessors think of us if we spent £360 million – which we have already established right now, because I can guarantee it will not be; we could be up to £500 million – building a quay that you cannot get into? The joke was always that Jersey men built their harbours up the beaches; well actually, we do as well. There is no sense at all in looking at  
3030 ‘5 and 6’; it makes no economic sense. In fact, I would go as far as to say it is economically illiterate.

Let us look at option 3 for a moment. What does option 3 give us? What it gives us is something four times bigger than our original proposal. I think we are in the £430-odd million range for option 3.

3035 What option 5 does not do – which is actually STSB’s preferred model; bear in mind, this is STSB’s preferred model – this is £800,000 spent, and they do not even know the underkeel clearance outside Longue Hougue South, as confirmed. We have got to spend another £4 million to finally find out, at the lowest astronomical tide, how much water is underneath. I will save you a quid: I will take my boat up there this weekend, I will do a spin round the corner, and I will give you the map, because it is all there. How on Earth have we spent £800,000 not knowing if a boat can get into the mouth or the depth on the lowest astronomical tide? Is there something wrong with this picture? If you do not know there is something wrong with this picture, I will get my crayons out at some point.

3040 Looking at 3, apart from it being an awful lot bigger than it needs to be, it does give us tidal. Actually, strangely enough, I would be very careful at the southern pier, because what that looks to me, it is made to look probably architecturally worse than it is. I think that is angles of repose, that is stones placed to create what would be the pier at the top. The original schematic was one-quarter of the size of that.

3045 On page 37, as Deputy Brouard amply pointed up, we have paid £800,000 for a fair amount of inaccuracy; what do you think we are going to do when we get £4 million? It is not going to get any better. He did talk about stats, and the reality is if you insert political bias into something – and no one can tell me there is not, because back in 2013 on the original Ports Master Plan document there was a strong drive to head to Longue Hougue South, so let us not pretend for a moment there is no political bias based in this report. Deputy Parkinson, I was a Committee Member at Economic Development, he has always said he has been in favour of Longue Hougue South – thank you.

3050 **Deputy Parkinson:** I was not a member of STSB when the report that is before the States was commissioned. I had no hand in specifying the terms of that report. Essentially, when I re-joined STSB, the process was already working.

3055 **Deputy Inder:** I am not entirely sure if that was a point of correction, but I did not even say that. What I said is, when I was a member of Economic Development, Deputy Parkinson told myself and Deputy Paint – and I remember exactly where we were: we were at the café at the bottom of the St Julian’s area, because we had a meeting with him – he said his preference has always been Longue Hougue South. With no knowledge at all, the political biases are already set in. Deputy Parkinson said to me that his preference is Longue Hougue South because I even spoke to him about high-siding Longue Hougue South as it is without the inert waste strategy, and he said, ‘You could dig a channel from Spur Point, and boats could go up.’ So unless I have completely made that up, which I certainly have not, that is the conversation we had.

3060 Moving on to page 37 itself, there is a problem with that. We have spent an awful lot of money on something that is largely inaccurate. Of course, because it has been made so big now, and it is almost four times the size of the original Proposition, of course it is bound to be made in some way uglier. But what it does give you, which option 5 does not, which is currently the Committee’s preferred option – that is their preferred option before they were given another amendment to agree with ... This is the problem I have got with this policy letter: they were determined to put option 5, they told you it was a smorgasbord, it is not a smorgasbord at all. Proposition 1 clearly says, ‘Option 5 is our preferred option.’ That is not choice; that is option 5. The only choice is to ‘not do it.’ We have had to run around with various amendments to make some changes.

3070 Option 5 is problematic because it does not improve in any way the length of our ro-ro 1 and 2; currently, we can get about 130 metres, I think it is, which is similar to Jersey. Option 5 does not do that. Option 3 does. It makes it tidal, it puts it in deeper water, it builds for the future. Deputy Brouard is quite right that ships are not getting any smaller; if anything, they are going to get bigger. Having spoken to Mr Luxon generally around this, he has said though that as boats get bigger,

frequency does diminish. But the fact is, the *Clipper* and the *Goodwill* are actually custom-built to go alongside in Guernsey; this is not off the shelf.

