



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 11th April 2025

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

Volume 14, No. 17

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

Ms J E Roland, Deputy Bailiff and Deputy Presiding Officer

Law Officers

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

People's Deputies

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

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representatives E. Hill and E. A. J. Snowdon

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

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

Absent at the Evocation

Deputy N. R. Inder (*relevé à 12h 01*) ; Deputy M. P. Leadbeater (*relevé à 10h 03*)

Business transacted

Evocation	5
Billet d'État VIII	5
10. Alderney Airport Runway Rehabilitation – Propositions as amended carried	5
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.32 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.02 p.m.</i>	<i>47</i>
11. Offshore Wind Opportunity for Guernsey - Update and Next Steps	83
Procedural – Motion to continue sitting – Motion carried.....	96
Offshore Wind Opportunity for Guernsey - Update and Next Steps – Debate continued – Propositions as amended carried.....	97
17. Schedule for future States' business – Proposition as amended carried	104
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 6.05 p.m.</i>	<i>108</i>

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE DEPUTY BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The States' Greffier

EVOCATION

Billet d'État VIII

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

10. Alderney Airport Runway Rehabilitation – Propositions as amended carried

Article 10.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter entitled 'Alderney Airport Runway Rehabilitation' dated 20th March 2025, they are of the opinion:-

1. To authorise and direct the Policy & Resources Committee, working with the States of Alderney (or one or more of its Committees) to:

a) agree the terms of reference and constitution of a commission on the future arrangements for the constitutional and working relationships between Guernsey and Alderney;

b) establish that commission; and

c) bring the relevant findings of that commission back to the parliaments of the islands involved, firstly with an interim report before the end of 2025 and secondly with a final report 12 months after that (before the end of 2026), ideally being before or at the same time as any Policy Letter setting out the outcomes of Proposition 2.

2. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee, working with the States' Trading Supervisory Board and in consultation with the States of Alderney, to undertake the work set out below and return to the States of Deliberation with its recommendations on the future of Alderney Airport:

a) to assess the feasibility, costs and timescales to extend the useable operational 'lifespan' of the current runway and airport infrastructure, including the existing control tower, fire station and terminal building, which may include pre-emptive patching work on the most critical parts of the runway and other airport pavement areas; and

b) to commission an aerodrome design company to investigate the viability of delivering a functional solution for an operational aerodrome in Alderney suitable for commercial air transport operations at a level appropriate for a small island community, within the £24 million budget as at 2025 commercial prices, as identified in the Major Capital Projects Portfolio.

3. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee, working with the States' Trading Supervisory Board and other States' Committees as needed, to develop detailed contingency plans for any extended period of closure of Alderney Airport as set out in Section 11 of this Policy Letter.

The States' Greffier: Billet d'État VIII, Article 10, Policy & Resources Committee – the Alderney Airport Runway Rehabilitation.

The Deputy Bailiff: Good morning, everybody. Before I invite Deputy Soulsby to open on behalf of the P&R Committee, in relations to Items 12 and 13, which are the two Items presented by the Committee for Employment & Social Security, those will be limited to six-minute speeches, both applying to the Committee itself but also in relation to the amendments. Other than that, we have got a lot to fit in today.

I am not going to time limit the speeches in relation to the Alderney Airport Runway Rehabilitation matter, but of course each one of you can impose your own self-discipline to ensure that you do not talk for the entire 15 minutes. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) You can also ensure that you use your give ways purposefully and also think whether not you are truly making a point of correction or point of order. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

With that I would ask Deputy Soulsby to open on behalf of the P&R Committee.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, madam.

The rehabilitation of Alderney's runway has been the subject of quite a few policy letters over the last 12 years and I have sat through all of them, although this is the first time I have opened a debate on one. I am pleased to do so as this is an important policy letter for both Alderney and Guernsey.

I am also pleased to see the President of Policy and Finance, Mr Bill Abel, in the gallery today as well, who we worked very closely together in the last Assembly during the pandemic at a time when he did his Island proud. I am very pleased to see him here today.

We are having this debate because what the States agreed earlier this term has proven not to be achievable within the cost envelope. It was the majority view at the time that option C+ represented best value for money at £24 million for a new extended runway, apron, terminal, fire station and control tower. However, having gone out to tender under a design-and-build contract resulted in the best quote being more than 50% higher; £37 million.

If we are living in times of plenty perhaps – just perhaps – that may not have been considered a big issue. However, we are not. The Committee recognises that strong and resilient transport links are critical to the success of the economies and communities of the Islands of the Bailiwick. However, solutions to deliver and maintain transport links need to be proportionate and reasonable, balancing and respecting the needs of both Alderney and Guernsey's communities, and recognising the financial constraints that the States finds itself under today.

Further investigations from the aerodrome design company, RPS, have shown that a do minimum approach could cost between £25 million and £42 million. The wide range of that cost reflects uncertainty of final design, logistical challenges of such a project on a small Island, and uncertainty over start date. These are material figures representing between £12,000 and £20,000 per Alderney resident.

It was interesting to find out from research of the documents of 1948 that there was some debate at that time about whether the aerodrome should be included in the transferred services. Indeed, it was said by the States' Advisory Council, which brought the proposals for the 1948 Agreement to the States at that time, that, and I quote:

We can visualise circumstances arising in which the States would no longer feel that the worth of an airfield to Alderney justified the cost.

50 However, here today in 2025, the Committee recognises that if Alderney Airport was to close, it would have significant impacts on the people of that Island and its future viability. So, a radical rethink of the project is needed to find a functional solution that can achieve a reasonable level of connectivity for the Alderney community within the financial limits of the States of Guernsey in the coming years. Therefore, the Committee is proposing that it is necessary to assess whether it is possible to extend the usable operational lifespan of the current runway and Airport infrastructure and also to consider what options there might be to deliver a functional aerodrome appropriate for a small Island community and, at the same time, to develop detailed contingency plans for an extended period of closure.

60 Contingency plans are just that; something to be used if they become needed. Planning ahead in case of a scenario where the Airport had to close for anything longer than a very short time period of days or weeks is not a given, it is a possibility, and as such we must plan for it.

Concurrent to that work, the Committee is proposing that a Bailiwick Commission is established with a view to resettling the relationship between Alderney and Guernsey. 1948 was a long time ago and was a very different world to the one today. Indeed, it was a year the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was brought in, that the then President of the United States raised taxes to pay for the rebuilding of Europe, the NHS began and our current Duke, King Charles III, was born.

65 It has been demonstrated in numerous debates on Alderney Airport and on different topics linked to the transferred services that it is no longer fit for purpose. The significant uncertainty of its application is a challenge to delivering effectively on the transferred services. This became apparent to me when I was President of Health & Social Care and since I have been on the Policy & Resources Committee. It is a time that the relationship between Alderney and Guernsey is resettled, recognising the existence of the 1948 Agreement but not solely focusing on it.

Previous attempts to review the 1948 Agreement have focused on the agreement itself and have caused some conflict between and within the Islands. The Committee is strongly of the view that to review the current relationships and to look to the future the best option would be to establish a constitutional commission called the 'Bailiwick Commission'. The proposed Bailiwick Commission will review constitutional and operational relationships. Implicit in this would also be the economic relationship, of course, and importantly, it will be undertaken by an independent panel.

75 The decision we are asking from Members today is for Guernsey's participation in a commission, that we are keen to encourage Alderney to work with us to establish a commission collaboratively for our mutual benefit.

Members will be aware that there is another policy letter due to be considered by the States at this meeting, or at least before the end of this political term. That policy letter is about a separate Sark matter, but also includes a Proposition about the proposed Bailiwick Commission. It is intended that the relationships between Guernsey and Alderney and Guernsey and Sark will be dealt with as separate strands or phases. There would need to be co-ordination to ensure that any Bailiwick-wide issues could also be properly considered.

85 Full participation and review from all stakeholders, in whichever Islands participate, would be encouraged. That would include governments, organisations, legal professionals and members of the public. The commission would not have the power to make binding recommendations or to impose actions on any Island. Whether to accept and implement any recommendations would be for the Islands' parliaments and governments to decide on.

The policy letter proposes that authority be delegated to the Policy & Resources Committee to agree the terms of reference and constitution of a commission and to establish that commission, together with the States of Alderney or one or more of its committees. In due course, the Policy & Resources Committee will bring the findings of the commission back to the States for consideration and it is proposed that there will be an interim report from the commission before the end of 2025 and a final report 12 months after that and no later than the end of 2026.

95 Ideally, the commission will report back at the same time as or before the Alderney Airport redesign comes back to the States. But it is not intended that either workstream will delay the other, and that is an important point when considering any amendment. It is important to progress both

100

workstreams at pace, and that should be borne in mind when considering whether the Propositions in the policy letter should be amended. Different teams will move each workstream forward.

Madam, the Policy & Resources Committee is determined to find an affordable solution in respect of Alderney's runway in accordance with its obligations of the 1948 Agreement, but we also believe that a review of that agreement is long overdue. The Committee thinks that it is in the best interests of both Islands that a review of the relationship between Guernsey and Alderney is undertaken that is more in keeping with the 21st century rather than the 20th.

The Policy & Resources Committee ask the States to support the Propositions attached to this policy letter.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy Snowdon, your amendment 1. Would you like the Greffier to read out your amendment?

Alderney Representative Snowdon: I would, yes, thank you.

The States' Greffier read out the amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Alderney Representative Snowdon.

[Amendment 1.](#)

In Proposition 1c), to delete the following text:- "ideally being before or at the same time as any Policy Letter setting out the outcomes of Proposition 2"

Alderney Representative Snowdon: Where to start with this one again. It is Alderney runway, I think round three for me.

I just want to really say that the policy letter says Alderney Runway Rehabilitation and that is what we should really be discussing and now we have gone into the Bailiwick Commission. What was the original policy letter has now drifted into the Bailiwick Commission, which I think I need to point out the risks and why this amendment I brought today with Mr Hill. It should really be separated out and that is why I put the amendment here today. Members of the community in Alderney and actually Guernsey have commented it feels a bit like Trump politics. I have said it is not Trump politics at all. I understand P&R's position. However, the Alderney runway does need to move forward.

I am going to be quite clear with this now. At the moment, the Report will come back in December 2026. Potentially, that would delay the Alderney runway until 2027 or 2028. Myself and members of the Alderney community and also States of Alderney have had lots of conversations with the Director of Civil Aviation and Guernsey Ports. The runway is end-of-life, and I think some of you have actually walked up and down the runway and seen the end-of-life, and you have probably heard all the passionate speeches from myself – you will hear from Mr Hill in a minute – and also Mr Roberts, and Paul Arditti, I think, going back some time when some of you were still in this Chamber.

It is inspected every three months, Alderney runway; every three months. Normally in the UK, it would be every 18 months to two years, because it is end-of-life and high risk. The amount of work that is going on, the maintenance, is tremendous, but there are situations where we have had runway closures because suddenly there are holes or potholes found or there is sinking, the water is damaging it, the tarmac is giving up, and it is really impacting the community.

So I am going to put this question to you. I am not looking for an answer, but you can answer it later on, if you want to. What happens if an accident actually happens on Alderney runway? Because it has been raised in this Chamber numerous times about how it is end of life, pushing it too far. It has been raised in the media, it has been raised by the States of Alderney, it has been raised by the community in Alderney, it has been raised by Guernsey community. I just do not understand how far we are going to push this until actually something happens and we actually go off the cliff and

150 suddenly we are into an emergency. That is not going to be good for anyone. Let us be honest about that.

With our meetings that we have had with the Director of Civil Aviation, and I am going to say this is the view that I have taken from those meetings, strong concerns have been expressed to us last year and also two weeks ago that the timeline does not seem to fit with the current runway that we have got now. It is being pushed too far. This is a problem that we have had with a bolt-on Bailiwick Commission on to an Alderney runway policy letter.

The problem is that further restrictions are likely to take place, if not already, with the Alderney runway. I am going to call them red flags, which will mean that there will be further restrictions. So if there is wet weather, potentially because you could have an aquaplaning incident with a plane or you could have other bits and pieces, you will suddenly find a situation where you will not be able to fly in the wet weather. Then those red flags keep on going on, and then you move to a runway closure, which would be end of the world for Alderney, definitely, and it would be a massive headache for Guernsey.

We have had numerous talks with Guernsey Ports, and I understand, actually, option A, or whatever we want to call it now – I forgot what the options are that we keep going on about – option C+ is definitely dead, but option A, we discussed in 2019 – some of this Assembly was still in the room in 2019 – it was supported. I understand all the design work and everything is actually in a stage where it can be speeded up considerably from the Guernsey civil servants that I have talked to and the Alderney civil servants that are on the boards communicating with the Guernsey Civil Service. There is no delay. It can move forward. The Bailiwick Commission is what delays the whole situation, hence why this amendment is with us today.

I do not want to say that we are negative at all about the Bailiwick Commission because we are not at all. I actually have, with permission from Mr Abel who is in the audience today, held a special meeting on 1st April 2025 by the Policy and Finance Committee who unanimously approved the establishment of the Bailiwick Commission. I do not want anyone saying that Alderney is not negative to the Bailiwick Commission because I think we have said it publicly. I am pretty sure Mr Abel said it publicly. I am saying it publicly now. Also we have had letters go to the Policy & Resources and there is a resolution from P&F. So Alderney is not holding back with the Bailiwick Commission at all. Obviously that is a different conversation about Sark, and I do not want to get into that today.

But the delays we must not see that we are going to potentially see if this amendment fails. The States of Alderney is fully supportive of this amendment that myself and Mr Hill have laid today. We understand the funding pressures on the States of Guernsey and there is no tax plan. That is basically down to the new Assembly to sort out.

However, we have been working for a number of years with the States of Guernsey and Policy & Resources, current form and old form, to streamline things; look at the 1948 Agreement where things can be more efficiently delivered and all those different aspects. There are a number of working streams that can be supplied if needed that we have been working on for quite some time.

I am going to be quite straight to the point with this because this – and I respect the media. We have got very good media in Guernsey and they cover a lot of things and this is just how they are reporting on different stories. But this does not help the relationship between Alderney and Guernsey if we carry on with the situation where what we have got is where Alderney runway potentially will be delayed if this amendment does not get through.

ITV channel, 'Alderney Airport trouble sparks constitutional concerns.' *The Sun*, only last week I think, 'Airport at risk on tiny Island that is so safe that kids can roam free like the 1970s.' *The Times*, 'Alderney held at ransom by runway repairs.' *Bailiwick Express* I think this week, 'People will die if Alderney runway is not sorted, warns petitioner.' *Guernsey Press*, 'Alderney's risk of being marooned without any action on the runway.' BBC Guernsey, 'Delays to Alderney Runway upgrade future risks.' Are these the sort of headlines that we actually want between our relationship between Alderney and Guernsey? We do not.

We need to be strong together. It is challenging times. We need to come together and work together. We want to bring the Bailiwick together, which I know the States of Alderney is very supportive of, and the community, but these sort of headlines are not helping us. The media has got it absolutely correct, because those are debates and conversations that we have had. Hence why this amendment is so important, because if this amendment does not go through, I feel that the relationship between Alderney and Guernsey is going to become more problematic, which is not going to help anyone.

I think the Chamber of Commerce wrote to everyone this week as well. I think they have put a little quote in their letter:

The Alderney Chamber stresses again the importance of air connectivity, hence the critical need for a safe runway and for a reliable air service to be maintained.

I believe that letter was sent to all Deputies, which had a bit more context to that as well. Then we had the petition, which I know a member of Policy & Resources kindly was on the steps and took that petition only this week, which states:

We urgently seek the support of the States of Deliberation to commence this project without any further delay.

If those delays do happen, what are the impacts? Well, the cost of the project is going to keep on going up. It is not going to go down, is it? Everything is going up the whole time. It is going to get more expensive. Even more money will be needed. The impacts to the Bailiwick and Alderney, the community, the business sector, the lack of confidence will result in less tax, say, from Alderney basically.

What I did say, which I did mention on, we do not want this becoming a CCA emergency. That is not going to help anyone. We think those headlines that I just read a minute ago were bad. It is going to be a lot worse in national papers if that is the situation that we get to. I am going to say this really nicely, and I really mean it nicely, but please can we stop playing political games and please can we get behind this amendment? This is key Bailiwick infrastructure and I ask for your support today.

Thank you.

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Deputy Bailiff: Alderney Representative Hill, do you formally second that amendment?

Alderney Representative Hill: I formally second it, but I reserve the right to speak.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.
Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, madam.

I strongly support this amendment for both practical reasons and reasons of optics. Optics are important here because perception can damage Alderney's economy considerably. It seems to me that this policy letter deals with two very important but entirely unlinked matters. The first is the need to review the 1948 Agreement, which I completely support. This is long overdue and having the project led by disinterested people – not uninterested but disinterested people – of real stature and relevant experience, makes absolutely perfect sense. Of course it will, as Deputy Soulsby said, be up to the various Islands' governments who will have to agree to any change in our constitutional or financial relationships at the end of that review.

But the review is important, so part one of the policy letter gets my full support, and I will expand on my hopes for that constitutional commission during general debate.

The second part of the policy letter deals with the need to renovate Alderney's runway, and I completely support that too, although sadly I have become rather cynical about the possibility of actually doing that within P&R's proposed financial envelope, particularly if that envelope includes the various buildings that we know need to be replaced, and that is as clear as mud, really, from Proposition 2.

Let us be clear, just a little bit of background before explaining why I want to decouple these two events. The previously approved C+ option did not crash and burn because the business case no longer stacked up. The business case was based on the revenue savings flowing from having a longer runway being quickly repaying the additional capital costs of that larger project. In the event, that business case proved to be far stronger than expected because the additional spend required for the proposed extension was absolutely minimal. Note the reason it could not go ahead was simply because the project in any of its forms proved more expensive than the States of Guernsey was willing to pay. STSB fully accept that, not arguing for C+ anymore, that is completely off the table.

At that point P&R tasked officers at Guernsey Ports, together with a new set of consultants, to price up the restoration of the current length of the runway, what was previously known as option A. This exercise only confirmed what we already knew, that the price would actually be very similar. At that point, we asked the question: what about a shorter runway? Not surprisingly, the answer came back that will not deliver much of a saving either. Then we asked just about reconstructing the middle section of the runway, which takes most of the load. Well, the same answer. Basically the costs largely revolve around mobilisation rather than the amount of tarmac or concrete that ends up being poured.

I have a real fear that the answer may end up being you simply cannot have a properly surfaced airstrip in Alderney, and by properly surfaced I mean either bitumen or concrete, capable of taking a 19-seater commercial aircraft and the buildings that are needed to support that operation for less than £24 million. Or if you do, it would be simply via resurfacing what you have already got, which may prove to be a very short-term solution indeed.

I am afraid that Proposition 2 in the policy letter does seem very much like a suggestion to do the same thing again, hoping for a different answer. That is a kind of way of looking at it. The other way of looking at it is a wolf in sheep's clothing, intended to show that a properly surfaced runway is no longer viable for a community of 2,000 people.

Of course I hope to be proven wrong over that, but two things are absolutely certain. Firstly, if it really can be done within that price then the sooner we get on with it the better. Let us crack on and get that report back. There is no time to lose.

Secondly, if it cannot be done within that price then also the sooner we know that the better. Because what if it comes back late in 2026 and says, 'No, you cannot do this within the price envelope that P&R is suggesting?' Why on earth stipulate, as Proposition 1 does in this policy letter, that no report ought to come back on the Alderney runway until the final report on stage 2 of the constitutional review comes to the States? That is scheduled for late 2026. Which in turn, as Alderney Representative Snowdon has said, may well mean the soonest that any work could be done would be the summer of 2028. But it is even worse if that report says it cannot be done when it is £24 million because then you are having to try and find a plan, whatever it is; F, or whatever it comes to by then.

Why on earth would we want to create that delay if avoidable? Particularly with the real risk that the runway may have to be closed well in advance of that. Something that would inflict absolutely devastating impacts on Alderney, its economy and its community.

Madam, I ask Members to imagine that they were just considering part two of this policy letter today. The first bit, dealing with the runway, without considering the important but unrelated issue of the constitutional review. If this was just a report on the runway, and the proposal from P&R was that really they did not want any report to come back to the Assembly before late 2026, we would all be asking, why on earth not earlier, if possible?

Deputy Soulsby says neither part is going to slow the other part down, but of course it will. Because it is possible to get a report back on the runway before the end of 2026 and we are being asked to vote that that should not happen, because the final result of the constitutional commission's work should come at least at the same time, if not sooner. That should still be our response to the proposal in this policy letter unless the two issues are somehow linked and this set of proposals link them when they are patently not linked.

In fact the attempt to link them really does get my suspicions going. Why on earth would anybody try to create that linkage? To my mind, the situation is crystal clear. Guernsey has a complete and undeniable obligation under a political agreement freely entered into to provide Alderney with a functional commercial aerodrome. It may be quite basic, it might be quite short, it might be quite narrow, it might be the minimum for an aircraft like a Twin Otter to land safely in the vast majority of weather conditions, but our obligation under the 1948 Agreement is crystal clear. Nothing coming out of a review about our future relationship can change that.

Maybe Guernsey's obligations under that 1948 Agreement were far too onerous. Maybe in hindsight our forefathers made a bit of an error in the amount of obligation they took on. Maybe going forward, Guernsey's obligations will be watered down somewhat in the light of new realities. Who knows? I do not. But I know this, whatever the possible changes in the relationship between Guernsey and Alderney in the future, the moral imperative to honour our existing obligations is absolute, and to renege on them would be absolutely shameful.

Someone very close to P&R recently said to me, or reminded me, that the 1948 Agreement is not a legal agreement, but simply a political one. That made me even more suspicious of the motives of linking these two subjects: the constitutional review and the runway. What, I thought to myself, is the relevance of whether it is a political or a legal agreement? The only difference arriving from it not being a legal agreement is that Guernsey obviously would not then face any legal consequences if it reneged on that agreement. But surely that is irrelevant, because Guernsey would never renege on a political agreement freely entered into with their close friends and neighbours, would they? I, for one, hope we would never even think about it. Scale down our future commitments, maybe; but walk away from our current obligations, never.

But if we would not do that, then why insist that the report on the runway has to wait until after the constitutional review has been completed? It makes no sense. Unless – if I was a cynical resident of the northern isle, I know exactly what would be going through my head right now. That there is a very big question mark over whether or not a viable commercial aerodrome can be delivered with the buildings required to support it in Alderney within P&R's price cap. And that P&R may well be arguing to the constitutional commission, and there is no reason why they should not, that an obligation to maintain an aerodrome in Alderney is too onerous to be a part of any new relationship going forward.

If those two reports come together late in 2026 or maybe 2027. because we do not know how long the work of the commission would take, some might argue that, look, it is just happenstance they both come together, but this makes this the ideal time to relieve the Guernsey taxpayer of their historic burden by abandoning Alderney's air connectivity then and there, and asking Alderney to rely on strengthened sea connectivity instead. Of course that prospect might be thrown into even greater prominence if there had been any forced closure of the runway in the meantime.

Absolutely none of that might actually be true. I certainly hope not, but just by making the linkage in this policy letter and creating the optic through which that linkage does, such fears are bound to raise their heads. As a result, we are going to be throwing a huge bucket of cold water over the economy of Alderney for the next two years. Who in their right mind would make a major investment in Alderney if they thought the Sword of Damocles hung over its community and its economy?

I know there are many larger Islands all around the world more populous than Alderney that do not have airports and have to rely on sea connectivity. But the difference is they have never had airports and their economies have developed on that basis. Alderney's economy and its very community has grown up over the last 80 years around having a functional commercial airport and

the impact of even questioning whether that can be maintained will devastate it in every imaginable way. Lack of investment, depopulation, a real downward spiral. So, Members, let us decouple the two important parts of this policy letter so it is made clear to everybody that while Guernsey does indeed, and I back this, want to take a fresh look at the future constitutional arrangements between the two Islands, it has no intention whatsoever in reneging on its long-standing obligation towards its neighbour.

Let us get the report on what to do with the Alderney runway back before this Assembly as quickly as ever we can. After all, a lot of the spade work has already been done. Relationships have been forged with potential contractors and options have been appraised. As worded, the earliest physical work could realistically be done is probably the summer of 2028, I think. But if the work already done is built upon, it is quite realistic to present an option to this Assembly later this year. For example, if the decision is to go out to tender on something very close to option A, rebuilding the current runway, that is pretty much ready to go. Potential contractors are already familiar with it, and the work could be carried out much sooner than that.

I think it is no exaggeration to say that procrastination could prove fatal to Alderney as we know it. And this linkage creates delay. So let us break the link and simply do both parts as quickly as we conceivably can.

Please vote for this amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater, do you wish to be relevéd?

Deputy Leadbeater: Yes, please, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, madam.

Just very briefly, perhaps saying some of what Deputy Roffey said, although not the first part. I think it is very clear why these two things are linked in this policy letter. I think it is right that the 1948 Agreement should be reviewed, so much has happened since then. I can understand fully why P&R see this as – I am sure the President will correct me if it is not true, but it simply seems as though it is a leverage that is not wanted to be lost. I think if perhaps this policy letter had come a couple of years ago, before Alderney's runway got to quite the state it is now, then there might have been an argument for that approach. Because, to be fair, Alderney perhaps – I am being very blunt here really – have had expectations that were too high, particularly in the support of option C+.

But I think everyone has had a pretty big reality check on this subject in recent years. I think what is needed is Alderney's airfield to be fixed before it cannot be fixed and before that has massive irreversible effects on that community. On that basis, I will be supporting this amendment to decouple these things. I am not going to throw rocks at P&R for their attempt to couple them up, and I can see the reasoning behind it, but that time has gone and I will be supporting this amendment.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Madam, the idea of a commission has been around for a long time. Deputy Helyar and I attended meetings with representatives from Alderney, representatives from Sark, and it was led by a former Minister who was responsible for the Channel Islands, or after he had moved on to other things, decided to give his assistance – considerable assistance – to see if we could fashion some kind of relationship and some kind of commission. Deputy Helyar and I were sent off into a siding and that matter did not proceed after a certain time.

I very much am going to support this amendment. I have no idea at all why the figure of £24 million is being put in the policy letter. It is unachievable. It is unachievable. You cannot buy a bag of crisps in relation to this kind of thing for the £24 million that is being figured. If that is an absolute cornerstone of P&R's policy, it is just unachievable and we should dispense with that now.

When I stood up in December 2022, I and the other four members of P&R at that time had all been advised and advised and advised by officers, who were paid and tasked to achieve that purpose, that £24.1 million was possible for the whole caboodle; replacing the fire station, replacing the terminal, everything else. None of us are shrinking violets, we asked the questions again and again. 'No, no', we were told by the officers, 'that is fine, you will be able to do it for £24 million.'

In the debate, quite properly, Deputy Burford stood up and she questioned those figures respectfully, and I gave an undertaking to the States that I would come back if they were going to be more than 10%. So if we got to £26.5 million, come back to the States and say it is now £28 million or £30 million. All of a sudden, and I do not think enough happened, we get to £37-plus million and we are all told in a States' debate, 'Well they were just figures that you were given in December 2022, were just figures of rough order of magnitude.' Well that is not good enough. That is not good enough to tell senior politicians, and for those senior politicians in good faith to tell the Assembly, which we did, that £24-or-so-million was the appropriate figure, give or take, and then come up with £37 million sometime later is, frankly, disgraceful, unacceptable. If you were to do that in business, you would be sacking your managers. But of course, we are the States of Guernsey, we do not sack anybody.

Those figures, I felt, not for the first time as a senior politician in Guernsey at the time, that I was badly let down by those who were advising me. But there is nothing we can do in relation to that. We have got to do with the situation as it is.

Alderney's economy is on the brink. It is struggling. Guernsey's economy is on the brink and it is struggling. We can have all the good news that we want but the reality is that both Islands are in a position that they find very difficult. But Alderney's is different. If they do not have a 21st century functioning airport their economy will collapse. It has been built, as Deputy Roffey said, for the last 80 years on an airport. That is the way they built their economy. I know you can say in Tanganyika or Papua New Guinea or whatever it is, all the Islands that surround them, that there are communities that might be bigger that do not have airports. That is in Papua New Guinea and other places. It is not in Guernsey. It is not in the Bailiwick of Guernsey.

The 2,000 people who live in Alderney need an airport. There are figures that are given about their economy and their GDP. Of course, it could be said, 'Well, look, if this was Guernsey, you would be spending hundreds of millions of pounds pro rata. We live in the Bailiwick of Guernsey. We have a 1948 Agreement. And Deputy Soulsby said in her opening that things have changed since 1948. We have got President Trump now instead of President Truman. Some will say – well, I am not going to make any further comment on that. We have got President Trump instead of President Truman. And in 1948, the football club that she and I support lost to Blackburn in the semi-final of the FA Cup. So there we are. Things move on, and challenges are different.

But at paragraph 10.6 of the policy letter, it says that:

In 2022, Alderney's economy was worth £61 million (£28,676 per capita). Guernsey's economy in the same period was estimated to be worth £3,332 million (£52,413 per capita).

The reason for that is because we have a very detailed and sustained finance sector, which Alderney does not possess. It cannot possess with 2,000 people. But you would not be saying to Deputy Brouard's friend, Mrs Le Page from Torteval, 'If you are 83 we are not going to give you this operation because if we did that for everybody in the Bailiwick, that would cost us such-and-such, we cannot afford it.' You look at each individual case.

Now it also said, and Frontier Economics I am sure are a renowned body, but I raise my eyebrows figuratively and literally when I see they say this:

Frontier Economics has estimated that the closure of Alderney Airport could have an economic cost of between £3.1 million to £6.2 million per year, which is 5% to 10% of Alderney's total Gross Value Added.

455

Well, they are completely wrong. If Alderney had to close for that period of time, their economy would shrink much more significantly than that, and much quicker than that. They base it on – it just shows you can have people with economics, who I am sure have got all the ologies in the world, but their common sense is perhaps left on the sideboard. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) The economic cost – I am not sure if that was a right-wing or a left-wing comment, but never mind.

460

The economic cost is based on reduced visitor spending, 33% to 65% reduction, and a contraction in the local financial and professional service sectors of 10% to 20%. It would be much more than that. I disagree with Deputy Burford saying perhaps the Alderney runway is in a worse position now than it was then. It was in a pretty diabolical situation in 2022. It was in a pretty diabolical situation in 2020. It was in a pretty diabolical situation in 2016. You can only patch things so much.

465

I think the cost is £400,000 per annum over the last couple of years. It is rightfully spent, but it is a waste of money because we should be addressing this issue now. We should be moving on with this issue now. I appreciate that Deputy Roffey says that the earliest that we can get a spade in the ground is about three and a half years' time. I keep my fingers crossed and my toes crossed that Alderney's runway can keep going with all the patching in the world until 2028 because it would be an absolute disaster, and if we think here that we can cut the ties with Alderley –

470

Deputy Roffey: Point of correction.

475

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache. Sorry, what is your point of correction.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sorry, I give way.

480

Deputy Roffey: That I did not say the soonest it could be done is in three and a half years. I said that if the report had to wait until after the constitutional commission had completed its work then it would take that long. I think it can be done much sooner than that.

Deputy Ferbrache: Thank you. I fully accept that correction. I am sorry, I misunderstood.

485

The point I am making is that we have got to get on with it in relation to where we are. Again, there is talk in this – I found some of this very interesting about the history of it, what happened in 1935 and what happened in 1966 and all that kind of stuff. Very interesting indeed. But we have got to deal with the reality of the situation now, and the reality is Alderney is teetering on the brink of complete collapse.

490

I am going to support them, I have already said I am going to support them, and if they want to bring other amendments, I will support them, because they are on the ground, they know what their community needs, and we have got to support them.

I am quite grateful that Deputy Roffey interrupted, because I got things wrong, I am grateful for that, but what I was going to go on to say was that if we think that in relation to Alderney, we can just cut the ties or cut down on the ties, Let us see what the British Government will say. The British Government will say – they look at us, whether we like it or not, and I quite like it actually, they look at us as the Bailiwick of Guernsey, that we are three Islands together, the three main Islands, and that we have got to be interlinked.

495

If Alderney went into a state of collapse, which is what it would do, and very quickly, if it did not have a proper and functioning runway, then Guernsey would be – some Minister in the UK would be picking up the phone straight away and saying, 'Get on with it, sort it out, this is your problem, get it done.'

500

Sometimes Alderney, and I have been a great supporter of Alderney, but sometimes people in Alderney have got to appreciate that people in Guernsey are going to have to subsidise this to a

massive degree. We can do all the arithmetic we like, and I talked about Frontier Economics' economics, and we can do all the situations that we want to say in relation to finances, but the fact is that this, whatever package ends up being done, will need to be largely financed by Guernsey. Alderney should not be bowing their knee or doffing their cap in that sense, but they ought to be respectful of that, because the people of Guernsey are going to have to pay it. The Mrs Le Page in Torteval, she goes and buys a petrol at Molesey Garage or wherever she gets it from, she is going to be paying tax, and that is going to go towards this, to help where we are.

When I read this, I thought how on earth are we going to get out of it, because we are told if there is massive work they are not going to be able to put up the work, the electricity is not going to be able to do it, they are not going to be able to get the stuff across. Well, there we are. But you can do things if you have to do them, and they will be done, and they need to be done.

I am going to support the amendment, but what I am also saying to my colleagues in the Assembly is that £24 million is not going to cut the mustard. When we also look at it, we have got to be realistic, their fire station needs replacing very soon, their terminal needs replacing, other stuff is going to come. If this Assembly balked at its duties, as it has done over the last three years, to make any significant decisions in relation to the refinancing of our finances, showered away because it is not an election, showered away because there is a solution blowing in the wind, if it had made those decisions we might have had more money in the kitty. We have not got that money in the kitty, but we have got this problem to solve and we need to solve it now.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.
Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: We have had three cracking speeches, not just, of course, from Deputy Soulsby, but excellent points from Deputy Roffey, Deputy Ferbrache and Deputy Burford. I find myself in a difficult position here on a dilemma, because people will know I have visited Alderney many times and I have had good friendships with Alderney politicians. Of course my late mother loved living in Alderney for 25 years and I have got strong links with the community.

The thing is, Deputy Ferbrache raised the point that the British Government might, in some way, put pressure on Guernsey to support our friends within the Bailiwick. But to my surprise and, if I am honest, slight disappointment, an ill-advised journalist asked Lord Ponsonby a question when he was on other business in Jersey and he pointed out that he was reluctant to get involved in what was a Bailiwick of Guernsey inter-governmental thing. I think we do have to work on this ourselves and find a solution that works for both parties.

Deputy Ferbrache also mentioned Frontier Economics. I may have bored people a bit yesterday when I went in at length about how the average household in Torteval or St Pierre du Bois are a bit better off than perhaps the average household in St. Sampson's. I do not know where St Peter Port is in that. But what I can say with a degree of certainty is the average household in Alderney is significantly less well off. Deputy Ferbrache is on the money when he says that candidates for the election, maybe all of us, we have to accept that now and for the foreseeable future Guernsey people will subsidise Alderney people to a degree. That was not always the case and may not be the case in the future if Alderney's economy improves through tidal power or some other way. But that is a reality.

