



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 2nd May 2014

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

Volume 3, No. 11

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

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

Law Officers

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

People's Deputies

St. Peter Port South

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

St. Peter Port North

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

St. Sampson

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

The Vale

Deputies M. J. Fallaize, D. B. Jones, L. B. Queripel, 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 R. A. Perrot, A. H. Brouard, A. M. Wilkie,
D. de G. De Lisle, Y. Burford, D. A. Inglis

The South-East

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

J. Torode, Esq. (H.M. Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

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

Business transacted

Billet d'État IX.....	569
VI. Guernsey Integrated On-Island Transport Strategy – Debate continued	569
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.30 p.m. and resumed at 2.30 p.m.</i>	<i>597</i>
VI. Guernsey Integrated On-Island Transport Strategy – Debate continued	597
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.32 p.m.</i>	<i>630</i>

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Greffier

EVOCATION

Billet d'État IX

ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

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

5 **The Greffier:** Billet d'État IX, Article VI. Continuation of debate on the Guernsey Integrated On-Island Transport Strategy.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, good morning to you all.
 The next amendment on the agenda is that proposed by Deputy Brouard, seconded by Deputy De Lisle.
10 Deputy Brouard.

Amendment:

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 £1.00 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;

Free travel for all persons above States pensionable age;

Consideration of and action on, the extant resolutions and thrust of section 4.6 Schools Bus Service of Billet d'État VII of 2006.'

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

15 I will be fairly brief because I think my fellow Deputy, Deputy St. Pier, yesterday, in introducing the 50p charge, made most of the points.

 The difference between mine and the previous one is that my contention is that the journey should be for £1, as it is now – and I will come back to that in a minute; free travel for children under 12, accompanied by an adult, as Deputy St. Pier... free travel for all children during term-time, in school uniform; free travel for all persons above States' pensionable age; and consideration of some of the school bus service
20 improvements, which are mentioned in the previous transport strategy.

 Just taking one point before Deputy Bebb perhaps stands up, yes, I am sure that, when they are looking at it, they will look at some disability issues as well as that particular part of it. As Deputy St. Pier said yesterday, I cannot write the full manual for the bus company.

25 There is no point in having a 50p fare when a £1 fare would be just as acceptable to the user, but a £1 fare would be a massive benefit to the taxpayer. With Deputy St. Pier up to, perhaps, up to £½ million would have been raised by the 50p; with the £1, up to £1 million could be raised – not being a disincentive for the person travelling on the bus, but a real incentive for us, as the States, when we are trying to cover our costs. We are struggling now to find savings to cover FTP. Yet, almost in this debate that we had

yesterday, we are living in a bubble and yet we can now, today, raise twice as much – I would guestimate up to about £700,000 with no discernable difference in the behaviour of people travelling.

Deputy Fallaize, who is going to support this amendment, is a great orator but sometimes in the length of his speeches, by the time he gets to the end he has forgotten what he said at the beginning (*Laughter*) and that is great because I am usually carried away with the story and it is really good. But he said something like, ‘You cannot do bus fares in the States. It is the States at its worst.’ But, there we are, we have a proposal to reduce the bus fares today from 50p to zero – so exactly what the States is doing. Then, of course, the other thing that Deputy Bebb also mentioned was that, ‘Well, you can always come back with a report’ – which he has mentioned, ‘a year or two down the road and then come back with a different bus fare’. Well, that is then doing the bus fares in the States.

None of that, to be honest, is relevant because the basic bus fare today is £1, the basic bus fare yesterday was £1 and with my amendment it will still be £1. There is no yo-yoing. It is £1.

The idea of an £8 card... The family arrives in Guernsey for their holiday. Mum and two kids, a 13-year-old, 14-year-old, whatever, eight-year-old. They go to the tourist desk, ‘We would like to get a bus ride to our hotel.’ They will go there and they say, ‘That will be super. No problems, that is a £32 card for the four of you.’ What an incentive! That is a mountain to climb. If they went to the Tourist Board and they said, ‘By the way, we have got a heavily-subsidised bus service and, for you being a tourist, you pay exactly the same as the local person and it is £1. That will be for the four children to get to town: £4.’ Super.

So it is not the £1 that makes the difference; it is the reliability; it is the convenience; it is the routes. I actually went on the bus about two weeks ago. It must have been about five years since I have been on the bus and it was not the £1 that put me off going. It was a good journey, but if it was £8 I think I would have fathomed out some other way to overcome it. I would not have gone on the bus thinking, ‘Well, I might have another journey another day.’ I would not even try it. If I have got to do an £8 hurdle, I am not even going to jump that high and I do not think everybody else should. So, please, the £1 is not the hurdle, the £8 is the hurdle.

The other part of the amendment asks us to look at the school bus service and that is absolutely critical. That is the one area where we do have some congestion problems and I am not saying anything different in this amendment. It basically reinforces what the Minority Report already says. I will just read a couple of lines before I sit down. This is from the Minority Report:

‘141. In accordance with the response to our consultation from the Education Department, we propose a review of the school bus service with a view to extending the current provision and ensuring that general scheduled improvements fully take into account school timings and routes. We also welcome the desire of the Education Department to work with the Environment Department in respect of the travel arrangements of its staff, students and community users.’

So the last point of my amendment fully concurs with the Minority Report. And, of course, with my report, it is pensioners for free and I am sure there can be other concessions as well.

If there is one piece of this road strategy that survives, let it be this. £1 is still heavily subsidised. We are struggling now on FTP. It does not make a difference to the person travelling, but it makes a hell of a difference to the taxpayer, with up to £1 million towards the services and things we put out. £8 is a real barrier and this is an opportunity for you to look at a real benefit to the community, which is: looking at the school bus service.

Please support the amendment.

Thank you, sir,

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

Deputy De Lisle: Yes, I do, sir, and I reserve the right to speak.

The Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Sir, given the very confusing position we find ourselves in today – with uncertainty as to will, perhaps, all of the Environment board continue, uncertainty from the amendment last night as to whether it included changing the rules whereby senior citizens, people aged over 65, were entitled, universally, if they lived in Guernsey or Alderney, to free transport, which represents a change by this States on bus fares again; and the uncertainty of the effects upon the strategy and the financing of the strategy and the issues Deputy St. Pier raised when, of course, he mixed capital and revenue, when he talked about the cost spending for the bus company – I think we are a bit muddled now.

I also accept what Deputy Fallaize said that, yet again, we pulled out of the tenth traffic strategy component bits and pieces. But we are where we are at 9.45 a.m. on a Friday morning and I look at this

amendment from that perspective. I have always said that free buses would be, on balance, a good thing, providing the States finance them properly and ensure – as Deputy St. Pier said – that the frequency, route network and reliability was also intrinsic to the network.

90 If it was a choice between freeness and a better service, I would opt for a better service and, if it was a choice between essential money for HSSD and the Disability Strategy and free buses, reluctantly, I would not go for the free buses. So we have to start from a variety of perspectives. That said, I believe that taxing and charging and benefiting transport strategy issues is a component part of the Tax, Benefits and Pensions Review. But that is a debate, partially, for another day.

95 I look at this amendment as it is then and I say, I think we should support it and I will explain to you why. A fixed fare of £1 per journey – which is more or less where we are now, except that visitors and tourists will be paying the same as a resident – includes – if I have got this right and the Environment Minister can correct me if I am wrong – free travel for children under the age of 12, accompanied by an adult, which is much better than the current system, where I believe all children aged three and over have to pay an adult fare, which represents a disincentive for travelling and a little bit of a punishment for those on low incomes.

Then we have free travel for all children during term-time. Well, I accept that. We retain, very clearly, with no grounds for manoeuvre, free travel for all persons above States' pensionable age and we have a fixed fare of £1 per journey, subject to appropriate discounts for multi-journey cards.

105 That could be interpreted – like yesterday's successful amendment – very creatively and the Environment Department, that had a funding source, or the States as whole or the company as the whole, if it had sponsorship from one source or another, could effectively reduce the fare to 10p. You know: 100 journeys for a £10 card. We could work with that.

110 I must admit there was one snag with the free buses. If the States wants to go back to free buses, I would look open-minded at another amendment, but there was one problem intrinsic to the Burford amendment and that was this £8 card, because –

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

115 **Deputy Burford:** Will you give way, Deputy Gollop?

Deputy Gollop: Yes.

120 **Deputy Burford:** I think I need to explain about this £8 card because it is starting to get a bit of a life of its own, rather more than it deserves, from how it is written in the Minority Report and – Sorry, John has given way to me.

125 It is the case that, whenever we have had meetings in Environment with the bus company and everything, the crucial issue that everything always comes back to is the fact that, while we welcome our cruise ship passengers and we want them to catch the buses, what 1,500 passengers arriving all at once tend to do is fill up the round the Island route, because it becomes a free Island tour or an Island tour for £1 or £2 – either way, extremely good value in terms of an Island tour.

130 CT Plus's original way of dealing with that was to simply pull the route number 7 that went round the Island, which is not a particularly constructive way of going forward, but it just shows what a dilemma this issue makes and, while we definitely welcome these passengers – we want to get them on – you cannot, in all conscience, have somebody who lives out at Torteval and wants to go to their afternoon shift on the bus, only to find that three buses go past full of cruise ship passengers. So you have to try and find a creative way –

135 **The Bailiff:** This is becoming a speech rather than just an interjection, Deputy Burford. You can make a speech later in the debate.

Deputy Burford: Right, thank you.

140 **Deputy Gollop:** Yes, let me explain the reality of what Deputy Burford has said. (*Laughter*) For many years under the old contract, under previous Ministers, when Island Coachways ran the service, they encountered exactly the same issue Deputy Burford has correctly identified.

145 I was a victim of this standing at St. Sampson's Bridge when one number 7 after another went by completely full of cruise passengers. It was even worse on a Sunday when the service was reduced. The old Environment Department partially compensated for this by upping the frequency of the service from every half an hour to every 20 minutes. That is what happened. It still was not enough and, of course, one year – as we remember – Island Coachways could not deliver that service because they had a shortage of drivers and vehicles for maintenance.

It was a problem. I am afraid to say the solution to the problem within the coherence of the previous strategy was simple. It was to make the service every ten minutes, to increase the resource. The Environment Department had that choice. They did not take it. It was the bus company that abolished route 7 and 7A, it was the Environment Department at a political level, approving the bus timetable changes and they reintroduced it by the clever routes 91 and 92 in a different round, despite telling Deputy De Lisle they would not reintroduce the service, but it came back on exactly the same route, more or less.

So the issue is simple. You could have dealt with the issue, Deputy Burford, by re-routing the coastal route other ways. But, in a way, she has made the point that I was going to make. Imagine you are a visitor to this Island on this day trip – not necessarily a cruise – or you come off at the Airport and you catch the bus. Instead of being £1 or free, or 50p or £2, the fare is £8, because your first experience of arriving in Guernsey is an £8 charge. If you are from Alderney and you come to Guernsey for the day – or Jersey even – it will be £8. Everybody in Guernsey, before using the bus, would presumably have to pay £8.

We could think of ways whereby the cards were sent free of charge to people, but the problem that Deputy Burford has identified could have been resolved in different ways. Why couldn't a special service have gone from the Harbour terminal where the cruise tenders come in? There were many different solutions to this. Admittedly, they require additional resources and some out-of-the-box thinking with the bus companies, but I think that we need to think more carefully about the buses and, surely, if we are having extra passengers – especially in the summer – that is a good thing and it is a selling point for Guernsey that cruise liner passengers do have a free ride round the Island. I cannot see the logic of where we are going on that respect and so, for all those reasons, I am afraid Deputy Brouard's amendment at this stage is the more rational one to support.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher and then Deputy Harwood.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Thank you, sir.

I will be supporting this measure. First of all, it is good for the taxpayer, (A Member: Hear, hear.) secondly, it now clarifies the situation regarding people over pensionable age and their free travel and, thirdly, I want to refer to the bus numbers travelling last March, which were put out by the Environment Department, but not – shall we say – they were overly confident in it; I would have thought they would have been jumping up and down with joy.

They have gone up month on month from last March, by about 7,500, eight and a bit per cent. That, to me, indicates that fares are not the problem, something else is and, to me, if you want to get even more passengers you just need a better service.

So, for those reasons, I think I am quite happy to support this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Harwood.

Deputy Harwood: Thank you, sir.

I chose not to speak yesterday in relation to the amendment proposed by Deputy St. Pier because I felt that others were able to elucidate, to explain and to argue very effectively – and I believe they did.

Like many others, I was disappointed at the outcome of the vote. The concern is – and I remind everybody that the essentiality and part of the structure of this integrated transport strategy is – providing a carrot and one of those carrots is actually providing a fare-less bus service. I would have been minded yesterday, sir, to have said we must not miss the bus. Today, I would acknowledge that the bus has started moving, but we should not hesitate to try and catch up with that bus.

Sir, those of this Assembly who remember – and it is two days ago, heavens above – the initial speech from Deputy Burford – the excellent speech from Deputy Burford, and everybody complimented her on that – the integrity of this strategy is vital.

Let us be in no uncertain terms, if we vote for Deputy Brouard's amendment – and Deputy Brouard has been perfectly frank; he has said all the way along that he would actually like to throw out both the strategies; he has been frank; others in this Assembly, I suspect, also would support his view – we are not merely removing a plank, we are putting a nail in the coffin of delivering... this Assembly, for the first time, – delivering an integrated transport strategy. Are we going to be content to sit back, as our predecessors did, over the last 10 years, failing to deliver a transport strategy? No.

Throw out this amendment. We still have to address whether or not the strategy can survive with a 50p charge. I believe it possibly can, but that means there will be an amendment short. But, for heaven's sake, get behind the integrated transport strategy and reject this amendment overwhelmingly. (Applause)

The Bailiff: Who wishes to speak next?

Deputy Storey and then Deputy Dave Jones.

Deputy Storey: Thank you, sir.

I would not normally choose to speak after a rousing speech like that, but I have to agree entirely with what Deputy Harwood has just said.

The point, for me, about this strategy is that you need to create a significantly different financial environment – if I can use that word without intending a pun – in order to change people’s day-to-day activities or habits.

What was being proposed by this report we are debating, was a significant difference to the financial environment and I think it stood a chance of actually changing people’s habits.

The movers of both alternative strategies, at the beginning, said that is what these strategies were about. It is about trying to change people’s habits and to get people to live healthier lives by walking and cycling and, in fact, walking to the bus, in order to get more exercise.

So what we have done yesterday, in approving an amendment to introduce a 50p fare, has watered down that difference. It has negated part of that financial environment which was going to encourage people to change their habits and to go to £1 is going to water it down even further. And if we keep on watering down the proposals in this strategy we will have nothing left. We will just have – as has been said before – a dog’s dinner and then, because it is ineffective, ‘Well, it was a bad strategy. What was the point of having an integrated transport strategy?’

So it seems to me that, if we do not stick to the bare bones of the proposal in this strategy, we are effectively going to come up with nothing and we have spent two and a half days, and maybe three days, debating something to end up coming up with nothing.

So I strongly resist the idea of taking the bus fare to £1 – and if I may diverge a little bit from this particular amendment because other speakers this morning have spoken in trepidation about the impact of the £8 entry permit, if you like, to using the free at use buses – every time I have gone to a foreign city like Amsterdam or Paris, the first thing you do is you buy a book of tickets and you spend significantly more than £8 in the appropriate currency. You do that as a tourist because you want to be able to get round the city without having to find the right coins every time you want to feed them into the machine to get onto the bus or the tram and you buy one of these carnet or whatever they happen to call it in that particular country. I cannot see how that is going to be a problem in Guernsey. Tourists are used to paying in this way to be able to use the public transport. So I would just like to lay that fear in people’s minds – that the £8 ticket is going to be something insurmountable for the tourists who come to this Island. It is not in the various major cities in Europe, why should it be a problem here?

So, sir, I would hope that we are not going end up with a dog’s breakfast. I hope we are not going to end up with a strategy which has no effect and will, in fact, produce no change in the situation which I, for one, feel that the present situation is untenable. We have got to do something to change the way we work and play on this Island and this proposed strategy give us a chance to get there. So I urge you all to maintain the integrity of this strategy and reject this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dave Jones, then Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy David Jones: Sir, I too agree that Deputy Burford’s speech was very passionate and it was well-crafted and well-delivered. I congratulated her personally on that issue, but it was just as wrong.

The former Chief Minister has just made a very passionate plea to the States, passionately delivered – passion I had not seen when he was Chief Minister, but never mind, (*Laughter*) we have moved on... passionately delivered, but clearly that is just as wrong.

We have now heard that we cannot support this amendment because it is about healthy walking. The people who are going for the bus will be just as healthy walking towards it, whether they pay 50p or £1, Deputy Storey. It is a red herring and a non-argument. It just does not wash, quite frankly.

As for transport in Europe, Deputy Le Lièvre and I found ourselves on a tram in Krakow with no kiosk to get a ticket before we boarded and we went to the square where Oscar Schindler’s factory was and got off the tram and thought, ‘Was that really free?’ Well, actually, it was not. We had just got on and got off without paying (*Laughter*) because there was nobody to know where to buy a ticket and nobody to pay the money to. We felt very guilty but we did pay our –

Deputy Le Lièvre: Actually, sir, we legged it. (*Laughter*)

Deputy David Jones: But this is really – when you go back to Deputy Brouard’s speech on this amendment – about the ridiculous idea that people will be asked to pay £8 immediately as they enter a bus, for their journey, rather than saying that – as he says – ‘You have got a family of four. It would be £4 for your journey.’ It is a sensible amendment. It is one we should support. It will also – as I said yesterday, with the 50p – bring in money for the Treasury that is sorely needed.

We keep missing that point here. We are quite happy to vote for paid parking and say, ‘Well, of course, we need that money to fund the bus service and to help the Treasury’, but, when it comes to something like this, there is an £8 incentive at one end for the passenger and the money will bring in close to £800,000-odd for the Treasury. We are saying ‘no’ because it all about healthy walking and we do not want to destroy the strategy. I do not think this is going to destroy the Minority Report at all. I think having the £8 charge will do more damage to people wanting to use the buses than this very sensible £1 fare.

So, please support this and let us move on.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you very much, sir.

I do not want the dog’s breakfast; I want what Deputy Harwood had for breakfast. *(Laughter)*

For those of you who know me well enough, clearly the Minority Report... the main author, clearly, has been Deputy Burford, but for those of you who know me well enough will see traces of my style, perhaps, within the document.

There is one line there that has been used several times which is, ‘policy Jenga’ and that is the way I describe what could happen when you start to slowly dismember, remove brick by brick, something that had structural integrity, something you acknowledged yesterday would stand alone and work.

My concern was that if we start to play this Jenga then the whole tower stops being integrated and it starts to collapse. That process, regrettably, started yesterday when Members supported the amendment laid by Deputy Luxon and by Deputy Gavin St. Pier, because what we do know about buses on Guernsey is that they are price sensitive, that when ridership was up by 1.6 million, the vernacular, people just understood within the community that buses were relatively inexpensive – they were cheap – and they used them for that reason.

Once you start to tinker with the price and there is not a clear understanding in the community whether you have got to be – I do not know whether I can get on a bus in a school uniform at the age of 50 but, if I do, do I get free fare? Once you start to have mechanisms like that things just do not have that integrity and policies and strategies collapse.

If I was a Member of the Commerce and Employment Department and if I was a Member of the Culture and Leisure Department, I would be on the largest soap box I could find I would be screaming out to people, ‘We have the potential for a free bus service so that when tourists get here, when people arrive on the Island...’ I mean, how many times have we seen letters in the *Press* from ‘Angry of Swanage’? I do not know if people in Swanage get angry. *(Laughter)* I think they get either vexed or moderately alarmed or something like that. Whatever it is, you see that they are not happy that the money which is... It is not cheap to get to Guernsey. They get here and they are asked, ‘Are you a holiday-maker? Where is your Ormer card?’ and all the rest. This misunderstanding about fares and the so many issues around the bus service that further complicate things. We could be celebrating the fact that Guernsey has a free bus service. Wouldn’t that have been absolutely fantastic and wouldn’t that have been an offering to the community, to the taxpayer that everyone is so fond of – who is actually also a bus user? The taxpayer is a bus user. Give people something back for once.

Yesterday, on the voted amendment – and it is the system of government we have and the system of government that I will defend... but you see the most unusual coalitions in this Assembly and, without wishing to offend people – because I have done that before today, by the way. *(Laughter)* No, no, I did. It was a Wednesday, I remember. What happened yesterday was there were people here who had legitimate – thank you, Deputy Trott – concerns about the bus service and the –

I am sorry, Deputy Trott, I could not hear myself. You were speaking.

Deputy Trott: It was not me, sir.

Deputy Brehaut: Well, if ever there was an epitaph, that was one! *(Laughter and applause)* I would pay to go to the Foulon Cemetery and read, ‘It was not me, sir.’

There are some odd coalitions that come together. There were people who were supportive and made a case for the 50p bus fare, but there were also people who, clearly, do not want the Minority Report, they do not want a road transport strategy – and Deputy Lowe is acknowledging that and nodding – and when we go into the main debate –

I will give way, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Deputy Lowe supported the previous strategy. There is still a strategy in place, but I am against paid parking. I made that very clear during my speech. And, while I am on my feet, can I just

330 actually say about the visitors? Yes, there are letters from the visitors who are complaining about the very department of which you are a Member having a two-tiered system, of £2 for visitors and £1 for locals.

335 **Deputy Brehaut:** Sir, when I wrote to SACC and asked that we had the provision to give way, it did not say to give way and then make a second or third speech and I think Members are lapsing into that, respectfully.

The odd coalition whereby there are people who have legitimate concerns about the bus service and its viability and they have the taxpayer in mind and they supported the amendment... but within the broad coalition there were people who would give speeches later and say, in the main debate, 'What do we have here now? Hold on a moment. We came in here with paid parking, we have free buses. What a mess we have got now. Look how it has been amended. What are we left with? Let us throw the whole thing out.'

340 Because that is where they want to be anyway.

So, Members, please, do not support this amendment. Do not support this amendment and let us try and move on.

Thank you.

345

The Bailiff: Deputy Perrot, then Deputy Burford.

350 **Deputy Perrot:** My reason for rising, originally, was that I was terribly worried about Deputy Harwood earlier on. I have never seen him quite so animated, even during some of the *longeurs* of our partner's meetings, years ago when I was always my reasonable self – others were not. But Deputy Harwood always kept his cool. I hope it has got nothing to do with the fact that I see that Mrs Harwood is actually sitting on the visitors' benches. So perhaps he is making some sort of demonstration of passion to you. (*Laughter and applause*)

355 But the real reason why I stand on my feet is that one would expect me, as a Member of the Treasury Board, to be supporting anything which brings money into the States' revenue and normally, in my snivelling way, I would follow anything which is led by the Minister on something like this. But this transcends that sort of motion – at least it seems to me it does.

360 This, to me, is a politically philosophical issue and I hate to repeat myself; in fact, we are all repeating ourselves. I do not know why on earth we are debating this, because we know whether we are going to support this amendment or not without debate, but the point is there is a *quid pro quo*. As far as I am concerned, because of the arguments which have been led by unfairness in relation to paid parking, the *quid pro quo* is the fact that we have a fully functional, free bus service.

365 I speak against myself, I think, in relation to the question of there being a swipe card. I think that that might be something which is just... I do not think that that is a particular issue. I take what Deputy Storey has to say. I am slightly alarmed, by the way, to hear how many of our Members spend their time pacing the streets of Amsterdam. (*Laughter*) We have had three of them already and, although one has their suspicions... (*Laughter*) [*Inaudible*] but I think the £8 for a swipe card would just disappear into people's concern. I do not think that is a real concern. I think there is a real concern, philosophically, about paying anything for buses.

370 I accept, actually, that if you get onto a bus and you have got to pay 50p or you have got to pay £1, I think, generally, people would not actually baulk at that. But I just think that philosophically it is wrong. That is why I am going to vote against the amendment – even though I still want to remain a Member of the Treasury. (*Laughter*)

375 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

Well, I will keep it brief so as not to repeat things.

380 I just echo everything that Deputy Harwood said in his excellent speech. But I will make a little point about this £8 card because, clearly, it is becoming an issue. That is regrettable in a way because, quite frankly, we are here to talk about higher level policy than trying to micromanage the detail of things.

I point you to a small part in the report where it talks about the £8 card and it says,

'The fine detail of how this will be managed will be finalised by the Department if the proposal for a free service is agreed.'

385 That is a really key part because, yes, there may be issues where we have a family thing or something and we will look at it in more detail, but this report would have been 600 pages long or 800 pages long if we had gone into that micro-detail.

Just picking up, very quickly, on the points that Deputy Gollop made, we had looked at a lot of the things you suggested, Deputy Gollop, and you can say, 'Well, we could increase the frequency of the round

390 the Island to every 10 minutes or five minutes, but what about the days when the cruise ships passengers are not in? That is a waste of a resource. Believe me, we have spent hours trying to come to a really good solution with this. The swipe card is one possible way forward, but it can be managed at departmental level so, please, let us not get hung up, start comparing it to how much a taxi is now. Let us keep our eyes on the bigger picture and the bigger prize.

395 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ogier.

Deputy Ogier: Thank you, sir.

400 When Deputy Brouard says £1 will not be a big matter to the users, I see it as the exact reverse and, from a former Social Security Deputy Minister, I find that view to be surprisingly unsympathetic with the large numbers of people who are struggling on this Island who would welcome cheaper buses.

If you listen to what he says, he uses the words 'I would guestimate' and here we are again, back on the floor of this Assembly once more – as the old Assemblies have always been berated for – using 'I guestimate', 'I think' and changing a well-honed piece of strategy by taking bits out and making sure that it will not work. He says the difference between 50p or £1 would make no discernable difference to the traveller, which is a completely false statement. As Deputy Barry Brehaut has explained and, as we all know, the price difference on the bus has a massive effect to its use. The cheaper it gets, the more people use it. The more expensive it gets, the fewer people use it.

410 Deputy Brouard has accessed no evidence to support his assertions. Rising prices in recent years show the exact opposite position to the one he asserts. Rising prices result in reduced bus use. He tells us £8 a year is a barrier to using the bus, but £2 a day – £1 a journey, either way – is not a barrier. How can £8 a year be a barrier and £2 a day not be a barrier? I think Deputy Brouard has told us the exact opposite, in many cases, of what evidence shows us to be true.

415 I have to warn Members of this Assembly, we are now in very dangerous circumstances, as other people have alluded to. These are the circumstances which old Assemblies strayed into time after time. These are the sorts of debates which bring us into disrepute. Look at what is happening here. A £1 bus fare and here we have another amendment to bring in the former majority policy of fuel duty and remove paid parking. We will dismember this strategy on the floor of this Chamber. And you can talk of money which is sorely needed, but it will come at the expense of a transport strategy which does not work. It is short-termism. By taking this money from the buses, you may well swell the coffers but you waste the money which will be invested in the rest of the transport strategy, as it will not deliver what you expect from it and, overall to the States of Guernsey and to the people of this Island, it will be a waste of resources.

425 Listening to John Gollop makes one believe that most people are only going to use the bus once and pay £8 for their journey. Hundreds and thousands of people will pay £8 once per year and use the free bus dozens, if not hundreds, of times. A few people may come to the Island for a very short time and decide not to pay the £8 for that privilege. Deputy Gollop knows more than most in this Chamber and must know from formulating Social Security strategy that one cannot base an entire strategy around a small minority of people.

430 If all Members have not worked out what is happening here in this Chamber, I can tell you. Someone said to me yesterday, 'It is not about the 50p rate, Scott, it is about making sure the transport strategy falls.' That is pretty old school, very old States.

