



**OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF THE**

**STATES OF DELIBERATION**

**OF THE**

**ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

**HANSARD**

**Royal Court House, Guernsey, Thursday, 1st May 2014**

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

**Volume 3, No. 10**

**ISSN 2049-8284**

**Present:**

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

**Law Officers**

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

**People's Deputies**

**St Peter Port South**

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

**St Peter Port North**

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

**St Sampson**

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

**The Vale**

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

**The Castel**

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

**The West**

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

**The South-East**

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

**Representatives of the Island of Alderney**

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

**The Clerk to the States of Deliberation**

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

**Absent at the Evocation**

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

Deputy E. G. Bebb (*relevé à 11h 56*); Deputy S. J. Ogier (*relevé à 9h 58*);  
Deputy R. A. Perrot (*relevé à 9h 58*); Deputy M. G. O'Hara (*relevé à 11h 56*)

## Business transacted

Evocation.....	499
<b>Billet d'État IX.....</b>	<b>499</b>
VI. Guernsey Integrated on-Island Transport Strategy – Debate continued .....	499
Welcome to Director of the Bureau des Iles Anglo-Normandes .....	527
Result of vote on amendment announced .....	527
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.30 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m. ....</i>	<i>528</i>
VI. Guernsey Integrated on-Island Transport Strategy – Debate continued .....	528
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.32 p.m. ....</i>	<i>563</i>

*PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK*

# States of Deliberation

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

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

## PRAYERS

*The Senior Deputy Greffier*

## EVOCATION

# Billet d'État IX

## ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

### VI. Guernsey Integrated on-Island Transport Strategy – Debate continued

*Article VI.*

*Amendment by Deputy Burford/Deputy Brehaut:*

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

*‘*

- 1. To agree the Vision as set out in paragraph 5, and the Transport Hierarchy as set out in paragraph 21, of the Minority Report of Deputy Y Burford and Deputy B L Brehaut entitled “INTEGRATED TRANSPORT STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN FOR GUERNSEY”, and published in an annexe to that States Report in accordance with Rule 2(4) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation.*
- 2. To rescind resolution 9 of Billet d'État VII 2006 “To approve the Environment Department’s intention to acquire and develop suitable sites that might become available for the construction of off-street residents’ parking facilities, as set out in section 4.9.7 of that Report”.*
- 3. To agree that the Department will record data in such a way as to enable meaningful measurements of change in travelling modes to be calculated.*
- 4. To agree that a banded First Registration Duty based on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and vehicle width shall be introduced as specified Table 1, and as described in paragraphs 29 to 45, of the Minority Report referred to in Proposition 1.*
- 5. To agree that paid parking shall be introduced through:*
  - a. a system of long stay paid parking at the Odeon, the majority of North Beach, Havelet (South Esplanade long stay section), La Valette, Castle Emplacement, the Salerie and St Julian’s Avenue , and in such other on-street long-stay parking places in St Peter Port as shall be identified by Ordinance, (see paragraph 54 i of that Minority Report);*
  - b. a chargeable annual disc parking clock for short stay parking in disc zones of 2.5 hours or less in St Peter Port, with minor exceptions, and in all disc zones in the rest of the Island, (see paragraph 54 vii of that Minority Report); and*
  - c. the re-designation of certain disc zone areas and spaces into long stay paid parking (see paragraph 54 ii of that Minority Report); and*
  - d. the re-designation of Victoria and Albert Piers and the current 2 hour disc zone at North Beach into 2.5 hour disc zones (see paragraph 54 iii of that Minority Report) .*

*and as described in paragraphs 46 to 63 of that Minority Report.*

6. *To agree that States Members who wish to avail themselves of parking on any or all States Days at Lukis House shall pay £165 per year commencing 1 November 2014 as described in paragraph 62 of that Minority Report.*
7. *To agree a decrease of 1.2p per litre in the duty on petrol and gas oil other than fuel used for air or marine navigation with effect from April 2015, as described in paragraph 63 of that Minority Report.*
8. *To direct the Treasury and Resources Department in conjunction with the Environment Department to investigate the best method of accounting for and taxing the benefit to employees of employer-provided parking, by implementing a benefit-in-kind charge to tax or a workplace parking levy as described in paragraphs 64 to 67 of that Minority Report, and to report back to the States with proposals by January 2015.*
9. *To approve the intention of the Environment Department to investigate and implement a trial system of Park and Ride, subject to a suitable site being located, as outlined in paragraph 68 of that Minority Report.*
10. *To approve the intention of the Environment Department to investigate and implement measures to encourage car sharing as outlined in paragraphs 69 to 70 of that Minority Report.*
11. *To approve the changes applicable to learner drivers as outlined in paragraph 72 of that Minority Report.*
12. *To agree to the construction of a bus depot, and to direct the Treasury and Resources Department to classify the bus depot as a pipeline project for Capital reserve funding, as detailed in paragraph 82 of that Minority Report.*
13. *To approve the policy in respect of free bus travel as set out in paragraph 85 of that Minority Report and the implementation of the other improvements to the public bus service as set out in paragraphs 86 to 91 of that Minority Report.*
14. *To endorse the issuance of up to 8 additional taxi licences in a new category which require vehicles specifically adapted for the needs of disabled people, as set out in paragraph 96 of that Minority Report.*
15. *To direct the Environment Department to investigate possible improvement to taxi provision in Guernsey and to report back to the States by July 2015 with their proposals (see paragraph 97 of that Minority Report).*
16. *To approve the measures in relation to motorcycling, as outlined in paragraphs 98 to 100 of that Minority Report.*
17. *To approve the measures in relation to cycling infrastructure provision, promotion, education and investment, as set out in paragraphs 101 and 114 to 122 of that Minority Report.*
18. *To approve the intention of the Environment Department to investigate the feasibility of introducing legislation on presumed liability for greater protection of cyclists and pedestrians, as set out in paragraph 123 of that Minority Report.*
19. *To approve the measures in relation to walking and pedestrian infrastructure provision, promotion and investment, as set out in paragraphs 125 to 130 of that Minority Report.*
20. *To agree to the promotion and requirements of Travel Plans for businesses, schools and States Departments, as set out in paragraphs 132 and 140 of that Minority Report.*
21. *To direct the Environment Department in conjunction with the Commerce and Employment Department and the Public Services Department to conduct a review of commercial vehicle activity and circulation with a view to improvements in accordance with the Vision, as set out in paragraph 133 of that Minority Report, and to report back to the States by July 2015 with their proposals.*
22. *To approve the intention of the Environment Department to review speed limits as described in paragraph 137 of that Minority Report.*
23. *To approve the proposals in relation to disabled people as set out in paragraphs 143 to 148 and 162 of that Minority Report.*
24. *To direct the Environment Department to consider the Vision and the recommendations in paragraph 154 of that Minority Report in reviewing the Development Plan.*
25. *To approve that the Strategy as set out in that Minority Report will be funded by a combination of:*
  - (a) a First Registration Duty as set out in paragraphs 29 to 45 of that Minority Report;*
  - (b) income from paid parking including parking clocks as set out in paragraphs 46 to 55 and 57 to 63 of that Minority Report.*
26. *To direct the Treasury and Resources Department to take account of the Strategy funding requirements, as set out in Appendix 6 of that Minority Report, when recommending cash limits and routine capital allocations for the Environment Department for 2015 and subsequent years.*

27. *To authorise the Treasury and Resources Department, if required, to approve a transfer from the Budget Reserve of up to £835,000 to the budget of the Environment Department in 2014 to fund the implementation of the Strategy.*
28. *To direct to Environment Department to conduct a review of the Transport Strategy and report back to the States by December 2017 with an analysis of the effectiveness of the measures implemented, and recommendations in relation to changes that may be required in order to continue to deliver the Vision.*
29. *To direct the preparation of such legislation as may be necessary so as to give effect to their above decisions.”.*

**The Senior Deputy Greffier:** Billet d’État IX, Article VI.

5     **The Bailiff:** Members, we continue the debate on the amendment proposed by Deputy Burford, seconded by Deputy Brehaut.  
Deputy Langlois.

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

10     Sir, yesterday was an interesting day. I think we have all probably forgotten what the Chairman of SACC, Deputy Fallaize, said much earlier yesterday. He has forgotten my name this morning, anyway, so *touché*. (*Laughter*) Deputy Fallaize is, of course, a very influential Member of this Assembly on occasion. Some of his influence is overt and some slightly more covert but, nevertheless, we listen to what he says on most occasions and I seem to remember, despite my failing short-term memory, that he said yesterday morning, ‘Can you remember what we are here to decide today? That is we are here to decide what to  
15     debate.’ Now, I suggest that two thirds of the way through yesterday, we had all forgotten that, because the debate was flowing in all sorts of directions and we totally ignored him and we really should not totally ignore the Chairman of the SACC committee, even though we would often like to.

20     Sir, this is a day to decide certain big things for this Island, (*Laughter*) but can I echo his plea, can we first decide what we are going to debate fairly quickly and then get on to the substance, because, with apologies to our Alderney Representatives, this is like the semi-final in a Muratti. It is something you have to go through to –

25     **Alderney Representative Harvey:** Point of order there. This is a bit racist, if you do not mind my saying so. (*Laughter*)

**Deputy Fallaize:** Also, this is not quite as one-sided.

30     **Deputy Langlois:** Sir, could the Chairman of SACC not pinch my next line. (*Laughter*) It is something you have to go through even if you know the score might be a little bit closer than that particular event. But, we are where we are: a good old fashioned phrase that always works. The old ones are the best. So, let us get on. We are where we are this morning, but can we please get on with the debate?

35     I will add my congratulations to Deputy Burford for all the work she has done, for her speech, for the logical way in which she presented what she sees as a complete package, as a coherent package. She would not have got up and said all that she said if she did not believe that would work. However, can I just put a little health warning on this? I hear, yet again, references to, ‘It is such a passionate argument.’ And then, in brackets, which is unsaid, ‘So, she must be right’. Now, can we just not get carried away with this? It does not always work that way. If we go down that path every time in this Assembly, each of the 47 of us have got at least one thing we feel very passionate about. We get up, we say it passionately, ‘That is what it should be’ and we then change this Island irrevocably in certain ways that could or could not be a good  
40     thing. So, passion alone does not make people right.

45     The talk yesterday about listening to the right people was an interesting debate, partly focused by Deputy Lester Queripel and Deputy Perrot about how you ever count. I have crossed swords with people many times in the past about the validity or otherwise of surveys and who you talk to and so on, but interestingly, can we also remember when we get to vote a little bit later on, whether we debate one set of  
50     Propositions or another, can we also remember that no matter what we have heard and what evidence has been produced, to many people in this Island – and I am in the camp who says, ‘to most people in this Island’ – cars are far from being offensive items. They are actually useful bits of kit that help you get round. It is the way the Island is organised. It is the way we are. It is where we chose to live, it is what we chose to do with our time and so on and many people, for most people, it actually enhances their way of life. It does not destroy it. So, can we be a little bit careful about the passionate assumption that this is to do away with the evil of the car.

The biggest danger yesterday, to my mind, was when we got into really fanciful language on both sides and I am not going to pick out too many examples, but we heard, 'Cloud Cuckoo Land.' Do we really want Guernsey to be like Amsterdam? That confuses me a little bit. There are other aspects of Amsterdam that a number of you would vote against. *(Laughter)* Although I expect you would receive support from some quarters. Let us not get carried away. We are not Amsterdam. We are not the M27. We are Guernsey and people travel to work quite a short distance and so on. So, can we be a little bit careful with the fanciful stuff.

But, most of all, it will be very easy to end up with a really fancy, good-looking strategy. Strategies are good. Strategies are the flavour of this Assembly. It has been said before: we have got them all over the place. They only work if you can turn them into practice. So, can we actually get on today with debating some of the practicalities and any of you who, yesterday, have been seduced, if that is the right word, by ideals, can we now focus today very much on the practicalities, of the nuts and bolts of what could become a useful strategy if we take care.

**The Bailiff:** Yes, Deputy Storey, then Deputy Lowe and Deputy Gillson.

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

Yesterday, some speakers actually suggested that we did not need the Transport Strategy and at least one other Deputy stated that we have got a Transport Strategy, so why do we need a new one. Well, all I can say to those people is, well, open your eyes, have a look round. We do need a Transport Strategy.

We had a strategy, we thought, some years ago where we were going to introduce a new fleet of buses and a highly improved service and that was going to be funded by paid parking. Well, we bought the buses and we started off with what I think was an improved service, but we did not introduce the paid parking. How is that strategy? We need to settle on a package of moves to actually create a strategy that works and that means looking at the whole of the Transport Strategy and not just bits of it, it seems to me.

Now, the Majority Report, sir, seems to me to be going out of its way to try to satisfy all views without upsetting anybody unduly – trying to satisfy a wide range of personal interests and I would submit, sir, that that cannot be done, because both of these reports have at their core the objective of changing people's habits and to do something along the lines that, 'Well, it really does not upset anybody', is not the sort of way to go to change the way they operate and they run their daily lives.

I need to and I have should have done, perhaps at the beginning, declare an interest in this as a St Peter Port Deputy and, for me, wearing that hat, the Minority Report takes the whole problem, if I may say, by the throat and it comes up with many helpful answers to what is, for me, a real problem. It has been very well written and it even delves into the financial implications of what they are suggesting. So, I would support that approach, because unless you come up with what some people have suggested were aggressive suggestions, in the Minority Report, if you do not actually change the situation so that people notice there is a change, then you will not get a change. It will just be business as normal.

So I think that the Minority Report goes quite a long way to change people's approach to the situation, but also takes into account the necessary requirements of the commercial community and also the residents, especially residents in St Peter Port, because one of the things that concerns me is when people talk of congestion, a lot of people talk about, 'Well it took an extra five minutes to drive from A to B.' Well, your five minutes, if you live outside town, is our pollution in town. And if all the muck that collects on my window sill at home is ending up in my lungs, then it must be affecting everybody else that lives in town. So, congestion is not just an extra five minutes to get to work.

Now, I have to say that I do not agree with all the recommendations that are in the Minority Report and I will talk about those in general debate, if I may, sir, but for the time being, as Deputy Langlois said, we have got to decide which report to debate and I would urge you all to debate the Minority Report rather than the departmental Report.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

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

I am not quite sure if I really wanted to speak after listening to Deputy Langlois. He is talking about passion and seduction and then he is talking about Amsterdam and it is a bit racy in here this morning, sir. *(Laughter)* I am getting a bit hot under the collar. It is a bit hot in here. I agree, Deputy Trott. It is a bit hot in here, isn't it?

And listening to the last speaker about the pollution, well, try living in the Vale. We take all your rubbish. We have fumes that are really quite obnoxious and we then have to breathe in 24 hours round the clock. Try living, like my colleague on my right here, near the power station and the fumes and the rubbish and the soot that they have from the power station. That is the price of living on a small Island, I am afraid.



We have to put up with some of these things as best we can and adjust them as best we can, but that is the price.

115 Listening to the debate yesterday, it is very much a case of two camps: opinions from those in one camp saying we have a traffic problem, to the others saying we have a congestion problem at rush hour. I am with the latter. There are many who struggle with the pace of life, trying to fit in working and bringing up a family and balancing the books financially. They need help and support from this Government, not penalised for bringing their car into town so they can go to work.

120 I agree we do have a congestion problem at rush hour. That is after eight o'clock when North Beach and the Salerie car parks are full. So, who are those using their cars, congesting the roads between eight and nine when tailbacks of cars crawling along the road exist? Could it be all those commuters with private parking? As it is not those without; they are already parked. So how would the Traffic Strategy work, addressing private parking for commuters? They would still bring their cars into town, rightly so, and still cause tailbacks.

125 Deputy Brehaut said yesterday and he listed many roads in St Martin's and along Les Banques. He said 'traffic', and I quote, 'grinds to a halt.' Really? No, it moves slowly during the rush hour, but grinds to a halt? For how long Deputy Brehaut? Half an hour or an hour or longer? A gross exaggeration of this so-called problem, that we must solve apparently. Well, I have not seen or heard about these long, although in  
130 other parts of the world, if it was half an hour ground to a halt, they would be welcomed as they really do grind to a halt for much longer. But, do we call a few minutes stopped as a problem? Should we and other road users be more tolerant of others? I think we should. Sometimes the reason traffic gets snarled up and crawls along is because the cyclist in front of traffic is causing the tailbacks, especially if you are going up hills. The Grange is a prime example – I would add a comment here as well. Those of you that want an  
135 open-door population policy – if you think Guernsey has a traffic problem now, you have not seen anything yet. Bear this debate in mind when the population report returns.

I pose a question for Members in here today. How many of you, during the last five weeks, since the Billet was published, have changed your habits of when you use your cars? Are you now walking, cycling or taking the bus? Very few of you may be. But those who really believe in the Minority or Majority  
140 Report, you should have been practising what we – and that is not me – are proposing to progress and proceed as the Traffic Strategy. Are you comfortable, sending out a message, 'Do as we say, not as we practise, because, hey ho, our lifestyles are different and we could not possibly manage without our cars. But we expect you to or we expect you to... [*Inaudible*]'

Too often yesterday we heard, 'You need to vote for one of these reports.' Deputy De Lisle and Deputy  
145 Laurie Queripel reminded you that you do not have to do that at all. There are three options: support the Majority or the Minority Report or the third option: reject both. Somebody said yesterday, they would vote for the Minority Report and vote against the substantive propositions. Why do that? Do not waste time. If you are really not signed up to the Minority or Majority Report, do as Deputy Brehaut urged you to do yesterday. Just be honest. Vote out both. Come back if you want to tinker by adding alternatives or  
150 additions to the 2006 Strategy that is still in place. Please do not mess about fining people under the disguise of paid parking. If you feel that strongly about people leaving their cars on North Beach and the Salerie car parks all day – and I do not – then, remove the 10-hour restriction. It is as simple as that. It is self-policing that way. If no long-term parking spaces, people will not take their cars. And it is a shame there is an amendment from those that are calling for the congestion and the problems in town, that, there  
155 again, the truth is that we want people to park their cars in the 10-hour parks, because the money is needed to fund the strategy. Do it through the right way. Do it through the Tax Strategy that is coming forward or the Billet and amend it through tax.

Vale Douzaine have quite a cross-section of Douzeniers from within our community, both in age and backgrounds, retired or working. Yet, when Deputy Fallaize asked the Douzeniers to vote on paid parking,  
160 only one supported paid parking. And, yes, it was made clear to them before they voted, by Deputy Jones, that short-term parking of two and a half hours would be free. One Douzenier who works in finance in town said, 'Short-term car parks will be used by commuters and they will move their cars, as the cost of £1,500 per year is something that many cannot afford on top of the increasing costs – most inflicted in the costs these days are by the States of Guernsey. They are now struggling financially. You want to encourage as  
165 many as possible to work, raising more money through contributions in Income Tax. That is good news, but then do not you take away the money for them doing so.

Having a survey is very commendable, with the Minority Report and we have got the details in here with the Majority Report, but why are there so few? Any Traffic Strategy involves all of the population and should include every household. Why seek responses from so few and use the feedback from approximately  
170 500 as sufficient? The *Press* carried out a survey and those asked rejected paid parking. Bus Users' Group did not want free buses. The Guernsey Motor Traders' Association, we have heard from them and we have heard from many others as well. Certainly, those posting on social media, that I have seen, the majority do

not support paid parking and ask, 'What problem, apart from congestion with traffic during the rush hour, exists?'

I look forward to the Island-wide voting debate, because if such credence has been given to such a small number and SACC had nearly 7,000 replies supporting some form of Island-wide voting, I am looking to the same support for when that comes back from these Members who are using the 500. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

So, who is calling for this change of behaviour? Where did it come from, this change of behaviour? Was it the small percentage of respondents? This change of behaviour tag really comes across as dictatorial and 'We know better, people of Guernsey. You had better change your lifestyle, with encouragement, of course.' I would expect a parent to use such terminology when pretty cross with their child, but not a States of Guernsey talking about our population who dare to use their car and park it for more than two and half hours. 'Get on the bus or we will charge you'.

The health card angle has been used during debate and that is very commendable and every one of us contributes to doing our best to support health initiatives. I am not convinced, though, it is healthy, wanting to achieve four buses, crammed with 40 people in a bus, breathing in one another's germs and passengers are coughing and sneezing and spreading bugs. (*Laughter*) Not the best environment to be healthy. Also, you try being in a crowded bus on a day when it is raining heavy. Go today on a crowded bus when it is raining heavy. You get in there and the smell at times is not particularly pleasant with wet clothes and people smelling, I can assure you. And Deputy Brehaut is waving and saying, 'That is fine, we do that now.' Maybe you do, maybe you do not and I am not sure they use it every day. But, do on a rainy day. Be it inflicted upon you every day to do that when it is raining.

And it is even worse for others when the rain starts and they no longer have a coat to protect their clothes. They have to sit on a wet seat and you want more people on buses.

We need to do something about the bus service. The bus service is not good. The summer service has now been promoted as an awful lot better, but it can only be an awful lot better on how dire it was, but it is not better than how it was before CT Plus came along. So, it depends who your starting point is.

We do not have a problem, as such. We have a congestion problem with slow moving traffic during the rush hour. Nearly every day, once cars have passed Admiral Park traffic lights, going towards town, traffic flows without any problems. When I was on the Environment Department, a paper was produced asking us to support another area for small cars. This time on the Albert Pier. This followed the introduction of the small car parking scheme on the Arm of the Crown Pier. I refused to approve such a scheme until the civil servants produced a small car parking scheme, starting at Frossard House as it was unfair that many civil servants and States' Members could park at Frossard House, regardless of the size of their vehicle, without any restrictions, yet the States want to single out the public who park in town. I asked for that paper, which never appeared and why am I not surprised about that? The rest, they say, is history.

Ideas of paid parking should also be history. We have the Tax and Benefit Pensions report coming up soon. We have Deputy Le Lièvre's coming forward as well. If you really want to actually raise more money, do it through the proper means, through the Budget and then send directions that ask to go to Environment Department.

I would have liked both of these Reports to have included a campaign sponsored by the States of Guernsey, something along the lines of, 'With so many living on this Island, please be more tolerant of others. Live and let live. We are different and all have different lifestyles and needs. Think before you criticise how others run their lives.' Because we should be sending out a message that we really do not want to involve more bureaucracy than is needed or necessary for how people run their lives.

I commend those who like to cycle or even use their legs and walk or go on the bus. It is their choice – most of the time. In some ways, most of us want to choose a car in a style and size of our choice that suits what we need. So, where will it end? Will we see another report in the future telling us what size house we must live in, that is good for the environment? If you have got only two of you living in a house, you can only have one bedroom, because you are wasting... not good for the environment. Life is all about choice. Most in here, I suggest, own more than one form of transport or within their family. That is fine. Life is about choice.

The electorate chose us to represent them and we are here to represent them and on this occasion I have had an overwhelming response asking me to please reject both Reports, as they do not want paid parking and they do not see there is a traffic problem other than a congestion problem at certain times of the day. Please do not use a sledgehammer to crack an egg and, as I said before, if you really want cars off North Beach and the Salerie car park, an amendment today should be placed to remove all 10-hour parking from 1st June to before the year end. And for the avoidance of doubt, I would not support such an amendment.

I thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Langlois.

**Deputy Langlois:** Point of correction, sir. Just briefly, is not the expression, ‘Crowded bus’ a contradiction in terms, currently in Guernsey? (*Laughter*)

**Deputy Lowe:** That is for the future.

**The Bailiff:** Sorry, Deputy Ogier, you wish to be *relevé* and Deputy Perrot, as well, you wish to be *relevé*?

I call next Deputy Gillson then Deputy Soulsby and Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Gillson:** Sir, clearly there are issues regarding traffic in the Island – issues which negatively impact on the population. Many of the roads in the Island are not cycle or pedestrian friendly. Many do not have pavements. So, there is good reason to see change. Therefore, there is clearly a need for a Transport Strategy and for some positive action to be done to encourage non-car forms of transport.

Listening to the speeches, one could be forgiven for thinking that only the Minority Report is trying to achieve a change in travel habits, but that is not so. Either of the two strategies, the Main Environment Report or the Minority Report, will have a positive impact. There are many similarities between them and the differences are reasonably minor. Looking at the document produced by Environment, you can see they both have the main aims of seeking to address the adverse impacts of vehicles. They both recognise real barriers to increasing the use of alternative transport. They both want to improve cycling and create initiatives. Walking initiatives are included in both. A free bus is included in both. There is a lot of similarity, so it is not a case that only the Minority one will deliver a change in people’s habits.

The main difference between the two strategies is funding. Much of the funding for both is similar with taxes, various other taxes and duties. The big difference is either imposing paid parking on the few or a fuel surcharge on the many. For that reason, I am going to focus on paid parking. I am also focusing on it because it is an integral part of the Minority Report. The Minority Report says that it is a whole package, so voting on the Minority Report and then voting out paid parking is not an option, according to the Minority Report.

Now, I accept that, unlike Deputy Lowe, it is not all about congestion, but congestion is an element, so we should consider it. It is not unusual for long-term parking in town on North Beach, Salerie Corner to be full at 8.15 a.m., 8.25 a.m., but, at that time, even later on, there is a regularly a tailback of traffic, right as far as the former Tobacco Factory. So, clearly, those cars in the tailback are not parking in 10-hour zones. Logically, they must be parking elsewhere and most likely on sites which are provided by their employers.

Now, I accept the Minority Report does go some way to try and address this. It suggests that paid parking and parking provided by an employer would be considered a benefit in kind and there is logic to that, because it would equal up the cost base for those who come in a park in public lines and those park in their employer’s. But, no work has been conducted on this. We do not know if it is possible to make work-provided car parks a benefit in kind and we can assume it is possible, but there would a major question in relation to which areas of town would apply and where would be the inclusion zone. Where would it end? What office buildings would be included? And what about people who have to use their car for their work who are in that zone?

What about people who move in and out of the zone – for instance, the staff at C&E in St Martin’s? Now there is no mention of paid parking in St Martin’s so presumably there would be no benefit in kind tax for office workers in St Martin’s – yet they regularly have to come down to Frossard House. Now, if that was within the benefit of kind zone, would they have to pay a proportionate benefit in kind, because they travel down one day a week for CoG meeting or whatever? It is a great unknown as to whether it is practical to have a benefit in kind.

So that is an unknown and if we approve paid parking and we find we do not have a benefit of kind, then we have got an unfair situation and it is an unfair situation which a Minority Report accepts is unfair by virtue of the fact that they suggesting paid parking and parking on private land is a benefit in kind, so we could end up with a position which, by virtue of the way the report is written, implies that they do not want to end up. And I think unfairness is a real issue with paid parking.

So, the small point about paid parking, it does nothing to affect through traffic. Through town, good or bad, is a main north/south thoroughfare. Significant amounts of the traffic is going to be through traffic, but paid parking will not alleviate that congestion and people who contribute to the congestion through this through traffic will pay nothing towards the funding of a strategy. Again, the Minority Report is fundamentally unfair.

When looking at paid parking, we cannot ignore the effect on town as a retail centre. Now, reading the Minority Report, it is clear the aim of introducing paid parking is to reduce the number of cars coming into town. Deputy Burford, in her speech, mentioned shared spaces and pedestrian areas; that they increase attractiveness of retail areas, therefore increase sales and the viability of shops and that is true, but we already have them. Our major retail routes – the High Street, the Arcade, Le Pollet – are all pedestrian

295 areas. Now, I could not see anything in the Minority Report about extending pedestrian areas. The introduction of paid parking will do nothing to increase the amount of shared spaces or pedestrian areas. So referring to shared spaces as a justification to introduce paid parking sounds great, but in the context of our Island and our present system, it is totally spurious.

300 In fact, what is proposed by the Minority Report may even increase the number of cars coming into the Pier areas. It says so at paragraph 55 of the Minority Report. There is a section relating to changing timed parking zones to two and half hour periods and I quote:

‘It is considered that this maximum time limit will also promote turnover of spaces.’

That has to mean more cars coming into town. The Minority Report is actually advocating more cars coming into the area of the Pier car parks. And the removal of three hour zones from North Beach will also force more cars into that area.

305 So, on one hand, we have the Minority Report that considers the need for less cars in town, but to allay the fear of the retail industry, section 55 suggests there may well be an increase. After all, as I said, if you write in a report, ‘a greater turnover of cars’ that has to mean more cars coming in.

Now, of equal importance is the number of parking spaces available and the period they are. This is where there is significant concern in the Minority Report. It includes a proposal to change all the three-hour spaces in North Beach car park to long-stay parking, a net reduction in short-term parking in town. But mention is made that the introduction of paid parking will free up valuable land in car parks, but it does not mention... But land can only be freed up if it is in big enough blocks. Yet the Minority Report makes no mention of reducing large blocks of car parking spaces. There is a general suggestion, in paragraph 51, that land will be given over for harbour uses in time, but, as I have already mentioned, paragraph 54(ii) states the three-hour zones will be converted into long-stay spaces to compensate for the loss of spaces to other harbour activities.

315 So, it seems a real contradiction. One section of the Report advocates replacing a number of long-term spaces, the other section in the same Report advocates increasing the number of spaces – not only just increasing them, increasing them at the cost of short-term spaces which are there for the benefit of shoppers. Because, as Deputy Lowe said, if you want to dissuade people parking in North Beach, actually the easiest is just half the number of spaces. Do that without paid parking.

320 But, sir, I suppose my biggest concern about paid parking is the unfairness of paid parking. It is unfair to expect one group of drivers, a relatively small group of drivers, to part-fund the Island-wide strategy. Clearly, the introduction of a Transport Strategy which includes real actions would involve additional expenditure. This funding will need to be raised one way or another. The key is the way we raise money. The key is to ensure we raise funds in a way which is as fair as possible. Now the traffic issues are not just limited to town. The strategy is not limited to town. The vehicles which will be affected by the strategy are not limited to town. Issues affect the whole of the Island and all vehicles which use our roads. Therefore, it is fundamentally unfair to target one small section of road users to significantly contribute to the strategy.