So Mrs Le Page in Torteval, who may be better off than we realise, or not, will be paying tax to support Mr Page in Alderney, who possibly has only moved there a few years ago. That is another question. But we have to see it in the round.

I was a little confused with Deputy Roffey's passionate speech. Although I certainly appreciated his candour because on the one hand he was saying that it is unthinkable and wrong that the States would renege on its promise to do the runway and on the key part of the 1948 Agreement that has lasted for three generations. I agree with Deputy Ferbrache, the idea that Alderney would not have an airport is completely socially and commercially unrealistic. How it is funded is really the issue.

But Deputy Roffey was having it both ways in a way, because he suggested that it is time to look, as Deputy Ferbrache did, at Truman versus Trump, although it was Truman who set an atom bomb off, but there you go. That now is the time to look at the Agreement.

560 The nature of the Agreement is an implied contract, perhaps, for all kinds of services and goods, and inevitably tough conversations may ensue on what might be more economical ways of doing it. I differ from, I think, my colleagues on Policy & Resources, and perhaps some of the other participants in this, in that I do not believe the 1948 Agreement is the problem. It is one of the issues, but it is not in itself the main problem. I think there are challenging economic times generally we are in, we do not have the surpluses of 20 years ago, but I would say the three issues I would
565 identify from some experience of the situation is firstly the Machinery of Government in Guernsey does need reform, and even more so perhaps the Machinery of Government in Alderney.

I think if they had a structure whereby decisions could be taken by a smaller Executive or an elected President with powers or a mayor or whatever, that would be of help, because they have gone through with a limited resource for elections in the last few months. They have elections more
570 frequently than I make speeches almost. Maybe not that.

The second point is their Civil Service is an incredible asset to them in the Bailiwick, but they have been through Chief Executives almost as quickly as I eat my pies and jacket potatoes. They have gone through a lot of staff and that has not helped. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

The third point, obviously, I think the Alderney economy went through relative booms in the
575 1970s and 1980s and again around the millennium, but they are now on the wrong side of the demographics and the lack of economic growth is a big pressure. But where I do support my Alderney colleagues, and I expect Mr Snowdon and Mr Hill will make very good speeches on this, is I think the transferred services model is a very complicated one in terms of management accounts.

I go back in time a bit and I will tell you a quick anecdote. I remember when I was doing my
580 everlasting questions, I posed a question to Deputy Parkinson, when he was Treasury Minister and Deputy Chief Minister, asking for the relative cost of Alderney to the Bailiwick and the response I got through the then Chief Officer was, 'We are not allowed to give you that information. It would be politically unwise', because the view for a decade or two was almost Alderney was the fifth parish.

We then started to get more disciplined with the accounts, and we realised, as Deputy Trott has
585 explained, there was a substantial deficit, even more if you included interest on capital and so on. But, as Deputy Ferbrache said, you do get elements of the Island, elderly people, people in different parts, who cost more than others, and Deputy Trott has many times said, rightly, that the average family in Guernsey may not be paying enough tax to support their children at school if they have more than one. I think that is a bigger argument.

But the issue we have got is the need for economic development in Alderney. But I think, going
590 back to the transferred services and where I think the current arrangement needs review is, I think we do silver plating services for Alderney. I look at Sark and they make do and muddle most of the time, I hope, but I think the level of services we give Alderney – I do not mean essential services but I mean the transfer of senior civil servants or professionals or people coming over here every other
595 week for medical check-up when they could do it online, the regulatory model, maybe of the police and other services. I think what we have done is understandably we have adopted a Guernsey model for Alderney.

The biggest problem I think Alderney has is not the 1948 Agreement but the fiscal union. That
600 is the source of the issue. You look at the Isles of Scilly or the Scottish Isles, they are in a fiscal union with the United Kingdom. Big societies with big tax income that can support smaller places. Alderney are in a fiscal union with us, but I – I will give way to Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Thank you.

I have heard a number of people say we are in fiscal union with Alderney. We are of course in
605 partial fiscal union with Alderney. A substantial amount of their income is retained on Island for purposes that they design appropriate. So it is partial fiscal union not full fiscal union, which of course means that the figures are more dramatic than I have regularly said in this Assembly.

Deputy Gollop: Yes, I do stand corrected there because of course Alderney has different taxation for things from companies to rates. I will make a point here – two points really – that we actually, in recent budgets, have given Alderney a lower tax cap to encourage high net worths. That is interesting. But another point is Deputy Matthews and others – Members past and present – have sometimes observed that our rates are comparatively low in Guernsey compared to some English or other places. The relevance here is, I wonder if it would be possible for Alderney to raise additional money, especially from non-resident holiday homers, on rates, so that they could provide a quantum towards the Airport development, which I wish to see happen as soon as possible.

I am tempted by this amendment, but I think the main Propositions are clear, that Policy & Resources on the first place want, ideally, the discussions to start as soon as possible, which would be to see how we can increase revenue from Alderney and the economy and reduce costs to Guernsey. Pragmatically, the States will look at that.

But we, collectively, on Policy & Resources, are resolved to allow this project to continue, where, again, I have sympathy with Deputy Ferbrache's view, and I think something Deputy Burford said as well, is I do not think we are going to find a conventional runway at the moment for £24 million. Even if the amendment wins, or the States throw all of this out, nothing is going to happen. We have to get on with this. I am very sympathetic to Alderney States' Members and all professional people who live on the Island being involved in the procurement process. I have said, although this might break the party line, that I would be more than happy if Alderney can find a robust way of being part of the procurement, to bring in a scheme that works for them for £24 million or less, then I would support that. Or even if it was more than £24 million and Alderney, through private finance or other revenue streams, could finance the difference. I think that is an important point to make as well.

I think all of us need a mandate to know whether the subsidy works too. But I think the main reason for us sticking together on this tough policy letter is – we do not want to be like President Trump, there was a comparison made on the media about bigger states and smaller states, But we all know President Trump, who seems to change his mind now and then quite quickly, he is a negotiator, he likes the format of *The Apprentice*, and I think what we do want to do is to have not a new deal exactly, but we need the effort on all sides to find a 21st century solution that may include greater subsidy but may also include better ways of doing things, smarter ways of doing things, as Deputy Kazantseva-Miller always says that we lack, looking for meaningful savings, looking for maybe more commissioning, maybe for more self-government, maybe for more responsibility, maybe a tax rate for Alderney that reflects its higher expenditure. I do not know.

We need that conversation. I wanted to get on it as quickly as possible. They are linked because even if we de-link it today, I do not honestly think the new States would be happy to progress this project until we are clearer about the future dimensions and how Alderney and Guernsey and all of the Islands can work together.

The Deputy Bailiff: Three minutes left, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Two minute warning – three minute warning. I think I have more or less said enough, but what I would also add is we need the ability to focus and I think the openness that a commission would bring, and new thinking and new minds, would make more of this Assembly more likely to support Economic Development's projects for Alderney and that can only be helpful.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, madam.

Reluctantly, I am not going to be able to support this. It is really Deputy Roffey who has got me to my feet about reneging on its obligations from Guernsey's point of view and Her Majesty's control, and we know we have been in discussion ever since my days from the Alderney liaison as

to the effectiveness of one party, whether Alderney or Guernsey, wishing to change the obligations under the 1948 Agreement. I do not think either party is locked in for the next 1,000 years. I think there must be a mechanism that each party can come away, just as in a marriage you sometimes need a divorce or you might need to do some sort of settlement. I do not have a problem with us changing the parameters of the 1948 Agreement.

My view is that the 1948 Agreement has caused the problems. It has put in a subsidy which has allowed behaviours which are only viable with a continued subsidy and it has put in expectations beyond sustainability. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I will say that again; the 1948 Agreement, in my view, has caused the problem. It has put in a subsidy which has allowed behaviours which are only viable with a continued subsidy and expectations beyond sustainability and that goes right the way to the heart of both the immigration, second homeowners, the politicians themselves. They do not have the ability to deal with the real issues of their Island because they are being looked after from the point of view of Guernsey, so their main functions of health, education, policing, security and so on are done by someone else and they are left with water, roads and a few other bits and pieces. That does not make a healthy way to go forward.

I just reflect from the conversations that we were having with regard to the Alderney runway and I voted in favour of the progress in that regard, but there were a few things that I mentioned. What happened to seatbelts? What happened to crash helmets? What happened to the top-ups at the care home, which is provided by the Alderney Government, which is then provided by Guernsey taxpayers, so Mrs Le Page is not only paying for the care home in Alderney to be built but she is also then having to pay for her own care home to be built in Guernsey privately. It is these anomalies that need to come out not for today but I will just reflect on it. You need to look at the comparison between Alderney and Sark where an Island must make do with what it has got without that subsidy. Reluctantly I would love to see Alderney progress but I think we need to reflect back on that 1948 Agreement, because it has just brought about behaviours which I think are unsustainable.

Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Please take off your jackets if you are too warm.
Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, madam.

So far most of the speakers have had a very close relationship with Alderney and certainly at the constitutional level, and so I understand why the speeches have been quite wide-ranging and necessarily detailed.

My relationship with Alderney, bar having family members there, has been mainly this term related to the work that we do with education – and wonderful it is every time we go up and visit the school – but I remind Members that this particular amendment that we are on is pretty narrow in terms of why the proposal is tied specifically to the work of the design for the Alderney runway. We could possibly be shorter than we are being at the moment in discussing this.

So having looked at the policy letter, the purpose of the commission is not set yet, page 23. If we look at that, it is at a very high level at this stage and it is noting really that the 1948 Agreement is no longer fit for purpose, for the purpose for which it was designed. I do not think there is really any contentiousness about that issue. Obviously a lot of people are looking at that and have been for quite a long time but it then starts, we are asked through the policy letter, you can note on page 25, that it states that the finding of such a commission would be informative rather than binding and it would also help to clarify the roles and responsibilities for the facilities which may be developed in Alderney providing much needed clarity for both Islands. I think that is really the nub of this and what I would like to hear from Policy & Resources members is if the findings are informative and not binding then what is the problem with proceeding with very urgent works on the Alderney runway just to get some clarity about some of the facilities therein?

I understand that is a nice to have and in the expediency of looking at organisational roles and understanding the finer details, but given the urgency of the works needed at Alderney runway –

when I landed the other day on Monday when we went up for the governing board meeting we were diverted on to the grass strip, which obviously would not have been possible in certain weather conditions. Luckily it was a spring day. It has been pretty dry for the last few weeks. There is no way if we had had heavy rainfall we would have been able to use that grass strip at all. I understand last year there had been two aquaplaning events.

This is serious stuff. We would not put up with that here in Guernsey but we are expecting our cousins in Alderney to put up with this. For me the nice to haves of making sure that all the bows are tightly done up and the packaging is all clear as a result of the output on the commission, which is informative, not binding, to clarify the roles for me has to come second to the urgent work that needs to be done on the runway to make it serviceable and safe because at the moment it does not feel like it is safe.

I would really appreciate the Policy & Resources members giving some clarity on that. I know that Deputy Trott is standing but I think, for expediency, I know that he has got a chance to respond so it would be helpful probably if he could respond in the round rather than give way.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Thank you, madam.

Well, I completely agree and support this amendment. The runway issue cannot wait until we have sorted out a review of the 1948 Agreement. The runway is simply collapsing and could be shut down by the relevant authorities pretty well at any time with disastrous consequences for Alderney.

Under the 1948 Agreement we are committed to providing an airfield and we need to, for the time being, honour that commitment and I will return to that later.

On the cost of the runway and the issues surrounding that, the truth is that, as Deputy Roffey said, any hard surface runway, whether that be asphalt or concrete, will be very expensive and to some extent it does not really matter very much how long the runway is. As Deputy Roffey said, if you have set up a batch concrete mixer on Alderney running it for an extra week or two does not hugely affect the total cost of the project.

The alternative to a metal runway, and I will use the term 'metal' for a hard surface, would be to go back to a grass runway, and that is an option that does at least deserve to be considered. That, after all, was what existed in 1948. That is what the States of Guernsey signed up to repairing and supporting and I believe the Twin Otters can land on a grass strip. So it is not an option that we should dismiss out of hand; it does need a bit more thought but we are not here to engineer the runway. We are here to say that this issue needs to be separated out and we need to urgently come up with proposals to do something about it.

Any metal runway, if we go down that route, will be very expensive. But even at £37 million the cost of rehabilitating the Alderney runway with all the associated buildings would be not much more than the estimated cost of replacing the Guernsey Dairy and the reality is that these capital projects are very expensive. To some extent I think we just have to be realistic about that. The cost of the economy of Alderney collapsing would be far greater and Deputy Ferbrache rightly says the UK Government look to Guernsey to sort out this problem regards Alderney as our responsibility.

Some people might disagree with that but I am very sure that that is a correct analysis, that the UK Government do expect us to deal with this and if we try to walk away altogether from the commitments in the 1948 Agreement I think the UK Government might be justified in intervening directly if the Bailiwick's constitutional affairs to set matters, in their view, straight. That would be an extremely dangerous precedent for the Island of Guernsey and indeed for the whole Bailiwick. We simply cannot shirk our responsibilities here. We need to do something, we need to do something urgently. Whether that something is a new hard surface runway, metal runway, whatever you call it, or whether it is a grass strip, is something we could probably – not in this debate but at some time – be usefully discussing. But the fact is we are committed to providing a runway and the

existing runway is on the verge of collapse. It could be condemned by the aviation authorities at any time.

765 We need to get on with this. It is much too urgent to leave this, to tie this to some review of the 1948 Agreement, which could take many years. For goodness' sake, let us decouple these issues, consider the runway problem separately, and get on with making a decision.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Helyar.

770

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, madam.

To the extent that it is a special interest, I would like to declare the fact that I am a co-owner of a property in Alderney so I do fly backwards and forwards there very frequently.

775 Deputy Ferbrache made an excellent point about the negotiations that have gone on and I think Deputy Dudley-Owen really was right on point, because we were doing quite well to start with. It is a very simple amendment. All this does is decouple the timing of a commission and the timing of the runway repair. That is all it does. It decouples the timing of it because it just takes out the words 'ideally being before or at the same time as.' That is it. It does not say, 'Let us not have a commission' it does not say, 'Let us not do the runway', it just decouples it and that is really important, and there are two reasons for that.

780 As Deputy Ferbrache said, we undertook quite detailed discussions behind closed doors, because I think it was important for us to start those discussions by examining the cultural red lines that might exist between Alderney, Sark and Guernsey because they are fiercely independent societies and there are certainly some things that their communities would not want to give up to Guernsey in terms of independence. It was important to explore those behind closed doors to start with and we did a lot of it. We invested a lot of time in it so I would not like Members to think that the implication in the words here, and I am sure it was not intended by Policy & Resources, but I would not like Members to feel that the implication is that Alderney does not want to come to the table and discuss the 1948 Agreement, because it desperately does.

790 I think the people of Alderney and the Alderney Representatives and Members of the Alderney States absolutely understand that what we have at the moment does not work effectively and they really do want to come to the table and talk about it. It is not fair to lead them up the gallows, put a rope around their neck, and then start asking them whether they would like something different or not, which is my view about what this coupling of these two things does. It is not good optics, as Deputy Roffey has said.

795 I am absolutely convinced that communities and those politicians in both Islands will commit fully to a commission. I fully support both options but I do not support them being coupled together in this way and so I really do think Members, if just for the sake of harmony among the Islands of the Bailiwick and it has been described – Deputy Brouard described it as a divorce. We are not in a marriage; we are in a family. With divorce comes maintenance unfortunately and that is one of the things that was left out of that discussion. We are in a family and you cannot choose your relatives. You have to get on and we need to find a better way of doing that.

Members, I would fully endorse Alderney Representative Snowden's amendment and ask that we support it and move on.

805 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Murray.

Deputy Murray: Thank you, madam.

810 I am going to take a very contrary view and probably a very controversial view. I am a Scot by birth so I am always very concerned about money. (*Laughter*) That is exactly what this discussion is about. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Current money and future money for both Islands. I think there has been an assumption here that we can somehow just find a solution immediately, albeit it will not be in place immediately, for a further need, which we do not yet know what will be. We have not

815 defined what that will be. It may be that actually we will recognise, and I suspect Alderney probably
does already recognise, they are going to have to grow their population by some four or five times
to be able to sustain any kind of future. That is not going to happen tomorrow but if that is the
direction of travel then you will build all of your communications and your interconnectivity on that
basis, which is probably what I think they are going to have to do, or we are going to have to do,
820 together. The reality is Guernsey cannot afford its future. That is the truth. (**A Member:** Yes.)

We cannot afford our future. It is the bald reality. We have to get to some reality here in this
Assembly. We have to, because we have not got sufficient funds to fund the obligations of an ageing
demographic. We have not got it, not with the model as it stands today. We cannot do it. We are
subscale and if we are subscale Alderney is even worse. Well, we know it is even worse.

825 It is conceivable that together we will be able to chart a future that means that we can afford
our joint futures but we have not done that yet. We are about to do exactly what we always do in
here, to take something in isolation and ignore the longer-term pictures of whether that fits or it
does not. We can have all the moral indignation that we want, and I have heard a lot of it in here
today. Nobody is running away from obligations. What we are trying to do here is to bring reality
830 to this Assembly, bearing in mind it will not be this Assembly that is going to deliver this. We do
not even know what the next Assembly will do and we cannot bind them either.

What we do know is that we are going to have to do these things together, one or the other of
them may come first. We have said 'ideally' and ideally of course if we had that, that is fine.
Deputy Parkinson just mentioned what may very well be the solution, a grass runway (**A Member:**
835 Yes.) but a grass runway is not going to be any good for 10,000 or 12,000 people. It might be fine
for 2,000 people. We have got to work through that.

You cannot do these things individually. You just cannot. These things need to be working
together, the future of Alderney's economy as well as what the solution might look like to fulfil that.
That is what is being tried to achieve here. It is not running away from the problem; it is trying to
840 find a solution that is going to be affordable and sustainable and will work for both Islands. That is
what we are trying to achieve here. Trying to separate them out at the moment is futile. Are we
saying that we will just, I do not know, resurface, rebuild the runway such as it stands whatever the
cost, not even knowing what aircraft are going to go into that runway, because that is part of the
solution as well? This is a multifaceted situation.

845 **A Member:** Of course it is.

Deputy Murray: I completely understand Alderney's concern. This has taken far too long but
the only way to solve it is to know where we are going and frankly the only way to know where we
850 are going is together to work towards what we believe we can find a solution for that we can sustain.
I cannot sign up to an amount of money that I do not know is going to either be wasteful or
insufficient for what the future of Alderney needs, what we as joint Islanders of Bailiwick need. That
is all that this policy letter is trying to achieve. It is wrapped up in the 1948 Agreement because that
is, if you like, the constitution between us and we are in this partial fiscal union, and that may not
855 be sustainable. It may need to be a full fiscal union for the whole thing to work and we want it to
work.

I very much support Alderney but I am not going to stand and just say we will just resurface the
runway and to hell with the future. The future matters to the type of runway we put in if we are
going to put in a runway, and I am sure that we are but, for example, if we can put Twin Otters in
860 there, as I know Deputy Burford has said time and time again, and she is quite right, they can land
on grass; a reinforced grass situation. That might be the right solution to keep Alderney with the
level of independence it has got and the size of population it has got. I do not know, I am not
qualified, but I want to find out. I do not just want to commit to something that just replaces what
we have got at considerable expense, and that is just the runway, as was pointed out before.

865 Everything that goes with that is going to cost even more money. I do not know where it is going
to come from. We can put Guernsey in debt to do that or we can put Alderney in debt to do that

but the level of debt is going to have to be repaid by somebody, so we do not want to incur more debt than is absolutely necessary so do not assume that this is either/or. These two things have to work together.

870 Thank you, madam.

A Member: Well said.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

875 Deputy Le Tissier.

Deputy Le Tissier: Thank you, madam.

That old saying, 'I was not going to speak' applies. I was going to agree with Deputy Parkinson and Deputy Murray about the runway, but I am not sure grass is suitable for the winter, but I would like Policy & Resources to consider a gravel runway, because these Twin Otters can land on the beach and they do in Scotland – I do not think there is a suitable beach in Alderney – but gravel? Is that going to be cheaper? I do not know. I am not an expert.

I will just add that this amendment has some similarities to yesterday's debate on rectories, and I am going to be blunt but it is not personal, if we take this Proposition out what is the incentive for Alderney to engage fully with any commission? The truth is, and you may not like it, but the truth is you effectively negotiate from positions of strength. You may not like it, but it is the way of the world, hence the similarity with yesterday's debate on rectories. As Deputy Brouard said earlier in this debate, I think he mentioned crash helmets being one item that is outstanding and the health system. To me it is a bit expensive to provide an airport at vast cost for only 1,500 people. The point that concerns me, and this would no doubt be addressed in the commission, is that many of those 1,500 people in Alderney are retirees and they just come to the Island so their contributions are going to be limited.

I will finish here because I have got some other points I wanted to make in other amendments. Unfortunately I cannot support this amendment.

895 Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy Taylor.

900 **Deputy Taylor:** Thank you, madam.

If the States were to decide to delay or not proceed at all with any significant work to the Alderney Airport runway there would be consequences to manage. Those consequences include the impact to Alderney's community and for Alderney and importantly Guernsey's economies, given that we are in existing fiscal relationships between the two Islands. Sorry, I am a little out of breath because I literally just ran up the stairs so I could speak. Those are not my words, madam, in other words *Top Gear* magazine, they are the words of the Policy & Resources Committee agreed unanimously in their policy letter at paragraph 10.3. I have got 15 minutes so I might as well catch my breath.

910 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Taylor, you do not need 15 minutes. Can I just say that only two Members of the Chamber have actually talked for more than seven minutes so they have been guided by my guidance that not everybody needs to fill the 15 minutes.

915 **Deputy Taylor:** Anyway, those are not my words, madam. Those are the words of the Policy & Resources Committee and, in my view looking at the unamended Propositions, I think that this Assembly agreeing to them would be delaying works to the Alderney runway. I think we would all agree with that. So the question I really have –

Deputy Trott: Madam, a point of correction.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, what is your point of correction, Deputy Trott?

Deputy Trott: The point of correction is that the independent group that has included staff who report directly to the STSB have indicated strongly that it is more likely than not that work on the Alderney runway will not commence until 2028. My preference is that it would happen earlier but I see Alderney Representative Snowden shaking his head as he so often does, madam, but that is the independent advice that we have received. So to suggest that our Proposition is in some way or another a delaying tactic is utterly false.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Taylor.

Deputy Taylor: Madam, I see it as a delay so I do not think that is a valid point of correction from Deputy Trott. That might be his view.

The question I would pose to Deputy Trott, because – I do not know who is mumbling – is how does Deputy Trott envisage that we would manage those consequences? Madam, I do not think that this particular amendment is going to speed up the process of bringing forward works on the Alderney runway but it is not going to create a further delay. I think unamended that we are likely to see a delay, Deputy Trott can disagree with that, but I would like to know, and maybe it is in this debate or in a future one, but this is part of the policy letter, how Deputy Trott envisages that we will manage those consequences to both Alderney and Guernsey's economies.

Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you. Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Just in case anyone is confused, Deputy Trott is replying on behalf. Thank you, Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, madam. I am glad everybody is aware of that now.

I will speak on just a few points that I think are pertinent to how things have gone. When we started with Alderney Representative Snowden in relation to opening on this amendment, he talked about how Alderney very much all are very happy to have the Bailiwick Commission but really when he spoke he did not sound like it. It sounded like the complete opposite. He spoke about this as being Trumpian. Well, if this is Trumpian we would find some high-net-worth multibillionaire to go into Alderney and perhaps –

Deputy Dudley-Owen: A point of correction.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Dudley-Owen, what is your point of correction?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Alderney Representative Snowden never said that the commission was Trumpian. He said that some people had said that Policy & Resources were coming across as being Trumpian and he defended the Policy & Resources' position.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you. Is that called 'womansplaining', Deputy Dudley-Owen?
(Laughter)

Deputy Soulsby, please carry on.

970 **Deputy Soulsby:** Yes, well, I think that I did not say that the Bailiwick Commission was Trumpian. I said that Alderney Representative Snowden referenced Trumpian and I said those people who think it is Trumpian, well, Policy & Resources have not gone out to look for a multibillionaire to go into Alderney and shut down all the transferred services. That is what I would see that President Trump has been doing at the moment, whether that is a good thing or not, but that is what we are doing. I find it very difficult to relate to being Trumpian. This feels like a delaying tactic, the amendment. There has been a lot of talk about delaying tactics in relation to the runway but there is no way that the Bailiwick Commission will delay the work that is carried out on the runway and, as I said in my opening speech the intention is very much for the runway and the work of the Bailiwick Commission to work in parallel.

980 I would like Alderney Representative Snowden, who represents Alderney here, to confirm to the Assembly, when he sums up, that Alderney will be very happy to support the Bailiwick Commission and its setting up this summer. I will let Alderney Representative Snowden respond. He has got that opportunity at the end and I thought I would reference that now.

985 I did find Deputy Roffey's speech rather unfortunate and the cynicism in it really came out very strong. I found it quite concerning, certainly in my capacity when I was on Health & Social Care, and in particular doing a lot to support Alderney, I believe very much in that strong relationship that we have. We saw that nowhere more so than during 2020 and 2021, so the idea that there is some underlying reason not to be mentioned but to say that we do not want to build a runway at all, but we have got Policy & Resources Committees made up of various Members who have slightly different viewpoints and what we have ended up with is a policy letter that represents the views of the whole of that Committee and that is I think – and what is in there is very open about what we are trying to do. There is not anything hidden underneath. So I do think Deputy Roffey's speech was rather unfortunate. (**A Member:** So do I.)

995 Really this goes back to other comments linking the runway to the 1948 Agreement but really the project, the cost of the runway, we are looking at – as Deputy Ferbrache said, it is not going to come within £24 million, which is what the States have approved. The States have said that that is our cost envelope. We know we do not have all the money for the whole of the capital portfolio at the moment so now we are saying we are going to have to spend more, but associated with that is a fundamental change to our political relationship.

1000 We are saying we are happy, effectively, to give more money for Alderney than we are for essential services and capital investment in Guernsey. That is a fundamental thing we have got to consider. It will not be us that will need to consider, it will be the next Assembly, and the next Assembly, when it is confronted with, 'Here we are. Here is the runway, it is going to cost £30-something million' or however long it will take, it will be more than that, so where is this money coming from and what commitments have we got to the relationship and who is going to be funding that? Is it all going to be down to the Guernsey taxpayer? It is fundamentally a very different – while just agreeing to the runway sounds like that is absolutely right, let us decouple it from the 1948 Agreement, it is absolutely linked and that is what we are trying to do. We are trying to help the next Assembly and I will not be in that debate. This will be my last, fortunately, but those points will come up absolutely of how we are going to pay for it.

1010 There was talk about we should have been doing it earlier and the Bailiwick Commission should have been starting and perhaps we should have linked it earlier. I totally agree. It was Deputy Burford who said that, and it was something I was trying to get set up last term. I tried to do it earlier this term, but there was no desire to do so, so that is why we are where we are at the moment.

1015 Yes, it is not an either/or and Deputy Dudley-Owen spoke about either/or. This is about making sure that we can do two things in parallel. I think Deputy Murray absolutely nailed it for me. I knew absolutely the way the debate was going that Deputy Murray would talk about us being subscale, and that is the point. Alderney cannot be self-sufficient as it is, and in this modern world it cannot be self-sufficient with all the requirements that we need in this modern world. Just look at the Airport now. All the requirements that are needed by CAA and fire services and control towers that

never needed to exist in 1948. Life has moved on. As I said in my opening speech, we are in a very different world although Spurs are still doing just as badly.

Guernsey is going down that route, as Deputy Murray made very clear. We are struggling with all those requirements and people talk about getting rid of regulation but we cannot be the first movers in that. Yes, we might hear good news from, say, the EU that they are looking at cutting things like GDP up; great, that is fantastic, but it is very difficult for us to be the first movers when it comes to regulation and until such time as others change we must live with much more onerous requirements than ever there were nearly 80 years ago. Really we cannot be in this having such a fiscal union, in the 1948 Agreement, after 80 years. We have really got to move on it so these two run in parallel because basically the Bailiwick Commission and the runway are both needed right now and that is what Policy & Resources are trying to do; move both on the path to something that is far better than we have got at the moment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Alderney Representative Hill.

Alderney Representative Hill: Well, this is going to be an interesting little discussion. I think one of the most important things, as you have probably seen today, there are actually three amendments. The third amendment is one I have proposed, which is to add the word 'economic' so some of the people who have debated in this first bit, which is purely about decoupling the findings of a commission from the urgent requirement for us to have a safe and reliable airport, that is the point of this amendment.

I have heard some speeches, very well put by Deputy Gollop, Deputy Murray, and now Deputy Soulsby about economic development, making it justified and how we are going to grow the population, blah, blah, blah. I will answer those in amendment number 3.

Deputy Soulsby: Point of correction, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: I did not talk about the economic development and growing the population at all. It was absolutely not part of what I was talking about.

Alderney Representative Hill: Oh, well, but what we are talking about here and I want you now to put yourselves in the position –

The Deputy Bailiff: Alderney Representative Hill, can I remind you that you are to address your points through me?

Alderney Representative Hill: Okay. I would like you all – sorry, madam – your Majesty (*Laughter*) anyway, there we are –

The Deputy Bailiff: It is a little early to call me your Majesty.

Alderney Representative Hill: – everyone in this Assembly to put themselves in the position of the regulator. It is his name which is on the licence, and we did have an informal chat with him and I say 'informal', and one of the biggest things that he has said is, 'You are in special measures, you are going to have inspections every three months.' That is pretty stringent special measures, but what he also said was that what they are looking for is a sign and something firm and more tangible that somebody, somewhere, is going to do something about the current situation and when.

He is not just going to write another certificate on and on and on. He is not prepared to do that and, by his reading of this policy letter, that indeed he is not really prepared to accept a potential solution to this problem as late as 2027-28. He wants to see tangible evidence that together we

have a plan to solve this problem and bring the Airport to something that he is happy and relaxed to license.

We will talk about the commission – pardon? Yes, give way.

The Deputy Bailiff: Are you giving way, Alderney Representative Hill?

Alderney Representative Hill: Yes, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: I thank Alderney Representative Hill for giving way and I take the opportunity in terms of the timing, he was talking about getting something done by 2027-28, to correct something that Deputy Trott said. My advice from STSB staff is the project teams' current expectation is that a contractor could be mobilised in early 2027 to begin on the runway in the summer of 2027 and complete the work by the end of 2027.

Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Alderney Representative Hill.

Alderney Representative Hill: Thank you for that clarification but it is still not good enough for the regulator and he has told us that we must prove that we have a tangible plan, and he is not at all relaxed with the slightly open-ended linkage with a commission.

I am going to talk a little about this commission. This commission is going to be a far larger piece of work than I think any of us around this room have imagined. It is a major piece of bureaucracy, inquiries, investigations and, as can be seen in particular in relation to transferred services, that up until the accounts of 2023 they were estimated – I am pretty sure that the commission, in order to get a handle on the realistic and real financial fiscal situation between our two Islands might even ask for a complete forensic audit so that they can make a decision. How long is that going to take? We do not know. Things do not seem to happen that quickly and that is the nature of government.

We could be sitting with a treacly slow commission that might take an awful lot longer and therefore everything has to wait but unfortunately you cannot compare tarmac with a commission. Unfortunately they are different items and we have to recognise that we have a potential regulatory issue with the runway, which they are prepared at the moment to come and inspect every three months but we cannot guarantee that unless we have a tangible plan that they can see that we are going to do something about it. Indeed he said this has been going on for 10 years and it is worrying him.

On that point – on this point only – what I am asking and what Alderney is asking is by decoupling it we have something we can say, 'Yes, we are going to do a commission but we do not know how much work the commission is going to be' and there are a lot of people here second guessing what the commission is going to do. Well, fine, but that is not the discussion today. All right? It is not. You cannot prejudge what the terms of reference are going to be, and that is something that will take place in the due course of time. Of course we want to improve Alderney's economy, and we have plans which I will explain to you in the third amendment, but give us a chance. I do think sometimes people do rather just say, 'Oh, Alderney' but in fact that Airport in 2000 had 109,000 people through it. That is a lot of people. Then, even today, it has 49,000 people using it and Deputy Soulsby talks about cost per resident, but do you judge the success of Southampton Airport by the residents in Eastleigh? No, you divide it by all the people who use the airport so that figure of per resident, 12,000 or 13,000 is a little unfair. In the policy document it talks about whether Alderney Airport is an economic enabler or social. For 49,000 people using it, it is a lot of broken legs (*Laughter*).

1125 The other thing that people do need to realise is that 25,000 people land at your airport from Alderney so it is actually not a bad earner, and that is never mentioned. It is actually I think, and I am probably going to have a point of correction here, it is the fifth most used route out of your airport.

1130 So we are asking a very simple thing. We cannot really wait for the results of a commission, which we do not know how big the work is going to be, we do not know how long it is really going to take and yes, we can put in this thing 'ideally' and so on, but as with most things, particularly in governmental life, these things will probably take a lot longer. Therefore we do not have that luxury of waiting for the results of the findings of a report when we have an airport tarmac runway that is in serious degradation. That is all that we are asking at this point.

1135 We can discuss the commission and we can discuss Alderney's participation later but just on this point I would ask the Members of the Assembly to say is it right to link the results of a commission, which we warmly welcome – we have said that in the Policy and Finance resolution, which we brought in our briefcases today in case there were any doubting Thomases, we are not going to do a dine and dash.

1140 We are committed to a better relationship between us, more understanding and growing both economies because if we succeed you succeed. If we fail you will also fail a bit more than you might think, indeed, a total which is in the policy letter of £4 million to £6 million per year could be the potential contingency costs should we not be able to reach a resolution about the runway. I am asking you, please – and this point, and it is a very small point – is to decouple the commission and its findings with getting on with the urgent work for the runway.

1145 I would just like now to dispel a few myths. Firstly, it seems to be implied, mainly in the media but I think by some people, that Alderney demanded a C+ option. We did not. We were told that Aurigny needed that option in order to continue flying there because they wanted to rationalise their fleet. We do not want Heathrow – let us be absolutely clear and indeed at the moment we are talking only about tarmacking, resurfacing, rehabilitating the actual runway. The terminal, the fire station, those things, those are some things that we indeed perhaps as Alderney will have to look at ourselves and how we can somehow do something about that. So let us strip it right back.

1150 Also I would ask you to ask yourself: is the exam question right? The exam question is we need a runway that has this, that, this, that, this that but actually what we need is what do we actually need as a runway? In fact the answer is sitting in front of us. It is there already, 877 m, maybe widen it a bit, yes, but the answer is there. It does not need a year or more of designers and so on. Indeed, I would suspect that one of the reasons why the budget has gone so high on this is because probably we are asking the wrong questions to the tenderers. We need to make up our mind, strip it right back, make the runway safe, give us what is there and we will potentially be able to land this perhaps within the envelope, maybe even a little bit less. That is out for judge, but we do not know.