I do not think that was the purpose of the proposer and the seconder of yesterday's amendment at all, but I think that is what it was about for some. They hope that amending one of the fundamentals in this strategy will change enough people's minds and make the strategy unsupportable, as it is no longer as coherent as it was when it made a very great deal of sense.

435 These are very tried and tested methods used by previous Assemblies. Methods I thought had been blown away by the winds of change. If you have not been through this sort of thing before, this is how it starts. If you do not like a policy and you do not think you can take it down by force of argument, you have to resort to more creative measures.

440 Firstly, you make a small, well-meaning but fundamental change which wounds the policy. It is then wounded. It becomes easier for others to dispatch or renders it unlikely to succeed fully in its aims. You heard it from Deputy Brouard yesterday: 'Vote for it now and then vote against it later.' It is not what it is about. It is not about 50p and it is not about £1. The larger game is one of a number of plays. Not to have the Minority Report, not to have the Majority Report, not to have any report or to change the strategy into one they wish. If you cannot bring something down face to face, move it a little, nudge it, wound it, turn it, run it over a cliff. We are watching some pretty ancient motives at work here and from an anthological point of view it is intriguing to watch. (*Laughter*) It is not about £1 bus fares, it is about bringing the beast down. Can I get some nods from people who have seen this strategy at work in this Assembly before?

You can either participate in this larger hunt or you can say, ‘Enough, we are not going to do government this way.’ I do not want the strategy to end this way. I think that is both bad governance from a process point of view on the floor of this Assembly and I think it is bad government. I think we can do something about this and still come out with a good result for Guernsey – a compromised result.

For the first time in a decade in the transport realm we came close to something that will actually make a difference: a well-balanced set of proposals that actually stand a chance of delivering some meaningful change and then one of its fundamentals has changed. We have seen it so often before in so many of the other Assemblies and it brings us into disrepute when we do this.

At the moment it may not seem like much at 50p, but it is. You can say, ‘Hey, it is only 50p’ or ‘Hey, it is only £1’, but it was only 50p a few years ago and, whilst numbers improved, it did not result in the wholesale changes our transport desperately needs. So the spear is being driven in and somebody needs to come along and drive a bigger spear in and drive a larger £1 fare in.

As I said yesterday, I do not think that was the purpose of the proposer and the seconder, but they got a lot of support from people who actually do not want a 50p bus fare at all, but will take whatever mechanism damages the Minority Report and I think bringing the beast down is the purpose of this amendment. This strategy – the Minority Report – is a change in vision. It is a fundamental shift on what we value. It is a fundamental shift on what we pay for and what we get free. It is only a nudge but it is a significant nudge. It is the difference between the right nudge and the wrong nudge. It is the difference between earning £100 and spending £99.75 and earning £100 and spending £100.25. It is only 50p, but it results in very different directions. Changing a small part of the fundamentals can result in unintended and unwanted outcomes. This strategy puts a value on free parking and introduces something free, where before it was charged for. What it does is it changes the paradigm. It changes value and it changes perception and it nudges and I heard Deputy St. Pier yesterday talking of nudges. He knows the value of nudges.

When you design a system, you can subtly change the outcomes by putting in suitable nudges. Small changes which can result in significantly different outcomes. Supermarkets do this all the time. You go into a supermarket. They do this by placing certain products in certain places, passively nudging us to buy. They put sweets and chocolates at eye level of children, at the boring lines of the checkout. They are nudging you all the time by their product placement. You buy them, John. *(Laughter)* That is probably the most obvious, but system designers will have been all over the shop and carefully designed a whole raft of nudges we probably are not even aware of. In a canteen, food choices vary considerably depending on where in the process food is put and a good canteen manager can decide what nudge to engage in. Do they nudge the sales of healthy food and snacks which benefit the customer, do they nudge the sales of food with the greatest profit margin, benefitting their employer or do they choose the product that they get free cookies for, for selling the most of – benefitting themselves?

If you are designing a system of transport and you make parking free and charge for buses, you are nudging the user to park their car. If you are designing a transport system and you make parking paid for and free buses, you are nudging the user to take the bus – something this strategy carefully does. If you are designing a transport system and you make parking paid for and buses paid for, there is no clear message, there is no clear nudge to your strategy. If you are bringing in a transport system designed to lead to a change in behaviour, why would you nudge the user away from the desired outcome or fudge your message?

Yesterday, we fudged the message by putting a 50p charge on. I think we completely decimate the message by putting a £1 charge on, but I know there will also be a move today to momentarily release the 50p charge and to try and move this strategy forward for a short while to see how it would work without that nudge being removed and with the proper nudge being introduced.

So the nudge is about the headline rate and we are often told that we should not seek to change our headline taxation rate, for example. Our 20% tax band is virtually sacrosanct, not because 21% would be a particularly radical diversion; it is because it is a headline rate, widely publicised and carries a weight beyond the number itself. 21% tax is not just 1% more than 20%. It is an entirely different world more. It is Isle of Man – 20%; Jersey – 20%; Guernsey – 21%. It is not 1% more; it is do not do business there anymore.

It is the same for free buses. Free buses send such a powerful message to the Island and I know families who are already vowing to switch to the free bus service. We have heard the argument that 50p is not much different, but it is a *world* of difference.

Free buses is a powerful message. Deputy De Lisle yesterday, suggesting a 1p fare – anything to break that headline rate. That is what is going on. It is not about 50p, £1 or 1p; it is about breaking the integral parts of the strategy apart. So, listen to this: paid parking and free buses; paid parking and £1 buses. The difference between those two strategies is not £1, it is the difference between likely success and probable failure to reach the desired outcomes. It is the difference between a successful nudge and an unclear message. The strategy can limp on. It will still bring about changes in vehicle choice, but I do believe it will act as anywhere near the incentive for people to swap cars for buses anymore and I am sure having to pay

for both parking and the bus will be deeply unpopular and it will not work as a strategy. So, in my view, we have missed a subtle trick and we have lost already far more than has been gained.

I am reminded of the swing on a tree designed by a committee where one side of the rope is too long, the other is too short, the seat does not quite fit and one rope attaches in the middle of the seat. We cannot all have a hand in designing the swing (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and putting in features we all want. You end up with something unworkable – some Frankenstein type output. The strategy has a tolerance for some changes, but before we mess even further around with one of the fundamentals – the free bus service – I would urge Members not to support this amendment.

I would like Members to give the nascent strategy the chance to operate as intended before further changing one of the pieces it relies on to work and playing into the hands of those who would see this strategy fail. If you support the Minority Report, please reject this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

Deputy St. Pier: Sir, I was going to actually ask that you close the debate under 14(1), sir.

The Bailiff: 14(1). [*Inaudible*] (*Interjection and laughter*)

Deputy Brehaut: It was not me, sir.

Deputy St. Pier: I was not interrupting another Member under the Rule, sir.

The Bailiff: I had actually called Deputy Trott so we will go to 14(1) after he has spoken.

Deputy Trott: Thank you.

Sir, can I ask Members to indulge me and turn to page 646 of the Billet? The reason I want Members to do that is that I saw a number of colleagues whose opinions I respect enormously nodding in agreement when Deputy Ogier was saying, ‘We are going back to the bad old days of not making evidence-based and objective decisions.’ Whilst, on page 646, the graph is difficult to read, it is obvious even to someone who suffers from a partial colour blindness like me, that 57% of people who had expressed an opinion were of the view that £1 for a bus charge was right and 25% expressed no opinion at all, which meant that 82% either were happy with a bus charge of £1 or did not have a passionately objectionable view to it. That is evidence based, sir, and that is, for me, entirely supportive of the objectives in Deputy Brouard’s amendment and that is why I support it.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: We now invoke Rule 14(1). I remind Members what Rule 14(1) says: ‘A Member who has not already spoken in the debate.’ Deputy St. Pier had not spoken – ‘may request me to close the debate under any matter.’ I shall immediately put that request to the vote and if two-thirds or more Members vote in support of it then, subject to the Minister of the Treasury and Resources Department having the right to comment on any financial implications, (*Laughter*) the matter shall be put to the vote.

So, what you are voting on is that the debate on this amendment be immediately closed. If you wish to close the debate, you vote Pour. If you wish the debate to continue on this amendment, you vote Contre, and we will have to have a recorded vote as it requires a two-thirds majority.

There was a recorded vote

Rule 14(1):

Not carried – Pour 29, Contre 18, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 0

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Alderney Rep. Jean	Deputy Brehaut	None	None
Alderney Rep. Harvey	Deputy Domaille		
Deputy Harwood	Deputy Robert Jones		
Deputy Kuttelwascher	Deputy Lester Queripel		
Deputy Langlois	Deputy Trott		
Deputy Le Clerc	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Lowe		
Deputy Sherbourne	Deputy Le Lièvre		
Deputy Conder	Deputy Spruce		
Deputy Storey	Deputy Duquemin		
Deputy Bebb	Deputy Green		
Deputy St Pier	Deputy Dorey		
Deputy Stewart	Deputy Le Tocq		

Deputy Gillson	Deputy Brouard
Deputy Le Pelley	Deputy De Lisle
Deputy Ogier	Deputy Soulsby
Deputy Fallaize	Deputy Sillars
Deputy David Jones	Deputy O'Hara
Deputy Collins	
Deputy Paint	
Deputy James	
Deputy Adam	
Deputy Perrot	
Deputy Wilkie	
Deputy Burford	
Deputy Inglis	
Deputy Luxon	
Deputy Quin	
Deputy Hadley	

The Bailiff: Well, Members, the result of the vote on whether to close the debate on the Deputy Brouard amendment was 29 votes in favour, 18 votes against. It did not secure the requisite two-thirds majority. Debate will continue.

565 Deputy Bebb.

Deputy Bebb: Thank you, Monsieur le Bailli.

I did not actually intend to speak on this particular amendment because I thought that Deputy Harwood's passionate speech would actually push people into the appropriate direction. But I think that Deputy Trott's recent speech bears some analysis.

570 The first point I would say is that, if you ask people in isolation what you think of a £1 bus fare, the answer is, 'Of course, it is reasonable.' But we all know that it is not an isolated question that we are being asked today. The whole thing is: what is the balance of the total report? And, realistically, that £1 bus fare – the opinion there – is not taking in the context of whether we also introduce paid parking, whether we also introduce additional taxes on the width and on the CO₂ emissions. This is an integrated approach. The fact that people responded to that singular question in isolation that, yes, they think that £1 is reasonable, is evidently a red herring. I am disappointed as to such an opinion being expressed.

575 Evidently, I believe that £1 is wrong. If you want evidence as to what it does, when it was 50p, we have 1.6 million journeys being taken and when it moved up to £1, we ended up under the position which I believe now to be 1.2 million journeys. I am sure that Deputy Domaille, in his summing up, will correct me if I am incorrect there. But a drop and if the numbers are incorrect, regardless, everybody knows the effect of putting additional cost onto the bus is a serious drop in the numbers and that is not the direction of travel for any of this strategy and, therefore, please roundly reject this amendment.

585 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Domaille: Can I just do a point of clarification? It is 1.3 million.

590 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Yes, I just wanted to make one small point after Deputy Bebb. Is he then saying we should throw out the whole consultation, because if you look further down it says, 'Only 8% of people think buses should be free.'? (*Interjections*)

595 **The Bailiff:** Deputy De Lisle.

Deputy De Lisle: Thank you, sir.

600 I think that most people in this Island know that there is no such thing as a free ride and with this amendment on the table at the moment, you can, with this amendment, travel on the bus for 60p and we can rid ourselves of the discriminatory tourist £2 fares – all pay the same – tourists and locals alike – and OAPs, sir, and children ride free. All are major bonuses, as I see it, for the transport strategy. It is not good enough to say that the transport strategy is something new. We have had this transport strategy running since 2006 and the objectives are essentially the same as in 2006 today: to reduce the adverse impacts of vehicle use and encourage the use of alternative forms of transport.

605 Sir, if the economic climate was different this amendment would not be necessary but, given the current economic circumstances, with the Island running a significant Budget deficit – £20 million or so – funded by using our savings through the Contingency Fund and, given that the ETI receipts are not as rosy as we

would like, according to recent reports from Treasury, and given the threat of a GST goods and services tax around the corner if the States fails to trim expenditure, I do not see free buses as an option. In fact, we have never had it with the transport strategy. We started with 50p and inflation has taken it a bit higher.

If we had more money, it would be great to have lower fares and if and when the economy improves I would support a relook at these fares, but we cannot subsidise the bus service any more than we are doing at the present. And people working in towns, sir, must not be discriminated against. It is against basic human rights to do so (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and would impact on the lowest paid. We have to be fair. We have to be equitable to all workers, no matter where they work in this Island; all the taxpayers alike, travelling and commuting to work. I call on Members to support this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Does anyone else wish to speak on the amendment?

Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you, sir.

Deputy Harwood made a passionate speech which may have convinced some of my colleagues, sir, but it certainly did not convince me. (*Laughter*) He said if we support this amendment then we would remove a plank from the very foundation of the strategy. He focused on a potential negative but did not focus on any positives and, as in every case, sir, there are positives and there are negatives.

I have already spoken against the transport strategy because it discriminates against the motorist. As Deputy De Lisle just said in his speech, sir, the motorist is being asked to pay for the whole strategy and that is discrimination. If that is not a prime example of discrimination then I do not know what is. And there is very little in the recommendations on offer in the transport strategy that the Environment Department could not do now. So why have they not done it? They are duty bound and they have failed. So, instead of doing the day job, they have presented us with a transport strategy when we already have a transport strategy.

Deputy Hadley: On a point of order, Mr Bailiff, aren't we straying away from the amendment?

The Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel, are you going to come back to the amendment?

Deputy Lester Queripel: Well, I thought I was on it, sir, but I will dispense with the next page of my speech and move back to the amendment.

But we are being asked to decide whether or not we agree with paid parking and a free bus service.

The Bailiff: Not on this amendment. (*Laughter*)

Deputy Lester Queripel: I thought I might stick that in without you noticing, sir.

But I made it clear I am totally opposed to a free bus service. I am totally opposed to paid parking because the motorist is already paying. The bus user already pays to use the bus and they accept they have to pay to use the bus and even the Bus Users Group do not want a free bus service. I was at the meeting of the Bus Users Group recently – as was Deputy Lowe and Deputy Gollop – and it was at that meeting that one of the members actually walked out in disgust and in protest, because the majority of the members present made it quite clear they were not in favour of either a free or fare-less bus service. I do not need to read a report of that meeting in the *Press*. I do not need to hear a report broadcast on the radio. I was there and I know what I heard and the person who walked out in disgust has already told the media why he walked out, so I am not revealing anything that was considered to be confidential.

To me, sir – to state the obvious – those who speak in favour of this amendment obviously see no merit whatsoever in introducing this transport strategy when we already have one and those who speak against this amendment obviously want to introduce the strategy, which will achieve very little except cause major inconvenience to the majority of our fellow islanders.

So I am going to support this amendment because it guarantees free travel for children under the age of 12, when accompanied by an adult; it guarantees free travel for all children travelling in term-time, in school uniform; it guarantees free travel for pensioners – which was very good news for our Age Concern Members, sir; it does not discriminate against tourists. (*Laughter*) Well, I agree it (**Deputy Ogier:** Terrorists?) should discriminate against terrorists, but I did not say 'terrorist', Deputy Ogier. I said 'tourists'. Am I making myself clear, Deputy Ogier? (*Laughter*) Visitors who are welcomed to the Island currently get discriminated against because they have to pay more to travel on a bus. I am wondering if I should repeat that, sir. I wonder if I have clarified the definition of the word 'tourist'.

I could not support Deputy St. Pier's amendment because it did not guarantee any of those and, of course – as other speakers have already pointed out – the additional benefit of supporting this amendment is that it benefits the taxpayer. It is a win, win amendment and, in my view, we really do need to support it.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Does anyone else wish to speak on the amendment?

Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: Sir, I will be very brief but – particularly after Deputy Harwood's Churchillian riposte earlier – I have not got a lot to add to that, but we should take note of his and also Deputy Ogier's rejoinder particularly, I think, when it comes to recognising the dangers of tinkering around at this stage with something that we have asked the Department to investigate. They have been instructed, they have obviously had deliberations sufficient that there have been two reports on it and we have, as Deputy Trott indicated, evidence in front of us.

In fact, in the Minority Report, from paragraph 76 to 94... several pages of evidence, as to why a bus service, which is free at point of use, at this juncture is the right way forward.

I hope that Members have taken the liberty of reading the reference of the Van Goeverden research, which, for me, was very convincing, but somehow I doubt it, because when Deputy Trott talks about evidence he conveniently speaks of one graph on page 646, but if you look below at graph 32 – the one below it – you will see that in the research done a significant number of people did not use the bus at all. So if you ask people who do not use the bus what they think about bus fares, it is not surprising that some will be very happy to pay whatever you like because they have no intention to do it.

The whole purpose of the proposals which are before us at the moment is to encourage people to think of alternatives to car transport. As I said yesterday, I know for one that I need that sort of encouragement and particularly because we have a situation where our public transport has deteriorated. It is that Jenga situation that Deputy Brehaut was talking about. Well, in fact, we are pretty good as an Assembly at deconstructing things. That is the way we are wired, but constructing things requires evidence-based... requires a small group to go away and that is what we have been presented with, evidence-based as to why at this particularly juncture – whether it is 50p or a £1 – I am against it.

I am against this Assembly setting those sort of prices. It really is micromanaging, when this Assembly used to set the price of milk. Come on. This is ridiculous. We cannot do it. We cannot have the information before us all the time, even if we spent all our time in here which would be only to discuss this, there are other issues that we need to discuss. Whilst I feel as passionately – well nearly as passionately – (*Laughter*) as Deputy Harwood, about this issue, I do believe there are other issues as well and that is why we construct ourselves in the way we do.

We have a Department that has given serious consideration to it. Both the Majority Report and the Minority Report came back with the same proposal for a free at use service. Let us not tinker around with it and, therefore, vote against this amendment.

The Bailiff: I see no one else rising.

Deputy Domaille, do you wish to reply before Deputy Brouard does so?

Deputy Domaille: Yes, sir.

Given the events of the last few days – I mean, the Majority Report, we have not debated; we are on the Minority Report – given the comments that have been made, given the various statements that have been made, I am really getting extremely concerned that we are going to be leaving today with nothing and I am getting very worried about that.

I have made my views known on paid parking – I simply do not support it. I have made my views known on free bus fares – I think they are a fundamental plank of the Majority strategy; I think they are a very fundamental plank of the Minority strategy. I have agonised over this over last night and I really do not think that the paid parking proposals are going to go through. I do not think they will go through and I do not think we will have that funding element in the Minority strategy.

So, as convinced as I am about free bus fares, this Assembly has voted *not* to have free bus fares. If this free bus fare goes through then, if Members look at page 774, in terms of the funding, what we would be left with is the first registration duty – which I made my views about how I thought that was too aggressive, but I am now saying I want to get a result out of today. So I can vote for those. That would give £3.15 million. That is the £4.15 less the £1 million. That £3.15 million, if you take out the free buses – which Members have already agreed to take out – then we have the expanded bus network – which I fully support; we have replaced the previous cut to the bus contract – I fully support that; we have the bus infrastructure improvements – I fully support that; we have the cycle infrastructure improvements; we have the pedestrian infrastructure improvements; we have the public round improvements; important that we have the disability

transport measures and – even though I spoke against them yesterday – we have the vehicle subsidies. Those total £2.25 million.

So, if this £1 fare is accepted – and I am still agonising over it, but I do have to do my job – then we will have more than sufficient funds to carry out that work. We will be able to improve the bus service, which is... That is my number one reason for being here, frankly. I want a better bus service. We could – even though I spoke against it yesterday – still do the bus depot because I would then be suggesting that the reduction in fuel duty does not take place. In other words, the 1.2p in fuel duty could stay, with £1 bus fare and we could carry out that work.

The problem with that is that the notion of a free bus fare and the selling of getting people onto the bus is fundamental to both strategies. Really what I am saying to Members is – and I am opposed to paid parking and I will oppose it – when you vote, think very carefully about that because, whilst the funds and the funding stack up – and I am tending to think, well that is the most pragmatic way forward on this, because I am extremely worried of going away from here today with nothing and I, for one, am really not prepared to carry on working with a bus service that I know is not fit for purpose... I am having to try and work within what we have got. Whilst we do disagree within the Environment Board, I think we are all agreed that the bus service has to be improved and I am just not prepared to go away from today unable to improve the bus service. So I just ask Members to think about that long and hard. If you are prepared to go with a free bus service then you will have to accept my opposition to the paid parking and I think that will fail. If you do not go for the free bus service, you have to accept that you are taking away the real kick start that this service needs and so, please, think very long and hard about it. I have and I have almost persuaded myself to vote for the £1 fare.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

I do not normally say this but thank you for the debate this time round. Normally we come to the States and we act out a theatre. We know where we are, we have got our speeches and we are prepared, but we are actually, really, today doing a real debate, with people really thinking on their feet and bringing things up. I think that is really very helpful.

Deputy Gollop, thank you for your support. The cruise ship passengers is an issue but I think the way to solve that is by the Environment Department proactively going to the cruise ship companies and setting up a package with either the bus company we have got or the other commercial activities in the Island and coming together and putting a package together for those cruise ship passengers at the front. Do not let them get as far as the bus terminus looking for the £1 ride around the Island. Catch them early with a proper comprehensive package... that you are going to see the aquarium or you are going to see Saumarez Park, or wherever it is you are going to take them, and have a package ready that is competitive and that makes it far more attractive than just sitting on the bus with the local people going round the edge of the Island. So I think that can be solved there.

Deputy Kuttelwascher, thank you for your support.

Deputy Harwood, you are saying that this is the nail in the coffin. I do not see it this way. I see it as the opposite. This is a helping hand because, if you have got that £8 charge, you are not going to get people on the buses. I will come to something else... I will jump to it now. I had not realised – and this is where Deputy Scott is saying, ‘Oh, you are picking at the edges. This is the whole beautifully-crafted, one package.’ It is not. It is not the Mona Lisa or some art treasure that you cannot touch. It is just a group of suggestions that may help us in our transport strategy. So, Deputy Scott, saying, ‘Don’t touch it, don’t touch it.’ And then you touch it and you think the £8 charge suddenly does not become for life, which I thought it was, it is now an annual charge.

I will give way to Deputy Scott.

Deputy Ogier: If it is an annual charge or if it is a lifetime charge I am not exactly sure, so please do not take me as an expert on it. Perhaps I can ask Deputy Burford to clarify whether it is annual or lifetime. I assumed it was annual but it may well be for the lifetime of the card.

Deputy Brouard: I am sorry. I thought Deputy Scott said it was an annual charge. I distinctly heard him say it was an annual charge.

Deputy Bebb: Point of order. I am sorry but I think that it is Deputy Ogier, not Deputy Scott.

Deputy Brouard: My apologies.

Deputy Ogier: I did say it was annual, but I am saying not to take my word on that level of detail.
 790 *(Laughter)* It may well be for the lifetime of the card. So I would just advise Deputy Brouard not to swivel his entire argument on the fact that I said it was an £8 annual charge.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

795 **Deputy Brouard:** Whatever way you cut it, sir, if it is going to be a charge for a family of four... It goes back to what Deputy Ogier was saying about people who may need the help of Social Security. If we are saying that the strategy is to give an alternative to the car but people still have cars, the Minority Report is going to hit that low income family with £1,200 to park on the Pier. Then that family is going to have that decision, do we use the bus today and it will be four of us, so do we pay the £32 up front on that first
 800 journey? It is not going to happen. That is why – going back to what Deputy Harwood was saying – my amendment the nail in the coffin or the killer blow... This is the breath of oxygen that this strategy needs, because you do not go on the bus judging the fare. What you are worried about is whether the bus is going to turn up. If you have got a doctor's appointment and you are seeing the specialist and you are down at PEH and you have got to get there for a certain time and that specialist is only over that day, you want to
 805 make sure that bus is going to get you there. You are not worried whether it is going to be £1 or 50p. That is not the issue. It is the reliability. You want the route to be able to get you there. If you are going into work and you are a middle employee, you are not concerned about the £1, you are concerned that you make sure you get to work on time, that you are not going to be sanctioned by your boss or something. You want that reliability. It is the service and the reliability and the routes; it is not the fare. So, Deputy Harwood, I see it a
 810 different way.

Deputy Jones, thank you very much indeed for your support.

Deputy Brehaut, again, we are removing something that had integrity. It is the opposite. I am giving you the integrity. This is not a game of Jenga. This is trying to build a strategy piece by piece. What Deputy
 815 Burford and yourself report to us is not a perfect model. Just as Deputy Ogier has then intimidated he does not know quite how it is going to work. Is it the fare this? Is it that? I thought it was going to be a full package, but it just shows there are cheats in the particular overall thing and I believe that having a £1 fare makes it a lot more easier for people to access the bus, if they so desire.

I do not think it is the detail. I think an £8 barrier is quite a heavy barrier. Again, you cannot have the cake and the bun. You cannot have your cake and eat it. You cannot say that the whole strategy is perfect
 820 and then say, 'Oh, by the way, one of the main things is the £8 charge,' and then say, 'Well, actually, we did not really think of that.' It is not that way. We are building together the best transport strategy we can with the money that we have got and the money we have got is not a lot and we are struggling in departments with our FTP and here is an opportunity... Okay, it may change a slight amount of people's choices, but I do not think it will. I think we will be able to get into the Treasury Revenue some money
 825 from those people who are actually using that service, because the bigger hurdle you throw away is this £8 gate to get in. It also then gives you the opportunity to have a really first rate school bus service and it also lets the kids, not only go on the school bus service but use the ordinary transport – the public system – as well.

Deputy Trott, thank you for the reality check. That is absolutely spot on. We could all pick and choose
 830 which little bits we want to take out, but when we go back to the evidence the price is not that sensitive.

Thank you, Deputy De Lisle. You very kindly mentioned the discriminatory £2 fares.

The bus fare system we are making today and that is in this amendment is better... If Deputy Domaille
 835 wants to take something away today that is better than the system we have got now, this is it. It is better for the school children; it is better for the tourists; it is better for us as a society and it means there are no big barriers for anybody to get on the bus. You do not have to suddenly pay £8 to get on the bus. You can just go on the bus. You can try it; see if it works for your family and I think another £32 per annum for a family of four is just another hurdle. I almost sometimes think perhaps you are trying to do it to make it so bad that actually we will not use the bus at all.

Deputy Lester Queripel is absolutely right: it is not for the motorist to pay for the whole strategy. Let us
 840 make it a little bit fair and even. We are saying it is not for just the Income Tax payers to pay for the whole of the States. Well, neither it is for the motorist to pay for all the transport.

Deputy Le Tocq said we are tinkering round the edges. Again, it is fundamentally different. I think we
 845 are actually building on what is being put forward. We are taking it apart and we are reconstructing it and what I am coming up with, I believe, is a far better thing. So, Deputy Domaille, please do not worry – this piece is a good piece; it is not going to affect people who are going to take the bus; it will make them have that opportunity to take the bus when, in fact, an £8 charge will just push them away before they even start.

Please vote for this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

850 **The Bailiff:** We vote, then, on the amendment proposed by Deputy Brouard, seconded by Deputy De Lisle. We will have a recorded vote.

There was a recorded vote

855 *Amendment by Deputies Brouard and De Lisle:
Not carried – Pour 19, Contre 28, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 0*

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

860 **Deputy St. Pier:** Sir, whilst we are waiting for the vote, could I perhaps suggest that the Fallaize amendment is taken next.