3085 If you move out, to something like option 3, you open up real opportunities when we are long gone. Your quays get bigger, option 3 opens it to a leisure port, and if there is any sense retained in the Committee, should you as Members vote for this route, I suggest they do not come back with exactly this option, and do a reduced version which reflects the aesthetics of the harbour and is not made to look so big to the point that you just cannot vote for it because it has been made so ugly.  
3090 I suspect there is some truth in that because that is how politics works: if you do not want something, you play it down; if you want something, you play it up. That is how it works. Nothing is ever as straight as is.

In short, madam, the current Proposition is Proposition 5 ... this is to replace Proposition 1, which would put Proposition 3 as a better outcome. This is by far a better solution for Guernsey because  
3095 this is actually deliverable. Combination 5 is undeliverable, and I will not, under any circumstances support either 5 or 6, which gives us effectively a tidal harbour. It is an utter nonsense to go spending another £4 million on something that you cannot get into 24/7, 365 days a year. So this, by far, is better than combination 5, which I will be rejecting, and supporting this.

Thank you.

3100

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Prow.

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

I rise in support of amendment 6, which I was very happy to second, which asks the Assembly to  
3105 approve combination 3. This is outlined in paragraphs 6.17 and 6.18 on page 28 of the policy letter.

Before I go any further, I thank STSB for all the presentations they have sponsored in support of their proposals, and also the Harbour Master for giving up his valuable time in meeting with Deputy Brouard and I. Furthermore, I thank Deputy Brouard for all his hard work done on this amendment, and I think his thorough research is reflected in his excellent opening speech. I also thank Deputy  
3110 Inder for the detail that he has put in and for his passion, which stems from the requête that was brought last term and is reflected in his views with regard to the future harbour development. In some ways, both of those detailed speeches, you will be pleased to know, will make my speech shorter.

But Madam, in my view, the only real, viable option, based upon the information provided, is  
3115 combination 3, to extend St Peter Port Harbour eastward. Paragraph 1.14 states that:

As with our current ports, any new development would represent a long-term investment to meet the island's requirements for generations.

Paragraph 1.15 goes on to emphasise:

The strategic importance of the Future Harbour Development work should not be underestimated ... with the potential to provide lasting benefits ...

3120

I fully agree with the policy letter in that regard.

However, unlike the STSB proposal, combination 3 achieves this through an ambitious and major opportunity to make the provision in one deep-water, non-tidal harbour, a point emphasised by Deputy Brouard in his opening. I will repeat that: 'to make the provision in one deep-water, non-tidal harbour,' rather than STSB's two-harbour combination.  
3125

Crucially, this option leaves Spur Bay alone and avoids a fragmentation of activity and development at Longue Hougue South, with all the uncertainties and challenges this presents.

Combination 5, the STSB's preferred option, is outlined on page 30 and in figure 4. It is described as an 'extensive new port facility,' but it only relocates some of the activities away from the current  
3130 harbours. It only, effectively, creates two quays to do this. It is certainly extensive in size, with a huge area being reclaimed from the sea at Spur Bay, in what is described in the legend at point 2 as a



'land reclamation project,' in addition to a very extensive container and freight marshalling yard at point 1 on the same plan.

3135 But, as said and emphasised in other speeches, the harbour facility only appears to facilitate berthing for two vessels. Interestingly, it states at 6.21 that:

RoRo (and RoPax) operations would remain at St Peter Port ...

Would they? 8.24 states that:

3140 ... Combination 5, the actual physical design ... can be such that it could be equipped at a later date to accommodate all commercial freight and international passenger activities currently located at St Peter Port Harbour ...