1160 As to the grass runway option in fact a grass runway –

The Deputy Bailiff: You have two and a half minutes left, Alderney Representative Hill.

1165 **Alderney Representative Hill:** – is just as expensive as resurfacing using hard structures and also you have got to understand it cannot be an all year, all round weather solution. Yes, an Otter can land there but it might not be able to land there if we had a particularly wet winter like we had this year.

1170 Finally, Deputy Murray said we do not even know what planes we are going to have. I think it is fairly clear from Aurigny – they announced yesterday or the day before I think it was roughly what their plans are, which are Twin Otters. So we do have more answers to the question than we had three days ago.

Please decouple this. We will get on with it. We will not let you down and we want to work together.

1175 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Members, we are ultimately the Bailiwick of Guernsey and Deputy Ferbrache said exactly the same. I could not stop by thinking that if Jersey had the amazing assets that we have got, the other Islands in the Bailiwick, instead of continuing to see them as liabilities as I feel is the relationship currently, the mindset with Alderney, they would seek to maximise the opportunity that having other Islands in our amazing Bailiwick presents to us. I think this is the fundamental change in the mindset and in the approach that we have got to re-establish with Alderney and our other Island communities. There needs to be a reset but we need to look at them as assets rather than liabilities. This is especially so given that Guernsey is the smallest of the Crown Dependencies, that landmass is an issue for us, that we cannot continue expanding our borders, etc. We have got to work with our unique Islands in the Bailiwick to really capitalise on what we have got rather than continuously seeking to undermine that relationship.

Alderney, it has been very interesting to read through the history and just really better understand what Alderney went through in completely re-establishing their community and economy after the Second World War. The Island was completely devastated and to see where they have reached to. Part of that success has been through being quite innovative and being able to accommodate the establishment of the Alderney Gambling Commission. I do not think actually the relationship between the two Islands, as has been demonstrated by the two Alderney Representatives, is fully understood and the cost accounting between transferred services versus the value we get from the economy and the economic co-operation is actually fully understood.

Yes, absolutely, these are the kind of things we need to be considering through the Bailiwick Commission but the Bailiwick Commission, I very much agree with Alderney Representative Hill's concern, that this is quite a substantial piece of work and there is absolutely no guarantee whatsoever, and I can pretty much assure you that it is not going to conclude in 2026. There will be lots of discussions, implications, and I think this piece of work will continue to rumble on, very importantly, but it is not going to complete.

This piece of work, I just do not see why we are using the Alderney runway as the negotiating tactic. Why Alderney runway? Why are we not then maybe talking about the transferred health services or education services and negotiating at the same time, or home affairs provision or whatever it is? Why are we continuing to narrow down on the runway as effectively this pawn in this game and in this negotiation?

My personal view is that I do not see circumstances under which Alderney would not have or should not have a runway, an airstrip. This is absolutely essential and I think the key question is how can we get to the most sustainable, affordable, cost-effective solution that also future-proofs Alderney for the future? We will debate further amendments further down but I think the core of the question is irrespective of what is going to happen to Alderney, whether it is going to have 14,000 people as Deputy Murray potentially wants to understand, or 5,000 people or it might have 100,000 tourists coming in or 50,000 tourists coming in. I think the key of what we need to get to is what is the most sustainable solution and, off the back of it, what is the sustainable aviation model in the wider Bailiwick and inter-Island. I think this is where Deputy Burford's amendment is coming in, to hopefully help give us better direction of what is a sustainable model.

I also agree with Alderney Representative Hill. Looking at option C+, and I am sure Deputy Burford will speak to that further in, it does seem to be completely over-engineered and for us to think that at some point flying ATRs to a tiny community was a good idea was fundamentally flawed.

Deputy Taylor: A point of order, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Taylor.

Deputy Taylor: This 17(6), I think we are straying a little bit further from what the amendment is seeking to delete from the original Propositions.

The Deputy Bailiff: To be fair, as Policy & Resources have made clear in their responses, although it looks like a simple amendment it is actually a rather substantial change, so each person who has spoken has generally spoken larger than just the few words that appear on the paper, Deputy Taylor, so I am going to allow Deputy Kazantseva-Miller to continue.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: I think the point I am making is that the key question between us in relation to the runway is how do we get to the most efficient, sustainable solution, and that is irrespective of actually what a future agreement through a future Bailiwick Commission may look like. I absolutely support that we should be decoupling that work, that we should proceed because these conversations have been ongoing for 12 years. This again exemplifies how terrible we are in taking investment decisions, in making decisions in the first place and especially in making infrastructure decisions. The reason why it is costing so much is because we were not able to make a decision previously. It is as simple as that, so let us get on with making and helping Alderney and us progress with the runway policy letter but let us look at Alderney in a positive manner.

Having said that, I do always say it takes two to tango and I would like to ask that as part of this work, as part of hopefully this vote of confidence for Alderney, that we do need to hear more from Alderney. We have not had really any presentations from Alderney this political term. We need a much closer co-operation and understanding of what is Alderney's future economic plan. We should be developing a more holistic vision together, and I think that really has to come through, through the Bailiwick Commission report, through working closer on economic development initiatives. I think we really need the reciprocation from Alderney to make that happen, to give them that vote of confidence, so please support this amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: The 26(1) please, madam?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Prow has asked for the guillotine motion. Those who still wish to speak in debate on this amendment please stand in your places. Do you wish me to put it to the vote, Deputy Prow?

Deputy Prow: Yes, please, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: So we will try *aux voix* first. Those who support the guillotine motion, to guillotine debate on Amendment 1, please say *pour*. Those against.

Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.

The Deputy Bailiff: We are going to do a vote, please, on the SEV please. Members, you should have before you the procedural motion. I think some of you have not quite logged in yet, so please do so quickly. The States' Greffier, would you open the voting, please?

There was a recorded vote.

Not Carried – Pour 13, Contre 20, Ne vote pas 4, Did not vote 2, Absent 1

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	Blin, Chris	de Sausmarez, Lindsay	Gollop, John	Inder, Neil
Burford, Yvonne	Brouard, Al	Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Mahoney, David	
Cameron, Andy	Bury, Tina	Le Tocq, Jonathan		

Dyke, John	de Lisle, David	Taylor, Andrew
Hill, Edward	Fairclough, Simon	
Le Tissier, Chris	Falla, Steve	
Leadbeater, Marc	Ferbrache, Peter	
Meerveld, Carl	Gabriel, Adrian	
Murray, Bob	Haskins, Sam	
Oliver, Victoria	Helyar, Mark	
Parkinson, Charles	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha	
Prow, Robert	Matthews, Aidan	
Snowdon, Alexander	McKenna, Liam	
	Moakes, Nick	
	Queripel, Lester	
	Roffey, Peter	
	Soulsby, Heidi	
	St Pier, Gavin	
	Trott, Lyndon	
	Vermeulen, Simon	

The Deputy Bailiff: They voted in relation to the guillotine motion, pour 13, contre 20, there were 4 abstentions and 2 Members were not in the Chamber at the time of the vote.

1280 I will turn to Deputy St Pier to speak next.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, madam.

I shall be brief and, notwithstanding your observation that a number have spoken more broadly than this amendment or the words on this amendment, I shall confine myself to it because I do actually consider it to be a relatively simple matter of the decoupling of the commission from the project.

A number of years ago I perhaps – and perhaps if I had been on Policy & Resources or when I was on Policy & Resources would have felt the way that they have and presented the Proposition in the way that they have but time has moved on. I think, as Deputy Ferbrache and others have said, the runway has continued to deteriorate and action is needed. I do think, as Deputy Roffey and others have said, it is inappropriate to provide any linkage now. The time for that has passed and for that reason and that reason alone I will be supporting this amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Queripel.

1295

Deputy Queripel: Thank you, madam.

Once again we are where we should not be. This should have been resolved years ago. It is a classic case of not doing the job properly in the first place, and taking the patch-it-up approach time and time again. The message just does not get through. If you do not maintain something properly as it should be maintained, then it will fall into disrepair and it will cost a lot more.

Sadly that has been the States' approach for decades and it is often caused by personalities, people who do not want to listen to someone else's point of view. Sufficient maintenance, in my view, is common sense, but of course common sense is subjective. Common sense to one person is not necessarily going to be common sense to another person.

I have listened to both sides of the argument. What we are told in the explanatory note absolutely nails this whole issue for me. We are told in the explanatory note that the Airport rehabilitation was previously agreed by both States on several occasions over the past decade. It was not the States of Alderney that moved away from the 2019 resolutions to rehabilitate the Airport at a cost of £12.2 million, with research, which ultimately proved fruitless, on extending the Airport to enable the operation of much larger aircraft. Yet it is now Alderney as a whole that is being put at a very major risk of a collapse in both its economy and in the social well-being of its residents and visitors because of a decision by this Assembly to abandon the single rehabilitation in December 2022.

It goes on to say:

1315

We firmly believe the States of Deliberation should honour its previous commitments to resolve rehabilitation of the Island's critical airport infrastructure before embarking on a wider review of the relationship between the two Islands.

This amendment has the effect of keeping the Bailiwick Commission as a priority, however, provides the flexibility to avoid risk of closure and serviceability of the runway by continuing the works relating to the delivery of a solution to it. That says it all for me, ma'am, which is why I am going to support this amendment, because, as has already been said, if Alderney thrives, we all thrive, but if Alderney collapses then surely we all suffer.

Thank you, ma'am.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Blin.

1325

Deputy Blin: Thank you, ma'am.

I am going to keep this short simply because I think everything has been covered all the way with the arguments. I am going to just bring it back to the real basics of how I perceive this. The runway is in a dire situation and needs to be fixed. Decoupling it would allow that to be looked at. However, the speech that got my attention the most was that of my colleague Deputy Murray. He made it very clear that – and other things were related by Representative Hill, saying, 'Well, we see the runway in front of us, we know it could be a Dornier or it could be an Otter', etc. But a conversation does have to take place to decide what that is going to be. So I am going to bring it back to a very basic interpretation: the timing.

I am going to ask – I believe it will be Deputy Trott when he speaks, or if he asks me to give way. It comes down to this: there seems to be a little bit of a leeway about the timing. To get the runway fixed straightaway or whether it is to have the Convention or the 1948 Agreement or the commission reviewed. What we cannot do is wait.

So far what we have been doing, and it was expressed that there are reviews to the runway or rather inspections of the runway every several months and there has been several hundred thousand spent on the runway to keep it going. It is basic business sense, in a sense, although I did take on Deputy Helyar's point that it is a family. But there is a point and we have to sort all this stuff out. It is very easy to say, 'Look, just get us the runway and then we will sort the Convention and the Agreement out', but it just does not feel right. But as my colleague Deputy Queripel has said, this has been going on for way too long, this is way beyond anything there. So I am going to be needing info to express the reality of how long it will take for the commission side – in other words, not to decouple it – against how long will it take, and I would expect to hear there is something from Representative Snowden to get that runway done, because otherwise it is all numbers.

The one thing that has concerned me and bothered me the most was actually a speech by Deputy Ferbrache, because when we were going through the option C of the Airport, I remember at the time I was totally opposed to it. I did not see ATRs landing there, I did not see the cost of £24 million, I did not see anything of it. But what I do appreciate from Deputy Ferbrache is that he stated – and he put his reputation on it – that he was given those figures. Those figures he was told could be achievable. The figures I was getting from other sources were not looking like that. Then he stakes his political reputation as well, saying that, 'And if, by the way, it comes back 10% over, I will go.'

So I am now knowledgeable that a Deputy as intelligent as Deputy Ferbrache can actually have a situation where he has been, let us say, given information which is not accurate. But then all of these conversations are like that, so I just want to get down – I will not give way because I will be finished nearly. I just want to get down to the nitty-gritty, to the basics of what it is going to be. We need the urgent repair or change of the runway.

I was surprised to hear Representative Hill say, 'Well, actually, do not worry about the fire section or the buildings or the areas', which is interesting because it means this is not making it stick to £24 million or £36 million or £37 million or whatever the figure is going to be. So it would be good

1365 if we could come back to just that saving grace when it comes down to the timing of achieving all of this.

So I am going to stop there. I just hope that from what I have said in my speech that this can be covered by both because that is how the decision is going to be. We have more amendments on the way and we have other business to do. So I would be grateful to hear that information.

1370

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

1375

Deputy Le Tocq: Thank you, madam.

I will be brief and I will keep to the amendment itself. First of all I want to thank the Representatives of Alderney for working with us and for their contributions to debate. I understand the passion with which they approach this particular issue. I would feel equally if I was in Alderney. In fact, I have a friend here in Guernsey who calls the Alderney-Guernsey route a lifeline route for them because they want to return to visit their families. So it works in both ways.

1380

I think the issue that the amendment lays, however, is one really that boils down to trust. That is a difficulty because we have had a breaking-down of trust. I am going to sound a little bit different to some of my colleagues on P&R. Therefore, some of the arguments – I would say probably much of it here – is over a piece of wording that in the end may not come down to anything at all. So I do not want to disappoint, but I probably will, my Alderney Representative friends, whether the phrase they want to remove is in or not. I do not think it is going to make a lot of difference. Apart from anything else – we are not very good as an Assembly, madam, to keeping to deadlines and to achieving objectives. We have just got to get on with this and we have got to have some degree of trust.

1385

I am sounding conciliatory because I believe, in the end, we need to recognise that the words that we agree in this, in the end, will not make a lot of difference. They are just a resolution of this Assembly. We have an election coming up, things could change anyway and there could be totally different people with the need to rebuild trust again. That is the world that we live in. We have to be realistic about this.

1390

I certainly want to see it proceed. I did not vote for the initial C+ proposal and, sadly, I am – I was very willing to be proven right but we find ourselves in this position today. We have to move forward on both of these issues, whether they are aligned or not, whether it is ideal or not to do that. Therefore, I would encourage my friends in Alderney – and I use this opportunity, madam, to thank those who signed the petition, which I received on behalf of the Committee. I have read through the comments. I understand this passion, I understand why they want to make the changes such as the one that is before us in the amendment. But, to be honest, I do not really think it will make that much difference in the end.

1395

1400

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Dyke.

1405

Deputy Dyke: Thank you, ma'am.

I will do the shortest speech ever. In my view, if you want to get things done, you try and do them concurrently rather than consecutively (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) so far as you can. It seems to me that these two items can be dealt with concurrently rather than consecutively. So in order to get things on and move two things at once, let us do them concurrently and support this amendment. That is my view.

1410

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Does anybody else wish to speak in relation to the amendment?
Deputy Leadbeater.

1415

Deputy Leadbeater: Yes, just on the back of Deputy Le Tocq there. I was not going to speak. I have just been looking at this because it is basically ideally being put forward at the same time as a policy letter. So I have been listening to the debate and trying to understand if this is really going to make such of a difference. Deputy Le Tocq, sitting on P&R, tells us it is not. So does that mean P&R will just support the amendment and we can move forward, yes?

The Deputy Bailiff: Does anybody else wish to speak on the amendment? In that case I will turn to Deputy Trott, who is replying on behalf of P&R.

Deputy Trott: I will start by dealing with Deputy Dyke's point. He very sensibly wants things done concurrently, i.e. at the same time. What he must do if he wants that is reject the amendment, not to allow it to decouple, which would mean that it would probably run, almost certainly run, consecutively.

Deputy Taylor: If I could make a correction.

Deputy Trott: Let us understand the –

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Taylor, what is your point of correction?

Deputy Taylor: The work can still be done concurrently if the amendment is successful or not, so Deputy Trott is wrong to say that would not happen.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

A Member: It does not make any difference.

Deputy Trott: It is much more likely to be as I explained but there is still a possibility. So let us look at what the intent of the amendment is. The intent is to decouple the Bailiwick Commission from the work on the future of Alderney Airport. The extensive explanatory note includes:

While the States of Alderney are fully committed to an objective review of the modern day relationship between the islands, as set out in the Bailiwick Commission proposals, the Island is totally reliant upon its airport and air infrastructure, and this needs to be resolved before we can sit down and work constructively and objectively on our joint futures.

Why? Why? Surely the two things should be done at the same time unless there is a motive. We will come to that in a moment.

The Policy & Resources Committee strongly advises the Assembly to vote contre on this amendment, because if you removed the important line you take away the motivation for the States of Alderney to engage in the Bailiwick Commission, potentially. Potentially. You are not creating an environment where there is genuine momentum.

A recent meeting at official level with Alderney on the next steps for seeking the States of Alderney approval for the commission have also indicated that there is a lack of will in Alderney to move the matter at a pace. I am not surprised, not in the least bit surprised. I will explain why in the moment. The explanatory note suggests that the commission should follow the Airport when it can and should run in parallel.

I am going to remind us of our financial position. Guernsey's, the Bailiwick's, fiscal position is in a parlous state. We all agreed on that just a few weeks ago. It is in a parlous state. But I want to pay mind to the Alderney Reps' accomplishment, because they have approached this debate exactly as I would have done had I been in their position. They are trying to kick the Bailiwick Commission as far down the road as possible. This is what the amendment is seeking to do, and who can blame them. Who can blame them?

Alderney Representative Hill: Sorry, a point of correction.

1470 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I am not going to – tell me what it is but I think it is unlikely I am going to accept his point of correction. *(Laughter)*

1475 **Alderney Representative Hill:** I thought we had made it clear that we brought with us a resolution from Policy & Finance that we fully approved the commission, and there was never any indication in any of our speeches that we wanted to kick it down the road.

Deputy Trott: The effect of this amendment is that that is a probable outcome. You have signed up to the commission, you think it is an excellent idea. There are some terms of reference needed. Let us get on with it. Let us get on with it. Why would you want to delay it? I have an idea – it is pure speculation – as to why the Alderney community and the Alderney Representatives in particular might want to decouple it.

1480 Let us just explore a little bit of background, because sometimes we forget, unless we remind ourselves, that there is an audited fiscal deficit – partial fiscal deficit – currently of at least £10 million per annum between Guernsey and Alderney. Included in that is the extraordinary amount of the subsidy that is paid by the Guernsey taxpayer – £2 million now but it would have got completely out of hand if we had not done something about it – which is a material part of that sum.

1485 If we assume that there are 2,000 people who live on Alderney throughout the year – that is a big stretch, madam, but I am being generous because we know that a large number of Alderney residents shoot off to other homes during the winter months – we know this is a fact – when its population falls dramatically. But I shall be generous and assume that there are 2,000 souls in Alderney who are permanently resident, even though we know there are not. So an investment of £24 million is the equivalent of spending £800 million on a Guernsey infrastructure project on a per capita basis. This is how enormous these sums of money are. Sometimes we talk about them in such a way that we forget, as Deputy Ferbrache regularly reminds us, there is no money tree. These are astronomical sums of money on a per-capita basis. But the Policy & Resources Committee supports that because it thinks it can be done.

1495 Another thing we ought to remind ourselves of is that we, in the fiscal union, have £150 million to fund what this Alderney has determined is priority investment in infrastructure of £1 billion. £150 million to fund £1 billion and £24 million of it will be going on the Alderney runway. That is how seriously we take investment into Alderney. Do we get the amount of thanks we should get for it? I do not believe so.

1500 Madam, one of the Alderney Representatives – I shall not identify them personally – has told his community on a radio interview that I, Lyndon Trott, Deputy Lyndon Trott, will have blood on my hands if something happens on Alderney runway. No, I will not. Alderney runway is currently permitted to be used as a runway. That could change. It could have changed at any time over the last three or four years, maybe longer. It could change at any time over the next two or three. It is currently licensed. I will not decide whether it is permissible or not. That will be a matter for the Director of Civil Aviation. That is his job. Neither will he have blood on his hands if anything goes wrong. It is still serviceable. It is this sort of language which is extremely unhelpful. It is inflammatory, it is designed to get a reaction and I think it is most unwelcome. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)**

1505 We do not have a magic money tree. I said before we are not even in full fiscal union. Much of Alderney's income is retained on Island. That is fine, but we need to bear that in mind. The reason I mention that is the cost of capital is a really important factor. We incur costs currently of about £400,000 a year. That is the annualised cost over recent years of maintaining the runway. I am prepared to accept that that could rise. That could possibly go 50% higher. We know that because that is under option C. The cost of maintenance could go from £400,000 to £600,000 per annum. But £24 million costs £1.2 million a year to fund, so the cost of maintenance is half what the ongoing, enduring cost of capital is.

I will tell you what a businessman would do, or woman for that matter, what businesspeople would do. They would opt for the maintenance option. But we are not doing that because we understand our social responsibilities to Alderney. Alderney must understand its social responsibilities to us. I think that part of the equation is missing.

We have been clear that – I think we make this clear in the States' report – that the summer of 2027 is the most likely time that this work is likely to commence. It could be, we have been advised, despite my friend Deputy Parkinson's intervention, that it could be 2028. There are a number of reasons. There are a number of reasons for that, not least the fact that if you go for an asphalt reconstruction, you have to get the batching plant to Alderney that is of the size to make it economically justifiable. Even getting that batching plant off a ship on to the quay and then transporting it from the quay to the Airport is a logistical challenge. This project is a logistical challenge.

So these people who are saying, 'Look, we are pretty much at the summer of 2025. You are going to be lucky if you get this done by the end of 2027.' I see Alderney Representative Snowdon hovering. Would you like me to give way? I am very happy to do so.

Alderney Representative Snowdon: I will be replying to the debate in a minute, thank you.

Deputy Trott: So I repeat that; the logistical difficulties are material. So do not blame P&R for telling you the truth.

Let us now move to Deputy Roffey. I thought Deputy Roffey's speech was a cracker. It was he and the STSB who primarily forced through the ridiculous C+ option, (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) which came in a staggering 50% more at tender stage than was agreed by this Assembly. So why are we where we are today? Well, the delay is a direct consequence of that absurd proposition. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) (**A Member:** Exactly.) Indeed, it is not – we have done our best and I distinctly remember standing in this Assembly and making comments along those lines.

Remember option C+ was an all-singing, all-dancing mini Heathrow-type project. There was this, that and the other. Frankly, it was comical. So the reason we are exposed now, the reason there are challenges, is as a consequence of that decision by the Assembly, which was narrowly passed. I am sure there are some in this Assembly who have reflected on that time and wish they had not supported it, because there is a chance that we would have a functioning, fully remediated service in Alderney at this time had we had the common sense to reject – the idea of flying ATRs into Alderney. We were the laughing stock, but there we are.

Deputy Brouard was of the view that the 1948 Agreement was the root of the problem with our relationship today and must be addressed. 'It is no longer fit for purpose, it has not been for years, get it done.' They are very wise words from a long-standing States Member and I thank him for that. I could not agree with him more. There is no plausible case, from Guernsey's perspective, to delay this impartial, independent analysis, independent commission.

What have Alderney got to be afraid of? It is independent. It is a group of very experienced people who will be coming together and assessing all of the options. I do not know what they are afraid of unless they fear that the commission will seek to materially reduce the budget, the amount of subsidy. I am not entirely sure that is a good idea, but let us wait and see. I do know £10 million is an awful lot of money.

Two thousand people in Guernsey on average earnings basically pay their tax to the Exchequer in Guernsey and it is siphoned up to support the 2,000 people who live in Alderney. That is the reality of the transaction. Probably the extent of the tax they pay on their income funds directly 2,000 souls in Alderney. I do not think that is fair and I never have and I do not think the Alderney Reps think it is fair. So why do we not have a Bailiwick Commission immediately? We set it up, we go for it and it determines whether that relationship is appropriate or otherwise in the 21st century.

Instead, the amendment seeks to decouple the process in a way that kicks it down the road, probably for two years, maybe for three years, possibly even longer. £10 million times three is

£30 million. £10 million times four is £40 million. I do not criticise them. It is exactly what I would have done, madam, exactly what I would have done.

Deputy Parkinson – and I am grateful for his intervention – advised us that a grass strip would accommodate the new types of aircraft likely to be introduced, like the Twin Otters. I personally very much hope that we do introduce Twin Otters, but I am assuming that this will be – I have always wanted Twin Otters. I remember flying one years ago, it is a lovely little aircraft. I remember, as I was telling the Deputy Bailiff earlier, landing it on a grass strip and it was lovely. We should have always had Twin Otters from the word go, another absurd decision to go with new generation Dorniers, for which there are hardly any parts available. That has certainly caused much of a problem. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Stripping the current runway and replacing it with a grass-enforced option would be very much cheaper and faster. Why? Because the batching plant issues are not an issue. There are other logistics and commercial availability. All of these factors make it quicker. So if you really want a speedy decision, we need a grass runway. You could probably have it this summer, at the very latest next summer. No, you do not want that. You do not want that. You want what you –

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Trott, you are falling into that trap.

Deputy Trott: I should know better.

The Deputy Bailiff: You should know better.

Deputy Trott: It will be 25 years on 1st May, madam, and I deserve to be chastised. Thank you for that. (*Laughter*) I should not fall into that trap. Through you, madam, this is where we have a contradiction here, because one is rapid and expedient and cheaper. The other is potentially much lengthier, significantly more expensive and logistically very challenging.

Deputy Helyar says this is a simple amendment. No, it is not simple at all. The cost to the Guernsey taxpayer, which I remind through you, madam, are his electorate. The Alderney electorates are not his. I know he spends a lot of time up there, he admits that. But the Guernsey electorate need to understand that this is not a simple amendment, this amendment potentially creates significant additional delay, significant risks and with it potentially very material increases in cost.

I have already talked about the extent of the subsidies that will continue on before the Bailiwick Commission meets.

I want to talk a little bit about the very capable, the very able and the very amenable Lord Ponsonby, because he supports the idea of the Bailiwick Commission. He wants it to get going as soon as possible, as I think many of us do. He thinks it is the time – the time now – to look at the 1948 Agreement, and has asked me personally, ‘Why would you want to delay?’ I explained why you might want to delay. It is really important that we get on with this.

I will tell you why it is really important. Because I have had enough, personally, of the tensions that exist between the two communities. I want them to go away. The way to make them go away is to sort out this extremely dated, completely unfit-for-purpose agreement. It needs to be modernised and it should be modernised coterminously. If I had had my way, we would have commenced this work many years ago.

Deputy Taylor was asked how will we manage the effect of the Alderney runway. It is a great question and it is one of the reasons why I want it done as soon as possible and one of the reasons why a grass alternative is almost certainly a faster alternative. Because it is currently licensed by the Director of Civil Aviation, he could consider it unsuitable straightaway. He could do that tonight, he could do that this afternoon. Our Alderney Representatives might need to go home on a boat this evening rather than fly home. (*Laughter*) How on earth can I speculate?

But what I do know is that Guernsey will, in the interim, continue to patch the runway. It will continue to patch it in a way that is significantly less expensive for the Guernsey taxpayer than the

alternatives. The Alderney Representatives have my Committee's undertaking that that will happen, notwithstanding it will effectively be done by the STSB anyway.

Then Alderney Representative Hill talked about special measures. They could close the Alderney Airport at any time. Well, they could, but Jersey Airport is also under special measures. They are slightly different. It is not uncommon for airports to be focused on a particular part of an aerodrome's operation to be focused in this way.

So even, madam, even if Alderney runway can be fully remediated with asphalt by 2027 – and we will be lucky if that happens – why, I ask again, would this Assembly not want coterminous consideration of the future relationship to take place? That is the sensible thing to do. Let us please, as we get towards the end of this term, send a strong signal that we are not prepared to procrastinate, we are not prepared to kick it down the road. We want the most affordable, cost-effective solution to this problem, and the very best way of doing it – the very best way of doing it – is voting contre on this amendment, and I hope that Members will.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Trott.

Deputy Inder, you were marked indisposé but you are here, so do you wish to be relevé?

Deputy Inder: Yes, please, ma'am.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes. Alderney Representative Snowdon. Can I remind you, you are limited to 15 minutes?

Alderney Representative Snowdon: Thank you very much.

Firstly, I just want to say thank you to all the Deputies for having this really detailed debate about the amendment we have here today. Particular thanks to the Deputies that said they were going to support this. I am going to start with the bit, because I think we seem to have got a bit confused – maybe the last speaker – we were missing the point of the actual amendment that was put on the table for us today.

So this is from Guernsey Ports and the Alderney Civil Service, who was part of helping a little bit with the Guernsey Ports side. These are the notes that I have been given: the timeline can be achieved to have the agreed scheme for Alderney Airport back to the States by the end of the year – that is this year, just to be clear – with a view of commencing work in 2026.

That is from Guernsey Ports and also the Alderney Civil Service that have been working with Guernsey Ports. Just to make everyone a little bit more confident I have got it right, I am pleased Deputy Roffey has written the same thing to me here. So let us just clear that up, because it is all about the timeline. As I said when I opened up with this amendment – and Mr Hill has reinforced it, and a few other Deputies, very kindly –

Deputy Trott: On a point of correction, and there will be many of these unless you are very careful.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Trott –

Deputy Trott: Through you, madam, yes.

The Deputy Bailiff: There is no need to waggle your pen at Alderney Representative Snowdon like that. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Trott: Okay. I never said that a proposal could not get back to this Assembly by the end of this year. I talked about when the Alderney runway work would be done. The two things are different things entirely. It could be that a proposal comes before this Assembly later on this year

that says, 'This is the contract. However, they cannot do it until the summer of 2027.' That is entirely possible and that was the point that I was making.

1675 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.
Alderney Representative Snowdon.

Alderney Representative Snowdon: Does my time start again?

1680 **The Deputy Bailiff:** No, it just stopped. It halted and now it is running.

Alderney Representative Snowdon: Brilliant, thank you.

I understand the excitement but let us stick to the facts, which we are trying to do today, if that is all right. So I will read it again, 'With a view of commencing the work by 2026.' I do not think I can be any clearer with that. Also, I have Deputy Roffey who has backed me up on that with a kind note that that potentially could happen if that is taken forward.

The problem we have, and what this amendment is all about, is trying to stop an Alderney runway closure, because if you get an Alderney runway closure the community is going to sink, the economy is going to sink, it is going to cost a shedload of money, it is going to be a disaster for Guernsey, it is going to be a disaster for Alderney. Let us not beat about the bush, it will be in national papers everywhere as well.

So I do not think this, 'Oh, Alderney is against the Bailiwick Commission' and all of this stuff, this was fantasy, pure fantasy, this is coming up. We have the Chairman of Policy & Finance that has indicated a strong letter, which I think was attached to the policy letter about supporting the Bailiwick Commission. We have the – as I keep repeating. We go round and round in circles. That is why we are not getting anywhere, really, but anyway.

As I keep repeating, the special meeting of the Policy & Finance Committee on 1st April 2025 all supported the establishment of the Bailiwick Commission. The problem we have is that it has been bolted on to the Alderney runway, which means the delays come in place, which means the risk of runway closure is now high risk and getting greater, hence why this amendment is trying to unpause it.

Deputy Trott: Point of correction, madam.

1705 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Trott, what is your point of correction?

Deputy Trott: Delays do not come in. It would start immediately, the terms of reference, and the commission was populated. It could start well in advance of the States debating any future proposals on the runway. That is the point. Why would you delay unless you had an interest in delaying because of the extraordinary fiscal imbalance?

The Deputy Bailiff: Alderney Representative Snowdon, please carry on.

1715 **Alderney Representative Snowdon:** Yes, I will try and carry on but it is a bit frustrating when you are trying to reply to the debate and the debate is carrying on.

The Deputy Bailiff: To be fair, Alderney Representative Snowdon, if there is a point of correction, Deputy Trott is able to bring it. So please carry on.

1720 **Alderney Representative Snowdon:** Yes. I appreciate it.

Okay, so just going through very quickly, thank you for the support of the Members that have supported this. Referring Deputy Gollop – and I think Deputy Gollop is quite a strong fan of Alderney. He comes up to Alderney quite a lot. Your mother was in Alderney, obviously, for some

time. But regarding the transfer of services, as again, this before you on P&R, the old P&R has spent quite a lot of time going all over this and starting all the different streamlines with the States of Alderney at the time, which is still ongoing.

If it gives Deputy Gollop any reassurance, I will invite the whole of P&R to come to Alderney before the end of this term to look at those workstreams in a bit more detail and carry it forward. There is not a resistance from the States of Alderney to get involved and round the table. The door is open, it is just P&R has to come through it. Maybe you want to become on behalf of P&R, Deputy Gollop. That would be nice to see.

Deputy Brouard, I understand your position and I do not think I am going to be able to convince you, but again the worry is regarding that the runway closure now looks like it is getting very close and very concerning, so I think that is basically why I would like him to support the amendment, but I understand his position.

Deputy Murray. I have a lot of respect for Deputy Murray, a Member of Policy & Resources. I understand that there is a bigger picture here with the taxation, no tax plan, pressures on the States of Guernsey, pressures on the Bailiwick. I absolutely respect that. However, this amendment is to decouple it so that the Alderney runway does not start going the way that it potentially will be going and that we get into a worse situation.

So I do not actually see what is wrong, why P&R, as was mentioned by one of the speakers, cannot actually support this amendment. It is actually a good signal that we are working, and I do not think anyone actually talked about no runway at all. I know P&R are now saying that the £24 million is potentially a lot of money, which it is a lot of money, but remember the Green Paper that you put to this Assembly – that was P&R – actually supported the £24 million, which was to note that it actually did support it.

So I am not going to go on because I am going to waste too much time because we have quite a lot of other business stacking up, but I would look to your support on this so we can hopefully move forward and, at the end of the day, this is trying to avoid – I must emphasise ‘avoid’ – things getting a lot worse if or when Alderney runway closes.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Members, you should now have before you on your screens the amendment. States’ Greffier, would you open the voting?

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 28, Contre 10, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 0, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	DID NOT VOTE	ABSENT
Aldwell, Sue	Blin, Chris	Burford, Yvonne	None	Inder, Neil
Bury, Tina	Brouard, Al			
Cameron, Andy	Gollop, John			
de Lisle, David	Le Tissier, Chris			
de Sausmarez, Lindsay	Le Tocq, Jonathan			
Dudley-Owen, Andrea	McKenna, Liam			
Dyke, John	Meerveld, Carl			
Fairclough, Simon	Murray, Bob			
Falla, Steve	Soulsby, Heidi			
Ferbrache, Peter	Trott, Lyndon			
Gabriel, Adrian				
Haskins, Sam				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Mahoney, David				
Matthews, Aidan				

Moakes, Nick
Oliver, Victoria
Parkinson, Charles
Prow, Robert
Queripel, Lester
Roffey, Peter
Snowdon, Alexander
St Pier, Gavin
Taylor, Andrew
Vermeulen, Simon

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to amendment 1, there voted pour 28, contre 10. There was 1 abstention. Therefore, I will declare the outcome as passed.

1765 Before we move on to Amendment 2, given our time today and the hope that we might get through quite a lot more business, if I put a motion to the House that we start again at two o'clock rather than 2.30, it may be that we can start slightly earlier.

Those who would support a motion that we start at two o'clock, please say pour.

Members voted Pour.

