

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

TUESDAY, 8th JULY 2008

PUBLIC BUSINESS – resumption	2
1. Energy from Waste Facility: establishment and acceptance of tender (P.72/2008).....	2
1.1 Deputy G.W.J. de Faye of St. Helier (The Minister for Transport and Technical Services):.....	2
1.1.1 Connétable A.S. Crowcroft of St. Helier:.....	9
1.1.2 Senator F.E. Cohen:.....	14
1.1.3 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:.....	14
1.1.4 Deputy J.B. Fox of St. Helier:.....	26
1.1.5 Deputy J.A. Martin:.....	28
1.1.6 Deputy C.J. Scott Warren of St. Saviour:.....	30
1.1.7 Connétable S.A. Yates of St. Martin:.....	31
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED.....	33
The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):.....	33
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT.....	33
1.1.8 Deputy S.C. Ferguson of St. Brelade:.....	33
1.1.9 Deputy C.H. Egré:.....	35
1.1.10 Deputy A.E. Pryke of Trinity:.....	36
1.1.11 Deputy R.C. Duhamel of St. Saviour:.....	36
1.1.12 Deputy J.J. Huet of St. Helier:.....	55
1.1.13 Deputy S. Power of St. Brelade:.....	58
1.1.14 Deputy A.D. Lewis of St. John:.....	60
1.1.15 Senator F.H. Walker:.....	62
ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED.....	66
ADJOURNMENT.....	66

The Roll was called and the Dean led the Assembly in Prayer.

PUBLIC BUSINESS – resumption

1. Energy from Waste Facility: establishment and acceptance of tender (P.72/2008)

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

We come now to the continuation of Public Business. As agreed, the first item to be taken today is the Energy from Waste Facility: establishment and acceptance of tender and I ask the Deputy Greffier to read the proposition.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

The States are asked to decide whether they are of opinion to refer to their Act dated 13th July 2005 in which they approved a new solid waste strategy and charged the then Environmental Public Services Committee to investigate fully alternative and conventional technologies to provide the final disposal route for the residual waste remaining following the implementation of the systems and facilities and to their Act dated 28th June 2006 in which they agreed that any such technologies for the final disposal route for the residual waste should be located at La Collette II reclamation site and (a) to approve the preferred solution for the replacement of the Bellozanne incinerator of an Energy from Waste facility as set out in sections 8 and 10.1 of the report of the Transport and Technical Services Department dated 20th May 2008, (b) to authorise the Minister for Transport and Technical Services to accept the tender of the preferred bidder subject to the approval of the transfer from the consolidated fund of the necessary capital expenditure.

1.1 Deputy G.W.J. de Faye of St. Helier (The Minister for Transport and Technical Services):

It is hard to over-emphasise the dire position that Jersey's key strategic waste disposal facility is now in. The Bellozanne incinerator is effectively crippled and will never operate at full capacity again. This is hardly surprising as the plant is well past its original design life and should have been replaced on an operational basis several years ago. Very regrettably, successive States Assemblies and those subsidiary bodies that are more directly responsible have contrived, by failing to make the appropriate decisions over the last decade, to place the Island's ability to properly dispose of its own rubbish in serious jeopardy. This year, following serious structural failures in the main steel joists that support the bunker crane at the incinerator, the Bellozanne chimney that stands immediately alongside the plant suffered some level of movement that broke a gas-tight seal formed between an internal flue and one of a series of internal reinforced concrete support platforms near the top of the chimney stack. This allowed the exhaust gases to mingle with moisture that gathers at the very top level of the chimney, effectively creating a sulphuric acid generator that was producing a highly corrosive substance 24 hours per day. That acid progressively ate away at the steel reinforced concrete floor, which supports 3 internal brick flues of some 40 tonnes in weight. By the time this was all discovered and mitigating action was taken, the steeplejacks considered the position to be so fragile that they have not placed any additional weight on the corroded support platform, which now has an induced curvature resulting from its structural weakness reacting to the weight above it. For Members who may not yet appreciate the gravity of the position, I should emphasise that continued acid attack would have caused that concrete platform to fail. Rendering the chimney safe by securing the damaged platform with steel cables bolted to the outside of the chimney will cost around £0.75 million. The operational capacity of the chimney has been severely curtailed as the internal vibrations caused by the speed and volume of the exiting emissions must now be reduced. This has particularly affected the newest of the 3 incinerator streams, which can no longer operate at full capacity, and that is why I am now describing the plant to Members as being permanently crippled. I do not intend to labour this aspect of the debate any further. Previously, various individuals had argued that the appropriate course of action was to seek to prolong the life of the Bellozanne incinerator as opposed to replacing it. It must surely be obvious to all Members that this concept is now utterly