865 **The Bailiff:** That was what I was going to propose as, while we are debating bus fares, it seems the logical place to debate it. So the amendment proposed by Deputy Fallaize, seconded by Deputy Le Tocq – it has been circulated during the course of the morning – is the one that I propose you take next, just after I have announced the result of the vote, which I am about to do on the Deputy Brouard, Deputy De Lisle amendment. There were 19 votes in favour; 28 against. I declare the amendment lost.

So, Deputy Fallaize, for the benefit for people listening at home, perhaps you would like to give an explanation at the outset of what the effect of this amendment is.

870 **Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.
Well, shall I read it, sir? Will that be helpful?

The Bailiff: Well, except, in reading it, it refers then to paragraphs in the Minority Report that people may not have access to. But whatever you think is most helpful to you.

875 *Amendment:
To delete Proposition 13 and substitute therefor:*

'13. To approve for a period of 18 months the policies in respect of the costs of bus travel as set out at paragraphs 85 and 87 of that Minority Report, including the policy that bus travel will be free at the point of use, provided that there shall be a presumption that at the expiration of that period of 18 months a fare structure shall be introduced along the lines set out in the amendment proposed by Deputy G A St Pier and seconded by Deputy P A Luxon in respect of Article 6 on Billet d'État IX of 2014, unless before then the States have resolved to maintain bus travel free at the point of use following consideration of a report from the Environment Department setting out a case to justify the policy of fares free at the point of use based on the impact of that policy on the number of bus passengers and the performance of the bus service generally.'

Deputy Fallaize: Well, I will leave those bits out.
The amendment, essentially reads:

“To delete Proposition 13 and substitute, therefor:

“13. To approve for a period of 18 months policies in respect of the costs of bus travel as set out... [in the] Minority Report, including the policy that bus travel will be free at the point of use, provided that there shall be a presumption that at the expiration of the period of 18 months a fare structure shall be introduced along the lines set out in the amendment proposed by Deputy G A St. Pier and Deputy Luxon...”

– yesterday –

“...unless before then the States have resolved to maintain bus travel free at the point of use following consideration of a report from the Environment Department setting out a case to justify that policy... based on the impact... on the number of bus passengers and the performance of the bus service generally.”

880

Sir, previous States – to put it politely – have not always covered themselves in glory when trying to construct road transport strategies and they say that history repeats itself first as tragedy and second as farce and it does feel as if we are taking that journey, or it has since 5 o’clock yesterday afternoon.

885

Throughout debate on Wednesday and most of yesterday, the approach of the present States felt very different to the approach of previous States. Much of the debate had recognised the need for an on-island transport policy which, above all else, was integrated. Then late yesterday afternoon, suddenly and possibly unintentionally, we became busily engaged in dissecting and risking the disintegration of a previously integrated set of proposals.

890

Sir, I was fortified in that view when, upon leaving this place, I saw that the broadest smiles were being worn by those Members who in debate over the previous two days have been calling, quite openly, for the wholesale rejection of almost everything in both the Majority and Minority Reports and I do not blame them. Believe me, their goal is now within touching distance.

895

The amendment last night was carried by a coalition of some States’ Members who are very strongly committed to a transport strategy and we have just heard from Members telling us that to park free in town is a human right. Deputy Brouard has just laid an amendment in which he is talking about positive rates for bus fares being ‘the oxygen needed to breathe life into this strategy’. For 48 hours, he concluded every speech he made by imploring the States, when we vote on the substantive Propositions, to throw out the whole lot!

900

Sir, this amendment is an attempt – imperfectly, perhaps – to create a coalition between what I believe to be the majority of Members in the States who want to see a progressive and sustainable on-Island road transport strategy. The question now is whether those Members who are committed to agreeing an integrated policy can reach a pragmatic compromise on the policy to be adopted with respect to bus fares.

905

I am hoping that this amendment represents that pragmatic compromise. It is kindly seconded by the Chief Minister and I am hopeful that it reaches a pragmatic compromise, because it is to be supported by Deputies St. Pier and Deputy Luxon who were the proposer and seconder of last night’s amendment.

I understand the concerns which persuaded them to lay their amendment yesterday. I will go into some of this in a moment, but the unintended consequence of their amendment is likely to be the wholesale rejection of an integrated transport strategy.

910

Some Members have emphasised the *quid pro quo* or carrots and sticks, where, undoubtedly, the greatest carrot is, or was, a bus service free at the point of use. Other Members are concerned about the income foregone by reducing fares to zero and by the untested nature of such a scheme locally. Both arguments have merit. Neither is wrong but, if the Members who hold those two slightly different views remain in different camps, opposing each other – as occurred when we voted on the St. Pier/Luxon amendment last night – all they are going to achieve, with respect, is the defeat of each other and the greater prize of an integrated transport strategy will remain elusive.

915

Some Members’ preference is for a bus service free at the point of use, permanently. In laying this amendment, I am asking them to compromise. Some Members’ preference is for a bus service with comparatively inexpensive fares but not zero and, in laying this amendment, I am asking them to compromise. This amendment provides for the *quid pro quo*. The carrot of a bus service, free at the point of use but qualified, limited, because it maintains the presumption that, after the period of 18 months, we will adopt the fare structure which the States agreed to – albeit by one vote – yesterday in supporting Deputy St. Pier’s amendment. But it does allow the Environment Department, before the end of that 18-month period, to return to the States and to set out a case – if they believe there is one – for the continuation of free fares, not based on intuition, but based on the experience of passenger numbers and the experience of the service locally during that period of 12 months or 15 months. We will have a much better chance at that point of making an evidence-based decision. We will not find ourselves here, trying to guess – based on nothing much more than intuition – whether it ought to be 20p or 40p or 50p or £1. We will have the data in front of us based on 12 months or 15 months, perhaps, of bus travel free at the point of use.

925

Sir, the amendment which was approved last night did not include pensioners. As things stand, our new transport strategy, which aims to encourage the use of transport other than motor vehicles, includes a policy, on day one, of increasing bus fares to all pensioners. That is a policy that we have inserted as a result of the vote on the amendment last night and this amendment addresses that. The difference in income foregone between this amendment and Deputy St. Pier's amendment last night is likely to be around £200,000.

Deputy Ogier made this point about the use of taxpayers' money and Deputy De Lisle said a free bus service is unaffordable. What is unaffordable is pumping millions and millions of pounds into a bus service which is like a hole in the ground! We, at the moment, are pumping millions of pounds into a service and passenger numbers are going down. What on earth do we want to maintain that policy for? Are we going to leave here today and say we have agreed to new transport policy over the next 10 years? Actually, we are not going to pump, perhaps, £25 million into a bus service, we are going to pump £30 million or £40 million into a bus service. And passenger numbers are likely to continue going down. That is not a sensible transport policy. That is not value for taxpayers' money.

It was a key policy. Deputy Domaille called it 'fundamental' 15 minutes ago. A fundamental part of the Minority Report and the Majority Report was the free bus service – an absolutely key plank of the policy. In fact, it was, really, the substantial carrot in there. It is alright talking about making cycle lanes better and all those sorts of things. Those are very peripheral things. If we want to make a big difference we need a big carrot and that was the big carrot and we have taken it out and it was based – that carrot – on the States' Policy and Research Unit finding that there was a fairly strong correlation between bus fares and bus passenger journeys.

A key point that was made in debate yesterday by the seconder of this amendment, the Chief Minister, was that there is and there has been for some time – I am paraphrasing, admittedly – a crisis of confidence in Guernsey's bus service. It is that crisis of confidence which the Majority Report and the Minority Report were trying to tackle with a fare-less bus service.

We can convince ourselves in here that it does not matter too much whether it is 50p or £1. We can convince ourselves – sat here, as the armchair bus passenger – of the merit of a bus service, but we have got to articulate that to the public. We have to sell to the public a compelling case for changing their transport choices and, in terms of articulating that policy on which the integrated transport strategy is based and winning that argument publicly, a zero fare service makes a very significant contribution. That is what the Environment Department – whether the Majority Report or the Minority Report are approved – were intending to do: to put that at the centrepiece of publicising and articulating, publicly, their new transport strategy – a bus service free at the point of use. We ripped that to pieces last night.

Yesterday morning, we inserted a series of bigger sticks than we started with. Bigger sticks on vehicles emissions, bigger sticks on the width of vehicles, bigger sticks on parking and, in the afternoon, we took away the one substantial tasty carrot which the balance of sticks and carrots had been constructed upon in the first place. We did have a compelling case: additional charges for actions, which we considered worthy of being discouraged but, in return, a bus service free at the point of use. A compelling case to say to people, 'We are introducing these charges, but you can avoid them by using public transport. You can avoid the charges altogether by using public transport.' That was the compelling case, to sell to the public for this new transport strategy.

As things stand, we have thrown away that compelling case. The case now, as it stands, is that we are going to impose a series of bigger sticks on people and we are going to take bus fares back to where they were in 2010. Wow! That is the policy, as it stands. That is the transport policy, as it stands. It is a total and utter waste of time.

Deputy Ogier is right: this is about the power of the message, the power of the States to be able to articulate and make the case for a new transport strategy and it relies upon a bus service free at the point of use, at least at the beginning because you have to try to encourage people onto the service.

Deputy Domaille went through the money that would be left in various permutations of votes and he talked about the importance of having money to invest in the bus service. He is right, but it would be throwing good money after bad if we do not encourage a sufficient number of people to change their transport choices and, if we leave here today, just hitting people over the head with bigger and bigger sticks and do not put in substantial carrots, we have got no chance. This simply turns itself into a revenue raising strategy. I am tempted to say, if that is where we are headed, we should throw the whole lot out and wait for the Tax and Benefits Revenue, because we have turned the whole thing into a revenue-raising initiative without any substantial carrots and the people who never wanted this transport strategy in the first place get exactly what they want.

Sir, I do not want to labour the point about the history of on-Island transport policies, but it is relevant because we might as well be back in 2003 or back in 2006. We are painfully dissecting something which was integrated and is now at very real risk of disintegrating, and I think it reflects very badly on the ability of the States to govern and to put in place sustainable and integrated policy.

As I say, this is a pragmatic compromise. It does not mean that we have permanently free fares. It does mean that the onus is on those who believe in free fares, in the long run, to make the case for those free fares; otherwise, we will adopt the fare structure, as set out in Deputy St. Pier's amendment last night. This puts the onus on the people who want free fares in the long run, but it does mean that they can have some evidence to use. It will give the Department 12 or 15 months to monitor bus passenger numbers.

Sir, I hope that this amendment will be supported by the 23 Members who, yesterday, voted against Deputy St. Pier's amendment, by the authors of the Minority Report – the central plank of their policy was a free bus service – and by the authors of the Majority Report who, 48 hours ago, laid a report before the States, which had a fare-less service absolutely at its heart.

There is no reason whatsoever for those Members not to support this amendment, because it takes us back to where they were. It retains the flagship policy of fares free at the point of use. We are not talking about paid parking in this amendment, we are talking about what our bus fare policy is and the Environment Department – all five of them – came in to this debate with a policy for a free bus service. I am asking them to stick to that position. That is the point: free at the point of use was one of two or three flagship policies in both reports; it was what the whole thing was built on; it is the *quid pro quo* that this integrated policy is meant to be established on.

So, sir, having managed to construct an amendment, with the support of the Chief Minister and with the support of Deputy St. Pier and with the support of Deputy Luxon and with the support of the authors of the Minority Report, I would ask those Members who do believe that we need some measure of change in our transport strategy, who do believe in an integrated strategy, to join together when voting on this amendment and to establish a policy of a service, free at the point of use, for 18 months, after which we can see real live Guernsey data and then set a long-term pricing policy.

Thank you, sir.

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

Deputy Le Tocq: I do, sir.

The Bailiff: I call Deputy St. Pier, then Deputy Trott and Deputy Dave Jones.

Deputy St. Pier: Sir, Deputy Brehaut has referred a number of times – and a number of people have referred – to playing policy Jenga. As an aside, I suspect that the Treasury and Resources Board and the Social Security Department will be playing in aid of that when they come back to present the Personal Tax, Pensions and Benefits Review.

Picking up on a comment made by Deputy Domaille in his closing on the previous amendment, I feel, sir, that the bigger barrier to the adoption of the transport strategy we have before us and the more important vote, actually is on Proposition 5 – on paid parking – and I think, to some extent, this discussion in relation to bus fares is a little bit of a distraction, because without paid parking then the whole strategy does indeed fall.

I spoke, yesterday, about buses being at the core of the strategy. Deputy Domaille referred to them as being the central plank. Deputy Harwood has referred to the integrity of the strategy being dependent on buses. But, despite Deputy Fallaize's speech just now, I remain of the view – as I was yesterday – that free buses are not at the core of the strategy. Frequent bus services are at the core of the strategy, reliable bus services are at the core of the strategy and a decent bus route network is at the core of the strategy.

There was – as I referred to yesterday – some hyperbole. I think Deputy Ogier referred to 'political vandalism'. He has not said it yet this morning but, again, in the debate on the previous amendment that there were some who wanted to make sure that it fails. I appreciate his recognition, but that, certainly, was not my intention and I remain of the view that the strategy would be no less integrated with a modest bus fare.

I know it was only in jest, but we even came dangerously close to a comparison with fascist Germany and I was very pleased to clarify with Deputy Wilkie that it was just reference to the Weimar Republic.

Deputy Ogier: I was only 10 years out, sir, and I did actually think it was 1920, but I could not remember.

Deputy St. Pier: It was only in jest anyway.

Deputy Le Lièvre did passionately, though, refer to the... that the free buses were the *quid pro quo* for paid parking. Indeed, Deputy Harwood referred, equally passionately, to that this morning and Deputy Fallaize has used the same term – 'It is the *quid pro quo*'. Again, I would say and suggest, respectfully, to them that the *quid pro quo* should be a frequent, reliable bus service with a decent network.

1050 So, for me, I think that the 50p suggestion – which was a compromise from the current fare structure I
felt, what was on the back of a belief that price is not a barrier, based on the evidence, some of which
Deputy Trott has referred to – but it was a compromise to signal the change that others had referred to, to
signal the need for change and that was why I voted against the Deputy Brouard amendment. I can see
1055 attractions in retaining a modest fee. It does maintain the transport hierarchy which, again, Deputy Trott
referred to yesterday and I referred to in my closing comments on my own amendment. It would also allow
additional incentives to be created at some point. So, for example, if somebody were to pay to park for
more than eight hours, you could give them a free bus ticket to use within the next month or some such
incentive, so that they may be incentivised to switch their mode of transport.

1060 Deputy Fallaize referred to this further amendment as being a pragmatic compromise. In my opening
comments yesterday, I said that this felt like a £3 million experiment and it was one that I simply could not
support, given the free buses was a £3 million experiment, which I felt unable to support, given the amount
of public money that was already going to the buses. Hence my suggestion of what I thought was a
compromise. But this further amendment, I think, as Deputy Fallaize has said, does ensure that the
1065 experiment is capped. It is capped in terms of time and it does require that evidence is produced before the
policy is embedded forever and a day and it is for that reason it does address my key concerns and I am
content to support the amendment, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

1070 **Deputy Trott:** Sir, I love this place. I really do. I find it one of the most fascinating environments. Let
us just look at what we are tempted to do here and let us put ourselves in the hands of our media and/or
electorate.

We came in yesterday with a proposal from the Environment Department, which was chucked down in
favour of a Minority Report and, as a result of that, we started debating a raft of amendments and one of
1075 them was to move from a free bus service to introducing a 50p fare. During that time, my good friend,
Deputy Fallaize, told us it would be bonkers to set bus fares on the floor of this Assembly and the Chief
Minister, who seconded this amendment, said, ‘We used to set the price of milk on this Assembly. Absolute
madness.’ And now here we are with an amendment from at least two Deputies, asking us to scrap the
previous decision of 50p to go back to a free one but maybe not indefinitely, because we are also, then,
1080 going to have a Proposition brought back in front of us so we can debate the price of bus fares again! And
the reason I stand, sir, is not because I disagree with anything that the Treasury Minister has said, it is
because it is this type of hypocrisy that brings this place into disrepute. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

The Bailiff: Deputy Dave Jones.

1085 **Deputy David Jones:** I think Deputy Trott has stolen some of my thunder, because I was incredulous
listening to – incredulous; it is a new word I learned some time ago – Deputy Fallaize’s speech, because he
talks about political manoeuvring and this is not right and we should not be doing any of this and then
produces an amendment which does exactly that.

1090 We made a decision last night about bus fares. We chose to adopt the Treasury’s quite sensible position
that nothing in life is for free and the bus users need to contribute something at least to that improved bus
service. I felt passionately about having a bus service. I stand shoulder to shoulder with the Environment
Minister in making sure that we have a bus service that is fit for purpose. Chuck the rest of it out, because I
am only interested in that bus service. I am determined to make a speech later, which you will love.

1095 He said, ‘We have to sell this to the public. We are here to govern.’ The public have already made clear
two things. They do not want paid parking, so we are ramming that down their throats. We are saying, ‘We
are determined to make you have it’ even though the public have decided, by surveys, that they do not want
it, but then you have the audacity to say, ‘But, of course, we are here to sell it to them. They do not want it.’
Then, when it comes to making sure that the bus service is sustainable, by at least having some minimal
1100 charge that makes that more likely than less likely, you say, ‘Well, it should be free, because that is the
carrot and, somehow, this big, bad bunny rabbit has jumped out the hat and ate the carrot and there is
nothing left.’ It is a nonsense. It is a complete nonsense.

I agree with others who said, ‘This Minority Report is not the Holy Grail; it is a group of well thought
out proposals’ – that I disagree with, but they are well thought out and a lot of time has been spent putting
1105 them together – ‘that have been presented to the States as an alternative to the Environment report,’ at
which the States decided, yesterday, to run with. But they keep coming back saying, ‘Well, you got it
wrong yesterday’, reminds me of somebody else who use to lecture us for hours on end about how we keep
getting it wrong and they kept bringing back to the States until we got it right. It almost like the EU. If you
do not get the vote you want, keep asking the question until you get the answer you want. And this
1110 amendment does exactly that.

We made a decision last night. We are now here wasting even more time this morning, by going back over an amendment to try and get the original position in place for the free bus service and it will bring in no more money for the running of this bus service but, of course, Deputy Fallaize and those who wanted a free bus service will revert us back to that position.

1115 Throw this amendment out and, please, can we get on to general debate and the issue of voting on the Propositions.

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

1120 **Deputy Hadley:** One of the things I have been criticised for in the past is being too passionate and so it is with some amusement today that I listen to the two former Chief Ministers getting more passionate than I have ever seen either of them before.

I had not been in this Assembly very long before it was made clear to me that I did not understand Guernsey politics and that we are all Members of the Government and that the success of this Assembly is in our ability to compromise and to reach consensus decisions. Here we have our Housing Minister telling
1125 us that we cannot compromise, we have got to kick out this Resolution.

To my mind, this is an excellent compromise (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) that we all should be able to sign up to and it then avoids us making ourselves look really silly by leaving this session of Parliament with no strategy at all. That will really damage our reputation.

1130 So I think we should all sign up to this amendment in the spirit with which we normally reach decisions.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

1135 This is not a compromise by any stretch of the imagination. This is a very clever ploy, by a very clever politician. This is a Trojan Horse, sir. It is coming to do its job and it comes galloping over and to the sigh of relief by the Minority support viewers or hopers that this is going to save their bacon. This is shallow.

This is so shallow, because you claim that you are now going to have an evidence-based decision-making system coming into place that is going to solve it all in 18 months' time, but you then choose to put
1140 your eye patch on, when you look down at the 20 pages of evidence that are already there and all the statistics that people have already gathered.

Now I am accused of breathing life into the Minority Report almost, but I do because a £1 fee or a 50p fee is more likely for someone to get on the bus than if they have an £8 barrier and I think we will just be putting more and more money into a system that, unfortunately, our people will not be able to use. And it
1145 misses the whole point and – as the Treasury Minister said and I have said as well and everybody else – it is the reliability and route, not the pricing.

So I come, very quickly, to one question to Deputy Fallaize. We are now 18 months down the road. We have had the report and let us just say it says that passenger numbers have gone up. Is Deputy Fallaize going to push the button to put the 50p fee up? Or, we are 18 months down the road and bus usage numbers
1150 have gone down. Are we going to push the button to have the 50p? Because it makes no difference. It just kicks the can down the road. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) It just makes it look all wrapped up in umpteen words on here. It means absolutely nothing because you are not going to be in a better position in 18 months' time, whether or not you shall have a 50p bus, because you will have the same arguments again. 'Well, if you put it up now to 50p, we are going to stop the numbers of passengers rising' or 'If you put the
1155 50p in now, you are going to make the numbers fall.' You cannot have it both ways.

So, please, be absolutely clear to me, when you sum up, exactly what you will do (**The Bailiff:** Through the Chair.) with the data if it is showing an increase and if it is showing a decrease. When will you push the button to have the 50p?

Thank you, sir.

1160

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Sir, I know that sometimes I feel like the proud mummy who says about the little boy walking along, 'Oh, they are all marching out of step, except for my Johnny who is marching in step.' But,
1165 when I look at the extraordinary events, like Deputy Trott, of the last few days, at lunchtime we voted for free buses, by teatime, we had not only voted to restore the policies of a decade earlier, but we actually took away, by my understanding, the old people's concession. So, it is utterly absurd.

Today, I voted for Deputy Brouard's amendment that puts the old people's concession back and makes children free, for the most part, and one gets a bit chastised for that. But, actually, I respect the spirit of
1170 compromise and I will support this amendment, because it is good to see several of the leading Ministers on board.

I did not support everything Deputy Fallaize said in his speech. It is a classic case of pot calling the kettle black here, but the longer you go on, the more things you say that can irritate people. (*Laughter*) The shorter the speech, the better – as Deputy Green always says and he is often right.

Because Deputy Fallaize's... the first half of his speech was absolutely excellent. It rightly pointed out the strategic necessity of coming out with a coherent, integrated approach and of working in a way that is progressive.

The second half brought up, a few times, this issue that we are wasting money; the black hole is the drain, that you are putting money into the bus company for. I do not accept that. The bus company, in its existing mode, already has functions that the Island has to have: transport for schools and students, which is a necessity; transport for tourists, which benefits the Commerce and Employment, Culture and Leisure economy and transport for the 8,000 people, that Deputy Burford referred to, who we need to socially include.

Deputy Fallaize, in his speech, mentioned armchair bus travellers in the States. Well, I am not really an armchair traveller; I am an actual, real traveller, to a degree, and I think we will need to sustain the bus service at the current levels of finance or indeed greater, to provide a better service for those people without cars. That is surely a major asset for social policy.

The arguments Deputy Fallaize and Deputy Burford have raised, that the money could be better value for money if instead of six people on a bus, you had 16, because it was more appealing on a marginal choice level to current motorists. Clearly, if more people used the buses it would benefit congestion and society as a whole and I think there is a coalition here between people who regard the buses as a social and current travel service – like the Bus Users Group – and, as Deputy Darren Duquemin said yesterday, the none bus users; that, in a way, the strategies and Deputy Fallaize's amendment is more targeted at, because success or failure in those terms depends on rising numbers, based upon the choice being a valid one.

Well, I can accept that. I think the experiment will be useful. I think we should get behind this now, rather than the mixed messages of yesterday and, although I have minor operational quibbles about the £8 card, I think they can be sorted out by liaison with the Department and I think we should move on and vote for this before lunch.

The Bailiff: Deputy De Lisle and Deputy Lowe.

Deputy De Lisle: Yes, sir, I just cannot see how we can afford a free bus service – particularly with the fact that economic circumstances have changed, with the Island running a very significant budget deficit and we, here, are pouring in some of our savings to support that and I am very concerned, sir, of the threat behind the economic realities of a good civil services tax around the corner and I think we have got to realise that all we are doing is pushing ourselves toward that end, if we are not careful.

I do not believe that people will object to a 50p fare on the buses which, of course, with multiple journey card discounts, can be a lot less than that, for people that are travelling regularly. So I do not think people will object to that.

Of course, it does not prevent the Department from holding a free day now and again, if they want to market and promote the system. That is something that was done very early by myself. Of course, I got into a bit of trouble with my board over it, but the fact was that one can promote a free day now and again, in order to entice people onto the bus service – and it works. So I would like to suggest here and now that we throw out this amendment and stick to the 50p fare and, perhaps, introduce now and again, an enticement, if you like, in terms of a free day.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe, followed by Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

I certainly was not part of any coalition. I have not supported the Minority Report, because I do not agree with paid parking and it was sold to this States as, 'You have to take it as a package' and paid parking was part of it, to fund the rest of the strategy. There is quite a lot in here that I actually agree with, but it had to be a package and so therefore I cannot support the Minority Report.

But this amendment is rather clever, really, because Members, if they approve this and we go further on during the debate, are going to be pressured, through a motion, that they are going to have to support paid parking, whether they wanted to or not. Because, to approve this amendment, you are wanting to delay for 18 months, whenever it starts – and again I look forward to the Minister of the Environment Department informing us when all these policies will actually start, because we could be talking two or three years away. I do not know. When we are we talking about? But it does say you have to look at all the policies, to the encouragement to get people on the bus – which will be the paid parking, it will be the cycle paths, it will

be all the measures that are in here and there are many of them; an awful lot of them. A lot of them are to be commended.

1235 But all of that has to be in place as part of this strategy before you can have real accurate data to see if it is working or not. Because you cannot just put on the free bus for 18 months without all the other things put in place. So how long is it going to take? The Minister said yesterday, and made it very clear to Members – whether they were listening or not, it is a case of whether they heard or wanted to hear – that it was going to take a long time to implement because they do not have the resources, it is going to cost an awful lot of money and it will not happen overnight. So, on being told that yesterday, this amendment is reliant on all of that being in place, before you have got accurate data.

1240 So even if you had that in place now, even if some magic fairy came to Roger Domaille – and the mind boggles on that one actually. I probably should use some other terminology – (*Laughter*) but if somebody came along with a nice cheque to Deputy Domaille and said, ‘There you go. You can put all that in place and it will be in place and it does not take long to do. It will be in place within a few weeks.’ You can then have a true 18 months of knowing how this will work or not.

1245 Under this amendment, you will not. You will not know for quite some foreseeable time. It will be the next election before you actually know, so you can, actually, hide behind this if we are not actually going forward really, with any accurate data or knowing if it works or it does not work – because I cannot see that happening in the next two years – for all the work that is required to fulfil the strategy that is in place here.

1250 But in the meantime some Members said yesterday... and I think that is where some of the upset came after that vote, because there were many Members that stood up and said, they supported the Minority Report, but not all of it and what a good report it was. There were some that said they did not support paid parking, even though they were told part of the Minority Report was reliant on the paid parking, but they still supported the Minority Report and they say they are going to take a separate vote under 5 and they will reject that part. So if you have got a scenario at the end of this, if this amendment is approved, there may be some who will still – and it may be the majority vote against paid parking. And this amendment, if it is successful, you have got 18 months. So you have got 18 months of no money coming in from paid parking and you have got 18 months of no 50p coming in to contribute even a smidgen of money for the bus service, for the Environment Department to be able to operate. You will have a bigger drain and a bigger black hole for the bus service than what you have got now and yet that is supported by the Minister of Treasury and Resources. It is just staggeringly unbelievable.