1770 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Very well, we will start a two o'clock after lunch, Amendment 2. Alderney Representative Snowdon, would you like the Greffier to read the amendment?

Alderney Representative Snowdon: Yes, I would, thank you.

1775 *The States' Greffier read out the amendment.*

The Deputy Bailiff: Alderney Representative Snowdon.

[Amendment 2](#)

In Proposition 2 -

(a) to delete the words, "in consultation with", and

(b) immediately after the words "future of Alderney Airport", to insert, "no later than December 2025".

1780 **Alderney Representative Snowdon:** Thank you, madam.

I am going to try and be quite quick on this, and thank you for the support of the last amendment. This is really trying to ensure that the States of Alderney are round the table, because it is in our interest, as it is in the States of Guernsey's interest, to try and find a solution that moves forward quickly with the Alderney runway.

1785 The States of Alderney have been working behind the scenes quite hard and I thank our Alderney civil servants and Guernsey Ports. But I think there can be better working together and greater working together if we are at the table a lot more often than we are at the moment regarding efficiency, cost efficiency, reducing the mobilisation costs, for instance storage of States of Alderney land and other bits of aspects that I think it is really important that Alderney now comes to the table and we try and speak this up, because – and I do not want to keep repeating myself – the time is really running out with the Alderney runway being end of life. So I hope this is a simple amendment and I look for to concluding, fingers crossed, when we get there.

1790

The Deputy Bailiff: Alderney Representative Hill, do you formally second that?

1795 **Alderney Representative Hill:** I formally second it and reserve the right to speak, thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Who wishes to speak on this amendment?

Deputy Gollop.

1800

Deputy Gollop: I am openminded on this amendment, but we did discuss it extensively at Policy & Resources and we are perhaps really wary of it. I am a bit confused about it, I have to say, because Mr Hill, in a very interesting and powerful speech, made the observation – I do not think I would go as far as him, but he said that the Bailiwick Commission would be a very big task, a big project, one that would involve all sorts of considerations from one end of the spectrum – migration policies and housing Laws – to, I do not know, motorbike helmets, to costs of hospitals and schools, to scaled services, to transport, whatever. Deputy Murray very ably put we need to even think ahead about projected economy and population sizes.

1805

If that is the case, and it is a huge enterprise, it does seem a bit premature to talk about December 2025, which is, what, eight months away. In fact, it is five months after the election and if you allow for the summer break and new Committees, that is a serious resource. Actually, though, like Deputy Trott and nearly everyone else who has spoken, I want to see the project done as quickly as possible, so maybe I will give that part the benefit of the doubt.

1810

But the other part about the States of Alderney being at the table, yes, but in what context? Because the States of Alderney as an entity, is it represented by our two popular representatives here, who won the plebiscite? Is it represented by the Chairman of Policy & Finance or by the Chief Executive of Alderney, if they have one, or by the President, who sometimes has a civic and statutory role, and in what way will they contribute? I need more information because I do want participation, I do want partnership, I do want to support Alderney, but what I do not want to see is an unrepresentative figure from Alderney perhaps blocking and holding up the valuable work that needs to be done.

1815

1820

I would see the Commission actually as facilitating the kind of economic development –

The Deputy Bailiff: Sorry, Deputy Gollop, on my reading of the amendment, this goes to the Airport not to the commission. Is that correct, Alderney Representative Snowdon?

1825

Alderney Representative Snowdon: Yes, you are absolutely correct, thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, and you are talking about the work of the commission?

1830

Deputy Gollop: Well, I certainly support partnership on the Airport, as I said earlier. I think the Airport –

The Deputy Bailiff: This amendment goes directly to the timing of the Airport, not in relation to the commission.

1835

Deputy Gollop: Yes. Well, yes, but if we support the whole policy letter, by inference –

The Deputy Bailiff: It has just been decoupled, Deputy Gollop.

1840

Deputy Gollop: Yes, it has. *(Laughter)*

The Deputy Bailiff: Can you keep to the relevant – the amendment? Thank you.
Does anybody else wish to talk on this amendment?
Alderney Representative Hill.

1845

Alderney Representative Hill: Thank you.

I would just like to reiterate why Alderney would like to have a seat at the table, in reference to the runway and the airfield. One of the things is that our local fire brigade, we do have local experience. One of the points that Deputy Trott raised was about asphalt batching machines. In fact,

1850

I can inform you that next week one is being delivered to Alderney. I am not quite sure what it is going to do but it is being delivered and it does not seem to be a problem. In fact, we had a new crane delivered about three years ago, I think, or was it four years ago, which was just brought up on the beach. So we do have solutions.

1855 Because we are local, we can reduce mobilisation costs, particularly the issues that were highlighted by the tenderers, as far as I can see, were staff accommodation, road access, water – three things – and indeed the batching plant and the ability to get large machinery on to the Island. The staff accommodation I solved in precisely one phone call and it is now 60 bedrooms, and probably at a lot better price than what the tenderers were even possibly imagining.

1860 Road access. Well, we will have to come to the party. We will have to say, 'Yes, okay, we will not charge them for the road damage that is going to be done by lifting the heavy machinery', and we want to simplify the design and tender process, which at the moment we have no say. We are locked out. We can reduce costs, and this is what it is about, to the public. This is what you keep all going on about, which is how can we bring this into a budget that is acceptable to everybody here and the Guernsey and Bailiwick taxpayer. We can do that.

1865 Also – and I have to be careful what I promise here – we have indicated in the past that we would come to the table with money. In fact, on the C+ option we offered £3.5 million. I do not actually see that is earmarked in our Island Plan. In fact, that in itself should be a reason why we should have a seat at the table. Indeed, to help speed things up, we are even prepared to start funding some of the cost of the development and design and things in order to get it going. But we need to have a seat at the table and I would be grateful if you could allow it. After all, we are prepared to go as high as £3.5 million to help this project happen.

Thank you.

1875 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Does anybody else wish to speak on this amendment?
In that case I will turn to Deputy Trott to respond on behalf of P&R.

Deputy Trott: Thank you, madam.

1880 I do not think there is a great deal to say. My fear is that the more people sat at the table, the longer the process may take. But it is clear on the last vote where this Assembly's thoughts lay, so I will only make one contribution. That is that I believe that the batching plant that – this is through you, madam – Alderney Representative Hill has referred to is a small-scale operation suitable for patching rather than totally resurfacing. But the Assembly will determine whether this is an appropriate amendment to support or not.

1885 What I will advise at this stage is that we will – I have listened very carefully to what the Alderney Representatives said, madam. Their clear intent is to want to get on with the commission. Therefore, we will be bringing an amendment that will seek to endorse that officially and formally in order that this happens immediately.

1890 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Alderney Representative Snowdon.

Alderney Representative Snowdon: Thank you.

I am not sure what else I can really say on this replying to the debate, but, thank you. I presume P&R are now going to support this, hopefully, and I think put this to the vote.

1895 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.. Members, you should have before you the wording of Amendment 2. I will ask the States' Greffier now to open the voting.

1900 *There was a recorded vote.*

Carried – Pour 33, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 4, Did not vote 2, Absent 0

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	DID NOT VOTE	ABSENT
Aldwell, Sue	McKenna, Liam	Meerveld, Carl	Bury, Tina	None
Blin, Chris		Murray, Bob	St Pier, Gavin	
Brouard, Al		Soulsby, Heidi		
Burford, Yvonne		Trott, Lyndon		
Cameron, Andy				
de Lisle, David				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Haskins, Sam				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Le Tocq, Jonathan				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Mahoney, David				
Matthews, Aidan				
Moakes, Nick				
Oliver, Victoria				
Parkinson, Charles				
Prow, Robert				
Queripel, Lester				
Roffey, Peter				
Snowdon, Alexander				
Taylor, Andrew				
Vermeulen, Simon				

1905

The Deputy Bailiff: The vote in relation to Amendment 2, pour 33, 1 contre, there were 4 abstentions and 2 Members were not in the Chamber at the time of the vote. I therefore declare the outcome as passed.

Alderney Representative Hill, would you like the States' Greffier to read your amendment?

1910

Alderney Representative Hill: Yes.

The States' Greffier read out Amendment 3.

1915

The Deputy Bailiff: Alderney Representative Hill.

[Amendment 3.](#)

In Proposition 1a), immediately after the words "arrangements for the constitutional", to insert, "economic".

Alderney Representative Hill: Thank you, your Honour.

1920

This is actually, hopefully, a slightly more optimistic, upbeat part of this debate. We started with some fairly funereal discussions early on this morning. One of the reasons why I wanted to bring in the word 'economic' was that it is important in this commission, and indeed now some of the people have already pre-empted this little bit of the debate, about what the commission is really going to be about. I believe that this is an incredible chance to actually answer some of the things mentioned by Deputy Miller, who said that it is time that Alderney's economic situation, where we are going,

1925 what is its strategy, is actually relayed to you and, more importantly, to the outside world looking in.

We have a chance with this commission. It is going to be very publicly scrutinised by people outside the Bailiwick and indeed potential investors into the Bailiwick who might be deciding whether they are going to invest in the Bailiwick or Jersey or indeed elsewhere where our competitors are.

1930 However, it is also important to look at what – we have to have a requalification of the relative contributions of what Alderney has provided and what it can bring and indeed has brought, but slightly – and I am going to be careful here – underplayed, some of the things that it has done. I am only going to refer to the 2015 Frontier Economics’ report about the gambling, where they actually estimated that as a result of the Alderney Gambling Control Commission being in Alderney, it was producing £25 million towards GDP. Subsequent to that, that regulator has hinted or strongly written, that in fact that figure could be well higher. Those figures will be known in April, but they are talking about 2.5% to 3% of GDP, which is between £65 million and £90 million.

1935 That is not a bad contribution for 2,000 people, as a result of Alderney being there. What I would like to point out, as the Bailiwick, is that we have a unique proposition, a proposition that Jersey, Malta and other places cannot, in the sense we have two jurisdictions within the Bailiwick. I would like to refer you to yesterday’s debate about privacy. A Deputy asked me why I had voted against it. Because actually I could see the value of Alderney not having that and you having it. Like a supermarket or a brand, it has two cereals but actually they go into the same pot. It is called white labelling. It is a very well-known thing.

1940 If you take, for instance, the gambling, that did not sit comfortably with your image of a Guernsey financial centre, but it is something that Alderney could do and has done and has produced. I am sorry to say this, but there are 250 people working in Guernsey, earning an average of £65,000 a year, between the ages of 25 and 50, who are working in that industry, exactly the target audience. That is as a result of Alderney gambling existing. You would not have that here, it is not that easy to resettle it. I know some people think it is; it is not. It is a highly complex industry, yet it is something that Alderney, as Deputy Miller said in an email to you all, is a very convenient sandbox to try out ideas and not affect your reputation. If they fly, which they have done in this case, is that not something to be celebrated? Is that not something that we should all embrace?

1950 So when we are looking at this commission, I think there has to also be an understanding that where you have Islands in the jurisdictions, there are some unavoidable costs in doing business. One of them is communications between those Islands. Spain, the Balearics and the Canary Islands have managed it very well and they have all sorts of ways of creating air bridges between the Island to make them work. Unfortunately, the United Kingdom, with its Crown Dependencies, particularly in the Caribbean and everything, have not been that successful. Indeed, most of the airlinks between the Caribbeans have had a serious problems.

1955 But we have a unique proposition here. You have two jurisdictions that might appeal to different markets. Indeed, we have had recently a spike of interest of family offices wanting to set up in Alderney. Why? Because they felt it was more discrete, it was not such an obvious offshore finance redlight, for wanting to say a better word. It was discrete, it was unheard, it was comparatively unknown and it has serious advantages. Those advantages we should all be taking.

1960 If you look at the figures, one of the other things that has come up, both from Aurigny and from the gaming industry, was housing of employees, housing of pilots. We can help you with that if we had a reliable airbridge between us, where we could have people actually living on Alderney coming and working here. We can help you. These are the things that I am asking that we take a positive look at how we can grow the economies together. It is not just simply saying to the outside world – and I think you would all agree as an Assembly, you all stand for election, that a positive message is far better than a negative message. This is something where we should be proud and we should be having that discussion as well on how we can grow together, rather than just looking at a cost-cutting and totally negative image.

1975

Yes, we want to cut costs. Yes, we need to cut costs on health. We know that and in fact Alderney people constantly say they have identified areas that we can save money. We want to do that, of course we do, and that is what should be welcome. But the main focus has to be if Alderney grows, you grow. We can do that together, and that is why a crucial part of this commission answering Deputy Murray's serious concerns about how we can possibly pay for this runway, how can we possibly be financially sustainable, this is how we are going to do it. The answer is yes; now what is the question?

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, madam.

I do not really want to address the wider considerations of this amendment around the economic value, and I think that is a matter that will get debated in this amendment. I just want to caution through you, madam, the Assembly around an implication around the Island's reputation around anti-money laundering, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) terrorist financing and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The international standards are set by the Financial Action Task Force (FATF). They apply to any jurisdiction. Where we apply all the legislation that governs those areas which we are evaluated by Moneyval, those responsibilities are done by Bailiwick Law. So in those instances Alderney's reputation around e-gaming and Guernsey's reputation are inextricably linked. I think any suggestion – and I am not saying that this is Alderney Representative Hill's intention, but I am just flagging up that it is very dangerous in the extreme to be suggesting that Alderney and e-gaming can go in one direction and Guernsey can go in another because simply that is unrealistic and dangerous in the extreme.

I have got up before lunch because I think it is very important to set that scene. If that is not Alderney Representative Hill's intention, perhaps he can clarify that when he sums up.

Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Sorry, I should have said Alderney Representative Snowdon, do you formally second this?

Alderney Representative Snowdon: I do, yes. Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, sorry. Yes, Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Rule 26(1) please.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Burford is seeking a guillotine motion on this amendment. Those who wish to speak on this amendment please stand in your seats? Do you still wish me to put it for vote? Do you want me to put it to the vote?

Deputy Burford: Yes.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes. So we will do it *aux voix*. Those who support the guillotine motion to terminate debate on the amendment please say *pour*; those against. The debate is guillotined.

Members voted Pour.

The Deputy Bailiff: So when we return after lunch we will return with the responses. Remember two o'clock return after lunch.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.32 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 2.02 p.m.*

The Deputy Bailiff: Oh, sorry.

2030 **A Member:** I will give it a go, if you like. *(Laughter)*

The Deputy Bailiff: You are all starting to look the same. Deputy Trott, are you replying on behalf of P&R?

2035 **Deputy Trott:** Yes.

The Deputy Bailiff: I do not know who to apologise for that one.

2040 **Deputy Trott:** Madam, I think this amendment in my view makes complete sense. I think the economy should, of course, be part of any matter of this type. It would be in my view absurd to ignore the economy, or for that matter the fiscal position, when undertaking a discussion of this type.

2045 Alderney Representative Hill says if Alderney grows, Guernsey grows. I think the truth is that if Alderney grows we subsidise less because the amount of growth that would be necessary to eradicate the current partial fiscal deficit, or fiscal deficit that is based on partial fiscal union, would be absolutely astronomical, but I understand the point he makes.

2050 Madam, I would like to address one or two things about the e-gaming sector, which was mentioned in Alderney Representative Hill's remarks. While Guernsey value the economic contribution made by the e-gaming sector and fully support its continuation and development in Guernsey, it is not helpful, as is so often the case in this Assembly, to overstate its contribution to the economy. Some of the numbers being stated recently seem to have been extrapolated based on some significantly over-optimistic assumptions. This is one of the things, of course, that the Bailiwick Commission will do. It will provide us with facts rather than speculation, and that has to be a good thing.

2055 The 2022 accounts provided figures for the total direct economic contribution to the Bailiwick of the e-gaming sector in Alderney, which was estimated at £27.8 million, which comprised £4 million in respect of Alderney and £23.8 million in respect of Guernsey. They sound big numbers but its immediate contribution to GDP is less than 1%; quite significantly less than 1%. Those are the sorts of numbers that we need to consider in context.

2060 Madam, to provide some clearer indication of the scale of the activity which is currently undertaken in Guernsey, in June 2024 – much more recent numbers – around 80 people were employed in gambling and betting activities, including those employed in traditional gambling activities. That is less than 0.3% of all people employed in the Bailiwick, and additionally in the context of the specific debate as a digital enterprise sector it is, compared to many other jurisdictions, less dependent on physical travel.

2065 So I hope that is helpful, madam. These figures and many others will be submitted to the Bailiwick Commission in order that they can consider their accuracy or otherwise. As I mentioned, P&R will be bringing an amendment soon which, if supported, will see the Commission get up and running as quickly as we can.

2070 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.
Alderney Representative Hill.

2075 **Alderney Representative Hill:** Thank you, Madam Bailiff; and thank you, Deputy Trott, for in principle supporting our amendment.

I am not going to get involved in an argument or any kind of discussion about the Gambling Commission because I am not on the Gambling Commission. I just had the information I was given by our regulator, and I agree with you, the only way that can be sorted out is through the commission. I would welcome that discussion. I just hope that whatever the result we can all agree, and I look forward to that bit of work being undertaken. I think it does further emphasise my point earlier this morning that we are going to hit these kind of things all along the way with the Commission and it is going to be a much larger piece of work than I think we perhaps might have originally imagined.

I am going to wind this up quickly because I have seen a pile of amendments. I also know that there are many other items that you want to get finished in this Assembly. So I am just going to highlight one point that was made to me yesterday at lunch. There is really very little information known about Alderney's economy and what is really there. We have gambling. We have potential with tidal, which hopefully by 2026 we will see a real piece of progress on that, which will result in some quite considerable royalties to be available.

Hopefully, if we can sort out our reliability of air transport, our tourism figures should go up. Also, we do have financial services. We have Fort Group. We have Bellerive. We have Stenham and we have about five or six other trust companies. We also have PwC. So we do have some rosebuds which I think could easily be grown and also how we can work and improve the tax take for you to pay for some of the services that you offer us as a transferred service. I am just going to leave it at that and I hope that you would all agree that economic development is an important part of the Commission.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you. Members, you should have on your screen before you Amendment 3. States' Greffier, would you open the voting please?

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 35, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 4, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	None	Meerveld, Carl	Brouard, Al	None
Blin, Chris			Bury, Tina	
Burford, Yvonne			Oliver, Victoria	
Cameron, Andy			St Pier, Gavin	
de Lisle, David				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Haskins, Sam				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Le Tocq, Jonathan				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Mahoney, David				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				
Parkinson, Charles				

Prow, Robert
Queripel, Lester
Roffey, Peter
Snowdon, Alexander
Soulsby, Heidi
Taylor, Andrew
Trott, Lyndon
Vermeulen, Simon

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to Amendment 3, there voted pour 35 and there was 1 abstention, 4 Members were not in the Chamber at the time of the vote. I therefore declare that amendment has been passed.

2110 Deputy Burford, would you like the States' Greffier to read out your amendment?

Deputy Burford: No, thank you, madam. I think I will press on.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

2115

[Amendment 4.](#)

1. To reword the text of proposition 2b as follows:

"b) to commission a report as expeditiously as possible in order to establish the lowest possible cost and most practical and pragmatic approach, for the delivery of a functional solution to maintain an operational aerodrome in Alderney into the future, focusing on the paved runway, with dimensions of up to 877m in length and 18m in width, or exceptionally 23m in width only if prior regulatory consultation shows that the current 18m regulatory alleviation cannot be maintained, and generally seeking regulatory alleviations where possible to minimise the amount of work needed, consistent with safety, and with consideration of any associated unavoidable work elsewhere on the airfield, all suitable for the operation of commercial air transport operations by readily available and conventionally-powered Code B aircraft, ideally with between 12 and 20 seats."

2. To add a new proposition as follows:

"3. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee, in consultation with other Committees as appropriate, to investigate the feasibility of re-establishing an inter-island route network between Guernsey, Jersey and Alderney as well as between Alderney and Southampton, and with full and due consideration given to designating the Guernsey-Jersey route as a lifeline route, with all routes operated by a single Channel Islands based operator using a small fleet of appropriate Code B aircraft."

Deputy Burford: This amendment is in two parts. Firstly, it tightens up Proposition 2(b) so that the investigation into what we can do in Alderney will be quicker, cheaper and not drift into yet more flights of fancy. A significant part of the reason why we have not progressed with Alderney Airport this term has been over-ambition. It reached its apogee with the frankly ludicrous decision to put a 72-seater aircraft into an Island of 2,000 people. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I need to say that my starting point in this whole debate is that I fully support keeping a functioning airfield in Alderney. That is why I voted against option C+ in December 2022 and offered alternatives, because in my view C+ did not have a cat in Hades' chance of ever going anywhere, and not just because of the cost.

2120

2125

In order to have some chance of keeping Alderney connected, we need to bring ambition back down to the ground for a soft landing, and my amendment seeks to do just that. The most significant part of my changes to Proposition 2(b) concerns the width of the runway, and this is crucial. The 120-page report on which all the latest costings and subsequent proposals in this policy letter are predicated is based on a fundamental and worrying error. That error was the claim that Guernsey Ports' aerodrome regulator had stated that the runway should be widened from 18 m to 30 m to allow for future precision approaches. Did no one at all question this? Did no one ask why

2130

a tiny Island community should need precision approaches requiring an almost doubling of the runway area at a time when we are probably deciding on whether or not we can afford an airfield at all? (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Alderney, like small airfields everywhere, has operated with non-precision approaches forever. For the uninitiated, the essential difference between a precision approach and a non-precision approach is the altitude to which an aircraft can descend in conditions of poor visibility, with a precision approach giving the pilot a moderately improved chance of seeing the runway in fog and continuing to a landing. However, taken over a year, the number of flights that would benefit from this are very few indeed, and in any case it is not only a luxury that is not in any way needed, it is a luxury that we simply cannot afford.

Given all of this, I really struggle to believe that the regulator would have said this. So I telephoned the DCA, who was extremely helpful and who told me, as I fully expected he would, that he had most certainly not specified that Alderney's runway needed to be widened to 30 m. What is more, he also told me that it did not need to be widened to 23 m either. In fact, he said the current width of 18 m is absolutely fine, it is just the condition that needs urgently addressing. Yet the two options that the RPS report developed costs for were both 30 m wide and one was the same size as C+ when that was already dead in the water. So it is not just Alderney's runway that is crumbling, it is the very foundations of this policy letter.

There are excerpts from the report in the policy letter, but I requested the full version from STSB so that I could dig deeper into the 30-m wide mystery. The consultants point to the fact that there was a direction from the Guernsey regulator that it needed to be 30 m wide, which is not the case, and they also point to the fact that one of the types of non-precision instrument approaches used in Alderney may be reclassified next year by the CAA as a precision approach, and precision approaches do need a 30-m wide runway for Code B aircraft. But the key point that was completely missed is that a general reclassification of this particular type of approach to precision status does not stop it continuing to also be used for non-precision minima on an 18-m runway.

We still have the alternative of lateral navigation (LNAV) and non-directional beacon (NDB) instrument approaches, and indeed visual approaches, so there is zero need or justification to say that 30 m is required. Of course, widening to 30 m also means that all the lighting has to be changed and so on and so forth, racking up the cost at every turn.

So I telephoned STSB and asked for the evidence of where they believe the regulator had specified a 30-m-wide runway. I was told that it was said on a Teams call with the project team. What I suspect actually happened was that it was stated that precision approaches need a 30-m-wide runway for Code B aircraft, which is true, and then the project team picked up and ran with that without understanding that Alderney does not have and does not need precision approaches. This was compounded when the £125,000 consultants also failed to question it.

Going forward, the terms of reference for whoever is commissioned to action the costing exercise specified in Proposition 2(b) need to make abundantly clear that what is wanted is the lowest cost solution that enables Alderney to carry on operating flights into the future on a regular and scheduled basis, with regulatory alleviations wherever they can be obtained, rather than assumptions that they cannot, which has been the *modus operandi* to date. As the policy letter shows, numerous small airfields in the UK operate commercial flights from runways the same size or smaller than Alderney's current runway, and the report helpfully gives some examples. The majority of those runways are 18 m wide, just like Alderney.

But undeterred, the report pressed on and priced up a 30-m-wide runway. Most of these other airfields operate from inferior surfaces, such as graded hard core, and while I am not suggesting graded hard core is a solution for Alderney because it does have issues, I mention it as an example of how expectations need to be lowered and managed.

In addition, I have removed the £24 million price cap from the Proposition, not because I think we should spend more, most certainly not, but because I do not want whoever is commissioned working up to that figure. The policy letter makes clear that the problem is not just the cost of fixing the runway. It is the cost of getting plant there to build one much bigger than is needed. An

2185 18-m-wide runway is less than two thirds the area of a 30-m runway, which is the minimum that the policy letter examines. Additionally, by retaining the current width there is less knock-on impact on lighting and other ancillaries. One assumes that the harbour was not altered and roads were not destroyed when the runway was first laid, and if we start constraining our ambition to the minimum of what is actually needed, then we might have some chance of success. Limitations such as water
2190 supply for construction are quoted in the policy letter and they presumably become less significantly limiting when you only build half as much.

This really should not be as difficult as it is being made out to be. The terms of reference also need to look at how Alderney can potentially keep operating during rehabilitation or resurfacing works by using the 0321 grass runway, which would be feasible with Twin Otters in the summer
2195 when waterlogging and lighting are not generally issues. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Other changes when compared with P&R's Proposition 2(b) concern seeking regulatory alleviations rather than assuming they are not available, something we failed to do when undertaking the pavements project in Guernsey, resulting in unnecessary expenditure and runway and safety areas the same size as London Gatwick.

2200 The second part of this amendment is of a piece with the first part, and that is why I have not laid it separately, that and time. It adds a new Proposition with a direction to look at reuniting the inter-island routes on small aircraft as that is the only way an air service to Alderney is ever likely to come close to washing its face and it would greatly improve Guernsey-Jersey connectivity. It is essentially the same amendment that I laid in December 2022, which narrowly lost when promises
2205 of ATRs were in the air or, indeed, not in the air as it turns out. But we have all slept since then, so I shall briefly recap.

A single event 20 years ago played a starring role in where we are today. It was certainly the reason we have subsequently shelled out millions on subsidising the Alderney route. That event, of course, was the removal of the sole operator protection from the Guernsey-Jersey route, thus
2210 opening it up to competition, and with that ideological decision the problems began. The reason that the current Alderney public service obligation (PSO) is uneconomic and unattractive and the reason that there has not been anyone else credible wanting to operate Alderney routes is that a route network comprising purely of routes in and out of Alderney is too small to run a coherent, breakeven operation that sufficiently occupies crews and aircraft. It has no opportunity to spread
2215 all the fixed costs of running an aircraft type and the fleet is so small that redundancy is either non-existent or extremely expensive.

However, if one could bring together again all of the inter-island routes, all of a sudden it makes for a viable route network for a small fleet of small aircraft such as Twin Otters to operate a service. This would have to be part of an existing locally-based airline operation so that economies of scale
2220 could be made on commonalities such as ground handling, scheduling and other fixed costs. It does not work as a stand-alone airline.

Members have in other debates bemoaned the loss of the frequent Guernsey-Jersey flight schedule, and while I do not ever see us going back to the passenger numbers of the early 2000s, which routinely necessitated 10 or 12 flights a day in either direction in a 16-seater aircraft, there is
2225 no doubt that one of the reasons for falling passenger numbers, apart from Zoom, is the lack of flight frequency caused directly by operating a large 72-seat aircraft in between Guernsey and Jersey. Putting oversize vessels on a route is always a mistake.

The optimal aircraft for the inter-island routes is the Twin Otter. It is big enough without being too big. It can operate on grass and it is in current production. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)
2230 Furthermore, unlike some aircraft, the width of the runway does not impact on the crosswind limit of the Twin Otter, which is 27 knots regardless. I have always believed that the Guernsey-Jersey route should be a lifeline route limited to a single operator as allowing a second operator on to it before open skies was what led to where we are. It is likely that that could qualify as such under the current Air Transport Licensing Policy Statement. The amendment does not specifically direct it so
2235 as not to override the authority of the TLA, but it strongly recommends it and requires careful consideration of it. This solution would not only serve our Alderney friends very well but it would

also serve both Guernsey and Jersey much better than the current arrangement and it would likely grow that market.

This is not a criticism of the current route operator – they are legitimately using the regional fleet they happen to have to provide a service on an open skies route – but it is illustrative of the effects of using an aircraft that is too large for the service needed. At the end of the day, we are here to do the best for our Island, our economy and our community.

The two parts of this amendment go hand in hand as a package to keep a functioning airfield in Alderney at the lowest possible cost as well as reducing ongoing subsidies and improving inter-island connectivity. However, the function of an amendment is to insert these two Propositions into the final substantive Propositions, so if there are any Members who only wish to vote for one part, then please support the amendment and vote accordingly at the substantive stage. It has also been suggested to me that members of the TLA may abstain because of references to lifeline routes, but the amendment merely directs consideration of this and as such I do not believe that any conflict exists for the authority in supporting this amendment and I ask Members to support it.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Do you formally second that, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller?

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Yes, madam.

Deputy Inder: Madam, this is just purely procedural just for consistency. I just want to test if Members consider this goes further than the Propositions.

The Deputy Bailiff: It does go further than the original Proposition. Do you wish to vote on that basis, Deputy Inder?

Deputy Inder: Yes.

The Deputy Bailiff: Ladies and gentlemen, you have heard that Deputy Inder is seeking to invoke – yes, Deputy Helyar.

Deputy Helyar: Madam, could we have a recorded vote please?

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, we can. Rule 24(6) that an amendment goes further than the original Proposition, and just to remind you of what that Rule says, that does not mean it is ruled out of order but that effectively Deputy Inder is putting forward a motion that the amendment be not debated and no vote be taken on it. So if you support that motion, then you should say pour. If you do not support that motion, you should say contre. So those who – sorry. But as Deputy Helyar has asked for a recorded vote, you should indicate accordingly on your SEV.

Greffier, have you had a chance to put that on the SEV?

A Member: Madam, just to confirm that if people want to debate the amendment they are voting contre?

The Deputy Bailiff: That is correct. So if you want a debate and you want to vote on the amendment, you need to vote contre.

So the motion is now on your screens. If you do not wish to vote and debate this amendment, you should vote pour. If you do wish to debate this amendment and vote on it, you should vote contre. States' Greffier, would you open the voting on this please?

There was a recorded vote.

2290

Not Carried – Pour 2, Contre 34, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 3, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Falla, Steve	Aldwell, Sue	Le Tissier, Chris	Bury, Tina	None
Inder, Neil	Blin, Chris		Oliver, Victoria	
	Brouard, Al		St Pier, Gavin	
	Burford, Yvonne			
	Cameron, Andy			
	de Lisle, David			
	de Sausmarez, Lindsay			
	Dudley-Owen, Andrea			
	Dyke, John			
	Fairclough, Simon			
	Ferbrache, Peter			
	Gabriel, Adrian			
	Gollop, John			
	Haskins, Sam			
	Helyar, Mark			
	Hill, Edward			
	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha			
	Le Tocq, Jonathan			
	Leadbeater, Marc			
	Mahoney, David			
	Matthews, Aidan			
	McKenna, Liam			
	Meerveld, Carl			
	Moakes, Nick			
	Murray, Bob			
	Parkinson, Charles			
	Prow, Robert			
	Queripel, Lester			
	Roffey, Peter			
	Snowdon, Alexander			
	Soulsby, Heidi			
	Taylor, Andrew			
	Trott, Lyndon			
	Vermeulen, Simon			

2295 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Greffier, can you close the voting please? There voted in relation to the 24(6) motion: pour 2 (*Laughter*), contre 34, there was 2 abstention and 3 Members were not in the Chamber.

Who wishes to speak on this amendment? Deputy McKenna, you actually made it out of your seat so I will pick you first. (*Laughter*)

2300 **Deputy McKenna:** Thank you, madam.

I rise in full support of Deputy Burford and Deputy Kazantseva-Miller's amendment. I know Deputy Inder is always right because, well, he will tell you. (*Laughter*) He actually said to me once he thought he was wrong but then he phoned me later to say he was wrong. I said to Deputy Inder, I said, 'Neil' – and he did (*Laughter*) – I said, 'you vote for Amendment 4 because Deputy Burford is a former international pilot and there is nobody more qualified in aviation than Deputy Burford.' So for me, whatever she says on this is good enough for me.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Vermeulen.

2310 **Deputy Vermeulen:** Thank you, madam.

I just rise to make Members aware of a couple of things with this one. The first part of it makes complete sense. Inter-island connectivity is very important and obviously we have to have the right

width runway in Alderney. It must not be twice as wide as it has to be. So I think the first part I can support.

2315 The second part, inter-island connectivity with Guernsey and Jersey, I just want to make Members aware that numbers have tumbled last year on the inter-island and it is felt that that was largely down to price, the cost of the ticket between the two Islands. On investigating that further and talking with other airlines, I was told, "Simon, the biggest problem here is the £30 you have to pay in airport fees before you even leave the runway, before you even take off". So while it might
2320 well be a better situation, there is that reality.

Then the other one is how would it affect the current incumbent who is flying Guernsey-Jersey and does not operate a type B aircraft, which is a slowish one? So you also have to think about that one. For that reason – did we say we would take them separately?

2325 **The Deputy Bailiff:** You would need to vote for the amendment and then vote for them separately if they form Propositions.

Deputy Vermeulen: Thank you.

2330 So yes, those were the only two points, but when we hark back to how it used to be when Aurigny was Aurigny and it was in private ownership and it had Islanders and Trislanders, they used to fly around everywhere, including the coast of France. It was very well supported and made a profit every year, right up until the last year when it was run from the States.

Thank you, madam.

2335 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Vermeulen.
Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Madam, this is an amendment. When I read it when I received it I was lukewarm about it, but having heard what I think was a truly excellent speech from Deputy Burford
2340 (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) it has convinced me absolutely.

There are a couple of points that arise. Firstly – and it is a point I have frankly moaned about and commented about in other regards – we have had people, the Project Board, and we have had an independent expert or consultants paid £125,000, Deputy Burford said, who did not check basic information. So if you are a layperson – if somebody was speaking to Deputy Burford it would ring
2345 bells with her because she has that expertise. If somebody spoke to me about that, I do not have that expertise. I would be relying upon what the expert told me because I think that would be a reasonable position. Can we get better experts? Can we get better civil servants? (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Can we get better people to give us better information? Because time and time again we are given information upon which we, in good faith, as non-experts in that particular field, rely and it is
2350 wrong. It is not just wrong by a little bit, it is wrong by a big bit. So that is the first thing, so I am very grateful to Deputy Burford for making that clear.

The second point really is Deputy Vermeulen. All that Deputy Burford and Deputy Kazantseva-Miller are looking for is a feasibility study to see if it is feasible. Deputy Vermeulen and I must have different views of history in relation to Aurigny because when
2355 Aurigny was in private hands it was going bust. It had to be sold and the States – somebody else bought it and then somebody else bought it because otherwise Aurigny was going to fail. So to say it was all rosy in private hands is looking at a fairy tale programme that I stopped watching when I stopped watching *Watch with Mother* all those years ago. The fact is that this is something that stands a chance of success and it should be looked at. So, madam, through you, I would like to say
2360 to the two Deputies who proposed and seconded this amendment, well done.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I have been flying all over the place a bit here. To go back to my failed speech earlier, I desperately want a cost-effective, joint between Guernsey and Jersey, maybe Guernsey and Alderney, maybe Jersey as well, quick solution to the airfield dilemma. But, of course, we passed collectively that ideally the date would be December 2025, which really is not very long in political terms, especially in an election year.