unrealistic, not to say potentially hazardous. Indeed it has been ruled out by the consultants advising the Environment Scrutiny Panel. Although the question of just how long the operational capacity of the plant can be prolonged remains, as without it Jersey faces a crisis. This is a serious matter as the Island has no significant alternative disposal route for our waste. Increasingly frequent boiler breakdowns at Bellozanne have necessitated the stockpiling of baled waste at La Collette. Transport and Technical Services has been obliged to purchase a new baling machine to cope. The situation with the chimney has made matters worse and T.T.S. (Transport and Technical Services) is already looking at additional sites for stockpiling waste as well as investigating the opportunities for shipping waste off Island. The early signs are not promising and it will probably be helpful to Members to take an opportunity to address the general shipping issues at this point. In respect of shipping general waste to the United Kingdom mainland, a regulatory officer from the Environment Agency has already delivered this view and I quote: "The U.K. (United Kingdom) Plan on Shipments of Waste 2007 prohibits imports of waste for disposal except from those countries where bilateral agreements or a duly reasoned request has been agreed beforehand. Approval for import in these circumstances is based on the determination that the exporting country does not have, nor can be reasonably expected to acquire the technical capacity or the necessary facilities to dispose of its waste in an environmentally sound manner. Because Jersey has the technical capacity and necessary facilities for dealing with municipal and/or domestic waste, a request to include this type of waste in a duly reasoned request is unlikely to be approved." I think that Members can understand the general thrust of that response is pretty clear. However, it should be said it is a different matter for recyclable materials being delivered to recycling plants in the United Kingdom and Europe, except that the cost of shipping in containers is not nearly as cheap as the Environment Scrutiny Panel might have you believe. Nevertheless, the panel seems to have moved on from earlier advice being passed to T.T.S., which was that local shippers were prepared to carry container-loads of local materials free, as otherwise those containers were travelling empty. The department has in fact consistently followed up these claims but so far has never been able to strike the same deals that appear to come so easily to Environment Scrutiny. The latest shipping costs on offer now presented to States Members as well in the reissue of R.69, *Waste Management: Alternative Suggestions of the Environment Scrutiny Panel* is now between £25 and £35 per tonne. While we agree with these prices for shipping container costs, that pricing does overlook the extra costs associated with some of the special packaging required for various recyclables, such as waste electricals, as well as the haulage costs at either end; all of which effectively triple the quoted container fee. This, of course, is the experience of living on an Island which already informs us that it is cheaper and wiser to avoid the costs of shipping wherever possible. Having the benefit of hindsight is a wonderful thing and, therefore, it is rather easy to criticise the Public Services Committee that met on 16th October 2000 under the presidency of the then Deputy Simon Crowcroft. However, it was a fateful meeting as the committee considered a report from consultants Carl Brow that, among other things, recommended the commissioning of an E.f.W. (Energy from Waste) incinerator for the cost of £60 million. Doubtless with good environmental intentions, the committee rejected officer advice and called for further work to be carried out to research, and I quote: "alternative methods of treating and disposing of non-inert waste." Nearly 8 years later one has to wonder just how much hindsight needs to be acquired before a conclusive decision can be reached on commissioning a new incinerator. However, in the intervening period a number of things have been learnt. Firstly, Jersey's experience has shown that bolting on additional incinerators to existing streams is very expensive and creates all sorts of compatibility and maintenance issues. This was dealt with in considerable detail in 2001, in a report by consultants Babtie Fichtner who investigated then the possibility of refurbishing the Bellozanne incinerator. Thus, even assuming that the Bellozanne plant was not crippled, virtually all parties now accept that bolting on yet more bits and pieces is not a viable proposition, either for the existing incinerator or for future incinerators. Rather surprisingly, the emissions still pouring daily from the Bellozanne chimney had not surfaced as a significant political issue around that time. Instead, political representatives found themselves deluged with all sorts of alternative waste