330 The Majority Report is fairer. It targets all vehicles, a wider net than paid parking.

Sir, I would now like to consider the financial projections contained in Table 3 on page 774. I am not going to question the actual numbers. I realise they are estimates, based on many assumptions, but I will question whether the amounts can deliver what is being proposed. For instance, let us consider the £420,000 to improve cycling infrastructure. The report includes a number of initiatives and ideas towards cycling infrastructure. So, one would expect that the £420,000 is an estimate of the costs of those improvements. That would be a reasonable way of producing a budget for a new project. You work out the dimensions of the project and estimate costs. But, no, that is not how the amount has been calculated. If you read note 66, it explains the amount is based on an arbitrary amount of £7 per person, per year. So, from what is written in the report, there seems to be no correlation between the cost of what is planned and the amount in the budget. So, what happens if that is not enough?

340 Sir, in summary, you may have guessed I am not going to support this amendment. There is a significant overlap between the two Reports. In general terms, the carrots are very similar. If you want a better public transport, both reports want free buses. If you want initiatives to encourage alternative transport, both reports have it. Personally, I would like to see more roads converted into one-way systems with cycle paths like we have round St Sampson’s High School. I would like to see the whole of the road from the Capelles School, Pitronnerie Road, possibly the Red Lion, one way into town with a cycle path, balanced by the Rohais and out to De Beauvoir as one way with a cycle path the other way. That would make driving a bit less convenient, but it would make cycling or walking much easier and much safer. Now that initiative could be achieved under either strategy. That initiative does not need the stick of paid parking.

350 Such initiatives as a better bus service can be delivered by the Main Report without paid parking. As I have mentioned, there is a lot to commend both Reports. There is a lot of similarity between the two Reports. The biggest is funding and that is why I am not supporting the Minority Report.

But there is another further concern, a risk with the Minority Report. The number of unknowns which I contend within the Minority Report compared to the Main Report. This can be seen by the number of additional reports each strategy requires to be bought back to the States. In the Majority Report there is one. It is a report on the sale of vehicles from public land. Contrast this to the Minority Report. The Minority Report requires the same report on the sale of vehicles from public land; a report on commercial vehicles and measures to align commercial vehicle activity as strategy aims; the report on benefits in kind; the report on taxi provision; the report on presumed liability legislation, where if a cyclist is involved in an accident, the other party is presumed to be the party at fault; the review of speed limits; the review of congestion of traffic round the bridge; dynamic parking; and reports on the buyback and rent out schemes for taxi plates. This is a big list of unknowns. They are all part of the Minority Report, but, as yet, no work has been done on them. We do not know if they are possible.

So, I think we should first try to achieve a change people's attitudes using carrots more than sticks. We should implement the Majority Report strategy. It is going to be reviewed in a couple of years and we can evaluate then, has it worked, has it not worked? It may have worked and we may not need paid parking. We may have to bring it in, but at least doing it in a staged way is less risky for towns than the introduction of paid parking. Sometimes a staged approach, the less risky, is safest. So, let us improve the bus service. Let us improve the cycling and walking infrastructure and after those have been considered and have been shown that they do not work, then use the harsh arbitrary and quite narrow stick of paid parking.

Sir, I think we should reject this amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby and then Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, Deputy Langlois will be pleased to hear that I do not want to take up too much longer of Members' time on this debate. It has already taken longer than it took me to run the London Marathon the other week. *(Applause)* And there were a couple of times yesterday when it did seem just as painful as running 26 miles. I will leave it to Members to work out when that was.

Generally, though, I found it quite a good debate. Now, I will begin by making comments on behalf of the Public Accounts Committee with regard to the financial information contained within both the Minority Report and the Main Report and then give my own thoughts. I will start by making clear that the Public Accounts Committee has significant concerns about the quality of the financial information contained within both strategies. It is our belief that no assurance can be given as to the robustness of the financial information presented within either Report.

I now outline a number of specific areas of concern across both Reports. There is heavy emphasis on education and communication within the Main Report. However, this is not reflected by the level of the cost presented in the schedule of expenditure on page 617, being £100,000 in the first year and £50,000 thereafter, excluding staff costs. The Minority Report is generally more detailed. However, we would question why capital items are presented together with revenue expenditure. For example, the cost of bus shelters and real-time information systems, whilst the bus depots is being considered as an advertised expense. It would be preferable if these figures could have been analysed separately.

A key aspect of both reports is to influence behaviour, such that the motor vehicle is not the default choice of transportation. The reports propose various means of achieving this aim. However, how can we be sure either strategy actually represents value for money? The Committee would consider that unless any strategy includes firm targets, specifically what each strategy wants to achieve and by when, it is very difficult to measure success or failure. As an example, both aim to increase a level of bus usage and the principal means of doing this is through the removal of bus fares. However, nowhere does either report state what would be a minimum target of this policy or how to determine its success.

At the core of the Minority Report, is the implementation of paid parking. Again, there are no clear targets defined in terms of car park occupancy, though 85% is mentioned as an aim and dynamic pricing considered at some undefined point in the future.

Neither report outlines targets for the level of reduction of cars on the road; an increased level of cycling or the use of alternative modes of transport. The targets that are mentioned are not clearly defined. For example, in the Main Report, in section 15.4 it states that the Department has allowed for a 10% per annum swing away from larger, more polluting vehicles and has allowed for a 1% per annum reduction in fuel use in favour of walking, cycling and bus use. It also mentions a 10% swing to cleaner vehicles and 10% to narrower vehicles. Paragraph 164 of the Minority Report mentions a need for a worthwhile modal shift, but, again, this is not quantified.

It is a view of the Public Accounts Committee that with few meaningful and measureable targets, it will be impossible to judge whether the money raised is being spent effectively. As an example, it is far from clear that if we reduce the number of cars on the road by 1% to 2%, it will make a substantive difference in terms of the aims of the strategies. It is also clearly debatable if this level of behavioural change is worth the money it is estimated is required.

Another specific concern relates to the wide range of assumptions being made that do not appear to have any stated justification other than being considered by the authors as reasonable. These include reduction of fuel use, car use and a variety of infrastructure improvements. In terms of fuel duty rises, various academic papers that have shown the correlation between increases in fuel prices and a reduction in car usage which supports the Policy and Research Unit's report. However, the situation is not so black and white. A study undertaken last year showed that whilst usage went down, car users were not willing to reduce journeys for transporting family members and shopping. In addition, it is not possible to ignore the effect the 2008 financial crash might have had on the level of fuel usage. We would also question the calculations of potential fuel income being based on an annual mileage of 10,000 miles and would question how this estimate was arrived at.

Sir, in summary, the Public Accounts Committee has major concerns about the financial aspects of both the strategies being presented in terms of what they are setting out to achieve and the assumptions being made. It is our belief that no assurance can be given as to the robustness of the financial information contained within either strategy at this stage.

Now, speaking from a personal point of view, I must say that I consider the Minority Report better written, better thought through and better considered than the Main Report. The presentation was certainly more professional and I commend Deputy Burford in particular for the hard work she has put in since the beginning of this term in developing a strategy and what has become the Minority Report. There are some great ideas in both Reports. In particular I support all the ideas to make the environment better for those wanting to get from A to B on two wheels or two legs. For too long cyclists on this Island have been considered irritants who just get in the way of the motorist. Government should positively support those who choose the alternative forms of transport. This is essential if societal attitudes are to change.

Yesterday, Deputy Laurie Queripel talked about a cycle tax, but he completely misses the point that the taxes, charges, whatever you want to call them, are designed to influence behaviour. The last thing we should, therefore, be doing is taxing the mode of transport we want to encourage. (A Member: Hear, hear.) So, yes, we need more cycle lanes, one way systems, cycle networks. We have needed them for years.

At the same time, I also agree with the need to promote responsible driving. I find it amazing how people's personalities completely change when they get behind the wheel.

The Canadian Philosopher Marshall McLuhan once remarked and I quote:

'The car has become the carapace, the protected and aggressive shell, of urban and suburban man.'

And, believe me, the best place to witness this – or should this be worst? – is on a bike, being cut up by a driver who tries to pass you with just inches to spare or getting as close to your rear wheel and revving the engine. These are selfish and thoughtless actions that should be addressed. Of course, some cyclists are not immune from criticism either, but cyclists are vulnerable road users.

I was once knocked off my bike at the top of Grange. Fortunately for me, I got hit by a Hyundai Dynamica and not a Range Rover or other four wheel drive. Indeed, I do wonder who came off better on that, me with all my bruises and broken ribs or the Hyundai with its broken windscreen and wing mirror. Anyway, having had a rather close encounter with an automobile than is good for you, I did end up having to be stretchered off in an ambulance to the PEH and whilst I was being transported one of the paramedics on board told me their term for a cyclist here was 'future customer'. We cannot let that continue.

So I welcome all initiatives to make our roads a less stressful and dangerous place to be. But, then I cannot see anyone here really objecting to either of the above elements of the report. It all seems so obvious and long overdue. To me, this should be the first part of any strategy to develop and implement. If only it was as easy as that.

These reports also contain other far more reaching proposals to consider and I would just like to focus on three of the most contentious: first registration duty, buses and paid parking. Now both reports do adopt a first registration duty. I am not convinced that a vehicle's width should be used for a basis of taxation because it does not reflect the overall impact of a vehicle on the road and I do have issues regarding the effect of this element of the duty for certain business, which is why I have laid my amendment. However, that aspect aside, I do believe it is about time we dealt with the polluting effects of motor vehicles: the biggest source of greenhouse gas emissions on this Island. We are far behind other more enlightened jurisdictions in seeking to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and it would be incomprehensible for this not to be part of any Transport Strategy. The question is whether such a duty is significant enough to achieve its stated aim of behavioural change.

From the analysis I have done, I believe there is little in Main Report to incentivise people to move to a smaller, less polluting vehicle. I took the annualised costs provided of the vehicles listed on page 621 and divided that by the cars against that price. What I found was that the annualised costs of buying a Ford Ka as a proportion of its retail price would be just 0.6%; in fact the same as for a larger and more expensive BMW 520i. So, how would that influence the buying decision?

The Minority Report is better structured so that a larger, more polluting car will attract a proportionately higher annualised cost. For instance, in this case, there will be no charge for a Ford Ka, but for a Land Rover Freelander, the annualised cost, as a proportionate of its retail price, will be 1.3%. It also makes sense to offer a subsidy for electric vehicles to off-set the higher purchase price to some extent. Just taxing is not enough. This is something other jurisdictions, such as France have realised they need to bring in. So, for me the burden of first registration is better developed in the Minority Report.

However, saying all that, I am unsure whether a first registration duty will be as effective in influencing behaviour as an annual tax. It will take longer to have an effect and may have unintended consequences in terms of buying choices.

Turning to the buses, current usage is pitiful. I did a rough calculation as to bus occupancy using the annual passenger figures and working out the number of routes operated throughout the year and worked out that the average bus occupancy is approximately nine people. This is for buses with a maximum occupancy of around 50. We found out from the Transport Consultation that just 3% of respondents use a bus five days a week, but 66% think that there are sufficient bus routes around them. So, why do we not all use buses? The answer is given further on, where 77% say car use is essential with 91% saying it is more convenient than public transport. So, will making the buses free make any difference? I really do not think it will and apart from the noise over charging visitors more than locals, the evidence is that people think the fares are very reasonable now anyway.

The problem is not the cost. It is the service provided and on that basis, I welcome the initiatives in both reports to incentivise people to hop on a bus. But I see no reason to make the bus service free, especially when we consider all the other expenditure demands at the moment and there is no guarantee bus usage will increase or have any effect on vehicle congestion. Indeed, I seem to recall, when the bus drivers went on strike last year, how many people commented on how the traffic flowed better!

Now, even what was known as the Soviet Socialist Republic of Sheffield charged 20p a ride in 1980s and that is about 80p to 90p now. It was really popular, but then it was also a really well run service. So, yes, let us get the smaller shuttle buses. Let us have the bus tracker apps and let us have more suitable bus shelters. Get a proper fit for purpose bus service and it may get more people out of their cars. At the end of the day, we do not have the density of population ever to have a public transport service that meets the needs of every person wherever they live to enable them to go wherever they want, whenever they want on this Island.

So finally, and inexorably, I come to paid parking. I know there are some here with very strong feelings about whether or not we should introduce paid parking, but I have always had an open mind about the merits or otherwise. I spent the last couple of months listening to the arguments on both sides and they both sound fair and reasonable in theory. From using paid parking to change behaviour on the one hand to the fact that it is inequitable on the other. I have listened and questioned. I have also read numerous research papers – one in French, though it did involve heavy use of Google Translate, so I might not have got the whole picture. But, I have come into this with an open mind.

I am still concerned about the principle of paid parking in the manner envisaged in the Minority Report and I will give a couple of reasons why. The first arose from watching a BBC series being broadcast at the moment called 'Parking Mad'. The documentary follows a battle between wardens, bailiffs and drivers primarily over parking fines, but also sheds a light on how parking charges influence behaviour. In the first episode we saw a pay and display car park right next to a station, completely empty, but motorists were driving around the neighbourhood to find free kerbside spaces, making life a misery for the residents. I believe if paid parking were introduced here, especially only in town car parks, exactly the same thing could happen. It just moves the parking problem further away. It will be just another way in which Guernsey will turn into little England and we will not be the better for it. (A Member: Hear, hear.)

Another reason for concern relates to the counter-argument to the point that paid parking is inequitable. The proponents of paid parking say that it is expensive to run a car anyway and so the poorest in our society will be better off without one. (Laughter) However, the authors of the report have explicitly stated that they do not want to get rid of the motor car, only to cut down unnecessary journeys by car and that there are times when we all need one. So, this strategy will have little effect, other than to make life less convenient for those who I would argue are not only cash poor, but time poor as well.

So, in summary, I believe the Minority Report is in many ways superior to that of the Main Report and I am therefore inclined to support it at this stage. Indeed, as with Deputy Duquemin, I was so underwhelmed by the Department's presentations of its report that I feel like there was little belief in what they are proposing anyway. I may not have agreed with all Deputy Burford said – I do not. But at least she believed in what she was saying. However, I am still concerned about the effects of paid parking in practice, especially before we know we have an adequate bus service, before those in the public and private sector who get a car parking space are suddenly charged.

The application of the user-pays principle in this situation is also a big issue that has only just been touched on in debate. User-pays principle, yes, something which I have studied in depth and have a degree

to prove it, but the user pays principle takes things to another level which could have significant consequences if adopted across the States and which I will cover off in the main debate. So, whilst I will support the Minority over the Main Report now, I have to say, I will not be able to support all aspects of the report as it stands. Frankly, I think both strategies are a sledgehammer to crack a nut (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and if ever the phrase ‘keep it simple’ was appropriate, it is in relation to a Transport Strategy for Guernsey. (*Applause*)

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop, then Deputy St Pier and Deputy Sherbourne.

**Deputy Gollop:** Sir, just to round up a few points that have been made, before I get into the main meat of it, really. Firstly, I nearly interjected when Deputy Jones was talking about the money wasted, the £33 million that had been already given to the bus companies and that we should be ashamed of ourselves, who sat on previous Environment Departments and Traffic Departments and so on. I think the point that has been made is that, I think all those Departments have been guilty of misleading the public and the States. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Not because they misspent the money. Some of it may have been misspent, but because they were promising something they could not deliver and it was not just that they could not deliver, through a magic wand, that the Guernseyman or woman would leave their cars and jump on the bus. It was more basic than that. They were promising to provide a realistic alternative to the private car and they did not have enough money to do it. And that applies to both of these strategies as well, but I will come onto that.

I did slightly carp at Deputy Langlois’ jest about there never being a full bus, because I have travelled on buses, even in the last week, which have been full. They are frequently full. They are full with tourists. They are full with people going to hotels. They are full, occasionally, at peak hours on the busier routes, such as to the airport, and they are certainly full when school children, scholars, who are, perhaps, at school, at the Grammar School and colleges or wherever, going from one part of the Island to another on the scheduled service and, indeed, Deputy Domaille would confirm that the northern routes, particularly, are full at commuter times.

Now, when you see a bus and it is seven o’clock on a winter’s evening and it is just turning round at L’Eree Bay, of course it is empty, because it has unloaded everybody and it is not likely to pick up many people on a windy day in January. So, we have to be sceptical of these figures and Deputy Soulsby’s analysis of only nine is not that bad, actually. A few years ago, it would have been five or six. Remember, we have 700,000 using the buses in 1998. That is a fact. And you cannot have it both ways. If you put on more services to make the services more attractive and run earlier in the morning, late at night, they serve more rural areas as well as the built up corridors, they are bound to drop in average loadings, because, clearly, you experiment with a six in the morning journey, a few workers to the airport or hospital were needed, but it will be less popular than the journey at eight in the morning and so those are points.

And I also heard Deputy Lowe, I think, talking about going to Amsterdam, which might be fun, because I would love to go there for the cultural delights (*Laughter*) – you know, the Anne Frank Exhibition and the van Gogh and so on.

**Deputy Le Clerc:** You did not say that before, John.

**Deputy Gollop:** Well, but, in fact, a former Deputy offered to take me there for a weekend once, but that is another story. (*Laughter*)

I must admit, I am not jumping up and down with excitement at these traffic strategies, even Deputy Burford’s amendment. I think Deputy Burford has set a new standard of work for a Deputy. I think that she has emulated, if not surpassed the kind of Civil Service or scrutiny approach that we need for policy and that is to be commended. And I will support the amendment as the best available package on the table.

That said, I am not a believer in it and I am not a believer in Deputy Domaille’s Majority Report and I am not a believer in doing nothing either. (*Laughter*) So I have sat through many, many traffic debates. I even wrote one of the strategies myself for Friends of the Earth in the early 1990’s and they all have a fundamental philosophical flaw, and the philosophical flaw is simple. They combine three incompatible policies. The first issue that is embedded within them is the desire, environmentally, for us to be less polluting and have a better Island – a kind of dandelion vision. I think most of us, but not all of us, who like the cars can support that and strategically all of our policies have gone along that route for many years, as Deputy Burford outlined. Where, I think, some States Members have been a bit naughty in the past is they voted for these policies without really believing in them. They have actually not believed in them, but they have not amended them either. But, I can support them on a feel good level. (*Laughter*)

The second issue that we really need is more money for the States. We desperately need more funds for coastal construction, for capital investment, for the Police possibly, for health and social services, for education, whatever and the motor car is a good source of finance. It is a cash cow and Deputy Jones and I



595 want to milk it for all its worth! I want the motorist to pay much, much more than they are doing, so I want to support everything. I want to support the MOTs. I want to support the paid parking. I want to support the extra tax on fuel, because that is going to come anyway, sooner or later.

So, you have got to be realistic. If you say we do not want the money for health education and investment, presumably you want tax allowances to be frozen or you want other forms of taxation or whatever. You cannot have everything and the motor taxation is a better way than any other way.

600 And some Members in the corner there were saying, 'Oh, well this is a form of social engineering.' Of course it is. But, I would answer that point in two ways. Poor little me, smoking my cigarettes out there with half a dozen others, has been taxed out of existence (*Laughter and interjections*) and that has been a policy of social engineering. It has not been based entirely on physical reasons and, of course, we support the colleges and support university students and all sorts of other fine endeavours. That is a form of social  
605 engineering, to structure the society we want. Mortgage tax relief is a kind of social engineering as well. Where do we end with that? So, I start with the principle we need the money and we have assets that we can look at and we are doing that in every other sphere, so why is the motorist protected?

The third point which Deputy Soulsby raised, and others, is the state of the bus service. Because of the nature of Guernsey's geography, its population, where it lives, it is even a different shape from Jersey, a bus  
610 service can never be commercially paying its way. Even at the height of the golden era of the 1950's and 1960's, it did not in the winter months, but it was subsidised by the 443 guest houses we read about in the *Press* last week. That era has gone and it was inevitable that the buses would hit stormy waters and we do need to support the buses for the reasons Deputy Burford mostly gave – social inclusion. I would say to Deputy Soulsby, the extra money spent on it should not be considered wasted, even if it only delivered two  
615 per cent improvements, because it is about making life better for the 8,000 people who do not have a car. And I would also point and commend page 577 of the main strategy which says, the strategy focus is about making it easier, safer and beneficial to use the alternative transport means more frequently. And it is about making that possible by taking away some of the dominance of the private motor vehicle.

But the reason why I do not jump up and down for joy at Deputy Burford's strategy is not just that there  
620 could be unforeseen consequences of residential parking, the popularity of the town and so on, but it is also about the issue that Deputy Ogier raised yesterday that it does not go far enough, neither does. And I tell you why it does not go far enough. What is the price of a litre of fuel in Guernsey? Round about 118p, give or take garages. In the Isle of Man, it is 148p in some places. We mentioned my trip to Amsterdam or wherever it was going to be – well some of you did. I did – (*Laughter*) and also Copenhagen. I went to  
625 Copenhagen once and saw the Little Mermaid. It was quite interesting. But, those two cities were highlighted in Deputy Burford's video technology, the presentation that Darren Duquemin rightly commended. Denmark has a litre price, on Wikipedia, of £1.59 a litre, in English money. The Netherlands is number two on this list – Italy is there somewhere as well – £1.58. Now, we know that people in those countries have a lower average income than ourselves, per capita, and we know that we are better off than  
630 them and our Island is so much smaller than those places, so our motoring costs are likely to be less, in a sense. But, we have a social engineering policy of the cheapest motoring in Europe. So, how we can go from being where we are now to where they are with our level of motoring tax, it is ridiculous.

The point is that the effect of either strategy will be miniscule in achieving any profound objective on the motorist of Guernsey and their choices.

635 I could mention paid parking here as well. Just across the water in Weymouth, the nearest English town to us, I notice that a rate to park at the council offices, per day, for eight hours, was £11. Not £5 or £6. Look across the water to Jersey and the core rate, although there are cheaper and dearer alternatives, is 74p a unit, which would approximate to about... well, it is more than 60p and Jersey still has problems. It has a worse bus service than us in a number of respects. It has as many cars. It is building highways and underpasses on  
640 so on. So, my real point is, neither strategy is fiscally tough enough to achieve any significant objective and in both strategies the number of buses being proposed is laughably small. In the 1970s, Guernsey had 110 vehicles used on scheduled services. We currently have 41. One of the strategies proposes another four and the other one proposes another two. Well, that is really going to pack in another million passengers a year!

The reality is we do not really know what we are doing, but rather than doing nothing and allowing the  
645 bus services to deteriorate further and the number of cars on the Island to increase and when a road is closed the congestion can stop everything for half an hour around the Island, we have to support the sterling work Deputy Burford has begun to do. But, I really do believe this is just phase one of a much bigger task. (*Applause*)

650 **The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** Thank you, sir.

I will begin by speaking on behalf of Treasury and Resources and making some additional comments and then speak individually.

Sir, Treasury and Resources' comments letter is set out pages 788 and 789 of the Billet and I think there are, hopefully, fairly self-explanatory comments in there, so I do not intend to either repeat or expand on those. However, a couple of issues have arisen during debate which I think it is worth addressing and providing a Treasury view on.

In particular, the question of the bus depot under the Minority Report and how that would be financed and managed by the Minority Report, given that this is the amendment we are speaking to. The Minority Report clearly is proposing that a bus depot is built on the back of a loan and that would, the programme itself or the project itself, would be managed as part of the States' capital investment portfolio, so it would have the same rigour in terms of project management. The income stream to fund the loan and the repayment of the loan would come from the Capital Reserve and, therefore, Treasury and Resources would be recommending additional appropriations into the Capital Reserve, currently estimated £1.15 million per annum and, of course, the funding for that is provided for by other elements of the strategy. So, just to explain how it would be managed and accounted for within the Capital Reserve.

Secondly, sir, there has been some dispute, argument, about whether the proposals amount to charges or taxes and, therefore, what the impact would be on the overall fiscal and economic plan and so on. I understand the Law Officers, although I have not seen this, I have been advised that the Law Officers' advice is that the width and emissions charges are charges rather than taxes. I am not sure that Treasury necessarily would agree with that position. We would regard them as taxes. They do not, if you like, meet Policy Council's advice on the level of charging, which should be linked to the costs incurred and so on. But, irrespective of that, I think the reality is – and this is probably a point which Deputy David Jones made yesterday – is the public will regard them as money out of their pocket and, therefore, the nomenclature is to some extent irrelevant. Therefore, in terms of the overall take from Government from individuals, it would form part of that.

Secondly, I would also like to just, perhaps, endorse and commend Deputy Soulsby's comments on behalf of the Public Accounts Committee, particularly the comments about the lack of amortisation in relation to the bus fleet and the absence of clear realisable benefits and targets in terms of objectives.

The other point I would like to make is that I think the Assembly should recognise that, if the Minority Report is accepted, then one of the issues which we in the Personal Tax and Pensions and Benefits Review are aware of is, if you like, the headroom for motor charges, taxes, in all its forms, could well be, to some extent, limited because of the charges which will come through the Transport Strategy. Therefore, if we are either looking to raise new money, which is the point to which Deputy Gollop was speaking, or if we are simply looking to diversify our tax base from direct taxes to indirect taxes, either because we believe we are over-dependant on direct taxation with 73% coming from income-related revenue, or even if we do not buy that argument, we recognise that, actually, our tax allowances now, given that they are less than the UK for the first time, we now have a competitiveness issue in relation to our Personal Income Tax system and, therefore, we may wish to address that issue by diversifying into indirect taxes. Then, to some extent, our capacity to do so, through major taxation may be limited by some of the measures taken here. To give you, by way of example, a road tax of 80,000 vehicles at £100 per vehicle is £8 million; £200 per vehicle is £16 million. So the numbers are quite significant. So recognising the interaction there with tax strategies elsewhere is a relevant point.

However, speaking personally, again, like others, I would regard the Minority Report as being very coherent and, again, as others have done, would commend Deputy Burford on the extensive work that she has put in here. I have expressed these views to Deputy Burford, so it will come as no surprise to her. I think that the Minority Report very clearly articulates aspirations. I am not sure that it is as clear in articulating what the problem is, although she did address some of that in her opening speech yesterday. The vision I do not find particularly visionary for me and I think there could be more there and, again, she and I have spoken about that.

At the core of the strategy is the matter of free buses and, for me, that is also... It is, of course, the core of both strategies and Deputy Soulsby spoke to that as well and I do regard that as being a significant hole in the strategy, but I will not say more about that, because I will speak to that when I lay my amendment later during the debate.

I do have a number of specific comments on the Minority Report, which, again, I have raised with Deputy Burford and I am sure she may seek to address some of these in responding to the debate. On page 716 of the Billet, it says that the number of journeys undertaken in private motor vehicles will continue to increase. I cannot find any evidence of that referred to in the report and, in fact, it would be inconsistent with the survey of vehicle movements on page 687 of the Majority Report which, in essence, shows no change in the number of vehicles commuting into St Peter Port in the last 10 years. On page 721, the Minority Report says that progress has been outstripped by vehicle ownership and population growth, that is progress in terms of the reduction of traffic. Again, I cannot find anything to support that statement.

I would also seek Deputy Burford's explanation as to how the Department will ensure foreign vehicles are not illegally circulated to avoid the first registration charge. That is presented as a statement of fact, that

there is no explanation as to how that would be addressed. On page 726 of the Billet, there is a statement that annual charges – that is annual emissions and width charges – would be the most effective disincentive to large and high emission vehicles, but it has been discounted, not least because of the staffing and administration costs. One of the ideas which have been presented, I think, when the reports came to the Treasury and Resources Department is actually whether that could be addressed by linking it with insurance renewals rather than that task being undertaken by Government, but obviously, that idea has not been picked up. So, we are left with the first registration charge and, again, I would be grateful if Deputy Burford could explain why that will not be a disincentive to trade for smaller and more efficient vehicles once people have bought a vehicle with the first registration charge. It will come at some cost and they may be less disincentivised to trade to smaller and more efficient vehicles as their circumstances change, in the absence of annual charges. I would be grateful for some comment on that.

Deputy Soulsby also referred to the displacement of vehicles by the introduction of paid parking in certain areas of town and, in particular, if there is a Member of Culture and Leisure who has not spoken, I would be grateful if there could be a comment as to whether they have a view on the impact on Beau Séjour because I am quite sure it is already used by some commuters and I am quite sure it will attract more and how they would seek to manage that particular challenge. That would be appreciated.

With regard to disabled exemptions, these, of course, are entirely appropriate and I would support that. However, of course, as we all know, in a very small number of cases, they are abused and, of course, the incentives to abuse them further will increase and I think it is incredibly important for the community that we do have confidence that the disabled badge and exemption system is robust and is granting exemptions to those that actually need it. I am sure that none of us would wish those that are disabled and in need of such exemptions, we would not wish to see them become victims of verbal abuse or worse or false claims and so I think it is in the interests of the disabled community as well that there is a very robust regime around the granting of those exemptions, particularly if paid parking were to be introduced.

Finally, in regard to Deputy Lowe's questions about whether behaviour has changed as a result of the Billet, I certainly have sought to ride on a bicycle where I can and when I can. In fact, I think I saw Deputy Lowe when I was out the other day. I think this is about nudges, what is proposed in here. The proposal in relation to charging us at Lucas House, I think, almost certainly, if a charge were introduced, I would at least be asking my colleagues in St Sampson's if anyone would wish to car share, so we can have one space between two rather than two of us having one, whether that would be taken up. So, I think it would change some behaviour and that is what I see the Minority Report doing.

So, I, too, will be supporting the Minority Report at this stage, as Deputy Soulsby put it, but obviously, as I say, I will be speaking further on the matter of buses which I do regard as a significant issue later in the debate.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Sherbourne, then Deputy James and Deputy Wilkie.

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

Colleagues, I would like to start by also recording my thanks to all the speech makers over the last *n* hours. The standard of the debate, I think, has been really good and I would like to thank the analysts – and we have got some excellent analysts amongst us – the idealists, the pragmatists and, sadly, some of the pessimists. *(Laughter)* Those speeches have helped me to clarify my thoughts and I really do, also, want to record thanks to the authors of both Reports. It was a tremendous task that they actually had. Neither was going to get everything right, but I do thank them for that.