1260 We have, here, some way of going forward on a bus service, which we are all... Most of us are realistic. You may get some more that will go on the bus, but you are not going to get many more going on the bus. All you are going to do, I suggest, with your paid parking, is cause more problems and more people are going to have the choice of selling their car to be able to go and use the bus service, because they will not be able to afford paid parking that is going to exist. And anybody that wants to close their ears to that, of how people are struggling now and families are struggling or people that have not even got families, that are struggling now financially, are going to be hit very hard by the paid parking. But that is okay because, ‘We do not worry about those. They can go on the bus. It does not matter about them. They can go on the bus. We are okay. We have got a car. We can afford to run a car. That is alright.’ Most of the people in here have got even more than one vehicle, but that does not matter. ‘We are okay.’ There are many in our community who are going struggle over this and we are just picking out a few who happen to be coming into town to park. As I said yesterday, those people who we are hitting are parking before 8 o’clock, before the congestion even starts, because where the congestion starts is after 8 o’clock and those Piers and the North Beach and the Odeon Car Park, they are all full. So it is not from there. It is people going in to the places that are paid for within their workplace and, yet, they will still be okay. It is either about congestion or it is not about congestion and it is either about getting people onto buses or not onto buses. But it should not be part of paid parking. That is where I differ completely over this here.

1275 So I say to Members, think very carefully over this one because this is a clever move. This is a move that if you support this, you are going to have a huge amount of pressure on you – those that are against paid parking – that, unless you vote for paid parking, you will have more than 18 months of no money coming in the pot, because you have stopped the 50p and you did not have even paid parking.

1280 So where is the magic fairy coming to help the Environment Department on this absolute mess that you have got in front of you today? You made the decision yesterday. You want to stick with it and move on and that is democracy and, if this goes through, that is democracy but it will not be a very good way of going forward with no money in the pot whatsoever.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey and then Deputy Brehaut, Deputy Storey, Deputy Lester Queripel.

1290 **Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I would like to make it clear that I support paid parking. So I believe there has to be a balance that everybody needs to contribute towards our transportation strategy and I would ask Members to turn to page

774 of the Billet and table 3, because I think there have been a lot of erroneous messages given out by Members in terms of what is the key part of the strategy. Because the key part in the strategy is the first registration duty, which will generate £4.15 million. That is the key part.

But then, if you look on the expenditure side: expand the bus network – £300,000; replace previous cuts to bus contract – £400,000; bus infrastructure – £150,000; cycle infrastructure – £420,000; pedestrian infrastructure – £330,000; public realm improvements – £200,000. I could go on.

So the message I am trying to say is that there is considerable money going to go into expanding the bus network and I think that is the key to making the bus network attractive to people. I do not believe that making it free will make it more attractive to people than charging 50p.

As I mentioned yesterday, Deputy Perrot said we need a first class bus service and the most important thing is that we have the money to be able to make a first class bus service. And I think that you have to be fair. I think that the users of the bus service have to make some contribution towards it. We are increasing the expenditure on the bus service. We are already putting in a very large subsidy. With this policy, we are going to increase the amount of money going to the bus service, even more. I think there has to be some pay back from those people... that they make a contribution. So that is one of the reasons why I supported the St. Pier amendment yesterday.

I think Deputy Fallaize, at the beginning of his speech, said ‘There is a crisis of confidence in the bus service.’ That crisis of confidence is the deterioration of the quality of the bus service and what this is doing is reversing that deterioration and doing the improvement. That is what will make the difference. I do not believe the free bus... making it free will make the difference.

He mentioned in his speech about £200,000. I would ask him to explain how he gets that £200,000. I took the St. Pier amendment... roughly half the existing bus fares. On page 774, it says that, ‘free buses will forego £1 million.’ So I took it that we foregoed £½ million, by putting it half way between the existing bus fares and free. So, by running it for 18 months on free, I think you are £750,000, not £200,000, which is what he said. Perhaps he could explain to me why he came to that £200,000, because I cannot.

The final thing is, the points I made yesterday about the £8 swipe card, that will still exist with this amendment because it refers to paragraph 85, which includes the £8 swipe card. So I do not understand and I thought the debate yesterday accepted that the £8 swipe card is not going to encourage tourists, it is not going to encourage cruise people to use the bus service. So I think, actually, this amendment is not going to achieve what it wants to do and I ask you to reject this amendment, go back to what we decided yesterday – which I think is a fair compromise between the contribution the motorist makes and the contribution that the bus user makes – with the improvements in the bus service, as outlined in the Minority Report. So please reject this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

Deputy Brouard said, ‘It is an attempt to save our bacon.’ It is not an attempt to save our bacon. It is an attempt to save the reputation – the collective reputation – of this Assembly.

The idea that this is such an elaborate, cunning plan... and I realise, listening to Deputy Lowe, I think she is a bit concerned by this amendment and that we could end up with a strategy. If you support this amendment, be careful – you might just end up with a strategy (*Laughter*) which... people do not want this strategy. They want to walk out of this Assembly later today or, perhaps, early next month and say to people, ‘I told them. They would not listen to me. There is not a problem with traffic. And we have wasted days of debate and, again, the States cannot make up their mind.’ That is what – and Deputy Lowe is nodding. That is what Deputy Lowe... that is her choice; that is her preference.

Again, there is the ‘us’ and there is the ‘them’. The ‘us’ are those who charge you. Those are the wicked ones. They want to take your money. They want to charge you for everything. We do not need to pay to park. There is not the traffic. And, do you know, they want to squeeze very penny out of you. That is ‘us’ and then there is the ‘them’, of course. There are those who... ‘We do not want to do that’ and loathe any charging and, ‘I do not want to put any charge on the community and I would never consider putting a charge on the community.’

I did hear from the Housing Minister – and I do point out to Deputy Jones – the sole signatory of the letter from the Housing Department is actually supportive and acknowledges that you need incentives and disincentives. When Housing had to face their own demons – they had to face their own demons on fees and charges – what did they do? They charged the people of this community; they levelled charges for nine months licences; they levelled charges for Right to Work.

So we all face these obstacles and problems, but it makes some Members very uncomfortable, so they have to step aside from the Assembly; they do not want to be part of it.

I think it was Disraeli who said, if I am correct – (Deputy David Jones: Sir –) He said – I will give way because there is always entertainment value. (*Laughter*)

1355 **Deputy David Jones:** On a point of order, that is exactly what I am asking for the bus users to be charged. (*Laughter*)

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

1360 **Deputy Brehaut:** No, no, no. There is charge and there is cost. And the cost to this community – (*Interjections*) No, well the cost to the community of a perpetually failing bus service is something that I do not want to face and I know, for those who do not want this strategy, it is all sort of falling into place nicely at the moment and they want to build on the theme and they sense they can take a few more Members with them.

1365 I think it was Disraeli who used the phrase, ‘I am your leader. I will follow you.’ That is what we hear more and more of in this Assembly. ‘I am an elected representative of the community. Put me in there to lead. By the way, what is it exactly that you want? If it gets a bit tricky, then I probably will not do it. I probably will not face up to that decision.’

1370 It would the Groundhog Day of all Groundhog Days, if we do not support this amendment and then we end up, for Heaven’s sake, without another transport strategy. And, surely, the fact that the authors of the last amendment – sorry, the bus fare amendment, if I could put it that way; the 50p – support this amendment and realise the sense and logic in this amendment.

1375 So do not, please, take us to that wretched moment where we could leave this Assembly, again – I know it is only to debate, that 30 to 17 that acknowledged what a great piece of work the Minority Report was. Let us get it in front of us. To then start to dismember it is just really too much, because we will end up with nothing and I know that some of you in this Assembly want nothing. I understand that and I wonder just why that is.

Thank you.

1380 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Storey.

Deputy Storey: Thank you, sir.

I have been listening to the debate and I have had to respond by scribbling some notes down on my little note pad here, because I cannot believe a lot of what I have been hearing.

1385 The point, sir, surely is that we need an integrated public transport policy. The States, several years ago, acknowledged that and charged the Environment Department with coming back to this Assembly with an integrated policy. And here we are discussing little bits and pieces. ‘Oh, well, we will chuck that out.’ ‘We do not like that.’ ‘We will change that a bit, because it is a bit too much this way or that way.’ Well, let us face it, really, a lot of time and effort has been put into preparing the policy – or both policies, but we are just talking about the minority policy at the moment – and it has been shown to be self-funding. So, all this business about, ‘We cannot afford this. We cannot afford that.’ Well, we are not talking about whether we can afford it, we are talking about whether we can afford to forego part of what the policy is suggesting.

1390 The other point which strikes me is that the free bus service was a central plank in both policies that were presented to us for debate and the reason why it was a central plank was because the objective of both policies was to try to increase the number of bus journeys made and reduce the number of car journeys made, and I think that is a laudable objective.

1395 At the moment, sir – and Deputy St. Pier gave us some numbers which, unfortunately, I cannot remember at the moment but – we are subsidising the bus service to a significant amount. We are subsidising a service which is not used by very many people. How stupid is that? I would be much more happy about subsidising a service which is used by a large number of people. That is a different kettle of fish altogether. So I do not have a problem, in principle, about subsidising the bus service. Where I have a problem is we are subsidising a service that nobody is using and that is the biggest problem that we have at the moment with our transport non-strategy.

1405 If we kick out the flagship policy of free bus use, not only have we wasted the time of the people who have produced these strategies for us – which have been excellently produced and excellently presented – not only would we be wasting their time, but we would be wasting *our* time as well. We would have spent three days in this Chamber and ended up with absolutely nothing.

As far as I am concerned, we have got a policy. We need to give the policy a run; see how it works; suck it and see, if you like; just see how effective it is. That is the pragmatic compromise that is being proposed in this amendment.

1410 Once we have run it for a short period, we will then be in a position to actually decide what to do based on evidence, because at the moment we might have evidence from surveys but, as we have been told, a lot of the people who provided evidence in relation to what they would be prepared to pay for a ride on the bus, they never use the bus anyway. So the surveys that we have got – although they give us a bit of a guide – do

not necessarily give us the evidence. If we try this policy out for a period, as suggested, of 18 months, we will have evidence on how successful this strategy has been.

So, to me, this amendment is a very sensible compromise, a very sensible Proposition and deserves all our support, because then we will be able to actually make an informed decision on how we want to proceed with the strategy for integrated transport on this Island.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel, then Deputy Duquemin.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you, sir.

I am going to read my speech as I have written it, but it does a twist at the end.

I think I am in something of dilemma, sir – and I am sure Deputy Fallaize will resolve my dilemma – because I did not vote for Deputy St. Pier’s amendment, because he gave no guarantee of free travel for those islanders who currently are able to travel for free. And Deputy Fallaize’s amendment, of course, does, in a way, seem to provide that guarantee. But supporting it comes at a price. Well, that is what it seems to me, because it still leaves the door wide open for paid parking to be introduced via the Minority Report. So I think Deputy Fallaize’s amendment is very much a carrot and the stick could hit us later in the form of paid parking.

So I think I am between a rock and hard place and I would very much appreciate Deputy Fallaize’s thoughts on that when he responds, because I very much want to continue with free use for our buses, for those islanders who currently use them for free, but I am totally opposed to paid parking.

This whole debate has been rather like a game of chess. I do not know if Deputy Fallaize plays chess or not but I know one thing: I would not want to play him because he would probably invent his own moves. *(Laughter)* Also, this debate has been rather like a card game and Deputy Fallaize may – and I emphasis, may because he might have another card up his sleeve and, of course, that can be the Joker, but he may – have played his Ace. He knows that Deputy St. Pier’s amendment rather lives in hope that concessions will stay as they are for bus users. Although, as Deputy St. Pier did say, his amendment does not actually seek to remove those concessions.

Sir, if I vote in favour of this amendment, I will be supporting free buses for a trial period of 18 months. Then, depending on the results of the experiment, there is a real possibility that everyone who uses the bus will then have to pay to do so.

Here is a twist, sir, because, actually, as I was writing this speech, Deputy De Lisle made his speech and Deputy Lowe made her speech, and they resolved my dilemma because they said or at least I think they said, ‘What would be worse for the whole community? Having to pay 50p for a bus fare or pay for parking?’ So the obvious thing for me to do is to reject this – what is disguised as an amendment or as a ploy to keep the chance of paid parking being introduced. And I thank Deputy Fallaize for listening, sir, but I no longer need to hear his response, because Deputy De Lisle, as I say, and Deputy Lowe, resolved my dilemma and I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Does anyone have anything to say, that has not already been said over the past 48 hours? *(Laughter)*

Deputy Duquemin.

Deputy Duquemin: We have a challenge there. Thank you for that.

Sir, during his speech this morning, Deputy Scott Ogier asked, perhaps, a Member of Commerce and Employment or Culture and Leisure to look at it from the tourist perspective and I was hopefully quite passionate in that yesterday my speech was talking about how we can look after the tourist better.

My understanding from the Minority Report proposals – and it is a clarification I have sought today from Deputy Burford – is that the £8 card was for life; it was not a card that was a just a one-off. Sir, I have an Oyster card – just the same way that Deputy Stewart has one – and it is very powerful because when I venture to London – not, maybe as frequently as I once did, but when I venture to London – it is almost as though I feel like a local when, just in the same way that all the people that are there just put their card on the machine, it works.

During his speech, Deputy Scott Ogier also spoke about Mr and Mrs Angry from Swanage and the letters from Mr and Mrs Angry from Swanage – sorry, it was Deputy Brehaut, I do apologise... spoke about Mr and Mrs Angry from Swanage who often would have said, ‘We came to Guernsey. We were charged a different price and we are never going to come back.’ Well, my guess is that they will come back and they will feel great when they come back 12 months later with a card in their pocket that would still give them free travel on all travel, because we do have repeat visitors. I think the figures are as many as 50% of

Guernsey visitors come back year in, year out. I do believe that this is a very powerful message and something that we can give the free trial... make it happen, then we will realise the benefits.

But those, of course, are the visitors. I am also interested in the islanders that are here 24/7, 365. A phrase that Deputy Fallaize used in his opening speech this morning... He spoke about, 'Selling the bus service to them. How do we sell bus service to them?' And I repeat what I said yesterday in the sense that it is about the bus non-users, not about the bus users. Yes, it will be route. Yes, it will be frequency. Yes, it will be reliability. But what we do need to do, sir, is we need people to try the service.

In a previous life, I was in advertising and I photocopied this morning a thing all about marketing's most compelling words and, let me tell you, the one of them on this sheet of paper that they say is the most impressive is 'Free'. It will make a difference. It will happen.

I also looked at a thing this morning online and it spoke about how you used the word 'Free'. This is definitely Deputy Ogier – one of his favourite words at the moment seems to be 'nudges'. I think if we go thorough *Hansard* at a later date and we put in 'nudge', we will find half of Deputy Ogier's speeches. But there is a fantastic phrase in this thing. They said the word 'free' – the concept of something being free – 'nudges fence sitters by eliminating risk. It rewards the deal seeker in each of us and it is a tool from separating you from the competition.' Remember, the competition here is jumping in a car and continuing the congestion. That is the competition we are trying to do. 'Free' jumped out. I could go on, sir, but the point is that it will make a massive difference.

Unlike Deputy Gollop, I thought Deputy Fallaize did say something in the second half of his speech that made a lot of sense (*Laughter*) and it was a point that Deputy Storey has just alluded to. It was the fact that we are, as a Government, already spending, on behalf of islanders, whether it be through the pounds that they pay in taxation or charges, millions and millions of pounds on a bus service.

I have just done some number crunching, so I hope it is... Deputy Lowe, I think, in your speech you used the word 'smidgen'. 'It was appropriate to get a smidgen of money back from the people that use the buses.' That was the word you used. But that, for me, comes at a massive cost.

So the question is: are we happy to have half empty buses, perhaps with nine people on, or are we determined to sell our buses – using that magic word 'free' and hopefully have 19, 29 or even 39 people on that same bus? The figures in the report, on 774... my understanding is that the normal cost now, post-FTP, is £2.2 million going to the bus contract. If we then add on the £1 million that would be the forgone fares, the £0.3 million for the expanded bus network, the £400,000 for the weighting back to pre-FTP days, the £150,000 for bus infrastructure and the money for the bus depot – whether that be cutbacks or general revenue expenditure, depending how we look at it – that is an annual cost of £5 million for what is, effectively – there will peaks and troughs in the current bus usage, but – roughly – when you look at the chart on one of the other pages I have got in front of me – is roughly one million journeys.

My basic maths is £5 million divided by one million: the cost of a bus journey is £5 per bus journey. That is how much it is costing. So, in paying the 50p, would it be better that we get the subsidy down to £4.50? Yes or no? Or are we better being free and getting two millions journeys on the buses and the subsidy would be only £2.50 per journey? That is the game changer. That is what we are trying to achieve. I think Deputy Fallaize did use this phrase, 'It is all about value for money for the taxpayer.' It is not the quantity in money in isolation. It is what we do with the money and I want this Government – this States – to be innovative, to be in a position, to have new ideas, to be forward thinking; and I wanted this States to not only have the conviction but also the confidence to carry things through and that is why I make a plea – not for first time during these debates, sir – that the States does follow through and we keep this transport strategy as intact as it possibly can be and I urge people to accept this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ogier.

Deputy Ogier: Thank you, sir.

It looks to me that this amendment is one of our last chances to put in place a system which works. If you listen to the speeches today, we have heard the use of the term 'hypocrisy' because Members are attempting to roll back a decision of yesterday which amended bus fares on the floors of the Assembly. Some Members, yesterday, said we should not set bus fares on the floor of the Assembly, it is not the right place to do it; but, nevertheless, Members did. So we have done something that we should not do.

This amendment recognises that desire to get involved in the detail by some Members and says, 'Okay. If you really want, let us bring back the evidence – the carefully considered deliberation and recommendations – before this Assembly so that we can make a considered decision.' It is not another part of the Assembly setting bus fares on the floor of this Assembly. It is saying, 'A bus fare was set. We think, in retrospect, that was perhaps not the best decision. Let us go back to a point where the bus fare was not set and if you really want to set the bus fares, we will bring a report back with due diligence that has been

considered in a committee with some weighed recommendations, which is the fairest way, the most sensible way, to do it.'

This amendment returns the policy to that point where the fares had not been set on the floor of the Assembly. The amendment, for example, yesterday, meant that the old age concession went. This is what we get when we start with meaningful amendments which have unintended consequences, because they have not necessarily gone through the rigour of committee discussions. Some are appropriate, some would benefit from a greater degree of examination.

I think the best and safest direction is to roll back the situation as proposed in this amendment and return at a later date with a level of details Members want to see, but with the information, with the analysis and with the level of due diligence performed on it through the rigours of committee discussion.

We hear from people, who have supported nearly every amendment against this report, now calling it a mess. It is only a mess because those Members supported all the amendments (*Laughter*) to a strategy which was not a mess. They pulled pieces out of a tower of blocks which fitted well together. It is now in danger of falling down and the architects of that ruin just dust their hands and go, 'Look at it. It is a mess. What a disgrace. I am absolutely outraged.' This is how it happens. We pass an amendment, then we find out we have missed our pensioners. This is how the mess occurs. We are hearing from some Deputies, 'I think it is £200,000 we are out, not £750,000 like he says.' Look at where we are, due to pulling the blocks out. It is a tragedy and the kicker is this is exactly what those who wish the report to fail have engineered. This is where they want us to be. This is where they set out, Wednesday morning, thinking, 'If we can only get here, then we can get the transport strategy out.' This is deliberate! We are deliberately put here!

Well, we have all been around the block a considerable time. We have seen it happen on a number of debates. Those of you who are supporting the downfall of this transport strategy... I know there are some who say, 'Pass this, pass this, pass this' and then said it yesterday. 'Pass this, pass this' and then throw it all out. Those are the people I am talking about. The people who want this to fail and are using this variety of amendments to vote in so that it will make a mess and we can then vote it out in the end because it does not make any sense.

Those of you who are supporting the downfall of the transport strategy, those of you who are voting for paid buses and the removal of paid parking, are just participating in the downfall of the strategy. We are finely balanced in this Chamber. We have had other issues other the last 10 years in which we have been finely balanced. Some compromised solution has to be found and that compromise is to start off with what we know hangs together well and tweak it, if necessary, based on evidence gained from our experience. I want us to leave with a good solution today.

I thank Deputy St. Pier and Deputy Luxon, honestly, for agreeing a pragmatic, compromised way forward which is, in my view, the only way to come out of this with a result for Guernsey. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I would prefer to see the fundamentals of this integrated strategy in operation, intact, before we dismember it or change its fundamentals. I would like to see the uptake of the buses before we decide to charge. I think we should see how much success the strategy is having before we decide to change its design. To change it before it even begins does not give it a chance to work. The waste strategy dragged on like this and this is how it happened in every debate – everyone chasing their desires with no thought for compromise. I compromised. I supported a Suez smaller incinerator to reach a compromise. I was part of the PSD board that brought that forward and recommended it to this Assembly.

The Bailiff: Are we moving off the debate on the present amendment, Deputy Ogier?

Deputy Ogier: I was just merely seeking to add information so Members would not stand up and accuse me of anything. I am sorry, Deputy Brouard, I am nearly finished.

I just am just making the point that I compromise. When it comes to an impasse that we cannot reach anywhere forward, I compromise. I park some of my ideals for a moment to get a good result for this Island and that is what we need to do today. You need to park some of your unbending ideals and reach for somewhere that this States can move forward and this Island can move forward.

We need to leave with something which works and not some sort of catweazle hybrid which satisfies no-one, is expensive and does not do what it should. If you want something which works, please, support the amendment, but if you want to go on dismembering the report and turning it into something which does not work, you should vote against it. For me, that is the reality of the choice. Support the amendment and leave with something or vote against and carry on this dismemberment, because paid parking is going to come out next and what is left over will be the shards of an integrated strategy with two massive pieces of policy, paid buses and free parking, now through the middle of it.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard. Is this a very short speech?

1595 **Deputy Brouard:** Just a point of clarification, sir. Just to remind Deputy Ogier that when he compromised and agreed to Suez, he made the wrong decision, sir.

The Bailiff: Is it a very short speech?
Deputy Luxon.

1600 **Deputy Luxon:** Mr Bailiff, thank you.

Yesterday, when we approved the amendment, by 24 to 23, I gave serious thought, thinking about this overnight and, sir, the last thing that I would have wanted to do was to risk allowing this Assembly and this Island not to achieve an integrated Guernsey transport strategy as a result of that amendment. I was able to compromise – not by overturning that democratic decision we made yesterday – because what this amendment does is to say that decision stands, but we defer it and that will allow us to have evidence base, in terms of the merits and the strength and the power of the fare-less charge, which in 18 months' time, 15 months' time, we can then review the decision that we made yesterday. That is a compromise I am prepared to make and I realise the contradiction or the hypocrisy that that may appear to be. I do not want to ignore a debate on the democratic decision that we make but, on the basis of the implications, I am happy to compromise because we stay with the decision we made yesterday, we defer its commencement to allow ourselves to have more real evidence about the merits of whether 50p, a notional charge or fare-less is actually the best thing.

I want us – this Assembly and the Island – to be able to walk away from this debate with a decision on a transport strategy and, of course, the real telling decision will come clearly now when we debate Proposition 5, about paid parking. I would rather we made the decision based around that core fundamental – which my colleague, the Minister of the Environment Department, has made very clear – and that is why I am happy, sir, and prepared to compromise to allow us to continue to see if we can reach a meaningful, proactive decision about the Minority Report as our integrated strategy or not, and I do support the strategy.

Thank you, sir.

1620

The Bailiff: It is now time to rise, so I just remind Members we are clearly not going to finish the business of this meeting today. The Rules provide that we come back on the second Wednesday, which will be 14th May, so we will be certain of proceeding on 14th May with any unfinished business.

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

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

1625 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members, we continue the debate on the amendment proposed by Deputy Fallaize, seconded by Deputy Le Tocq.
Deputy Laurie Queripel will speak first.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

1630 This is difficult because I believe Deputy Fallaize is making a sincere call for unison amongst Members. I think it is a sincere appeal for Members to find some common ground.

It is difficult for me, sir, because although he will deny it, I think this is still predicated on paid parking and I am opposed to paid parking, and I can hear the moans and the grumbles, so I know he disagrees with me.

1635 My other concern is that last night we voted for an amendment that made the bus fare 50p and that amendment did not include an explicit concession for pensioners. That bothers me and I think we will have to amend that. If that fare stays in place we will have to amend that before we leave this Chamber.

My other concern, sir, is because we now have that 50p structure in place and if that is not changed, potentially, the income derived from bus fares will only be half of what it was before, when it was £1, and that is a concern for me as well.

1640 There is also something else that is emerging during this debate that I find rather distasteful and is being led by Deputy Ogier and Deputy Brehaut, sir. They are painting this scene that those who are keen supporters of this report are like Little Red Riding Hood skipping through the forest with their basket of goodies, and those who have genuine concerns and genuine misgivings and are not convinced about this, are like the big bad wolf waiting to ambush the poor dear and ransack her basket. *(Laughter)*

1645 I give way to Little – Deputy Ogier, sir. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Ogier: Thank you.

I think perhaps a clarification is in order. I was saying that *some* people are. I was not saying *all* opponents are; I was saying some people have come in here to get the transport strategy thrown out. I heard Deputy Brouard say, 'Pass it, pass it, pass it. We will throw it out later.' I did not say '*all*'. I recognise some people have real concerns. Some people just want all of it out.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, Deputy Ogier.

Sir, I take on board what Deputy Ogier is saying, but that in itself is a tactic – it is a debating ploy – and it is just the kind of nudge that Deputy Ogier was referring to this morning. But, as I say, nothing could be further from the truth. Both parties want to deliver good things to the people of Guernsey, but both have different ideas as to what those good things are. I think we have all made that clear. I think I laid my cards on the table very clearly, very early on.

Sir, this is a debating Chamber, this is where policy is made and we all have our own opinions as to what makes good policy – policy that we feel is right or in the best interests of the people of Guernsey. And we will tailor our arguments accordingly. That is politics. So I happen to think that the goodies on offer in this report, including the free bus service, have too bitter an aftertaste. It is too bitter a pill for taxpayers and motorists to swallow.

It is not – and I say this to Deputy Brehaut, sir, through you – about being a crowd pleaser. Of course, we have to raise revenues for services and, of course, the public will bear the cost, but it is about Members being convinced that the measures being proposed or put in place are the right measures.

Sir, we have heard some talk about the free bus service being a cornerstone of this structure, and the structure will lose integrity if this component is removed. Well, sir, I am worried about the cement, and the cement of this structure is the disproportionate price that taxpayers who do not use the bus service and motorists will pay. There is too much cement in this structure for me.

That is my evaluation. That is the result of my survey. Of course, I know the architects of this structure think it is sound and nobody likes their creation to be criticised, because they believe in it – it constitutes their vision. But I think this cornerstone is made of sandstone. I simply do not believe the change in behaviour will be significant enough to justify it. So therefore, although I do acknowledge the sincere intentions of Deputy Fallaize, I will have to vote against this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, I want to support this amendment – I like the idea this is a nice fluffy amendment – but I cannot, for three reasons.

The first goes back to what I said yesterday, where are the targets, the KPIs? The States in this nice fluffy amendment, that the Environment Department has to set out a case to justify the policy of fares free at the point of use based on the impact of that policy on the number of bus passengers and the performance of the bus service generally... Well, here we go again. We are being asked to support something where we have no idea of success or criteria. Even the Treasury and Resources Minister expressed his concerns in the report of their lack of targets and KPIs. I am amazed he can support this amendment.

The other problem is the timescale. Is 18 months long enough to obtain a meaningful analysis, especially given we have a bus contract which needs to be negotiated? I am sure that is not going to be an easy task with these reports going through. Even if it is possible to produce reliable data in such a short space of time, well, this is supposed to be – we are being told all the time – an integrated transport strategy, therefore, these same provisos should also apply to paid parking. It might – just might – sway me to support it.