disposal technologies. The most well remembered will be the high pressure steam autoclave that formed part of a mixed technology disposal route proposed by Recycled Refuse International. So, faced with a confusing array of alternative options, in August 2003 the Environment and Public Services Committee of the day decided to initiate a tender process and advertised throughout Europe to determine the best waste solution for the Island. This debate today represents the culmination of that tendering process. As will be clear, the whole process that was triggered by the desire to research alternative methods of waste disposal has gone on for far too long. Matters were not helped when the States decided to instigate yet another investigation of alternative technologies after an amendment was added to the 2005 Solid Waste Strategy. Transport and Technical Services Department, and previously Environment and Public Services, have now analysed over 70 different waste treatment variants. Certain protocols have been applied. One that should be familiar to Members is that no technology will be considered unless it is represented by at least 2 plants that have successfully operated on an industrial basis for at least 2 years. Now, that particular protocol eliminated a significant number of new technologies and, interestingly, was recently supported, virtually word for word, by Juniper, the consultants commissioned by the Environment Scrutiny Panel. Other important considerations were efficiency in respect of electricity generation, the commercial viability of by-products and final disposal routes for any waste residues. Numerous consultants and experts weighed up the alternatives, and here I would like to pay tribute to the work carried out over several years by the Waste Strategy Steering Group which included not only States Members but also officers, experts in their own fields, from a number of our different departments. With that valuable assistance and advice, the steering group helped the Transport and Technical Services Department to whittle down the options that emerged from the original tender process. Regrettably, even at the final stages and for a variety of reasons, some promising tenderers withdrew, mainly for more certain offers of business elsewhere. However, in the end, the final preferred choices remained as incinerators that produce electricity. Regrettably, in the intervening years between 2000 and 2008, a number of predictions and concerns have come true. As a primarily based European product, incinerators are priced in euros. They had also been a rather unfashionable technology but, due to the emergence of a European landfill directive that threatened heavy fines for land filling, municipal authorities around Europe swiftly turned to incineration as the most effective alternative solution to dealing with increasing quantities of waste. Thus, over a very short period, the incinerator construction business turned from a buyer's to a seller's market and to compound the effect of rising prices, Sterling slumped against the euro. To make matters even worse, the global price of steel also surged. All of which makes the £60 million deal rejected in 2000 look like something of a bargain. Sadly, that is all now consigned to history and the individuals involved will question their own consciences or not. What I do want to say to the Assembly is that we still have a bargain that can be realised. The tender process was a keen one and we have a competitive price to strike. That deal is currently frozen, irrespective of the continuing fluctuations of currency and commodity prices, but only for a matter of weeks. I will understand the concerns of both Members and the public over spending over £100 million. Even so, Members must remember that £106 million will buy a 2-stream Energy from Waste incinerator with reliable modern flue gas treatment that will have a design life of some 25 years and will produce 25 years' worth of electricity from a 10 megawatt turbine amounting to around 6 per cent of the Island's power demand. The new turbine, incidentally, will produce about 3 times as much power as the existing generator at Bellozanne. Now, I would not expect Members to rely on information that is merely corroborated by Transport and Technical Services Department and its consultants. Consequently, Members have been provided with a review of the cost comparisons in appendix 2 of projet 72 by Deloitte & Touche LLP. It includes net present values that some Members have asked for and continues to demonstrate that in financial terms the proposal of the preferred option being put forward to the States is the cheapest in respect of annual cost of all the variant technology options that have been considered. The tender bid consortium is led by C.N.I.M., a major international company with its origins in France; the letters formerly representing Construction Navales et Industrielles de la Méditerranée. C.N.I.M. are leaders in their field and are

supported by Spie Batignoles and the Jersey construction company Camerons. If we wanted a top specification incinerator, which I strongly suggest that we do, C.N.I.M. can provide it. So I do urge Members not to let another opportunity slip away. The approved location for the new E.f.W. plant is at La Collette to take advantage of the infrastructure existing at the J.E.C. (Jersey Electricity Company) power station. In particular, the existing chimney will be utilised and that location has already received outline planning permission in principle and the location does not form part of this debate under P.72. Nevertheless, I want to say that I have considerable sympathy with the concerns of residents living nearby and obviously with their political representatives and that is why the Transport and Technical Services Department has been consulting with Hopkins Architects to ensure that the building design is of a high quality. However, I do not accept the argument that a new incinerator building will somehow compromise a so-called gateway to St. Helier. In my experience most ferry passengers arriving in Jersey, assuming that they have not already made their way to the car deck for disembarkation, are taking in the historic proportions of Elizabeth Castle and not the industrial view on the starboard side which already contains the fuel farm and a very substantially-sized power station and chimney. While on the subject of the fuel farm, I should again emphasise that following the Buncefield incident, full risk assessment has been carried out in respect of the proximity of the proposed incinerator and the new hazard zones. It has emerged that, due to the low levels of personnel using and accessing the building, E.f.W. is an acceptable development and, indeed, it is one of the few types of development that could be located in that particular area. Returning to that location, I would suggest an opportune solution that could be considered in the short to medium term, which would be to increase the height of the mound or hill to the eastern side of the La Collette II reclamation site. Many Members will already know that a slight curvature in the existing reclamation site rock wall limits the height of the existing mound. A marginal extension to the reclamation site could replace the currently forming 2 low mounds to one much longer mound that would be very significantly higher with the potential to screen the greater part of the industrial zone to the west. Such an extension to the east has tremendous potential for increased public amenity as well as the more obvious aesthetic effect of screening and, if Members felt it appropriate, I would be happy to pursue those matters further.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire of St. Helier:

Could the Minister tell us how high the proposed mound would be, please?