I would like to refer, for a moment, to a comment or a caution, a warning, that was offered yesterday by Deputy Perrot, regarding the nature of the split report, a split board. I have no problem with that whatsoever. As far as I am concerned, this is democracy in action. A Minority Report was appropriate, if members of the Board felt strongly that there could not be consensus agreement and, quite frankly, I applaud them for it, because only too often, I feel that we have reports brought to us that are a result of consensus that fall well short of the ideal. Maybe that is the nature of consensus government, but I think it has actually brought us to where we are today, with lots of things in this Island to put right. So I would like to record my admiration for both parties in the formation of those Reports.

My feeling, just as a final comment on that, the real issue for me, is not so much that they presented us with two Reports, a split Board – I would be concerned if that split continued and that they were unable to fulfil the desires of a States' decision. That would be a big issue for me, but I think they are grown up boys and girls and they will be able to rise to the occasion and do whatever the States wills them to do.

Half of us, as we all know, are new Members – new Members this term and we are half way through this term. It is quite a scary thought. For many of us, it is a very steep learning curve and we are, perhaps, only now beginning to get our head round some of the main issues. Learning the procedures of the States

takes long enough. Being frustrated by the procedures of the States is something we live with day in and day out.

The first half of our tenure in this Chamber has been dominated, in my mind, by the FTP: saving money, overseeing cuts in service. I think that that is generating, in this Assembly, a mind-set that is basically 'cannot do'. 'We cannot do because of this. We cannot do because of that'. And, in fact, in many respects, we have exacerbated the problem by authorising reports that we can hide behind. We will put it off for another nine months, another 12 months.

We are half-way through this term. We need to get on with the serious business of governing the Island. (A Member: Hear, hear.) During my canvassing experience in north of St Peter Port, there were quite a lot of issues that were discussed on the door step, but the ones that came up time and time again were an affordable, reliable public transport system. Most of the people I spoke to want that. They would use the buses, I am sure, if we could improve the service. They were concerned about paid parking, understandably, but they were more concerned about residents' parking, which is an issue which is also being addressed, I believe at the moment. The two do go together.

As a specific comment about paid parking proposal, I have problems with what is being proposed. I do believe we should pay for our clocks. I think that that is a universal charge. I think that is justified wherever we park in the Island. I would be willing, certainly, to pay more. I do have a problem, however, for the 10-hour parking, people paying, if you like, the full 10 hours, because if they have purchased their clock, in my mind, they have bought, if you like, two and half hours' credit, wherever they park in the Island. Now, that may be a wrong assumption, but that has not been addressed and I would ask Deputy Burford if she would be kind enough to, perhaps, explain why you have not gone down that route.

I do not agree with everything in the Minority Report, but I do believe that it is the one that will enable us to get going with this problem. It is subject to quite a lot of amendments, some of which I support, others I do not and my perspective has been very much influenced by discussions with general public and commercial interest groups. I have spent quite a lot of time speaking with them, raising their issues with me as they have with all of you, I am sure, through e-mails and the letters we have received and that will influence my approach towards the amendments.

I do not think that we should hold back any further. We should move forward. I have reflected on that and I do support the Minority Report in basic substance and will wish to make the necessary amendments. For me, kicking the issue down the road is not an option. Waiting for a multitude of reports is a soft option. We have been elected to make changes and to make difficult decisions. That was very clear. Most of us said that at some time during hustings. We know we have got to make difficult decisions. Deputy Gollop's speech a few moments ago, for me, summed up the situation we are facing. It does come down to money. I feel the Minority Report has been well thought through and the funding issues have been well thought through. I do not agree with all of them, but I doubt whether you would ever get a full 100% agreement from anyone in this Assembly or from the whole Assembly. So, we are into compromises. We have got an opportunity today to do what we were elected to do. We can provide the Environment Board with a clear direction of implementing what I consider is a well thought through policy with the necessary amendments. So, let us get on with it and I would ask you to support the Minority Report.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy James.

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

My comments will, indeed, be brief. I know we have heard many people say that and then take out a six page speech. However, I, likewise, would wish to have on record, sir, my thanks to Deputy Burford. I would certainly like to commend her report. I think, for me, sir, it was, perhaps, one of the most impressive speeches that I have heard this term and I was delighted – well, rather amused, sir – at a comment on Radio Guernsey early this morning, by Rupert Dorey, Chamber of Commerce. I do not know whether many of you heard it, but when asked his opinion of Deputy Burford's speech – and I will not try the accent, but I think it was Michael Caine – he said 'it blew the bloany doors off!' and I certainly could identify with that comment.

So I would like to address some of the comments Deputy Jones said yesterday. The thing with Deputy David Jones, when he addresses this Assembly, you are never really left in any doubt of what he is saying (Laughter) and if you will recall he was not too complimentary about the bus service yesterday. Well, I would like to counteract some of those comments, sir, and at the risk of being described as the PR officer for CT Plus, those are not my experiences.

During States' meetings, I always try to get here by bus, as I did this morning. The only discomfort that I had was waiting at the bus stop and being drenched – well certainly my feet were – by inconsiderate drivers driving past. So, yes, Deputy Lowe talks about people getting on the buses wet and smelly and all the rest of it. However, the only part of me that was wet and I would hope not smelly were my feet.

So, it was certainly not an unpleasant experience and I can certainly... I am fortunate, maybe – I live on the route 42. The bus stop is just round the corner, straight into town, it drops me here. However, that journey, whether I come by bus or by car, takes exactly the same length of time and there I am sitting on the bus this morning thinking of the criticism levelled at buses being late. Of course buses are being late! Look at the cars they have to negotiate. But, we are tolerant, are we not? Those of us that drive to meetings and we rush in because we are late and it is that blasted traffic again that has held us up, but we do not... What about the poor bus drivers? When they arrive late at the bus stop, does he say to the passenger, ‘It is all that traffic, making me late’? So, let us be realistic. Let us be fair. Let us know heap huge criticism on the bus service.

I was not in favour of either report when I came to the Assembly yesterday but, like Deputy Sherbourne, I have been incredibly impressed with the quality of the debate and the speeches that I have heard. I think Deputy Lowe’s comments, also, about personal choice is all very laudable. We all want personal choice and I would support that, providing it does not disadvantage other people. I would like to think that most things that I do in life are with consideration to other people, as long as it does not disadvantage or impact on other people.

I am not a great fan of paid parking and never have been, but I am mindful of supporting the Minority Report on the proviso of supporting Deputy Stewart’s comments yesterday and of Deputy Perrot who, likewise, said they had apprehension about paid parking, but it would have to be implemented alongside or after we have introduced an efficient and effective bus service.

So, I do thank both Deputy Burford and Deputy Brehaut for their efforts in putting this report together and I will be supporting the Minority Report.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Wilkie and then Deputy Inglis and Alderney Representative Jean.

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

As many of you who have read these transport strategies, laid before us today, I have mixed feelings. I applaud some of the aims and policies and, yet, despair at others. Both strategies must be applauded for their ambition of reducing the Island’s traffic problems. We all know in heart of hearts that the Island would be a better place to live if we had less traffic. We all would probably be healthier and lead longer lives if we drove less and walked more. I certainly know I would. Both strategies have made provision for disability issues and they recognise it is about the entire journey and not just having wheelchair access on buses. Disabled people still need to get to the bus stop and may have to encounter small pavements or even no pavements at all and there are many different disabilities facing Islanders. Both strategies recognise the need for a level playing field and that all Islanders, irrespective of any disability, should have access to transport. I must heap further praise on the Minority Report for identifying the funding to be spent on disability transport issues.

Now, after heaping all this praise, I should also advise the Assembly that neither report actually gives a complete solution for disabled Islanders, but they recognise it is a step in the right direction. And it truly heartens me that this Assembly has had the vision to vote through the Disability and Inclusion Strategy which is now affecting States-wide policy development.

Now, on another matter, as has already been said, I have an issue with a free bus service. Firstly, we are proising spending a million pounds on a new service that people are not clamouring for, at a time when Departments are trying to turn over stone in order to create ongoing savings, both Reports recommend creating ongoing costs of £1 million per year. And what happens if the aims of the strategy to increase the buses actually succeed? What if it actually works? We may require more buses, more drivers and without a bus charge, the costs will escalate unchecked as it will be demand-led. The unknown financial implications are too great to support a free bus service. The current charge of £1 for a bus journey, I believe, is sustainable and acceptable to the majority of people, if the bus network is increased. If you tie this in with a GPS bus mapping system which means you can see what my colleague Deputy Perrot, who is not here, calls an electronic communication device, where the bus is on the route. This will cut time wasted waiting for buses and taking away the unknown factor of, ‘Has it come early? Have I missed it? Is it late? Have I misread the impossibly complex bus timetable?’ Give people a modern bus service with increased routes and they will use it without spending £1 million on free buses and if we do not have a free bus service, we will not need paid parking.

In the survey, many people stated their wish not to travel by car. The fact that we do not have a credible alternative means they cannot pursue those wishes. Give them that choice, give them a credible alternative before we use paid parking to basically eject them from their cars.

Having said all that, I do not agree with an increase in fuel duty either.

So, I cannot support free buses and I do not believe paid parking should be implemented now, but I am not saying it should not be done in the future. The bus service has to be proved to be effective and Islanders

given an opportunity to pursue their wishes not to travel by car. So, as I am reading it, how can I make this happen? Well, I will vote for the Minority Report, but vote against the Proposition on paid parking and vote for Deputy St Pier's amendment, which will enact Deputy Brehaut's amendment to pay £1 per bus journey. Easy! (*Laughter*) And I ask Members to do the same.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Inglis and the Alderney Representative Jean.

**Deputy Inglis:** Members, I rise nearly two hours after Deputy Langlois said, 'Come on, let us make a decision. Let us vote on which report we then want to then itemise and breakdown into sizable chunks.' So, I will be brief.

The question of expectations of our wants in this Island is one of the keys in how we will develop our Transport Strategy. When I worked in the UK, I was losing two hours a day in commuting. When I lived in St Sampson's and working in St Sampson's I gained one and three quarter hours, which was really useful to me at that time, but then it became relative. I lost it. You find other things to do. So, it is a question of how we view this Transport Strategy as being relative to what our needs are.

I can support the principle of the Minority Report. We must move forward with it with intensive vigour. I think that the Department will need to work together, because fundamentally there is only one area that has caused a major concern and that is obviously this paid parking.

Our decision must have focus to achieve the changes, but the car is still going to be the mainstay of moving around the Island. How we invest in resources and time will be crucial for our future generations who, like Deputy Sherbourne was saying, we have got to make strong and important decisions that will effect generations in 10, 15, 20 years' time, because everything associated with our lifestyle becomes imbedded in how we live and enjoy this Island.

I would just like to conclude a comment Deputy St Pier brought up regarding the Culture and Leisure Department and how we view parking, specifically at Beau Séjour. We have adopted a controlled approach to ensuring that the users of our service have that facility available to them. That is what draws them in to use the facilities. We sought the views of people in the area and users and there is an appetite to pay for the service that we can provide and as Deputy St Pier is fully aware, the penalties being applied do provide the Treasury and Resources Department with revenue. We would much like to see it in our coffers, but if it helps Guernsey and it helps what we are out to achieve, then that is the most important issue.

I would say that we will probably have concerns that there will be a migration of vehicles to Beau Séjour, but again, we have contingencies that we think allow us to deal with that, because we have taken the pragmatic approach that people will want to use areas that might be affected by paid parking.

Thank you very much, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Alderney Representative Jean.

**Alderney Representative Jean:** Thank you, sir.

Sir, fellow Deputies, it fascinates me to see this three/two split in the Environment Committee. On the one hand the Minority Report is too extreme for me. I am quite worried about it. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Paid parking and vehicle width tax: very expensive for the Guernsey people. More money poured into the bus service. I am not sure how well the bus service works and I have my doubts about that investment. Social engineering, I call it, or certainly an aspect of it. I do not believe I was elected here to this fine Assembly to take part in trying to move the public this way and that.

As was very well explained yesterday, these proposals will cost the public thousands of pounds over each year and make their lives not so easy. Trying to steer people into smaller cars with width taxes or to use their cars less with a fuel tax and then – and I really cannot believe this – expect them to use a bus service. You cannot expect people with busy lives, under all kinds of pressure, to do this. They must have the choice. The stopping and the starting, which is part of the drawback of relying on a bus service.

Bring proposals which are straight, to this States, without the social engineering aspects. I know the Deputies working on both the Minority and the Majority Transport Strategy have worked very hard and I respect them for that, but a split committee, social engineering tax with incentives and disincentives... I am reminded of Deputy Perrot's words yesterday saying – and I know he will correct me. Well he is not here unfortunately, but he might even correct me when he comes back, if I get it wrong. He would vote for the Minority Report and then vote for the amendments to throw out most of it.

I am not that game. I will vote against both reports in the hope that we can all learn something. This is neither, for me, good government. It is my believe that those people who elected us have every right to expect to see us all dealing with proposals which are not full of twists and corners and trying to make people do things which ultimately bring resentment, frustration and genuine concern at the public's lack of ability to do anything about these matters. They entrust us with that duty.

I urge you all to vote against both proposals. We cannot take the risk of relying on amendments. We must move this on and try again.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Sillars.

**Deputy Sillars:** Sir, I will be very brief. I feel I want to support a report, but I am struggling. I cannot support paid parking, never have done and I cannot see how I ever will, but this is across the whole Island and not just in town. But everything has been said and I am not going to repeat that.

It has been said that the Minority Report is a complete package and I accept that, but when you sum up, Deputy Burford, could you please, for me, say if it is possible to support the Minority Report without actually having to support paid parking?

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Adam.

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

I need proof as well, probably I agree with Deputy Sillars. I have listened to all the speeches: fantastic variety, but one that actually hit me straight between the eyes was Deputy Gollop's. He actually was honest. He said, 'If you want to be effective; you want to actually be real about things, do so.' He quoted Norway, £1.56 for petrol a litre. He quoted Denmark, £1.55 per litre. He was suggesting that if you want to affect people's behaviour, yes, it may be social engineering, but you have to be brave and put maybe 20p, 30p or 40p a litre on petrol in Guernsey. Forty-three thousand people who have licences to drive cars or vehicles in Guernsey would be up in arms and that is not viable.

Sir, Deputy Fallaize is looking at me as if to say, 'Why is it not viable?' I do not think you can go to that extremes, but if you wish to achieve all aspirations mentioned in these reports, it may be necessary to move towards more swinging financial things.

I personally agree with the Minority Report or agree with most of the Propositions. I have always voted for paid parking. I prefer the way that the Minority Report has put it forward, whereby you actually pay for your parking clock so that you are helping all parking areas to be maintained in Guernsey, plus two and a half hours freedom in those sites and then you say to people, once you have got a decent bus service available – and I think that has to come into force first of all – that you must pay for 10-hour spaces. Therefore, I agree with that aspect. I think it is quite well thought out.

However, one of my concerns is how are you going to bring in all the suggestions and changes in either report within the next three or four months? We are talking about bringing in paid parking, buses, new bus service, CO<sub>2</sub> tax, width tax, etc, and starting to raise money from about half way through this year. I think these are all good ideas, but I think it has to be planned carefully and moved forward.

So, sir, as I state, I support the Minority Report. I have got concerns about the financial position which has been highlighted by both Deputy Kuttelwascher and Deputy Gavin St Pier, but I think of the two, it is presented better, clearer, well researched and I thank them for it.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak on the amendment?  
Chief Minister, Deputy Le Tocq.

**The Chief Minister (Deputy Le Tocq):** Thank you, sir.

Sir, the Policy Council Ministers around the table, as I am sure Members will be aware, had no corporate view particularly. (*Laughter*) In fact, there were many individual views, often different to their departmental views as well. Do not laugh at us, because you are all the same! (*Laughter*) This is because on such issues – issues like paid parking, particularly, if we can use that one – we all love to, passionately, as Deputy Langlois would put it, delve down into detail very quickly and whilst I do believe that the majority of us here would have largely the same objectives if we were to look at that, we have different ways in which we would like to achieve them. And so it is, perhaps, not surprising that we have different views on this.

But the time has come, sir, for us to make a decision and to decide, as Deputy Fallaize put it early on yesterday, which of these strategies that we are going to debate, amend necessarily, tweak and then bring into focus and I believe it does have to be one or the other. I know we have a choice of three. We can turn both of them out, but I would encourage this Assembly not to do so at this juncture.

Sir, both reports have great merit and I will join with others who have said and who have sought to commend the authors of both reports, because they both, for me, read as significant improvements on previous attempts at integrated strategies and I think that is something to be commended and something that

we need to take note of. Both reports set out with the same objectives and that is good to note too. Neither are perfect or will please everyone.

Sir, if we seek to please everyone, if we are looking for a solution that is a fix all, cure all, then we will always fail and we will always chose in the end to defer this for another day in the hope that that panacea is around the corner. It is not. We, therefore, need to make a choice and to agree to compromise and so I am well prepared that at the end of the day, when we do take the vote, there will be aspects of this that I will not be happy with.

But this is not the end of the day, as it were, because I am sure in years to come, there will be further changes to the strategy and even some of us here who may end up in the minority may be pleasantly surprised at the way things turn out, or otherwise, and it is down to future Assemblies to choose how they respond to that.

Now, sir, I am no eco-pirate, nor am I a Greeny, although I did once seriously consider voting for the Green Party in a UK election when I was living there as the other alternatives in the borough at the time were either out of touch or very dull and the Green candidate talked about levitation, (*Laughter*) which was at least interesting and would certainly be a radical Transport Strategy. (*Laughter*) In the event, I think I provided a spoilt paper in the ballot box. I may not be an environmentalist of that type, but I do care about Guernsey and I can care about our environment and I do want to see improvements in health and, therefore, in lifestyles and, perhaps, that has not been touched on so much in the debate, maybe it will later on, but I know, for one, that I need incentives and disincentives in order to be encouraged to change my lifestyle.

Now, the Minority Report, to me, when I read it first of all, it gave me the impression of being considered. It gave me the impression of being convincing. I was taken aback by the arguments and the evidence that it provided for those arguments. It also gave me the impression and, perhaps, because I was reading it after the Majority Report of being comprehensive as well. It sought to clear up some of the holes that I saw, some of the gaps in the Majority Report. But the most important thing with the Minority Report, for me, and others have touched on this as well, is that it was delivered with conviction. It has been presented and delivered with conviction. Now, why is that important? I use that word as opposed to passion, because conviction in politics is important. I am sure Deputy Burford would not want to be associated with other female politicians in the British Isles that have been associated with that term, 'conviction politics' but, nevertheless, there has been and it is important that we recognise that, because it is part of the way in which we should be leading in areas of Government. We need to take seriously not only the arguments for a particular thing, but whether we have the convictions to deliver on them.

The Majority Report, however, for me, seemed in the end slightly incomplete. There was something not quite there in reading it and moreover has been, from my perspective, presented, unfortunately, with a distinct lack of conviction. That makes me think that I presume that the authors of the Minority Report chose to produce a Minority Report, because they could not bring their conviction totally behind the Majority Report, but I am actually a bit concerned that those behind the Majority Report cannot bring their conviction behind it either and, therefore, if we are to see an outworking of these things, I want people of conviction to be behind the implementation of the strategy.

Much has been made, sir, about carrots and sticks and I pick up on some comments that I think Deputy Gillson made. I believe that it is not an either/or; it is a both/and. We need carrots and we need sticks. We need incentives and we need disincentives, because as Deputy Duquemin alluded to, there are certain carrots that do not look that attractive to begin with and it may well be just having the carrot of a free bus service is not that attractive. But there are also, similarly, certain sticks that do not feel like sticks, necessarily. An extra 5p on a litre of petrol is not going to be felt like a stick in the same way as having to pay to park. And I recognise there needs to be a balance here, but despite that, in my view, we need to have – and the Minority Report provides this – both the carrot and the stick in order to see the sort of changes that need to happen in our society.

And I have been impressed in other places: in Holland, in Denmark, in London itself, where my daughters are students there, with the cycling and what can be done in those places to enhance a community and to make it a safer place for pedestrians and non-users of the car. I think we could do the same thing here and I hope we can make today the first step towards that.

So, I encourage Members of the Assembly to support the Minority Report.  
Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak on this amendment? No? Well, then, Deputy Domaille, do you wish to speak?

**Deputy Domaille:** Yes, I think I will respond, sir. Thank you, sir.

First, I will restrict my comments purely to the amendment and not, at this time, to the points that have been raised regarding the Majority Report. I think that is for later in the day and I really want to stay focused on this amendment. That said, bearing in mind the last speaker's comments, please do not doubt



my commitment and conviction to the vision and the contents of the Majority Report. Please do not doubt that. I am not in the business of coming here and wasting my time on putting forward proposals that I do not support.

1085 I could also say, I have to say this and I actually really, really mean this, I congratulate Deputy Burford and Deputy Brehaut. I think the way they have approached this, I think the presentations, I think the speech today or yesterday, rather, are absolutely excellent and I wish I could speak as well, frankly, and that is it. So, well done, I think.

1090 I should remind Members... Sorry, and any comments I have made here are purely targeted at the proposals and are not taking any shape or form as a criticism of any individual at all. I must get that out the way, sir. That is important.

1095 I would like to remind Members that, actually, many of the proposals in both reports, particularly with regard to improving transport alternatives, bringing improvements to the bus service, improvements to the taxis, improvements to pedestrians, cyclist and motorcyclists are similar, as are measures for improvements for the disabled and measures against pavement surfing, abuse of unloading bays, etc, travel plans and the promotion of transport alternatives. Yes, the Minority Report is doing more. That is because it is spending more and I believe unfairly and unreasonably so. It is raising more than £1 million over and above what the Majority strategy is proposing.

1100 Also, to make it clear, I support a lot of the proposals in the Minority Report. After all, they are very similar to the Majority Report. However, some of the proposed measures, I consider to be unfair and unreasonable and that the proposed cures will have consequences that are worse than the problems they seek to resolve.

1105 We must ensure we keep a sense of perspective. We do have a problem, but we are not choking to death or suffering the gridlock that we see in other jurisdictions. Whilst some action is most definitely required, the extent of the minority strategy is not warranted. We are in uncertain times, with a number of threats for our ongoing prosperity and there are significant consequences for individuals and businesses in this Minority Report. Whilst town, in particular, will be badly affected, individuals and businesses will incur significant costs with some unfairly carrying more of the burden than others. There are a number of issues that need to be highlighted, not just the ones that have been raised in the media and elsewhere.

1110 This amendment is much more than just the introduction of paid parking, although, in my opinion, it should be rejected on that ground alone. The effects of the proposed changes are more than may at first be apparent and my comments will be uncharacteristically long for which I apologise, but I ask Members to bear with me, because I think I believe the devil is in the detail.

1115 I will just begin with a caution. Several Members have said that they can approve this amendment safe in the knowledge that it can be amended later today or maybe sometime in the future or maybe tomorrow, I do not know, we will see how we go. The Minority Report is very honest. It makes it very clear that anything more than minor amendments will cause the strategy to fail. Paragraph 20 of the Minority Report states and I quote:

‘Many of the measures are interdependent upon each other.’

In paragraph 169 it is stated that:

‘Playing “Jenga”

1120 – and I had to find out what that was – I asked my wife –

‘with the elements of this Strategy runs the very real risk of the Strategy outcomes collapsing.’

1125 I will begin with the width and emission charges. The principle is common to both reports, particularly in that the charge will only apply to new registrations and Deputy St Pier raised that. The charges in the Minority report though are much more aggressive and, by way of example, in the Majority Report the combined duty costs for a Renault Scenic are £350. In the Minority Report, they are £2,000 which is more than five times as much and is almost the same amount as a large commercial vehicle would pay. In addition to being much higher, the rates start at a lower width range, beginning at 1751 mm. Not only are the charges significantly more, but even more unfairly, the Scenic can be said to be a popular family car and the family will be paying £2,000 in duty. The single person or couple who do not need a large car and can afford a small electric or hybrid car will receive up to £1,600 in subsidy, regardless of personal circumstances. I do not consider that to be fair or reasonable. Some may say it is possible to buy an electric car similar to the Astra which satisfies the needs of the family and therefore the family can benefit from the subsidy. However, electric and hybrid cars are at least £5,000 more than the popular affordable family petrol cars and, in some instances, they are actually double the cost and are frankly out of reach of many families. Electric cars are primarily for the better off, yet here we are proposing to subsidise them.

With regard to commercial vehicles, the Minority Report, with the proposed cap, treats the larger commercial vehicles much more favourably than other vehicles. I realise these may be amended later with the various amendments, but the reasons to oppose this still remain. It is these larger commercial vehicles which are a major contributor to emissions, to pavement surfing, to squeezing other motorists against hedges, etc, and worrying – and that is a polite word – pedestrians and cyclists. The cap is illogical, unfair and unreasonable. It means many car owners pay a lot more – in some cases more than twice as much as the tipper truck or ready mix concrete lorry. Furthermore, not only are non-commercial users unfairly treated, but so are the smaller commercial operators. Owners of average sized vans will be paying the same as the larger commercial vehicles operators. This cannot be right. Where is the incentive for them to use smaller, cleaner vehicles?

There must be doubt over the definition of commercial. For instance, does it include estate agents' cars, vets, hearses, private vehicles displaying advertising? Does it include hire cars and garage courtesy cars? Where do the Suzuki carry vans fit in which are a favourite for the self-employed, as well as the dog owner?

One further point, in presentations to Members and today, yesterday, actually, examples have been given how once the fuel charge in the Main Report is added, the Minority Report's proposals are not so aggressive. However, the examples pay no heed to the proposed £1.65 million in parking charges, which the proposers have acknowledged. Once these are added, the real picture is completely the opposite. This is best demonstrated by the fact that the Majority takes a maximum of £2.8 million from the motoring public, falling to less than £2 million. That is every year. The Minority Report takes £3.25 million plus a £1.15 million to fund the bus depot.

With regard to the bus depot, the proposed funding seems suspiciously like hypothecation to me and its classification as a pipeline project is circumventing the agreed prioritisation processes. Members will be aware the States have already said it is not a priority at the moment, which I very much regret, but that is what they have said and it must be unfair and plain wrong to prioritise this ahead of other equally or, perhaps, more necessary infrastructure requirements. This is compounded by the fact we have not yet decided on the sort of service and fleet we require. The operator's requirements are not known and while there is talk of a Pitronnerie Road site, it is not certain it will be available. Depending on the outcome of the bus tender process, it is even possible the successful operator will not want the States to provide the depot. It is far more sensible to monitor the performance of the selected operator for, say, three years and then apply through the next round of capital prioritisation for the new depot, if required. I am a bit surprised with Deputy Adam's comments in that, saying he would support that, when it is going against the capital prioritisation process.

Proposition 9 refers to the implementation of a trial system of park and ride, subject to a suitable site being identified. No available land has been identified and such land as might be found may have to be purchased and/or existing users displaced. In any event, the site will have to be surfaced, signage, lines, etc, and the report does not identify the funds required or where they will come from. It certainly will not be the Environment. We are struggling to get money for coastal prevention plans.

While I am on the topic of resources, the amendment and the supporting Minority Report call for nine reports which will severely stretch our already over stretched resources, even with the additional staff and both reports have the additional staff, who, in any event, will be busy in the various work-streams contained in the report. We will almost certainly have to outsource work to consultants and I have to caution, I do not believe we will have sufficient funds to do the research and write the reports.

I would add that a review of speed limits as called for in this amendment has previously been done and the near universal feedback was not to generally change speed limits, but to concentrate on particularly difficult locations.

With regard to Proposition 24, the Vision Plan – this is a caution, I am afraid – whilst it is fine to consider such things as part of planning, 'consider' actually does not mean a great deal and what is more important is the intent of the direction and the very clear direction here is to remove or at least significantly reduce car parking spaces for new developments. Members should be very clear about the road, pardon the pun, they are starting on, if they support the Minority Report. They would be using transport policy to shape and direct planning policy in advance of the Planning Inquiry which is required by statute.

Incidentally, paragraph 61 on page 740 refers to reducing car parking provision in town with the medium to longer term. So, once we start down this road, then everything will come in through the transport policy.

Moving on, paid parking. While it can be a good revenue earner, especially if strictly enforced, its effectiveness in reducing congestion and improving traffic flows in other jurisdictions is, at the very least, questionable. Paid parking is simply not the Guernsey way and that is one of Guernsey's attractions. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Only 30% of people supported paid parking for long-stay. That is on page 648, the pie chart. The proposals, as set out in the Minority Report, are purely about controlling demand and the charges will do nothing to reduce congestion across the Island or even town. They do nothing for areas such

as the Bridge and St Martin's. In fact, they will make the situation at the Bridge and St Martin's worse. They do nothing to reduce passing traffic and will, in fact, cause problems across town and on the outskirts as commuters look for somewhere else to park. The charges are unfair and hit only town workers and businesses. Those that can afford it will park close to the destination; those that cannot afford it will park further out, causing congestion and other problems for areas such as Ville au Roi and Route Isabelle and we have seen that already. But, it will be made worse by paid parking.

The frequent and free bus services into town, proposed in both reports will make this creeping urbanisation worse, in that parking just on the outskirts of town and walking or bussing the rest of the journey will be an attractive option for many. Yellow lines will be appearing in all sorts of places. This is supposed to be a strategy that deals with road transport, Island-wide. If, indeed, paid parking is necessary for the modal shift or, in my language the unwarranted social engineering required by the Minority Report, then it should be Island-wide and include areas such as the Bridge, St Martin's, around schools, hospitals, sporting venues. It seems to me that if the amendment is accepted, the obvious consequence will be the extending of paid parking and/or benefits of kind to include schools, hospital, public buildings and other areas Island-wide and I have not heard anything that would lead me to – and Deputy Fallaize has just reinforced it – to think I am wrong in this assumption.