Deputy Ogier talks about problems with amendments not going through the rigour of Committee discussion. Well, here is a prime example. I therefore cannot support this wolf in sheep's clothing of an amendment.

Deputy Bebb: Thank you, Monsieur le Bailli.

I will be supporting this amendment, but I think that the first thing I would like to do is correct a few things that have been said in debate on this amendment.

Deputy Dave Jones said that the people do not want paid parking. Well, if Members would turn to page 648 of the Billet, they will see that according to the consultation 47% do not want paid parking, the remainder were content with some form of payment parking in town. So I think that we can be fair to say the number of people who do not want paid parking against the number of people who do want paid parking is probably around 50% each. So it is not a case of the whole of Guernsey does not want paid parking.

But I do recognise his position and I fully understand that certain Members of this Assembly were elected having made the promise that they objected to paid parking; for which I fully understand that they will object to paid parking. I stood on the message that I wanted paid parking and it is therefore fully within

my intention to vote for paid parking, but that is an issue of paid parking. The issue before us today is the issue – right now – is the issue of free buses.

1710 Deputy Dorey pointed out that his view is the bus user should pay a little as well as the car user. He has stated firmly that he is a supporter of paid parking but he believes that some burden should also fall on the bus user. My issue with that is thinking that the two are different. What is currently the car user is what we hope within the transport strategy to be tomorrow's bus user and therefore the idea that you tax him one way or another... Well, no, the idea is that we try and modify the behaviour of the individuals, and to modify that behaviour I firmly believe that the strong message of a free bus service is the incentive to get
1715 people out of their cars and on to the bus. I believe it is a very strong message.

Deputy Trott pointed out that he believed this to be hypocrisy to now change the decision that was made yesterday. I think it is the strongest term he used. Certainly other Members have used similar terms to say that we decided yesterday.

1720 May I suggest to Members that the decision yesterday, on the 50p, was not exactly in everybody's mind a binary choice? I heard a number of Deputies say they were not sure. I heard a number of people feel, 'Is free correct? Should there be a charge?' And the idea that there is simply only a black and white answer is not true. There are people who are quite rightly in the middle, not convinced by one argument or the other.

1725 I believe that this amendment gives those Members that opportunity in order to trial a free bus, and then when the numbers have come back to this Assembly, they can make an educated opinion as to whether it should then be free – No, Deputy De Lisle, I am not giving way – or whether they would actually rather see a charge.

I also understand what Deputy Lowe was saying in her speech – that what is the point that we would be willing to see the charge? Now, for me, my understanding –

1730 **Deputy Lowe:** Point of correction, sir.

Deputy Bebb: – of the numbers concerning the bus users –

1735 **Deputy Lowe:** Point of correction, sir, or point of information. It will not be –

Deputy Bebb: There is no such thing as a point of information.

Deputy Lowe: Okay, whatever. *(Laughter)*

1740 **Deputy Bebb:** No, I am sorry Deputy Lowe.

I am sorry, sir. No, it is not giving way, but it is –

1745 **Deputy Bebb:** I have not given way. *[Inaudible]*

The Bailiff: Are you asking him to give way? *[Inaudible]*

Deputy Bebb: No

1750 **Deputy Lowe:** Sorry?

The Bailiff: *[Inaudible]*

1755 **Deputy Lowe:** Point of order, sir. It will be a point of order, sir. Point of order. Deputy Bebb has just stated that it will be for this Assembly when it comes back. It will not - it is after the election that is actually October 2016.

Deputy Bebb: I referred to this Assembly as this Chamber, this Government, as it were. If we want to split hairs over an election period then we can.

1760 Now then, the truth is that, personally, I would be content to see a charge raised once we have, first of all, reversed the trend that is happening at the moment, so we see an increase from the current 1.3 million journeys back to at least 1.6. Now, given that the intention of the strategy is in order to see an increase in bus users but also to manage the bus service so that it comes back to the standard that it was previously. Evidently, personally, I would make the judgement of seeing at least 1.8 million if not 2 million passengers
1765 and, at that point in time, I believe that the trend and therefore the good habit will have been engrained within the Island and then we can look at introducing a charge. But that is me, personally. It is up to each and every individual who will be here when that debate comes forward, to then set their own criteria.

1770 So this amendment gives us the opportunity to understand what effect free buses will do. It reverses some of the previous poor decisions – in my opinion – that the amendment of 50p, put in place because it did not allow for the dispensation that we expected for the pensioners and so forth... It gives us that free bus service, it gives us the time scale and for those people who say that we have decided how much we are going to do, in my understanding, we have not decided anything. All we are doing at the moment is deciding what Propositions will be the final Propositions to vote on. So please do not say that we have decided anything because, until we have voted on the Propositions to accept them or not, all we have is a process of trying to agree which Propositions we feel are appropriate to be our final decision. Therefore, nobody could say that what we currently have is one thing or another. We have nothing until we vote on the final Propositions. Please would you support this amendment in order to allow evidence-based decisions.

Thank you.

1780 **Deputy Trott:** Another point of correction. I did not want to interrupt Deputy Bebb but he inferred, sir, that I suggested that it was hypocrisy for this Assembly to seek to change the rate. I did not. That is yo-yo politics. The hypocrisy I referred to was the fact that two Members who advised us of the foolishness of trying to change the rate on the floor of the Assembly were now seeking to do precisely that. That was the hypocrisy I was seeking to emphasise, sir.

1785 **The Bailiff:** *[Inaudible]*

1790 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Sir, it is not hypocritical, I believe, because this amendment simply returns the situation, largely speaking, to the recommendations set out in the report from the Environment Department. It simply asked for evidence, which they are best placed to provide and to analyse, to demonstrate that the strategy is working here in Guernsey. It is not hypocrisy. It is a return to that recommendation set about in the Environment Department and given them an opportunity to do that because they are best placed to do that, and then after a trial period, which is the compromise position, to come back so that this Assembly can ratify it or not, whether it wishes to continue or to make some charge.

1795 I made it clear when I spoke yesterday, or the day before or whichever day it was, that personally I do believe that a small charge should be made. In fact, I think in due course a charge can increase and I do not think it is hypocritical to say that. But, because of the situation we find ourselves in at this moment, I do believe that a zero based fare at the point of use is the best place forward for changing the culture from being so car dependent.

1800 Therefore I agree, to some degree, with what Deputy Dorey was saying. I have always been in favour of paid parking. I do not try to hide that and never have done at all. But this particular thing is about trying to encourage bus use, particularly for those... Much has been said about those who are poor in our community with regards to cars, but there are many people who are so unable to afford the sorts of things we may take for granted in this Assembly – they cannot afford to run a car – and already we need to take that into consideration.

1805 Therefore, I am supporting this amendment. I am very happy to do so. I am also very glad that the Treasury Minister and the PSD Minister have also agreed to support it on the basis that it gives this Assembly an opportunity – and Guernsey an opportunity – to see whether the strategy will work. Otherwise the danger is that there will be a strategy but it will not be the strategy that was designed to deal with the situation that we find ourselves in today and, as a result of that, because it has been pulled apart and reconstructed in a very poor way, it could then be criticised for not working when, in fact, it was never designed to work on that basis. ‘Integrated’ is the word put at the top; integrated is what it must be. Therefore I encourage this Assembly to support this amendment.

1815 **The Bailiff:** *[Inaudible]*

Deputy Conder: Thank you, sir.

1820 I have only spoken very briefly on this topic over the last two days of debate. I try to usually only speak if I think I can add something that may not be apparent to colleagues or perhaps I have some knowledge in the area. So I have confined myself to one very brief speech, over the last couple of days. But, I do rise now to support this amendment on a number of grounds.

I have said in the past in this Chamber that I personally am fiscally conservative, and I certainly stand by that and believe that I am. And in this context I supported the Minority environmental strategy and support this amendment on the basis that both the strategy and this amendment are fiscally neutral.

1825 Deputy Dorey already referred us to page 774 – the summary of estimated annual income and expenditure. Although the design of the report is imaginative in terms of its use of brackets and where it puts income or where it puts expenditure, actually, if you just aggregate all of that, it is fiscally neutral in its

totality. So it does not bust any of our financial constraints in its totality. It does not add to the overall fiscal burden.

For me, much more importantly, and why I feel it is so important to support this strategy and add free buses back into the total strategy, is: it is a total package. Without free buses or by adding the additional income it takes away the behavioural changes which this strategy was trying to engender. It is not just about free buses or paid parking or vehicle registration duty. It is also about cycle infrastructure, pedestrian infrastructure, public realm improvement, disability transport measures, and other changes.

It is a total strategy. We want – the authors – and this Government, if it passes this, want to endeavour to change behaviour. It wants to get people back on to buses and out of their cars. It wants to get me on to my bicycle. It wants to change behaviour. To be honest, we need to know whether free bus passes will engender that change of behaviour and that is why I actually feel this amendment is perhaps more imaginative in terms of identifying change than even the original Proposition – because it does give us the opportunity to make that judgement.

I do want to see change in behaviour. I want to be able to ride up the Fosse André and see if I can keep up with Deputy Bebb. There is no chance of that, of course, (*Laughter*) I want to be able to walk up the Fosse André with my dad without having to push both of us into the hedge to avoid pavement surfing because they cannot get past the vehicle that is coming towards them. I want to be able to sit in my garden at 5 o'clock in the evening without being gassed by petrol fumes of the 30 or 40 cars that are sitting outside just the other side of the wall, waiting to get through the traffic lights to turn into the *Couture*. I do not know whether this strategy will change behaviours. I do not whether free buses will change behaviours. But I want the chance to find out.

Sir, nothing is cast in stone, this amendment allows us to judge, over a period, whether or not free buses, along with the rest of the strategy, will change those behaviours and give us a better environment and a better Island.

I would like to say, although I suspect colleagues would not agree, that actually paid parking is not cast in stone. It is not in any way full-blooded paid parking. But that cannot be... This Government and future Governments can do whatever they wish. If it is found not to work, if it is found not to be desired, well, a future Government could repeal it, in just the same way as if we do not like free buses or they do not work, we can keep the 50p or £1. But we need to establish whether or not this strategy, in its entirety, as an integrated integral process, can change those behaviours and improve this Island.

I would not hold myself up as any expert, whatsoever, in environment and transport strategy, which is why I have been reluctant to stand, but I do know something about research: you have to have data to establish whether or not the outcomes you expected were.

If the Environment Department returns in 18 months and says, 'Actually, there has not really been a change,' well, I am not going to vote to keep free buses. If paid parking is deemed in 18 months or two years, or if the electorate were daft enough to bring me back to this Assembly post-2016... and we wanted to change it then I am perfectly happy, but I want the evidence. Without a properly grounded period of actually seeing whether it works and whether this environment strategy can work, and whether behavioural change – which is what is absolutely at the core of this strategy... whether or not we know we can change it then I do not want to break this strategy.

So, in summary, sir, I have high optimism that this strategy will work in its entirety. I hope that this Assembly will allow this 18 months of free bus strategy actually to be implemented, so we can establish whether or not the high aspirations and high ideals of the authors of this report is actually real and that it can actually work and we can change behaviours.

In closing, sir, I hope that this Environment Department can find its way to work together, because we elected them two years ago to bring this strategy back, and I have confidence in them. I hope they can work together to deliver this strategy.

The Bailiff: [*Inaudible*]

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Thank you, sir.

One of the problems with this amendment is really in the last few lines where, to assess the impact of zero fares on the buses, the Department is required to:

'[Come to a decision] based on the impact of that policy on the number of bus passengers, and the performance of the bus service generally.'

I have no idea how you are going to possibly measure that, for a number of reasons, and I am very much in the same camp as Deputy Soulsby on that.

I refer back to the bus passenger figures for March. That is a big change or reversal of previous falling numbers of bus passengers. In fact, they went up by 7,498, which is an 8.34% rise. Now, I do not know if

that is a one-off or not, but I do know we are now in May so CT Plus will have the figures for April. It will be interesting because, if you have a similar rise, you now have a rising trend in bus passenger use. How on earth would you strip that out then to decide what extra bus passenger use there might be if you had free fares? Well, you cannot. So I think what is being asked is not measurable. There are all sorts of reasons why bus passenger figures go up and down and whether the bus fare is free or not is just one of them.

So I believe it is rather woolly amendment which I do not think you can accurately deliver on. This so-called data which will be gleaned, tell me how you are going to do it because I do not know, I really do not. You will be making all sorts of assumptions and, in fact, you may actually have a rising number of bus passengers now and a rising trend, in which case you think, 'Well, we have turned the corner. Does it matter?' You might end up with your 1.7 million or 2 million without doing anything. So I will not be supporting this because I do not think the amendment is sufficiently detailed in how you would measure whatever may be the increase in bus passenger use by having a zero fare.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: *[Inaudible]*

Deputy Le Lièvre: Thank you, sir.

When we started this debate, the speeches were very much congratulatory: 'Well-written report', 'thorough', 'excellent', 'lots of hard work', 'three cheers for Deputy Burford'. Then since the debate has gone on, it is, 'Well, all we said was it was well-written. We did not agree with anything that was in it. Let us amend it to death.'

I would like to set the clock back slightly to the stage when we were giving it plaudits. What nobody said – at least I did not hear it, maybe I was not listening – was the processes that Deputy Burford and Deputy Brehaut – but I think probably mainly Deputy Burford – went through in creating her conceptual design. She did not sit in front of the telly, I would suspect and say, 'I think I will have a bit of this and I will have a bit of that and I will put it together and that is what it looks like.' No, the strategy would have been comprised of components that had been well crafted, and well sculpted, tested, researched, and put together in a delicate fashion. Some might have had to be amended and I suspect that each component looked slight different to that which she originally envisaged, by the time she was finished.

She would have made allowances for all sorts of thing – in take up and things that were not going to be taken up – and she would have come up with, eventually, this conceptual package, this integrated strategy, which we see on page 774. Now that for me is probably the most important part of the report because it sets out, I think, in half a page all of the key elements of the strategy and their costs and the income.

Now, when, just a few moments ago, I mentioned the fact that she would have made allowances and what I have not heard anybody say during the debate is that the first registration duty is estimated at £4.15 million but that is a 30% reduction on the actual income that would have been derived if nobody changed their car purchasing habits. So, if nobody changed their car purchasing habits, that figure would be £6 million or thereabouts. And if that was the case then we would end up with £2 million more than we had started with. But, of course, people will change their habits. It could be the other way. They might say, 'Well, I am not going to buy my Range Rover Vogue at £78,000, I am going to buy a Smart car.' But I somehow do not think that is going to be the case. If you want a Range Rover Vogue, adding on the CO₂ component and the width component are not going to change your mind. But there will be some change and, very carefully, Deputy Burford has reduced the overall income from £6 million to £4.15 million.

But it is only one of a number of elements that she will have had to assess and make a best estimate for. The cost of the foregone fares on the free buses is one such figure – as is paid parking. We none of us know – including Deputy Burford – what those elements are going to be.

So what we see on page 774 is a conceptual, well thought through design for an integrated transport strategy. And I, for one, do not want to see it changed, because if you change it at any stage in this process – and we are after all putting it into place for the first time... if the States agree, we put it into place for the first time – nobody knows what the outcome will be, nobody knows what the end results and how some of these elements will actually interrelate or not interrelate, as the case might be. We might be up in some areas and down in another. When we tinker with it and we mess it about when we put in charges for bus fares, when we take out paid parking, none of us know.

We did not know to start with but, by the time we have tinkered with it, none of us will ever be able to say whether the integrated transport strategy, as designed by Deputy Burford and Deputy Brehaut, would ever have worked. We will not be able to say it. We just will not know and in five years' time we will still be arguing about bus fares and paid parking and there will be no bus strategy, there will be no integrated strategy, there will not be anything else; we will be where we are today.

So, as far as I am concerned, the Fallaize/Le Tocq amendment sets the clock back to where we were late yesterday afternoon. It sets the picture back as largely as that drawn up on page 774 and I would plead with people to leave it like that. We have to try this out. It is almost insulting, as far as I am concerned, for

somebody to say, 'Well, I have given it some thought and what I would like to see is: bash 75p on bus fares, or £1 or £1.25. Let's not stop there, put two quid in.' It is one element. They have not sat down for hundreds and hundreds of hours and designed something which is an integrated, well thought through, conceptual model, which we have to take the bold move and put into place to see how it goes.

It could be, as Deputy Conder said, that a year from now we might discover that the income from first registrations is far higher or far lower than we thought. We might have to introduce bus fares before or rule them out completely – we just do not know. But the more you tinker with it today, the less likelihood in six months to a year's time you will ever know what the outcome of this well thought through, integrated strategy would have been. We will have ruined it forever and we will be back to square one.

I would therefore ask that you agree to the amendment and let us get on with what is, after all, only an experiment.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: *[Inaudible]*

Deputy Burford: Thank you.

I just wonder whether Deputy Le Lièvre has been sitting in my living room for the last six months.

I notice I was on the front page of the *Press* today. The last time I was on the front page of the *Press*, I think, was on 7th July 1990 when I had just been forced to crash land a disabled aircraft at Guernsey Airport – and I have to tell you this is more painful. *(Laughter and applause)*

I am grateful to Deputy Fallaize for bringing this well-considered amendment, which will allow free buses to be introduced as envisaged by the strategy, and supported by 30 of you yesterday, insofar as you supported the report at that stage.

This amendment fulfils two laudable aims. First of all, it prevents the strategy from being diluted. Even the comparatively modest fare of 50p is enough of a barrier to deter some potential bus users. And removing as many barriers to bus use as possible is a central tenet of our strategy. Remember, buses in this context are in direct competition with the car, so any point of use cost puts the bus at a disadvantage to the car, which does not charge its user to get into the vehicle.

Secondly, this amendment offers the reassurance that prompted Deputy St Pier to place his amendment yesterday – the reassurance that we are not putting ourselves at risk by committing to a scheme before we can prove it works. I am confident that it will work, as long as the buses are free at the point of use, and I welcome this opportunity to prove that within a specified time frame.

This amendment gives the transport strategy a fair shot. Without it we face the very real possibility that we will walk out of this Assembly with either a hobbled transport strategy or indeed no transport strategy at all – effectively wasting more than two years of time, resources and money in the process, with yet again nothing to show for it.

I would encourage Members who have spoken encouragingly about the Minority Report to accept that when we vote on this amendment.

The Bailiff: Does anyone else wish to speak? No?

Deputy Domaille then and Deputy Fallaize will reply to the debate. Deputy Domaille.

Deputy Domaille: Thank you, sir.

We have talked about the hours that have been spent on this topic by one Department. I reckon we have been about 700 working hours so far in this debate – 47 of us and two and a half days. I am aware of my comments before about the £1 fare upset or annoyed Deputy Burford, for which I apologise for the upset, but I still remain concerned that we are going to leave here today – maybe even in a fortnight's time – without a strategy. I am extremely concerned about that.

Now, with regards to the free fares, free fares were central to the Majority Report; they are central to the Minority Report and therefore it follows that, having believed them to be central for the Majority Report, I believe them to be central for the Minority Report. But I have some problems and I ask Deputy Fallaize – and I have actually sent a little note so – if we could clarify these for me.

The first one is – and I know it has been talked about, and this is not a criticism but – there is this £8 charge for a swipe card. Now, we need the swipe card, or a swipe card of some sort, to get the data. That is quite right and proper and that is fine. My concern with it is that it is actually not a free bus service. I am not going to go into the arguments of the £8 fare and the pros and cons. I perfectly understand why it is there and I can see the logic behind it and I understand it. But I am concerned that, actually, we will have this initial barrier. Now, a little bit tied in with that is that it was always my intention if the Majority Report had even been debated or carried through... is that I would have been intending – and I am sure the Board would have signed up to it – to be putting measures in place as soon as we could, so that I would not have hung around and waited. Now, I would very much like to put a free bus service in – with this £8 card, if we

are on the Minority Report – as soon as possible and I believe the funding will be there to do it. Deputy Burford has set up a model that will show that the funding is there. So I believe that I can actually introduce these free fares earlier.

The problem I have spinning off of that is twofold. The first one is: will the 18 months run from when we introduce the free fares – which I would like to introduce as soon as possible; or, alternatively, will they run from April 2015 date, which is when the new contract will hopefully have been to the States and come into force? So I need that clarified.

In fairness, I have to say the other side is that, in introducing the free fares earlier than April 2015, we are going to have to negotiate with CT Plus. Those negotiations are not going to be easy. It was not that long ago that we took some credits from them. So I can see some problems there. But I would like, before we move to the vote, for this to be clarified as to when the 18 months will run from and the bit about the card.

The other thing that bothers me about that – and it is something that I do not know the way round – is, with the introduction of the £8 card, that means that the concessions that we presently run will fall, so that if – whether it was April or whenever – we put in place this card, are the old age pensioners and children over three going to be exempt, in which case we have a data collecting problem, or not?

Now, I say these comments not in a negative way – I want a free bus service – but I think we need just to have those points clarified, so that we can all understand exactly what it is we are voting for and, for the avoidance of doubt, I will be voting for the amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

I spare a thought for the poor folk who are listening to us on the radio, because when I stood up to open debate you said to me, ‘Please read out your amendment so that people will understand what it is that we are debating.’ So I read out the amendment, which was all about bus fares, and then for half the debate the people listening on the radio would have heard a debate about paid parking, and they must have been as confused as I was during part of the debate – particularly early on when Deputy Lowe and Deputy Jones, and others who have a preoccupation with paid parking, were talking about it at some length.

Sir, this amendment is not related to paid parking. It is an amendment to Proposition 13 which is entirely about bus fares. Paid parking is not mentioned in the original Proposition. It was not mentioned in Deputy St Pier’s amendment. It is not mentioned in this amendment. It is not even the same Proposition.

When we go to the vote at the end of this debate, we will inevitably vote separately on some of the Propositions, and one of the Propositions we will vote separately on will be Proposition 5. That is a Proposition about paid parking. This is a Proposition about bus fares.

When I say that I am trying to amend Proposition 13, in a way, I am not really trying to amend Proposition 13, what I am trying to do is reinsert the initial (*Interjection*) Proposition 13 – or at least the Proposition 13 which relates to Deputy Burford’s Minority Report.

I am trying to prevent the integrated transport strategy from being dissected and dismembered by amendment but, because of the decision the States made last night, I am having to do it by amendment. So I am not going to accept any criticism about being hypocritical. I tried to defeat the amendment last night, but because the States voted in favour of it I am not just going to throw my hands up and say, ‘Oh well, okay’.

I am trying to repair what I consider to be irreparable damage done to the integrity of these Propositions by the vote on the amendment last night, by accident. Because that is not the intention that Deputy St Pier and Deputy Luxon had. The amendment carried by one vote and the proposer and seconder have recognised that it has had unforeseen consequences.

My amendment is not some sort of elaborate ploy to insert all sorts of weird and wacky ideas into the transport strategy. It is an attempt to say we were presented with two versions of a transport strategy six weeks ago – we have seen them; they are both complete; they both set out their arguments; we have all had an opportunity to consider them. I am trying to return us to the point where we can take one of these strategies as a composite strategy. So I am trying to re-establish the integrity of the road transport strategy.

Deputy Lester Queripel can vote separately – in fact, he will vote separately on paid parking and bus fares. If he votes against this amendment... Well, I will tell you what will happen: Proposition 5 will be taken before Proposition 13 and a vote will be cast on paid parking. I do not know what the outcome will be – it will be what it will be. Then we will come to Proposition 13. If Deputy Queripel votes against this amendment, when we come to vote on the substantive Proposition 13, he will either have to vote for pensioners to pay a bus fare of 50p or he will have to vote for everybody to pay a bus fare of £1, because they will be the only options left. Because this amendment is the last opportunity to establish a scheme of bus fares across the board, which are free at the point of use. If he wants pensioners not to pay for the bus, he will have to vote for this amendment. Otherwise he will be left with a Proposition which does not take pensioners out of a 50p rate.

2070 It is true, because if the Environment Department take – I will give way to Deputy Dorey.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

2075 **Deputy Dorey:** Sir, I thought that we had established yesterday – because there is an outstanding resolution of the States about free buses for pensioners – that this one does not overrule it, it just adds to it. I thought that was what we had established yesterday.

The Bailiff: Mr Procureur.

2080 **The Procureur:** What we established yesterday was, from recollection, in consequence of Deputy Trott's very helpful intervention, that the proposals for bus fares will have to come back to the States at some stage and we would sort it out then. That was the result.

2085 But, whilst I am on my feet, I am a little bit confused because at present my understanding is that there is an arrangement whereby pensioners do not pay to travel on the bus – if the States were to reject the Proposition about bus fares, presumably that arrangement would continue.

2090 **Deputy Fallaize:** Yes, and everybody else would continue to pay £1, which is the present rate. That is what I am saying – you have got to make a choice, if the amendment loses, between protecting the free pensioners' fares or everybody having to pay £1. So we enter into a new transport strategy with this aim of getting more and more people onto public transport and we still have a £1 bus fare. Well, that clearly does not make any sense.

2095 Now, the Procureur has just said, 'Well okay, if the Proposition, as it stands at the moment, is accepted then we will have to come back and have another debate about bus fares.' Well, where has that got us then? Where on earth has that really – (*Laughter*) No, but I am talking about the Proposition which is in place because of Deputy St Pier's amendment. My Proposition does not need another debate about bus fares because everybody is free at the point of use.

2100 Yes, we will have a debate about bus fares in the light of 12 or 15 months' worth of evidence, based on the data collected by having a free service. But apparently now we are told that, if we vote against this amendment and we vote for the Proposition as amended last night, we will have to have another debate in a few months about bus fares because we really do not know what we decided last night.

2105 Deputy Jones and Deputy Brouard appealed for the States not to change their decision of last night. They said, 'We made a decision last night. Do not change it again.' But in between last night and the speech, what Deputy Jones forgets is that he implored the States to double the fare that we agreed last night from 50p to £1 (*Interjection*) but of course they will oppose this amendment. They will oppose this amendment because they have to get this amendment kicked out so that the entire strategy can be kicked out. That is what it is all about. The only way to ensure that the strategy is dis-integrated before we go to the vote at the end of the debate is to chuck out this amendment.

I will give way to Deputy Jones.

2110 **Deputy David Jones:** Sir, the Deputy is misleading the Assembly. We do not have to kick out this amendment to throw out the whole lot. We can do that when we come to the vote. So it is simply not true to say that this amendment, by Deputy Brouard and I, is dependent on kicking this amendment out for it all to fall. At the end of this debate we can agree to throw out the whole lot if we wish.

2115 **Deputy Fallaize:** I do not know what Deputy Jones is talking about. This is not an amendment by him and Deputy Brouard. This is an amendment by me and Deputy Le Tocq, and (*Laughter*) I did not say you have to kick out this amendment so that you can kick out everything at the end. I am saying it makes it much easier. It means that when we go to the vote at the end the strategy is already dis-integrated. And if it is falling around about our ears it will be much easier to make the case against voting for it as a whole strategy.

2120 Deputy Brouard asked what will provoke the change of policy – if we went to free fares, what might, in 18 months' time, make us increase the fares? I think potentially either passengers going down or passengers going up, because if passengers have gone down (*Laughter*) then we might take the view, 'Well, there is no point in maintaining a free fare because clearly that has not had the desired impact.' If, however, we have seen an increase in passengers, we might take the view – it might be in 18 months, might be in three years, whenever it is – that actually there is now a degree of confidence in the bus service, which is sufficient so that we can introduce a positive fare. But the key with a free at the point of use fare, to start with, is that it helps to repair the considerable degree of lost confidence there is in the bus service at the moment.