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

I am not in a position to give accurate details at this stage. It would depend on the rock wall below it. I would now like to pursue one of the aspects of waste disposal that has been a major problem to grapple with for most Members, and that is recycling and recycling targets. First of all, it is important to appreciate that there is very little agreement between countries as to what constitutes recycling. For example, using incinerator bottom ash might not be considered as recycling or it might acquire a low grade recycling status; while using bottom ash as an aggregate material to make concrete blocks for building might be regarded as a high grade level of recycling. Therefore, it is difficult to make direct comparisons between different places. Similarly, most publicly declared recycling targets are aspirational but not necessarily realistic. I take a local example, which I am sure Members will be familiar with and, as we will have heard, certainly on the news today and in your editions of the *Town Crier* that have been dispensed to Members this morning, the zero waste project that is still continuing at Havre des Pas has to be complimented and it certainly kicked off with a good name in public relations terms. But, regrettably, it did fall rather short of recycling 100 per cent of local rubbish. As an experiment in kerbside collections, the trial was indeed welcomed by Transport and Technical Services and the Parish of St. Helier have, up to now, claimed a 50 per cent recycling rate. In reality, the department believes this was, in fact, a capture rate, and a reasonably impressive one, which showed what could be done; but it was one that effectively fell within realistic expectations. Jersey has been slow to take up recycling, despite having got off to a very responsible start with glass collections. However, things have taken a

dramatic turn in recent years and targets are close to being achieved and, as a result, have been moved higher from 32 per cent to 36 per cent. Unfortunately, due to a buoyant economy and booming consumer demands, the total tonnage of waste has also increased over the same period, growing by 9 per cent since 2005. This means that steadily increasing recycling has not reduced the amount of material that ends up in the incinerator and it is these dynamics that form part of the calculations undertaken to work out the capacity that a new incinerator will need. Some other factors involved are the number of households in the Island, as distinct from the numbers of people, as well as the expected growth rate of the economy. However, although the detailed modelling of Jersey's likely waste stream over the next 2 decades is fairly complicated, the general background principles are rather basic. Primarily, the more recycling you do the more expensive it becomes. So, while recycling is environmentally responsible, not to say desirable, there is a balance that needs to be struck. By contrast, incineration is a relatively cheap way of disposing of refuse. It is a flexible and robust operation. Where the prevailing evidence indicates steadily increasing volumes of waste, despite recycling initiatives, it makes more sense to build a plant with spare capacity rather than one where the capacity may be exceeded. There have been suggestions that an oversized plant which normally operates 24 hours a day will face fundamental operational difficulties if recycling is very successful and there is not enough rubbish to burn. That is simply not true. The proposed 2-stream plant will often operate at just one stream at a time, which would offer just over 50,000 tonnes per year capacity at 100 per cent efficiency. However, the stream can be de-rated to as low as 36,000 tonnes throughput; thus the new plant can operate through a range of capacity loadings from 36,000 up to 105,000 tonnes per year. During this time the other stream can be either maintained or left on standby. In the extremely unlikely event that rubbish volumes drop even further, the incinerator can be simply shut down until waste levels in the storage feed bunker build up to operational levels. Start ups and shut downs are relatively simple procedures that involve raising the furnace and boilers to operating temperatures of around 800 degrees centigrade or allowing temperatures to cool down. As it is important to allow for the gentle expansion and contraction of incinerator components, those procedures are conducted over several hours. Consequently, start ups and shut downs are not conducted on a daily basis as that would increase wear on the plant. The existing incinerator is currently handling around 70,000 tonnes of waste per year. Given that the economy is expanding, that projections indicate that the number of households will increase and that total volumes of waste continue to rise, it is extremely unlikely that there will ever be less than 36,000 tonnes of rubbish per year to burn. The real worry is whether 105,000 tonne maximum capacity is enough. The latest calculations indicate that it will be enough as long as the Island continues to push ahead with recycling in a fairly vigorous way. Again, to contradict those who claim that a new incinerator will curtail recycling, it is the opposite which is true. This is because existing recycling figures have been built into the capacity equation. The balanced approach set out in the 2005 Solid Waste Strategy, combining recycling and an Energy from Waste incinerator, can now be effectively set in stone or, more accurately, in the fabric of a new incinerator plant. This will represent a cultural step change for the whole Island and will necessitate the roll out of kerbside collections for recyclable material such as paper, cans and plastic bottles in every Parish. I very much welcome the moves I have seen today, announced by the Constable of St. Helier, that he is forthwith to tackle the recycle issue related to plastic bottles. Those moves will be supported by more "bring bank" opportunities for a wider selection of recyclable materials and, in time, a permanent re-use and recycling centre as well as an enclosed green waste composting operation. This task though will not be easy. The Parish Connétables are already coming to realise the cost implications of increased kerbside collections and even "bring banks" have posed problems. On the positive side, the issue seems to be one of public demand. But following an enthusiastic start, the Connétable of Grouville had to take stock of matters when one of his "bring bank" operations was overwhelmed by responsible recyclers, regrettably from other Parishes. So Members must understand that more recycling will require more money and that is not something likely to emerge from a new tax in the near future. But, if we commit that extra money to recycling, can we get by with a smaller incinerator? Let me be clear, there are few, if