This extension of paid parking would include reviewing the level of charging which is hinted at with a suggestion of introducing dynamic parking to paragraph 60 of the Minority Report. This is where the charge goes up as the number of spaces reduces or people pay for the time spent in an area, a version of the London congestion charge. Flexitime workers would suffer and, as such, there will be a race for spaces.

Just as an aside, the £16 charge for the parking clock has been mentioned. I do not see how that is going to reduce vehicle use. It will increase income, but it is not going to reduce vehicle use. If we are to have paid parking for what will be effectively all long-stay parking in town, there must be implications for harbour users, for instance the fishermen going to sea, and for those with parking permits and for town residents. Now, as far as the town residents are concerned and the resident parking permits that were referred to in the Minority Report, we are at draft stage. It is yet to come to the board. It will be coming to this Assembly. So, I will make these comments in that light. Certainly, it was originally intended, by me, if nobody else, to introduce permits that could carry an administrative charge only. Clearly, if the going rate for five days a week parking is £1,200 or more, with a benefit in kind tax for employees, then the charge for a permit for seven days a week, 23 hour parking, would have to be reconsidered. A further factor is that there are not enough parking spaces for residents in some parts of town. People living around the Salerie, for instance, and they would have no choice but to use the paid long-stay parking areas.

While I am on the topic of the draft resident parking proposals, one of the consequences, if they are approved, will be the removal of 343 – yes, 343 – long-term spaces. Clearly, if paid parking is introduced, then the scramble for parking spaces will intensify, which in turn will increase the adverse impacts on other areas of St Peter Port, as I mentioned earlier.

I have a number of operational concerns with regard to the proposed different payment mechanisms. Lower charges for some, with electric hybrid vehicles, use of apps and mobile phone accounts. Clearly, there are a number of people who do not understand, and I am one of them, or use mobile phone technology and it will be a confusing to some to know whether or not you can pay the lower charge. Visitors will be unsure about what to do. People's mobile phones may simply not work and in any event the suggested technology is prone to failure. Those without the technology, which may well be the elderly, will have to walk to the few and far between paid parking machines. There will be confusion and people will end up being fined for not complying.

Another of the unfair consequences of paid parking is the proposed introduction of taxation for employers of town businesses only. I have to ask, why only town businesses? As far as I am aware, all taxes in Guernsey apply Island-wide and it is difficult to understand how such a location tax could be applied and more importantly justified. Clearly the levying of this tax on people who work for some St Peter Port businesses will make it more difficult for these businesses to recruit and retain staff and will inevitably lead to these business paying more and being less competitive with other Island businesses and without being a doom-monger you can see a worst case scenario where it may be the final straw, causing businesses to relocate or even close down or possibly go off Island. Well, I am sorry, but it does not take very much for some of these people to make this decision to leave and it can be just simply something as much as bad weather. It does not take much. There are final straws.

The larger firms may be able to recompense staff in other ways, but smaller firms may be less able to absorb such costs. Employers may already have paid for land for staff parking and will then have to reimburse employees in other ways, if they can afford it. Presumably there will have to be exemptions for employees to use their vehicles for work which, in itself, presents problems deciding what point such exemptions should apply. This lack of clarity on how to proceed and hence the unforeseen circumstances, including resource burdens is a feature of the Minority Report. I have already made mention of the lack of funding for the uncertain park and ride scheme and I have commented at length on the paid parking

proposals. There are others, that I will not dwell on, but I will just comment on. The suggestion of shared spaces in Le Pollet, for example, where the distinction between pavement and road would be removed if possible, that does not just mean removing the pavements and taking up the tarmac and presumably repaving with cobbles or similar, but in all likelihood it also means rerunning drainage that is currently alongside the pavement gutters. This will not be cheap and, once again, no resources are made available for this, this floated promise of Pollet ground improvement.

There are other concerns regarding the Minority Report I could raise, including the permanency of free bus fares and the States operating the bus service, but I believe I have more than made the case for rejecting this amendment.

In conclusion, these proposals are unfair and unreasonable. At a time when the economy is not in a good state and the state of people's finances are under strain, they are unfairly and unreasonable taking an extra £3.25 million, plus £1.15 million to fund the bus depot from the motoring public every year which must impact on the economy generally. In comparison the Majority Report is taking an extra £2 million a year by year 5, excluding any funding for a bus depot, which will be properly dealt with through the capital expenditure procedure.

To repeat what I said at the beginning, we must ensure we keep a sense of perspective. We are not choking to death or suffering the gridlock we see in other jurisdictions. While action is required, this aggressive strategy is not warranted. The measures contained in the Majority Report including improved alternatives for the motorists, improved bus services, improved facilities for the disabled, improved for pedestrians, cyclists and motor cyclists are far more proportionate and fair.

Please reject the amendment. Thank you, sir. (*Applause*)

**The Procureur:** I would not wish to be rising to my feet amid a round of applause. I understand that when I felt the need, some time ago, to take a sabbatical from this rich debate, the Treasury and Resources Minister advised the Assembly of some advice that he had from colleagues in my Chambers, that the proposed CO<sub>2</sub> and width duties would be classified as charges and not taxes.

**The Bailiff:** That is correct.

**The Procureur:** They certainly feel like taxes or duties to me and I am told by the colleague who gave that advice that, in fact, he advised exactly to the contrary, so we are in agreement with the Treasury and Resources Department, that these measures would properly be classified as taxes, if that really is important to anybody.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you. Deputies Bebb and O'Hara, do you wish to be *relevé*? Thank you.

Deputy Burford, are you ready to reply? It has been a long debate, are you ready to reply now? You are. Deputy Burford, then.

**Deputy Burford:** Okay. Right, I will try and get these pieces of paper in order with some luck.

Firstly, thank you to all of those who have spoken in support of the Minority Report and for your kind words about my speech and the report itself.

My fellow Western Deputy and environmentalist, Deputy De Lisle, spoke about the state of suffering town centres in the UK. So, ignoring the fact that we are safeguarding and, indeed, improving free parking for shoppers anyway, last night I went in search of the evidence that removing paid parking helps towns thrive and it just is not there. Towns are certainly suffering, but they acknowledge the three factors I mentioned yesterday: the recession, out of town shopping and, most importantly, the internet.

The Chief Executive of the Association of Town and City Management says:

'Parking is not a universal panacea and free parking certainly is not. There is evidence that suggests town and cities can thrive in cases where parking has been significantly reduced. Parking carries an opportunity cost for other uses such as leisure, business and residential. The key message is don't leave things to chance. Having a plan for parking as a wider Transport Strategy is vital.'

Deputy De Lisle and Deputy Jones are concerned about the creation of four new positions for the purpose of implementing the Transport Strategy. Well, putting aside the question of how they expect all the numerous workstreams in this Report to be implemented without the staff and resource to do it, what I would say is actually four new positions represents excellent value for money in the long run. We all know that prevention is better than cure and it is much, much cheaper too. The health theme alone amply demonstrates just one example of long-term cost savings. By getting this right now, we will avoid the need to employ many health professionals in the future, as the health benefits of active travel are one of the main reasons we need this strategy.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy De Lisle.

**Deputy De Lisle:** Thank you very much indeed.

On a point of... I believe that the Member is actually confusing the issue and also leading to some controversy here, because the UK Government is very clear, through Eric Pickles, the UK Communities and Local Government Secretary, who has warned councils right through England and Wales that the anti-car dogma is contributing to the death of traditional high streets and he has called on local authorities to ban draconian parking policies that have led to motorists abandoning town centres. So, I think it is very important that we get that straight, that councils have been doing just what the actual government in the UK is prescribing not to do and that is to bring in paid parking and to continue with paid parking, because it is ruining the high streets throughout the country.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

**Deputy Burford:** Well, fortunately, we are not bringing in paid parking for shoppers. (*Laughter and applause*) I will not give way, again. Thank you.

Deputy Jones in his self-confessed rant complains that the motorist is treated as a cash cow. You did use the word, Deputy Jones. This is not true. The motorist in this strategy can choose to buy a car with either a rebate or with no charges. The motorist can choose to catch a free bus into town. Less cash cow and more piggy bank. He says that the people of Guernsey pay for the parking areas. This is true. So, perhaps, we should be working to a position whereby they are used by more of the people who actually funded them. Instead of North Beach car park, how about North Beach park? Somebody wipe Deputy Luxon's brow on that one. The people of Guernsey also paid for Beau Séjour, but I cannot nip in for a free swim anytime I fancy and it bears repeating that paid parking is not a tax. Tax is a very emotive word. What this report proposes is a charge for the use of a facility and it is an avoidable charge at that, especially once we have made the alternatives so much more viable.

Deputy Paint, who is not in the Assembly, clearly has issues with the responses of the Chamber of Commerce to the public consultation. The Transport Sub-group of the Chamber produced a response to the public consultation. It was passed by their council and submitted to Environment. Now, when we were analysing the responses, many were from individuals, some were from groups, some had names on, some were anonymous. Because it was not possible to always tell how many people were behind a single submission, we decided to count each one as though it had come from a single person, so if we are guilty of anything, it is underreporting the views of the Sub-group but, more importantly, is the fact that the measures and conclusions in the Minority Report come from a vast body of diverse evidence and not just a few sources.

Deputy Paint also describes the Armageddon scenario where local workers will flee town because they cannot get there anymore and multitudes of guest workers will take their place. But what was not clear to me was how these guest workers could manage to get to town when the local people could not. (*Laughter*) Deputy Paint describes the 1.2p reduction in the Minority Report as a sprat to catch a mackerel. But there is nothing fishy about it. (*Laughter*) Sorry! It is just a fair adjustment as it was originally put... (*Laughter*) in place in lieu of paid parking. There we are!

Finally, Deputy Paint quotes Advocate Ferbrache who reportedly says that the Transport Strategy is social engineering. If he wants an example of social engineering, look no further than the infrastructure and culture we currently have that favours the private motor car over every other form of transport. Forcing people to own a car if they want to participate in society is a perfect example of social engineering.

I would like to offer an assurance to Deputy Le Clerc that we are committed to coming back with the most robust and extensive residents' parking scheme we can for States' Members to debate.

Deputy Brouard seems to have very high expectations of what £403,000 can do. The contraflow around St Sampson's High and Le Murier cost a quarter of a million. Buses cost in the order of £150,000. He acknowledges that transport moves 66% faster when the schools are out, so just imagine a first-rate public transport service and greatly increased walking and cycling could, in time, make every day like school holidays in transport terms. The reason the 19 secondhand school buses were not taken forward is we simply do not have anywhere to put them. We need a bus depot. But he is supportive of encouraging smaller cars and making them green and that is what we propose with subsidies up to £1,600, town charging points and preferential parking for electric vehicles. I will not dwell on the £1 bus fare, because we might be coming back to that later.

Turning to Deputy Stewart's comments, I fully agree with his comments about the buses and our proposals for the scheduled bus service do not preclude in any way a taxi bus scheme operating alongside as mentioned in paragraph 162 of the report and I absolutely agree that a significant improvement in the bus service is essential before we bring in paid parking, as is also made clear in the Report. The issue of benefit in kind is something which falls squarely into Treasury and Resources mandate and we are proposing they return with a report at which time Members can dissect it. It was something that came up a surprising

number of times in consultation as a perceived fairness issue. There are numerous aspects to be worked out and several ways it could be done, including as a work place parking levy.

As I advised Members by e-mail, Deputy Soulsby's amendment does not cause us any unmanageable issues on funding or behaviour change and therefore we will not be opposing it.

1380 Deputy Lester Queripel, I have been heartened to know that my speech yesterday has changed some opinions within this Assembly, but I have a feeling that no matter how long I speak or how much evidence I cite, I will not win Deputy Queripel over. (*Interjection*) If the open e-mail sent to Deputy Queripel has not moved his head and his heart, then I know when to admit to defeat on this particular individual. (*Laughter and interjection*) Let me see if I can squeeze the response into one tiny paragraph. You need a Requête to get rid of a resolution; samples are how surveys work; buses will still be largely tax payer as opposed to motorist funded; and if you really want us to raise our game, approve this Minority Report and give us the wherewithal to do the job.

1385 Deputy Perrot knows that paid parking is not a tax and he is absolutely right that the *quid pro quo* is a first class public transport system. He is worried that if you tinker with one Proposition, you might affect another. That is the problem with integration, but here is an easy solution and that is to vote for all of the proposals. (*Laughter*)

1390 On the subject of tinkering, we are not tinkering with taxes. Well, we may be tinkering with taxes, because we have just had some updates from the Procureur and, indeed, it is a little confusing, because we had a quite detailed e-mail chain from... sorry, I want to say 'HMRC – what is the word I am looking for? (*Interjection*) Border Agency, there we go! – the Border Agency and the Law Officers which indicated to the contrary, but no doubt this will be worked out in due course.

1395 Deputy Perrot also says that the problem is not defined, but I think Deputy Green did an excellent job of defining it, but it is important to say that it is not all about fixing problems. It is also about preventing problems from occurring, complete traffic saturation at peak times and the looming obesity crisis for example and it is about creating positive impacts from scratch. I mean, it is not a problem that cars park on the pier, but if we could find a way to remove that need, could we not do something a whole lot more imaginative, attractive and inclusive with that space? (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

1400 Deputy Duquemin understates the number of times we agree on things. I can remember at least three occasions. (*Laughter*) He highlights the importance of integration and I cannot disagree, so let us make that four.

1405 I thank Deputy Green for his careful and considered analysis and understanding of the Minority Report and what we are trying to do. He is right that behaviour change is not an aim in its own right, but a way of achieving the wider objectives.

I thank Deputy Harwood for his speech and have noted his comments on residents' parking.

1410 Deputy Conder mentions the possible fall off in revenue as a result of behaviour change and the report does address this issue. He also asks me to respond specifically to his question of what measure we propose to implement to improve cycling safety. Although there is not enough time to go into all the finer details here and now, I would like to reassure him that it is something we are serious about tackling, we have looked at a lot research and evidence from other jurisdictions and we have spoken to a lot of people about this locally, including Alastair Carey who, for very sad reasons, is an authority on the subject. Essentially, there are lots and lots of measures that can improve cycle safety, from Trixi mirrors and advanced stop lines at traffic lights that greatly increase cyclists' visibility, especially to larger vehicles, to reviewing our laws on HGV mirror requirements, for example, which lag well behind the UK and European standard. However, all the evidence points to one factor about all else that will improve cycle safety and that is to get more cyclists on the road. This is effective for a number of reasons. So, I hope, Deputy Conder, you will soon be one of them.

1415 On to the comments from Deputy Laurie Queripel. Deputy Laurie Queripel is concerned that two and half hours free parking is a tiny carrot but, at present, shoppers have two hours because you cannot get a three, five or 10 hour space, because they are all full of commuters from about 8 a.m. So, the status quo for shopper parking is worse than what is being proposed. He asks how we are going to police it, but in addition to the traffic wardens, we are proposing a special constable for such matters.

1425 Now, I have to respond on the subject of making cyclists pay road tax. Leaving aside the small matter which Deputy Soulsby highlighted that, as an approach, you do not generally tax something you are trying to promote, there is another flaw with this idea and that is motorists do not actually pay any road tax either. 1430 If we were to tax bicycles, let us say, £100 per year for 15 kilo bike, then a 1500 kilo car would need to pay £10,000 a year. Motorists do pay fuel duty, but the income from fuel duty does not cover... Sorry you asked me to give way there. Could I finish this sentence, it might answer your question?

1435 Motorists do pay fuel duty, but the income from fuel duty does not cover all the direct and indirect costs to the public purse that are caused by vehicles. It is a fact that when all of the impacts are taken into account, cars are subsidised by society. That might be an uncomfortable or inconvenient fact for some, but the evidence shows it to be the case.

Deputy Queripel says that we do not need a strategy. All we need is a bit of tailored tinkering. I find it incredible that anybody would think that a mature developed jurisdiction should not have a proper sustainable transport policy.

1440 Deputy Spruce is still calling the Minority Report draconian. He picks an example of one of the wider family cars and says that if you want to buy a new one, the Minority Report will impose a higher charge than the Department's report. This is the case, but what he fails to tell you is that there are plenty of family cars that will not incur any charges and, of course, you do not have to buy a new car. You can buy a second hand one and avoid the charge altogether, but unless you happen to buy an electric vehicle, you will have to put petrol in your car and, under the Main Report, that will cost you an extra £55 every year.

1445 Deputy Bebb picks up the point I made in my opening speech about how radical this strategy is, but politics is the art of the possible. However, I do firmly believe that we can make a significant and worthwhile start with the measures in this report. Furthermore, I have not come this far to give up now and if the strategy is approved, I will work tirelessly in Environment to progress its implementation.

1450 Deputy Langlois. I cannot find anywhere in either report where it says that cars are offensive items. Indeed, both reports acknowledge the essentiality of the private car. Deputy Langlois is right: strategies only work if you implement them. That is why this is also an action plan.

Deputy Storey highlights the importance of an integrated package which has teeth.

1455 Deputy Lowe, a top notch bus service will help families. Travel plans, improved facilities, a better bus service will also give those with private parking other options. Deputy Lowe is spot on about the population issue. That is why we need to be proactive about starting to change things now. Why did Deputy Lowe not lay an amendment to remove 10 hour parking if she feels that is the solution? Finally, I fully agree that the bus service needs a radical overhaul. Is that not what the report says?

1460 Deputy Gillson is absolutely right that the vision and aims of both reports are similar, but what is lacking in the Department's report is any disincentive to actually make it work. I have addressed the issue of benefit in kind already and I have covered paid parking comprehensively yesterday.

The Report strikes a balance between congestion at peak times and keeping short stay places available for the shopper. When the fact is that the three hours zones are already used by long-stay commuters. I also await Deputy Gillson's amendment to reduce the parking spaces.

1465 Deputy Gillson also says that the Main Report is fairer because 5p is put on fuel. How is this fair when it pushes up prices for everyone, even those who do not use cars?

The reports that the Minority Report asked to be brought back – commercial vehicles, benefit in kind, taxi provision, etc – these are not all 100 or 200 pages, major reports. They are not entire unknowns in that they are integral to the work, but they still have significant potential to add benefits to the whole.

1470 Meaningful improvements have been too long in coming and a softly, softly staged approach is simply too weak.

Deputy Soulsby highlights the issue of targets. Targets are one of my favourite hobby horses and I could talk for a long time and you will be relieved to know that I am not going to. Jersey put a target of 15% in their report. It was a single line in the report. Now, they could have left that out and that would not have changed the report at all. It was a number that they thought of and they put it in there. We have to be a little bit careful with targets, because most of them are arbitrary and most of them are simply a number that somebody has thought up, but what really is important is measurements and there is a proposition or a recommendation that we measure things and we see how they are going and then we know how to actually structure things going forward and the Minority Report, although it runs for three and a half years, also does acknowledge that things can be changed. In fact, it will be essential to change things throughout the life of the strategy in response to this kind of data. The 10,000 miles figure was used in the Main Report. I agree that it overstated it and that is why I have used 6,000 miles for all of my calculations. I thank her for her comments on cycling and we certainly want to make cycling safer.

1475

1485 In terms of the width and emissions charges, the width one only makes up a third of the first registration charge, with emissions making up two thirds of the charge, so the emphasis is on the environmental effect and the emissions, unlike in the Main Report where the balance is the other way round.

I disagree with Deputy Soulsby about the bus fares but we will no doubt be discussing that later.

Deputy Gollop. There are very few places where bus services do pay their way, but they are essential and if we are going to have a bus service, let us have a good one.

1490 I have addressed the 'radicality' issue of the strategy previously and I note Deputy Gollop's advice to the Treasury Minister to look at fuel duty. I think that was what he was saying. *(Laughter)*

Deputy St Pier, thank you for the clarification to Members on the bus depot funding, how it will be managed and confirming that dealing with the bus depot this way does not displace other capital projects. The bus fleet is not amortised in the Minority Report, because it was successful in the capital prioritisation initial phase last year. The number of vehicles increasing on the roads is related to population. The Minority Report does admit that if population suddenly crashes, then, of course, traffic congestion will reduce and

1495

then perhaps we will not have an issue with it, but I do not really think that is the call most people are making on the direction that the population is going to go.

Foreign vehicles being circulated: the Main Report does refer to the legislation already in existence to stop this from happening. It is an enforcement issue and, again, we will be having a member of enforcement staff as part of our proposals.

An annual emissions tax, yes, it is not a bad idea, but I think the other issue with an annual emissions tax is that fuel duty was put on in place of motor tax when it was rescinded and then we would need to then look at rescinding that fuel duty if we were going to move to an annual emissions tax, so that perhaps that might be another thought for the Minister that that is why it is not forming part of this Report.

Most vehicles stay in circulation for about 10 or 12 years, so while I understand what you are saying about when somebody is committed to buying a vehicle and then emissions fall on vehicles if they become more efficient, whichever way it is cut, it is not going to make any difference, because short of a scrappage scheme, which I know the motor traders were interested in, vehicles are going to stay in circulation for a length of time and the Minority Report actually tries to get people to buy the most efficient vehicle that is available at the time and I do not see that we can do more than that. The issue with the scrappage scheme, interestingly, is that when they brought it in the UK and the reasons were because they were losing jobs in the motor industry and they wanted to support that, to stop having job losses, rather than for any environmental reasons, a lot of people were opposed to it. The Institute of Fiscal Studies and Greenpeace were both opposed to it and that really is not an alliance you see very often.

Deputy Sherbourne, the two and a half hour credit: well, people who pay in long-stay, who park in long-stay spaces also park in short-stay spaces, so that is the reasoning behind why they would not necessarily get a credit. I do not think that answers your question properly but I will try and explain it later.

Deputy James makes the really good point that often our personal choices impact upon other people and I do not think we should forget that.

Deputy Wilkie does not support free buses, because they might be too successful, (*Laughter*) as a result of being too successful. Apropos of nothing, actually, I was amused at the parallels between people sitting in their cars and cursing the traffic and Deputies making speeches and cursing the length of debates. (*Laughter*)

Thank you to Deputy Inglis about his clarification about Beau Séjour.

Alderney Representative Jean says the Report is too extreme, but, of course, we have heard, for others, it does not go far enough and I have already commented on social engineering. Alderney Representative Jean says that people must have a choice, but where is the choice for people who cannot drive due to health or other issues?

Deputy Sillars wants to know if it is possible to support the Minority Report without supporting paid parking? Yes, it is perfectly possible, because the Propositions are separate, but I would absolutely advocate against it.

Deputy Adam had no problem with £1.50 for fuel per litre. I probably have no problem with £1.50 a litre for fuel, but I bet I am in a very small minority and this minority will be of no use if 23 do not agree with me.

Paid parking implementation is not proposed for a year. April 2015 is the earliest date that we would look at it and certainly not until a decent bus service is in place.

I thank the Chief Minister for his support and that brings me to Deputy Domaille's comments. The Minority Report does spend more, but it does more. It provides for a bus depot, which the Main Report does not. There is no evidence that town will be badly affected, but there is evidence to the contrary. Most of the amendments that are being laid are minor and the only amendments that we are opposing are the bus fare increases. I have already addressed the issues with the first registration duty and I would say that a Renault Scenic is not necessarily a middle sized car. Jersey brought in a vehicle excise duty on first registration. It was quite modest and it has not really had any effect. We can cite all the different car models we like. I cited a Honda Jazz yesterday, something that has got five doors and you can get five people in and, under our report, that works out at £34 per year cheaper, so we could play that game all day long. Members have had a chance to look at the tables in both reports.

Private car owners of very large vehicles are paying more than commercial vehicles, because private car owners of very large vehicles have a greater choice as to whether to buy that vehicle or not.

Parking charges, parking long-stay, is used by 4% of motorists and that can simply be compared to fuel which is used by 99% of motorists.

The bus depot is not jumping the capital prioritisation queue. It is being funded through income and the capital prioritisation bid made last year by the Department for the bus depot, which was available for all Members to read in the Members' Room, outlined all the reasons why it is essential that we have a bus depot.

I have covered the reports that the Minority Report asks to be brought back.



Comments on land use: all the comments and recommendations on land use in the Minority Report were done together with the team working on the Development Plan Review.

1560 I see no point in rehashing the arguments on paid parking any more. You will be relieved to know, I think we are done on that.

1565 So, that covers all of the comments, I think. However, I cannot close without expressing some thanks. While this report has been an enormous piece of work for me, it would not have been possible without the unstinting support of the staff at Environment, in particular the Chief Officer and the Manager of Traffic Services, who made themselves constantly available to answer my hundreds of questions. I would also like to thank Deputy Brehaut for his work, enthusiasm and encouragement and, finally, Deputy Domaille for his even-handed and collegiate handling of the whole matter. Thank you. *(Applause)*

1570 I could stop there, couldn't I? Just one more thing. In closing, I ask you to support this amendment for the Minority Report as the only credible set of proposals before you today. The Main Report does not contain the means to deliver on its proposals and will cost £2.5 million a year for negligible effect. This strategy is long overdue. Let us get on a deliver the change. *(Applause)*

**The Bailiff:** Members of the States, you are being asked to vote on the amendment proposed by Deputy Burford, seconded by Deputy Brehaut and there is a request for recorded vote.

1575 **Deputy Lowe:** Could I declare an interest as well, please, sir? We own a taxi business.

**The Bailiff:** Yes, thank you, Deputy Lowe.

*There was a recorded vote.*

#### Welcome to Director of the Bureau des Iles Anglo-Normandes

1580 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, while the votes are being formally counted, may I just draw your attention to the presence in the Public Gallery and to formally welcome Dr Mahdia Belgroune who is the Director of BIAN, the Bureau des Iles Anglo-Normandes that the Islands have established in common. Welcome to you. *(Applause)*

#### Result of vote on amendment announced

1585 *Amendment by Deputy Burford/Deputy Brehaut:*  
*Carried – Pour 30, Contre 17, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 0*

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Alderney Rep. Harvey	Alderney Rep. Jean	None	None
Deputy Harwood	Deputy Kuttelwascher		
Deputy Brehaut	Deputy Domaille		
Deputy Robert Jones	Deputy Langlois		
Deputy Le Clerc	Deputy Lester Queripel		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Gillson		
Deputy Sherbourne	Deputy Le Pelley		
Deputy Conder	Deputy David Jones		
Deputy Storey	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
Deputy Bebb	Deputy Lowe		
Deputy St Pier	Deputy Spruce		
Deputy Stewart	Deputy Collins		
Deputy Ogier	Deputy Paint		
Deputy Trott	Deputy Brouard		
Deputy Fallaize	Deputy De Lisle		
Deputy Le Lièvre	Deputy Sillars		
Deputy Duquemin	Deputy Quin		
Deputy Green			
Deputy Dorey			
Deputy Le Tocq			
Deputy James			
Deputy Adam			
Deputy Perrot			
Deputy Wilkie			
Deputy Burford			

Deputy Inglis  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Luxon  
Deputy O'Hara  
Deputy Hadley

1590 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members, the result of the voting on the amendment proposed by Deputy Burford, seconded by Deputy Brehaut is 30 votes in favour, 17 against. I declare the amendment carried.

Just before we rise for lunch, there have been quite a number of other amendments circulated and I just want to make sure that I have a record of all those that have been circulated. I believe it is seven in total and the order in which I propose to take them is in the order of the Propositions to which they relate. So, I am going to read them out in a moment. If I miss any, will people please let me know?

1595 The first amendment is one proposed by Deputy Bebb and seconded by Deputy Sherbourne, which will add a new Proposition 3A.

That will be followed by an amendment proposed by Deputy Soulsby and seconded by Deputy Le Clerc that amends Proposition 4.

1600 The third one is proposed by Deputy Jones and seconded by Alderney Representative Jean which also amends Proposition 4.

The fifth one is proposed by Deputy Lester Queripel and seconded by Deputy Ogier and amends Proposition 5.

1605 The sixth is proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Luxon that proposes to delete Proposition 13 and replace it with another Proposition 13, differently worded, and, if that is successful, there will then be an amendment proposed by Deputy Brouard and seconded by Deputy De Lisle that further amends that amended Proposition.

Finally, we have an amendment proposed by Deputy Inglis, seconded by Deputy Green that inserts a new Proposition 27A in between 27 and 28.

1610 Have I included any that are not to be moved or have I omitted any that have been circulated, that I for some reason do not have track of? No. I see no-one rising. In that case, those are the amendments we will be dealing with this afternoon. That is the order in which we will take them.

So, we will rise now and resume at 2.30 pm.

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

## **VI. Guernsey Integrated on-Island Transport Strategy – Debate continued**

1615 **The Bailiff:** We begin this afternoon with the amendment proposed by Deputy Bebb, seconded by Deputy Sherbourne.  
Deputy Bebb.

*To insert an additional Proposition 3A as follows:*

*3A. To agree that the Department in collaboration with other appropriate Departments will lay before the States, no later than June 2015, the benefits and disbenefits of increasing or decreasing activities contained in the aforementioned measurements.*

1620 **Deputy Bebb:** Thank you, *Monsieur le Bailli*.

I am sure the debate has actually gone on long enough and this is a fairly modest amendment, so I would ask Members to support it.

The Minority Report's third Proposition reads, as follows:

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

1625 What I propose is an addition to that Proposition and it is included in my amendment, which I will read to Members because I realise that not everybody might have a paper copy in front of them. It is to insert an additional Proposition 3A, as follows:

'To agree that the Department in collaboration with other appropriate Departments will lay before the States, no later than June 2015, the benefits and disbenefits of increasing or decreasing activities contained in the aforementioned measurements.'

Now, I do not wish to prejudice that debate that the Department would have, but evidently I would expect the Environment Department to engage with the Health and Social Services Department, particularly with Dr Stephen Bridgman in his role as the Medical Officer of Health, in order to agree certain measurements and the health benefits and disbenefits that would be received from certain activities. So, obviously, if we can accurately measure that more people walk and that we see a reduction within car traffic, do we want to measure air pollution within the busiest areas and see whether there has been a correlation in decrease in air pollution and the health benefits or disbenefits of such activity?