I agree entirely with Deputy Ferbrache. Deputy Burford made an outstanding and well-researched speech, but there is perhaps an issue here that in expanding the text to commission a report as expeditiously – I like that word – as possible in order to establish the lowest possible cost, this again perhaps you could argue narrows the scope because you are no longer looking at Heathrow or even Southampton or even Jersey airports. But it does seem a relatively big ask in the time because we really have to get a wriggle on with this if it is going anywhere.

I entirely agree with the thrust of Deputy Burford's speech that we over-engineer situations which should have more of an Isles of Scilly, Scottish Isles approach. We should look for appropriate technology. We need a regulator who is pragmatic and sometimes – I do support our civil servants because they help us so, but sometimes I do think that the consultants do give over-packaged solutions and perhaps sometimes you get advice that is a bit risk averse because they will look at all the possible scenarios rather than making a pragmatic decision. We on Policy & Resources do scrutinise, as much as you can in the time, all of these reports and, of course, there was a previous P&R as well. So I, on balance, support Proposition 1.

Proposition 2 I personally support, but I think there are misgivings about that perhaps from other senior politicians. There are two issues here, of course. First of all, one price of going for a lower cost runway and a small fleet of planes that are nimble and flexible, Deputy Burford may have more knowledge than me on this, but one possible price – and I was only reflecting over lunch with colleagues about the late great Deputy Jan Kuttelwascher and the expertise he gave the Chamber on air flight matters as well. One of the things I recall him saying was that it was a possibility if we did not get rid of the Islanders, the Trislanders rather, although there were Islanders being used by Blue Islands, and replace them with the Dorniers, for example, Alderney would lose its so-called lifeline route to Southampton because Southampton airport might not wish small planes to go or to accommodate them. Airlines have changed. Southampton airport has had to have a more tight business model and maybe that advice is not valid any more.

On a personal level, I would like the Southampton-Alderney flights to continue directly because I think they are very useful for business, tourism, health and particularly the visitors that Alderney Representative Hill referred to that would expand their economy. Some, about half of the population of Alderney I would say, have really strong links with southern England more than Guernsey. I wish to know whether it is mentioned whether the Southampton service would be accommodated within this. It implies, of course, it does.

The other point that has to be made is that I personally – because I am pro working with Jersey despite floating around at times – have always seen the Guernsey-Jersey route as a lifeline service, but that is my nostalgia to the golden era when we had a half hourly or hourly shuttle service and people like me used to be weighed to see if I was weighing down the plane. I was worth two children in terms of my bags as well. It was like a flying bus service. Times have changed and two factors that have changed is the times when financial institutions had subsidiaries in both Islands have tended to contract and they now specialise more, though I notice the top law firms are generally in both Islands. Of course, Zoom has come in, as Deputy Burford raised the point. Also, probably Deputy Trott and others would argue that we have to compete with Jersey, and we do compete effectively for business, but maybe they do have our lunch on occasions and we have to look for their breakfasts.

Therefore, the Guernsey-Jersey is not a lifeline service to us. It is a nice to have. It is perhaps essential on the community side, not just for tourism but for visiting friends, for sports, arts, leisure. So I think there are two schools of thought about whether Guernsey-Jersey is a lifeline route. I think the mood of the Assembly today is to be more flexible and to look outside the box for cheaper

2415 solutions because the previous ideas did not come to anything. So I think this is a good amendment but there are others down the line.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

2420 **Deputy Inder:** Thank you, madam.

Deputy Burford, it may surprise you but I thought that was an exceptional speech. The first question I was going to ask Deputy Burford is whether she tested assumptions about the DCA. I was so quick to get up and put some challenge in. I did not have to. She had already done her homework and spoken to DCA. It appears to have no negative provisional view; I think that would be reasonably fair to say.

2425 Members, we have been here before. I am going to give a word of warning for this, probably too late for this States, and you have heard me say this before. A future Government really does need to get to grips with the type of advice it is getting, and this is right across the board. This is from Harbours, this is from Airport, possibly Deputy Vermeulen from runways. I think we are being taken. I genuinely think we are being taken and I think Guernsey is seen as a lucky dip with people. We just basically slavishly go along, write out cheques for hundreds of thousands of pounds and it has become a racket. The job of the consultant in Guernsey in the main appears to benefit themselves, not necessarily the people of Guernsey. We spend so much time doing consultations at the 50s, 60s, 100s, 200s, 300,000s and there is no policy direction out of it. Please, I would beg
2430 the next P&R and possibly the next scrutiny to look at this properly because I am absolutely convinced this Island is being taken.

I will give way.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Blin.

2440 **Deputy Blin:** I thank Deputy Inder for giving way. It was just to see if you would agree that it is not only the selection of the consultants and their manner but it should come down to how we do our terms of reference because that is the other part where sometimes we do not look at it through.

2445 **Deputy Inder:** I will accept that Deputy Blin has probably been through a terms of reference recently and probably seen more than I necessarily have. I agree, the terms of reference are so wide sometimes it almost allows the consultant just to basically take your watch and tell you what time it is, which they often do. So thank you, Deputy Burford, for that part; just for that part. Now I am going to move on a bit.

2450 No, I am not actually. I am going to go back to this. You would have to say we are actually quite lucky and we should not be able to make decisions by luck. We are lucky that we have had an international pilot who has hung around airports for a majority of her career and actually knows something. I am absolutely certain this is going to get through the Assembly. I have a – and I will give way to Deputy Helyar.

2455 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Helyar.

Deputy Helyar: I wonder if Deputy Inder would agree with me that the Rule that we have that if you have an interest and you are an expert in a particular subject you have to leave the
2460 conversation is one that we should consider getting rid of.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Helyar, as much as I think that it would be an interesting conversation, I do want to keep on the debate which is on these particular Propositions. We are running out of time, we are on our last afternoon, so please can you focus on the Propositions in hand?
2465

Deputy Indor: I was just answering the question, ma'am, but I will take your advice on that.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

2470

Deputy Indor: Anyway, the point remains, we have had a very good speech from Deputy Burford so far, but listen very carefully, it is not what she said, it is what we have actually done. We have been, I think, railroaded over the past few years, if not two terms, by some fairly bad advice and the single job is basically collecting fees out of the taxpayer. I genuinely believe that. I see many people, for those consultants listening, nodding their heads in healthy agreement.

2475

Anyway, moving on to the second part of the amendment. The Members are not aware, but Committee members should be aware, including Deputy Kazantseva-Miller because she was in the room, that on 18th February of this year as part of the ongoing work to review air transport licensing, our Committee were specifically asked whether they wished to designate the Guernsey and Jersey route as an essential route.

2480

The Committee were unanimous in their decision – so that is all five – that they did not wish to designate the Guernsey-Jersey route as essential. To prove that, the review of the air transport licensing will be taken forward by the Future Committee. The Future Committee is not too far off being able to bring that Air Policy Statement to the States for debate. It is also important to note that there is currently an operator servicing the Guernsey-Jersey route and if designated there will need to be a transitional arrangement.

2485

The amendment itself asked P&R to look at this, or rather take on this role, and potentially the TLA as well, relating to the Guernsey-Jersey route, but the TLA does not have the specialist or financial information necessary to assess that frequency or service and fare levels of aircraft types which can be specified to ensure profitable service. So the recommendation down from our Committee, which would have been five but now appears to be four, is to reject that part.

2490

But I am a democratic. If clunkily through this there is a view that a Jersey and Guernsey route should be designated, it does not necessarily need to go to P&R, you basically just have to direct the Committee *for* Economic Development to give that direction.

2495

So, madam, Members of the Assembly, if this amendment is successful, which I suspect it is going to be, I will be laying, with Deputy Falla, Amendment 6 that takes a new direction: effectively give it to Economic Development to look at. I am absolutely certain the new Economic Development, like the old Economic Development, when it has taken direction will carry on and do that work. Given how far ahead that Air Policy Statement is, we have just run out of road. I can imagine this will be back to a future States before December of this year, so we are already ahead of the game. I will leave it at that.

2500

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

2505

Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, madam.

I think we are in fear of moving away from the original Propositions into airport licensing and route licensing. I am very grateful to Deputy Burford for her bringing the Amendment 1(b), I think that is very helpful. Thank you for the explanation because I, like Deputy Ferbrache, would not have picked any of that up, so thank you very much.

2510

I am a little bit concerned about Proposition 2. It is the old adage, if you want to make a small fortune out of running an airline, start with a large one (*Laughter*) because as soon as you start designating routes, that usually means there is a subsidy that is going to go with it. Someone said, 'Why would I want a subsidy to fly to Jersey? Why would I want to give a Jerseyman a subsidy to fly here?' (*Laughter and Interjections*) I am happy for us as Islanders, as Guernseymen, to give a subsidy for our Islanders to go to the UK and we have Aurigny to do that; happy to pay for that.

2515

I am even happy for Alderney residents to pay extra outside of the 1948 Agreement on the fiscal union to subsidise an airline to fly them to Southampton, but, please, if we are going to be fiscally prudent, as soon as you start with airlines and subsidies it is going to cost. Most of the time these are where people are going on holidays, they are going to see friends, it is not necessarily essential travel. I am not too sure we should be in the business of subsidising these type of routes, we need to think about more of the essential pieces of the operation.

Thank you very much, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Alderney Representative Snowdon.

Alderney Representative Snowdon: Yes, I am going to be really quick just because we are running out of time. We both support this and thank you for bringing it.

Deputy Queripel: Rule 26(1), ma'am, please.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Queripel is seeking to guillotine the debate on this amendment. Those who wish to contribute towards the debate, please stand in your places. Do you wish me to put it to the vote, Deputy Queripel?

Deputy Queripel: I do, ma'am.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Queripel's motion is to guillotine the debate. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Contre.

The Deputy Bailiff: The contre win. Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.
I am not sure where Deputy *(Interjection)* –

A Member: It is 'madam'.

Deputy Roffey: Sorry?

A Member: It is 'madam'. You said, 'Thank you, sir.'

The Deputy Bailiff: No, you just called me 'sir', Deputy Roffey, that was your only *(Interjection)* –

Deputy Roffey: I have got the new terminology: your Majesty. *(Laughter)* You did not know you were her representative, did you? *(Laughter)*

I am not sure where Deputy Brouard gets this business of a subsidy fund because I do not think there is anything in Deputy Burford's amendment that mentions subsidies. In fact, I think what she is trying to achieve with the second part of her amendment is making a subsidy less likely by making things a business model that works better. By the way, I think we are already subsidising Jersey people to come here, are we not? We are subsidising a ferry operation between the two *(Laughter)* Islands and they are not. Having started with the second part of her amendment, I will carry on with it.

Deputy Inder: A point of correction, ma'am.

2570 **The Deputy Bailiff:** What is your point of correction, Deputy Inder?

Deputy Inder: It is not a subsidy, it is route development. It comes from a different pot.
(Laughter)

2575 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey, do carry on.

Deputy Roffey: I accept it is a rose by another name. Yes, okay.

I share Deputy Burford's view though about that disastrous decision all those years ago, that ideological decision that actually destroyed what was a very – I do not think we would have exactly
2580 the same service today as we had back then. We consigned it rapidly, unfortunately, to the waste bin of history.

Getting back to it is not quite as easy as it might seem because we have an airline operating Guernsey to Jersey; we have a different airline operating Guernsey to Alderney. We cannot force either of them to stop operating; we could stop giving a PSO, I suppose. However, I do think there
2585 are ways that it can be achieved. I think actually having P&R's involvement in this might be quite useful because I do not think it is only about route licensing.

If I was being really pedantic, I do not think there is any way we can guarantee it will only be one airline because, even if it is a lifeline route, that is not a monopoly, that is just a licence requirement. Somebody could apply for a new licence on the Gatwick route now and if that could meet the
2590 licence requirements – unless they are onerous, it is unlikely – then they would be able to operate.

But that is just being slightly pedantic, I guess. We cannot guarantee it but in all likelihood, if we ever got back to the happy situation that there was one airline operating relatively small aircraft between all of the Islands and beyond, it would be unlikely to be challenged. I do like, even though it has got really nothing to do with this policy letter, the second part of her amendment.

2595 The first half, I am totally puzzled. I am in the same boat as Deputy Ferbrache of being somebody who I think has got quite good critical skills, but have no expertise in this area. I have sat here this afternoon and heard Deputy Burford say she has spoken to the Director of Civil Aviation who said that we could carry on with an 18 m width of airstrip in Alderney.

I am getting advice from expert staff saying, 'What we can say with a high degree of certainty is that to maintain the current runway length of 877 m, it will need to be widened to 23 m.' That is a requirement of any runway of more than 800 m in length. While Alderney Airport has a derogation in place for the current width of 18 m, such shortcomings will have to be addressed when any major work is carried out. I think what they are saying is a bit like we used to have a terminal too close to the runway in Guernsey, but it was permitted until we did major work on the runway and then we
2600 had to move the terminal.

I am not accusing Deputy Burford of being wrong and I am not accusing the people feeding me this information of being wrong, all I am saying is it is an impossible task. Luckily, it does not really matter because the wording of Deputy Burford's amendment does say, even though it wants to retain 18 m, 'Or exceptionally 23 m in width only if prior regulatory consultation shows that the
2610 current 18 m regulatory alleviation cannot be maintained.' So she has got that covered but it is an area where I am getting totally different information from different sides.

I think the only other thing that slightly worries me about the first part of the amendment is that we – I give way to Deputy Parkinson who may well be better connected to the outside world than I am.

2615

Deputy Parkinson: Well, Deputy Roffey, I think to complete what he said, would agree that if the Alderney runway was reduced to less than 800 m, then the width could be maintained at 18 m.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

2620

Deputy Roffey: Yes, that is absolutely right. If we discard effectively nearly 100 m of the runway, that could happen and Twin Otters could easily land on a runway of less than 800 m in length. If it was Twin Otters, you are limiting yourself to what you can use there equipment-wise to a certain extent but they could certainly land on that.

2625 What I do want to disabuse people of, though, is this idea because the whole area is going to then be a lot less that needs to be paved, that there is going to almost be a linear reduction in the cost. Because if there is one thing the last few years has taught me is that linear relationship is just not there. It is about mobilisation and that is why I am glad that Alderney is going to be around the table because it is about staff accommodation, it is about getting heavy equipment, it is about getting batching plants.

2630 The one thing that perhaps slightly worries me about this is that, given the need for speed that we were talking about this morning – STSB has had no role in the policy making to this policy letter – one of the options that I thought should be looked at was just going out to tender for option A, because that is ready to go, and then negotiating with whoever because you cannot do it until you have got a contractor.

2635 How can we address those costs of mobilisation and get them right down? I do not believe we can go out with option A with this amendment because the width on option A is more than 18 m wide. I am just worried if this is too limiting. I am not saying it is not the right solution, all I am saying is if you are saying that this is the only parameter solution you can have, perhaps the quickest route to market might be removed. I wish it had been a bit more flexible in saying, 'Consider this but that is not all you can do.' Basically, I am in exactly the same position as Deputy Ferbrache of saying I work my best judgement on the expert information I am given, and sometimes that can be difficult.

2640 While I am on my feet, I would like to correct one thing that the President of the Policy & Resources Committee said this morning, that the President of the Policy & Resources Committee suggested that STSB have brought option C+ to this Assembly. In reality, it was the Policy & Resources Committee – with the support admittedly as a secondary signature but led by Policy & Resources – that brought that policy letter to this Assembly.

2650 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Who else wishes to speak on this amendment?
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

2655 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Madam, Deputy Burford has really done all the homework on this and I wanted to compliment her as well on various technical and thorough analyses. But when she called me earlier on to talk about her approach and the issues she has identified, it also very much confirmed my own view I have formed that strategically the inter-island routes should be served by smaller planes.

2660 I did approve then the option C+ but it was probably the only policy letter this whole political term where, despite listening very carefully to the debate, I could not make a strong decision pour or contre until the very last moment. I only voted for it because I just thought we need to do something to get it moving.

2665 I think as we are seeing it today it has proved to be a disastrous decision. Retrospectively we tried to find a solution more focused around solving Aurigny's losses and problems and the PSO, rather than actually designing something that would solve structurally our connectivity. At the core of Deputy Burford's argument, which is very much linked to the second Proposition in their amendment, is that you need to have the right planes for the right segments. There is no point flying huge planes to tiny islands. This is the problem we have had with both flying to Alderney and, equally, flying to Jersey.

2670 I just wanted to remind us again that we have got a Bailiwick. We have got a Bailiwick with multiple islands and we have got their connectivity to Jersey. Jersey does not have a Bailiwick so they will never be looking at small plane solutions, but we should be. We should really realise that we are ultimately a network of small islands and that our connectivity strategy in relation for inter-

island travel, both for planes and also ferries, has to be routed in using the right vessels. I think with our ferry connectivity, this is exactly the direction of travel we are also following with hopefully Islands Unlimited becoming that ferry taxi service.

I think at the core of the argument is that we need to move for inter-island travel into the direction of smaller planes. I think the key of the argument is that we have got to see the inter-island network as a whole rather than seeing independent routes in their singularity, which is what the current Air Policy Framework does.

Deputy Inder reminded me that I indeed made the decision not to designate the Guernsey-Jersey route as a lifeline route earlier this year. I very much remember that but I do not think my decision to support this amendment is actually contrary to that. Because what the amendment suggests is that we need to look at inter-island travel as a whole rather than look independently at different routes. I think with this in mind, the Air Policy Framework may need to be amended and may need to change as part of that work. It is not currently prescribed in the Proposition but perhaps the amendment that Deputy Inder is bringing might more specifically say the Air Policy Framework needs to be changed.

So, Members, I think this is a very constructive and pragmatic amendment to move forward. I really hope this will make a real difference in terms of finding a pragmatic solution, both immediate solution for the runway, but actually more excitingly really putting a stake in the ground to say, 'We are going to take a proactive, pragmatic approach to try to re-establish a small plane network.' I think it could be quite exciting because smaller planes are likelier to be able to be electrified and using more sustainable fuel in the future. Deputy Burford is shaking her head.

I think it offers us actually some really exciting opportunities, not just for inter-island travel, but also potentially for travel to France; you have got the connectivity to Southampton. I think this could be really exciting. It is not going to be very easy to make it happen, as Deputy Roffey said, but I think that is absolutely the right direction of travel. We should send a strong message that that is what we want to do strategically and make sure, whether it is Committee for Economic Development, STSB, P&R, we work together to make it happen as soon as possible.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.
Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, madam.

I will be brief. I was not going to speak but I think I will on the back of Deputy Roffey's comments. He was saying the last policy letter was brought by P&R with the support of STSB at the time, but two members of P&R did not support the policy letter: myself and Deputy Le Tocq did not support the proposals at the time. Indeed, I was happy to second the amendment that was again put forward by Deputy Burford, which is now giving its second attempt here. It sounds as if it is going to be much more popular than it was the first time round, which I am delighted about, so I am very happy to support it.

I did see an earlier iteration, there were concerns about stating definitively the Guernsey-Jersey route. There were other elements to it but those have all been dealt with. I think there is nothing here – I would not speak for P&R; Deputy Trott will be doing that in a minute – that I can see would be an issue that P&R would have with it at all.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Thank you, ma'am.

I have no problem supporting the first clause of the amendment. I have some concerns about the second one, which I hope Deputy Burford could reassure me on in her closing speech. I appreciate that the new Proposition simply requires Policy & Resources Committee to investigate

2725 the feasibility of re-establishing an inter-island route using smaller planes. But it seems to me very unlikely, from what I know of the airlines, that either Aurigny or Blue Islands would be interested in operating a fleet of planes like Twin Otters. The suggestion here is that this should be operated by a single Channel Islands-based operator.

2730 Now I know there is, I think it is Air Alderney and possibly other nascent operators in the area, but the two established operators, it seems to me, would be very unlikely to want to do this. Maybe they could be induced to do it by putting a PSO on the Channel Islands' services and therefore offered a significant amount of money to do it. Perhaps Deputy Burford could comment in her summing-up on how realistic this is. I give way to Deputy Roffey.

2735 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: I do not know if I want to help my Vice-President, but in a hypothetical situation – it is utterly hypothetical because there is an established operator in Guernsey-Jersey at the moment – my understanding, were that to become vacant or Aurigny to run it, their preferred method will be somewhere between what he is saying and what Deputy Burford is saying, i.e., an ATR at peak times of in the morning and at teatime, and smaller aircraft, if they were in their fleet, to do the times of day when there is less demand, like late morning and early afternoon.

2745 **Deputy Parkinson:** Well, indeed, it may be possible that they would use a combination of aircraft, but both Blue Islands and Aurigny have the benefit at the moment of operating a single aircraft-type. In the case of Aurigny, they have worked very hard, and it has cost them a great deal of money, and it cost us a lot of disruption for them to get to the point where they will have a single aircraft-type. I know that currently they operate Dorniers but, as has been stated, the intention clearly is to outsource or contract out the operation of the Alderney route to somebody who operates Twin Otters for a living.

2750 They are trying very hard to get to a position where they only operate one aircraft type. I think the Proposition here is to invite them to basically take on another aircraft type, and I very much suspect they will not want to do it.

2755 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, ma'am.

I very much support both these Propositions and thank Deputy Burford for bringing them. In fact, if her previous amendment very similar to this had been supported some time ago, we would probably have a repaired Alderney runway by now. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Deputy Burford is obviously very knowledgeable on the subject and has done a lot of research, and for that I thank her on behalf of all of us.

2765 I also would like and pick up the point that Deputy Soulsby mentioned, that this is not prescriptive. It suggests Code B aircraft ideally should be considered. It looks at due consideration given to designating Guernsey-Jersey a lifetime route, not specifying it should be. So I think there is complete flexibility here for this to be taken forward and consider all the options. My only slight concern was, when I saw the amendment first, the lack of specific inclusion of Alderney at the table in these discussions, but I think the amendments that have already been passed by this Assembly resolved that, so I have no reservations in supporting this.

2770 But I would pick up on Deputy Parkinson's comments. Air Alderney I know is particularly interested in running routes like this and potentially reintroducing Islanders, which are single-pilot operator, nine seat, so would fit into that Code B aircraft category. I know of at least one other operator that is expressing a strong interest in also operating a service like this. It may be that that service gets done jointly with one of the incumbents, as Deputy Roffey suggested, whereby it could be done as a joint venture with the less heavy demand flights being handled as small aircraft with the existing incumbent operators providing the larger aircraft for the high-demand periods.

But the trick here is really to approach it in a more entrepreneurial way, look at different options. Governments generally, not just Guernsey, have a nasty habit of sitting there, doing the specification in isolation, and blindly following it and not considering other options or cancelling them out by rigid specifications. I like the approach that has been taken here, which is taking a more pragmatic approach and looking for what we can save, what we can actually do within the envelope and hopefully get this done and implemented for the greater good of us all.

Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Alderney Representative Hill.

Alderney Representative Hill: Thank you, Madam Bailiff.

I would just like to say that we are family friends of the Baileys, Derrick Bailey, who started Aurigny in 1967. In 1972 Aurigny was in the *Guinness Book of Records* for being one of the world's most profitable airlines per capita. I think it was interesting that someone, I think it was Deputy Brouard, who implied that if they did the Guernsey-Jersey route that somehow it would have to be subsidised.

If we look at the past module, in fact, all we are really talking about here is a rewind of what Aurigny really was. If you study the report put together by Edward Pinnegar you look at the shrinking of the routes within the Islands and the various routes that used to be run by the airline. In fact, what Deputy Burford is going back to – obviously we cannot go back to Trislanders because they are no longer manufactured – was an original successful business module. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) So everyone can sit there and go – sorry, yes, I give way.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Alderney Representative Hill, I do not actually remember 1968 but he clearly does. (*Laughter and Interjections*) I think there may be a case of him looking slightly through rose-tinted glasses, even somebody who has seen technology and regulations move on in the marine trade. If I apply that in 1968, one pilot smoking his cigarette, with a VHF radio, flying one-handed to Jersey – and probably drunk as well – (*Laughter*) everything has changed and is completely different to 60 years on.

So, with the greatest respect, I think he needs to reconsider whether there is any comparison between 1968 and modern regulations and the cost of aviation, as there are in the marine industry, because it ain't what it was.

The Deputy Bailiff: Alderney Representative Hill.

Alderney Representative Hill: Thank you for that.

I cannot really answer whether the pilots were drunk or not but I will take that there might have been a few anecdotal stories. However, going back to my original point, I have actually looked at this quite at length. If you run the figures through, if Aurigny has a Guernsey-Jersey route and it is part of a triangle, that it does substantially reduce the need for a PSO in terms of the amount of money that it requires.

I really think that Deputy Burford's amendment is an exciting one because it will explore that opportunity. I also think that we do need to sit down with Blue Islands. I do not think there is enough room in the Channel Islands for two airlines full stop. The 168,000, 170,000 people is a tough call for two airlines to operate profitably out of it. I think it is a discussion that may need to be had perhaps in the next Assembly and indeed with our Jersey colleagues.

In general I support her amendment. I think it is extremely well-thought-out and, what is more important, there are so many backseat aviation operators, both in Alderney and Guernsey and probably in Jersey, but it is absolutely so refreshing to hear from somebody who is a commercial

airline pilot and actually knows the science and the technology and the business behind it. Therefore, we support it.

2830 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Does anybody else wish to speak on the amendment. No? In that case, I will turn to Deputy Trott to reply on behalf of P&R.

2835

Deputy Trott: A few comments, please, if I may, madam.

The first is that Deputy Burford has said much of her excellent speech before. I think when she said it last time, I might have 'Hear, hear'd' a couple of more times than I did today. But then I remember hearing it before, realising how much sense it made, and being absolutely staggered at how the States at that time was not listening.

2840

We do not have a magic money tree. How many times have we heard my predecessor say that? Of course, he is absolutely right to do so. What this amendment is doing is trying to find a better solution, a cost-effective solution. It says things like, 'It should focus on the paved runway' but that does not exclude grass. It says, 'Of up to 866 m' but that does not mean that it should not be 800 m or less which would enable it, as we have heard, to be 18 m wide.

2845

It says, 'After due consideration has been given to designating the Guernsey-Jersey route as a lifeline route.' Now I am happy to support that because I cannot see how the Guernsey-Jersey route would be considered a lifeline route. I think it is absurd that we currently consider Alderney as having two lifeline routes. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) It is bizarre beyond any kind of ... well I find it very difficult to reconcile that.

2850

Deputy Murray: A point of correction.

The Deputy Bailiff: What is your point of correction, Deputy Murray?

2855

Deputy Murray: I believe Alderney only has one lifeline route which is Guernsey to Alderney.

Deputy Trott: Well if that is the case, we are heavily subsidising –

2860

A Member: Just to have money.

Deputy Trott: Yes, we are heavily subsidising the Alderney-Jersey route through a PSO. While I am talking about corrections, it is important to remember, through you, madam –

2865

The Deputy Bailiff: Southampton.

Deputy Trott: Southampton, sorry, is that I was not on P&R when this absurd proposal was brought, this absurd proposal which, as we have already established, has held us back god knows how long. Let us not forget, option C+ was something that would not have looked out of place in a Gulf state. To describe it as over specified really does not, I think, do it justice. But it says 'and due consideration given to designating' that route.

2870

It is simply a consideration. I cannot see how you can have a lifeline route between Guernsey and Jersey. In fact, there are a number of arguments as to why it may be absolutely the opposite, but this is not the time nor place.

2875

I will make one final comment in making it clear that P&R will support this. It is a comment made about consultants earlier – and I think it is a fair comment – that we are reluctant to litigate against consultants in a way that might see them, on some occasions, sharpen the advice that they give us. I am very conscious of something I was told by one of the Island's most senior architects years ago when he said, 'The very best outcome for a design consultant is to receive an awful lot of money

2880 from a client to design something that is never built, because when it is built that is when the liabilities for the consultant start.'

If a consultant can say what it likes, when it likes, losing sight of some of the simple facts such as the width of the runway which add millions of pounds of additional cost, I think there is a justification for once in a while employing some capable litigators. I do not know if anyone knows
2885 any. (*Laughter and Interjections*) I had completely forgotten, there is Jeremy Wessels. I had forgotten, I apologise. (*Laughter*) Well we have not had one this week, have we, so we have a bit of fun, through you, madam, with my very good friend, Deputy Ferbrache.

The point is that we should be a little bit more robust with our advisers. This is a superb amendment. It was a great amendment last time round, it is even better now, because clearly this
2890 Assembly is listening at last.

Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

2895 **Deputy Burford:** Thank you, madam.

Thank you, Deputy McKenna for your support. Deputy Vermeulen, the second part you were talking about. Of course, I just think I need to stress again – because from some of the comments that people are making generally I think it was a little bit lost – is that what is crucial for the operation of an aircraft type is that the route network is big enough. In fact, I think this is something that came
2900 out very much, this is why I was quite supportive of the Brittany Ferries thing because our route is near a lot of the other routes that they do, so it is logical that the extension on to us is not difficult.

What we need to do is expand the routes with the correct aircraft, and then they will start to be profitable or at least not incur the level of £2 million or £1.5 million, whatever it is this week, subsidy that we are currently paying on the Alderney PSO. Of course, this would not preclude, if the market
2905 was there, the near coast of France, so return to something like the Dinard route. I did not put it in because I am not at all sure that the market is there, but it is something that becomes possible, whereas at the moment it simply is not.

I think it was Deputy Vermeulen who mentioned that Blue Islands and Aurigny do not have Twin Otters. That is correct. In fact, even when this news that we had yesterday or the day before that
2910 Aurigny are going to damp lease some Twin Otters, they still do not have Twin Otters, they just have an arrangement with another airline. I do not see how this favours Blue Islands over Aurigny.

There is nothing to say that Blue Islands could not go to the States of Jersey and say, 'Oh, look, there is this opportunity to run these inter-Island routes.' We would bite their hand off if they want to come and do the Alderney and the Guernsey-Jersey and everything else, and get a loan from the
2915 States of Jersey and (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) lease themselves five Twin Otters.

This is not directed at Aurigny but it has to be an established Channel Islands' airline who can manage this sort of thing. Quite frankly, I do not feel that a small startup or whatever in Alderney fits into that category. I think it needs someone with a proper reservation system, booking system, engineering and everything else that is available if we want it to succeed. We are past the point
2920 where we can take a punt on this. This needs to be solid.

So thank you to Deputy Ferbrache for his kind words. I think Aurigny did operate in profit for many years before it got to the point of us buying them, and certainly for about 40 years. I know when I flew Trislanders in 1994 we used to be told what the break-even level was. I do not know if that was to try and encourage us to ask people to get in the aircraft and up the numbers a bit, but
2925 it was something like six on the Alderney-Southampton, and those days are long gone.

Deputy Gollop, I got a little bit confused because we have not mentioned Heathrow and things and I was not really sure where we were going with all of that. (*Interjection by Deputy Gollop*) I think some of the points you did bring up, they were an eclectic mix. The purpose of the amendment for the consultants – well not consultants, what word did we use? – to commission an aerodrome design
2930 company. I have taken out the words 'aerodrome design company' they set my teeth on edge a bit, so I just said, 'Commission a report' and P&R can choose who that comes from.

The report that we had from RPS – I suspect I am the only person apart from the people on the Committees who have seen this because I asked for a copy of it – included a whole foray into different types of electric aircraft. This is not relevant at this time. This is the whole point, we should not be looking at all of this stuff.

This is pie in the sky – sorry, I will carry on with the puns – and this is the whole purpose of the Proposition, to narrow everything down to bring it to things that are available, things that are practical, and not waste any time in a 125-page consultant report, £1,000 a page, I suppose, on that basis, that just looked at so many things that we did not need to look at, quite frankly. There is a lot of stuff in there that I think was valid and I am not damning the whole report.

Also on the report, I have no way of knowing, because I did not get as far – I ran out of time with 1,300 pages of other things to read – as asking for the terms of reference for that report. I am not going to be laying the blame, particularly with the consultants, although the bit about the non-precision approaches was completely wrong. I do not know where the responsibility for that sits. The terms of reference could have expanded it to include electric aircraft and such like and only 30 m wide runways and things. We have to be a little bit careful when we are throwing accusations around perhaps.

Deputy Gollop, I am still with you here, did ask about the Southampton-Alderney flight, would that continue. I think it is essential that it continues because this is about building a route network. A 16-seater, 18-seater aircraft is the right aircraft for that route because it is a thin route and it needs to go into Alderney where you need a small aircraft. I would say it is essential that the Southampton-Alderney would continue under this model.

I have made the point about Jersey, although what I would say is that when I brought this amendment 30 months ago, two and a half years ago, I had had quite a few conversations with Deputy Le Tocq because at that time I think he was speaking with – it could have been Deputy Morel, I am not sure – some counterparts in Jersey and the feedback I had at the time, and I think Deputy Le Tocq may have mentioned this in the debate, was that they were warm to the idea. Because, let us be honest, more frequent flights in between Guernsey and Jersey benefits both Islands.

Deputy Gollop and some others, the word 'lifeline' route. I think I am going to spend a little time on this and then I will not pick up on it where other people have mentioned it. I think different people feel different things by 'lifeline' route. The actual main thrust of a lifeline route is that if another operator wants to come on to a lifeline route, they have to put in an application, they cannot just take it for granted that they will be awarded a licence. That is the start and end of it. I am happy to stand corrected, but as I understand it, that is the start and end of it.

It is not about the route being essential but I think what it is far more about than it being lifeline, like we all fall over if we do not have it, I think it is – I will just finish my point first and then you can correct all the bits I get wrong – more about us knowing that if another operator were to come onto it, it does not result in a happy outcome for anybody.

We saw this when we had, I think it was Blue Islands or Aurigny, or it could have been Aurigny and another operator. (**A Member:** Rockhopper.) It was Rockhopper, was it? More recently I think Aurigny had a go at competing on the Jersey route (**A Member:** Hear. Hear.) and the only thing that happened is that everybody loses money. (**A Member:** Yes.) As we have to pay when Aurigny loses money, then I think we blinked first in that instance because it was taxpayers' money as opposed to – would you like me to give way, Deputy Inder?

Deputy Inder: It is just a bit of qualification; whether it helps or not I am not entirely sure.

The TLA, as I understand it, cannot give a licence without having regard for the Air Policy Statement (**Deputy Burford:** Yes.) which under legislation lives under Economic Development, which I will get to hopefully on Amendment 6. It is going to be quite difficult to go down this process without including Economic Development in that in any way, shape or form. The TLA do not have free and unencumbered powers without having regard for the Air Policy Statement which needs updating for us to get to the Guernsey-Jersey bit.

2985 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you.