any, who believe that we can get by without an incinerator facility of some sort. The short-term answer is no because the pressures that increase the amounts of rubbish being generated in Jersey are continuing. The States is about to debate rezoning more land for housing, so the number of local households that contribute to generating waste continues to rise. Immigration policies are still the subject of debate but I suggest that there is very little chance that a net nil migration position can be achieved. The economy is booming and consumerism within the Island does not seem likely to reverse its trend. As I have indicated before, the early stages of recycling are the most easily achievable and Members, I am sure, will be aware how in the last few years the recycling rates delivered by Transport and Technical Services have shot up from 20 per cent to nearly 30 per cent, but I can advise Members that now the going gets tough. Let us take a family, a family that goes through so many cans of food and drink per week. If all these are being recycled, then there is nowhere else to go to raise the recycling rate for metal cans in that household. That small example underlines why progressively higher recycling rates become more and more difficult to achieve. But what else could be recycled? Food waste is being touted as the big alternative via anaerobic digestion. This is a system that has some merit. Among other things it usefully generates methane gas as an energy source. But is it right for Jersey? The major downside in the process is that it produces thousands of tonnes of compost that then has to find a further disposal route and let us not forget that once one instigates a process, it effectively becomes a permanent process. Therefore, we will be having to find a disposal route for an additional, say, tens of thousands of tonnes of composted food waste on an ongoing and permanent basis. The department is already having a level of difficulty finding places to dispose of sewage sludge. We are obliged to pay farmers modest amounts for accepting on their fields both sewage and, let us not forget, the high quality green waste compost that is also produced by Transport and Technical Services. But the farmers, and dairy farmers in particular, have their own issues with composting, and dairy farmers regularly have to divest themselves of quantities of slurry produced by their herds. It is being suggested that there is some enormous land bank that we can easily contribute to. The fact is that land bank is under pressure already. Where else can we go: the dunes, Jersey heath lands? It is impossible to start diverting compost to these areas without seriously changing the bio-habitats simply by the addition of new materials. So we have a difficult problem with disposal. Of course, there are very large areas of agricultural fields where one might expect that composting might be welcome. Indeed it is, as long as it is the right sort of composting. But, and I need to emphasise this, very large landowners in this Island who are in the agricultural business are subject to supermarket protocols that govern precisely what they may put on their fields. I have no doubt that my claims will be questioned later on in this debate and I want to say very early on that I agree with the Environment Scrutiny Panel's position, that food waste composting does take place. It can be undertaken safely under regulations issued under the United Kingdom Government by Defra (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs), so I do not deny that food waste composting is a reality. Nevertheless, as I have said in the past to members of the Scrutiny Panel, DEFRA does not buy Jersey Royal potatoes and when you start looking at issues that apply to products being sold to U.K. customers we find ourselves in the realm of supermarket protocols. So may I just read to Members a little bit of correspondence that has been acquired from a technical agronomy manager, and later I will also refer to information received from our main growers: "Jersey is a pretty unique place. I know of no other location that produces a legally protected named crop of such sought after potential. I know also of no other location that plants potatoes year after year in the same place and rests the land by summer pasture. So Jersey is a bit of a special case." I should emphasise that, because it is the annual cropping that is the key feature in respect of supermarket protocols. Many supermarket protocols will allow 5-year rotations but Jersey, because of the annual crop rotation, falls into a special category. So I hope that if, at later stages in the debate, claims are made, we can be quite clear that the claims are made on an appropriate basis. I continue with the quote: "Things can go wrong here and perhaps other places can be more forgiving. In the 1950s and 60s when copper-based blight sprays were widely used in Jersey, it was your fields that had above national average of copper content and if chemistry had