2130 Now, the points that were raised by Deputy Domaille – and Deputy Lowe raised these points as well – as far as timing is concerned, my view is that the transport strategy... I do not know exactly when this

transport strategy commences. Different parts start at different times, I think. But there is going to be a time when the various sticks are introduced and there is going to be a time when we have a new bus contract, and it is possibly going to be around about the same kind of time. I would envisage that it is from that period that we start collecting the data over the 12 months or the 15 months, because it is by then that we will have in place the new service and the other parts of the new transport strategy, which will enable us to make a proper analysis of the effects.

But if Deputy Domaille says, 'Well, in advance of that, I have got sufficient money to introduce a free service before then,' well then fine – there is nothing in this amendment which precludes that, but what we do not want to have is that you press 'go' now on the 12 or 15 months and then half way through that you change the contract. Clearly, that would be ridiculous. It would be far better for us to change the contract then have the 12 or 15-month period collecting the data.

Deputy Dorey asked how I got to £200,000. Well, the honest answer was that I asked the author of the report that we are debating. But he has to remember that it includes the swipe card. You have to take into account. If you are comparing where we were last night with now, the swipe card was not included last night. You have to include the swipe card. You have to include all the concessions which were in Deputy St Pier's amendment and I do not think... He is talking about 18 months but actually it would be more likely over a period of 12 or 15 months, because it would only run for 18 months and we would have to have had the analysis done before then and then the report produced. So that is how you get to the figure of around about £200,000. But, as I say, I spoke to Deputy Burford about that.

Deputy Storey and Deputy Conder made the point that, if we are going to set long-term pricing policy – and we now appear to be absolutely stuck with that as the States, because that is the outcome of last night's amendment... if we are going to do that, it is better that we do it on the basis of evidence collected in Guernsey. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) We have heard a lot of criticism of the evidence that is produced in the report and in the Minority Report: 'Well, it is based on other jurisdictions,' 'It is theoretical,' 'It is a survey, but there are not very many people involved in the survey.' Actually, they are all fair criticisms. Although it is the only available evidence we have to make policy at the moment. But I think if we are going to set long term pricing policy for bus fares, we ought to do it on the basis of evidence and data collected in Guernsey, and that is the advantage that this amendment provides.

Deputy Duquemin raised the point that reminded me that, of course, all the costs of a bus service are really in the staff and the maintenance, and the infrastructure and the petrol – and all those costs apply irrespective of how many passengers you are taking per bus. The best way – in fact, the only way – of materially reducing the subsidy per passenger is to get more passengers on to the bus. You are not going to reduce the subsidy to any great extent by charging the half a dozen people who are going round the Island at the moment an extra 50p. If you get 10 people on a bus at the moment and instead of it being free, they are paying 50p, that is five quid. If you want to get the subsidy down per passenger you have got to get more people on the bus. You have got to get a material shift in travelling habits, and that is the whole purpose of a free bus service – as recognised in the Majority Report and in the Minority Report.

Deputy Kuttelwascher thinks the bus service may have turned the corner. (*Laughter and interjections*) Okay. He wants to get out more with Deputy Queripel, I think. (*Laughter and interjections*) Both. He is not sure that the things in the amendment can be measured. Well, the key criteria in the amendment is the number of bus passengers. I cannot believe it is beyond the wit of the Environment Department to measure the number of bus passengers. And, yes, he says, 'Well, you cannot be absolutely certain why an individual person got on a bus,' Was it because they did not have access to a car one day or was it because of the price of the fare? Those are fair points, but that analysis has to be done in setting pricing anyway. Otherwise you just take the view, 'Well, every time it comes to revise bus fares just stick our fingers in the air.' It has to be based on evidence and the Departments concerned have to make their best estimate at how the various factors have influenced behaviour.

Actually, the Policy and Research Unit have done it already. They have produced this analysis of price elasticity of demand. It is in the Billet. They suggest that there is a strong correlation between bus fares and the number of passengers. I think they say a change of a penny changes the number of passengers by just over four and a half thousand. I think that is what they suggested. So that analysis has already been done.

Deputy Ogier says – and he is quite correct – some Members have the objective of dismembering this strategy. I disagree slightly with him because I do not have a problem with those Members. I am quite happy... Members come in and say, 'We do not want this road transport strategy. We do not think the Majority Report is right or the Minority Report is right. We either want something completely different or we do not believe there should be a strategy, or we do not think we should debate it now, or we should wait for some other reports.' Those are all perfectly legitimate positions. Honest positions. But those Members are in the minority.

What will defeat the transport strategy is if the majority of Members who want a road transport strategy cannot unite around the subject of bus fares. I make that appeal, in particular, to Members, like Deputy Dorey, who have said, 'I want an integrated road transport strategy.' Well, let us look at the realpolitik of

this for a minute. Being pragmatic, if you cannot reach an agreement on bus fares, you are not going to get an integrated road transport strategy when we go to the final vote. It is just not going to happen.

2195 Deputy Domaille had all these questions, ‘Well, when do we start collecting the data?’ And ‘What about OAPs and under threes? Will they be exempt?’ Look, if this amendment loses you will not have to worry about all that, because the strategy will have been completely torpedoed and it will lose when we go to the final vote.

2200 So the Members who want to dismember the strategy... perfectly legitimate position, but they cannot do it alone. They need the assistance of the Members who favour an integrated transport strategy, but are prepared to sacrifice it at the altar of a 50p bus fare. And I would appeal to them not to do that, please.

Deputy Luxon is correct that, effectively, this amendment defers the decision that was made last evening and allows us to reconsider the issue in the light of evidence of real passengers travelling on real buses in Guernsey.

2205 Deputy Domaille said that a bus service free at the point of use was *central* to Majority Report and the Minority Report. That was the word he used – ‘central’. Now, that does not mean it is a plank that can be taken out. It is central. The whole thing collapses because – as Deputy Duquemin pointed out – if you do not have the service free at the point of use when you are trying to articulate and promote this new strategy to the public of Guernsey, it will not work.

2210 This amendment, sir, does not represent my ideal outcome. It is not the policy I would adopt if it were left entirely to me. I have moved. I have compromised. Deputy Luxon has compromised. Deputy St Pier has compromised. The Chief Minister has compromised. I would ask the other Members who support the principle of an integrated transport strategy also to compromise, to reciprocate and to vote for this amendment in order to retain the integrated nature of the strategy.

2215 It comes down to this, sir: there are some Members who are utterly convinced that bus fares free at the point of use are either wrong or will not make any difference at all to the success of the strategy. Of course they will vote against the amendment. I accept that. But if there is any Member who believes that bus fares free at the point of use, appropriately limited and capped in the way that they are in this amendment, could play a role in an integrated transport strategy, please vote for the amendment. Because if you vote against the amendment you lose the integrated strategy.

2220 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

2225 **Deputy Brouard:** Just a question that I asked that I did not get an answer to, sir. If I could just ask Deputy Fallaize, if he has just got a second? He answered part of it – that the real evidence he will use will be the bus passenger numbers – but the actual question I asked was: if the numbers go up over the 18 months, will you introduce the 50p and if numbers go down will you introduce the 50p?

2230 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, it is very difficult to give a commitment 18 months in advance, when we do not actually know what the data is. (*Interjections*) However, I have said, in principle, I think that it is possible that one could make a case for bus fares to go up whether passengers have gone up or down, because if they have gone up then you have obviously captured lots more people and once you have captured lots more people it can probably bear some increase in cost. If, however, they have gone down then what is the point of continuing with a free service, because it is clearly then just a subsidy that is totally unnecessary?

The key behind this amendment is that you start with a free service so that you can capture more passengers. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) Does that answer Deputy Brouard’s question, sir?

2240 **Deputy Brouard:** It answers it, sir, but it does not give us a real answer because the idea of –

2245 **Deputy Fallaize:** Deputy Brouard wants me to adopt a degree of prescience. Okay, I will give you a guarantee. (*Interjections*) He asked me how I would vote. Fine. If it takes this undertaking to get this amendment through, I will vote to go to 50p in 18 months, whatever has happened to bus passenger numbers, because I believe passionately that you are not going to get this strategy off the ground until you have got a free service.

2250 Now, if the Environment Department come back in 18 months’ time and can demonstrate, with a financial case and a case based on passenger numbers, that we need to maintain this free service, I am sure the States will do that. But Deputy Brouard wants me to stand here and give a commitment of what every Member of the States is going to do in 18 months’ time, when we do not actually know whether bus passenger numbers have gone up or down. I am not that good.

I have finished my speech, Deputy Lowe, so I do not need to give way.

The Bailiff: Is it a point?

2255 **Deputy Lowe:** I was standing before he sat down.

The Bailiff: Well, he did not give way to you while he was speaking, so –

2260 **Deputy Lowe:** Okay.

The Bailiff: We vote then on the –

Deputy Fallaize: Do you have a point, sorry?

2265 **Deputy Lowe:** Yes, I do, because I just wanted to – Thank you. You – (*Interjections*) (**Deputy Fallaize:** Yes.) Okay.

The Bailiff: I am sorry, I thought he had finished his –

2270 **Deputy Fallaize:** I had.

Deputy Lowe: No, he is just asking me what I wanted to say. (*Interjections*) What is going on?

2275 **The Bailiff:** But he could not give way to you once he had finished. That is the point.

Deputy Fallaize: I just said, sir, ‘I do not need to give way. I have finished my speech.’ If Deputy Lowe wishes to ask a question or raise a point of correction she may. If she is just going to sort of hang in mid-air, (**Deputy Lowe:** No.) can we please go to a recorded vote? (*Laughter and applause*)

2280 **Deputy Lowe:** In that case –

The Bailiff: Is it a point of order or a point of correction?

2285 **Deputy Lowe:** Well, it is a point of correction then, because Deputy Fallaize just said the 18 months... he would give a guarantee, when in his speech he actually said it will be the 18 months which will be the same time as the contract. So it will be after the next election.

The Bailiff: There has been a request, Members, for a recorded vote on the amendment proposed by Deputy Fallaize and seconded by Deputy Le Tocq.

2290 *There was a recorded vote*

2295 **The Bailiff:** While the vote is being formally counted, I believe we have two amendments remaining – one that was circulated overnight, proposed by Deputy Gillson, seconded by Deputy Le Pelley. I believe that has been circulated to everybody. Yes. The other one from Deputy Inglis, seconded by Deputy Green. As the first one relates to Proposition 5, I propose that we will take that next. Deputy Jones?

2300 **Deputy David Jones:** Mr Bailiff, it is my intention that, if Deputy Gillson’s amendment is passed, then I will lay a very short amendment about Alderney being excluded from that, because it is about the difference between fuel prices and paid parking.

2305 **The Bailiff:** We may have three amendments but what I was really trying to get to was that we will take Deputy Gillson’s amendment next, if I am right in thinking that, at the moment, all we have is that one and Deputy Inglis’ amendment.

*Amendment by Deputies Fallaize and Le Tocq:
Carried – Pour 31, Contre 15, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1*

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Alderney Rep. Jean	Deputy Kuttelwascher	None	Deputy Langlois
Alderney Rep. Harvey	Deputy Lester Queripel		
Deputy Harwood	Deputy Trott		
Deputy Brehaut	Deputy David Jones		

Deputy Domaille	Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Robert Jones	Deputy Lowe
Deputy Le Clerc	Deputy Spruce
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Dorey
Deputy Sherbourne	Deputy Paint
Deputy Conder	Deputy Brouard
Deputy Storey	Deputy Wilkie
Deputy Bebb	Deputy De Lisle
Deputy St Pier	Deputy Inglis
Deputy Stewart	Deputy Soulsby
Deputy Gillson	Deputy Quin
Deputy Le Pelley	
Deputy Ogier	
Deputy Fallaize	
Deputy Le Lièvre	
Deputy Collins	
Deputy Duquemin	
Deputy Green	
Deputy Le Tocq	
Deputy James	
Deputy Adam	
Deputy Perrot	
Deputy Burford	
Deputy Sillars	
Deputy Luxon	
Deputy O'Hara	
Deputy Hadley	

2310 The formal count of the votes on the Deputy Fallaize/Deputy Le Tocq amendment was 31 votes in favour, 15 against. It says one abstention. Did we have an abstention? He was not present. One absent. It should be one absent rather than one abstention. So 31 in favour, 15 against. I declare the amendment carried.

The Bailiff: So Deputy Gillson.

2315

Amendment:

To delete proposition 5 and replace it with the original proposition 12:

'5. To direct the Treasury and Resources Department, at the earliest opportunity, to increase the rate of duty on petrol and gas oil (other than fuel used for air or marine navigation) by 5p per litre as set out in section 11.13 I of that Report.'

Deputy Gillson: Thank you, sir.

First of all, I would like to thank Deputy Le Pelley for agreeing to second this amendment.

This is a very straight forward amendment. It is binary decision: paid parking or fuel duty?

2320 During the debate on the Minority Report, a number of Deputies expressed support for the report but reservations on the introduction of paid parking – some saying they would support the Minority Report, but later vote against paid parking.

2325 The problem with this approach is that it would result in a funding gap for the Minority Report of about £1 million pounds. This amendment fills that funding gap because this amendment replaces the £1 million lost from paid parking with £1 million from fuel duty.

2330 Sir, I am going to make a very short speech because yesterday I made a speech explaining why I do not support paid parking, so I am not going to repeat all of those reasons here – those arguments stand. I remain opposed to the introduction of paid parking. But rather than wait until the final votes and risk ending up with an unfunded strategy because paid parking is thrown out – and Deputy Domaille is somebody who said that he thinks there is a possibility it will be and there is a possibility... so rather than wait with that risk, this allows Members to vote against paid parking – as many have said they would – but provides the funding for the carrots which are a central part of the strategy.

So I hope Members who do not like paid parking will take the opportunity to support this amendment, so that we can then get rid of paid parking but have a strategy which is funded.

2335 Thank you.

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

Deputy Le Pelley: I do, sir, and reserve the right to talk in general debate.

2340

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Sir, at the risk of tedious repetition, (*Interjection*) oh no, it already is a bit. Deputy Fallaize said to us earlier, ‘Do not just see this as a revenue raising debate,’ but I think it does have a revenue raising element. I personally am in a minority, I think, today, in that I think we need to raise both car parking charges and fuel, and the time will come when we will do fiscally. I therefore logically have to support this amendment.

I also suspect that it would create more than 5p per litre. Sorry, it will be more than £1 million pounds raised. I think, actually, the figure would be somewhat higher than that.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dave Jones.

Deputy David Jones: Thank you.

Well, I find this amendment very odd because Deputy Brouard and I already have added 1½p to a litre of fuel to avoid paid parking last time. So what seems to happen then, is that every time you bring paid parking back to the Assembly, we ratchet up the fuel price (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) in order to avoid having it. Now, if that is not conning the general public I do not know what is.

So I do not know where I am with this now because, as I say, Deputy Brouard and I have already done this. The 1½p per litre on fuel is still there – although I understand in the Minority Report they want to remove it. I will believe that when I see it. But this is just barking. We are ratcheting up the cost of fuel to the motorist every single time paid parking rears its ugly head in this Assembly.

The Bailiff: Deputy Bebb.

Deputy Bebb: I think that in this debate, for myself and Dave Jones to be on the same side, shows how barking this is. (*Laughter and interjections*) It really is.

Absolutely, as Deputy Dave Jones says, this is supposed to be a transport strategy not in order to actually just raise revenue. I believe in paid parking and we will vote differently on that one, but I do not think that raising 5p as an excuse in order to just ratchet up is the right answer.

This is a poor amendment. Please reject it immediately.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sillars.

Deputy Sillars: Sir, I want an integrated transport strategy. I voted Pour to the last amendment to try and keep the transport strategy in place. My problem is, and always has been, paid parking.

Up until now I have not had the opportunity to vote for a strategy excluding paid parking. This amendment will allow me, if successful, to vote for a complete strategy fully-funded without, in my view, the huge risks and unfairness that paid parking in town brings about.

Regarding paid parking, a lot has been said but we have been told to suck it and see. Well, I am not prepared to suck it and see. I for one cannot risk being part of this experiment, for if it fails – and fail... I mean really it does affect the town, really does affect the lower paid; I am convinced it will – then I do not want to be part of it.

I also accept that if paid parking is not replaced by an increase in fuel duty then there is a real danger of no strategy at all, and I really do not want that either. So, reluctantly, I will vote for this amendment as it is the lesser of two evils.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Does anyone else wish to speak on the amendment?

Deputy Kuttelwascher, then Deputy Stewart.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Sir, I am just challenging this number of it raising £1 million. It is closer to £2 million. (*Interjections*) I had a reply from the Deputy Treasurer in 2013: a 1.2 increase in fuel duty raised just under £400,000. So if you multiply that by four, it is 1.6, but it may be 1.7. So it is a substantial rise in taxation.

Another thing that now concerns me – especially with regard to something Deputy Le Lièvre said – was that if nobody changed their behaviour then the amount of revenue raised would be quite high, especially on things like width and CO₂ duty. So, although I have not had time, I am beginning to think now that the revenue raising measures in this transport strategy are actually greater than we had for the whole Budget for 2014 – and that for me is an issue because what we are now descending to is Departments setting mini budgets as we go along and I do not think that is good governance, and that is my concern.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Stewart.

2405 **Deputy Stewart:** Sir, I will be brief.

I cannot support this. Most of the cost will be borne by a lot of our small businesses that are driving round the Island, all day every day. Those costs will then be passed on to the consumer – increased costs of freight. We have been through these arguments. They are well rehearsed. So I cannot support this amendment.

2410 We have already had massive hikes in our fuel over the last 10 years in Guernsey and I think, frankly, enough is enough. I will then have to reconsider my position on some of the approach we took with some of the commercial vehicles on the CO₂ as well.

So I will not be supporting this amendment.

2415 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Pelley.

Deputy Le Pelley: Thank you, sir.

I am mindful of the fact that you have told us that we should not be repeating what we said in the past. I have said very little so there is not much chance of me doing that, personally, but of course I must not say what others have said.

2420 I would like to say that I have been very impressed by the well-researched and documented reports. The excellent speeches over three days – and there continue to be good speeches, (*Interjection*) hopefully not for another three days, quite right Deputy Bebb – and some excellent arguments, well-articulated and delivered, have been given.

2425 We do need an excellent bus service. The service that we have today falls so very far below what we need and what we must have. The whole debate will, I think, resolve around how an improved bus service is to be funded.

In supporting Deputy Gillson's amendment, I am looking for a very detailed debate on exactly how funding should be raised to ensure that we get the bus service that this Island must have. And I cannot support paid parking. So how are we going to fund it without paid parking? I am supporting this so that we debate exactly how we fund it. This is one other alternative way of finding the funds that we need to provide a sensible satisfactory bus service that this Island is desperate for.

2430 Thank you.

2435 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you very much, Mr Bailiff.

The report that you all so heartedly endorsed yesterday acknowledged the concept within the report which is one of modal shift, that people have alternatives, that people have options and people have choices. So if you are looking for the incentives and disincentives then 5p a litre simply does not work.

2440 Now, the proposer of this amendment has just arrived in a new job. He is now the Home Department Minister and I wonder how much time the Home Department... how much time the Fire and Rescue spend disproportionately on road traffic accidents and those time consuming events? How much time, energy and salaries go into police pay, road safety, traffic and, fortunately fewer and fewer, but still the occasional road death and associated costs in more than one way? Now, in 1970 approximately 40,000 cars, 1996 – 60,000, 20 years later around 80,000.

2445 5p makes no difference, whatsoever, and if the message from the new Home Department Minister is, 'Carry on driving', that concerns me a little bit because driving and not trying to manage it in any way has enormous cost implications for the Department that he is now head of.

2450 So I cannot support this amendment either, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Harwood.

Deputy Harwood: Thank you, sir.

2455 I can give an assurance to all the Members of the States the passion is spent! (*Laughter*) Sir, I would urge Members to reject this amendment. We had a debate in full on the reasons why it was bad to rely upon an increase in fuel duty, when we debated whether we should go for the Minority Report or the Majority Report. It is very difficult to address this issue without repetition.

2460 I would urge Members to take note of the comments made by Deputy Kevin Stewart because, as I said in my speech when we were debating the pros and cons of the Minority and the Majority Report, the key issue here is: is it appropriate that *all* drivers, even those who need the use of the car for social purposes and who may not necessarily be coming in to town, should have to bear the costs of the entire strategy? No, it is

not. It is not a fair burden. It is an arbitrary burden and I would urge all States Members, once again, to reject the motion of the reliance upon fuel duty. It will not change people's attitudes. It has not changed attitudes in the past. We need to go back to the premise of the Minority Report – the strategy in there. And I am afraid it is paid parking.

The Bailiff: Deputy Storey.

Deputy Storey: Sir, I will be very brief.

My concern here is that the reason behind this proposal is to balance the books on the strategy. The only problem with that is once you have taken away paid parking you have not got a strategy. So it is nonsense to think purely in financial terms about, 'Well, 5p a litre is the equivalent to what we would raise on paid parking,' because the impact of 5p a litre is relatively small and the impact on paid parking is relatively significant, and the whole objective of the integrated policy is to try to change people's behaviour in some small way – the nudge – so that people are using buses a bit more and cars a bit less. Putting 5p on a litre of petrol is not the way to achieve that integrated policy.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: Sir, I cannot support this because, as the previous speaker has said, it is not going to have the effect of changing behaviour. Fuel prices go up and down on a regular basis for other reasons, because of the price oil, and so this is by no means guaranteed that it will affect people's behaviour or push them in that sort of direction. As was said before, it is not enough of a stick to do so. It is a bit like the advice my father gave me years ago, when I was a student. He said when you want to take £20 out for your weekly allowance, take it in ones so that you feel the effect of spending far more than just with one note. This would not do that.

In any case, I do believe that this Assembly will, in a different debate, need to consider the sorts of tax-raising issues, of this kind, for different reasons. So linking it into this strategy is not very wise at all.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: All of the arguments as to why fuel duty is an utterly ineffective measure in achieving behaviour change have been well-rehearsed at length and I am not going to reiterate them. It will not change behaviour. It will add to the costs of everyone.

This amendment attempts to revive the funding of the main report – a report that only had one person speak in support of it, apart from the three Departmental Members. That report cannot be revived. The patient is dead.

This amendment is an attempt by those so ideologically opposed to paid parking that they would agree to anything rather than risk is being introduced. If you do not want paid parking I respect that – vote against it; that is your right – but do not completely dismantle a thoroughly integrated strategy and give the people of Guernsey an unworkable strategy. That would be the worst of all worlds and, indeed, I would vote against my own report at that stage because it would be taking money from people for no benefit.

I urge Members to vote against this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Adam.

Deputy Adam: I would just like to comment, along with Deputy Harwood, concerning using a tax on petrol for specific purpose.

Deputy Le Pelley talked very strongly about how important it was to have a good functional funded bus service. I accept all that but the problem is: what happens in the Budget? For at least, probably, the 10 years I have been in this Assembly, every Budget we see some form of increase on what is called 'consumers' taxation' – and it usually includes petrol.

Therefore, if you put 5p on petrol and then give it to a specific purpose, such as bus support, then you have £1 million or £1.5 million that you cannot use for what I think are important services, such as education, HSSD, and social security funding.

Now, you have that choice to make. If you are going to hypothecate where you take what is usually a general revenue source of taxation and increase in moneys, and take it out now and say, 'That is where it is going you are going,' to have to take money out from these other Departments which cannot, at the present time, afford losing what, to them, is a tiny amount – it is only 1% or 2% – but it is, in the present day, a significant amount.

For this reason I cannot support this. I will have to stick with the Minority Report methodology, which is not very pleasant – I accept that completely – but is reasonable under the circumstances. And that is not

2525 just paid parking. Everyone talks about paid parking. It is paid parking specifically for long-term parking. It is not paid parking for two and a half hours. Also it is paid parking in the format of having discs in your car that have cost you £16.

Therefore, all drivers are contributing to parking throughout the Island. Those using the long term are contributing specifically for that purpose and they have a choice of whether they use upgraded, efficient, comfortable public transport or whether they want to take their car. Some of us will continue to use our cars
2530 – I accept that.

So, sir, I will vote against this amendment. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Quin, then Deputy Spruce.

2535 **Deputy Quin:** Thank you, sir.

I thought part of the traffic strategy was to dissuade people from using cars. Well, paid parking would do that. This 5p... as a Member of both Home Department and Culture and Leisure, the increase on our fuel bills would be horrendous. My advice to everyone is to kick this out. This is an anti-paid parking. Be brave enough to vote against paid parking and do not try these back door measures.

2540 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Spruce. (*Interjection*) I had called Deputy Spruce. We will hear Deputy Spruce and then we will invoke 14(1).

2545 **Deputy Spruce:** It looks like I am going to be in the minority here and say that I think this proposal is absolutely sensible.

It absolutely astounds me the amount of people in this room, that seem to have no idea what the impact this is going to have on literally thousands of people who work in St Peter Port. There are people that come into this town to work, eight to 10 hours a day. It is going to cost them £1,300 a year. I have said this already once, but a small group of people are going to be forced to pay for an integrated road transport strategy, which is going to affect the whole Island and benefit the whole Island's travelling public.
2550

You would swear this was a simple discussion between paid parking or a free bus service, but the proposals in Deputy Burford's Minority Report and, in fact, the proposals in the Majority Report encompass a whole range of motoring and transport benefits and options which have to be funded. So it is about funding and this is a way that the whole of the Island's travelling public can fund all the measures that are necessary.
2555

So I seriously ask you to think about all the thousands of people that are going to have £1,300 a year taken out of their back pocket so that you can reach – sorry, Deputy Burford – your ideology. Because I am not against paid parking, ideologically, I am against robbing... basically raiding thousands of people by £1,300 a year. It is a huge cost.
2560

So I would ask you to support this amendment.

The Bailiff: Well, we have got a request for a guillotine motion.

2565 **Deputy Trott:** I was going to say, sir, would it not be sensible to ask how many more wish to speak?

The Bailiff: How many more wish to speak? (*Laughter and interjections*)

Deputy Trott: It will not take me very long, sir.

2570 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott, Deputy Brouard. Deputy Hadley, do you wish me to place the request to close the debate?

Deputy Hadley: [*Inaudible*]

2575 **The Bailiff:** Well, we have already heard 16 speeches, so, quite quickly.
Deputy Trott.

2580 **Deputy Trott:** A couple of comments for balance, more than anything else, sir. Not declaring an interest as regards this amendment in either way. The comment that fuel duty does not change behaviour – it most certainly does and that is recognised in the Gillson/Le Pelley amendment where they have specifically excluded marine fuels. There is absolutely no doubt that marine tourism would be very significantly affected if the same amount of duty was levied as for road vehicles, and that has been debated by this Assembly and considered to be the case on several previous occasions.

2585 The Chief Minister made the point about market movements in the international energy markets and, of course, he is quite right that we can see fluctuations as the result of a crisis somewhere in the Middle East that could easily see the price enhanced by 5%, or indeed a discount of 5%, applied and if we are able to shop at a certain supermarket when offers are on, discounts of up to 10% per litre are available.

2590 Something else that is worthy of mention is the effect, of course, that an introduction of a 5% GST would have – and I am conscious of the fact that the Chief Minister is undecided on this important issue, but he might wish to follow me with the maths that, at present levels, a 5% level of GST would see a 6p per litre increase in the price of fuel.