 I was talking more about the licensing than the Air Policy Framework. But in any case I think the important point about a lifeline route is the objective is to protect a route. I think if you invested –
2990 and whether it will be Jersey that did it or whether Guernsey does it through Aurigny – in setting up a whole route network of all the inter-island flights again, you are not going to want to leave a vulnerability that undermines one of the key routes which would have been the Jersey-Guernsey route. The mechanism to stop having that vulnerability is designating it as a lifeline route, so it falls out of open skies, in fact, goes back to how all routes were before we had *quasi* open skies.

2995 Deputy Inder, I think I have probably covered the point. Deputy Inder did anticipate some amendments which may be laid, and so I am going to give an anticipatory response as it was raised. It does say in my Proposition that it is Policy & Resources in conjunction with other Committees as required. I have put Policy & Resources essentially because Policy & Resources were party to all the policy letters that have come to this Assembly on this subject, but they are required to consult with
3000 other Committees as appropriate. I think a future amendment is unnecessary but we will come to that.

 Deputy Brouard, subsidies. As I have the opportunity to reply, I did not want to stand up and interrupt you in mid-flow but there is no suggestion of a subsidy. More to the point, you were linking a lifeline route with a *de facto* subsidy. We do not subsidise the Gatwick route, which is a
3005 lifeline route. Well we subsidise it to the extent that if Aurigny makes a loss eventually this Assembly will have to cover it. (*Interjection by Deputy Brouard*) A lifeline route does not *de facto* imply a subsidy. (*Interjection by Deputy Brouard*) Okay, well, we have different views.

 Deputy Roffey, the point about the 18 m runway, I think it was actually picked up by both Deputy Parkinson and Deputy Trott – I have obviously set some hares running on the lifeline aspect
3010 – that my amendment says up to 877 m. In fact, do not make it any longer, so 799 m is not only entirely possible and probably cheaper, but it also is still plenty long enough for a Twin Otter. While trying to make my amendment as tight as possible to avoid unnecessary work, I also have left room for manoeuvre in areas where I think it is needed. If we go back to option A in the policy letter two and a half years ago, which was essentially refurbishing the runway, and that was then 23 m times
3015 799, that was costed at the time at £14 million.

 Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, I thank her for your support in seconding the amendment. Thanks also to Deputy Soulsby because, although Deputy Soulsby did not in the end second this amendment, she gave me some helpful pointers and it was modified, and feedback from what Deputy Trott had thought. I have actually undertaken quite a lot of consultation on this amendment
3020 and I think it has been helpful.

 Deputy Parkinson seems to think that it is very unlikely that either Blue Islands or Aurigny will want to do this. I do not know that that is the case. There is the issue of the fact that there are two operators, but then again it is still an open skies route, so one might want to think of it in that context. If Aurigny are damp leasing in Twin Otters anyway, it seems to me we are an awful lot closer
3025 to this than we have been at any point in recent years.

The Deputy Bailiff: Members, can you keep the chatter a little bit quieter, please; it is quite hard to hear what Deputy Burford is saying.

3030 **Deputy Burford:** Thank you.

 Deputy Roffey says that we could have an ATR operating at peak times on the Jersey with Twin Otters other times. Again, my amendment does not prevent that from happening. It is no different really to when we bring in a wet-leased aircraft to operate some of the Gatwick rotations. I think any airline are going to find that for best utilisation of their aircraft fleet, if they are going to have a

3035 fleet of small aircraft, then they want to get maximum utilisation. It will be a balancing act for the airline at the time if we get to that point. It does not say that that cannot happen.

I think this was still Deputy Parkinson talking about 'not another aircraft type'. The Dorniers are going to be going, so this is still going to go back to having a regional fleet and an inter-island fleet. I completely understand and concur with the actions that Aurigny have taken in rationalising, 3040 in moving on the jets, but the main problem with the Dorniers was they were operating on a route network that is too small.

If we start looking at slightly bigger airlines, once you start getting distinct route networks that demand a certain type, then at that point having two types is not out of the way, and it is certainly better than trying to build a short-for-ATRs runway in Alderney and put ATRs into Alderney. That 3045 was just the wrong way to address it.

Deputy Meerveld, yes, I am narrowing the terms of reference. Unfortunately, I think Deputy Meerveld was trying to expand them to some degree, mentioning Islanders and things. I do not believe that if this –

3050 **The Deputy Bailiff:** You only have 30 seconds left, Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: – is to go forward that Islanders are suitable and they are too small for the Jersey route. Alderney Representative Hill, I think your points about how Alderney was then and how it is now were adequately addressed. I think that is everything.

3055 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you very much, Deputy Burford.

Members, you should have before you on your screen Amendment 4. States' Greffier, would you open the voting on this, please?

3060 *There was a recorded vote.*

Carried – Pour 39, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	None	None	Bury, Tina	None
Blin, Chris				
Brouard, Al				
Burford, Yvonne				
Cameron, Andy				
de Lisle, David				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Haskins, Sam				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Le Tocq, Jonathan				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Mahoney, David				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				

Murray, Bob
Oliver, Victoria
Parkinson, Charles
Prow, Robert
Queripel, Lester
Roffey, Peter
Snowdon, Alexander
Soulsby, Heidi
St Pier, Gavin
Taylor, Andrew
Trott, Lyndon
Vermeulen, Simon

3065

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to Amendment 4, there voted pour 39, 1 Member was not in the Chamber at the time of the voting. The amendment is passed.

Deputy Inder, as Amendment 4 has been carried, am I correct that you are not going to lay Amendment 5 but you do wish to lay Amendment 6

3070

Deputy Inder: Yes.

The Deputy Bailiff: Do you wish the States' Greffier to read Amendment 6?

3075

Deputy Inder: Yes, please.

The States' Greffier read out Amendment 6.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

3080

Deputy Inder.

[Amendment 6.](#)

In Proposition 3, to substitute "the Committee for Economic Development" for "the Policy & Resources Committee" and to insert ", as part of the review of air transport licensing" immediately after "Code B aircraft".

Deputy Inder: Thank you, ma'am.

3085

A great debate and congratulations, Deputy Burford and Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, for the success. This is really about tidying up and a little bit of a reality and a small 'c' check on the excitement of potentially moving Alderney forward, reducing the costs and probably moving it a bit quicker.

3090

What the amendment seeks to do, it seeks to put effectively Economic Development at the forefront of it. There are reasons for it, so let us talk about the reality, what is going to happen in the next two or three months. We have got five members on our Committee, all have been very good Committee members, all are interested in licensing, most of whom are probably going to stand. Some of them are going to actually get in and probably some of them may even stand to be the next President of the Committee.

3095

We have got another three months left of this States and our officers will be listening today. If they are taking a direction, and by resolution, they will be carrying on working towards this resolution, so this will be happening. There is going to be no purdah here, nothing is going to stop; our Committee will be listening.

3100

As we transfer from the old regime to a new regime, 18th June the people decide. End of that month, the new body will install new Committees. Pretty closely after that we have, what, one or two States' Meetings, then we go into the summer holidays. Then we come back for a couple of months and then we go into Christmas. The next six months is actually not a lot of work and Policy & Resources will have an awful lot of work to do.

I hope Deputy Burford and Deputy Kazantseva-Miller will agree, it does not have any budget attached to it, it does not have any date, and if it falls off a cliff it is one of those things that is going to fall off a cliff. What I can assure Members is that for the next two or three months our officers will be listening and they will be paying attention to this. They will still be here while we are here and for the six months after the election they will be working towards whatever is resolved out of this Assembly today.

I am not entirely clear why it needed to be led by Policy & Resources and I will say nothing more on it than that. I think really if Members want to move this on in any way, shape and form I genuinely believe, given that members of our Committee are still going to be at least around the States, some of whom may well take my position, the most sensible thing to do is carry on with the existing mandate and allow all our officers to concentrate on this while P&R potentially do not have to because there is no date and potentially do not have a budget for it.

So all this simply does, this amendment, changes the words 'Policy & Resources' in the first sentence to substitute it for 'Committee for Economic Development' and inserts ', as part of the review of air transport licensing' immediately after the phrase 'Code B aircraft'. It is worth reminding Members as well, again, that we are not far off from the new Committee, one of its first jobs will be to complete the Air Policy Statement, we just did not have time to get to it.

That would be another opportunity for the new Committee, given what it has heard to date, to include whether Guernsey and Jersey becomes a lifeline link. If that gets into the States between June and the end of the September, TLA now has the framework, because they do not have the legal framework without giving regard for the policy statement which does not currently exist.

So your options are quite clear: you have a commitment from me to take regard from the Burford and Kazantseva-Miller amendment to work on this properly over the next two or three months, to include it as part of the handover, and to assure you that this will be carried on and possibly in part delivered by the end of this year, or your other option is to give it to P&R and recognise they are going to be quite busy. Deputy Trott, I would like to think he would agree, that when there is a transfer it is not necessarily something like this is going to be number one priority in a new term.

So those are the options to you: leave it within the mandate of the Committee and have some guarantee that this will be worked on now heading towards the end of this year; or, secondly, leave it with P&R and have no guarantee whatsoever.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Do you formally second that, Deputy Falla?

Deputy Falla: I do, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Madam, just as a technical amendment actually because I think Deputy Inder is right in the sense that it falls directly within Economic Development's mandate because we look and we are in the process of renewing the Air Policy Framework. I do not really feel the need to have a very long debate in this because it is directly within the mandate of Economic Development.

There may be a wider consideration to take into account but that is covered in consultation with other Committees. I think the Air Policy Framework is a key route through which we should be reviewing that. The importance of the work with other Committees is going to be within the amended Proposition as per the successful amendment. So I view it as a technical amendment; I think we should just get on with it.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

3155 **Deputy Burford:** Thank you, madam.

I would ask Members not to support this amendment. I gave extensive and careful consideration to the drafting of my amendment. Also, interestingly, the Rule 4(1) information here seems to have just been lifted from my amendment. I am not entirely sure, although again I stand to be corrected, that there was consultation on this amendment with the Policy & Resources Committee. No?

3160

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: I thank Deputy Burford for giving way.

3165 There was absolutely no consultation with any of the members of the Policy & Resources Committee whatsoever. This is not uncommon.

Deputy Burford: It also says that drafting advice was sought from the Policy & Resources Committee and I think I can take it for granted that that did not happen either. Of course, those were things that I did on my amendment. I will give way to Deputy Gabriel.

3170

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Ma'am, it begs the question that if the Rule 4.1 information is incorrect, whether we should be debating this at all or if we should have suspended the rules to allow the debate to happen.

3175

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, I think as we have already started the debate, I am afraid that horse has bolted. It is only a marginal change and I am going to rule that we can continue on with this debate.

3180

Thank you.

Deputy Burford: Okay, thanks.

The amendment that has just been unanimously agreed deliberately directed this back to Policy & Resources, but very clearly stating with consultation with other Committees as appropriate. So I did not even narrow it down to just two other Committees or whatever. I think that the involvement of Economic Development is a given in a matter that impinges on their mandate. This is entirely catered for in my amendments, and Deputy Inder seems to be discussing people who may or may not be on Committees in the future. I do not think that we can put any store by that. None of us know what that would be. We do not know who will be on P&R either. Were I fortunate enough to be elected, I would quite like to throw my hat in the ring, but I am not betting on anything.

3190

The other thing that concerns me in this amendment as well is the wanting to look at this as part of the review of air transport licensing. We know how long reviews can take sometimes. We had a debate earlier today on decoupling two parts of a previous Proposition so that one did not have to be dependent on the other. I do not feel in any way that these two things have to be linked. There is work to be done beforehand on feasibility of a lot of areas here.

3195

I would ask everyone, through you, madam, who has supported my amendment to stick with the wording of that amendment and reject this one.

Thank you.

3200

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Falla.

Deputy Falla: Thank you, madam.

I think Deputy Kazantseva-Miller has really made this speech for me. It really is not much more than a technical type of amendment. Deputy Burford slightly brushed this aside in her summing up on the previous amendment, but I would respectfully suggest that she has got the wrong pilot in

3205

the cockpit here and it is kind of removing our undercarriage. ED is already partway through a review of air transport licensing, which we are rightly under resolution to do. It is our job to do. To get P&R involved at this stage really smacks of one of those clunky overlapping Committee mandates and we really do not want to increase that.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: I do not think it is quite as black and white as that. I am a big defender of Committee mandates and I have got quite upset at times when various iterations of P&R have believed that they have got a mandate to do everything, and ignored individual Committee mandates.

If it was just a question of whether the Guernsey-Jersey route should be designated a lifeline route, there is no doubt in my mind that the proposals on that should be brought by Economic Development, because they are the ones – the Assembly decides, but they are the ones that bring it forward. But as I understand the wider context of Deputy Burford's amendment that was passed, it was about how do we get to a situation where you have inter-island and beyond network all operated by a single operator. Just designating Guernsey to Jersey as a lifeline route will not achieve that, it will not begin to achieve that. You will have one operator operating that lifeline route, you will have another operator operating another lifeline route between Guernsey and Alderney. I do not think it would be useful to go into how it could actually be achieved, but I believe that P&R's input into how it could possibly be achieved will be extremely important.

I think on balance I am going to vote against this amendment, not because I believe that we should be handing the wrong pilots the job of deciding whether it is a lifeline route, it is the other stuff that needs to be done in order to bring about the vision that 39 Members of this Assembly actually backed.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I am not particularly bothered if the amendment passes or not, but my preference I think actually is for the Deputy Burford perspective and Deputy Roffey, because I think they make the point well that the amendment that has just been carried unanimously really is about much more than just the current air framework. It is about actually looking at sensible rationalisation of air routes so that we maybe get more routes using more appropriate planes for greater efficiency.

I rise though for two reasons. Deputy Inder has often, and I think persuasively, made the argument that we are all at sea with transport. It is very confusing. You have STSB with at least two aspects, with Ports and Aurigny. We have Economic Development involved with tourism and transport. Policy & Resources got a lot of comment during the Black Swan events of last year. We have a strategic role for the Island, not just in finance, but in bringing Committees together and in actually maintaining our central infrastructure.

So of course Policy & Resources are involved as we have been heavily in issues with Alderney in this respect. Basically I think it works for it to be Policy & Resources but I would assure you, not that I have the power to, that we would work with Economic Development on a joint basis, and we do share some of the able officers who would be useful.

But one thing that worried me about the explanatory note on this, maybe I am being picky and maybe His Majesty's Procureur would say I am not on the right lines either, but it seeks that the review proposed is led by the Committee for Economic Development in the explanatory note, which has the mandate for air transport licensing. I thought we had an Air Transport Licensing Authority. I was a rather inactive President of that for four years. Deputy de Lisle now holds the role and I know he is having conversations with Aurigny. Deputy Le Tissier sits next to me and is on it.

We had a very weak and small mandate, but we effectively give permission for which – and somebody said by definition it means a sole operator. No, it does not, because we allow two

operators, Blue Islands and Aurigny, to fly between Guernsey and Southampton, which is a lifeline route.

But my point is, is this amendment not flawed in referring to air transport licensing? We know what they mean. They mean air transport policy but, yet again, we have a different Committee for that function. Everything comes back to our woeful Machinery of Government.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Blin.

Deputy Blin: Thank you, ma'am.

First of all, I am waiting for some information whether or not members of TLA are able to vote on lifeline routes. However, this stems from the Policy & Resources, in fact, policy letter, about rehabilitation of the Alderney runway, and then it is Deputy Burford who has brought an amendment which has been unanimously supported, which is an incredible feat. Then in that amendment she had actually specified with the same thought that, for example, Deputy McKenna had given full 100% her trust based on her ability to analyse professionalism, etc., which the whole Assembly did. There was a specific reason why she had actually placed it with Policy & Resources. I get the fact that actually Economic Development fits in the right place for this but I can just see that the whole purpose is we are trying to resolve a number of issues connected with Alderney, with the rehabilitation and other plans. If we watch it from that line and follow that line then actually the natural thing would be it would continue on with P&R, which would most probably have to work with Economic Development to continue.

I do not know if I can vote either way but I just wanted to put my point, which is the line of thought I am following.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, ma'am.

I will be brief, I am a little frustrated as to why we are here actually discussing this because in all reality it does not matter if it is P&R or Economic Development, they will be considering it of course, but it will be probably the same officers working on it, the same civil servants, no matter who they are working for, if it is ED or P&R. If it is ED, they might second someone in. We do not have air transport licensing civil servants sloshing around, have we? There is not some already designated to P&R, there is not some already designated to ED, so it is probably going to be the same civil servant who is tasked with this, so it does not really matter to me which banner they are working under. Can we just get on, get debating, and get some business sorted?

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Does anybody else wish to contribute to the debate on Amendment 6 before I turn to Deputy Trott?

Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Thank you, madam.

I shall be very brief. When I saw this amendment for the first time when it was placed on my desk, I think we ascertained that earlier, my view was, what does it matter? (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) But having listened to Deputy Burford, she made a point, and Deputy Roffey made one almost identical a few minutes later. How odd it must look if we unanimously support an amendment one moment and just a few breaths later we decide to amend something we have unanimously supported. I think on balance it just aids the credibility of this Assembly if we reject this amendment and stick with our original unanimous decision.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Just a couple of small points. Rule 4.1 has been updated, Policy & Resources were sent the amendment today, given that it was only published on Wednesday, so Deputy Trott may not have seen it but Deputy Gollop responded and said that he would support the amendment this morning. Five hours later – Deputy Trott may find it funny but this is Deputy Gollop, he is a Member of Policy & Resources and within five hours he is saying something – our votes are actually serious. (Interjection) Well, okay, I just do not find any of this particularly amusing inasmuch as I think we get to the end of the term and we find this all quite funny. But, anyway.

So as far as we understand, P&R officers have been sent the draft copy. PRC was sent a copy today, Deputy Trott may not have seen it. As I said, Deputy Gollop said he would respond in support.

It is really up to you, Members. I think it is a technical amendment. It is not the end of the world if you do not but I have explained to you that I have given my commitment that the work will carry on. It will carry on for the rest of the term and we will try and get to a position.

If you think that that after 18th June, the first thing that Policy & Resources are going to do is work on this, then I am afraid that they just are not going to. They are just not going to. If you support this amendment, then obviously you have got at least some commitment from me for the next few months that the work will carry on and help us get to the place that we need to be rather next term. But you will have no guarantee if you hand this to Policy & Resources that you will see this within a year and a half.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you. Members, you should have on your screen Amendment 6. States' Greffier would you open the voting, please?

There was a recorded vote.

Not Carried – Pour 16, Contre 20, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 2, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Cameron, Andy	Aldwell, Sue	Blin, Chris	Bury, Tina	None
Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Brouard, Al	de Lisle, David	Le Tocq, Jonathan	
Dyke, John	Burford, Yvonne			
Fairclough, Simon	de Sausmarez, Lindsay			
Falla, Steve	Ferbrache, Peter			
Gabriel, Adrian	Gollop, John			
Helyar, Mark	Haskins, Sam			
Inder, Neil	Hill, Edward			
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha	Leadbeater, Marc			
Le Tissier, Chris	McKenna, Liam			
Mahoney, David	Meerveld, Carl			
Matthews, Aidan	Murray, Bob			
Moakes, Nick	Parkinson, Charles			
Oliver, Victoria	Queripel, Lester			
Prow, Robert	Roffey, Peter			
Vermeulen, Simon	Snowdon, Alexander			
	Soulsby, Heidi			
	St Pier, Gavin			
	Taylor, Andrew			
	Trott, Lyndon			

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to Amendment 6, they voted: pour 16, contre 20 and there were 2 abstentions, 2 Members were not in the Chamber at the time of vote. I therefore declare the outcome as the amendment was not passed.

Deputy Trott, in relation to Amendment 7, would you like the States' Greffier to read your amendment?

Deputy Trott: It is short but, yes, please, madam.

The States' Greffier read out Amendment 7.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

3350

[Amendment 7.](#)

Insert the following at the start of Proposition 1c:

"commence the work of the commission so that it is undertaken at the same time as the work set out in Proposition 2 and to "

Deputy Trott: Madam, thank you, and I want to ceremoniously place my biro on the bench, so there is no chance of me wagging it at anyone. I think that is probably a good thing.

3355 Madam, following the success of Amendment 1, the members of the Policy & Resources Committee have discussed the implications of that amendment for the work of both the Alderney Runway Rehabilitation and the Bailiwick Commission. We accept and respect the decision of this Assembly not to couple the runway proposal and the set-up of a commission. However, we strongly believe it will not serve the next Assembly well to delay the work of the commission until after the States have agreed on the runway. In fact, if I and my colleagues have heard the Alderney Reps
3360 accurately, they want to crack on with this as eagerly as we do.

Running the work in parallel is not the same as coupling the projects. We must not delay on either workstream. As stated in the policy letter and during debate on Amendment 1, it is and has always been the intention of the Committee that these workstreams should run in parallel, not delaying or preventing progression of the other, but ensuring that there will be information
3365 available to inform the considerations of future Assemblies, and this remains the case.

Madam, the Committee, this Committee, sees the potential risk that should the result of Amendment 1 be that the two workstreams run consecutively, there could be delays at the stage when a final investment decision is needed. If a future Assembly does not feel it has the information it needs on the future of the relationship. This is something that no one in this Assembly would
3370 want to see, particularly me.

Simply put, this amendment does not link the milestones of each workstream, but ensures that both are setting off and progressing as a matter of priority. The amendment will be in the interests of both the States of Deliberation and the States of Alderney to work together. Madam, given the commitments made earlier in debate by Alderney Representative Snowden on the commitment to
3375 progress the Bailiwick Commission, it is hoped that this amendment can be supported by the whole Assembly to send a clear message that there should be no more delay.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby, do you formally second this amendment?

3380 **Deputy Soulsby:** I do, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

3385 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Madam, to me this amendment represents probably what exactly is wrong with our system of government because this is an amendment by the Policy & Resources Committee to its own policy letter to tell themselves to get on with doing some work (*Laughter*), which we are going to agree through hopefully agreeing Propositions 1 and 2.

Members, can you please dispose of this amendment? If P&R is really keen to get this work started, like Alderney has and like the whole Assembly, can they just get on with getting it started?
3390 This is farcical.

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache

Deputy Ferbrache: I agree completely and I turn Deputy Trott's words back to himself in the previous amendment when he said, when Deputy Inder was bringing an amendment, 'Well look, we have just passed the Burford amendment unanimously and now we are seeking to amend it.' The vote that our amendment won this morning was not unanimous but it was very conclusive indeed against the P&R position. This is unnecessary. This is just a completely unnecessary amendment without any consultation and I think it has a danger behind it, and it should be rejected as firmly – and hopefully unanimously because hopefully Deputy Trott will see the error of his ways, not wagging his biro – I am not wagging my biro at him – and realise that he can be wrong. I know that is a mysterious term to him, but he could be wrong and that this is a very poor piece of parliamentary procedure.

Deputy Haskins: Can I ask for a 26(1), please?

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Haskins has asked to guillotine the debate on this amendment. Those who still wish to contribute towards the debate on this amendment, please stand in your place. Do you wish to put it to the vote?

Deputy Haskins: Yes, please.

The Deputy Bailiff: We will do it first *aux voix*. Those who support the motion to guillotine the debate, please say pour; those against?

Members voted Pour

The Deputy Bailiff: You get the opportunity to reply, Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Apart from a bit of biro wagging from Deputy Ferbrache, I am not certain there is anything to reply to. The Alderney Rep this morning made it absolutely clear that this was the approach that they favoured. A decoupling, yet immediate formalisation of the Bailiwick Commission. Surely it is joined up to do it that way. They did not like the decoupling but they want to crack on. We are asking the Assembly to formalise that objective.

That is an entirely appropriate parliamentary process and frankly I am flabbergasted at any criticism to the contrary. But, once again, the States will decide.

The Deputy Bailiff: You should have on your screens, Members, Amendment 7. States' Greffier, would you open the voting, please?

There was a recorded vote.

Not Carried – Pour 11, Contre 21, Ne vote pas 6, Did not vote 2, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Brouard, Al	Aldwell, Sue	Blin, Chris	Bury, Tina	None
Burford, Yvonne	Dudley-Owen, Andrea	de Lisle, David	Le Tocq, Jonathan	
Cameron, Andy	Dyke, John	de Sausmarez, Lindsay		
Gollop, John	Fairclough, Simon	Falla, Steve		
Le Tissier, Chris	Ferbrache, Peter	Oliver, Victoria		
Matthews, Aidan	Gabriel, Adrian	St Pier, Gavin		
Meerveld, Carl	Haskins, Sam			
Murray, Bob	Helyar, Mark			
Roffey, Peter	Hill, Edward			
Soulsby, Heidi	Inder, Neil			

Trott, Lyndon Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
 Leadbeater, Marc
 Mahoney, David
 McKenna, Liam
 Moakes, Nick
 Parkinson, Charles
 Prow, Robert
 Queripel, Lester
 Snowdon, Alexander
 Taylor, Andrew
 Vermeulen, Simon

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to Amendment 7, they voted pour 11, contre 21, there were 6 abstentions and 2 Members who were not in the Chamber at the time of the vote. I therefore declare the amendment has not been passed.

So we will now turn to general debate. Who wishes to speak in general debate? Does anybody wish to speak in general debate?

Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Very short. I think Deputy Trott will remember actually, this very much feels like déjà vu. About this time last term, Policy & Resources lost another policy letter on the Airport runway, I think it was 2008-09, very close to the election and I think they have amended this into the same position.

There is some good stuff in it and I am genuinely grateful for the speech from Deputy Burford and even though Economic Development has lost that recent amendment, really I can write to officers now and say, 'Stop all work, we will wait for P&R to come and talk to us in 18 months' time'. I am not going to do that. I am a man of my word. I think this is important for the Assembly and I will ask officers to give consideration to the end of this debate and see if they can carry on working through to what is the resolution of the States today, to assist a new P&R when they might come back to us in a year and a half when they have started thinking about it.

A future Economic Development Committee may end up doing the work that we were told we were not going to do. But I think Members, in reality, irrespective of the anti-Alderney rhetoric which we get from the former P&R and the current P&R, it is fairly obvious that two terms want to deal with Alderney in some way, shape or form. The last term, the last States, wanted a redevelopment of the Alderney runway. Deputy Burford, I think has got us into the right place and I think a new Policy & Resources really needs to look at all of the Islands as well as one economic enterprise zone, and that might include turbines, it might include renewables, it might include electricity, and it might include economic growth.

I am actually glad the term is coming to an end because we do need a reset. I was not here the last session for a couple of days and I had – and what we hear in the States and what we hear on the radio, I listen to the radio, it is fairly obvious this States are basically fed up with each other. I think that is really quite clear listening to the speeches. But I think Guernsey and Alderney have got a greater future ahead of them and I will be supporting this policy letter in its entirety, and I will be asking officers to carry on doing some of the work they can do in the last two or three months rather than waiting 18 months, which is almost certainly what a new Policy & Resources will do before they get anywhere near this at all.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I want to get into Alderney's good books again and maybe I will take up the offer of visiting Alderney and finding out of what solutions they have to reducing costs, looking at accounts, scrutinising, all of that, and ideas where we could work in partnership better together.

3480 What I would say, and this is not just to my colleagues on Policy & Resources – and, yes, I agreed to the wording of the amendment but I changed my mind in the debate – but we should be working together. It should not be Policy & Resources or Economic Development, it should be both. That is when the harmony comes in.

3485 My plea to all of us, P&R and the rest of the States, especially as we are going into this interregnum in a non-ecclesiastical sense, when Members will not be meeting in conventional debate, we will have other things to do and new people will come in and all the rest of it. Well, perhaps we are a bit fed up at times, but what we need in the interregnum is a solid assurance that resources will be available, and by that I mean civil servants and money, to progress both the parallel workstreams as expeditiously as possible. I have been in the States long enough – disability strategy springs to mind 10 years ago, when that States would vote for things but they would not get
3490 progressed from what was then the senior leadership team. So we have to oversee that the senior leadership team and all their legal and professional advisers and contacts will deliver meaningful results like we did with Moneyval, on both the commission issues and the Airport issues, and now of course was also the small planes ideas in the Burford requête.

So I will have to keep my feet on the ground and hold everybody's feet to the fire.

3495 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Blin.

Deputy Blin: Thank you, ma'am.

3500 I would just like to keep it quite short, but actually I think this week we have done pretty well, when I think back to the DPA work there, in spite of what the minutiae put up there, the domestic abuse from Deputy Prow, the rectories, the beneficial ownership, we have covered a lot. Today is particularly interesting because with Alderney, I have been a good strong fan of Alderney for many years and to the point I would say that we looked at ideas, different ideas, different areas. So today
3505 was actually quite an outstanding point resulting where we have got to. But what I would like to add is, this last amendment, I can see what Deputy Trott was trying to achieve. We had all agreed as if in a meeting room, yes, let us work on this runway, and, yes, we are really keen to come to the table to do the agreement of constitution.

3510 It was almost like saying, 'Right then, we have got your side of it, how about you guys come to the table and we just get going straight away to look at that.' That is the feeling I got. If we had have reached that, and I would love to hear comments from our representatives from Alderney, that was, I think, the aim of what was about to happen there. It was maybe not perceived as that by the Assembly for whatever reason, and maybe this is where Deputy Inder is correct. Maybe people are getting tired or fed up.

3515 But I looked at it as actually today was an interesting – well, this week has been an interesting progression of things and we should be prouder than we act in the sense that we have made some progress. Also, there are positive things, and the other thing I would mention from Representative Hill talking about potential gain in, whether it be gaming or other tourism, he referred to energy, renewable energy and wind, which I believe we will be hopefully getting to start at least at some
3520 point, because there will be opportunities there, not sure, not assured, but the potential for growth which will benefit all of us. Really that is just what I wanted to add.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

3525 Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: I am not going to say anything about airports or runways but I want to briefly mention the constitutional commission because we have made a lot of progress this week, and I agree with Deputy Blin that we have – actually both Guernsey and Jersey are agreeing to set up a
3530 constitutional commission and both enthusiastically –

The Deputy Bailiff: Guernsey and Alderney.

Deputy Roffey: Sorry, sorry, I beg your pardon. That would be an interesting one. I did hear at one stage through the media that they were interested in taking on Alderney, so maybe they ought to be brought into it. I do not think that was really true though.

Alderney enthusiastically wanted to get on with it, we wanted to enthusiastically get on with it, the fact that the last amendment failed - I voted for it - is neither here nor there because Proposition 1 sets out a timetable which says it will happen quickly and be got on with.

The first bit of Proposition 1 says that we should delegate to Alderney and P&R to set up the terms of reference. We have heard earlier in reference to consultants how important terms of reference are. I just want to urge that these are as broad as they possibly can be.

I agree with Alderney Representative Hill, this is going to be a massive piece of work but I want it to be as massive as it possibly can. I do not want it just to look at the transfer of services that were agreed in 1948, I want to look at things like population control Laws, how Alderney and Guernsey intermesh, because as difficult as it is there, Alderney can never have ours because they require people to be able to come in more freely, and we do not want people using it as a back door, but at the same time young people born in Alderney or brought there as minors, I believe we ought to offer them far more freedom.

The scale of the problem would be so small that I really think we should offer them far more freedom to be treated as Guernsey people like we do with the children of open market residents, for instance.

I am not going to do a list of things that I want to see - maybe I will and send it in by post - but all I am urging is that speed is important, yes, but I think this is a once in a four or five generations review of the constitutional links, Please do not narrow it, make it as broad as it possibly can be.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: I will start with two comments really and I will be brief.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller has said before we should look at the Bailiwick as a whole. If we are going to have this commission and our economic considerations in the amendment successfully brought by Alderney Representative Hill, that is what we have to look at. Look at the economic as a whole. Like any country, any district, any area, you are going to have certain parts that are more productive financially than others, but they all make an economic contribution. So I commend her words.

Deputy Blin said he has always been a supporter of Alderney. I may be misremembering because I am a pensioner and it is a Friday afternoon, but he voted against Amendment 1. If that is supporting Alderney, I then do not support Alderney because I voted every time in favour of Alderney. Deputy Blin has turned my understanding of the English language into something completely different. But, nevertheless, he does support Alderney, as he supported me until 13th December 2023.

In relation to where we are concerning support, and in relation to that, the commission is a vital part. I commend Deputy Trott. I may have voted against certain things he has brought today, I know he means it and I know he will do his best in the next two and a half months, or whatever it may be, to set this thing in train. It certainly will not be finished but it should make good progress. The runway has to be got on with. The runway has to be got on with. The Burford amendment sets the parameters, it seems to me. We can check. I appreciate the difference the officers have said about 18, 23 m, and what Deputy Burford said. That should be checked in a nanosecond. Somebody is right, somebody is wrong. I think I know where I think the person is but we will wait and see, I do not prejudge anything.

But let us get on with this. Let us get on with the commission because we need to have a united Bailiwick, including Sark. We need to have the three main islands working together as a cohesive

unit, as Deputy Kazantseva-Miller says. Alderney is a theory of the practice, the reality is Alderney needs a new runway very soon.

3585

The Deputy Bailiff: Alderney Representative Hill.

Alderney Representative Hill: I would just like to say to everybody, through you, thank you very much for the amount of time that you spent today on this subject. It really means a lot to us that you have all put forward your very valuable contributions and for us it is a very important day. Thank you very much.

3590

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.
Does anybody else wish to speak in debate?
Deputy de Lisle.

3595

Deputy de Lisle: Just one point, ma'am.

TLA had hoped, actually, to get the review of air transport licensing this term. I just can only say that with the interest, actually, with another route as a possible lifeline route, this perhaps will stimulate that and move a little more quickly toward getting from Economic Development the review of air transport licensing. Perhaps this term or the beginning of next term.

3600

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.
Does anybody else wish to speak before I turn to Deputy Trott?
Deputy Trott.

3605

Deputy Trott: Madam, there is little, if anything, for me to respond to, but there is a point that is worthy of making, and that is that Proposition 1, if supported, will authorise us to direct the Policy & Resources Committee, working with the States of Alderney or one or more of its Committees, to agree the terms of reference and the constitution of the commission on the future arrangements for the constitutional, economic and working relationships between Guernsey and Alderney.

3610

Importantly, and this is the key, to bring the relevant findings of that commission back to the parliaments of the Island involved, firstly with an interim report before the end of 2025. I would expect this Assembly and the future Assembly to take a very dim view if that interim report was not brought back before this Assembly. That will mean that the constitution of this commission will need to take place very swiftly, within weeks, a few weeks, in order to ensure that it can meet that deadline.

3615

We will do everything that we can, madam, to ensure that it does. I see my colleagues in Alderney now nodding that they intend to do the same, despite rejecting an amendment earlier that would have ensured precisely the same, but in an official parliamentary process. But there we are, enough said, onwards and upwards.

3620

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Trott.

Is there any appetite for separating out the Propositions for the vote? I am terribly sorry, you do not have your microphone on.

3625

A Member: I think there is the new 4, which is the Deputy Burford amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: The Deputy Burford amendment is 3 and it is pushed what was 3 down to 4. So is it actually number 3 that you wish to do separately?

3630

A Member: Yes, 3 then.