not moved on, I would suggest that today you would not have an industry due to the high levels of metal in the ground. By introducing kitchen or house waste, you are running the risk of contaminants or objects that cannot be composted finding their way into the land. I am sure that you will use the best state-of-the-art kit but our concern as a retailer for Jersey is that in one field on one occasion something goes wrong and adverse headline or experience occurs. The States need to ask themselves whether the gain outweighs the risk. Are you solving one problem to create another?" The last sentence concludes: "Waitrose has good relations with the Island's growers but food scares, however small, are not grower specific and create havoc for all the Island growers. So I would ask again, do you need to take the risk?" To date the message from the States has been quite clear. This issue was debated in the 2005 Solid Waste Strategy and the States concluded it was sensible not to take the risk. However, the States did not then rule out, and I certainly do not now rule out, that circumstances may change and food waste may be a matter we will come to again some time in the future. I say to States Members that now is not the time to make that change and now is not the time to take the risk. Whatever the supermarkets may or may not say and however the protocols may or may not change, the message has come, also delivered in an e-mail to Transport and Technical Services Department dated 4th July; a message that is loud and clear: "The one thing to throw into the debate is that we, Jersey Royal, cannot be forced to take any compost and from our work with our customers, we will definitely not be taking any compost other than the green waste that Transport and Technical Services currently produce." But let us assume that we do recycle more. What is the effect on reducing tonnages? Unfortunately this all boils down to some issues that I have already covered, namely capture rates and what you might call recovery rates. It is a feature of general experience that for every 100 tonnes of waste that is attempted to be recycled, in reality the capture rate is about 70 per cent. The highest known of at the moment is 80 per cent and that would be very, very difficult to attain in the short term. The problem then is that, despite the fact that everybody tries hard to recycle properly, it is inevitable that there will be some contamination. It is a fact of the matter that, like it or not, some people prefer not to separate out the eaten chicken but we will just wrap it up again in the cellophane it came in. It is a fact that paper just might get a bit of the chip fat on it. Contamination is a feature of our household waste, so you are always not really going to get all the products that you want and inevitably products are going to be contaminated. Therefore, achieving those figures, achieving useful tonnages of recycling, is very difficult to do. It also needs to be borne in mind that household waste is only one aspect of the whole waste picture. Therefore, when you boil it all down, we might save a few tonnes but what is the impact on the incinerator and the incinerator capacity? Well, if you go back to food waste, unfortunately food does not burn very well. So we might make substantial inroads into food waste tonnages but it does not make a lot of difference down at the incinerator because the incinerator runs on thermal capacity. So we have looked at some of the alternatives and it is possible that the capacity of the plant could be reduced from 105,000 tonnes to perhaps 96 or 97,000 tonnes. Will that make a big difference to the price of the plant? No, it will not. Is it really worth making those extra expenditures and all that effort to save that level of capacity? I do not believe it is when the financial gains simply do not stack up. As is fairly typical of any major States debate, some issues have popped up at the last minute and I wish to address, first of all, the suggestion that there is some major health issue at stake. Some rather misleading statements have been made about the cancer risks for people caught in the downwind plume of the new incinerator chimney at La Collette. May I say, first of all, the primary issue we are dealing with here is the major and known contamination being caused by the Bellozanne chimney exhaust emissions right now. That is what I wish to stop and that is what I believe most Members here wish to see an end of. That chimney does not have flue gas cleaning equipment. The new one will and I believe most Members will have seen the charts produced of the plume fallout and how the levels that are completely off the scale for Bellozanne - which incidentally has detectable levels of contamination across the entire Island - are reduced to the absolute lowest level that is on the scale. We are talking hundreds and hundreds of times in terms of improvement in the emissions. There is nothing to worry about from a state-of-the-art, modern incinerator in respect of its exhaust emissions. But I

do not wish to stand here as the expert on that subject and I am sure that the Minister for Health, if there are any issues to be pursued on that side of matters, will be the person to listen to. It has also been suggested that somehow we are about to build a plant that will be out of date before we build it and this derives from a proposed E.U. (European Union) directive on waste. Well, 2 obvious things to say, first of all. It is still a proposal in terms of being a directive and, no, we are not in the E.U. anyway; but that is not to say that the standards may not be something that we would wish to aspire to. The draft directive defines criteria for when an Energy from Waste plant is classified as a recovery plant rather than a disposal plant and it will not mean that any Energy from Waste plant which does not achieve the criteria will have to be shut down in 2020. Indeed it would be entirely disastrous for the whole of Europe if that was the case as there are currently dozens and dozens of new incinerator plants being built: “To be classified as a recovery plant, an Energy from Waste plant must achieve an energy efficiency of 60 per cent if it is permitted before 1st January 2009 or 65 per cent after this date.” Clearly if the States approved the preferred option being put forward by the Council of Ministers, it would be before 1st January 2009 and in actual fact the new incinerator, on an energy efficiency rating, comes in ahead of 60 per cent; albeit by a margin, but it comes at about 61.3 per cent. Continuing: “The proposed plant will have an electrical efficiency [this is the E.U. proposal] of 24 per cent which is directly equivalent to an energy efficiency of 63 per cent.” Now, it is important to make sure that we are comparing the right issues. If Jersey wishes to fully comply with the E.U. directive, if and when it comes into force, it is easy and possible to provide a small amount of heat to local developers by a community heat process and that would take energy efficiency well above 65 per cent. I suggest to Members that this is something we can keep our eye on. It is soluble and we can maintain those standards. I would be delighted to be standing here explaining the details of a suite of cutting edge alternative technologies that would save the Island millions of pounds in the costs of waste disposal but this debate is not about how clever or not I am and, unfortunately, the 8-year search for alternatives to incineration has proved fruitless despite extended research and analysis. This debate is about doing the right thing for Jersey, so I would appeal to Members to put personalities to one side. Members may not appreciate my determined style of presentation but I hope none doubt that I believe passionately in working in the public interest and if I thought that a better solution to the Island’s waste problems existed, it would be before the Assembly today. The preferred solution being put forward by Transport and Technical Services and supported by the Council of Ministers is the cheapest, most robust and flexible option for dealing with our rubbish. It will operate alongside enhanced recycling programmes that will extend Island-wide; recycling across a wider range of items than are currently recovered. A new incinerator will offer assurance for the next 25 years. It will end the scandal of polluting emissions. It will be safe and it will be reliable. There is no more time to put off making a decision that should have been taken years ago and the opportunity to make this decision will not be repeated at currently quoted costs. Any further delay will simply cost more money. I urge Members to bring nearly a decade of prevarication to an end. Jersey led the field when the first Energy from Waste plant was commissioned. The Island has acquired nearly 30 years of experience operating these types of plant. We must not squander the skills that have been derived from that experience. A new Energy from Waste plant is the right thing for Jersey. We need it and we need it urgently and I ask Members to support the preferred solution that is put before them. **[Approbation]**