But Longue Hougue South, the extensive new harbour and reclamation project, comes with a Government health warning, contained within section 7. An email from former Deputy Barry Paint, a Guernsey general marine pilot for 21 years, kindly circulated to all Deputies by Deputy de Sausmarez, comes with an even sterner warning. Madam, the slogan on the box suggests that:

3145

Strong tidal streams, shallowness on the discharging berths, strong northerly or easterly winds, and dangerous reefs can seriously damage the bottom of your boat.

Returning to the policy letter, it highlights that:

A prerequisite for any harbour facility is that for the intended shipping, its waters and approaches are sufficiently safe to navigate ...

3150

The approaches to the north, including St Sampson's, are noted as 'difficult to navigate', and contention exists in this area.

It goes on to examine the operational constrained harbour in Jersey. It outlines virtual simulation runs into ports at Longue Hougue and, as Deputy Inder has outlined, this work is not complete and will come at a great deal of expense. It acknowledges that:

3155

... the northern port is likely to experience a greater incidence of high wind speeds ... tidal flows of up to 5 knots across the harbour entrance ...

Whilst in some circumstances, this was acceptable – the policy letter tells us:

At all states of the tide there were berthing challenges in 30 knot winds ... [Furthermore] it is very likely that entries to a harbour at Longue Hougue South would not be practicable during spring ebb tides. This would make a harbour in this location [much] more tidally constrained than the existing harbour at St Peter Port, for all vessels ... [Longue Hougue] harbour entry was made much more difficult in maximum ebb tidal flows ...

3160

Crucially, as table 7 outlines, the number of days per month on which the tidal stream would exceed the safe limits is 93 days annually, a point well made also by Deputy Inder.

At 7.32, we are informed about environmental issues. At 7.32, we understand:

From work undertaken on the EIA for Longue Hougue South Inert Waste Project ... [there are already] environmental risks and impacts from any development of this physical scale ...

3165

Furthermore, the new port would be over and above these, and different. Again, Deputy Inder has well outlined this. However, it must be also noted that any development to the east of the QEII remains to be determined environmentally, and this work is not complete.

I would suggest that any Member of the Assembly who is attracted to combination 5 reads the sections I have referred to with great care.

3170 It appears to be that combination 3 is a far more attractive Proposition. A new, large deep-water harbour east of the QEII Marina would accommodate both ro-ro and load-on/load-off, provide the location for a new passenger terminal and the GBA control point.

I should also note that rightly, at section 8.12:

Concerns have also since been raised that post-Brexit, customs requirements would be much more challenging to resource with significant numbers of international passengers and boat crews arriving in more than one port.

3175 I would suggest that combination 3 gives a better outlook, and this would be achieved without duplication of effort over two sites.

The Cambridge Berth and the new jetty would be released for potential development. As with combination 5, a large area within St Peter Port Harbour would be released for development of the blue economy, which I am extremely supportive of.

3180 Curiously, the advantage bullet-point in combination 5 regarding the uses of:

St Sampson's Harbour ... [to] become an extended marina for leisure craft, [and] with land currently used for freight operations also freed ...

– albeit over different timescales, as rightly pointed out by Deputy Brouard. It seems to me equally valid, these arguments, for option 3.

3185 Again, Deputy Brouard and Deputy Inder have covered the issues with hydrocarbon oils. I should just say that although combinations 5 and 3, again, for some reason, are worded differently, both options mention the progression of bulk fuels to switch to ISO containers. It should also be recognised that the use of these bulk fuels will drastically diminish over the coming decade.

3190 I echo what Deputy Brouard has said about being lucky with regard to having considered in detail the proposals before us: I am lucky that I am able to come to a firm decision. I commend combination 3 to this Assembly, through this amendment, amendment 6.

Thank you, madam.

3195 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson.