3635 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes, that is in relation to the inter-island network, that one?

A Member: Yes.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

3640 So, States' Greffier, if you would not mind grouping 1 and 2 together and 3 and 4 will need to be voted separately. Members, you should now have before you Propositions 1 and 2 as amended. States' Greffier, would you open the voting, please? It is Propositions 1 and 2.

There was a recorded vote.

3645

Carried – Pour 39, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	None	None	Bury, Tina	None
Blin, Chris				
Brouard, Al				
Burford, Yvonne				
Cameron, Andy				
de Lisle, David				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Haskins, Sam				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Le Tocq, Jonathan				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Mahoney, David				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				
Oliver, Victoria				
Parkinson, Charles				
Prow, Robert				
Queripel, Lester				
Roffey, Peter				
Snowdon, Alexander				
Soulsby, Heidi				
St Pier, Gavin				
Taylor, Andrew				
Trott, Lyndon				
Vermeulen, Simon				

3650 **The Deputy Bailiff:** In relation to Propositions 1 and 2, they voted pour 39 and 1 Member was not in the Chamber at the time of the voting. I therefore declare both those Propositions passed.

Would you kindly put Proposition 3 on the screens, please. On your screens is Proposition 3, which is the Amendment 4 inserted by Deputy Burford and Deputy Kazantseva-Miller's amendment. Would you open the voting please, States' Greffier?

3655 *There was a recorded vote.*

Carried – Pour 36, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	Brouard, Al	Le Tissier, Chris	Bury, Tina	None
Blin, Chris		Parkinson, Charles		
Burford, Yvonne				
Cameron, Andy				
de Lisle, David				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Haskins, Sam				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tocq, Jonathan				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Mahoney, David				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				
Oliver, Victoria				
Prow, Robert				
Queripel, Lester				
Roffey, Peter				
Snowdon, Alexander				
Soulsby, Heidi				
St Pier, Gavin				
Taylor, Andrew				
Trott, Lyndon				
Vermeulen, Simon				

3660 **The Deputy Bailiff:** In relation to Proposition 3, they voted pour 36, contre 1 and there were 2 abstentions, 1 Member was not in the Chamber at the time of the vote. I therefore declare the Proposition has been passed.

Finally, Proposition 4, please, States' Greffier. Would you open the voting on Proposition 4, please?

3665 *There was a recorded vote.*

Carried – Pour 39, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	None	None	Bury, Tina	None
Blin, Chris				
Brouard, Al				
Burford, Yvonne				
Cameron, Andy				
de Lisle, David				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				

Dyke, John
Fairclough, Simon
Falla, Steve
Ferbrache, Peter
Gabriel, Adrian
Gollop, John
Haskins, Sam
Helyar, Mark
Hill, Edward
Inder, Neil
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Le Tissier, Chris
Le Tocq, Jonathan
Leadbeater, Marc
Mahoney, David
Matthews, Aidan
McKenna, Liam
Meerveld, Carl
Moakes, Nick
Murray, Bob
Oliver, Victoria
Parkinson, Charles
Prow, Robert
Queripel, Lester
Roffey, Peter
Snowdon, Alexander
Soulsby, Heidi
St Pier, Gavin
Taylor, Andrew
Trott, Lyndon
Vermeulen, Simon

3670

The Deputy Bailiff: They voted in relation to Proposition 4, pour 39 and 1 Member was not in the Chamber at the time of the vote. I therefore declare that the Proposition has been passed.

COMMITTEE FOR POLICY AND RESOURCES

11. Offshore Wind Opportunity for Guernsey - Update and Next Steps

Article 11.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the policy letter entitled Offshore Wind Opportunity for Guernsey – Update and Next Steps, dated 20th March 2025, they are of the opinion:-

- 1. To approve next steps set out by the Policy & Resources Committee's Offshore Wind Group sub-committee (see paragraphs 5.2 to 5.7), and to direct the Policy & Resources Committee to submit a policy letter to the States of Deliberation by December 2026 at the latest which sets out the commercial leasing agreement, terms relating to that agreement and the preferred bidder; and*
- 2. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to establish an arm's length entity with appropriate political governance (see paragraph 6.4) to take forward the work of the offshore wind project through Phases 3 and 4 from the beginning of the new States' term.*

The States' Greffier: Article 11, Policy & Resources Committee, Offshore Wind Opportunity for Guernsey – Update and Next Steps.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

3675 **Deputy Trott:** Madam, I rise for procedural reasons to open this debate and request that you call Deputy Blin next in his capacity as Chairman of the Offshore Wind Group, who will, to all intents and purposes, expand on these opening remarks.

3680 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes, Deputy Trott, would you just confirm that in terms of Amendment 1 that is a technical amendment?

[Amendment 1](#)

In Proposition 1, for "(see paragraphs 5.2 to 5.7)" substitute "(see paragraphs 5.2 to 5.5)" and in Proposition 2, for "(see paragraph 6.4)" substitute "(see paragraph 5.4)".

3685 **Deputy Trott:** Yes, madam, it is a technical amendment and for which I apologise for the correction.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Murray, do you formally second that?

Deputy Murray: I do, ma'am.

3690 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Blin.

Deputy Blin: Thank you, ma'am.

3695 First of all, I thank our Chief Minister, Deputy Trott for his introduction due to the fact that we are a subcommittee of P&R. So as Chair of the Offshore Wind Committee of P&R, I would like to thank the Members of Policy & Resources for the support bringing this policy letter.

3700 I am very excited to introduce this significant policy initiative which has the potential to positively impact Guernsey's economic prosperity, energy and environmental sustainability. Ma'am, allow me to first reflect on the origins of this unique undertaking. This project originated from an entrepreneurial concept put forward by a colleague, Deputy David de Lisle, in October 2021. Deputy de Lisle had reached out to all Deputies encouraging an exploration of innovative approaches to developing renewable energy projects distinct from conventional methods used by the States. This appeal led to a pivotal meeting attended by 16 Deputies, resulting in the formation of three focused working groups, each tasked with investigating wind, tidal and solar power, respectively.

3705 Given the significant demands and complexities of the projects, it understandably took over a year for these working groups to produce their initial reports. This extensive timeline reflected the rigorous, independent and detailed research that was carried out. I will particularly commend Deputy Meerveld, who has been instrumental in the progress of this offshore group, because Deputy Meerveld initially devoted several hundred hours throughout the summer months of 2022 producing a comprehensive scoping report published in October of that year, which established a robust foundation for our ongoing efforts and has continued to be a driving force behind this initiative.

3710 In early 2023, building on Deputy Meerveld's work, an initial working group was then convened to further validate and expand on this crucial groundwork. However, the group's initial progress was somewhat limited, primarily due to insufficient inter-committee collaboration. Recognising this shortcoming, a critical shift did occur under the new Policy & Resources Committee under the helm of the current Deputy Trott. A revitalised working group was established, ensuring the inclusion of vital insights from the Committees from Economic Development, Environment & Infrastructure, and the States' Trading Supervisory Board, STSB.

3720 Here, I would like to specifically highlight the indispensable contribution of Deputy de Sausmarez and her team from Environment & Infrastructure, although initially excluded from the early stages, their subsequent involvement proved absolutely critical, significantly enhancing the collective

capability of the working group and enabling swift, meaningful progress. This strengthened collaboration culminated in the comprehensive proposal now before you, underpinned by detailed and rigorous analysis from leading international experts, including PA Consulting, the Carbon Trust and Ramboll. Their work in the field included defining and modelling a sample site of just over 150 km² with up to 1.3 GW capacity.

Their conclusion was that there is a viable opportunity for Guernsey to investigate going to market with and with a current preferred option of exporting to the UK that would contribute directly to the policy objective of maximising revenue from the seabed and will indirectly support the other policy objectives too, maximising direct revenue from the seabed, our principal objective, potentially enhancing Guernsey's energy security and independence and ensuring affordability of electricity for residents and businesses, making a disproportionate contribution towards our moral obligation to reduce global emissions.

The NPV, which has been mentioned throughout the policy letter, net present value, that uses many commercial, environmental and technical assumptions to come up with a baseline of potential current value paid up front of £300 million or revenues of £1.3 billion over the 35-year lifespan of the wind farm. I will reiterate at this point that this is based on the sample 150 km² site and obviously we have potential for much greater space than that.

However, this initiative goes beyond just the financial considerations. At its core, this proposal is about cultivating resilience, achieving sustainable progress, diversifying our economy and ensuring Guernsey's secure and prosperous future. It aligns directly with our clearly defined and agreed policy objectives as mentioned earlier. Our strategic approach to this transformative opportunity was structured into four clear phases, two of which have been already completed with meticulous care.

Phase 1 was essentially answering the question: is there a realistic opportunity for Guernsey to realize value from the seabed for a large-scale offshore wind development. That work covered early discussions with neighbouring governments and agencies, early discussions with potential developers, initial constraints mapping and analysis of data in Guernsey's water, alignment of the outcomes of the work to the States of Guernsey's policy objectives, technical reports on potential energy output, likely costs of development, and an assessment of the commercial viability of progressing development by identifying a sample site to estimate the net present value.

Phase 2 delved deeper. This work included identification of the key objectives for the States of Guernsey in developing the seabed leasing model, market research on past tenders in other jurisdictions to assess which leasing model elements suit Guernsey to meet our leasing objectives. a review of Guernsey, UK and French regulation to identify where updates would need to be made to our regulation, market analysis of structures involved in seabed leasing to create a high-level timeline, which you will see in appendix 4, and suggested immediate priority activities where the next phase of work begins.

Most importantly, estimating the potential value to Guernsey by calculating the estimated NPV. So to be clear, our leasing objectives: are limiting non-delivery of the offshore wind projects, unlocking the commercial value of the seabed, and minimising the cost and administrative burden for the States of Guernsey.

Very importantly, this work has been shared with our colleagues in Alderney, who also have an opportunity to develop a wind farm. We have committed to assisting them going forward and we hope that mutually beneficial co-operation can be established with Jersey, which is also pursuing a similar initiative. The policy letter before you clearly sets out the roadmap for phases 3 and 4, the critical next steps, and these phases will: identify specific viable sites through a comprehensive Marine Spatial Plan, secure clarity on market access routes and connectivity, establish robust and transparent consenting and licensing frameworks, develop detailed leasing and auction documentation, and conduct a competitive and transparent leasing process.

The P&R Committee has already demonstrated its commitment by allocating £1.3 million towards these next phases. However, the release of funds for phase 4 will be dependent on P&R's agreement and satisfaction with the progress and outcome of phase 3 to be detailed in a policy letter to this Assembly to consider before the end of 2026.

Furthermore, in section 5 of the policy letter, it shows how we intend to take forward the next stage of work. It is recommended that a light-touch Guernsey Development-style agency for the delivery be established to support and deliver the next phases of work in a more commercial style, arm's length from the States. A GDA-style delivery agency with appropriate political oversight that can build relationships with potential partners and move at pace. It will allow the necessary agility and commercial responsiveness. It assures that engagement with industry partners is efficient and effective, without compromising governance and still be accountable to the States.

Ma'am, this policy letter represents the culmination of the extensive, dedicated effort by many Deputies, officers and external consultants, and I would like to take the opportunity to mention them by name. Deputy Carl Meerveld, author of the scoping report, Deputy Lindsay de Sausmarez, representing the Committee *for the* Environment & Infrastructure, a key stakeholder in this initiative on multiple levels, but also as the Committee owning the Electricity Strategy, almost unanimously approved by this Assembly in 2023. Deputy John Dyke, a Member of the Development & Planning Committee, Deputy Nick Moakes, representing the Committee *for* Economic Development and STSB, I believe. And, most importantly, on the P&R side we have Deputy Lyndon Trott and Deputy Bob Murray representing the Committee *for* Policy & Resources.

The consultants employed are world leaders in this industry and have proved an invaluable resource in guiding the progress of this project. PA Consulting was retained with a primary focus on the commercial exploitation, Carbon Trust was retained with a primary focus on regulatory and approval processes and Ramboll, an engineering company developing wind farms, to evaluate the cost of building, maintaining and decommissioning in our varying depths of waters as a crucial part of the NPV calculation.

Also I would like to take this chance to thank the group that supported all the States' initiatives, the Civil Service officers who continue to make an invaluable contribution to progressing this initiative. So this policy letter represents a key milestone in this project. Our consultants and the working group at P&R have found that leasing our seabed for our wind farm has a very significant potential value. This policy letter allows this Assembly to review this potentially huge positive development, giving Guernsey the opportunity to unlock substantial economic, social and environmental benefits that will resonate positively for future generations.

Therefore, I ask you, Members, to support this transformative initiative and hoping that we can ensure Guernsey acts decisively today to wane for a resilient, prosperous and sustainable future for our Island and community.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Blin.

In my enthusiasm to move the debate on, we did not vote on the technical amendment. I am presuming that nobody wishes to debate the numbers on the particular forms in the Propositions? No. So can we just put that to the vote quickly, States' Greffier, and I apologise for that error on my part. Would you open the voting, please?

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 32, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 8, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	None	None	Bury, Tina	None
Blin, Chris			Helyar, Mark	
Brouard, Al			Inder, Neil	
Burford, Yvonne			Mahoney, David	
Cameron, Andy			Queripel, Lester	
de Lisle, David			Snowdon, Alexander	
de Sausmarez, Lindsay			Soulsby, Heidi	
Dudley-Owen, Andrea			Trott, Lyndon	
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				

Falla, Steve
Ferbrache, Peter
Gabriel, Adrian
Gollop, John
Haskins, Sam
Hill, Edward
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Le Tissier, Chris
Le Tocq, Jonathan
Leadbeater, Marc
Matthews, Aidan
McKenna, Liam
Meerveld, Carl
Moakes, Nick
Murray, Bob
Oliver, Victoria
Parkinson, Charles
Prow, Robert
Roffey, Peter
St Pier, Gavin
Taylor, Andrew
Vermeulen, Simon

3820 **The Deputy Bailiff:** There voted pour 32, there are 8 Members not in the Chamber at the time of the vote. I declare the amendment has been passed and I do apologise for not immediately putting that to the vote.

Returning to general debate following Deputy Blin's opening on behalf of P&R, Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you very much.

3825 I have just got one real comment to make. I am very pleased with the work that has been done by the team and I congratulate them getting this far. I very much hope it works. But as Deputy Tom Le Pelley, who used to sit in this House, said, 'Before you can have a chicken dinner you need to have a chicken.' I am just a little bit concerned that since we managed to get our territorial seas in 2019, five years on or six years on we still do not have ownership of the seabed.
3830 I know it is referenced in the report here on 6.7 and 6.8. My request to those involved in this is, for goodness sake, get the seabed into our controlled hands. I appreciate you could lease it from the Crown but I think that will only put another layer of bureaucracy if you want to move quickly. I think using Deputy Blin's words, which were 'Move at pace', you need to get the seabed first before you can start putting windmills on it and my encouragement to you and the team is to get on and get
3835 the seabed into the hands of Islanders.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Does anybody else wish to speak in general debate?

Deputy Ferbrache.

3840

Deputy Ferbrache: I was one of 60 sat in the same room with Deputy Blin and Deputy de Lisle at Frossard House and it was an encouraging meeting. Deputy de Lisle showed me, not long after, the considerable research he had already started upon. I forgot to give him a lift back to his home because he was carrying lots of files but I am sure the exercise did him good. But in relation to
3845 where we are, as somebody who has supported this project throughout unequivocally and unreservedly, and I still do, there are a couple of questions I would like Deputy Blin, or whoever is going to answer them, to answer them. I take Deputy Brouard's point about chickens that you cannot eat one until you have got one.

3850 But can I just ask – and it is a question and it is not going to alter my vote which is to support these Propositions – paragraph 2.14 is under the heading 'Potential Direct Value to Guernsey' and

it is something that Deputy Blin referred to in his opening and it quite rightly says at the subparagraph:

Exploitation of the seabed realistically requires Government partnership with an experienced developer.

3855 And then it goes on:

Reasonable base case assumptions suggest a developer would achieve significantly greater returns than required to justify its investment assuming an IRR of 7.5%. The NPV (using the assumption outlined in paragraph 3.5) ...

3860 I am not quite sure if that is the right paragraph because 3.5 talks about the end of phase 1, and the subcommittee agreed to prioritise three scenarios, but that may be that that is not the right paragraph. He can explain that anyway. It confused me a little but I am sure it is something that can be easily addressed:

... of this is estimated at £300 million – the excess value that a developer may be willing to share with the States of Guernsey for ownership of that project.

3865 My first question is in relation to that. That is the profit to the developer. The excess value. That is the developer's profit. That is how I would read it. How much of that, bearing in mind the discussions that have taken place, is it expected that the States of Guernsey would get? Is it 5%, 10%, 30%, 50% or whatever it may be? It is like having 300 chickens. If none of them lay any eggs, you cannot make an omelette, so we need to know what their position is in relation to that. And it goes on:

3870 The precise mechanism for sharing this would be subject to commercial negotiation.

And I fully accept that:

However, as a guide, a NPV of £300 million would equate to an upfront payment up to that amount (based on commercial negotiation) or alternatively up to £1,300 million over the active 35-year lifetime of the windfarm (if treated as annual payment based on real, undiscounted payments derived from windfarm net cashflows, and again dependent on commercial negotiations). While this is a reasonable base case, there is a significant potential range for this valuation due to the sensitivity of the assumptions, particularly price and investor expectations. The base case valuation is £300 million but the range between that and high cases is up to a positive £707 million.

3875 Does that mean that a £300 million figure could be £700 million and, if so, if we are going to get 10% of £300 million, that is £30 million and if we going to get 10% of £700 million, it is £70 million? When do we get it, over what period do we get it, and what percentage are we likely to get for the £1.3 billion? I appreciate it is just a 'How can you say?' in relation to this project.

3880 I am not asking Deputy Blin to nail his colours to the mast but I am asking him to let us know which direction the wind is blowing. Are we going to get 10% of that or 20% of that, all of it or 50% of that? Because I think that is what the public of Guernsey need to know, especially as we are just a couple of months away from an election and, no doubt, some people will be saying, 'Our problems will all be solved.' Deputy Blin is nodding. I am not saying he is saying it. I am just saying some. We may hear from others, I do not know, but our problems will be solved if we just wait for the wind farm to come on track because we will get tons and tons of money.

3885 We may well get tons and tons of money but I would like to know whether it is 1 t, 5 t or 1,000 t, but other than that, I commend all the people. I thought he was going to name the bus driver that took him in the coach and not do anything else in relation to these proposals and the people that bought them stamps so they could send it. It was interesting. I was just wondering where the list was going to end (*Laughter*).

3890 But in relation to all of that, this is a good project for Guernsey, at least potentially. We could spend up to £1.3 million excluding eternal legal expenses. Legal expenses is something that always

causes my face to light up (*Laughter*) in relation to them. Does that mean that we could have to pay a bit more for external legal expenses or are they paid by the external sources? But, again, I am grateful for the outline, I am grateful for the report and I wish it well.

The Deputy Bailiff: Just so there is not any confusion, Deputy Blin, who of course is not actually a member of P&R, will not be able to respond, but I think Deputy Meerveld will be capturing these points just before the final response by P&R.

Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Only briefly, I am going to commend everyone who has worked on this and Deputy Blin. I have to say it, Deputy Meerveld, a good idea is a good idea. It does not matter who comes up with it and of course Deputy de Lisle as well for starting it and Deputy Meerveld along with Deputy Moakes and members of E&I. So it is a great piece of work, so I commend it.

The only thing I would just ask them to consider – and this is probably more for sea fisheries and possibly external relations – is we do have an agreement with France and we have something like 64 votes, I think it is, who have access to our 6 to 12. As this goes through the motions and we do get to it at some point, however long, this is just really for *Hansard*, I would encourage him do not run too fast without negotiating with France on our 6 to 12 because they are free and unfettered. We are trawled up the west coast, we are posted up the west coast and past the south as well.

All I would do is ask, before you go too far, you are going to have to speak with our French, Normandy and Brittany [*Inaudible 4:47:16*]. It is not that strictly true but, in reality, I am just asking you for the record – maybe Deputy Meerveld is picking up the points – to just embed that somewhere just to keep them on board. So as soon as you know what the modelling looks like, you are going to have to keep on with that negotiation and work with them.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle:

Deputy de Lisle: Ma'am, I just wanted to say that this is a very positive beginning and I think we all here have to recognise that. It has come as a result of collaboration really of a number of Deputies, as was mentioned earlier, coming together and noting that we have fallen behind in terms of renewable energy generation. If we just look at the UK with already 40% of their energy coming from renewables, we have to really aspire to a major thrust in this particular area. What we did at that time was to look at not only just wind but solar and tidal renewable energy too and, in fact, reports were registered with P&R during this term on each of those sectors.

I think this is a further development within the whole area of wind and wind renewable energy and I think it is something that we have to see progressed, we have to all get behind as well of course solar development in the Island where we are really behind as well. It would be nice to have some encouragement really in solar for Islanders to really progress in that area too in waiting for in fact the wind renewables to start coming on board.

So we have an opportunity to get stuck in right away, and already some of the issues that were preventing us really progressing fast in solar have been looked at, considered and in fact some alleviated so that we can look more at solar development not only in terms of households but also in terms of office developments and commercial developments as well. I just hope that all Members will get behind this report, which is certainly a movement which has come out of early deliberations of the Deputies of the States this term.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, ma'am.

I am not sure that I will get behind the report. I think, in principle, I am extremely positive about any efforts that we make to diversify our energy efforts, but also our economic sectors. So I think,

3945 in principle, this is fantastic but I have a lot of questions here, and due credit to Deputy Blin who lined me up to get responses to these questions. But I am afraid the stars did not align in terms of workload and being able to get with some of those officers who might have been able to answer this.

3950 But suffice to say at the moment, unless I have some responses, then I do not think I am going to be able to, in good conscience, get behind some of these proposals just for good governance purposes. If I am not really understanding how we take these next steps and some of the detail, then I would not feel comfortable adding my vote to this.

3955 My first big question when I read this policy letter, which was of real interest – and it is quite simply put forward so it was quite easy to understand – was how can we be asking for money at this stage of the term when some of the Members in this Chamber, especially some of the Members behind this particular workstream, will be standing on a mandate to overturn the current GST proposals? I find that really difficult because, actually, it feels like this is not fully baked, this particular policy proposal, and so I would have liked to have seen it further developed before it came to the Assembly.

3960 But it feels to me that we are asking for more money here and also this should have been coupled with the policy letter that has been put forward by Environment & Infrastructure for the regulatory body. If you put the two together, that policy letter, which has not hit the Chamber yet, is asking for £700,000 for its first year set-up fees and this one is asking for £1.3 million, then that is a £2 million bill for the licensing body for E&I but also for these particular next steps to pay for that.

3965 Also there is the light touch GDA-style entity which is going to be set up which is referred to in paragraph 5.4. I was wondering who was going to co-ordinate that work and what actually does 'light touch' mean?

The Policy & Resources Committee recommends that establishing a 'light touch' Guernsey Development Agency-type entity is explored to support and deliver the next phases of work.

3970 Well, I just wondered where the guardrails were and what does oversight look like for a light touch version of the GDA, which is quite light touch already? So far as I am aware, there is no political membership of the GDA now, so I wondered who will be responsible for the budget oversight there. I will give way to Deputy Inder.

3975 **Deputy Inder:** Deputy Dudley-Owen has not been involved with the GDA. I think it is actually a very good example of where actually politicians get out of the way and good things happen. But there is a Political Oversight Group and it is populated by a member of Policy & Resources, a member of E&I and a member of Economic Development. So if it is exactly the same without explaining what the detail is, if it is going to be a facsimile of the GDA or similar without naming
3980 who has a title on it, if that is what 'good' looks like and the GDA is what good looks like – because there is no entirely political movement and they have freedom of thought and freedom to appoint their own people – it is actually a good thing.

3985 I do not know if that helps at all but just on the governance issue, the GDA had a Political Oversight Board, the President of Economic Development, a member of Policy & Resources and the President of E&I.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

3990 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you to Deputy Inder for his interjection. It is helpful in describing what the GDA looks like at the moment in terms of its structure and also that political oversight but this says, 'A light touch version', so it is not going to be a facsimile. The intention here is not to create a facsimile of the GDA, and so while it is helpful to know what the GDA does look like and the governance structure of that, in terms of this particular entity, I think that it would be helpful to hear from Deputy Meerveld when he responds.

3995 I noted that the fiduciary duty to administer the Crown's estate in the Vale of Guernsey is currently held by HMRG, a post fulfilled by our Procureur, but I therefore wondered what this would look like when it is transferred to the States of Guernsey and how do we ensure continuation of that fiduciary duty? Have the legal fees for that transfer been accounted for in that £1.3 million or are they in the estimate of £1 million that is on page 17? It is just not clear.

4000 Also when we are looking at the NPV, I was just wondering is that contingent on the export of the energy to the UK and what the market looks like in the UK? I think some of these questions will relate obviously to the E&I policy paper on the licensing entity as well.

One area that I was a little bit confused about was the appendices to the very short policy letter, which included an inception report, which was so operational. I just wondered why it had been included, but it did raise questions for me about the tender process and how this was awarded. Also I have been hearing for a couple of years now that a sum £600,000 was awarded to this subgroup and I have always wondered whether that is actually the case.

4005 Because I do not know what transparency there has been around that £600,000 and on what terms it was awarded and whether it was awarded on the basis of the scoping document done by Deputy Meerveld, which looks very good, but I wonder whether it ever made it to this Assembly because I do not recall seeing it other than on a press release. I wondered who the budget holder was for that particular subgroup and whether that budget was held within the subgroup or whether it actually had to go back up to P&R and those decisions had to be voted on within P&R. Also I wondered what the cost of this report was as well from the Carbon Trust.

4015 The other bit that struck me was that the scoping report that Deputy Trott was very complimentary about from Deputy Meerveld – and I was not sure whether it was actually Deputy Meerveld's report or Deputy de Lisle's report – was mentioned in the letter which was attached to the policy letter was not actually attached to the policy letter. I thought that it would have been a really good way to give Members that full transparency of the journey of this particular workstream. I think that it would have been very helpful.

4020 Ma'am, I think that that is the extent of my queries but, suffice to say, I do not feel comfortable voting for this, and I really do want to underline how keen I am for us to make these further explorations, but I feel that the work for my purposes is just quite not there yet and I would have liked to have seen a greater level of detail. I did not need to see that operational report whatsoever with names of officers in it, email chains, when an email needed to be sent and when a memo detailing when current and future considerations had been done, etc.

4025 I just thought that, for our level, we should be looking at the high-level strategy. We do not need to be down in the weeds. We are not civil servants here. We have excellent expert civil servants and we should not be doing that work or bringing it to the attention of the Assembly but, suffice to say, I wait to hear from the responses from colleagues.

4030 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

4035 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Thank you, madam.

I will be brief. I certainly want to support this initiative and I do believe we need to progress it. However, I am just going to raise some points of concern, or reality I guess, in terms of the speed at which I think things can progress. Notwithstanding the comments made by Deputy Inder before with regards to fisheries, I think that will certainly have to be addressed. There is no doubt about it.

4040 The French had significant problems initially with their existing project near St Brieuc, not far from us. They have got around that and there are some good things we can take away from that in terms of how we might engage with their fishermen that might be affected by any projects here. But the real nub I think is going to be how we can make any project cost-efficient in the long-term by engaging and being able to sell onwards to either the UK or to France. I point Members to paragraphs 1.5 to 1.8 particularly and 1.5 said, 'Notwithstanding the significant assumptions made' and those assumptions are particularly in terms of whether we will be given permission, in any case,

to have a contractual ability to link with the CfD-type projects in the UK or in France and the ability to get into the networks and that could take some time.

In fact, I think it will take some time, there is no doubt about it, particularly in today's climate with what is happening in the rest of the world. So let us be under no sense of thinking that this is some sort of panacea. It will be a project that will take time and we are going to be affected by decisions made outside of our jurisdiction and we are not going to have a lot of control over those things.

So it is just a reality check, madam, before Members think, 'This is great. We will soon be generating lots of electricity and bringing in the money.' I do not believe it will happen that way. I would like to be proven wrong, but I think even the concerns I had while this policy letter was being put together, have grown and not got easier.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you.

I am pleased to speak after Deputy Le Tocq as he always has lots of wisdom and a realistic view of what can happen and an unparalleled knowledge of France, although Deputy Blin is very knowledgeable about France too. I remember when I met him going to a conference in Caen. The thing is I am very supportive, but I actually like to get down into the weeds at times, and I do not want to be pushed out of the way, as Deputy Inder says, 'Get the politicians out of the way.'

But I can see the arguments for a professional commission because I do not think we Deputies could necessarily front that up and yet, on the other hand, we have had great enthusiasm from Deputy Trott and the others. I will come on to that. Deputy Trott entertains me here because he has been so supportive of the project. I remember years ago back in the board administration era when we were always being sold some crazy new green idea. I used to go to the Alternative Energy Society and there was a corps of them and he used to say, 'The problem with emerging technology is it is always emerging but never actually comes.' But that perhaps is changing now.

I take on board Deputy Le Tocq's point about the little fish, but I asked some questions of Deputy Inder and Deputy de Sausmarez in the last few months about the fishing industry because we all know that it is much smaller than it was. It was bigger when Deputy Trott was catching crabs and things perhaps, and it is financially struggling a little bit, and the reason I say that is I believe the States should subsidise and support our fishing sector.

I also believe in very strong conservation and the hull filled with lobsters and everything else but if we are realistic – and Deputy Meerveld will probably listen to this as everyone else might – the fishing industry on a very good day is 1% of our economy and probably a lot less than that, whereas this project is potentially worth millions. This is big. This would be an employer, it would be an enabler with France, it would strengthen our links and we might utilise the ports like, I do not know, Cherbourg.

There is so much potential here and so I will support it and I commend the enthusiasm of Deputies Meerveld, Dyke and Blin, who have led this project very well, and also Deputy de Lisle. I must not forget Deputy de Lisle because my only involvement in this really, apart from recently being on P&R, is I remember going to one or two of Deputy de Lisle's meetings in Frossard House when we had a larger Members' room at the time and being interested.

Yet, there were sceptics who came along and there were people who did not engage, but the reality is half a dozen Deputies, which narrowed down to three or four, worked together and, over time, they built bridges with Policy & Resources and maybe Deputy Ferbrache up to a point, Deputy de Sausmarez and others. But Deputy Ferbrache and others will always ask questions about financial delivery and, like Deputy Le Tocq, I do not see it as a panacea.

I think recently it has been good that the proponents of this have stressed that it is a long-term strategic resource. It may be here in 10 to 15 years but any belief that it will fundamentally change our financial or fiscal situation at the moment is not realistic. Indeed, the experts that we have had

will give vague figures and will say, 'Well, it may be three to 13 years depending on resources' and actually the more demand there is for this worldwide, the longer the waiting list is, I believe, for recruitment and so on.

It gets very complicated in terms of investments. It is MBA level finance and all the rest of it. I started a course and never finished it. This contract for differences intrigues me; a financial agreement where investors exchange the difference in values of an asset between when the contract opens and closes. CfD is embedded in the government of Sir Keir Starmer and the Labour Party, especially the former leader the Rt. Hon. Ed Miliband, but the problem there is he will not give up on it, although we have seen only this week Sir Keir changing his views about long-term climate objections.

He actually agrees with Deputy Murray in that respect. Deputy Murray was probably ahead of the game in suspecting that there would be realism that some of the environmental goals of a few years ago cannot be reached. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) But while the CfD regime is there and the Rt. Hon. Ed Miliband, we have a chance of benefiting in that but politicians change, policies change and governments change and I entirely endorse this project. I am different from Deputy Dudley-Owen in that I am a bit of a gambler.

I am prepared to take a risk on this because this is what it comes down to. We will utilise taxpayers' money and the resources of lawyers, officers and other parties to support something that may never happen or take a long time to happen. I also would like to speak out that I believe we should be working with potentially France and the UK because there may be changes coming to the grant but, clearly, they are the big landmass next to us that have the ports and the facilities.

I think too that we should work with Alderney, and Alderney perhaps could be in this, or they could be involved with tidal power. But I see no reason why they cannot run their own show but be integrated with the work that we can do. I also think it is slightly strange that we are not dealing with a renewable energy commission at the same time, but that is a detail because I support that as well. I come back to the little fish. The problem with the fish is the industry is limited so I suspect, if there are problems with that sector, we actually may have to support industry, but not – I will give way.

Deputy Inder: Deputy, I think the points that myself and Deputy Le Tocq have majored on, it is less about what our industry are doing, it is the relationship that we have got with France. Even though we have entirely a diminished fleet compared to the Brittany and the Normandy fleet, we still have an agreement with them. That is all this was about; it was not about counting fish, octopus, or the state of the industry. It was about the relationship and agreements we have post-Brexit to get us where we are today. That is all we were commenting on.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I think one issue is the potential impact it would have on the fishing industry commercially. We can support that through subsidies or other ways. If the issue is – as I think it is – also about our fishing rights and the complicated matrix of negotiations and arrangements with France, and potentially Jersey as well, then that will have to be looked at, and actually adds weight to my argument that we cannot just look to the UK in this. We have to really have this tacit support of the French commercial sector and the regional sectors of Brittany and Normandy, who are very friendly with us, and the Government of France.

In a way I think this is a very broad prospect but we should take the risk and get on with it because if we took the view this is too early and we should put it back, not only might we miss opportunities, but most significantly we would lose three or four months, or maybe a year, in the political interregnum and the inevitable disruption it brings to the political machine. So I really do hope this is approved today and the Offshore Commission as soon as possible too.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy Haskins.

Deputy Haskins: Thank you.

4155 I genuinely was not going to speak at all on this but I do want to raise just one point and that is based on these assumptions. It is bullet point 3 in the assumptions. Some Members know I do have an engineering background so this stuff does not confuse me, it actually quite excites me strangely, but it does.

4160 The assumption here is that the wind farm foundations are, by the time we get here, going to – the fixed foundations will be possible at the depths that we need. That is the assumption. Because the problem is that floating platforms have higher set up costs, upfront costs, and higher maintenance costs. That is the issue. In here the assumption is by the time we get there it is going to be okay because fixed foundations will be available.

4165 I assume the reason for this is because year on year, generally speaking, the depths of the fixed foundations have been increasing, which is good. That is great. We get more advanced, the human race is doing more and more wind farms, they are getting better and better and you increase efficiencies, and that is also in the fixed foundations. But here is my problem: such a huge assumption like that can make or break the viability of a project. Like other Members, I would like to just put a bit of realism on that.

4170 But the other problem with the fact that fixed foundations may well become deeper in the future, is that it opens up areas all over the world for those installations, which then means there is a much larger supply of locations to put wind farms, which then means there is less of a demand, so the amount of reward for giving those sites becomes a lot lower. It is just a bit of realism here. Really this comes down to a risk reward scenario.

4175 Members, that is the only point I will make. It is a big assumption and can make or break. Just before I sit down I will give way to Deputy Blin.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Blin.