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Is the proposition seconded? **[Seconded]**

1.1.1 Connétable A.S. Crowcroft of St. Helier:

It is a very good start to this debate. We have been assured by the Minister that personalities are going to be kept out of it and I must say that is one of the several matters I agree with him about. He did stoop into personalising it a couple of times but I think we will let that pass in the interests of hopefully having a debate which is about the issues, the principles and the costs rather than the

personalities. Other things I agree with the Minister about, and I am sure everybody in this House agrees, most importantly the existing incinerator is a disgrace and must be dealt with. I think, regardless of the decision that we make today, we really do need to work together and I feel that the Constables in particular will be willing to work with the Minister and with the department to take out of the waste stream in particular the things that are making the emissions so bad. It is, I believe, still practice that we are burning, for example, rubber tyres; we are burning hard plastics; we are burning batteries; and all kinds of things that chuck out the most dangerous products into the atmosphere. We need to tackle that now and to some extent ... and the Minister has not gone down this road - but to some extent in the recent build up to the debate people have been inclined to argue that the recent failures of the incinerator have some particular relevance on this debate. I am not sure that they do. We know, we accept, we have to replace the incinerator. What this debate is about is how we replace it. With what do we replace it? I agree with the Minister that a smaller incinerator ... he mentioned he could come down from 126 to 105, he could come down to 95,000 tonnes, and I agree with him that there is not much point in building an incinerator which is just a bit smaller. I agree with him that, if we build a new incinerator, the emissions will be within guidelines and, in fact, it has to be said, they will be a lot cleaner than what comes out of most of our cars and we should be paying a lot more attention to that perhaps than worrying about these very clean gases. But I suppose, with those opening remarks, our points of agreement have to end because while the Minister deplores the fact that 8 years have passed, and of course the process goes back longer than that, but 8 years have gone past since the year 2000 when a £60 million plant was offered to the then committee. He appears to suggest that nothing has happened in the world of waste treatment in the last 8 years or certainly that no ... he talks about a fruitless search for new technologies. Well, I am sorry but I think he is wrong. Enormous strides are being made in the field of alternative technologies. It is very easy for us to seize upon the snake oil salesmen who have come to our doors and I am not going to mention any of them by mentioning their names. There are people who are offering the States all kinds of treatments. But I do want to mention one in particular because the Parish of St. Helier got very close to setting up a trial plant for a particular Jersey-based company that claimed that they could take all of their household waste in black bags, have a material separating facility to take out the valuable bits, like aluminium cans and so on, and then treat thermally the remainder of the waste and produce a plastic-type pellet, and I was going to bring some along today but they are in my office. I have examples of the plastic extruded elements that this company has produced. This company made a presentation to the St. Helier procureurs, the Roads Committee, and indeed through the Environment Scrutiny Panel to the Constables and there was a great deal of interest across the board in this new process, particularly, I suppose, because it was being promoted by a Jersey company. Very sadly, the company has decided to start its trial plant in the United States and that, I think, is a great shame but what I want to emphasise to Members is that those plastic pellets that many Members have seen, that technology has not gone away, it has not been rubbished by anyone. Indeed the work is moving on a pace and many other technologies, that is not the only one, but many other ways of dealing with waste are being explored with ever-increasing vigour by communities around the world and we do not need to go into the reasons why that is happening; we all know why climate change is such a driver to people who are concerned about burning materials. One of the things that struck us most about this particular process, not only was it producing useful plastic panels, it could be used in a variety of ways, refuse derived fuel is another by-product of some of these processes but crucially it did not produce the 2 things that the proposed option today does produce. The proposed option may produce very clean exhaust gases but it still produces exhaust gases and we all know that these are a key concern in climate change discussions. So, however clean an incinerator is, it still has to have a chimney, it still has to generate a large carbon footprint. Secondly, and perhaps more worryingly, there is of course the ash which must be dealt with. Some of that ash will be useable and we understand that unlike our present incinerator the ash will be separated and bottom ash will be useful, possibly in concrete and other aggregates, but the heavily toxic fly ash, will have to be stored *ad infinitum* in expensive sealed pits. So, incineration does not reduce the need for land fill.