**Deputy Parkinson:** Madam, I rise simply to correct the impression given by Deputy Inder that this policy letter presented to the States is tainted by bias. As I said in my intervention during his remarks, I was not a member of STSB when this work was commissioned by the States as a result of the amendment to his requête. The work was ongoing when I re-joined STSB last October. I was not a member of the team that scored the options; that was all done independently by members of staff. All I have done is endorse the recommendations of that team who did the work.

3200 The fact that I have always thought that Longue Hougue South is the right solution does not mean that the work was tainted by bias. The work was carried out independently by professional staff who reached their own conclusions; I simply happened to agree with the conclusions that they have reached.

3205 Thank you, madam.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Parkinson.  
3210 Deputy Aldwell.

**Deputy Aldwell:** This has been my bedtime reading for the last fortnight, and I have to agree with Deputy Brouard and Deputy Prow. I could not possibly add anything to what they have said, because they seem to have covered everything.

3215 I have really listened to what everyone has had to say. I have been on Teams with Deputy Inder to find out more. I found out all kinds of information from ex-Deputy Barry Paint and various boating organisations, and I actually think this is the most sensible option, so I shall be agreeing with you on this.

Thank you.

3220

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy McKenna.

**Deputy McKenna:** Thank you, madam.

3225 I would just like to say, I agree 100% with Deputy Prow. I think it is wonderful, the research that Deputy Brouard has conducted (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) to come up with those facts and figures, which has been quite enlightening and very impressive.

3230 The wonderful thing – if Deputy Brouard will agree with me – about the tidal harbour and the hydrogen production, allowing for electric States' vehicles and possibly ships in the future with hydrogen electric power. It also brings into play our brothers from Alderney, Snowdon and Roberts, to go home with a renewed hope that we could possibly use that tidal electric power and link up with Alderney, as well as the Bailiwick with Herm and Sark. Not only that, we have got the greatest tidal currents in the world to utilise what you are suggesting. I think the future is really exciting. In the end I think Alderney, we just become closer and closer together, and maybe we will start selling our electric and hydrogen to the world; maybe this will be the solving of our problem.

3235 I would endorse everything that Deputy Prow ... and, especially if I could just say, wonderful research, Deputy Brouard. I vote for amendment 6.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Oliver.

3240 **Deputy Oliver:** Thank you, madam.

I was just wondering, because everybody is saying that they want to agree to combination 3, but as it is set out at the moment there is a whopping great barrier to protect the harbour. I forget the figures and I could not find it quickly in there, but it is very long and very deep. (*Laughter*) I do worry about it being the next Alderney Breakwater, with repairs.

3245 With that in mind, everybody said, 'You can tinker with it, you can change it, you can make it a bit smaller, and then it can still be used for everything they want it to be used on a smaller basis.' I was just wondering if Deputy Roffey was actually going to speak on this amendment, and if he was, is that actually possible to do? You can shrink that breakwater down and you can shrink the harbour? Or maybe you could potentially angle the outer wall to come in a bit, which potentially would prevent waves from going into that harbour? I just would be very interested if that can actually happen. Everybody has said potentially it can, but is that something we can do while still fitting in the boats that are necessary to be there?

3255 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey has indicated he wishes to exercise his right of reply prior to Deputy Brouard responding, so he will be given the opportunity, at least.

**Deputy Leadbeater:** In that case, I will call a 26(1), please.

3260 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Rule 26(1), who wishes still to contribute towards the debate on this amendment?

**Deputy Leadbeater:** Yes, I do, madam. (*Laughter*)

3265 **The Deputy Bailiff:** The motion is that the debate be closed. Those who support the motion; those against.

*Members voted Contre.*

3270 **The Deputy Bailiff:** The Contres have it.