2595 Finally, sir, it is important to remember that this is a much harder tax to avoid. As Deputy Spruce says, if you are paying on fuel everyone who uses a motor vehicle – whether they are travelling in it or the pilot of it – has to pay. That is certainly not the case, as very adequately explained by Deputy Spruce, with regards paid parking. So clearly this amendment is fairer.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

2600 Deputy Storey said that this was a small nudge. Well, paid parking to me, as a Guernsey donkey, is a rather large stick. And, as a Guernsey donkey, I would rather have carrots. But in the compromise that Deputy Ogier says we should all look at, for a few moments I will compromise and have an increase in fuel duty. With paid parking, you are using a divisive and mean charge on a minority to sort out an Island problem we scarcely define to pay for buses with paid parking, the ones having to pay for it by definition will not benefit.

2605 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Anyone else? No?

Deputy Domaille – Deputy Lester Queripel is just in time.

2610 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, I rise to seek clarification please from Deputy Gillson.

2615 Like him, I am totally opposed to paid parking, but several things can happen as a result of either supporting or rejecting this amendment. My first question is: I think I heard him say that the money will be ring-fenced – did he or did he not say that to provide all the bus shelters and cycle lanes etc? Will the money be ring-fenced? That is my first question.

Second question, if we support this amendment and paid parking goes through, won't the motorist then be paying twice, in effect? I apologise if I am missing fundamental points, but we are getting into micromanagement here after almost three days. And, to really put him on the spot, could he possibly explain all the other eventual permutations of either supporting or rejecting this amendment? *(Laughter)*

2620 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Anybody else? Deputy De Lisle.

2625 **Deputy De Lisle:** Just to make a clarification, sir, with regard to the 5p. I take it that that is without the 1.2p that is already in the strategy. I would like the Minister to just clarify that particular... I should say Deputy Gillson, to clarify that point, as well as the ring-fencing point that has already been asked.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Anyone else? No?

2630 Well, Deputy Domaille then, and then Deputy Gillson will reply.

Deputy Domaille: Thank you, sir.

2635 Obviously I will be supporting this amendment. Can I just put it back, I am not going to get into the argument over paid parking and all of that, because I think we really have done that to death and let us wait until we get on to get rid of these amendments. Then we can start again, no doubt.

2640 There is an important point here which is that actually the States could vote for, they might not go for the Minority strategy, they can vote for the proposals. They do not have to agree to paid parking or fuel duty or whatever. They could say, 'No. After all we have already said that we rate environmental measures with social and economic. No, we are not going to. We are going to take a slice off everybody's budget to pay for these measures.' Now, that is an option. Now that is not going to happen. All of us are all under pressure. That is it, right.

But we are, we have to, the Minority Report has had to, and they have done it in an honest fashion. The Majority Report has to identify possible areas of funding that can come into the equation. Now, in the case of fuel duty – and I know that it would appear that a majority of members do not agree, but – the analysis

2645 shows that the price of fuel affects behaviour. You can argue over the extent of it. You can argue over the extent. You cannot argue that it does affect behaviour. My opinion – as I said in my speech, I am not going to repeat everything – is that the fuel duty charge applies to all motorists. That is much, fairer than targeting a section of the community that has long-stay parking in St Peter Port.

2650 So I do support this amendment. I do accept... because you cannot have it all ways. I was accused of either having, I am not sure whether it was a carrot or a stick or a wet piece of celery, (*Laughter*) and some people say, 'This is going to cost all the businesses and everybody a lot of money and so we cannot have it,' and other people say, 'It is not going to have any effect.' You cannot have it both ways.

So I urge Members to support the amendment. I can already tell where this is going but I still urge Members to support the amendment.

2655 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gillson.

Deputy Gillson: Sir, thank you.
Firstly, Deputy Gollop –

2660 **The Bailiff:** Your microphone.

Deputy Gillson: Firstly, Deputy John Gollop spoke and thank you for the support. It is not just about raising, it is about funding the strategy.

2665 Deputy Jones does not know where we are. I will tell you where we are. We will have a strategy that does not have paid parking, but is funded. If people vote against paid parking at the very end we could end up with a strategy which is not funded.

2670 Deputy Bebb – it is not just the funding issue. This is an issue about paid parking or not paid parking, that is it. I brought forward the amendment now so that the decision is made and does not end up with a funding gap on the strategy – I will give way.

The Bailiff: Deputy Bebb.

2675 **Deputy Bebb:** In which case, Deputy Gillson, could I possibly ask you to clarify what would happen to the 1.2p which is currently in place (**A Member:** Hear, hear) in lieu of paid parking, because my question, and my assertion was simply that five pence every time someone mentions paid parking is inappropriate tax raising, rather than part of a strategy?

The Bailiff: Deputy Gillson.

2680 **Deputy Gillson:** The 1.2p as part of the strategy was part of the main strategy. The amount which is included in my amendment is taken from the main strategy. It is to fund the strategy. That is what it is there for.

Deputy Sillars, thank you for your support.

2685 Deputy Kuttelwascher – the £1 million. I have just taken the number from the report. That is where I took it from.

Deputy Stewart – the cost to business. Yes, but it is not a significant cost because, as Deputy Duquemin so well said yesterday, when he goes to buy his petrol it is just a couple of pounds on £30 – it is hardly noticeable. (*Interjection*) It is not a disincentive, I am not suggesting it is.

2690 Deputy Le Pelley, thank you for your words and, of course, supporting this.

2695 Deputy Brehaut – this will not get a modal shift. I believe in modal shift. I believe in it from carrots, not sticks, and I think that rejecting paid parking and replacing this with a duty will provide the money to be able to have a modal shift. You made some comments about the Home Minister suggesting people still drive and accidents. I would just remind you I am the person that, about 18 months ago, wrote to both Education and Environment asking if they would consider extending the track behind St Sampson's School so it would go through, so we would have a cycle path, basically, across the north of the Island. I am the person that yesterday in debate said I would like to see the road from the Capelles right to the Red Lion made one way with a cycle path. I said I would like to see the road from the Vrangue to Camp du Roi one way with a cycle path. So do not say that I am happy to see roads full of cars and accidents, because I am suggesting ways to actually stop it.

2700 No, I will not give way.

Deputy Harwood – is it appropriate that everybody bares the cost of the strategy? Well, yes, because it is not just a strategy about congestion in town, it is an Island-wide strategy. If we can create a shift with carrots of people cycling, like my suggestion, from Capelles right to Red Lion – that is not necessarily

2705 people going in to town. Everyone in the Island will benefit from this strategy. Therefore, it is appropriate that everybody in the Island contributes.

It is actually unfair to suggest that only a small number of people who happen to park in North Beach, who may happen to have to park in North Beach because they work late shift hours or early shifts... and so cannot get into town before the bus starts, cannot get into town because the buses do not come early enough. It is unfair for those to pay. So, this is actually fairer because it is spreading the load.

2710 Deputy Storey – reasons to balance the book but removes the strategy. No, it does not. It is not a disincentive. I do not like sticks, I prefer carrots, so what this does is it removes something which I am philosophically ideologically opposed to – I admit it – but it brings the money in so that we can have a full integrated strategy.

2715 Deputy Le Tocq referred to a stick. Well, actually I do not like the idea of a Government which influences people with sticks? Just how negative a Government do we want to be? One where we beat the population of Guernsey with sticks. I would rather encourage the modal shift by having carrots before them. This will fund carrots without a stick.

2720 Now, in 18 months or so it may be that this has not worked. Then we can consider it. But – in the same way that Deputy Fallaize was saying on the last amendment – let us bring in free buses and see how it goes, and then you can take it one step at a time. This does it. This brings in a strategy of carrots. It brings in, hopefully, enough money to be able to make Capelles to Red Lion one way with a bus lane, but with a cycle path, without sticks to beat the population.

I give way.

2725 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: I was just going to suggest that I do not think Deputy Gillson has ever actually ridden a donkey. (*Laughter*)

2730 **Deputy Gillson:** Sorry, did I...? Right, sir.

Deputy Burford – will not achieve the modal change and is ideologically opposed. I admit it. I am ideologically opposed to paid parking. The percentage duty is not to achieve modal shifts. It will achieve a shift. It will have some influence. It will not have as big an influence as paid parking, I admit it. But there again I admit that I do not like sticks, I do not want to beat the population of Guernsey up.

2735 Deputy Harwood – this provides the money to upgrade the bus service, the money will be there and you mentioned something, which I did not completely follow, about taking away moneys from other budgets. This is not taking moneys from any other Department budget.

2740 Deputy Quin, my Deputy Minister at Home – this is not a back door amendment hoping to stop paid parking. I am totally honest – this is to stop paid parking. It is an open front door amendment to stop paid parking. There is nothing coming in the back door with this.

I give way.

2745 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Quin.

Deputy Quin: Having suffered from FTP for the last few months on the Home Department I know this additional bill will leave us both with grey hairs.

2750 **Deputy Gillson:** We both already have it! (*Laughter*) We are very unfortunate.

Deputy Spruce, thank you for the support.

Deputy Trott – absolutely right, this is an amendment which is a fairer way of raising money.

Deputy Brouard, you are right, paid parking is a horrible stick. I do not want it. Like you, I prefer carrots.

2755 Deputy Queripel – the money will be... it will be as ring-fenced as any money raised within this Minority or what was the Majority Report, but the Minority which is now the substantive report. It is as ring fenced as any of that. What would happen if paid parking comes in as well? Well, no, this is an either/or amendment. It is two parts, 1) kick out paid parking and 2) bring in a levy. So, unless someone else brings another amendment to say bring in paid parking as well, that is not going to happen. (*Interjection*)

2760 Deputy De Lisle, what will happen to the 1.2p existing? I think that remains. I think this is exactly the same as the Majority Report and Deputy Domaille would be able to confirm that the 1.2p that is existing already remains. Yes.

Deputy Fallaize: No, it does not, sir, because the Proposition, as it has been amended by Deputy Burford's amendment will take 1.2p out.

2765

Deputy Gillson: Yes, you are right. Sorry it comes out.

Deputy Dorey: It is Proposition 7, for your information.

2770 **Deputy Gillson:** Absolutely right, it removes that.

Deputy De Lisle: Thank you for the clarification. (*Laughter*)

2775 **Deputy Gillson:** Sir, the bottom line is this is a very transparent amendment. It is a binary decision. Do you like paid parking? Do you want to nail your flag to the mast of paid parking? Or do you not like paid parking? I am clearly nailing my flag to the mast of not paid parking.

2780 The beauty of this amendment is this decision, this vote, is not being mixed up with anything about the Minority Report. We have the Minority Report. We have a strategy and that is going forward. So this is a simple choice, a choice that says if you do not have paid parking – and yesterday a number of people said, even though they supported the Minority Report, they would throw out paid parking... This says, ‘Okay, if you do not want paid parking do not have it, but we give the strategy the funding it will need.’ It is less of a risk. It actually supports the strategy because it will make sure that if that happens the strategy has money. It will have the funding. So, for me, the key to a strategy at this stage is not the stick, not beating the population into submission, it is about carrots. This amendment allows the strategy to be funded and those
2785 carrots to be in place. It allows cycle paths to be built. It allows us to increase pedestrian areas and pavements. Those things – the good things about a strategy... and it is fairer because everybody who uses a car will contribute towards it. So those people on the Bridge who will benefit from the strategy, those people in Capelles, in Torteval and St Saviours, who will benefit from the strategy, will help fund it. That is fair. Why pick on a few hundred people who park in one place?

2790 Of course, the irony is that when you have a strategy funded in part by paid parking, if your strategy is successful your income diminishes. So there is that quandary with if it is very successful, you start seeing that £1 million, which the strategy needs, actually reducing. This is fairer. It is less risky for town. It is, I think, a good amendment because we can go forward with a strategy – a positive strategy; we will have a positive strategy, not a negative based strategy, a positive one with carrots.

2795 So please, sir, I hope people will support this amendment and could we have a recorded vote, please?

The Bailiff: A recorded vote on the amendment.

2800 **Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, may I ask for clarification –

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

2805 **Deputy Fallaize:** – and I apologise if Deputy Gillson advised of this when he opened. What is the difference between the proposal to raise 5p, in terms of income, and the paid parking proposal?

Deputy Gillson: According to the figures in here, they are pretty even. It is a marginal difference.

2810 **Deputy Fallaize:** So if there is a marginal difference and we take out 1.2p after adding in 5p, we are left with 3.8p which must be less than is raised by paid parking. So, therefore, would the strategy remain underfunded?

The Bailiff: Deputy Gillson.

2815 **Deputy Gillson:** It does not remain significantly underfunded and it is a lot less underfunded than if you wait until the end of the debate and vote out paid parking without putting this funding in. This will provide funding that the strategy needs.

The Bailiff: A recorded vote on the amendment proposed by Deputy Gillson, seconded by Deputy Le Pelley.

2820 *There was a recorded vote.*

The Bailiff: Well, Members, while those votes are counted, can I suggest we move on with the final amendment, which is the one proposed by Deputy Inglis, seconded by Deputy Green.

Deputy Inglis.

2825

Amendment:

To insert a further proposition between Propositions 27 and 28 as follows:

'27A. To direct the Environment Department to re-investigate the merits and demerits of introducing a régime of compulsory periodic roadworthiness testing and certification of vehicles older than a specified age; and to report to the States with the Department's recommendations no later than at their Meeting in March 2015.'

Deputy Inglis: Thank you, sir.

Members of the Assembly, no carrots, no sticks with me. I am just asking for a report. May I say from the offset I have not and never have advocated an MOT test for Guernsey motorists? I am disappointed that
2830 little mention has been given in the Billet to the idea that a vehicle safety check be considered as a means of removing vehicles off the roads that are not compliant. The problem does exist.

Members, as has been mentioned many times in this Assembly, the wording of an amendment needs to be quite clear. However, this one seems to have been completely misunderstood. To recap, I wish the Environment Department to re-investigate the merits and de-merits of introducing a regime of compulsory, periodic road worthiness testing and certification of vehicles older than a specified age. I believe this will
2835 support one of the cornerstones of the transport strategy, dealing with – as Deputy Domaille advised in his opening speech – the social, fiscal, economic and environmental implications.

Now, naturally, we know the motor trade endorses the fact that five key areas should be periodically tested. Those areas being brakes, steering, tyres, body work and emissions. This safety test could easily be
2840 part of an owner's normal yearly service, if in fact they do that. Interested parties with appropriate knowledge and willing to provide the testing facilities, could be empowered to carry out the work with the States supporting in providing certification of conformity.

Now, some people will say the vehicle rectification system provides the necessary service already and it should be acknowledged that there is a concern that current roadside checks only create a snapshot of the problem. Having said that, 1,850 vehicles during 2012 and 2013 were reported for having specific vehicle
2845 faults. This, against a conservative estimation on my part of approximately £75,000 plus the infrastructure associated with this job, is a cost the taxpayer is paying for, with no charge whatsoever to the offender.

The scheme had the original intention of warning people of their responsibilities, giving them advice and the opportunity to rectify the faults, rather than be taken to court. In these fiscally challenging times, removing the Police presence from this function would allow officers to re-direct their efforts into other key
2850 areas of policing, but not to remove the ability to maintain spot safety checks.

Sir, may I remind the Assembly, 1,850 vehicles during 2012 and 2013 – that is four cars per day are taking part in this rectification scheme. Members, I would be failing in my responsibility if this form of simple testing was not considered by this Assembly. We must protect the public from... as was quoted in a court report which was last Friday, where the judge condemned the owner for operating an unsafe truck which was four tons overloaded.
2855

Finally, Deputy Burford, in her excellent speech, made the observation that the amendments target low income earners. I have no desire to target any specific group with this amendment, other than to promote responsible driving and safety.

2860 Members, please, I would welcome your support for this amendment to investigate and report back with recommendations.

The Bailiff: Deputy Green do you formally second the amendment?

2865 **Deputy Green:** I do indeed, sir, and reserve the right to speak.

Amendment by Deputies Gillson and Le Pelley:

Not carried – Pour 14, Contre 32, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1

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

2870 **The Bailiff:** If I can just announce the result of the votes on the amendment proposed by Deputy Gillson and seconded by Deputy Le Pelley. There were 14 votes in favour, 32 against. I declare that amendment lost.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut and then Deputy Dave Jones.

2875 **Deputy Brehaut:** Thank you, sir.
Deputy Burford and myself, as authors of the Minority Report, do not oppose this amendment, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you.
Deputy Jones.

2880 **Deputy David Jones:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff:
The problems I have with this amendment are several. Firstly, why are you asking the Environment Department to investigate something they have already investigated? Are you saying you do not trust Environment to have done it; you just want them to go back and keep doing it until they come back with a different answer? Because that is what it seems to me.

2885 The other thing is, I think the Police Rectification Scheme is probably better than the UK MOT system. The MOT system in the UK basically says that when your car left your garage on that day, you had a certificate to say that it was roadworthy. You could go down the road and jump up on a couple of kerbs, damage the steering, put the tracking out, then you could basically drive that for the rest of the year on that certificate. It is a rubbish system. You can buy those certificates in most pubs in the East End of London for almost anything. *(Laughter)* It is that kind of system.

2890 So I think our Police Vehicle Rectification Scheme is a much better system. And here we are again; we are loading, yet again, more expense onto the people of Guernsey for something that I do not think we need to do. It is not proven that many of the accidents, if any, are caused by faulty vehicles. It is mostly caused by speeding or people drink driving or a momentary lapse of attention or people being blinded by the sun – all kinds of reasons in Guernsey why people have accidents. But there are no real statistics and, actually, I would suspect that Environment have already had that conversation with the Police.

Now, the other thing that Deputy Inglis said is, of course, that it will save lots of Deputy Gillson's officers' time because they will not have to set up road checks to check on vehicles. Every time a police officer or traffic officer stops a vehicle – whether it is a roadside check dedicated to that task or not – they will check the vehicle. So that will not change at all. The police officers will still be doing it. Will the dedicated roadside checks go? I do not think so, because of the same reason I have just said.

The fact that you have had a certificate saying your car has been into a garage nine months ago and got one, will not stop the police officers looking round it or mounting checks, because having a certificate will not tell you whether a lorry is overloaded. So it is a complete and utter waste of time and it is adding yet more and more expense.

Every time this Assembly meets, we find more creative ways of relieving our people, who are struggling already, of more of their hard-earned money and this is another... I appreciate, Deputy Inglis, as he said, clearly on the radio, that they are only asking Environment to investigate this, but you are asking Environment to investigate something that they have already done – a complete and utter waste of civil service time at a time when we are trying to save as much money as we can. I think you should just reject this, allow Environment the credibility and the knowledge that they have already done this task and they found that it is unnecessary, and move on from there.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Sir, I think we should support this amendment.

For many years, I was Chairman and a committee member of Living Streets, which actually began out of one of the old traffic committees – the vulnerable road users working party – with myself and Mrs Pat Wisher and Deputy Tom Le Pelley; and one issue to campaign about are safer Island roads. The Minority Report has, I think, the vision of road safety officers and travel planners and I am satisfied that Deputy Brehaut and Deputy Burford would accept this amendment, because I think it is congruent to their vision.

One point that did come up during the last few weeks was an interesting, reasoned argument by the Guernsey motor trade. What perhaps surprised me – if not all of us – was that there are around 800 people who work in the industry and they want buy-in to the strategy and I think that they want to contribute their own ideas and this particular amendment, not surprisingly, would find their support; because it would be a revenue stream for them but, more importantly, might encourage the continued sale of newer or greener vehicles.

When you look at these issues – the brakes, the steering, the bodywork, the tyres, the emissions – we should not be running behind the European mainstream –

A Member: We are not, we are leading. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Gollop: – we should be leading the way and have one of the safest and greenest islands we can. We can afford it. It is time to start leading the field and not resisting everything that comes out of the European Union.

The Bailiff: Deputy Duquemin and then Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Duquemin: Thank you, sir.

I will be supporting this amendment. I think, as Deputy Inglis said at the outset, we are asking for a report to come back where we can consider this in perhaps more depth.

During my research on the whole of the transport strategy, I did spend time with Dave Beausire, the GMTA President, and it was a very good, honest chat. What happened was: I think he was able to illuminate to me the fact that, in his opinion, there are hundreds if not thousands of cars on Island roads that are un-roadworthy. And it was interesting – the two points that have possibly contributed to this most.

One is the absence of a motor tax, which is a reason for people persist with perhaps a car that they maybe just use at the weekends to maybe go to the rubbish tip because there is no need to provide or pay for motor tax. At the same time, it may be very little cost or even no cost at all to insure that vehicle, because many of the insurance companies all offer a multi-car insurance offering. So I think that, yes, sir, there is a real danger of hundreds if not thousands of cars on Island roads.

Now that I have children of my own, I am perhaps more aware of why I would like to make certain that every car on Island roads is roadworthy and the brakes work. If I can be very honest, going back many years, my first car at the age of 17 was a mini that I purchased for not very much money from my sister's boyfriend at the time – someone that Deputy Le Clerc may know well – and if I am honest, sir, the only way I was able to stop at the bottom of Cobo hill, was if I pulled on the handbrake. I am not proud of that

but that is the reality and I would have loved, at the time, someone to have said to me, ‘You cannot do that’, and a test would have stopped that.

2960 I would also like to add just one idea to the melting pot when, hopefully, after acceptance of this amendment, Environment does go away and consider this safety test, and that is this: that it will include an emissions test and then, when the car passes the test, that the motor mechanic or the garage would then stick on the back rear-view mirror of that car, three compulsory stickers and those stickers would display the width of the car, they would display the emissions of that car and there would also perhaps be one with a tick to say the year to say it had passed the test. The stickers that would show the width and the stickers that
2965 would show the emissions of the car, would be colour coded so we, as the person driving behind that car, would be in no doubt as to how green that car is and how suitable it is for Island roads.

We talk, in the transport strategy, about hitting people in the pocket, but I would also think that it would be worthy to hit them in their conscience too and even if they can afford it and I think Deputy Soulsby used the phrase yesterday – the people that have got the Chelsea tractors but do not need the Chelsea tractors perhaps, would think twice because when they are at the school car park picking up their children, they would perhaps, hopefully, feel just a little bit guilty and maybe they would look to have an alternative sticker, an alternative badge of honour.
2970

So, sir, I am supportive of this amendment for a number of reasons and I think that if we look at it in, hopefully, an innovative way, it can also hopefully be a way that not only the cars are roadworthy – which is of vital importance – but also it is another way to encourage people to purchase cars that are suitable for Island roads.
2975

Thank you, sir.

2980 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Sir, there seems to be a presumption, judging on the last couple of speeches, that re-investigating the issue will result in a recommendation to induce the test. But it could actually be that the Environment Department is so busy they will refer to their previous investigation and say, ‘We do not need it; end of story.’ (A Member: Hear, hear.) So that is what I feel about this.
2985

Had this been a direction to introduce some sort of scheme, that would be something else. Because I think there is something on the horizon now, which will not apply to Guernsey but will apply if you want to take your car into the EU or the UK, that if your car is more than three years old and you do not have a certificate, you will not be able to take it. So you could get the situation where we will have to introduce a test if you want to take your car away and I do not think that is far away.
2990

One thing that Deputy Jones said about MOT certificates – he is dead right, but one thing he is not right about is, having received an MOT certificate, that does not give you carte blanche for the next 12 months to drive an unsafe vehicle. If your tyre tread gets below limits or a light fails, the Police can still stop you and they can still prosecute you for these defects. So he is right – it only tells you that it passed the test on the day, but at least it is a regular annual test to work out whether the basis safety features of the car are up to it.
2995

So I am not going to support this because it is just another report on top of the other nine – is it? – that this strategy is proposing, but it may result in nothing more than a rejection of the whole idea, in which case nothing has been served.

Thank you, sir.

3000 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, I cannot support the amendment.

I think the Vehicle Rectification Scheme is quite sufficient. There are already enough other reports that could be in the pipeline if this report goes through. I think the Environment Department, which is not the largest in the States of Guernsey – by a long way, will have likely far too much to do in the next two years without adding just one more report on a problem that does not really exist.
3005

The Bailiff: Deputy De Lisle.

Deputy De Lisle: Sir, can I ask how vigilant the Police are with regard to this and how many vehicles actually are checked by the Police each year? Perhaps Deputy Inglis will have already researched this particular area.
3010

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Is there anyone else?
Deputy Green.
3015

Deputy Green: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

3020 I hesitate to say that this is a modest amendment, because that normally means that, in actual fact, the amendment in question is not particularly modest. But I think, on this occasion, it is fair to say that this is a relatively non-controversial amendment, in reality. I mean I agreed to second this amendment because, quite simply, I was disappointed by the lack of detail and the lack of analysis on the subject matter of road worthiness testing in the main Environment report.

3025 All we seem to have – and it is paragraph 8.10 of the main report – are a few lines of very brief finds about a heavy handed Guernsey MOT and an assertion that the cost in complexity of introducing such a scheme is considered to be one that outweighs the benefits.

3030 Well, that may or may not be the case but where is the detail, where is the analysis, where is the actual consideration of that and where is the consideration of a simplified Guernsey-fied system of road worthiness testing that could actually be of benefit and could actually work in this Island?

I found the lack of information in this Billet, on this pretty important subject, to be really disappointing and, from that Billet, I did not get a proper idea of what the strengths and weaknesses of the various possible regimes really are and I want to be able to make my own mind up on this and have the material to be able to do that, but I cannot on the basis of the material that we have in front of us.

3035 As I say, I want to see for myself what the strengths and weaknesses of a range of options are, set out fully, set out properly, before this Assembly can actually make a proper, considered and informed opinion. I am not prepared to simply overlook the idea of an MOT or indeed a more simplified cost effect alternative, without any further ado. I am not prepared to simply shoot from the hip, like some of my colleagues, and say, ‘no, we do not need this’, unless or until we have actually seen a well-argued case.

3040 Deputy Jones talks about the Police Car Rectification System and I quite accept it is a system that works pretty well. But, of course, that is a system that is basically funded by the general taxpayer. Now, is that correct? Is that something that should necessarily be reviewed? These are all options. We have a raft of FTP projects across the States. Is this not one that should actually be looked at as well, in terms of in keeping with the user pays principle?

3045 I will give way to Deputy Jones.

The Bailiff: Deputy Jones.

3050 **Deputy David Jones:** On a point of information, the reason I say that, Deputy Green, is because the Police will do it anyway. Every time they stop a car, they will still check that car.

3055 **Deputy Green:** But that does not necessarily mean that the current system that we have is necessarily the right one in this fiscal environment. There are other options and the reality is that if you support this amendment, which is merely asking the Department to re-investigate the merits and demerits, this Assembly will have the information to make a proper decision.

It is about doing the due diligence on this issue and I, for one, do not want to assume that MOT, or a variant on that, could not work or would not work without seeing a proper case. I think, as Parliamentarians, we owe a bigger duty to our electorate than that. I think we have to do the job properly and if you want to do the job properly you should vote for this amendment.

3060

The Bailiff: Deputy Sherbourne.

Deputy Sherbourne: Thank you, sir.

3065 Deputy Jones has a point with regard to the road traffic accidents that occur in the Island, I do not know that many are actually laid at the feet of mechanical failure. But there is mechanical failure from time to time and one of the reasons why maybe it is not reflected in RTAs is the speed limits that we have. Most small shunts over here are quite limited, so I do not think we can actually assume that there is not mechanical deterioration which has gone unchecked.

3070 I do not believe also – or subscribe to Deputy Green’s comments – that it should be necessarily a Police task. The Police staffing, for a start, would be affected by that. I agree they will always need to have checks. They will check cars as a matter of course, but they do not necessarily have to have purposeful stops where there are quite a few staff – including their mirrors and one thing and another – doing those checks.