One other Department that I would expect to engage in a very minor way is obviously the Education Department, as there is an expectation in the Minority Report to have cycle competency lessons within schools and therefore they may well decide with the Education Department in order to correlate the figures in that area.

It is a fairly modest amendment and I would hope that with little debate we can agree on it.  
Thank you.

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

**Deputy Sherbourne:** I do, sir. Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** And Deputy Kuttelwascher, you wish to speak, do you?

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Yes. The only thing that came to mind when I read this was, 'Hey, here is a request for yet another report to come back and there is already a plethora of reports coming back.' This will have resource implications and, as such, there is no mention whether it is something the Department could actually do within that date without additional resources.

So that is my question: what resources will be required to implement this?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy David Jones, then Deputy Hadley.

**Deputy David Jones:** My question for Deputy Bebb on this amendment is: how are Environment going to measure the pollution and separate it from pollution from aircraft exhaust at the airport, power station exhausts, all kinds of other pollution? How are they going to separate it out to find out which one is coming from cars? I mean, it is bonkers that we are even considering this amendment!

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Hadley and Deputy Soulsby.

**Deputy Hadley:** I think I would agree with some of that, but my concern is what it is going to cost to do all this and for what benefit, the results when we get them?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby, then Deputy De Lisle and Deputy Adam.

**Deputy Soulsby:** I fully support this amendment. I expect it is probably understandable, given what I said from the Public Accounts Committee point of view.

In response to Deputy Dave Jones' comments about how we would assess the different sorts of pollution, well that is actually done at the moment. Certainly, Environmental Health Department know exactly where the pollution is around the Island, particularly at the bottom of Fountain Street which is above acceptable limits.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy De Lisle.

**Deputy De Lisle:** Yes, sir. It seems to me that some of the information that Deputy Bebb would like to gather here would be gathered actually under recommendation 3 and I would just like to ask him what he feels will be the additional benefit of his particular amendment and the Proposition that he is laying.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Adam.

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

Deputy Soulsby has said partly what I was going to say. Right at this present time, there are detectors at Fountain Street, down at the Bridge area operating all the time and analysing the atmosphere and the particles that are harmful. If you want to know, there was recently a study done by the Environmental Health Director looking at these levels and seeing how they affect health, asthma, etc in the population.

So, this work is being done at the present time and it is just putting a baseline down, when you can get changes and seeing if in less traffic, what type of traffic depending on what is in the air. In actual fact, there are three areas: Fountain Street is one; down at the Bridge near you, Deputy Jones; and I forget the third area, which have got slightly higher levels but not nearly as high as any city in the UK or in other countries. Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Paint and then Deputy Luxon.

**Deputy Paint:** Gentlemen of the Assembly, this confuses me a little bit, because Deputy Soulsby, or somebody, said that they can tell where the emissions come from, but I really have a problem with that.

Within a 50-mile radius of this Island, there are about 700 ships a day passing up and down the Channel. Each of them burns between 2 and 40 tonnes of heavy oil a day and there are also all the ships that are going in and out of the bay of St Malo which have to pass us. That does not really include the fishing vessels and private boats in the Channel. On top of that, we have something like hundreds of passenger airlines passing over this Island every day, so how can you distinguish where the pollution, if there is any, comes from? I really find this difficult.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

**Deputy Luxon:** I can trump Deputy Paint's confusion, sir. Proposition 3 actually talks about:

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

This Proposition, obviously, asks the Environment Department to come back by June 2015 to look at the benefits and disbenefits of increasing or decreasing the activities that are in the Minority Report. It is not specifically about emissions or pollution. I will ask Deputy Bebb to confirm it, but it is about all of the proposals that are here within the Minority Report.

I am reluctant, probably, to support it on the basis that the Environment Department Minister, before lunch, reminded us that there are nine reports that would have to come back to the States and indeed a full review in December 2017 on the entire strategy itself. So I am not minded to support the amendment itself, because I already feel that probably it is going to happen, but I would like clarification that this is not specifically just about pollution; that it is about the entire minority proposals – the Strategy.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

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

Deputy Bebb is nodding his head in response to Deputy Luxon's question. Now, this has caused me confusion. (*Laughter*) Not because it is so hard to agree with Deputy Luxon, but just because I cannot work out what this amendment is asking me to agree to, because Proposition 3 is... Well, Deputy Luxon just read it out, but I will read out the bit I am referring to:

'... to enable meaningful measurements of change in travelling modes...'

and then this inserted Proposition is to agree that there will be an analysis of:

'... benefits and disbenefits of increasing or decreasing activities in the aforementioned measurements.'

Now, the way I read that, I take Proposition new 3A in this amendment in conjunction with Proposition 3 because the only aforementioned measurements which appear before 3A are the ones referred to in 3 which have nothing to do with the Minority Report other than changes in travelling modes.

So, Deputy Bebb is nodding his head as if to reply in the affirmative to Deputy Luxon's question about whether this would be a measurement of all the measures in the Minority Report, but I do not see how it can be, because the only measurements that are aforementioned to 3A are the ones in 3, not the ones after 3A.

So I am now very confused, sir, about what I am being asked to vote for in this amendment. I was inclined to vote for it, but if Deputy Bebb could just clarify what he would like me to vote for, that would probably be of some assistance. (*Laughter*)

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Langlois.

1740 **Deputy Langlois:** Yes, sir. I would be delighted to just add to Deputy Fallaize's confusion, (*Laughter*) simply on the grounds that I am going to agree with him almost 100% which, as everybody knows, is a fairly unusual situation in itself.

1745 I am always suspicious when a proposer of an amendment stands up and says, 'It is just a modest little one. Do not really think too hard about this, because it is all a bit of embellishment, nothing else.' This is all about proportionality. Proposition 3 in the Strategy that we have just approved by a substantial majority makes it perfectly clear that you have got to measure things, and you have got to measure things relating to very specific aspects of change in travelling modes and so on. Please let us not then talk about laying things before the States before next year. Some of the scientific complications of these measurements could be well over the top. It has resource implications. Sorry, let us stick with the Proposition – the very sensible Proposition – that we have got in the Strategy that I voted against. (*Laughter*)

1750

**The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak? Yes, Deputy Burford.

**Deputy Burford:** Yes, I think I understand where Deputy Bebb is coming from on this, but I too am a little uncertain about how it would be achieved.

1755 What I can say is that Proposition 3, if it is all approved this afternoon, within that, it would make sense, obviously, for any other data that we have which can inform future iterations of the Transport Strategy that might relate to the benefits of modal shift, and I think that could be wrapped up within that point, quite honestly.

1760 Just for Deputy Luxon, not all the reports in the Minority Report need to come back to the States. It is not quite as bad as it seems, I think.

**The Bailiff:** Anyone else? No? Deputy Domaille, do you wish to speak on it?

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

1765 I must say I am confused as well, frankly! (*Laughter*) But actually I think I understand the intention of this amendment. I would simply say that the Proposition 3 is eminently sensible to collect data in the right and proper fashion.

1770 Deputy Adam has already pointed out that a lot of the other information is already collected. It would be madness for the Environment Department not to refer to that other information in tandem with its own information and I think that is all that we need do.

1775 The bit about doing more reports and whatever, wherever they are going to and whoever they are going to, it is still work, it is still resources. The Environment Department, with whatever is decided today, is going to put into place to the letter and the spirit of what the States decides, but it is a heavy demand on resources and a report such as this, perhaps may be not a lot of work, nevertheless is draining those resources.

So I will listen to Deputy Bebb's responses to the questions that have been asked, but at the moment, I am not minded to support.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb, then, will reply to the debate.

1780

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

I am a little saddened as to the laziness of certain Deputies saying that they are confused on the day of debate when it was circulated two days ago. Really if people are confused, why are they actually raising it at this point in time?

1785 However, in order to actually clarify for those people who cannot actually be bothered to ask the question of me yesterday, whilst I was sat here, may I clarify? The measurements in relation to the report will actually measure the change in behaviour. That change in behaviour will evidently have some impact and I am thinking especially in relation to health here. If we see a change in behaviour of an increase with walking, then evidently there will be a benefit with health.

1790 The idea of the amendment would be that we could then tie the two together and maybe include this as a measurement towards the Obesity Strategy as well as to how effective the Transport Strategy is. The idea of having the Transport Strategy as this 'incy' little strategy on its own that does not engage with any of the other Strategy is madness and is actually not the intention of the Strategy, as is evident from those who have read it, and how it is trying to tie up with the other Strategies that the States are trying to put together.

1795 What this amendment would do, for instance, is that in relation to the Obesity Strategy, it is quite evident that we would like to see more people walking and cycling. It is quite evident that Proposition 3 will look to measure cycling and walking activities. Now then, what we would have is the position that when it came back to the States, then people can decide whether they want to investigate further as to how we could actually tie in the impact of air pollution and that would be something possible for us. It will have

1800 a cost implication – or it *may*, I think, is the better term. It *may* have a cost implication at that point in time, but that is the point when the cost implication should be raised and not prior to then, because to simply come back with a report does not have a cost implication.

I am pleased to hear Deputy Domaille say the amount of work involved would be minimal by his Department. I can assure Members that I have spoken to Dr Bridgman and he feels that this would tie in very well with the work that HSSD has published recently and would tie in with the work of the general Health part of HSSD.

I give way to Deputy Queripel.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Laurie Queripel.

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

I was just going to ask, sir, this report is meant to come back in June 2015, but not all the measures will be in place for that time. I do not think the paid parking element would have actually kicked in enough to be able to measure any meaningful benefits or disbenefits.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb.

**Deputy Bebb:** As I said, it is not in order to lay the report as to what the changes have been. It is to agree on what would be measured and the impact that any increase... So, for instance, if we see a decrease in car usage, what is the health impact of a decrease in car usage?

I did not think this was a particularly difficult thing to grasp, but evidently bigger pictures are. *(Laughter and interjections)* I think that what is being asked is a report that would come back specifying what benefits there would be to the measurements that the Department would already do. I do not believe that it would actually be a great resource cost, as Deputy Domaille agreed. Evidently, I will leave it there and Members can vote.

**The Bailiff:** We vote, then, on the amendment proposed by Deputy Bebb, seconded by Deputy Sherbourne. Those in favour; those against.

*Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.*

**The Bailiff:** I declare it lost.

Next we have an amendment proposed by Deputy Soulsby and seconded by Deputy Le Clerc that seeks to amend Proposition 4.

Deputy Soulsby.

*In Proposition 4, after the word 'paragraphs' delete the remaining text and replace with the following: '29 to 36 and 38 to 45 of the Minority Report referred to in Proposition 1, with the proviso that commercial vehicles shall only be subject to the CO<sub>2</sub> element of the First Registration Duty and that commercial vehicles' First Registration Duty shall be capped at £2000. Furthermore, commercial vehicles shall not be subject to the width element of the scheme (either duty or subsidy).'*

**Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, my amendment is purely focused on just one aspect which has come into both Strategies and that is the First Registration Duty.

Before I begin, I thought it would be useful for Members to know that I have a business which runs an Aixam Megavan. Mega by name, but not exactly nature. A rather quirky, it has to be admitted, micro-delivery van, but we have no intention of replacing it in the foreseeable future.

As I stated in the earlier debate on the Minority Report, I do believe that structurally, the Main Report bandings and charges would have had little effect on decision-making behaviour. The Minority Report's structure has more teeth and focus, as Deputy Burford made clear, on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions rather than width, so the economic impact of this amendment is pretty minimal. However, I am concerned with the effect it will have on the commercial sector. Yes, we have big vans on this Island and, yes, they can be annoying when you are going down a narrow lane, but businesses do not buy vans to make a statement. It is not like buying a 'Chelsea tractor' that never sees a speck of mud. These are working vehicles that have a purpose. A skip lorry carries a skip and has to be a certain size. A fuel lorry carries fuel and a cesspit lorry carries... Well, I do not think we need to add any more. *(Interjections)*

The size of the vehicle is not a lifestyle decision and in the current economic climate, a business is going to go for the smallest and cheaper vehicle it can get away with. To discriminate against businesses because of the vehicle they *have* to use is completely illogical.

I do not propose eradicating CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. As I stated earlier, I believe it is absolutely right that a charge should be placed on vehicles in that respect as it is possible for many businesses, not all, to make a choice and I would want to encourage business to buy new fuel-efficient vans and lorries rather than older vehicles where possible. However, I am concerned how business will be adversely affected due to the nature of the vehicles required and so I have proposed a reduction in the cap to £2,000 from £2,400, which is something I have carefully considered with Deputy Burford.

This amendment will have little effect on the smallest vans – the Fiat Fiorino or Transit Courier – which will fall under the width element anyway. However, this will cut the charges for a Fiat Doblò by £400, Scudo, £800 and Ducato by £400. I think it should be pretty straightforward to ensure vehicles are being used for commercial purposes with minimal work, especially if you consider this in the context of a whole new tax system.

Having discussed this with the trade, I believe that no extra forms will be required, with the information necessary obtainable from the B55 Form and the Vehicle Registration Form amended to state that the vehicle is for business purposes, together with the company name and tax number. The form will need to be amended anyway to include the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. In order to ensure width duty is paid should the vehicle cease to be used for business purposes, this can be picked up through updating the Vehicle Transfer Form.

Better still, it is clear to me from the information currently online that this whole process cries out for modernisation. It is daft that you can download a form from the internet, but then have to travel to Bulwer Avenue, by whatever means of transport, to register your vehicle. If e-government means anything, it should be at the heart of the Driver and Vehicle Licensing process.

Now, I do feel like I stand here on a regular basis questioning new policy initiatives that will hit business, so I am again here today, but I will continue doing so if it means I can prevent more unnecessary red tape, more businesses going bust and resultant job losses, as it is a whole community that suffers in the end.

This amendment will not eradicate increased costs completely, but will enable most businesses to make a decision in terms of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions which I believe is fair and reasonable in the context of the strategy as a whole.

I thank Deputy Burford and Deputy Brehaut for supporting this amendment and Deputy Burford in particular for her assistance. I therefore urge all Members to support this amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you.

Deputy Le Clerc, do you formally second the amendment?

**Deputy Le Clerc:** Yes, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford, do you wish to speak? Then Deputy Luxon.

**Deputy Burford:** Thank you.

We have examined the impact this amendment would have if successful on the income of the Minority Report and we believe it can be accommodated for the following reasons. Firstly, the cap proposed in the Minority Report means that that charge for many vehicles would have effectively not included the equivalent of the width element anyway, so no revenue is lost in those cases. Secondly, micro vans would receive a subsidy under the Minority Report, which they will not receive under the terms of this amendment. Lastly, an allowance has been made across all registrations, including private cars, which assumes a reduction in income of 30% due to behavioural shift. Accepting the argument that there is likely to be limited behaviour shift in the commercial sector, the assumed reduction in estimated income for that sector only could reasonably be reduced to 10%, thus facilitating the reduction in the commercial vehicle cap to £2,000 without unduly impacting the funding of this strategy, as proposed by this amendment.

It should also be remembered that under the Minority Report, commercial vehicles will benefit from the 1.2p litre reduction in fuel duty, equivalent to a reduction in fuel costs of around £24 a year for a large commercial vehicle. Therefore, as this amendment does not significantly adversely affect either the funding base or the behavioural philosophy of the Minority Report, we will not be opposing it and I thank Deputy Soulsby for the detailed work that she has done on it.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

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

I would like to thank Deputy Soulsby for laying this amendment. Before I do that, as I did not speak earlier in the debate about the Minority Report, I too would like to congratulate Deputy Burford and Deputy Brehaut, and indeed the Environment Department, for coping with what has been a very complex process to

get to where we are, but it has been a fantastic series of reports, presentations and speeches, so congratulations to her.

1915 I am pleased that she has indicated that she does not oppose this, because as a member of the PSD Board, she was part of the decision in terms of our letter of submission supporting the report and if I could just read from page 710:

‘Therefore, while the Department will support the measure in respect of vehicles used solely for private rather than commercial purposes, it does not support it for commercial vehicles, because of the impact on the economy that that will result and the fact that for perfectly understandably reasons behaviour change will almost certainly not necessarily occur.’

I just make that point, because I did make that point to Deputy Burford earlier.

1920 Sir, the real essence of this was about modal change in terms of car usage, the number of car journeys and that was why both the Department and I personally were uncomfortable about capturing the commercial vehicles within this and simply adding to inflationary costs for all Islanders. So, both from a Department point of view and personally, I was not comfortable and I think this amendment, without impacting on the overall Minority Report proposals which, as Deputy Burford said, is a very integrated series of proposals, so she would certainly not want to see too many amendments or changes that would  
1925 undermine it and I recognise that, but hearing her comments just now, I think we can support this amendment, recognising a fairness of keeping in with the spirit of the actual Minority Report. So I would urge Members to support this amendment.

Thank you.

1930 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop and then Deputy Stewart.

**Deputy Gollop:** Sir, as Deputy Burford is accepting this amendment, alright. I reserve my position on it. But I have got concerns about whether we are sending out too complacent a message to the business community, because we do want to change behaviour. I have always seen a facet of Guernsey life which is  
1935 even slightly different from Jersey life, that there are so many vans that go around the Island all the time, up, down and round. And, of course, people in reality often use their vehicles which are commercial in a domestic way and *vice versa*, so I think the dividing line between strictly commercial vehicles and domestic vehicles is not clear.

So, I am not sure if we are making the right move here in restricting a stream of income.

1940 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Stewart, then Deputy Dorey.

**Deputy Stewart:** Mr Bailiff, I congratulate my fellow Member on the Commerce and Employment Board for bringing this amendment. I will be supporting it fully. What I would like to remind the Assembly  
1945 is that this amendment will bring a real benefit for the drivers of commercial vehicles and, if you are a window cleaner or you are doing your gardening job, you cannot actually take your window cleaning materials on the job. You have to use your commercial vehicle. You have to drive round the Island and you have to do your job and, therefore, this amendment will be a lot fairer for those people, so I do urge you to support it.

1950 And as Deputy Gollop has said, he said he sees a lot of these people driving up, down and around the Island, but that is what they are doing. They are commercial people doing a commercial job, Deputy Gollop, and this is why we should support this amendment. These people are carrying out their business. They are driving the economy of Guernsey and that is why we need to support the amendment and support owners of commercial vehicles.

1955 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey, then Deputy Le Clerc.

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

1960 I cannot support this amendment. I support business, but one of the purposes of this report is to encourage pedestrians and one of the biggest threats to that is wide vehicles and people driving on pavements, which I think discourage people from walking. So if this amendment removes the width element from commercial vehicles, then I think that is going in the wrong direction. Surely, if we want to encourage people to walk, we need to stop people driving on pavements and the whole point of the width  
1965 element of the First Duty Registration is to encourage narrower vehicles. I believe that encouragement should be there to the commercial vehicle sector as well. There is a maximum cap anyway, so it is a limited amount of encouragement. But I believe that should be there for the commercial sector as well as the private car.

Thank you.



1970 **Deputy Le Clerc:** Thank you, you, sir.

I am afraid I will have to disagree with Deputy Dorey once again. I never thought that I would be standing here today asking for support to amend a Proposition on the width duty of commercial vehicles as it is not my field of expertise. Listening to Deputy Soulsby, she has a far greater knowledge of vans than I do. However, as the daughter of a retired carpenter and with two brothers who are also carpenters, I feel very strongly that this duty is unfair on the hard working, self-employed tradesmen and other local business who together work hard to contribute to the Guernsey economy.

1975 I found in the Guernsey facts and figures for 2013, 9.6% of people in employment were self-employed and although they will not all be driving commercial type vehicles, many of them do need a van for their businesses and many of them actually operate out of their vans, as premises are too expensive or unavailable. I appreciate that the Minority Report proposes a cap on commercial vehicles and excludes the tax on certain emergency and agricultural vehicles, but I believe that the proposals do not go far enough and are still unfair on local business on the Island. The majority of the time the businesses have to operate a size of vehicle suitable to their business needs and a smaller vehicle with no or low duty is not always an option. I know there was some talk this morning about clarification about what a commercial vehicle would be and in my very simplistic terms, I would have thought that when you go to have your insurance on your vehicle, you have to indicate whether it is for a business purposes and that would be some way of indicating whether that is a commercial vehicle. Again, that is a very simplistic view.

1980 In addition, I am sure that any extra costs incurred by a local business will ultimately be passed on to the consumer or customer. We have already seen traders from the UK come to the Island – ‘white van man’ – and undercut local businesses. There will, unless further amendments are placed, be the additional costs of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions on business and although I am not entirely happy with the cost, we must make some inroads into reducing our emissions and face up to our environmental responsibilities.

1990 Please vote for this amendment and protect our local businesses from another additional cost. Thank you.

1995 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Hadley and Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy Hadley:** Mr Bailiff, I agree with the sentiments of Deputy Dorey entirely. We are imposing all sorts of tax on individual people and here we are talking about relief for a business, and the amount of relief we are giving a business is so small per week, it is probably too small to pass on.

In the context of proportionality, I think I shall be voting against this amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

2005 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, I should just be grateful if Deputy Soulsby, in summing up, could just provide an explanation for the rationale for not also extending this exemption for commercial vehicles to the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions duty. I have had several explanations given to me, but I would just be interested in hearing her explanation of that, sir.

2010 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

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

I was initially torn on this one. I know this Assembly sees itself as business friendly, but sometimes, what I do not want to see on every occasion is that business comes before the environmental considerations. If we were to just wind the clock back by 10 years, virtually every tradesman of any size of business on this Island managed their way around the Island in little Rascal vans. Now, I appreciate the safety concerns regarding leg injuries and European legislation means that we see less of those type of vehicles, but when somebody walks onto the forecourt of any business and seeks to buy – I think the Australians call them ‘utes’ – these utility vehicles, you are paying £25,000 or £26,000 for a pickup truck, complete with chrome bumpers and very wide mirrors. That is a choice that that businessman, who may be a plumber, who may be an electrician, who may be a window cleaner is making. Now, although I am in support of the amendment, I was torn on this, because I think tradesmen and businesses have a lot more choice. I think for the carpenter and the person who is carrying plasterboard and marine ply around, you can only get a certain size sheet in a certain size of van. I understand that, but what we see if people spending a huge amount of money on vehicles that are not particularly environmentally friendly. They are wide and they are not, strictly speaking, essential.

2025 But on balance and I appreciate that for States’ Members to fully embrace and sign up to the Minority Report, concessions will need to be made, but I have to say, although I am supporting the amendment, I was torn and had to be persuaded to support this one, sir.

2030 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

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

I will be supporting the amendment and thank Deputy Soulsby for bringing it.

2035 Just remember that commercial businesses are the real drivers of the economy. This is pure extra burden for the local self-employed and, as Deputy Brehaut says, the size of 8x4 sheet of ply is 8x4 sheet of ply. That is the size. So just remember, at the very end of the day, to throw it out completely when we vote on the final Propositions.

Deputy Wilkie.

2040 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Wilkie.

**Deputy Wilkie:** Yes, I would just like to echo what Deputy Brouard has said and also that, being in the trade for 20 years, a small businessman, if you are in a small business and you need to move things around, most stuff comes on a pallet. You are not going to change the size of a pallet, you need that size van to fit that size pallet in the back of your van, so no matter how much width tax you put on, you are still going to need the same vehicle.

I would just like to make that point, sir.

2050 **The Bailiff:** Anyone else wishing to speak? No?  
Deputy Domaille.

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

I oppose this amendment. I spoke on the width tax this morning in opposing the Minority Report.

2055 Deputy Dorey, Deputy Gollop, Deputy Hadley... and, actually, Deputy Brehaut has given some good arguments as well and I appreciate his decision on balance. But the whole idea of the width tax is for owners of such vehicles to recognise that the disproportionate effects they have on all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists, but all road users and what we are trying to do here is make the travelling experience better for people and for people to think about the vehicles before they get them. Now, just to say, because the owner is a commercial vehicle, he or she should be exempt from a charge paid by private motorists is just illogical and unfair – totally unfair. I accept some operators have no option but to use wider vehicles, I accept that, but not all do and some can use smaller vehicles.

2060 And yes, the charge will increase costs, but the increased cost, if you take the life of the vehicle – remember this is a one-off charge and the number of miles they do – it is minimal.

2065 I also have to add, although I hear what the Deputy Le Clerc said, the term ‘commercial’: what is meant by commercial use? Is it a vet? Will a vet buying the new Land Rover Discovery be exempt? All sorts of other uses like that.

2070 So I find it very difficult to justify the logic behind this amendment or indeed any... the cap in the Minority Report, but that is carried now. That is it. That is fine. I accept that. *(Laughter)* Well, that is the way it is. But to be putting a cap on the width of a vehicle for some people and not for others is just unfair.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby will reply to the debate.

2075 **Deputy Soulsby:** Thanks for all the comments.

I am not going to spend ages going through all of them. I would like to thank Deputy Luxon in particular, who spoke about the issue of behavioural change. Many people who have not got so much of a choice within the commercial sector about what vehicle they have. Also, about the inflationary effect of the width element affecting the commercial sector.

2080 Deputy Gollop talked about sending a complacent message, but I reiterate about how the commercial sector have far less choice about the width of their vehicle, but have a much greater choice in regard to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, which is why – I think, I would answer Deputy St Pier’s comments about why – I am happy to keep the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions element within the duty. I would like to thank my Minister for his support. I would expect nothing else! *(Laughter and interjection)*

2085 I do find Deputy Dorey’s comments rather strange regarding pavement surfing. Is he, therefore, proposing we completely replace all our buses now? Have very narrow buses that do not have to surf the pavements? *(Laughter and interjection)* Great, but I would like to find any bus that will fall well under the width duties that we have got proposed here.

Deputy Hadley, again, I was very unclear about his concerns.

2090 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Hadley.

**Deputy Hadley:** I mean, the concern is that – if I may, Mr Bailiff, make it clear – we are talking about businesses that are turning over reasonable sums of money. The small businesses that are unlikely to be able to afford this probably buy second hand vehicles anyway. But if you are talking about a business, adding the businesses costs at a £1 per week to a business –

**Deputy Perrot:** Point of order, sir.  
Are we all allowed to speak twice, sir?

**The Bailiff:** No. I think he was adding a point of clarification, but I think he has now clarified what he was saying.

**Deputy Soulsby:** Well, all I say is that if Deputy Hadley thinks that there are lots of businesses making shedloads of money, then I think he needs to go to speak to the real businesses out there. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Remember, most local business owners over here are local individuals, so as well as being hit by their own business, they are also being hit on an individual level from the rest of the Strategy.

I covered off the definition of ‘commercial’, Deputy Domaille, through my earlier comments regarding the use of the B55 Form and Registration Form.

Basically, it boils down to whether Members believe businesses should take a hit to the bottom line for something over which they have little influence. When the purpose of this duty is to change behaviours, I cannot see how that makes logical sense. We have got to support our local businesses. I know that my fellow Commerce and Employment Board Member, Deputy Laurie Queripel, has passed on the details of 300 licence-plate numbers from vans registered in the UK, over the last two years. They will not have to pay width duty here. It will just make it even easier for the UK ‘white van man’ to undercut local business.

Now, the authors of this Report do support this amendment, for which I am grateful and I would urge all Members to do likewise.

**The Bailiff:** We vote, then, on the amendment proposed by Deputy Soulsby and seconded by Deputy Le Clerc. Those in favour; those against.

*Some Members voted Pour; others voted Contre.*

**The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.

The next amendment we move to is proposed by Deputy David Jones and seconded by Alderney Representative Jean.

*In Proposition 4 immediately after “shall be introduced”, to insert “, well understood that such Duty will apply when a vehicle is first registered in the Guernsey part of the register maintained under the Motor Taxation and Licensing (Guernsey) Law, 1987, and not in the Alderney part of that register, but otherwise”.*

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

Firstly, before presenting this, I would like to thank Her Majesty’s Procureur for the help, because he did say to us at the beginning that these kind of amendments are sometimes fraught with danger because of the unique relationship and the 1948 Agreement that the States of Guernsey has with the States of Alderney. We took that on board, but he fully accepted the spirit of what I was trying to do, and what Alderney Representative Jean was trying to do.

This is an integrated Transport Strategy for Guernsey and clearly, many of the aspect of this Strategy should not apply to Alderney, in my view. They do not have the same kind of issues that we have been dealing with this morning. The amendment B that we are looking at, which is the first one, is fairly self-explanatory and we just do not believe that it should apply to the Alderney part of the register under the Moto Taxation and Licencing Law.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Alderney Representative Jean, do you second the amendment?

**Alderney Representative Jean:** I do, sir. If I may I will speak briefly on it. (**The Bailiff:** Yes.)

It is just to echo and, first of all, to thank Deputy Dave Jones for assisting me with this Requête and the staff who helped as well. I am grateful, because the situation is different in Alderney and I would like Members to observe that and, if they would, vote for the amendment.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

2150 **Deputy Burford:** In respect of the First Registration Duty on page 726 of the Billet, it does say, 'excluding Alderney', but there is no provision to change the fuel duty for Alderney, so Alderney should benefit from the 1.2p reduction if that is carried.

**The Bailiff:** Alderney Representative Harvey.

2155 **Alderney Representative Harvey:** Thank you, sir.

Following my contribution to yesterday's debate, I was accused today of having lack of focus. Well, it is true. I do not have a Focus. I do have, however, a VW Golf, (*Laughter and applause*) which I purchased not two weeks ago from a dealer three miles from here – thus at a stroke, however minimally, helping remove one car from Guernsey's roads.

2160 For the privilege of so doing, I was charged £200 import duty in Alderney, so I do feel, although I hate to speak from personal experience, I have done my little bit to help with the congestion. One could argue, of course, that the regime of import duty in Alderney is the reason we have no congestion. That would be rather akin to saying umbrellas going up cause it to rain. The real truth, of course, is we do not have enough people, but that is a debate for another day, sir.

2165 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak on this amendment? Yes, Deputy St Pier.