**Deputy Queripel:** Recorded vote, please, madam?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** There is a request for a recorded vote, States' Greffier, if you insist.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Not carried – Pour 9, Contre 26, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 5*

**POUR**

Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Queripel  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Taylor  
Deputy Vermeulen  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Helyar

**CONTRE**

Deputy Matthews  
Deputy McKenna  
Deputy Moakes  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Prow  
Alderney Rep. Roberts  
Deputy Roffey  
Alderney Rep. Snowdon  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Aldwell  
Deputy Blin  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Bury  
Deputy Cameron  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Dyke  
Deputy Fairclough  
Deputy Falla  
Deputy Gabriel  
Deputy Haskins  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy Mahoney  
Deputy Murray  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Le Tissier

3275 **The Deputy Bailiff:** There voted Pour 9, Contre 26, there were 5 absentees. The motion is defeated; we will continue debate, although not for terribly long, because it is 5.25 p.m.  
Deputy Ferbrache.

3280 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Madam, I was not going to speak on this matter, but I am now because in relation to this particular amendment – very well put, indeed, extremely well put by Deputy Brouard; I thought it was an excellent speech, well researched. I know Deputy Paint and I know the work that he and Deputy Inder put into the requête that we already talked about previously.

3285 If we adopt this particular proposal, this particular amendment, we are knocking out Longue Hougue completely, it seems to me, because it would replace Longue Hougue, the £800,000 that has been spent to date would go, and we would not be able to look at Longue Hougue in the future. On that basis, bearing in mind we have got options 5 and 6, if they are passed in due course by the Assembly, that would still keep in all the options. In my view – Deputy Inder is going 'No, no, no', but in my view, yes, yes, yes, it would keep in all the options, and I would rather we considered *all* the options.

3290 Frankly, I like St Peter Port as an option. I am concerned over the £400 million becoming £600 million or £700 million; nothing is properly costed out. I am also concerned that – what I would not want to devalue in any way, although I appreciate all the other benefits, is the aesthetic value of St Peter Port, because it is such a treasure. I appreciate the marina is fine and you could probably do something that is reasonably sympathetic. But without full consideration, I cannot go as far as  
3295 accepting the very ably put amendment 3 – sorry, amendment 6; I forgot what the number is – by

Deputy Brouard, because it just takes out Longue Hougue completely, and I think we ought to keep all our options open.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Falla.

3300

**Deputy Falla:** Madam, I was not intending to speak either, but I will take 30 seconds.

My reservations about the Brouard amendment are that it does not appear to resolve the confictions that were identified in the policy letter. We are still not moving a lot of the commercial activity out of St Peter Port, and it does not seem to me that that is giving the opportunity presented by this whole debate. The continuing commercial activity is not an ideal bedfellow for increased leisure activity.

3305

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dyke.

3310

**Deputy Dyke:** Thank you. I will try to be brief as well.

I am glad that this proposal has been put forward by Deputy Brouard and I am glad he is feeling lucky about it. It has made me feel somewhat less lucky, as I had not paid sufficient attention to this one ahead of his excellent presentation.

3315

Can I ask one question? I think Deputy Inder mentioned and Deputy Brouard mentioned that this plan could be excessively large and could be slimmed down, which would make it less visually intrusive and, presumably, quite a lot less expensive on the basis that if you cut down the proportions by a percentage, then you square the area, making quite a big difference to the cost. How could we vote for something like that? It is not in front of us.

3320

Yes, I will sit down –

**Deputy Inder:** Thank you for giving way.

It has been alluded to – and this is more an opportunity to thank Deputy Oliver for raising this as well, and Deputy Dyke. It might be the case that when Deputy Roffey sums up – and potentially, actually, overnight, he could ask officers, seeing as we are likely to close soon, whether that would be possible, because I would be very surprised if it was not.

3325

**Deputy Dyke:** Thank you for that; that was the answer to my question. Thank you.

3330

**The Deputy Bailiff:** It is 5.29 p.m. Therefore, we will adjourn until tomorrow. Thank you for your contributions today everybody.

*The Assembly adjourned at 5.29 p.m.*