3075 As a young driver, I survived two serious accidents – both as a result of mechanical failures. I was a youngster with a car that was my first, but it was one where a kingpin snapped. You know what kingpins are – most of you do. They hold the wheels on, basically, (*Laughter*) and if they snap, the wheels flatten out or fold under the car. That happened to me at 55 miles an hour on a Hampshire lane and I ended up in a ditch, just skidded across the road – nothing I could do, no steering whatsoever – came to a stop. Luckily, nothing was coming in the opposite direction otherwise there would have been a head-on collision. I was in one piece. Luckily, I did actually wear a seat belt at that time. They were not in effect in Guernsey at that

3080 time. That actually saved any head injury. The first thing I did was to turn the engine off and I was shaking – engine off, handbrake on. But that was a real shock to me. (**A Member:** The ditch?) (*Laughter*) Yes, maybe because that ditch was full of water and so it was a bit unpleasant getting out of the car, but it was as a result of a mechanical failure.

3085 Now, I have always had an interest in cars and working on cars, renovating cars, repairing cars in my later life. And, as a teacher, most of us had to have some way of supplementing our meagre incomes. (*Interjections and Laughter*) If you have seen the effect of our environment on the under-side of cars, you will understand why we need brake checks. The corrosive atmosphere that we live in – the corrosive environment – does a lot of damage and it is not evident. Most people... or very few of you here actually check your brake lines. They do need checking.

3090 I support this as a review. I think there is a need for us to have safety checks and I also agree with Deputy Kuttelwascher, who tells us or informs us that the EU are likely to introduce at least some system where evidence will be required of road worthiness very, very soon.

3095 I do not think we should be in a position like we were with regulation of our finance industry, which was forced on us. I think we should be proactive and I think we should have these sorts of checks in place and certificates available for our population to be able to access Europe. Probably the UK will be a little bit more lenient with us. But I think there is a good case for it and I will be supporting this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Stewart and then Deputy Paint.

3100 **Deputy Paint:** Yes, just a point of clarification on this point, if I could. Could Deputy Sherbourne tell us whether this accident he had in the UK was many years ago or had his car had an MOT?

Deputy Sherbourne: It was pre-MOT and it was in Hampshire.

3105 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Stewart.

Deputy Stewart: I am not going to support this amendment because here we are now, we are all starting to micro-manage the Environment Department. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) This has got to stop. And Deputy Sherbourne, with a huge amount of respect, we are getting all these anecdotal stories. 3110 Here is another one. My dad bought a brand new Lexus, it was one and a half years old and he was driving through France, his steering broke and he ended up in a ditch, just like you, except he did not turn the engine on, he legged it. (*Laughter*)

3115 We can all bring out all these different stories. The fact of the matter is – Environment do their job. I mean we are getting so many amendments. Do you know what, those little Christmas trees – the air fresheners dangling off the mirror – really annoy me? Maybe we should tax them. Or you could investigate... (*Laughter*) or maybe anyone with a BBC Guernsey sticker could be double taxed, just for listening to the wrong station or something – I do not know. Where is this going to stop? Please reject this amendment and let us get on.

3120 **The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak? No?
Deputy Domaille and then it will be Deputy Inglis.

Deputy Domaille: Thank you, sir.

3125 I appreciate the intention behind the amendment but I will be asking the Assembly not to support it. Previous Assemblies have discussed amendments to this effect, I seem to recall on about three separate occasions, and on each occasion it has been lost. So it has not found favour.

We have looked in broad terms at what we need to set it up and I use the term ‘MOT’ for shorthand, but that refers to the Ministry of Transport test and ours would be called a different name – who knows what.

3130 This is not in any way to sound negative about the amendment, but it is to just give an idea to the sort of things we would have to do. The test would have to be prescribed to include the actual methods used by the mechanic to carry out the test and the paperwork required and the equipment used by the garage. So we would have to source the skills to prescribe the test. We have got to bring some expert in, some consultant in, to tell us how to do it because we will not simply be copying the UK. Any mechanic wanting to do the test would have to be able to demonstrate their competence to do the test, presumably achieved by a specific qualification in the UK.

3135 We would need to source a means of testing the mechanics – probably a visiting check tester. We would probably get somebody from the UK – but there we go. (*Interjection*) Sorry, the garage... It is important to highlight these because really I do not want the Department going away, spending time on a report to then come back and then find Members do not find favour. So the garage doing the tests also needs to be approved to make sure they have got the correct equipment available and it is calibrated properly and only

3140

allows approved mechanics to do the tests and it keeps the relevant documentation, pass its full test – because they can do all sorts of things like that and is a sound place to take the money and pass the fee on to Government.

Therefore, we need a way of testing the garages and, obviously, on occasion, a mechanic or a garage will fail the test, so we are going to have an appeal system put in place for them to go through. We might need – I do not think we will but we might need – an individual appeals system for someone who wants to appeal against an MOT failure. But I have not got a clue on that.

We need to investigate complaints of bad MOTs or where the garage has an active problem. We need an ability to remove failing garages and mechanics the right to do the MOT and then we would have to have appeal systems for that.

So we estimated garages will want about £50 to do this test but then we have got to add our admin costs for running the test. The initial setup will be quite high, but let us just forget that for the moment. So if we said about £10 per MOT, it would be about £40,000 a year. That would cover it. So the MOT, the test or whatever, will be in the region of £60. Following receipt of this amendment, we have done a bit more research and we asked our contacts in the Isle of Man if they had progressed their proposals, because they were going to have proposals to set up an MOT system; and if not, why they had not. They said they had carried out a survey and support for such a system was not high enough to consider introducing such a scheme. In fact, there was good support for a vehicle defect Rectification Scheme which they are currently rolling out and I understand to be broadly similar to ours.

With regard to our Vehicle Rectification Scheme, in 2012 there were 925 vehicles identified and there were various failures, but just by way of example, of that 925 vehicles, 763 were for lights and reflector problems, 10 were for brakes.

Members, I ask you not to commit the Environment Department to allocate sources to investigate any further and prepare a report and reject this amendment on the basis that I really do not think that any proposal would find favour.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inglis to reply to the debate.

Deputy Inglis: I would like to thank everyone for their contribution to this amendment.

Naturally, you will not be surprised that I am not fully supportive of some of the things that I have heard, but certainly Deputy Brehaut and Deputy Burford – thank you for your support.

Deputy Dave Jones – well, it is no more than I would expect from you, sir, (*Laughter*) and I purposely did not mention what Deputy Kuttelwascher mentioned about how there will be a day when we leave this Island and do have to produce a certificate of road worthiness. Now, that could be a very simple document, but it will happen and, dare I say, it will be probably a European Community-led element.

What I find really strange is that Deputy David Jones is a frequent visitor to France. I do not believe he just goes off, as you might expect. He would always – like I do when I go... you have a touring vest because you are a responsible driver. I did that last year and it was suggested that I should not take my car to France because it was fine in Guernsey but going down the motorway I could probably seize the engine.

So I was given the option of making that decision. I was not told, ‘You cannot take it’, but it was recommended that I should not.

So, from that point of view, this is where I see this test being applied. I do not see it as an MOT; an MOT is 128 points of which you could be failed on a very minor element. Having said that, the MOT works well in the UK because without it, you do not get insured. Over here, I am afraid to say, there is no attention to that sort of detail, so we work really hard at educating our young people to pass a test that a lot of people in this Assembly would struggle to take now. So they have the written test and they can only go on to the driving test before they have passed the written test. Then we just give them a carte blanche, get a vehicle – okay, they are going to have to pay a lot because they are young drivers, but – that is it, we just let them go. So, from that point of view, having a safety check has got to be reassuring.

Thank you, Deputy Gollop, for your support and Deputy Duquemin – you are highlighting a sticker concept. Again it becomes a badge of honour. It makes people realise actually this guy or this lady cares about the vehicle that they put out on the road. After all, they are lethal weapons so I am really surprised that people do not seem to want to take the responsibility of that.

And as I mentioned, Deputy Kuttelwascher, thank you very much for identifying what will become common practice – it could well be in a few years’ time but, from my perspective, now is the time to start investigating that to be prepared.

I am sorry Deputy Soulsby cannot support this. She seems to feel that the problem does not exist. Well, talking with various people who do the road tests... And I am surprised at what Deputy Domaille has said in terms of the rectification of faults. Yes, there is going to be lights but the one thing we all know is that a

light bulb that does not work, gives the Police the opportunity to check insurance and driving licence. But that is the only time they can check it. So there is benefit in that.

Deputy De Lisle – as I mentioned, the figures I have been given are 1,850 vehicles in the last two years. There have been a proportion that have been road tested. I believe the road tests occur twice a month. That is a lot of Police resources but when they do it, it is proving to be very effective.

Deputy Green, thank you very much for supporting the amendment and yes, you are absolutely right, there is very little detail – it was very quickly dismissed in the Billet, which I found a bit disconcerting.

I recognise that there is a cost that you have mentioned, Deputy Domaille, in terms of putting this information together but, as Deputy Green has mentioned, doing due diligence on something that you want to establish, to put something under oath for say the next 50 years... and we do not want them to do what Deputy Duquemin starting off life doing – and, dare I say, a lot of people in this room will have done the same – we want to set them on a track of being very safety conscious with a lethal weapon.

Deputy Sherbourne, thank you. As you highlighted, we should not assume the condition is as seen. It is something that we need professional advice on. One of the things that was going through my mind in terms of the test, is that it would be to a Guernsey approach; it would not be onerous in terms of certification. The certification is really to advise that the garage that might carry out that work can do it to a good standard. But I feel the advice... it is then for the owner to decide what they want to do with it.

Now, if they choose not to take any advice – like what happened with me last year – then that is their choice. I am not wishing to create a draconian piece of legislation that is going to cause lots of problems. As you said, we were talking about appeals – I do not want that at all. I just want to ensure that people have a responsible approach to driving and safety, which is exactly what you say in your report, Deputy Domaille.

Deputy Stewart – as I have said, I do not believe public safety is about micro management. That is clearly something that has affected, I am sure, lots of people in this Assembly. I have been on the receiving end of a car crash, not me personally but I have seen it affect the family and I have seen it end careers, and all because a vehicle drove into the back of another vehicle, that was not road worthy.

So taking that responsibility forward, as I say, I am not looking to create a draconian test, I want to generate responsible driving in this Island. It is too easy to whiz around our little lanes and think, 'It is fine. I will bounce off the hedges getting home. It is not a problem.' I really would like us to approach it in a sensible manner.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: We vote then on the amendment proposed by Deputy Inglis and seconded by Deputy Green. Those in favour; those against.

Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.

The Bailiff: I am going to have to call for a recorded vote.

There was a recorded vote.

The Bailiff: Well, while the votes are counted, I believe that concludes the last of the amendments so we can go into general debate.

Deputy Dave Jones.

Deputy David Jones: Thank you Mr Bailiff. I have been waiting three days to make this speech and, just to remove any doubt, this is actually the sensible Jones, as the public will recognise after hearing it.

Now, I know that some of the stuff in this speech we have moved on but it is not over until the fat lady sings and we have yet to go to the vote on all the Propositions so I am going to stick to it.

The Bailiff: Only if it is relevant, Deputy Jones.

Deputy David Jones: It is all relevant, sir. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Luxon: Did you say it is a white elephant? *(Laughter)*

Deputy David Jones: Whenever we are going to vote on something as important as this, it is all relevant. But I have no doubt you will interrupt me if you feel it is not.

Mr Bailiff, Members of the States, if these proposals from both counts are about changing people's behaviour – we have heard a lot about that – the Minority Report, for instance, describes it as modal shift. I do not know what modal shift is but I will put it in anyway because I read it in the Billet. *(Laughter)*

As a Government, the first thing we need to do is recognise the true nature of people's daily lives. They are busy, complex and usually timed in order to fit in all the things that people need to do in the course of a day and, for most people, on most days, it will not involve public transport, riding a bike or walking, simply because it does not work for them on any level. Now, until those who want to try and structure our people's lives to suit a doctrine that is dreamt up in somebody's living room or an office in Frossard House, recognise what actually happens out there on a daily basis, then you will never get agreement on car use between us and the public that we profess to serve.

The first thing any viable traffic strategy has to do is to provide a credible and realistic alternative mode of transport, as opposed to the use of private motor cars. We failed miserably in that regard and I had a little bit of a rant a couple of days ago about the huge amounts of money that we poured in to the buses and the bus service and there is one thing I left out, because I have never had the figures – and that is because I have never asked for them – and that is the amount of money that has been spent on maintenance and accident damage to the buses, which I suspect is considerable and probably runs into several other millions over that 11-year period.

So we failed miserably in that regard and we desperately need a decent public transport system in place and with a proven attraction before we start trying to force people from their cars. Now, Deputy Perrot said yesterday it is about choice, in one of his very humorous speeches – it is odd really because he accused me of being a comedian and yet he was the one getting all the laughs. (*Laughter*) But Deputy Perrot mentioned about choice but, of course, if only that were true because there is very little choice if you happen to be a lower wage earner or one of the poorer in our community.

Now, when their daily lives depend on being in certain places at certain times, they will simply not be served by walking, bike riding or boarding a bus half a mile from their home. We can only govern this island with the consent of our people and any government that does not recognise that basic truth is destined to be in permanent conflict with those who sent us here to represent them. The other thing we know for sure is that wealthy islanders will never give up their cars. So the only people who will be forced onto public transport or bicycles or onto their shoe leather, with this club wielded by these proposals, will once again be the poorer sections of our community. So, as a policy, in my view it is hugely discriminatory.

Moving on from the buses, let us look at some of the other proposals in the documents. The proposed width tax – well, we have dealt with that, but if ever there was a tax designed to be inflationary then this is it, together with the planned fuel hike in the proposals from the Environment Department – we have dealt with that. I know it is proposed to be a one-off width tax... No, I am not going to do that because we have dealt with that – which is always difficult when you have got a prepared speech.

But whose bills did you suppose that this width tax was going to end up on? With the utility companies, clearly it would be the bill payers as it would be passed on, with the freight companies the same. If you happen to have a wider car because you have got a big family, then you will pay three or four times because you will pay your utility bills, your food bills and then because you have a wider vehicle. Is it any wonder then that working families cannot make ends meet when their own elected deputies dream up ever more creating ways of taking their hard earned money from them and we have just seen some other ones here today.

One other point is that a large number of people over the years decide to buy smaller cars that do not attract the width tax, then clearly it becomes a self-defeating policy as the revenue to run the strategy slowly dries up from that source. So, having committed to having the revenue, I can only wonder what other creative taxes would have to be brought in to make up the shortfall.

Sorry, I have got a double sided speech which is difficult to follow.

We hear a lot about sticks and carrots. Well, both of these reports are far too much stick for me.

Moving on to the subject of paid parking – and it is still on the cards that we might vote for this so this is why I have left it in – I have singled this issue out of the Minority Report because the rest is along the lines of more taxes and charges on the motorist and commercial vehicles – which I simply cannot support, regardless of which report it is in. I also made a manifesto commitment that I would not vote for paid parking and I have not seen or heard any pressing reason why I should renege on that pledge over the last few days. You have to ask really why paid parking should be introduced.

Firstly, if its revenues are to help run a public transport system, then all motor vehicle users are already doing that through the increase in fuel taxes introduced by an amendment from myself and Deputy Brouard put forward in the last debate on that subject and, as I have already said, why should it be down to the long suffering motorist to pick up the bill for that when the buses are used by all the community. If, however, its purpose is to reduce commuter traffic coming into town, then it is discriminatory against all those who work in town who do not have their own underground or dedicated parking spaces and, of course, the low pay. I include amongst that the many civil servants who work at Frossard House. Nor will it discourage car use by a large number of these servants at Frossard House.

I accept that in the Minority Report paid parking will not apply to short-term spaces but I would argue strongly that commuters are shoppers too and they will be paying under these proposals. In any event, you

will have those on really good salaries who can afford to pay for parking, whatever the charge, and you will have others who work from town on fixed incomes who would struggle with these daily parking charges – and we have heard about £1,300 a year.

If, as I say, they are reasonably well paid then they will not use the buses anyway and the cost of running your car will seem insignificant for the convenience of using your own vehicle for daily transport. If you are on a low wage, then it will be a very substantial additional expense to your weekly bills. It will, without doubt, create a car riding apartheid between the rich and the poor and we already have a substantial rich/poor divide in many areas of Island life and what is being proposed will just extend that into who can afford to have and run their own private vehicles. If you want to know what the rich/poor divide is, see Deputy Le Lièvre for details.

It is also likely to cost a great deal to collect and police these parking charges than it will actually provide in revenue, in my view – unless, of course, the charges are to be gradually hiked up to pay for all this additional bureaucracy. That is the other reason that worries me about paid parking, because I do not believe the States can be trusted with this kind of revenue raising scheme, simply because the motorist will be seen as a convenient cash cow – which is what Deputy Gollop wants. At every budget parking rates will increase year on year, on environmental grounds or some other spurious reason for putting them up annually, and it is for the same reason I will not support a GST – but that is a debate we are yet to have.

My prediction that Jersey would use this more and more for raising revenue instead of cutting Government spending has come to pass and I have absolutely no doubt that it would happen here if we were every dumb enough to go down that route. Jersey also has several multi-storey car parks, which are very expensive to use, together with many other paid parking areas and yet still St Helier is gridlocked every day at certain times.

A recently Channel TV report – when I say ‘recent’, it was some time ago, but... Just a quick glance across the water shows that you are trying to price people out of their cars by parking charges in town, simply does not work and certainly does not do anything to ease traffic congestion.

I am also actually sick to death of hearing that we have to have paid parking because that is what happens elsewhere. That is not a valid argument. It is just an observation. They have and do lots of things in other countries that we do not here and we are a much better place for it, in my view.

In fact, it is interesting to read – and I think Deputy De Lisle made this point the other day – that a number of UK towns are now scrapping parking charges in their car parks to discourage reckless on-street parking; and also Deputy Soulsby made that view about a programme, which I watched actually – and it was very interesting. Enniskillen, for instance, in Ireland is another place that is scrapping paid parking.

People have to go about their daily lives as best they can and do what suits them and failure to recognise that personal transport plays a big part in that daily routine is simply not living in the real world. I make no apologies for repeating that statement because until we as Deputies recognise that is a fundamental truth, we will never find a workable solution.

Oliver Wendell Holmes said, ‘Taxes are the price we pay for living in a civilised society’, and that is true. However, when those taxes and charges are being levied unfairly as financial punishment to change behaviour, then it will be perceived that the States and its functionaries, on one hand and the taxpayer and their families on another, just grow further apart as the constant interference by the State in their daily lives becomes more and more overpowering.

This kind of financial blackmail helps to breed the growing distrust and anger amongst our people, who just want to get on with their lives with what income they have and without the States taking more of that income just because they can. The report tells us that vehicle taxes are an obvious option to fund the strategy and that they are not just a means of raising revenue but are also disincentives integral to the strategy and, for me, that is the problem because they will only be disincentives to the less well off in this community. They certainly will not affect the people on large salaries – the high wage earners. It will not make a jot worth of difference to them. Emission taxes, parking charges, fuel rises – it will not change the way that they use their cars a single jot.

Now, the reports talk about engagement and buy-in from the general population. That statement suggests that we are asking for their co-operation when, in fact, what we are really saying is, ‘Give up using your cars or we will make you pay dearly for it.’ I would also suggest that you are hardly likely to get that buy-in unless you have something for them to buy into and at present, without a viable public transport system, you simply do not. As I said, they most certainly will not buy in to a policy that is designed to punish them for owning and driving their cars.

The Environment Report for instance – and I know that one is gone – makes it clear that adopting their strategy will require more staff resources, I think both reports say that. On pages 615 and 616, bullet point 13.3 makes those points. We already know that the large chunk of the extra revenue raised will go on salaries and other staff benefits and so the bureaucratic machine rolls on.

We have other Departments struggling to meet their FTP targets, cutting services and shedding staff and then these reports that want to do completely the opposite. Is that really what we mean by joined up, effective government?

3385 While I am on the subject of cost, we know that this strategy will cost roughly £2 million. We have a pre-school education coming at us down the road at around another £2 million. That is £4 million of additional expenditure to be found at a time when we are desperately trying to meet our FTP targets and cut back. I have to tell you now that if it is a toss-up between the traffic strategy and pre-school education, my vote will go to the latter every day of the week.

3390 I think I have expressed in this speech what a large number of the general public are feeling about these proposals. So, in summing up, I would say get the buses sorted properly first, get the people interested in using them, because it is an excellent service and works for them, some days, and shelve the rest until that is done.

I will therefore not be supporting either of the reports.

3395 Thank you.

Amendment by Deputies Inglis and Green:

Not carried – Pour 16, Contre 28, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3

POUR

Deputy Harwood
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Robert Jones
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Sherbourne
Deputy Conder
Deputy Storey
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Duquemin
Deputy Green
Deputy Adam
Deputy De Lisle
Deputy Burford
Deputy Inglis
Deputy O'Hara

CONTRE

Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Domaille
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Bebb
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Stewart
Deputy Gillson
Deputy Ogier
Deputy Trott
Deputy David Jones
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Le Lièvre
Deputy Spruce
Deputy Collins
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Paint
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy James
Deputy Perrot
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Wilkie
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy Sillars
Deputy Luxon
Deputy Quin
Deputy Hadley

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Alderney Rep. Jean
Alderney Rep. Harvey
Deputy Langlois

3400 **The Bailiff:** I can announce the vote of the voting on the Deputy Inglis/Deputy Green amendment. There were 16 votes in favour, 28 against. The amendment was lost.

We now have a decision whether we continue beyond 5.30 p.m. or not. Can I just have an indication of how many people still wish to speak? Can you stand in your places if you intend to do so?

Well, I think, seeing that number, there is no way we are going to finish, even if we continue until 6.30 p.m. We will have to continue – (*Interjections*) No –

3405 Also the voting is going to take quite a long time as I suspect there are going to be a number of separate votes on different Propositions and, no doubt, recorded votes requested on each, and with the number of people standing, we are not going to finish even by 6.30 p.m.

Deputy Storey was first. Will you finish by 5.30 p.m. if you start now?

3410 **Deputy Le Lièvre:** Can I propose that we go to 6.30 p.m. and come in tomorrow, sir, because it is important that we finish this. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

Deputy David Jones: We cannot come in tomorrow.

3415 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Well, the trouble with those sorts of arrangements at this late hour – and I know I can speak for others as well – is in having travel arrangements off Island tomorrow morning.

3420 **The Bailiff:** The Rules provide for us to continue on the second Wednesday. It seems to me that we should follow the Rules. We are clearly not going to finish by 6.30 p.m. this evening. I think we stick to the Rules but Deputy Storey, if you are going to finish by 5.30 p.m. you may speak.

Deputy Storey: Very hard sir.

3425 **The Bailiff:** If you are in doubt, I do not want to rush you in your speech. If you are in doubt leave it until we come back in two weeks' time.

Deputy Storey: No, I have not a got a lot I wish to say, sir.

3430 Really, what I do wish to say is to reiterate that this report – its objective is to try to change people's behaviour in some small way, i.e. a nudge. But in order to achieve that it needs to have significant impact and making change in small amounts or making changes which people are not going to be upset by, is not going to achieve any change whatsoever.

3435 Now, I accept that introducing paid parking will not be popular. No new charge or tax is ever popular, sir. But I think I would go a bit further here and say that if paid parking is not in some way unpopular, the strategy will not have a chance of changing people's behaviour.

3440 At the end of the day, the objective of this integrated strategy is to try to get Mr and Mrs Average to use the bus rather more and their car rather less. I hope very sincerely that this is achieved because St Peter Port really has just become one great car park at the moment. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) If you come into St Peter Port and you look up at the skyline, you have got a fantastic vista of St Peter Port, it looks great, really attractive. If you look down, all you see are cars parked in rows and that is not an attractive proposition at all. So I do hope that this strategy does work and it does help to reduce the number of cars coming in to St Peter Port.

3445 I accept that this report to a large extent is work in progress, sir, and there are one or two items in the report which I would like to comment on, first of all, with recommendation 2. Now, I approve that the Environment should not be providing off-street parking at the taxpayer's expense, but what I do think is that the introduction of paid parking in town will open the door for private enterprise to provide some off-street parking, because it is a no-go at trying to invest in off-street parking when there is free parking just down the road. So the whole point about charging for parking in town is that it should open the door for more parking to be provided within the area of St Peter Port. I think that is quite important because we have already lost 200 car parking spaces because of the changes to handling methods on the portside and, in addition to that, we have now got Condor saying they want a –

3455 **Deputy Luxon:** A point of correction, sir. We did not lose 200 spaces. What we did is we found the equivalent spaces around other areas of the harbour. So in actual fact the berths 4, 5, 6 project did use some of the North Beach car parks, but we did not net lose any at all.

Thank you, sir.

Deputy Storey: Thank you for that comment because I shall come to that point shortly.

3460 But the point is that we are likely to lose another 200 spaces because Condor want to use a bigger ferry and in order to provide for the loading and unloading of that new ferry, they will take up additional space in the port. Therefore – especially whilst that building work is done – we are going to lose more parking spaces.

So there is a clear need for additional parking spaces in town and what has happened over the last period of work is that we have ended up with parking on the Castle emplacement.

3465 This is where I come up to recommendation 5a, because the castle emplacement is earmarked under this report for paid parking. Now, the most prestigious and attractive visitor attraction on the Island must be the castle and at the moment you cannot get to the castle for parked cars. The whole approach to the castle is jam packed full of parked cars and it is not a pretty sight and hardly attractive for tourists visiting.

3470 The next point I would like to raise is the point about park and ride. Now park and ride is a good idea and I have a suggestion – which I do not think is possibly practical in the short term but I would like the Environment Department to look at it if they would – and that is that each parish should provide their park and ride parking area and that we could run buses in an express way – express buses – from the park and ride in each parish into town both at rush hour for people.

3475 Also we could run the buses for the schools from the same point. So that people could drive there, put their children on the bus to the school and get themselves onto the bus into town, if that is needed. I am not

saying that is an easy task but I would like the Environment Department to look at the possibilities of that, as a way of reducing the traffic on the roads.

3480 Finally, sir, before I sit down, I believe it was in Copenhagen, there is a system whereby you do not have drop downs on kerbs to cross the road. The crossing of the road is at pavement level and the road is paved – Sorry, alright – (*Laughter*) the same colour as the path but not the road, which gives clear indication that the pedestrian has priority.

Now, to me that is a very sensible way of proceeding and helping to negotiate the problems of road traffic and pedestrians in crowded areas and I would also like the Environment Department to look at that please, sir, if they could.

3485 That is all I had to say, except to say that, apart from those points, I fully endorse what is now contained in the Minority Report we are discussing and I hope we actually make a decision and adopt that report as a worthwhile and viable strategy for the future.

Thank you.

3490 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members, we will resume at 9.30 a.m. on Wednesday 14th May and I would suggest that we probably will need to be here on Thursday 15th as well. So I think people need to make provision for that.

Deputy Perrot.

3495 **Deputy Perrot:** Sir, I wonder whether it might assist when we reconvene if there could be a sort of comprehensive reiteration...

The Bailiff: Yes, a consolidated set of Propositions.

3500 **Deputy Perrot:** Not just for me. I mean I lost the plot when my medication kicked in. (*Laughter*) I am not quite sure that all of us will remember exactly what every – well, at least, we will not in a fortnight's time – Member has said, so perhaps either that could be dealt with centrally on our electric machines or that we get some –

3505 **The Bailiff:** Well, I am sure it is possible to circulate a consolidated set of Propositions in their now amended form. You are not wanting to know the details of the amendments that were rejected, I take it. You do not want the rejected amendments, you just want the consolidated Propositions as they now stand? Yes, I am sure that can be arranged.

Thank you.

3510

The Assembly adjourned at 5.32 p.m.