2170 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, I feel I am duty bound to speak a little further to the issue which Deputy Dave Jones referred to in his opening comments, which is the inherent risks around this amendment, which again I think he said the Law Officers had drawn his attention to. Clearly, the issue is that we are in fiscal union with Alderney. There are many services which are paid for and enjoyed in one Island and paid for by the residents of the other Island, and I do suggest that we do tread with caution in seeking to unpick that fiscal union and take a pick-and-mix approach to what applies in each Island. I think there may very well be valid reasons to have a debate about whether what was appropriate in 1948 is still appropriate in 2014, but I am not sure it should necessarily be done on the back of the Transport Strategy.

2175 So I have considerable sympathy for and understand the rationale for bringing this, but do just offer that note of caution and on the basis of that point of principle, I will find myself unable to support this particular amendment.

2180 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

2185 **Deputy Gollop:** Sir, I want to support the amendment for, I think, two reasons. The first is the Representatives, Mr Harvey and Mr Jean, would explain or have explained on various occasions the economic issues that Alderney faces. Guernsey has in recent years had an expanding population. Alderney has had a contracting population. They have declined by maybe a quarter – the equivalent of Guernsey dropping from 60,000 to 48,000. The businesses there do limited trade, especially in the winter. We know, from research that we have had, that average incomes are lower and the average age of residents is higher. I do think they need to be treated as a special case, as a regional area, as a different community, with different membership of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, different company law and different rights regarding energy and the sea and so on. We should respect that from time to time and, indeed, in the past, the Treasury attitude of one size fits all has affected policy such as rates, TRP, which have not been in the Island's best interests.

2190 But there is a second and more obvious reason. We have all been talking liberally and maybe we will vote for later, either free buses or very cheap buses and we take it as read to have an Island-wide bus service where you can travel a long distance, such as from town to L'Eree or a short distance from town to the top of Grange. There is no such option in Alderney apart from one month a year in August. There is no bus service, state-subsidised or otherwise and so Alderney taxpayers who never visit Guernsey are paying for a service that they cannot and do not receive. I do not believe that to be fair and we should respect that by making Alderney an exception in this particular strategic case.

2200 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb and then Deputy Stewart.

2205 **Deputy Bebb:** Thank you, *Monsieur le Bailli*.

I am a little uncomfortable with this amendment and I think that Deputy St Pier actually pointed out part of the discomfort which is to separate the taxation of the two Islands. I believe that under the Arditti

2210 Requête, the Policy Council is to come back to this Assembly with measures in order to look at all the Alderney situation, and I am very supportive of that Requête in its aims. I accept that there are different circumstances in Alderney, but I think that the time to amend taxation, which I would accept as part of that Requête, should fall under that jurisdiction. Therefore, I am afraid that on this occasion, I will not be supporting this amendment.

2215 I do believe that the Arditti Requête is where we can reasonably look in the round at all taxation implications in relation to Alderney and, therefore, I would urge Members not to support this amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Stewart.

2220 **Deputy Stewart:** Mr Bailiff, I really rise to echo what Deputies Bebb and Deputy St Pier were saying. I am working fairly hard with the Alderney Liaison Group and am well aware of the economic situation that Alderney finds itself in at this moment, but I have to agree with Deputy St Pier, that what we cannot do is start cherry picking bits and pieces of tax to try to give them some sort of benefit.

2225 I also have a question as well and I do not know, really, who can answer this, but could this open up a possibility of a sort of CO<sub>2</sub> arbitrage going on, whereby you could have an Alderney-registered vehicle and bring it over to Guernsey? I am not quite sure what the restrictions are on driving Alderney-registered vehicles in Guernsey, but it could open up to other bits of problems here.

So I do not know if anyone can actually answer that question, but I will not be supporting this amendment.

2230 **The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak on the amendment? No?  
Deputy Domaille.

**Deputy Domaille:** No, it is alright. I think it has all been said. All I would say is that I do not believe that Alderney has the same sort of traffic problems that we have, and I will be supporting the amendment.

2235 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dave Jones to reply to the debate.

2240 **Deputy David Jones:** I think the Environment Minister has made exactly the point why this amendment was brought and I take on board the Treasury Minister's concerns and, of course, the Procureur's health warning, before these amendments were put together, about the 1948 Agreement.

However, we cannot have a situation where Departments bring forward strategies that are predominately made for Guernsey that have a detrimental effect, then, on Alderney, that do not enjoy the same problems or so-called issues that this Island does and just say, 'Well, do you know what, it is because we had this agreement in 1948, they will just have to live with it.'

2245 And the other thing is that the Treasury Minister has made it abundantly clear around the Policy Council table, on several occasions, that he is extremely concerned about Alderney's financial position and the future sustainability of that Island and yet here we are, every time we come here, we pass legislation that is meant to be for one purpose that has a detrimental effect on Alderney. It is not right what we are doing and they do not have a congestion problem and, even if they did, they have a parliament of their own that can deal with parking issues and all those kind of problems.

2250 The other thing, I point out to you, of course, is the tax part of the Road Fund Licence that is now on fuel is paid to us from Alderney and yet they still pay to repair their own roads. So, they get no benefit from paying that tax and so, okay, they do enjoy other benefits in other ways from the common purse of Guernsey. I accept that, but can we just keep this focused on what this about? As the Environment Minister has said, this is about a Traffic Strategy that is for Guernsey – thank you, Deputy Fallaize – and it has a knock-on detrimental effect, in my view, for Alderney, that should not be and that is why I am happy to put this amendment forward. It is entirely a matter for the States, of course.

2260 **The Bailiff:** Members, you vote, then, on the amendment proposed by Deputy Dave Jones, seconded by Alderney Representative Jean. Those in favour; those against.

*Some Members voted Pour; others voted Contre.*

2265 **The Bailiff:** I have had a request for a recorded vote. I was going to call it as having been carried, but it has been requested for a recorded vote. *(Interjection and laughter)*

*There was a recorded vote.*

2270 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members, while the votes are formally counted, we will move on with the amendment which is the next and that is proposed by Deputy Lester Queripel, seconded by Deputy Ogier. Deputy Lester Queripel.

*In Proposition 5, after the words 'Minority Report' where they appear for the last time, insert 'except that in relation to Proposition 5b, the Environment Department shall investigate ways of making the chargeable annual disc parking clock reusable every year (rather than car users having to purchase a new one) and if a reasonably practicable method can be identified by the Environment Department, to allow the parking clocks to be re-registered and re-used, then the Department shall adopt and implement it.'*

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

2275 I will just spend a moment or two, sir, elaborating on an explanatory note, if I may. It seems incredibly wasteful to dispose of 40,000 parking clocks every year and replace them with 40,000 plus new ones. And even though I appreciate the old clocks can be recycled, there will be still be costs associated with that and we also have to factor in the costs of producing tens of thousands of new clocks and the printing costs, the delivery costs, etc.

2280 It seems to me we can avoid all that wastefulness and the associated costs by making a parking clock reusable and I envisage the motorist producing their clock, having it stamped and re-registered every year for a further year, but, of course, Environment themselves will decide what procedure to adopt.

2285 I have had my current clock for about eight years and it is still in good working order. I have no detailed figures, sir, but I think we could safely say that most parking clocks will last for five years or so and bearing that in mind, we could avoid the issues of having to dispose of and renew over 200,000 parking clocks in that five-year period.

So, sir, I ask my colleagues to please to support an amendment that is not only environmentally friendly, but also realises cost and efficiency savings.

Thank you, sir.

2290 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier, do you formally second the amendment?

**Deputy Ogier:** And reserve my right to speak, thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you very much.

2295 *Amendment by Deputy David Jones/Alderney Representative Jean:  
Carried – Pour 34, Contre 13, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 0*

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Alderney Rep. Jean	Deputy Kuttelwascher	None	None
Alderney Rep. Harvey	Deputy Conder		
Deputy Harwood	Deputy Bebb		
Deputy Brehaut	Deputy St Pier		
Deputy Domaille	Deputy Stewart		
Deputy Langlois	Deputy Lowe		
Deputy Robert Jones	Deputy Le Lièvre		
Deputy Le Clerc	Deputy Spruce		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Duquemin		
Deputy Sherbourne	Deputy Dorey		
Deputy Storey	Deputy James		
Deputy Lester Queripel	Deputy Adam		
Deputy Gillson	Deputy Perrot		
Deputy Le Pelley			
Deputy Ogier			
Deputy Trott			
Deputy Fallaize			
Deputy David Jones			
Deputy Laurie Queripel			
Deputy Collins			
Deputy Green			
Deputy Paint			
Deputy Le Tocq			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Wilkie			
Deputy De Lisle			
Deputy Burford			
Deputy Inglis			
Deputy Soulsby			

Deputy Sillars  
Deputy Luxon  
Deputy O'Hara  
Deputy Quin  
Deputy Hadley

2300       **The Bailiff:** Just before I open debate, the result of the vote on the amendment proposed by Deputy David Jones, seconded by Alderney Representative Jean, 34 votes in favour, 13 against. I declare it carried. Who wishes to debate the Deputy Lester Queripel amendment? Deputy Brouard.

2305       **Deputy Brouard:** In the circumstances, I think it is a good idea, but an even better, really novel way of saving this is not bringing it in in the first place. *(Laughter)* So, vote it in now, remember to vote it out later. *(Laughter)*

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Duquemin.

2310       **Deputy Duquemin:** Sir, my first inclination when I read this amendment was to vote against it, because I thought it was, to once again borrow the verbiage of Deputy Paint, my colleague, was the eco-pirates going a bit mad here.

2315       But, in actual fact and it does say, in a very genuine way, 'if a reasonably practical method can be identified by the Environment Department'. Then I actually thought: it is more hassle than it is worth, it cannot be done. And then, I do not know how many... I used to be, but I am not longer a member, but I used to be a member in my younger days at L'Ancrese Golf Club and I remember the plastic holder that you put on your bag and there literally is a small sticker, a colourful sticker that you restick over the last sticker every year that said, in my case, '1998' or '1999' and everything.

2320       So, I think, in many ways, because it is good to be green, I am inclined to support this amendment, sir, and I think if a suggestion was wanted as to what that reasonably practical method could be, that it would be a parking clock, yes, but a sticker, whether it has a hologram on or whatever, that could literally but put over the parking clock. So, I am inclined to at least go for the investigation, sir.

Thank you.

2325       **The Bailiff:** Anyone else? No? Deputy Domaille?

**Deputy Domaille:** That is fine. It seems reasonable to me. We will go away and look at it. I think the sticker idea is obviously one idea. There may be the possibility of introducing some sort of chip technology which would actually fit in with other proposals in the strategy.

2330       So, no, we will look at it and that is fine. I am quite happy with it.

**The Bailiff:** Sorry, Deputy Luxon – Deputy Domaille was making the penultimate... I thought nobody else wished to speak. *(Interjection by Deputy Luxon and laughter)* Well, it is my error. Perhaps you stood earlier and I had missed you. I apologise.

2335       Deputy Lester Queripel to reply to the debate.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, yes, indeed. Not a great deal to say, sir, really, *(Laughter and interjections)* but I am sure I can think of something, sir!

2340       Just to emphasise that the logistics and practicalities, of course, will be decided by the Environment Department themselves, so I just ask that we go to the vote, please, sir. Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Yes, we vote, then, on the amendment proposed by Deputy Lester Queripel, seconded by Deputy Ogier. Those in favour; those against.

2345       *Some Members voted Pour; others voted Contre.*

**The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.

2350       Next, we have an amendment proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Luxon. Deputy St Pier.

*To delete Proposition 13 and replace it with:*

*'13. a) To approve the implementation of the improvements to the public bus service as set out in paragraphs 88 to 91 of that Minority Report*

*b) To approve for the duration of the Strategy a bus fare policy which provides for:*

- *A fixed fare of 50p per journey (subject to appropriate discounts for multi-journey cards);*
- *Free travel for children under the age of 12 accompanied by an adult;*
- *Free travel for all children during term time travelling in school uniform.'*

**Deputy St Pier:** Thank you, sir.

I said, when speaking on the Minority Report amendment, that, of course, free buses are at the core of both Strategies, but for me they are also a significant hole in the Strategy and I just want to speak a little bit further to that.

2355 I feel that the case for entirely free buses simply has not been made. Given the importance of free buses to the Strategy, of course, I would have been surprised to have received the support of either the Majority or the Minority authors but nonetheless, I feel it is worthy of bringing this amendment to have the debate.

2360 In the Reports, it makes it very clear that only 10% of those surveyed thought that £1 was too high. Only 20% of those surveyed were actually seeking free buses. It also notes that the number of pensioners travelling, who, of course, travel free have continued to decline, so it is clearly not the cost which is putting off those people. They are simply choosing not to do so and, again, the Report says the statistics, perhaps, say more about the convenience and dominance of the car than they do about the quality, availability and affordability of the bus service and that for me is the key. The key to improving usage of the bus service is all about the network and the frequency and not about the cost.

2365 Clearly, it makes a lot more sense within cities, which are cases which are cited in the Report, where the network and frequency are going to be much more available. For many in our community, it really will not matter whether it is free or, indeed, if we start to pay people to take the bus. Ultimately, if there is not a bus route and a frequent bus route which is close to them, they will not be using the bus service, whatever the cost or, indeed, whether they are paid to do so. So, for me, that is an absolutely fundamental weakness of this and, again, 91% of respondents considered that driving is more convenient than public transport. So, all the emphasis has to be on improving the convenience, improving the network.

2370 The whole strategy, as I said, buses are at the core of it and it feels like a very, very giant experiment which is going to cost us £12 million between now and the end of 2017, in terms of the measures in the Minority Report together with the development of the bus depot and, in addition, of course, we have the amortisation of the £5 million cost of amortising the bus fleet over that period as well. So, that takes it to well over £12 million, in addition to and above, of course, the support which is already going into the bus service. So, this is an awful lot of public money which is going in, without sufficient evidence to say that it will make a significance difference.

2380 Sir, I chose 50p in my amendment. I know there is another amendment coming forward suggesting £1. The logic for choosing 50p was simply the reference in page 83 of the Report that the start of the fall in the number of passengers on the buses coincided with the rise in the fares and that was, of course, from 50p upwards. It is no more scientific than that, my picking that number, but that was the logic entirely behind it.

2385 Sir, I have made no reference in my amendment to other concessions, whether that be for the disabled or the elderly. I felt that was simply a matter of operational policy, but I did specifically wish to draw attention to accompanied children, and indeed all school children, on the basis that, as has been said in previous speeches, getting more school children to use buses is a significant ambition of the Strategy and, therefore, it felt appropriate to refer to that, but by not referring to other concessions, I was not offering an opinion particularly on that.

2390 I have nothing further to add, sir, but will obviously happily respond to the debate.

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

**Deputy Luxon:** Yes, please, sir.

2395 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

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

2400 We are making pretty steady progress through these amendments, but I am determined to stop that now, (*Laughter*) because this amendment is different to all of the other amendments which have been laid and voted on so far and those which have been circulated.

2405 We have just, in effect, kicked out the Environment Department's proposed Strategy by deleting all of their Propositions and we have inserted in their place the Burford/Brehaut Transport Strategy and the reason I say this amendment is so different from all of the others is because this is the one amendment which Deputy Burford indicated she would oppose. I am not surprised that she is going to oppose this amendment, because this is the only amendment which truly flies in the face of the Integrated Transport Strategy which is outlined in her Minority Report and which the States have, in effect... well, not approved just yet, but



certainly decided that they prefer ahead of the Environment Department's proposal by a substantial majority.

2410 On this amendment, I think, again, of what I said yesterday – I think it was only yesterday, but it seems like weeks ago – about the dangers of leaving here with a dog's breakfast. This is precisely the kind of amendment which could lead to the creation of a dog's breakfast.

2415 I was alarmed when Deputy Wilkie spoke earlier today and he said, 'I want to support the Minority Report and, therefore, I will vote in favour of Deputy Burford's amendment, but then I will vote against paid parking and then I will vote against a free bus service.' Now, there is absolutely no point in doing that at all, because that is... I think Deputy Burford referred to it in her Minority Report as 'playing Jenga' and that is how the States, historically, have ended up with one Transport Strategy after another that is one dog's breakfast after another: by agreeing to strategies, the overall direction of something, and then bit by bit picking out its fundamental parts and trying to replace it with other things which, frankly, are written on the back of a fag packet and are not given proper analysis on the floor of the House.

2420 It is interesting; actually, Deputy St Pier has achieved something, because after nine hours of debate, he has finally managed to unite the Environment Department in opposition to his amendment. (*Laughter*) Both the original and the provisional wings of the Department are opposed to charging for buses as part of the Transport Strategy. The zero fare bus service was a key plank both of the Minority Report and the Majority Report. The Majority Report, because that is actually still the report that we are debating, funnily enough, at page 612 says that:

'Along with other elements of the strategy it is proposed that a key tool to reverse this transport behaviour is to have a free bus service to all users.'

2430 An industry rule of thumb suggests a 30% rise in passengers. An analysis of Guernsey's own data suggests a 15% to 25% increase in passenger carryings and that is borne out by the analysis that was carried out by Policy Council's Policy and Research Unit at page 659, where it reads that there is a fairly strong correlation found between bus fares and bus passenger journeys.

And later in their Report, we are advised by the Policy and Research Unit that their model predicts that for every additional 1p on a bus fare, there is a decrease of approximately 4,780 bus trips per year. So when Deputy St Pier says or implies that demand for buses is relatively price inelastic that is not supported by the analysis carried out by the Policy and Research Unit.

2435 But the strongest point I think is made in the Minority Report, which the States have just voted in favour of – for now, but I would not hold your breath, Deputy Jones (*Laughter*) – the strongest point is, it says there:

Presently, a commuter can drive their car into work and park free of charge by occupying a car parking space for up to ten hours. Alternatively, they can pay to travel in by bus. [...] It is proposed that this situation should be reversed so that if someone wishes to leave their car in long-stay parking then they should pay to do so, but if they are prepared to use the bus then it will be free at the point of use.'

2440 That is the entire fundamental basis upon which this Integrated Transport Strategy is based. The States have just voted for an amendment which includes paid parking and a free bus service. Now we have an amendment which tries to take out the free bus service. That is clearly going to leave the Strategy unbalanced and potentially lead to the dog's breakfast which the States have forced on the Environment Department as far as transport strategies go over the last decade or so.

2445 Deputy Perrot yesterday, in an excellent and highly amusing speech, spoke about the *quid pro quo*: that we introduce paid parking on the one hand, but on the other hand, to compensate for that, we provide a free bus service.

2450 Now, I have moved a long way on paid parking. When I was first in the States, I was opposed to paid parking for some of the reasons which we have heard in debate over the past 24 hours or so. A key component in making me change my mind has been this trade-off between paid parking and a free bus service and I have to say, if we take out the free bus service, I am not going to guarantee that I will vote for the Propositions as amended, because I do want to vote for a dog's breakfast of a Transport Strategy again.

2455 I agree with Deputy Perrot's analysis, but the free bus service is what the whole thing revolves around and, clearly, the authors of the Majority and Minority Reports agree. I think it is a very powerful message to be able to say, 'We have introduced paid parking. We have introduced a raft of other measures to try to discourage or limit use of the private motor vehicle, but in return we are providing a free bus service.' I think that, politically, is a powerful message. It is not as powerful to say, 'We are doing all of those things and we going to go back to the sort of bus fare we had about three years ago.' For me, that just does not work. It does not stack up.

2460 I also think, if we do that, if we vote for this amendment, always there will be the sense of having implemented this strategy in a sort of half-hearted way. I remember being sat in the Public Gallery with a

notebook, reporting for the *Press*, 12 or 13 years ago and the States were debating paid parking. The States approved paid parking and then the States considered a proposal to set the rate at 40p and threw it out. Then they considered a proposal to set the rate at 30p and threw it out. Then they considered a proposal to set the rate at 20p and threw it out. So the States ended up voting in favour of paid parking and then refusing the set a rate. That was under the Mellor Traffic Committee and throughout the life of that strategy it was said, ‘Well, you have not implemented the strategy. How can you tell whether it has worked? You have pumped all this money into the buses, but you have not implemented the rest of the strategy.’

In 2006, a not dissimilar thing happened. Deputy Brouard referred to this only yesterday. The States voted for a whole load of measures, but not all of them have been implemented. So Deputy Brouard, quite reasonably, comes to the States and says, ‘Well, why do you want to have new strategy when you have not implemented the previous one?’ We will be in exactly the same position today, if we approve the Strategy without the free bus service. It will always be said, ‘Well, you only introduced half the Strategy, so what was the point of that?’

I do not want to accept a Transport Strategy and then, bit by bit, start trying to emasculate it and removing the key plank of it.

Now, as I say, this amendment for a 50p fare would take us back more or less to where we were, within 10p or so, pre the 2010 increase. Then it was 60p and if one looks at the chart on page 664, after 2008 the increases in bus use started to decline. It was still increasing a little, but it was at a much lower rate in 2009 and 2010. The Environment Department says that it had started to plateau, but actually, the rate of increase had started to decline and that is where we would be going back to, if we accepted Deputy St Pier’s amendment.

So having just voted in favour of an amendment which introduces a Transport Strategy that is based entirely on wanting to change people’s behaviour and move their transport choices and, wherever possible, move them onto public transport, why would we want to go and immediately, as soon as we have done that, instead of having a fareless service, have a 50p service? The whole basis of the Strategy is that it has to revolve around the bus service which is as attractive as possible.

Now, the amendment new 13(b) reads:

‘To approve for the duration of the strategy a bus fare policy which provides for 50p per journey.’

Now, I think that is misleading. There is no duration of this Strategy. There is nothing in this Strategy which tells me the commencement date and the date on which it finishes. There is a date for it to have a review, but there is not an end date to this Strategy.

So this Strategy is in place until the States replace it with a different strategy. What this actually means, if the States vote in favour of this amendment, is that henceforth, bus fares will be determined on the floor of the States. It will need a States resolution to change the fare. Now, I do not think it sensible to have a debate some years hence where someone comes forward and says, ‘Well, actually, perhaps it should now be 55p’ and someone else says, ‘Well, I would rather have 65p.’ Someone else would rather have 60p or reduce it to 10p or have £1.20. I think that is the States at their very, very worst and I do not think that this Assembly is the right place to determine the precise bus fare. It is quite reasonable to say we should have a fareless service, because that is part of the Strategy, but, once we start getting into a positive rate, to say, ‘It should be 50p’, ‘It should be 55p’, ‘It should be 60p’, I cannot see that is sensible.

Deputy St Pier did admit that the 50p was more or less plucked out of the air. There is absolutely no justification for 50p. Why would I want 50p rather than 40p or 60p? Quite frankly, if this amendment gets through, I will probably vote for Deputy Brouard’s, because if it is going to be 50p, it might as well be a quid! *(Laughter)* But they can argue between themselves... and then throw it out, yes! You have just rumbled Deputy Brouard’s amendment there, I think. *(Laughter)* They can argue amongst themselves, but neither of them have a clue whether £1 or 50p is the right fare, but it will be interesting to hear them arguing. If this amendment gets through, Deputy St Pier will have to argue against setting it at £1. I do not know quite how he will do that, because he is not sure why he set it at 50p. *(Laughter)* It is odd – very odd.

Now I have heard, in the run up to this debate, the argument that people do not value things which are free. I think this is absolute nonsense. People seem to me to place quite a lot of value next to schools and hospitals and beaches, but we do not charge access to those things. So the idea that the public of Guernsey are going to descend on buses and litter them and vandalise them and leave graffiti all over them, just because it is a fareless service is absolutely nonsensical. I know Deputy St Pier did not say that, but it is a good argument nonetheless. *(Laughter)* And Deputy Luxon did tell me that in a conversation I had with him before this debate, so... *(Laughter)* No, it was in private, I thought.

Now, page 717, of this Minority Report tells us that:

‘This Strategy needs to be bold. The power of the status quo should not be underestimated and behavioural patterns are hard to shift, but effective use of equitable incentives will enhance the island’s economy and improve islanders’ quality of life.’

We have just approved an amendment with quite reasonable disincentives, but we need also to include the incentives. The criticism of the Environment Department's Report, if it is going to be called the Majority Report, was that it had some incentives in it, but it did not have sufficient disincentives. Now, we have the reverse problem. We have an attempt to introduce an amendment which starts taking away the incentives. There has to be a balance between the disincentives and the incentives. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) In the debate we have had over the last day and half, I think the majority of Members believe that the balance in Deputy Burford's Minority Report between incentives and disincentives is just about right and here we are, latish in the second day of debate, trying to unpick one of the key incentives with an amendment not based on science or any kind of logic but really just a 'finger in the air' job. Again, that would be the States at their very worst.

Also, a zero fare is quicker and easier. I have been on buses. I get fed up with people, especially tourists, who are in front. You get this business with the bus driver. Some of our bus drivers are not as helpful as they might be. They are not as helpful as they used to be. In all sorts of ways, our bus service has deteriorated since the change of operator, but you get stuck behind these people who are not sure how much they have to pay for a bus. You can get all the cards now. Some tourists get all the cards for free. In fact, the other day, my mum was looking after my daughter. She told the Environment Minister about this and the bus driver –

**Deputy Domaille:** Somewhat forcefully, it has to be said!

**Deputy Fallaize:** The bus driver was trying to charge the tourist and the tourist was a bit narked about all this and my mum said, 'If you go along to the kiosk, you will probably get a whole load of Ormer cards.' The chap in the kiosk was dishing out Ormer cards to the tourists and the tourist went back on the bus with the Ormer card and got on for free. But what you often get is people, they are not sure how much it costs and you get people in front of you saying, 'How much is it?', 'I have just got to find my Ormer card. Just wait there', or, 'I will give you £2 if you give me £1 change.' And then you get a person in front of you who is not sure if they have picked a euro or a pound coin. Now, if you have a fareless service... Deputy Jones knows what a euro is: he uses them when he goes to his second home. (*Laughter*) If you have a fareless service, you avoid all of that. It is a much swifter and easier process. You are on a bus and off the bus and I think that is a key attraction.

If you think about the way that other transport systems work, some of them do charge, but they charge up front before you actually get onto the transport, but I think it holds things up, to charge when people actually get onto the bus. So, I think that is another reason for rejecting this amendment.

Now, Deputy St Pier said that – and I agree with his point, actually – that the greatest impediment to people getting on the bus is deficiencies in the network, but the income from this amendment ain't going to pay for any of that. We have already heard from Deputy Burford what it costs to buy a new bus, in response to Deputy Brouard's claim or implication that with this additional money, I think it was £400,000, Environment might have revolutionised the school bus service. The income that will be raised by a 50p fare, with all these concessions included, is not very great at all. You are not going to effect serious improvements in the bus network by charging 50p. And it is price elastic. As you put the bus fare up – I know it is counterintuitive, because it does not seem a great deal, 50p difference. But the research does show that as you put the bus fare up, even marginally, the bus passenger use falls.

Bullet point 1 in this amendment is interesting, because that will cause an increase of 50p on the current rates being charged to pensioners. Deputy St Pier said he had not covered this in his amendment, but it is no use saying that. This is an amendment which, if it is approved, will lead to a States' resolution which will say, 'To approve that for the duration of the strategy the bus fare policy which provides for a fixed fare of 50p per journey' and the only concessions are for multi-journey cards, children under the age of 12, accompanied by an adult and children during term-time in a school uniform.

**Deputy Gollop:** Well, I actually was going to raise this question.

**Deputy Fallaize:** I think I will give way to Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Gollop:** Sorry. Perhaps the Procureur can advise. Will this curious amendment effectively nullify the current resolution that every resident in Guernsey or Alderney, older person, 65 or over, is entitled to completely complimentary and free transport?

**Deputy Fallaize:** Well, sir, I will have a go at it. The Procureur does not seem keen to stand up, so... (*Laughter*)

**The Procureur:** I am just not as young as I used to be. (*Laughter*)

**Deputy Brehaut:** You can get cheaper buses when that happens. *(Laughter)*

**Deputy Fallaize:** Well, it is quite clear. The amendment is to approve, for the duration of the strategy, bus fares of 50p per journey.' So, of course, it has to replace any extant resolution about previous fares. There is a States' resolution, I think, if Deputy Gollop goes back far enough, which says that bus fares will be 50p. That was the part of the Mellor Transport Strategy. Well, that obviously is not in place any more. So this would be the prevailing rate and this would put the rate up for pensioners.

Now, pensioners are among the people. They are part of our society and, presumably, they are among the group of people who we hope will be encouraged more and more to get onto public transport. How are we hoping to do that if we say to them, 'For the past  $x$  number of years, you have had a fareless service. Now we are putting it up to 50p'? That is absolutely bonkers.

**The Bailiff:** Are you happy to give way to Deputy Brouard? *(Interjection by Deputy Fallaize)*

**Deputy Brouard:** If it helps Deputy Fallaize, my amendment actually has it free for pensioners. *(Laughter)*

**Deputy Fallaize:** Yes – but remember to throw it out at the end. *(Laughter)*

We are hoping not to get to Deputy Brouard's amendment, because he promised not to lay it unless Deputy St Pier's got through. So, another very good reason for rejecting Deputy St Pier's amendment is that we will not get Deputy Brouard's amendment. *(Laughter)*

Now, I think if Deputy St Pier had said, 'Look, I am not convinced about the fareless service, so what I want to do is direct the Environment Department to review it after 12 months or 18 months, come back to the States, let us have an analysis of the change in passenger usage and we can establish the price elasticity,' I think that would have been quite reasonable. But he is not saying that. He is saying, 'Actually, I am not convinced about the case for a fareless service. I am not really sure why I like 50p, but we might as well go with 50p because for some reason, it seems preferable to a fareless service.' That is not logical.

Deputy Burford has spent months and months and months and so have the Environment Department, putting their Minority Report together and they have been convinced by the case for a fareless service. We cannot impose 50p off the back of the arguments that we have had delivered to us in this debate today.