4180 **Deputy Blin:** I thank Deputy Haskins. I did check how this could work and my only possibility to speak now is if a Deputy gives way so I am just going to take advantage to actually try to make a comment because actually what you have said is a very good point, and I heard my colleague saying a similar thing.

4185 So just to clarify, yes, it is correct. There are a lot of assumptions made through the consultants, and that is the way to do it. The reason we introduced the NPV was to start getting some statistics around it. We did mention in the introduction that there has been a sample area done of circa 150 km², so it is not X location, we cannot go and look where it is. It is actually based on two factors: on the different depths as well – so the samples were to ensure we had both depths – and, as is stated, that there are also changes in technology, not only in the depths of the fixed ones but also in the turbine sizes. When Saint-Brieuc was completed they were running around 7 MW and now we are 4190 well over double that, so that means double power, less pylons and turbines.

The other comment you were mentioning about, if that technology is improving at that exponential or fast rate then surely there will be other areas. But France, for example, has its target market of the gigawatts required and, like the UK, they are between the 40 GW and 50 GW, so we would fit inside. It is also a strategy of what requirements there are around our coastal waters.

4195 I do thank Deputy Haskins for giving way, thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.
Deputy Haskins.

4200 **Deputy Haskins:** I am grateful for Deputy Blin for that information.

The point that I would make is again it is still an assumption. There is technology within the turbines to have both a tidal turbine at the bottom and then a wind turbine on top. Fantastic. Will

it work? I do not know. It will not work at the moment because it is not there and readily commercially available, but it could be in the future. But the problem is, you have spent all that money putting in a fixed installation based on this; you are not going to realise those benefits and get to the point where you have made the money back to then invest.

Again, I just make these points for Members so that we go into this with our eyes open. I will support it and I hope that it can come to fruition.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy Helyar.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, ma'am.

I was a member of the Shadow Renewable Energy Commission in the two-year period prior to the last election, so it is quite a long time ago now; nearly seven years ago. That Commission met I think once in 18 months. To describe it as moribund and lacklustre would be a massive understatement. Since we are going through this kind of Tyrolean, Bavarian exercise of slapping ourselves on the back and thighs and everything at the moment, I thought I would stand up and do a bit of that as well because it was quite clear that after Deputy Meerveld had spent a huge amount of time on Google researching wind power and came up with an excellent report about it, that there was a groundswell among Members of the Assembly that wanted to see some actual progress in this area; not supervised, as it was before, by the Committee that is responsible for it but actually a bit of citizen science. Let us get on with this and make some progress.

So as a member of the Committee which created the subcommittee, of which Deputy Blin is now the Chairperson, I am very pleased to support this, although the spending appears to be within P&R's discretionary limit anyway. So, strictly speaking, the policy letter was not necessary but while we are all doing some celebratory back-clapping I thought I would join in.

Thank you very much.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Madam, first of all I wanted to wish Deputy Blin a happy birthday so it is an opportune day when he has been presenting this big policy letter, coinciding with his birthday.

Clearly there has been a lot of work, and this is indeed a good example of Deputies and others in the community trying to drive something through the Machinery of Government and us debating this in one of our last States' meetings. Clearly this is going to get very strong support and I absolutely endorse it. This policy letter, along with a lot of the work that has been done over the years, and the thinking, is finally indicating the economic opportunity that making use of our seabed has in relation to renewable energy generation.

I think it is not just the opportunity with the export of the energy, I think this is a real opportunity for the Bailiwick's economy in relation also to potentially having some of the wind turbines serving our domestic energy supply; using the proceeds generated to fund our own energy policy and energy transition; the jobs and employment that could be created off the back of servicing the wind farm; the potential of research and development; creating a university, something that Deputy Parkinson is very keen on. Also we talked about working with Alderney. If we are going to have a connection to the UK it is going to be passing via Alderney; can we connect and have a mini wind farm in Alderney so we create a Bailiwick-wide renewable energy project?

I really hope that it is very clear to the Assembly that this is a long-term infrastructure project with still many hurdles, many unknowns, a lot of innovation to still potentially come through, as Deputy Haskins said. This is not by all means settled technology; it is absolutely still a work in progress. So in order for us to maximise the opportunity and take a really pragmatic approach we

have got to take a long-term view in order for us to be able to maximise this opportunity; not only from a financial point of view but really from a sustainability point of view.

With the economic models being presented, the revenue generation models that have been presented to us, I think it would be a very bad position if we were forced effectively, having no other choice but to accept the revenue model where we are taking an upfront payment. Because the only way we would be forced to do that, I would say, if as an Assembly and as a community we continue to fail to stabilise our fiscal position as an Island. That will be the time when we will be forced to take potentially drastic decisions undermining the real value of the natural assets we have got, such as the seabed, in order to maximise that value for the community.

So I do want to point out that for us to ensure that this project is successful – and I do want to note, and I think this speaks to some of the points Deputy Dudley-Owen made, the majority of the political Members on the subgroup did not vote for tax proposals and other Members who are not on the current political group. I think if they are really passionate about taking this project forward they really need to demonstrate a strong commitment to stabilising our fiscal situation as soon as possible and make sure that we have got clear revenue streams coming that are able to fund this kind of workstream. We have already spent I think about £400,000. This policy letter is suggesting that the further work is going to cost £1.3 million. These costs can escalate and if we are taking a longer term approach the Government is likely to need to fund some of that work.

So the Assembly and the political Members and others who are passionate about seeing the realisation of this opportunity really need to ensure that the economic and fiscal stability for this Island is very clear. I have no doubt that this is exactly the kind of things investors and developers who might be listening to this today will also be seeking from a fiscally responsible, sustainable jurisdiction to commit to investing in Guernsey in the Bailiwick.

So, absolutely supportive of taking this forward but I really urge the Assembly to ensure we take a long term vision and we are fiscally responsible in how we are taking this forward.

Thank you.

**Procedural –
Motion to continue sitting –
Motion carried**

The Deputy Bailiff: Before we go any further in the debate, it is 5.25 p.m. and I want to test the willingness of the Assembly and how late they are prepared to work this evening. I get the sense there are not many more speeches in relation to general debate but Deputy Meerveld will be speaking and then Deputy Trott, although I understand that will not be for terribly long. Let us assume that takes us to about 5.40 p.m., we need to do the schedule for business, we have three amendments on that.

To start with, is the Chamber in agreement that rather than stopping now that we finish this debate and then do the schedule for business, and then once we have considered that, whether we are prepared to go any further. Is there support in the Chamber that we finish the Offshore Wind Opportunity debate and vote and then go onto the schedule for future business? If you support that motion please say pour. Those against. I am afraid it is going to have to be a recorded vote. So this is on the basis that we finish this debate and we do the schedule for business before we finish this evening. We have to do the schedule for business anyway, so take that into account.

The motion is on the screens now, again, rather pithily phrased, but in essence it means that we finish the debate and vote on the Offshore Wind Opportunity and then we do the schedule for business after that. That of course has three amendments. If you would not mind opening the voting please, States' Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

4300

Carried – Pour 22, Contre 17, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	Dudley-Owen, Andrea	None	Bury, Tina	None
Blin, Chris	Dyke, John			
Brouard, Al	Ferbrache, Peter			
Burford, Yvonne	Haskins, Sam			
Cameron, Andy	Helyar, Mark			
de Lisle, David	Inder, Neil			
de Sausmarez, Lindsay	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha			
Fairclough, Simon	Le Tissier, Chris			
Falla, Steve	Leadbeater, Marc			
Gabriel, Adrian	Mahoney, David			
Gollop, John	Murray, Bob			
Hill, Edward	Prow, Robert			
Le Tocq, Jonathan	Queripel, Lester			
Matthews, Aidan	St Pier, Gavin			
McKenna, Liam	Taylor, Andrew			
Meerveld, Carl	Trott, Lyndon			
Moakes, Nick	Vermeulen, Simon			
Oliver, Victoria				
Parkinson, Charles				
Roffey, Peter				
Snowdon, Alexander				
Soulsby, Heidi				

4305

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to the motion to continue to sit there voted pour 22, contre 17, and 1 Member was not in the Chamber at the time of the vote. Is there any appetite to continue, for example, to also debate the Social Security amendments. Is anybody going to support that motion if I put it? I am going to formally put it then.

Those who support the motion that we should continue until we finish the Employment & Social Security Propositions, they are at 12 and 13, those who support? Those against?

4310

Members voted Contre.

**Offshore Wind Opportunity for Guernsey -
Update and Next Steps –
Debate continued –
Propositions as amended carried**

4315

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, the contre win. So we will finish off the debate on Offshore Wind Opportunity and then we will move to the schedule of business. Who else wishes to speak in debate?
Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy Queripel: 26(1), Ma'am, please?

4320

The Deputy Bailiff: I am terribly sorry, Deputy Queripel –

Deputy Queripel: 26(1) please.

4325

The Deputy Queripel: Deputy Queripel, I am afraid I had already called Deputy de Sausmarez, I am terribly sorry.

Deputy de Sausmarez: If it is any consolation to Deputy Queripel, I do not intend to speak for long and I do not get the sense that there is a large queue of people hoping to contribute to this debate. Famous last words, perhaps.

4330 I just want to pick up on a couple of points that have arisen during debate. Really my role on the subcommittee has been, as Deputy Blin outlined, to really represent the areas of the mandate for the Environment & Infrastructure, which are several, not least energy policy and the Electricity Strategy, but also other related areas such as marine environment, climate change, and spatial planning. The Marine Spatial Plan is an important element, as the policy letter makes clear.

4335 Some of the things that I will touch upon, just very briefly, are some of that bigger picture stuff. Deputy de Lisle stated that we have fallen behind in renewable energy compared with the UK. Well, we are not in terms of electricity consumption more generally because of course the UK would be biting our arm off to be in the position that we are in. They have got very much more of the energy transition to go through themselves, compared with where we are because of course well over 90% of our electricity does come already from renewable or low carbon sources.

4340 When talking about locally-generated renewable energy, perhaps he has more of a point, but obviously that is something the Electricity Strategy is looking to address. There is some encouraging progress on those fronts. Indeed, as we went through this process in the subcommittee, one of the things that we did continually check or have been checking is to what degree we might be able to fill some of the objectives of the Electricity Strategy. So I think it is probably fair to point out that
4345 obviously the option that is being promoted through the policy letter, which is looking like the most viable at this point as an export model, so it does not necessarily directly contribute to the local domestic consumption but it does, nonetheless, have various other benefits and could actually in fact help to fulfil other aspects of the Electricity Strategy objectives at the same time.

I would take the opportunity to correct Deputy Dudley-Owen. We are not asking for £700-and-whatever for the OREC. It is actually a £346,000 in grant and potentially £121,000 in officer support
4350 as well. I can understand how she got to that inflated figure because we were maybe a little bit too overzealous in itemising what had already been agreed, but some of those very much overlapped.

Also another quick point of correction, Deputy Helyar was not actually a member of the Shadow Renewable Energy Commission. I know this because I was a member of that group with him and it
4355 was the Guernsey Renewable Energy Team, which is quite a different thing. I was a member of that team for an awful lot longer than Deputy Helyar was; I think he maybe was there for a couple of meetings or something, but actually the work that team did very substantially contributed to the report that Deputy Meerveld put together, which has helped bring us to this point. So I think it was a very unfair description; there was a lot of good work that went on in that team, a lot of the research
4360 and a lot of the progress has got us to where we are today.

Deputy de Lisle: A point of correction.

The Deputy Bailiff: What is your point of correction, Deputy de Lisle?
4365

Deputy de Lisle: The point of correction is that while 90% of our electricity is imported from France, the fact is that the renewable element of that is only one third. The rest is nuclear produced. I do not think we should lie to the public from that point of view.

4370 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy de Lisle, that is not parliamentary language to effectively accuse another Member of lying. I would like you to withdraw that please.

Deputy de Lisle: I beg your pardon?

4375 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I would like you to withdraw the fact you used the word 'lie' in relation to what Deputy de Sausmarez said.

Deputy de Lisle: Well, the point –

4380 **The Deputy Bailiff:** No, Deputy de Lisle, it is a firm –

Deputy de Lisle: The point was inaccurate, ma'am.

4385 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy de Lisle, if it is inaccurate that is one thing. You did not use that word; you used the word 'lie' and I will not have that language used when I am presiding over this Chamber.

Deputy de Lisle: I would like to use the word 'inaccurate' now.

4390 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.
Deputy de Sausmarez, please carry on.

4395 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** I can confirm that Deputy de Lisle's account, as I and members of the SGSB and members of Guernsey Electricity have been trying to explain for many years, is in fact the inaccurate account and what I said was indeed accurate.

Just very quickly on that bigger picture, Deputy Le Tocq talked about what is happening in the rest of the world and actually he is right that there are some changes going on, but I think that we are more likely than not to be beneficiaries of those changes. The UK's motivation in terms of its transition towards a greater proportion of renewable electricity is largely motivated by the economics of that and also the geopolitical situation, because obviously they do not want to be dependent on other jurisdictions for fossil fuel sourced electricity. The majority of their market is dominated by gas at the moment, and that does have its own geopolitical risks. Also there are potentially some benefits that the rest of the world may be able to put to good use if the US is less enthusiastic about pursuing offshore wind because it may well free up some of the supply chains to our favour.

4400 So really I just wanted to draw on a couple of those points that have come up during debate. I know Deputy Meerveld is going to cover off some of the other things. But I would just like to say it was disappointing that I and other members of the Committee *for the* Environment & Infrastructure were not involved from the outset, but I am very glad to say that we have been very fully involved since then. I do think that this has been a very thorough bit of work. I can give my assurance to people that we have looked at more than the economics. We do not go into a huge amount of detail but I can reassure Members that actually the work itself has been very detailed and very thorough, and we have given consideration to a very broad scope of things in that work. I think this is a very good proposal and I hope it does get very strong support from the Assembly.

4415 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

4420 **Deputy Soulsby:** Thank you, ma'am.

I would like to add to the communal back slapping. I think a lot of hard work has gone into this and certainly over the last year. I say that as someone who has not been directly involved in the whole work that has been going on. Of course we saw the original draft of the policy letter where I thought it was really useful, someone who was not an expert in this area asking the questions that I thought most people would ask, because it is very technical. I did not know what contracts for difference were until the policy letter, which did not actually state what it was, just that it was a very important thing. I think it makes it clear in the policy letter, so I do thank all those who have done that work.

I am responding to something Deputy Dudley-Owen said in her questions. It is a shame she is not in the room now, but I thought it was worth just commenting, she said she did not know where the money had come from and who approved it. But of course, as it says, a page was set up giving various details to help people understand that the policy letter on gov.gg/offshorewind talks about the offshore wind project was added in April 2024 as a new project in the major projects portfolio. Since then of course that gave P&R the opportunity and the authority to provide funding for the project. It provided funding of £600,000 to appoint technical and commercial consultants to help us make what we call an informed decision on whether to proceed, and another £145,000 to accelerate the development and agreement of a Marine Spatial Plan, which is absolutely needed to understand the options for exploiting the seabed.

A break clause was included in the consultancy contract to ensure the work would stop if early research indicated there was not a viable opportunity to explore. Clearly that was not the case and we are where we are today. Of course further progress will be dependent on the approval of this policy letter, and I do hope that Members all support it.

The Deputy Bailiff: Does anybody else wish to speak in general debate? In that case I will ask Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, ma'am.

So I will try and assist by addressing the debate so far. Deputy Brouard started off by mentioning the ownership of the seabed, and it was touched upon by Deputy Dudley-Owen as well. Yes, we have an extant resolution of the States to have the seabed transferred to our name, and His Majesty's Receiver General is quite happy to take a direction on that. But one of things we were considering in our group is commercially what impact that would have, and this is touched on in the policy letter.

If you are asking international finance companies to invest literally billions into Guernsey and that is tied to the lease of a seabed, then if I were in their shoes I would be looking at, 'Okay, what is the risk? Who are we leasing the seabed from?' If it is leasing the seabed from the Crown with 100% of the revenue HMRG and back to the States of Guernsey, we would perceive that as being no greater risk than leasing a piece of seabed anywhere in the UK, but as soon as you transfer that lease to us then they will say, 'Okay, if this jurisdiction decides to breach conditions of that lease or change the terms and we wish to sue them for the money we have lost investing in our project, what balance sheet do they have to repay us the billions?'

Basically it is one of the questions we will be asking very early in phase 3 is asking developers and the markets whether or not they would perceive it to be higher risk and, therefore, higher cost of financing which impacts the NPV if the seabed is owned by Guernsey. Then making a decision whether to expedite that or whether they would be more comfortable if the ownership was sitting with the Crown and, therefore, obviously more willing to bid and bid a higher price without any potential higher interest rate costs.

A Member: A point of order, Ma'am?

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy, what is your point of order?

A Member: I was just wondering if Deputy Meerveld is summing up on behalf of P&R because he is not actually on P&R, or if he is actually speaking in general debate.

The Deputy Bailiff: He is speaking in general debate because Deputy Trott is actually replying on behalf of P&R.

A Member: Okay, perfect, thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: But he has also only got 15 minutes, or rather 12 minutes and 56 seconds to do it.

A Member: Indeed.

4485

Deputy Meerveld: I had better hurry.

Okay, so basically with the seabed it is a question we need to ask as part of phase 3, and if we are going to do it we need to expedite it because you would not want to go to market for a lease when you are in the process of transferring an asset.

4490

Deputy Ferbrache asked of the £300 million or £1.3 billion that you might get over a 35-year period, how much of that would be potentially payable to Guernsey. Well, the answer is 100% is where the negotiations start because the NPV calculation includes – depending on whether it is a base case, the optimist or pessimistic valuation – a return to the developer of 7.5% to 8% before the NPV is calculated. So that is the excess value over the developer making a return on their investment.

4495

Also the way that the developments work is they do something called a ‘farm down’. When a developer builds a wind farm – it just happened in Dogger Bank last year – they will get to the stage where it starts producing electricity, or very close to producing electricity, where it has been effectively completely derisked and then they will sell down part of that wind farm at a lower yield because now it is a low-risk project. Their return actually jumps up significantly, 2% or 3% to the yield on the investment they still retain.

4500

So there are mechanisms in there where they can make a profit. They will want probably some of that to give them additional profit, but I would hope to start negotiating at 100%. That is what we hope to get. Compared to what the Crown Estate has got in 2022 where they were getting a £246 million a year option fee on a single wind farm of the sample size that we are looking at, per year, in advance of development, just to have the option to develop. Our estimates are actually, I believe, reasonable considering it is a new environment with higher interest rates under the Ukraine war supply chain issues. But I think they are perfectly achievable.

4505

Deputy Inder mentioned about the fishing industry. Absolutely; the Marine Spatial Plan will have to address both our domestic fishing industry and the French fishing industry as part of that process of identifying where we should or can develop a wind farm.

4510

Deputy de Lisle, I think his question about renewable energy has been addressed by Deputy de Sausmarez, but I would thank him for having come up with the original concept that started this whole process.

4515

Deputy Dudley-Owen unfortunately is no longer here but she referred to the cost to develop this further and how we are spending this £1.3 million. If she was in the room I would be reminding her of our first days together on the Education, Sport & Culture Committee in 2016 when we spent £2.6 million drawing up plans to develop La Mare de Carteret School, which we then decided not to redevelop. This States are constantly spending money: planning an incinerator; there was £11 million in commercial penalties for cancelling contracts on that, and about £20 million in total in that development process.

4520

We often start initiatives that we do not complete that cost millions. But that is very different to what we are asking for today. What we are asking for is not an investment in drawing up plans of something that may never be built; it is putting an investment into something that potentially could produce a tremendous return for Guernsey. It is an investment in exploring making money for a change, rather than alternative ways to spend it.

4525

Deputy Dudley-Owen mentioned a light touch GDA. I think it should have been more ‘a light touch entity, like the GDA’. We are envisaging something – or what we have discussed so far, which has not been finalised, is exactly like the GDA, with political oversight from Economic Development, Environment & Infrastructure, and P&R, and it would be structured with probably non-executive directors (NED), as well as people with business backgrounds, some retained, some not, and it would

4530

look at taking this forward in a more commercial way because that helps expedite the process and hopefully make us more money in the long term.

Remember, every day that we are not leasing that seabed is like owning an apartment and having it sit vacant. When you eventually rent it out you do not get the back rent for the time it was vacant.

I think the subgroup financing has been handled by Deputy Soulsby. The original scoping report – and Deputy Helyar touched on this with a rather derogatory comment about Google research – I think he forgets that I was the Managing Director, CEO, of investment research companies for the entire area of Asia and North America.

The first conversation I actually had before starting the report was with His Majesty's Receiver General to make sure there was ability to uprate the seabed. The next conversation I had was with Equinor to know whether it was possible to put wind farms, floating at that time, in our waters. I then spoke to Crown Estates, and then went out and built on the work that Deputy de Sausmarez mentioned about the Renewable Energy Commission, etc., that had already been done. But let me reassure him and everyone else that it was done very professionally and not a single word of the scoping report has ever been corrected or refuted by either our consultants or any of the developers we have since engaged.

Going on to Deputy Le Tocq. How can we do this cost efficiently? Can we connect to CfDs lending power? All these things are questions that have to be answered, but there are very good reasons why the UK would want to connect power to the south coast where they need it, where they would want help achieving their net zero goals and renewable energy objectives, and they make money out of issuing CfDs. They make very significant money out of providing CfDs. So again, they are likely to profit from that.

Deputy Gollop and to some extent Deputy Matthews. Ramboll actually build wind farms and they are currently building wind farms in deeper water, fixed bottom wind farms in deeper water than us. I also spoke to an engineer at Kent Engineering, one of the biggest specialist engineers in this area, and they are physically planning installations now in 85 m; our deepest section of water we are looking at is 75 m. So, yes, it can be done.

But earlier in the process we spoke to Equinor and said, 'Okay, if it is floating would it be commercially viable?' They said yes, even though it is two and a half times more expensive in capital our wind is sufficient, our resource is sufficient, it would still be profitable to build a wind farm in Guernsey even if it was floating.

As far as Alderney, they absolutely should be included. We have had a long conversation today about what it costs us to help sustain Alderney. If they do a wind farm it is a way of Alderney hopefully in the future becoming self-sufficient. France, why would they want to work with us? If the wind farm goes ahead it is likely to be billions of pounds of investment in French ports to build these; Cherbourg or Brest are the two most likely ports that these wind farms would be assembled in.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller; the fiscal situation and everything else. Throughout the tax debate there were many demands to come up with suggestions to make money, ways that we could actually produce money. This is it. This is not the time to talk about taxes or fiscal debate. This is an opportunity that potentially produces very significant amounts of revenue for Guernsey, that will require very little, other than a little bit of seed capital to carry on exploring it, very little investment from Guernsey, and will potentially diversify our economy, generate revenue, and – as Deputy Kazantseva-Miller mentioned – there are a lot of additional tangential benefits that come into this as well.

I have had a note put on my screen. If we do not spend this money we can guarantee we will not be able to realise this opportunity. That is what it comes down to. This is a relatively small amount of money in the grand scheme of things, we are not simply just spending it as an individual but, as far as the budget of the States is concerned and the money we spend things on, it is a relatively small amount of capital to continue a project which I hope – and again, going back to Deputy Le Tocq on timing, in the commercial world I would have been able to do everything we have done in two and a half years since the publication of the scoping report to date in six months.

If we set up an entity that could help accelerate this I would hope we would be going to market in 2026, not 2027.

There is an opportunity to go out there and there is revenue paid at the signing of contracts and ways to arrange staged payments throughout that enable Guernsey to take in some revenue before the wind farm actually ever produces any electricity. So I implore Members through you, madam, to support this policy letter, give us the opportunity to go out and explore what is an exciting and positive opportunity for Guernsey, and one that I think the general public of Guernsey would also keenly like to see explored and hopefully brought to fruition.

Thank you, ma'am.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy Trott to reply on behalf of P&R.

Deputy Trott: Madam, I think there is almost nothing to say (*Laughter*) and frankly, that will do nicely.

The Deputy Bailiff: Members, you have on your screens the two Propositions in relation to the Offshore Wind Opportunity. I am going to ask the States' Greffier to open the voting now please.

A Member: Madam, there appears to be a word missing in the paragraph point 2, it says,:

To establish an arm's length with appropriate political governance.

Body or commission or something?

The Deputy Bailiff: It will not invalidate the vote. Please do read in the proper Proposition, which unfortunately I cannot read to you right away. Is the word 'body'? (*Interjection*) You can feel confident in voting for this that you are voting for the Propositions that are set out properly in the Billet. And the word is 'entity' that is missed out. It is correct in the policy letter.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 33, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 6, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	None	Mahoney, David	Bury, Tina	None
Blin, Chris			Dudley-Owen, Andrea	
Brouard, Al			Helyar, Mark	
Burford, Yvonne			Leadbeater, Marc	
Cameron, Andy			Murray, Bob	
de Lisle, David			Taylor, Andrew	
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Haskins, Sam				
Hill, Edward				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Le Tocq, Jonathan				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				

Moakes, Nick
Oliver, Victoria
Parkinson, Charles
Prow, Robert
Queripel, Lester
Roffey, Peter
Snowdon, Alexander
Soulsby, Heidi
St Pier, Gavin
Trott, Lyndon
Vermeulen, Simon

The Deputy Bailiff: There voted in relation to the Proposition 33 pour, there was 1 abstention and 6 Members were not in the Chamber at the time of the voting. I, therefore, declare the Propositions have been passed. That is a very nice way to celebrate your birthday, Deputy Blin.

Let's move on now to the schedule of business. Deputy Trott?

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

17. Schedule for future States' business – Proposition as amended carried

Article 17.

The States are asked to decide:–

Whether, after consideration of the attached Schedule for Future States' Business, which sets out items for consideration at the Ordinary States Meeting on 30th April 2025, they are of the opinion to approve the Schedule.

Deputy Trott: With regards to the Schedule for Future States business, I so move.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Amendment 1, Deputy Roffey, would you like the States' Greffier to read out your amendment?

Amendment 1.

To insert an additional proposition as follows:

"2. To agree that, notwithstanding the provisions of Rule 6(3) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees, the meeting of the States of Deliberation scheduled to begin on 30th April should instead commence on the 29th April 2025."

Deputy Roffey: No, I think I can explain it quicker than having it read out.

It is that at the end of the month, instead of coming back on Wednesday, 30th April, we come back on Tuesday, 29th April, in order to have a four-day session rather than a three-day session. We have, as people have said, done really quite well but we still have five policy letters from this meeting that we have not finished plus, as always and natural, quite a heavy agenda of policy letters from the last meeting.

This is work that this Assembly has generated and I believe that this Assembly ought to deal with it for a couple of reasons. Firstly, simply because actually the Presidents and member of the Committees that have submitted these policy letters are across those briefs. They are able to present them knowledgeably, having done all the work. If it is left to a new bunch, which may be entirely different Committees, they will not have that advantage. I suspect in many cases they will have to withdraw the work, reconsider it over the months ahead, then possibly bring it back. It is just creating extra work and extra bureaucracy.

4645 Secondly, frankly, I think they are going to come in with their own policy agenda and want to crack on with it, and why should they be having to deal with our second-hand policy letters that we have left as a legacy for them? I know so far this Assembly has shown no appetite whatsoever to add even a single day's extra sitting when usually quite a few extra days are ended at the end of any political term. I do not think I can really say any more. People will know whether or not they are willing to work the extra day but I hope we will. It is not that much to ask; it is once every four years, 4650 or in this case once every four and a half years, one extra day sitting please to try and get on top of the work.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel, do you formally second that amendment?

4655 **Deputy Gabriel:** With pleasure, ma'am, and 26(1).

The Deputy Bailiff: A request to guillotine any debate on the amendment. Does anybody wish to debate this amendment? Do you wish to place it to the vote? We will try *aux voix*. Those who wish to guillotine debate on the amendment, please say *pour*? Those against?

4660 *Members voted Pour.*

The Deputy Bailiff: Although the contre sounded very loudly they did not have the volume I am afraid and the pour has won, so we will guillotine debate upon that.

4665 Deputy Trott, anything to reply?

Deputy Trott: I want to keep this going, madam. No.

The Deputy Bailiff: Then Deputy Roffey, do you have anything? No, nothing to add?

4670 **Deputy Roffey:** No, and I would quite like to know what Deputy Trott thought of the amendment but as he will not tell us I have got nothing to respond to.

The Deputy Bailiff: Too late. Members you have on your screens the proposal that we add an extra day, 29th April, on to the beginning of the next session. States' Greffier, would you open the voting please?

There was a recorded vote.

4680 *Carried – Pour 22, Contre 11, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 6, Absent 0*

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	de Lisle, David	Le Tocq, Jonathan	Bury, Tina	None
Blin, Chris	Ferbrache, Peter		Dudley-Owen, Andrea	
Brouard, Al	Haskins, Sam		Helyar, Mark	
Burford, Yvonne	Inder, Neil		Leadbeater, Marc	
Cameron, Andy	Le Tissier, Chris		Murray, Bob	
de Sausmarez, Lindsay	Mahoney, David		Taylor, Andrew	
Dyke, John	Moakes, Nick			
Fairclough, Simon	Queripel, Lester			
Falla, Steve	Soulsby, Heidi			
Gabriel, Adrian	St Pier, Gavin			
Gollop, John	Vermeulen, Simon			
Hill, Edward				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Oliver, Victoria				

Parkinson, Charles
Prow, Robert
Roffey, Peter
Snowdon, Alexander
Trott, Lyndon

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to the amendment there voted pour 22 (**Several Members:** Yay!), contre 11, there was 2 abstention and 6 Members were not in the Chamber at the time of the voting.
4685 Do you wish to lay amendment 2?

[Amendment 2.](#)

To insert an additional proposition as follows:

"2. To agree that, notwithstanding the provisions of Rule 6(3) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees, the meeting of the States of Deliberation scheduled to begin on 30th April should adjourn until Tuesday 6th May if it falls to be adjourned on Friday 2nd May."

Deputy Roffey: Yes, I am going to keep pushing it, Madam Deputy Bailiff.

I really hope that a four-day session at the end of April, beginning of May, will be sufficient to clear the decks but for all of the reasons that I stated earlier, I think it is important that we clear the decks, so in the distant possibility that we have not finished by the end of Friday, 2nd May, I do not think Members will be willing to come back at the weekend, I do not think they would be willing to come back on a Bank Holiday Monday, but this amendment suggests that in those unlikely circumstances that we will come back then on the Tuesday, which I think is 6th May, in order to complete the work of this Assembly.
4690
4695

The Deputy Bailiff: Do you formally second that amendment, Deputy Gabriel?

Deputy Gabriel: I do, Ma'am, and I would like to speak now –
4700

A Member: 26(1).

Deputy Gabriel: – if that is possible, before I get to 26(1)?

The Deputy Bailiff: No, I am afraid it got in, just in time.
4705

Deputy Gabriel: As I was speaking 26(1)?

The Deputy Bailiff: Those who wish to debate this amendment please stand in their places. Do you want me to put it to the vote, Deputy Inder? We will try *aux voix*. Those who support the motion to guillotine debate on this amendment, please say pour. Those against, say contre.
4710

Members voted Pour.

The Deputy Bailiff: The pours have it. We are guillotining the debate.
4715 Deputy Trott, on behalf of P&R?

Deputy Trott: Yes, I do have to make some comments on this one, madam, and that is that the Assembly needs to understand that a majority of members of P&R and at least two Presidents, one of which is still in the Assembly, the other is not, I think, will not be here in Guernsey. We will be attending at a function, an important function for Liberation Day, within the Speaker's quarters. So bear in mind that there will be many absentees should you approve this additional day.
4720

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey, do you have anything to say in response?

4725

Deputy Roffey: We will get through our work a bit quicker then. *(Laughter)*

4730

The Deputy Bailiff: Members, you should have on your screens the next amendment. This is Amendment 2 suggesting that in addition to the day beginning the session at the end of April you also add on 6th May. Please open the voting now, States' Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 10, Contre 21, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 7, Absent 0

4735

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Brouard, Al	Aldwell, Sue	de Sausmarez, Lindsay	Bury, Tina	None
Burford, Yvonne	Blin, Chris	Le Tocq, Jonathan	Cameron, Andy	
Fairclough, Simon	de Lisle, David		Dudley-Owen, Andrea	
Gabriel, Adrian	Dyke, John		Helyar, Mark	
Gollop, John	Falla, Steve		Leadbeater, Marc	
Haskins, Sam	Ferbrache, Peter		Murray, Bob	
Hill, Edward	Inder, Neil		Taylor, Andrew	
McKenna, Liam	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha			
Roffey, Peter	Le Tissier, Chris			
Snowdon, Alexander	Mahoney, David			
	Matthews, Aidan			
	Meerveld, Carl			
	Moakes, Nick			
	Oliver, Victoria			
	Parkinson, Charles			
	Prow, Robert			
	Queripel, Lester			
	Soulsby, Heidi			
	St Pier, Gavin			
	Trott, Lyndon			
	Vermeulen, Simon			

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to this amendment there voted pour 10, contre 21, and there were 2 abstentions, 7 Members were not in the Chamber at the time of voting. I, therefore, declare that the amendment has not passed.

4740

Are you going to put amendment 3? I am not sure you can –

Deputy Roffey: No, it falls to the ground because it talks about if we have not finished on the 6th, and we will not be sitting on the 6th.

4745

The Deputy Bailiff: So there we are. Well, Members, we come to the close then. Do you have anything to add in relation to the schedule, and taking into account those amendments? I am assuming nobody wishes to speak in general debate on the schedule? No, have you anything to add then?

4750

Deputy Trott: Only to say, madam, it has been yet another outstanding performance from the Chair, thank you ever so much indeed for being so excellent in discharging your duties, thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you. Therefore, we will formally put the schedule of business to the vote. States' Greffier, if you could put it on the SEV. Would you open the voting now please.

4755

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 22, Contre 11, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 6, Absent 0

4760

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	Haskins, Sam	None	Aldwell, Sue	None
Brouard, Al	Mahoney, David		Bury, Tina	
Burford, Yvonne	Queripel, Lester		Cameron, Andy	
de Lisle, David			Dudley-Owen, Andrea	
de Sausmarez, Lindsay			Helyar, Mark	
Dyke, John			Leadbeater, Marc	
Fairclough, Simon			Murray, Bob	
Falla, Steve			Taylor, Andrew	
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Hill, Edward				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Le Tocq, Jonathan				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Oliver, Victoria				
Parkinson, Charles				
Prow, Robert				
Roffey, Peter				
Snowdon, Alexander				
Soulsby, Heidi				
St Pier, Gavin				
Trott, Lyndon				
Vermeulen, Simon				

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to the Schedule of Business there voted pour 29, contre 3, and 8 Members were not in the Chamber at the time of the voting. So there we are, we bring this session to the close.

4765

All things being equal, this will be my last time I preside over this particular Chamber as the Bailiff will be doing (**Several Member:** Oh!) –thank you very much.

For those who are not standing, it has been a pleasure working with you. For those who are standing, good luck. Will you close the Assembly?

The Assembly adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

4770