I am nearly at the end, sir. It is absolutely key, at least at the beginning of this Strategy, to have a fareless service. I am not convinced it needs to stay at a zero fare, but we are trying to tempt people onto the bus. We are trying to encourage them, to try and use all the levers we have available to us to get them on the bus and the best way or one of the key ways we can do that is to have a zero fare. Maybe it will become 50p in two or three years' time. Maybe, eventually, it can settle at £1, but to begin with I think it needs to be a zero rate.

The subject of this Report is Guernsey Integrated On-Island Transport Strategy. The amendment we voted for is an integrated strategy and we should not now try to pick it apart. That is what previous States have done. That is why the Transport Strategy today is in a mess. We are within touching distance of sorting that out. Please do not try and undermine key planks of this strategy and please throw out this amendment. *(Applause)*

**The Bailiff:** Several people have already caught my attention. Deputy Stewart, then Deputy Paint, followed by Deputy Dave Jones and Deputy Lowe.

**Deputy Stewart:** I am not sure what I am going to do now. I actually support having a small charge and I will tell you why: because I go to London and I have an Oyster card and what an Oyster card does, apart from charging people, is help Transport for London understand who gets on the bus, who gets off the bus, at what times and when, even it is a small charge. So just to explain how an Oyster card works, for those that do not go to London all the time, it is a pre-paid card. I actually top mine up automatically, so Transport for London have the benefit of probably £15 of mine most of the time. But when you get on a bus, you tap it as you go in and as you get off the bus, you tap it as you go out. Now, in a day you can travel as many times as you like, right across London and there is a maximum charge and I think at the moment is somewhere under just a fiver. *(Interjection)* Well, I tap it anyway, as you go in and out. If you do not tap it on the way out, then you get charged the maximum fare for that day, so there is a real incentive for you, whether you are on the Underground or wherever, you tap in and you tap out again and that way they know that you have been on and got off the bus at the right time.

So no matter how many journeys you do in a day, it is never more than a certain amount. But what it does help Transport for London, it makes people do it, if they are on a very short journey, that should be only 20p, they make sure, on a tube or a bus, that they actually have that Oyster card with them and it is recorded. So the point of having a small fare and it could be a 50p maximum for a whole day, or whatever

2640 figure Deputy St Pier wants to pluck out of thin air, but I think it is important that there is even a small nominal charge, because one of the things that will make a bus service successful is for us in future to gather real data about where they are getting on that bus, when they are going off the bus, what times the peak buses are being used. It will help in planning the timetables. It will help in deploying the resources in the right areas and that is why, even if it a small nominal charge, but enough to make people use a card, so they are registered on and off that bus... If it is free, how are we going to plan our services going forward? How are we going to know who gets on at a bus, which bus stop they get off at? How are we going to plan?

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

2650 Deputy Burford's Minority Report, at page 747 says that in order to use the buses, there will be a requirement to purchase a swipe card at a cost of £8. That is provided for in this Minority Report, sir. So, they will be able to record all of the data.

**Deputy Steward:** Well, in that case, for me not to support some charging mechanism, I need to understand how that card will manage people getting on and off, because where is the incentive to swipe it or how it will work? Because otherwise, we will have a bus service again that is not in tune with what people's real needs are or how they are using the buses.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Paint. Can you switch your microphone on please?

2660 **Deputy Paint:** I really listen with interest to this and I absolutely just do not believe what I hear from Deputy Fallaize. For a start, there is never something for nothing. There will never be a free bus service. *(Interjection and laughter)* There will never be a free bus service. Somebody is going pay. There is no such a word as free bus service. There is free for nothing. It may be a fareless bus service: I accept that but it will not be free because somebody else is paying for it.

2670 But what has not been allowed for in Deputy Fallaize's speech or anybody else's so far is that the taxpayer gives £2.2 million towards it. The tax payer gives £2.2 million towards it. It should have been £2.5 million, but it is £2.2 million. So that will put locals at a disadvantage to all tourists. Every single one will be at a disadvantage to all tourists. The taxpayer, the car driver will be at a disadvantage because the States is subsidising by £2.2 million. That is why something like this... I was going to go for Deputy Brouard's £1, but any money you put against nothing, whether it is a 50p or whether it is a £1, the taxpayer, which is the car driver, which is every one of us here, is putting towards it. It is quite simple. So therefore there *should* be a charge.

So, I am sorry, sir. If people cannot see that, well I am very, very sad.

2675 Thank you.

**Deputy Bebb:** Could I ask for a point of clarification from Deputy Paint. His own Report, the Department Report, asks for a fareless bus service but he is now speaking against a fareless bus service. Does that mean that he was not supportive of the departmental Report?

2680 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Paint.

**Deputy Paint:** I made it quite clear in the Environment Department that there were certain aspects of this that I could not agree with. I made that quite clear and I am sure, if they are honest, that is what happened.

2685 Now, certain aspects of it, why I supported the Majority Report, is simply because I thought it was going to do less damage to the people in this Island – a lot less damage. So, I am sorry, that is the way it is. I could not possibly agree with everything on either Report, but mostly I will not agree with anything on the Minority Report.

2690 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dave Jones.

**Deputy David Jones:** Thank you, sir.

2695 Deputy Fallaize says that having paid parking is a trade-off for a free bus service. Well, of course, for the motorist it is not, because even if they choose not to use their car because of paid parking and get on the bus, they are still subject to all the other taxes and charges in this Report, so it not a trade-off between paid parking and a free bus service, because they still suffer all the other ills of this ill-thought out Strategy.

2700 I, at one time, agreed that we should have a free bus service. I changed my mind on that, some way back when I was looking at the way Departments were struggling with FTP and all the rest of it, and thought, well clearly, that is not any longer a sensible way forward.

And the other thing is, people do not value things that are free. If you look at the National Health Service, that tells you everything that you need to know about that. You say that our medical and our hospitals are free: no they are not. They cost the taxpayer of this Island over £100 million and if you add in – (*Interjection*) yes, the taxpayer of this Island for our healthcare service. Well, they are not, you see, that is the point and if you know anything about what Health is proposing in the future, we may see some of those services charged for. So the buses cannot be free in the future, in my view, and there must be a small charge.

I agree with you that, perhaps, the Treasury Minister, because I am not sure it is all of Treasury who are backing this... but it throws up the anomaly of this free service for the over-65s and that may have to be worded in another amendment. I do not know. But Deputy Brouard's amendment certainly does cover that issue with £1.

So, I understand what people are saying about the Strategy, but Deputy Fallaize has to understand, we did not all vote for the Strategy.

**The Bailiff:** I call next, Deputy Lowe, to be followed by Deputies Ogier and Duquemin.

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

Sir, reading this amendment, it makes it quite clear, free travel for children under the age of 12 accompanied by an adult, and then it says:

‘Free travel for all children during term time travelling in school uniform.’

So, that goes quite a considerable way to the current contract with CT Plus, because there are time restrictions, sir, where you can travel in school uniform on a school bus, from seven in the morning until nine, and three till five. This amendment goes a lot further than that. This amendment means that a lot of children can actually travel on buses for a lot longer outside of those restrictions. So it is contrary to the contract currently with the Environment Department.

It also throws in pupils attending Elizabeth College, Ladies' College and the College of Further Education, because currently, under the contract again, with the Environment Department, those pupils can only use that if they live in excess of two and a half miles away from the schools and are able to request a free multi-journey Ormer card from the States Education Department. So, again, you are throwing in a huge amount of pupils that would be able to use that under this amendment. Currently they are not, but again it clashes, I suggest, with the contract.

And, indeed, you put St Martin's School in, because St Martin's School is the only school where currently they are not part of the contract, but they would be able to use it under this amendment, because they have not got a school bus service, because they are seen as a parochial school where they all live very close by. So just having the wording there throws three areas of the current contract into total disarray, really.

And it is interesting, because much has been said about, if it is a free bus service, you will not be held up, you can get on the bus and off you go, because the driver can just get on with it. Well, that is not the case, because it has been said, you want data. It has been covered a little bit by Deputy Stewart there, but currently pensioners and school children, to get on those buses now, they have to tell the driver where they are going. It is registered in the machine so they have got the data. Are we saying under the Strategy, then, that actually we are not going to have that data, because you do not want the driver to be recording that? So, you are held up when you get on the bus with the driver, because it is there. That is how it works and that is how it must work, because you need the data to find that out.

The other thing I wanted to say was the Bus Users' Group: at the Extraordinary Meeting that they called for anybody who wanted to go on buses or did not go on buses and wanted to contribute – and it was extremely poorly attended, so if you can count those that were there, you really cannot... It is a bit like the survey of less than 500 going towards this Minority Report. There is not enough, in my opinion, to justify that is sufficient. But the Bus Users' Group, the committee, made it very clear at the time they did not support a free bus service. They wished to see a charge, because they felt, at that time, that having a free bus service would not be the way to go forward. They would rather there was a charge and the money could be put back into the service to make it more frequent and more reliable and if you did not have that money coming in, you would end up possibly losing the bus service because there would not possibly be as many people contributing, because it is free. So, they did, actually support some form of payment for going on the bus.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier.

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

2760 I have just heard that Deputy Kevin Stewart would not support a completely free bus service as he would like more records to be kept via something similar to a swipe card.

2765 As Deputy Fallaize says, the proposals that we currently have contained proposals for a swipe card to collect data exactly for the reasons that Deputy Stewart has outlined. And, true, we do not know how this card will exactly be used. I would argue that that, perhaps, is a detail this high level Strategy does not need to outline. There will be a card. It will be used. It will collect data and I would ask Deputy Stewart not to introduce a paid bus service just because we do not yet have details of how an information-gathering card would actually be used, whether it be tapped on or off or be swiped, etc. Such details would not normally be seen in such a high level strategy either. At the moment, I am comforted that there is such a method Deputy Stewart requires, even if I do not know exactly how it will be handled whilst getting on and off the bus.

2770 As I said in my speech, the Minority Report is a finely balanced series of nudges. The integration of the sticks and carrots in the Minority Report hang together like a well-balanced collection of incentives and disincentives should. The big prize: an improved provision of public transport, free, with smaller buses, improved routes, improved service, real incentives and disincentives, integrated and comprehensive.

2775 This amendment is designed to remove the big prize of the Minority Report and of the Majority Report. This amendment is designed to remove one of the major carrots of the strategy and, like Deputy Domaille explains, with a well stacked tower of Jenga blocks, if you start prizing pieces out of this Strategy, you lose the cohesion, you lose the strength, you risk the carefully balanced carrots and sticks and you increase the risk dramatically of the Strategy not working and the tower failing. The new Members of this Assembly will have seen the old Assemblies making these mistakes and many of the new Members came here vowing not to tread the same path. If Members pass this Strategy, then emasculate it by removing one of the major planks of getting it to work, Members will have brought this States to a similar situation to one which probably spurred them to run for Government in the first place. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

2785 I was not in favour of the Zero-10 vision, which was ultimately passed. I wanted something else. I also did not want Zero-10 to use up to half of the £200 million Contingency Reserve Fund. When this Assembly passed the Zero-10 Strategy, however, I subsequently recognised that to vote against using the Contingency Reserve would run the risk that the strategy this Assembly by a majority had passed would fail and my duty to this Assembly and the people of Guernsey then became to make the Strategy, with which I had not originally agreed, now work.

2790 So, for me to continue to vote against things I was not in favour of in the face of a decision being made, seriously ran the risk of derailing the whole Strategy, and I knew then I had a greater duty to the people of Guernsey and to the States of Guernsey and I would argue Members now have such a duty not to pass measures increasing the likelihood of the policy just passed failing, but passing measures increasing the likelihood that the States of Guernsey policy to succeed. Removing one of the central tenets of this Strategy would be an act of political vandalism with which I could not be associated and of which I would be ashamed.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Duquemin, then Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Bebb.

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

2800 I think there are about four or five points I would like to make, but I will be as brief as I can.

2805 The first one is to reiterate the point that the criticism that people do not value something when it is free and, like Deputy Fallaize, it was a point that Deputy Luxon had relayed to me. He is obviously lobbying hard, but people *do* value something when it is free. I value Cobo beach and it is free. (**Two Members:** Hear, hear.) I use that example deliberately, sir, because it is something that I value and it is free and it is something that visitors will value and it is free and just in the same way that I would like –

**A Member:** I do not think it will be free if we being in paid parking. You might have to pay for it.

**Deputy Duquemin:** Sorry, I do not understand the comment, so I will continue.

2810 Cobo beach is free and I value it greatly, but it is something that I share with tourists. I believe that the £2 fare, the discrepancy between a £2 fare and a £1 fare for visitors is probably the worst decision that a Government Department has taken in my two years in the States and it is something that I am very ashamed of. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) But here we have the chance to make it free for both visitors and locals and that would be something that we can be very proud of. I think, in many ways, that is almost what I expected Deputy Stewart to say in his speech, that he would have realised that a free bus service would be a very powerful tool for our tourism industry.

2815 And when you think about it, before anyone says, ‘Oh, yes, but they will have to pay for parking too’, no they will not, because the visitors will also be able to park in the two-and-a-half-hour zones in St Peter

Port so they will have the double whammy benefit of free parking if they are in a hire car or free if they in a bus fare.

**Deputy De Lisle:** Sir, if I can just –

**The Bailiff:** Are you asking him to give way or are you raising a point of order?

**Deputy De Lisle:** Well, it is a point of order.

I think the Deputy is misleading the House in that visitors appreciate the fact that they do not have any parking fees, because they can go off to the Islands, for example, without paying to park their cars.

**Deputy Duquemin:** My experience of that, sir, is that, actually, by the time they would be there, all those places would probably be occupied, because they would not want to miss –

I will carry on with my speech, sir.

I also draw example, having experienced it in a previous life, in ski resorts where there are free bus services in the ski resorts to get people around the ski resort as efficiently, as quickly and, dare I say it, in as user-friendly way as possible. It is interesting that when the ski resorts are really humming in the winter, that is when the bus services are free. In some, and I say only some, they then occasionally, in the summer months, when there are just a few people enjoying a summer vacation in those same mountain resorts, they actually charge. We are talking here about a user-friendly service which is free.

I think the other point that I would like to make is, it is important at this point to make the differential as great as possible. Deputy Burford in her opening speech alluded to the Jersey example, where the discrepancy between the cost of a commute into St Helier on the buses compared to paid parking, the differential was not great and we should make that differential as great as possible. As I said in my speech yesterday, I repeat it now, a Tweet that I did 471 days ago was paid parking and free buses is a powerful contrast and I do not want to lose that. So, keep that differential as great as possible.

The fourth point I would like to make, sir, is, I think, and I did try to scribble it down as quickly as possible, at the very start of Deputy St Pier's introduction to his amendment, he said, 'Free buses are at the core of the Strategy.' That was the phrase that he used and that is the point. They are at the core of the Strategy and we should do everything we can to keep them there and not to meddle.

To answer one of Deputy Lowe's points and it is one that I had scrawled down, when she mentioned... In a way she was very honest and she did question the logic of it, but she spoke about the Bus Users' Group and the fact that the Bus Users' Group were in favour of paying a fare. Well, to be honest, I am not interested in the Bus Users' Group. I am interested in the Bus *Non-Users'* Group, (**A Member:** Yes!) (*Laughter and applause*) because we do not need the Bus Users to get on the buses. They are there already. What we need is we need the – If there was a Bus Non-Users' Group, that is who we should be listening to. So we need to get people on the buses. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

My final point is a point that I made yesterday and it is... In a way, I think, Deputy Fallaize made a plea to the Assembly when he spoke about not messing this whole thing up now at this point. He used the phrase of 'a dog's breakfast'. I am not going to use that phrase. What we have got here, we have got the chance for an Integrated Traffic Strategy and what I do not want is to dis-integrate it. I do not want a dis-integrated strategy and we need to keep it.

Traffic management: we are on the road here to doing something very special and I am going to finish by just almost turning it over to football management and use a phrase here of someone 'parking the bus'. Well, hopefully, José Mourinho has realised, and football fans, that it is not pretty and after last night it is not very effective either and we do not need to do that. We want effective and what the Minority Report has given us is something that can be effective, so please, just like Deputy Fallaize made that plea, let us not mess it up.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

**Deputy Lowe:** Sir, just a point of correction and clarification – whatever one you want to pick, really.

With regard to the Bus Users' Group, sir, they actually said this at the meeting, as 1.2 million people who travel, is that they wished to see some form of a better frequency and reliability. So, currently, as you know the numbers are going down so unless they actually can improve the bus service, your 1.2 million travellers so far will reduce even more, which will not be replaced by the same number, I would suggest.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq and then Deputy Bebb and Deputy Brehaut.

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



2880 **Deputy Le Tocq:** And Deputy Lowe raises a very good point, because this is exactly why –

**Deputy Hadley:** I need to correct Deputy Lowe!

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

2885

**Deputy Le Tocq:** This is exactly why I do not support this amendment.

Generally speaking, I would be in favour of charging something for everything, but I think we have got a lot of undoing to do. We have got a bus service that has lost credibility. We have got a bus service that has become unpopular, even amongst its current users, let alone the non-users. As a result of that, I am in

2890

favour and strongly in favour of a zero fare, at least to begin with. It can always go up in the future, as Deputy Fallaize said. We can always choose to do that, but we have got a lot of undoing to do and when you do that, winning back public confidence is actually a hard thing to do and there needs to be a clear incentive that is quite a huge incentive to use the bus. It makes it easier and makes it more accessible.

2895

I also think, in the area of paid parking, it is a bit like non-VAT in Guernsey. People have said – and it is always Islanders that have said – ‘Oh, people like coming to Guernsey, because there is no VAT or there is no parking charges.’ It is a load of rubbish, because no-one ever said, ‘Oh, I am going to go to Guernsey, because there is free parking.’ They may appreciate it when they come here with their cars, but I can almost guarantee you, because I know a number of people, particularly with young families that come to Guernsey, that would certainly think seriously about the costs of coming to Guernsey if they thought, ‘Oh, I will go to

2900

Guernsey. I do not need take my car, because there is a free at point of use bus service.’ That would make a difference and I think that would also affect our tourism industries.

So, I am in favour of this at this juncture and I would encourage Members of the Assembly to vote against this amendment, because I think we need to let it have some opportunity attraction. It needs to have some time to see how it is working and to let it take place, because we have got the problem of a bus service that has, for the last couple of years. I have got an Ormer card in my pocket. It is an old blue one, because I do not use it any longer. I did for a while. I started to use it, because it was a good service for a while. It improved, but the undoing of the bad image that it has got now is going to take some serious change and part of that serious change, part of the integrated strategy, everybody is paying for this, etc. Let us accept we are calling it free, but it is free at point of use. Part of that has to be a zero charge, which is

2905

2910

funded in other ways. Both the Majority Report, as others have said, and the Minority Report, chose that and to fund it in slightly different ways. We have now got the Minority Report, the type of funding in front of us, but the principle is the same, so that we have a free service which draws a line in the sand over the bad service that we have had recently and the ability to start something new which gains credibility, gains support and can see a new bus service emerging which, perhaps, in due course, there will be charges for at point of use.

2915

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb.

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

2920

I was not really going to enter into the Bus User Group, but I feel that it is being bandied about so much that if Members will indulge me, I would like to read the statement from the Bus User Group.

‘The Bus Users’ Group supports a sustainable Integrated Transport Strategy which particularly focuses on an Island-wide inclusive public transport system providing an improved experience for bus travellers – for instance, bus shelters. We want to see a reliable, frequent, punctual bus service’ –

Don’t we all?

‘Fares should be as low as is sustainable and the cost of public transport should be visibly less than car use to encourage take-up. However, we are not insistent on a free bus service at the expense of greater frequency and reliability. Since the Minority Report allocates more resources in a more timely fashion to be above vision, BUG can support it for the sections which deal with the buses.’

2925

Now, Members, there is nothing in that statement that says that they do not agree with a free at the point of use bus service. They would be quite happy with it, but not at the expense of the reliability. So can we stop saying that the Bus Users’ Group do not support free bus service? It is not true.

2930

The two points that I wanted to raise before I thought that clarification was necessary: the first reason that I was going to oppose this amendment was because the sections that dealt with the exemptions from charges did not extend to disabilities, but I realise that Deputy St Pier then in his opening speech said that he would expect exemptions on disabilities. Now, there is nothing in the amendment saying that and I do not know how that would actually happen. I expect that the Environment Department would need to come back here, which is another reason we should reject this.

But at this time, it is possible for certain disabled Islanders to gain a free Ormer card. It is something that is available sometimes and I can tell you that the take-up is poor. It does not work very effectively and that is because it is highly reliant at times on – Well, I know, I was talking to certain mental health sufferers and they were explaining to me how realistically you have to talk to the psychologist, the psychiatrist, you need to actually deal with this, that and the other and you have to ask for it. It is not frequently asked for. A free bus service means that we remove all that questioning. We remove all the need to involve Social Security and additional bureaucracy. It means that people have a free bus service which is vital for a number of our disabled Islanders. They are unable to drive and the bus is a key means of getting around for them. I believe, therefore, this amendment would cause the situation that is in place at the moment and that is a further barrier to travel to disabled Islanders. It is there at the moment. A free bus service would remove that barrier and therefore that in itself is a reason to reject this amendment.

But if we look at the wider picture, I think that a free at a point of use bus service is the fair pay-off for paid parking. I have defended this Minority Report vigorously with various Islanders on the basis that people will have a choice of either driving into town and paying for the parking, or going into town on a free bus and that to me is a fair choice. I do not believe that saying, ‘Well, if you drive into town, you have to pay for the parking and, by the way, if you want to use the bus, we will charge you for that’ is fair. Islanders would view it, quite rightly, as simply increasing charges. They will view it as just increasing the whole cost of travel and that is not something that I can support. I want Islanders to feel that there is a much cheaper option, that is the healthier option and that is to use buses or cycling or walking.

Now, Deputy Burford, in the opening speech for her amendment, clearly laid out the reason why Jersey Authority felt that their Transport Strategy failed. I believe that the figures were a charge of around £5 per day for parking, but if you want to use the bus, it is around £3.60. I am sure... Yes, £3.60, thank you, Deputy Burford. So, the difference between using the bus and parking is not sufficient to drive the change that we want to see. Therefore, putting this charge on the bus is that route. It is going into the route of making, as people have said already, a dog’s breakfast – I have always used the term, ‘dog’s dinner’ (*Laughter*) – of the strategy. Please reject this amendment. It is poorly considered, poorly thought out and it will not allow the strategy to deliver its aims.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott, followed by Deputy Luxon, Deputy Brehaut and Deputy Le Lièvre.

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

This is the first time I have spoken in this debate and what has got me to my feet is the utter hypocrisy of some Members and reference to elasticity of demand and it seems to me, on balance, that Deputy St Pier’s amendment is much more aligned with the Integrated Strategy than some people think.

Let us look at the decision making process of the average Guern, sir. (*Laughter and interjections*) He thinks to himself – Deputy Bebb objects to that. Some Guernsey people do think slightly differently than you, Deputy Bebb, and I will tell you what they are likely to think. They are likely to think, ‘Cor, bloaney ’eck! It is 50p to take the bus. I am not going to take the bus. I am going to walk instead.’ Well that is a good thing, isn’t it? And they might think, ‘Cor, bloaney ’eck! It is 50p to take the bus. I am not going to take the bus. I am going to ride my bike instead.’ And that is a good thing, isn’t it? And they might think, ‘Cor ’ecky! It is 50p to take the bus. I am not going to do that. I am going to cadge a lift.’

**Deputy Perrot:** I do object to this bad language! (*Laughter and interjections*)

**Deputy Trott:** ‘I am not going to take the bus, sir. It is 50p. I am going to cadge a lift. I am going to car share.’ Well that is a good thing.

But, then, again, the Guernseyman might think, ‘Oh, it is 50p to take bus. I will take my car. Although that is definitely not a good thing, sir, because that will definitely cost me more.’ And I will tell you something else the Guernseyman might think, and Guernseywoman. They just might think, ‘You know paying 50p for a bus fare is not only a good thing for all the reasons I have given, but it will also mean that there will be more money in the kitty for health and pre-school education and all the other really important things that are on the Treasury Minister’s mind.’

I think the Treasury Minister has got this one spot on, sir.

**Several Members:** Hear, hear. (*Laughter*)

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

**Deputy Luxon:** Sir, I would like to know where Deputy Trott went for lunch or, indeed, who with!

Sir, I remember once saying to Deputy Bebb, outside the Chamber, after he had made a comment to one of his amendments: 'I think I know where this is going.' And I said to him outside, that was silly saying that, because you gave the game away. Now, I know I am stood next to the proposer of this amendment, but

2995 I have got a sense about where this amendment is going.

Just for clarity, personally I support the Minority Report and, again, I respect and regard much of it and the last thing that I wanted to do, by seconding this, was to risk unbalancing it, as Deputy Fallaize mentioned. I looked at it and felt uncomfortable both with the charges for the commercial vehicle width and also the free bus, purely because I felt that there was not sufficient evidence in the Report that a 50p, a

3000 small charge – yes it was a unilaterally decided amount – but would it impact negatively on the overall Strategy? That was my genuine belief, but, as I said earlier when I spoke, I did not want to risk undermining what Deputy Bebb described as upsetting the Jenga box at paragraph 169 on page 773. Never the intention to remotely risk jeopardising the logic of the overall Strategy.

And I have to say it scared me when I saw Deputy Brouard's amendment that he would place, if this amendment was successful, because I actually recognise that that would completely undermine the Strategy and, of course, I have to accept, would this amendment at charging 50p rather than zero, would it also have that impact? I still do not think it would, but I have listened to Deputies Fallaize and Duquemin and Ogier – that is most of my PSD Board Members, and obviously I have got a meeting later this week with them

3005 (*Laughter*) – and I recognise the logic of that which you described.

So, sir, my position is, I felt – £500,000 per year is not inconsiderable, Deputy Fallaize, in my view – that could have used to offset other aspects of the costs of this Strategy or allowed the Environment Department to use that money to accelerate some of their proposals. So, that was my thinking behind seconding the amendment, from my first read of the Report and the second read. As I say, it just left me feeling uncomfortable and I felt this amendment would not risk undermining, would not risk taking it

3015 towards that dog's breakfast status Deputy Fallaize mentioned before. But I have listened careful to what Members have said and I recognise their concerns. I just wanted to clarify the logic for why bringing this amendment forward.

Thank you, sir.

3020 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut, to be followed by Deputy Le Lièvre and Deputy Dorey.

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

Can I say that Deputy Fallaize's speech absolutely nailed it and as one of the facilitators said at a couple of meetings we have been to with States' Members, 'just check in with yourselves for a moment.'

3025 The Transport Strategy has been travelling down the superhighway this morning and now a slip road has appeared and over-learned behaviour has kicked in and we are tempted to take it. If we go back to 2006, 2007, 1.6 million bus users. Ridership, as it is called, was up. It was becoming successful. People were moving, gravitating back towards the buses. We removed the subsidy, which is probably about £400,000 in real numbers or even more. We put the fares up. We did not introduce paid parking and what happened?

3030 We have a bus service which actually is more reliable than people imagine it is, but the context, when we talk about buses is so negative, that it is not the association between being... It is not that it is free. It is just that people do not want to be associated with what most Islanders consider to be a failing service.

If we just go back to where we were, not that many hours ago: Deputy Burford's speech. You all said it was thoughtful, you said it was considered, it was balanced – most of you, sorry – it was well drafted, it was integrated, it was bold, it was well thought out and it was ambitious. That is what you said. You also said it was integrated. But, now, as I think for those of you in this Assembly who will not support any strategy whatsoever, we are just looking again for these little slip roads, these little get-out clauses that steer us away from introducing, for the very first time, a real integrated workable Transport Strategy.

We have been before, as Deputy Fallaize said. I was not in the first decision, but certainly when the States' Members decided the ridiculous spectacle of agreeing to introduce paid parking, then not agreeing an hourly rate was a spectacular disaster. You can just feel that if we not too careful, we could end up in that position again, Members. I implore you to stick with where you wanted to go just a few hours ago with the Minority Report and not be tempted into areas that will, excuse the pun, lead us into yet another cul-de-sac, which means we can make no progress.

3045 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Lièvre.

**Deputy Le Lièvre:** Thank you, sir.

3050 Deputy Paint said, half an hour ago, that nothing is free. Well, he is certainly right there, because when I signed up for the Minority Report, it was on the basis that, if I buy a new Land Rover I am going to pay an extra £4,000 or £5,000 for the privilege of running it and I was willing to do that with an environmental hat

on. An when I voted for the Minority Report, it was on the basis of a *quid pro quo* agreement: in exchange for my £5,000, I would get a free bus service, so that my five or six journeys a year, over 10 years, would work out at about £100 each. (*Laughter*) It was not a good deal, I will admit that, but with my environmental hat on, I was willing to do that.

Now, if we are to break that economic arrangement I made in relation to the Minority Report this morning, in the afternoon by saying you are now going to pay for your free bus service, which costs me £100 per journey, then I am afraid the deal is off as far as I am concerned. What is more, if the Treasury Minister's amendment is approved, then Deputy Brouard is going to come along and hike it up by 100% in that very afternoon. It sounds like Germany in the 1930s. (*Laughter*) I was willing to offer a deal, to come into a deal. But that deal is now off. If this amendment is approved, that deal is off and I will march across the floor into Deputy Brouard's camp and I will see the whole of this Strategy go down the pan where it deserves to. We made a deal this morning. I will pay for it via a new car purchase and in return, I will get a free bus service. If that is not going to be the case, the deal is off.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey and then Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, sir. A lot of people have mentioned the free service, but paragraph 85, which is in the amendment that we have approved and not in the amendment that we are now debating, talks about £8 per person for a swipe card. Now, a lot of people have spoken about how it will be beneficial to the tourist industry. Our tourist industry is not people staying for one week or two weeks. It is short stay, it is cruise passengers. They will each have to pay £8 under the proposals which are in the Billet. If they are here for a day, if they want to go on the bus, it will cost them £8 per person. So, I do not think it is quite as free as you might think.

And if we are trying to encourage local people to actually try the bus service, if you want to try it and it is going to cost you £8, is that actually going to encourage you to try it? I think, actually, if you only had to pay 50p, you might be encouraged to try it, but if you had to go and pay £8 and you do not know whether you are going carry on using the bus, it is actually a dis-encouragement. So, I actually think that a lot of people have made comments about a free bus service and encouragement and they are not right when you actually look at what is in paragraph 85.

You also go on and people like Deputy Fallaize said that we can then increase it at some time in the future. Well, if you go to paragraph 86, again from the Report, it says the benefits of a free public service are that it should be offered as a permanent change, because temporary changes do not lead to structural change. So, if you are going to not vote for this amendment because you believe it is going to be only a temporary, then you are going against what is in the Report, because it says you either believe in a free bus service permanently or you do not. Do not vote for it on the basis that a number of people have said, 'We can do this temporarily, then it can go up.'

But I come back to, I think Deputy Perrot said yesterday, about we need a first-class bus service. I would rather have a system where you pay for it and actually you can put more money, because the most important thing, I think, which will make the change is not a free bus service; it is the quality. It is the punctuality and it is the quality and the frequency and if the 50p results in more money being generated and more money going to the bus service, then I think that will be a better change and better for the improvement of the bus service.

So I would urge people to think very carefully before they vote and actually think this amendment, I believe, is better than what is in the original Minority Report.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop and then Deputy Hadley.

**Deputy Gollop:** Probably we are all making compromises today or one sort of the other, and I can agree with Deputy Dorey as far as he goes, inasmuch that, given a choice between funding improvements in services, routes and frequencies, and the freedom from a bus user point of view – e.g. me or from thousands of disabled people, the 8,000 people Deputy Burford referred to who do not have cars – the priority is the quality and reliability of the service. But I think the strategy goes further than that and it is also, as Deputy Duquemin said, relating to not just the bus users, but the non-bus users. Deputy Duquemin is quite right about how people do value free things. A free quality service that we definitely appreciate is, of course, the insurance side of secondary care. That would be one example. Education and, of course, the free newspapers that Deputy Duquemin edited: the *Globe* and the *Leader*, in the past.

But, I agree too that we need to have an Integrated Transport Strategy and I feel somewhat disintegrated now. Mind you, I am not alone in thinking that!

I will just make a few points about, I think, where we are at. Deputy Fallaize mentioned amendments passed when he was a journalist, and I have had that sense of *déjà vu*. The then Deputy Bisson actually put an amendment, seconded by Deputy Flouquet as I recall, to have a 50p limit. It was also designed to stop people having very low fares on cards. Of course, a weakness in Deputy St Pier's is that it could well be that the company and the States between them could on the discounts actually give a 10p fare or a 20p fare, because it allows the possibility of very generous discounts, which somewhat defeats the object of this exercise.

And then, of course, the fares went up. We called in management consultants, a political decision was made, and we saw a drop-off in use. So we are going back 10 years to a strategy that did not quite work. I do not understand that.

The second point is – I know this sounds a bit sad, but I actually wrote down all the transport strategies I could think of in the last 20 years that the States has discussed and, if I include Deputy De Lisle's policy of distributing leaflets when he was Minister and focusing on the school bus service particularly, we have had 10. All those strategies have either been ousted or unravelled very quickly, which is why we are where we are.

The third point is my very numerate and mathematical colleague, Deputy Le Clerc, who serves with me on two Committees, has identified that at Social Security level, the Board probably pays £4,500 currently as a gesture to those on low incomes for bus fares.

We also know there are taxi fares in the frame. We know Education – part of the existing contract is the scholars' fares to and from schools. I would argue that there will be some, relatively limited, but still reasonable savings by supporting the Deputy Burford policy and not going with the amendment here.

But there are, in fact, two other reasons. The first is family values. I have had this conversation with Deputy Burford in the past. If one looks the current fares, one can make a case for saying they are relatively cheap: £1 is the norm; £2, perhaps, if you are non-local. We have been through that. And you can go down as low as 50p, unless you are over 65 and it is free, by buying £30 at a time – but not everybody had £30 to spend or would wish to spend £30 in that way on a card. But, from a family point of view, the numbers do not make sense, because one person in the car and four people in the car costs more or less the same marginal cost. One person on a bus is one quarter as cheap as four people on the bus, especially if the children are aged over three years of age, when they have to pay full fare. We are discouraging families from the using bus by having any form of fare.

My final point is pure political logic. I think this is a no-brainer. The States, clearly, has identified, in numerous reports that it is our political intention to encourage extra use of the public transport bus services by current motorists where feasible and surely, a zero fare is more attractive than a 50p fare or a £1 fare. So if we vote for the amendment we are going against the reason we started sitting here in the first place.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Hadley.

**Deputy Hadley:** Mr Bailiff, I was starting to warm to Deputy Dorey earlier on and rose to approve of what he said, but that has not lasted very long, I am afraid, (*Laughter*) because I think his last speech was awful!

There are some things to draw out of it, though. He pointed out that it is not completely free service. We pay £8. Listening to what other people said earlier on when it was said that people do not value something that is for nothing. Well, of course, we see it is not for nothing. You have got to pay £8 to have the service of the buses. Mind you, having spent the £8 – I am sure I have got Scottish blood in me, because once I have spent that £8 – I shall want to go on the bus a bit more often, (*Laughter*) because I shall want my money's worth out of it. So, there is that sort of logic to it as well,

But having said all of that, we come back with the fundamental points that Deputy Fallaize said. Do not let us start messing around with the Strategy. We voted for a strategy. Throw out any suggestion that we change it.

**The Bailiff:** Anyone else? Deputy Laurie Queripel, then Deputy Burford.

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

With regard to Deputy Hadley, sir, he has not got to wait for the Strategy, because he is a pensioner, so he can go on the bus for free now, as far as I can tell!

**Deputy Hadley:** Mr Bailiff, I do object to my age (*Laughter*) being bandied around this Assembly.

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** He does not look like one, sir. He is a very young looking pensioner! (*Laughter*)

But I rise because I do warm to two points that Deputy Dorey made, sir. I am a bit concerned by something – one particular thing that the Chief Minister said, sir. To fanfare a service as being free to the user, sir, and then somewhere down the line to then decide to charge a fare, I think that will be slightly underhand and disingenuous, sir, because what would happen is, if people really enter into the spirit of this Strategy and they board the buses in droves and then you tell them somewhere down the line, ‘Actually, you know, we probably need to charge you 20p or 50p now,’ I do not think that will be a very good advert at all for this Strategy. So, it is either permanently free or people need to know that somewhere down the line they may need to be charged to use the bus service. I do not like that very much, so I hope that is not going to be the case if this all goes through, sir.

I think Deputy Dorey made a really good point about the £8 card. As far as Deputy Hadley is concerned, that would be a bargain for him, if he could purchase a card for £8 and then use the bus 100 times a year. But for the short-term visitor or the day tripper, sir, to be told, ‘Oh, we have got a free bus service here, but actually you are going to have to buy an £8 card to use it’, that is almost Orwellian language as far as I am concerned, so that is not a good deal at all for the short-term visitor –

Deputy Robert Jones, I give way to you, sir. The sensible Jones! (*Laughter*) I might change my mind though.

**Deputy Robert Jones:** I think you probably will in a moment!

Would Deputy Laurie Queripel not agree that £8 could be seen by a tourist to be a bargain compared to, maybe, the £15 taxi fare from the airport to their hotel? Would he also say that the £8 would possibly be seen as a bargain compared to maybe the £25 to £30 per day car hire?

I just think, if we start drilling down into detail, we are going to lose the whole thread of these things. I think a lot of tourists may see that an £8 card with a very, very efficient and frequent bus service which can see them not having to use a car or a taxi and travelling round the Island for one day or two days for £8, compared to the cost of lots of other forms of transport, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I think we have really got to remember that the choices that we are trying to achieve for these people not only apply to the locals but to the tourists as well.

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Sir, I think that is probably a fair point, but my point is, sir, for a visitor to be told that the buses are free and they are only here for a day or a couple of days and then to be told they have got to pay £8 for a card, I do not agree with that. I can see the point that Deputy Rob Jones is making, sir, but I do not entirely agree with that at all.

So, sir, those are the two points. I really do not think that we should trumpet, loudly, a free bus service and then tell people further down the line when they have entered into the spirit of it and they are boarding buses in their droves that they are going to have to pay 20p or 50p somewhere down the line and I do not think it is a very good advert for our short-term visitors, sir, to be told it is a free service, but then you have got to pay £8 – although I do take on board Deputy Rob Jones’ point, sir.

Thank you. (*Interjections and laughter*)

**Deputy Robert Jones:** Have I lost my opportunity?

**The Bailiff:** You have not spoken, Deputy Jones.

**Deputy Robert Jones:** Maybe I could, briefly before Deputy Burford stands up?

I think the key to that message is actually to tell people that it is not free, because if we start out on a Strategy telling people – (*Interjection*) No, the point is that we tell them that it will be £8 for a card. We will tell them it will cost this for that. We will not actually stand up there and tell everybody it is free.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

**Deputy Trott:** Technically speaking, I cannot now, sir, because Deputy Jones has sat down, so I am going to be a good boy and sit down as well.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Trott. Deputy Burford.

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

Okay, I remain of the firm opinion that a free at the point of use bus service would be an asset to the Transport Strategy and a fantastic advert for Guernsey as a place that takes sustainable transport seriously, for all the reasons I outlined yesterday.

Referring to the surveys about what people would pay, it must be remembered that some of the people who think £1 is okay may never intend to use a bus, just like the majority of people who support cycling on pavements are probably motorists who want cyclists out of the way.

3235 If this amendment is passed, it will be a blow, albeit not a fatal one due to the latitude in the amendment for multi-journey cards and numerous concessions, and I think - was it Deputy Gollop who said we could have journeys via card, 10 journeys for £1? So there is a lot of scope for that to happen, so with that in mind, will all those concessions, the likely income is not being £500,000 quite possibly, but probably in the order of £250,000 or £300,000. That is not to be sneezed at, but surely that kind of income is actually, if the  
3240 alternative is that we could do something as progressive as a free bus service, then I do not think that figure comes into play quite as much as perhaps some people think. The money for all the improvements to the bus service is already provided for in the Strategy in any case.

The data point that Deputy Stewart made is an important one and it is absolutely vital and we are committed to finding a way to make that work. I hear what you say about fare thing, but you know, I think  
3245 with a little bit of thinking we could certainly manage to do it without the fare. We do not have the centre doors and everything that they have on London buses or other places, where passengers can get off. Passengers always have to go past the driver, so I feel that it is something that can be done.

Deputy Lowe: clashes with the contract. Well, they are not an issue, really, insofar as just having a free bus service is already a clash with the contract, and Environment has made it clear – I am sure it is in the  
3250 Report – that all changes ahead of the 2015 break with CT Plus would have to be subject to negotiation with the operator but thereafter, we can incorporate them. So the clash with the contract, I do not see as an issue at all.

Deputy Dorey, I think –

3255 **The Bailiff:** Are you asking that Deputy Burford gives way, because I am not sure that she is giving way. Are you asking that she gives way or are you raising a point of order?

**Deputy Lowe:** Point of order, sir, if that is alright?

It is just the amendment makes it very clear. It does not set a date from January, 2015. It actually says:

‘a) To approve the implementation of the improvements to the public service as set out in paragraphs 88 to 91 of that Minority Report

b) To approve for the duration of the Strategy a bus fare policy...’

3260 So, it is actually at the start of the Strategy, which we approved today.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Which is when? When is the start date?

**Deputy Lowe:** Well, we approved the Strategy today.

3265

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

**Deputy Burford:** I certainly read the... not that I am supporting amendment, but I did read it in the context of the other things in the Report and the duration of the Strategy, I felt was rather referring to the  
3270 end of the Strategy rather than the start.

The £8, I think – Deputy Sensible Jones, is it, we are calling you now? *(Laughter)* Deputy Jones made some good points about that. Let us not get bogged down with £8. It is half a taxi fare from the airport. I think that is a very good analogy. The cheapest multi-journey card on the bus fares now is maybe, I do not know exactly, about £18 probably.

3275 The idea of whether the buses are going to stay free permanently. Well, the buses will stay free as long as this Assembly is happy for them to stay free, because at any time somebody can bring a resolution back, a Requête to change it if they really did not feel it was right and, indeed, if for any reason the Environment Department felt it was not right, I am sure they would address it.

The difference was, that in my Report, having done some research, there is some evidence – and I dare  
3280 say it does not affect vast swathes of people – but there is evidence that people can base the ideas of where they live on their transport choices and so that was reason for not giving it an end date. But I did want to give it an end date either. I know in the Main Report they did. They said, ‘Well, let us do this for three years, because then we can go back to some fares’, but actually, I wanted to say, let us have free buses and we will go forward with that as a policy until there is justification for a policy to make it any different.

3285 Anyway, I think that sums up all I needed to say on those points.

The only other thing was to Deputy Paint. They are not free buses. It is not free parking. As simple as that.

Sir, it would be disappointing in the extreme to remove one of the more radical elements of the Strategy, so I would exhort you all to have vision and vote against this amendment.

**Several Members:** Hear, hear.

**The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak? Deputy Le Pelley and then Deputy De Lisle.

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

I am going to throw some Bonio into the dog's breakfast, I think! (*Laughter*) We can all tell whereabouts we are in the life of this Assembly, can't we? We are about half way. Two years after the last election: long enough for some of us to have forgotten our election promises. And two years away from the next election: plenty of time for people to forget what we have actually broken in promises.

I am standing here to explain my situation and my position and why I am going to take the actions that I am going to take.

Two years ago, when I was doing my electioneering, my hustings, answering hustings questions and knocking on doors, I was taking views of various people as to what they wanted and what they did not want, should I be successful in being elected. As such, I am standing here with a mandate given by those people who voted me into office.

The great majority said, 'We do not want paid parking.' (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) They did not want GST and they did not want St Sampson's Infant School to close. Those were the three things that came over to me very loud and clear when I was walking the streets of St Sampson's. I voted in accordance with that. I voted not to close St Sampson's Infants. I lost, but I kept my word. I promised people that I would vote against paid parking. I am going to keep my word and that is the way I will be voting today.

Thank you.

**Deputy Ogier:** I was elected in the same district after saying I *would* support paid parking.

**Deputy Le Pelley:** Obviously not by the same people, sir. (*Laughter*)

**The Bailiff:** Deputy De Lisle.

**Deputy De Lisle:** Yes, sir. I just wanted to say that I think it is quite preposterous for Members of this Assembly to want to punish a few workers in town with the cost of the whole Transportation Strategy on their shoulders. I think, really, it is quite wrong. I think if one is – I was told earlier, of course, that short-term parking was not to be paid for, but it is, in fact. It is not just a matter of long-term parking, but it is short-term parking as well and I think it is quite wrong, sir. I think it is quite wrong that that should be laid against a few workers in town rather than across the whole spectrum.

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, a point of order.

We appear to have strayed away from the amendment, sir. (*Interjections*)

**The Bailiff:** Deputy De Lisle.

**Deputy De Lisle:** But going on, (*Laughter*) I would want to make the point that I do not support, of course, the motorist actually paying for a free bus service of the nature that is being... Other than, of course, OAPs and school children. So, I think that one has to and the Assembly has to consider again what they are doing, because what is being suggested is a very discriminatory policy and I do not think it is right, with respect to the way that the charges are going to be applied with a Minority Report.

Therefore, I would support the funding arrangements, either 50p or 1p along the lines that we have been carrying out over this particular part.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Rob Jones is asking you to give way.

**Deputy Robert Jones:** I was hoping that Deputies, when making their speeches, would be persuasive and I was just wondering whether Deputy De Lisle could enlighten me as to whether he feels that the £1 would be punishing the workers, because I think what is being proposed by the Minority Report is a choice, either going into town with your car and paying to leave it there for 10 hours or getting on a bus which, after paying your £8, is free to use. Could he please clarify his views on those points?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy De Lisle.



3350 **Deputy De Lisle:** My point is that any paid parking would be extended right across the Island and it would not allow for parties to park freely in other areas and subject only town workers to the paid parking fee.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Clerc.

3355 **Deputy Le Clerc:** Sir, I am rather confused by Deputy De Lisle's speech there, but I would like to remind him of a few months ago in the Assembly that he felt people in the western parishes were social excluded because they did not have a decent bus service. So I would expect him to encourage a decent bus service and if that is free at the point of use, that would hopefully encourage people to use it in the other parishes and also encourage a better service. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) (*Interjections*)

3360 For my own personal point of view, I am still very, very confused and I do not which way I am going to vote! I think that is one of the reason why debate is really, really important, but perhaps some clarification from Deputy De Lisle.

3365 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Domaille? Sorry, are you wanting to speak now in any event or are you wanting this to be the penultimate speech? Let us just make sure that we have finished. Does anyone wish to speak? No.

In that case Deputy Domaille and that will be followed by Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy Domaille:** Thank you, sir. Thank you. That is good.

3370 Now, I just want to make it very clear that I am not going to support this amendment. A free bus service, we are in the Minority Report Strategy. A free bus service: Majority Report Strategy, Minority Report Strategy, central plank. End of matter. End of discussion. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

3375 Now, there are two points that I do need just to raise. The first one is that the Environment Department will need clarity. If this amendment was to be successful, we need clarity with regard to old age pensioners. We need clarity as to whether or not the fare structure will give a concession for OAPs or not and we need that.

3380 The other point that I will make is that, if this amendment were to be passed, as with all of the measures that we have got today, the Environment Department will begin work straightaway. That is what we are tasked to do and within that, if this amendment was successful, we would go back to CT Plus and we would probably be going to Treasury too, because there is a monetary influence in it. The very earliest we could put it in place would be roughly three months, but we would try to do so if we could.

3385 But also with regard to the bus contract, please remember the contract will be coming back next April with a revised contract, with a much improved service, particularly under the Minority Report and so there will be an opportunity to look again, at that time, when you have got more facts and figures in front of you. But what is really important about the free bus service – and I take your point about the permanency of the fares – but I think Deputy Burford and I both agree that if circumstances dictate we come back with something else, we will do so as the Environment Board.

3390 The point about free at the point of delivery, or pick up, or whatever you want to call it, is that it is to kick start the interest in the buses. This is fundamental to the Strategy and so I really do urge Members to reject.

I should make one point: Deputy Gollop said the existing fares go as low as 50p. They go down to 60p actually. It does not matter, but the point is that bus passenger numbers are not going up. They did do last month, but that was one month.

3395 And the other thing I would say is the fare of 50p was roughly what it was when we started on this journey three years or four years ago and, even at 50p, the passenger numbers plateaued at something around the 1.6 million. We are aiming for much more than that, so I really do ask you to reject this amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

3400 **Deputy St Pier:** Thank you, sir and thank you to everybody who contributed to the debate, which I very much enjoyed.

3405 There was a quite a lot of hyperbole. Deputy Fallaize began by referring to a dog's breakfast and that this amendment would turn the whole Transport Strategy into a dog's breakfast. Everything would collapse under the weight of this amendment.

Let us face reality: the real core resolution or Proposition that we will need to agree on is the paid parking one and without that going through, that will be the real death knell to this Strategy, not this one.

Deputy Domaille described it as being a central plank and that their ambition was to have much more than 1.6 million. But, of course, we do not know what the numbers are that he was aiming for, because we do not have those numbers articulated, or those targets articulated, in either of the Reports.

Had Deputy Burford, or indeed the Majority Report, come to this Assembly with reports which recommend that the Strategy was dependent on a 50p bus fare or a 75p bus fare or a 20p bus fare, that in itself would have been presented as being absolutely core to the Strategy. There is no justification provided in the reports, no evidence to support them being entirely free and therefore, that is not the core to the success of the Strategy, as is acknowledged by the Chief Minister in his speech, and as I made in my opening speech. The core to the success of this is the frequency and the quality of the service and the network, not price. There is no evidence to support pricing being critical.

Deputy Fallaize also suggested that introducing this would reverse the incentives and disincentives between driving and taking the bus. Again, that is a gross overstatement. Clearly with paid parking at 60p an hour for 10 hours, that will cost someone driving in £6. A 50p bus fare each way without a multiple-fare discount of course would cost £1. So there will still be a substantial incentive to take the bus, which is the objective of the policy, but it would not change the core incentive to use the buses.

Deputy Fallaize also said that there is, of course, no end date and it would require a States resolution to increase this fare. Well, of course, there is absolutely no difference between this amendment and the core proposition of a zero fare which equally has no end date and would require a resolution to change it. So there is no difference there.

Deputy Fallaize also suggested that a fareless service would be quicker, but of course we already know that it will be a service which does require some kind of card to check in, so that the routes can be monitored and data collected. So there is not a significant difference and, actually, it is of course entirely possible to move to a cashless service which, of course, exists in many jurisdictions using cards with a fare loaded onto the card. So again, I see no difference between what is proposed in the Minority Report that is inconsistent with the introduction of a small fare.

With regard to the concessions, whether it is for the aged or others, there is nothing in this resolution that would prevent those concessions being negotiated as part of any revised contract.

The review will be happening. I think Deputy Fallaize said there would be no review, but of course, that will be happening anyway as part of the policy before the end of December...

In short, this Strategy will be no less integrated simply because there will be a small fare. The incentive of the reduction in the bus fare from its current position to 50p will remain as a core element of the Strategy.

Deputy Lowe, again, I think that point has been addressed. The contracts are described as Deputy Burford said. That issue faces the free bus service anyway. Those contracts will need to be negotiated again, as the Minister alluded to.

Deputy Ogier, again, I think slightly overstated it when he referred to that this would be 'political vandalism' and 'emasculatation of the Strategy' and that we would be 'losing the big prize'. Can I just remind all Members that with this Strategy and with the existing subsidies of the bus service, between now and the end of December 2017, taxpayers will be paying £22.3 million towards the bus service? If we have this amendment, there will be at most £1.5 million and, as Deputy Burford said, quite possibly a little less.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb has asked you to give way.

**Deputy Bebb:** Thank you for giving way, Deputy St Pier.

Could I ask for clarification that, if nothing were to be done and we kicked it all out, do you have the figures as to how much you would spend anyway?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** I believe we would spend £8.8 million, broadly speaking.

So what we are in essence asking for, what I am seeking by this amendment, is a small contribution on the user-pays principle from those using the buses – say £1.5 million, optimistically, if Deputy Burford is right. That is less than 10% of the total subsidy that will be going into the bus service. I do not consider that to be unreasonable.

Deputy Duquemin referred to Cobo beach. I think I would suggest to him that that is a poor analogy. Cobo beach is not a taxpayer-funded service.

With regard to visitors, I think we are pretty unique as a jurisdiction, in that we actually collect very little from our visitors in terms of contribution to public services and again, I do not consider it unreasonable to seek a 50p fare from them.

With regard to free bus services in ski resorts, I would suggest to him, sir, that he has paid for that through his ski pass.

Deputy Le Tocq again was supportive of having a zero fare and spoke of the fact that it would encourage the tourist industry. With respect to the Chief Minister, sir, I do not think there was any evidence presented to support that other than, perhaps, wishful thinking. (*Interjection*) And, again, just to re-emphasise the point that the key issue here is not fare, in terms of 'undoing all the bad', to use his phrase. It is all about the quality of service. If the service does not improve, it does not matter what the fare is, you will still not be using that aging blue Ormer card.

With regard to Deputy Bebb, who quoted from the Bus Users' Group, again the key element that came through several times in the passage he quoted is it is all about frequency and reliability, which is the point that I made. It is not about the fares and again I would suggest, sir, that his statement with regard to removing barriers for the disabled was not evidenced.

Deputy Bebb has also spoken on a number of occasions about the health benefits of this Strategy, quite rightly, of the whole strategy. Then Deputy Trott beat me to it with emphasising, of course, that in the hierarchy of transport, cycling and walking is of course above the use of the bus. The free bus strategy, of course, provides no incentive to move to cycling or walking first and this amendment, sir, I would suggest is a greater encouragement and fits in with other strategies, including the Obesity Strategy, which I would hope that Deputy Bebb would endorse.

Deputy Le Lièvre's very expensive bus trips over the next few years, having purchased a new Land Rover, sir, of course, with this amendment, his £100 bus fare will go up to £100.50. (*Laughter*) I think, sir, I enjoyed the reference to Germany in the 1930s. I think he was probably referring to Germany in the 1920s actually.

Deputy Dorey's comments about the £8 card, I think, are very good, because I think we do have to acknowledge that an £8 initial charge will be a barrier to entry for some people in trialling the service.

Deputy Gollop referred to multi-discounts and I would suggest, sir, that actually having a multi-discount card or multi-discounts, as provided for by the amendment, will encourage greater use of buses and I think Deputy Burford, to be fair, in her very fair comments, which I have almost described as a summing up, actually perhaps did acknowledge that point.

I know I have not acknowledged all those who spoke, but I hopefully have addressed most of the key points. My central point, sir, is that the key issue to this Integrated Transport Strategy, the delivery of it will not be impeded by having a very modest fare. Indeed, I would suggest that it has some benefits and will enhance it and we should acknowledge that the key test has yet to come in relation to paid parking. But, in the meantime, sir, I would encourage all Members to support this amendment and would request a recorded vote, sir.

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

I do need clarification with regard to the OAPs. He has indicated that we can, but is it in the intention that we do give a concession for OAPs or we do not?

**Deputy St Pier:** I did say that, I believe, in my opening statement, sir.

**Deputy Fallaize:** But sir, if the States approve this amendment and then approve the Proposition as amended, there will be a States' resolution which says to approve a bus fare policy of 50p per journey and the only discount will be for multi-journey cards. If Environment go and introduce a fareless service for pensioners, they will be acting against the States' resolution and although Environment Departments of the past did that, this one obviously will not want to (*Laughter*) and, therefore, they would have to come back to the States, presumably, and seek another States' resolution.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, again, I believe it is probably a matter that perhaps the Procureur could advise. I do not believe there is anything in this resolution which will prevent the Environment Department doing that, within their mandate, if they saw fit, sir.

**The Procureur:** Well, we do want, certainly, to get some clarity, Treasury Minister. I take it that the formulation of a policy on bus fares really refers to the contract which will be negotiated with the bus company and the terms on which that one will be approached.

But, I mean, if the States are purporting to give a direction which will result in the Environment Department being required to go to the bus company and say, 'We only want you to give free travel to children in uniforms, etc', and it does not mention elderly people, well then, it does seem to me that the States have not asked the Environment Department to ask the bus company to give free travel to elderly people. It is perfectly easy, but I think we do have to have it clear.

3530 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

**Deputy Lowe:** Sir, rather than re-opening the debate again, would it be possible that, depending on the outcome of the result of this amendment, that if the amendment is passed, that an amendment is produced tomorrow to go against the substantive Propositions for when we go and vote? (*Interjections*)

3535 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

**Deputy Brouard:** The proposal, sir, if the Treasury Minister and the seconder were so minded, if we just allow them to put in 'old aged pensioners' into one of the lines – would that be just a simple way, sir?

3540 **The Bailiff:** That then may re-open debate.

**Deputy Bebb:** Could I say, if that were the case, obviously I would need clarification in relation to the exemptions on disabilities.

3545 **Deputy Trott:** Sir, are we not overcomplicating this matter?

**The Bailiff:** I think we are –

3550 **Deputy Trott:** As Deputy Burford said in her most recent speech, the issue will have to be discussed with the bus company in any event. That is likely to require additional scrutiny by this Assembly and that would be the time for that detail to be addressed.

**Several Members:** Hear, hear.

3555 **The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, I would concur with Deputy Trott. As I said in my opening comments, there was nothing in this amendment that was seeking to overturn existing concessions. It is quite clearly, self-evidently, with an amendment of this kind, impossible to cover off every aspect of a fare policy including the level of discount. That is, it would be a matter for the Environment Department to manage and negotiate and not something that would need to be micro-managed by this Assembly. It was not my intention to require that of this Assembly. Clearly, if this amendment is passed and further clarification on those points would be preferred by Members to the resolution, then I am sure that can be done before the end of this meeting, sir.

**The Bailiff:** There has been a request for a recorded vote, so we go to a recorded vote on the amendment proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Luxon.

3570 *There was a recorded vote.*

*Amendment by Deputy St Pier/Deputy Luxon:  
Carried – Pour 24, Contre 23, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 0*

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Kuttelwascher	Alderney Rep. Jean	None	None
Deputy Langlois	Alderney Rep. Harvey		
Deputy Le Clerc	Deputy Harwood		
Deputy St Pier	Deputy Brehaut		
Deputy Stewart	Deputy Domaille		
Deputy Gillson	Deputy Robert Jones		
Deputy Le Pelley	Deputy Gollop		
Deputy Trott	Deputy Sherbourne		
Deputy David Jones	Deputy Conder		
Deputy Laurie Queripel	Deputy Storey		
Deputy Lowe	Deputy Bebb		
Deputy Collins	Deputy Lester Queripel		
Deputy Dorey	Deputy Ogier		
Deputy Paint	Deputy Fallaize		
Deputy Adam	Deputy Le Lièvre		
Deputy Brouard	Deputy Spruce		
Deputy Wilkie	Deputy Duquemin		
Deputy De Lisle	Deputy Green		
Deputy Inglis	Deputy Le Tocq		

Deputy Soulsby	Deputy James
Deputy Sillars	Deputy Perrot
Deputy Luxon	Deputy Burford
Deputy O'Hara	Deputy Hadley
Deputy Quin	

3575

**The Bailiff:** Well, Members, the result of the vote on the amendment proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Luxon: there were 24 votes in favour; 23 against. I declare it carried. (*Applause*)

3580

I believe that means that we will start tomorrow morning with the Deputy Brouard/Deputy De Lisle amendment. Is that right? We have one more amendment, which is proposed by Deputy Inglis, seconded by Deputy Green and then we can start general debate. (*Laughter*) If Members are writing speeches overnight can I ask them not to repeat what they have already said in any speeches they have already delivered? (*Laughter*)

*The Assembly adjourned at 5.32 p.m.*