There will still be a need for permanent sealed pits for the toxic ash which are currently going on down at La Collette and I think Members should not forget that incineration has these by-products which have to be dealt with. Significantly, the alternative treatment, such as the one I mentioned earlier, do not produce any by-products. They are closed systems, they do not generate much other than water, and they do not generate any toxic ash. So, that is why I do not believe it is right to assume that these alternatives are not moving forward. They are moving forward and so a key question: is what is being proposed today the best environmental option for the Island? I would say that the case has not yet been made. Alternative technologies, as I say, need to be further explored. Indeed I am going to quote, and I am sure many Members will be quoting from the recent Juniper Report. In the executive summary which is perhaps the easiest place to start in 1.6 the consultants say: "In our opinion, handling all of the Island's residual waste within a single E.f.W. is an acceptable way of dealing with the problems, however, we do not accept that a case has yet been made that this is either the only practical approach, or indeed the best approach for Jersey." They are not ruling out incinerators; indeed Juniper spent a lot of their time recommending incinerators to large organisations, but they are not yet recommending it to us. Further down the executive summary in 1.11, and I quote: "We believe officers are right to stress the importance of only using proven technologies and agree with the criteria that have been adopted for judging this parameter, however, some technology options seem to have been eliminated on the basis of incorrect or outdated information. Within the body of our report we also criticise some of the other grounds that we use to narrow the range of technologies deemed to be appropriate for consideration as part of an overall integrated approach to managing wastes on the Island. We are concerned that this has led to an overemphasis on a solution dominated by a single, oversized E.f.W." Now, Members of course can simply ignore the Juniper Report if they wish and indeed Juniper were brought over yesterday by the Environment Scrutiny Panel to meet States Members and many States Members attended those meetings. I know that some of the Ministers who attended a briefing with Juniper were engaged, toward the end of that meeting, in trying to get from Juniper statements that they could use today. As I am speaking first, I am not going to be able to counter those but what I want to read out, and I wrote it down verbatim, and it will be on the record subsequently from the panel meeting. I want to read out a statement which I think very much corroborates the earlier statements from their report. The Managing Director said this: "There is a risk that we buy a large incinerator at a time when the world is waking up to the problem of climate change. We could end up with a white elephant as waste arisings dramatically fall off following changes in behaviour, supermarket protocols and so on." I think that of course is the difficulty of the decision we have to make today. The Minister has made perhaps a compelling case for buying this particular incinerator; in fact, he called it a bargain, which I thought was probably over-egging the pudding, but his case has been well made. What Members have to decide is: will we end up with a white elephant? Will the world move on so rapidly, in terms of dealing with the environmental disasters that are coming up on us much faster as an international community than we ever thought they were, will the public begin to respond, as they have done so remarkably recently with the ability, almost overnight, to stop using carrier bags. The ability again almost overnight to stop smoking in workplaces and pubs. Are we not going to see supermarkets adopting new protocols about how they receive food into the supermarkets and therefore how far retailers sell products that we will see a rapid falling off in the amount of waste the world is having to deal with? I am confident. I am an optimist. People may accuse me of lacking realism, but I see the signs of a sea change in our attitude to the environment and I want Jersey to be at the forefront of any sea change. We were when we brought in ultra violet treatment for sewage. The Minister mentioned our incinerator as an example of how we were ahead of the game. I am not sure that is correct. We certainly were in our introduction of U.V. (ultra violet) treatment of sewage and people came from far and wide to see what Jersey were doing. I want people to come to Jersey to see how we are managing our waste. They will not come and see our incinerator, I am pretty sure of that, unless the Planning Minister does a superb job which is architectural superno and people come to admire the architecture of it. But they certainly will not come to admire our treatment of waste if we simply go down the safe and relatively risk-

free route of building this large E.f.W. So, I think in terms of the environment, and I started with the environment because I think the Island is trying to be seen as a major player in the environment. I do not believe that to approve this proposition today is to secure the best environmental option for Jersey. I know some Ministers will have spoken to top dogs in the world of environmental science who will say: "Oh, yes, incineration is the new green way to treat waste." I suppose at the end of the day it comes down to ideology. I, and know a lot of my parishioners, simply do not like the idea of burning something which has value, which has a use. They accept there are all kinds of problems in getting to that use but they are not comfortable with the idea of burning it. So, I have looked at the alternative technologies which I think should be pursued further. I want to deal now with recycling. The Deputy was much kinder to the Parishes' zero waste scheme than he has been in the past. The fact is, and I believe this is understood by Members, that when the Parish set out its zero waste scheme they were not saying that overnight they would achieve zero waste production from these particular homes and indeed to quote from the report we published: "The term zero waste has been adopted by some communities around the world to indicate that they wish to pursue the highest standards of waste minimisation and recycling and indeed zero waste communities are flourishing around the world, particularly in places like New Zealand, which places a high value on its green credentials." The fact is that what we have found, and I know that the same has been found in St. John with their kerb side collection scheme, is that the public are really keen in Jersey to recycle. They are frustrated by the difficulties which beset them when they try to do it. I am convinced that kerb side collection is the way forward, not least because of requiring people to drive to bring banks is in itself a creator of greenhouse gases. Not everyone has access to a car after all, and surely people in today's society have a right to expect an efficient and co-ordinated collection of their recycled waste. However, I think we have to be a little careful here because what the Minister appears to be asking the ratepayers of the Island to do is to pay for kerb side collection, run by their Parishes, but then to pay as taxpayers for what may be an oversized incinerator. Now, I believe that I can persuade my ratepayers, when we have our budget meeting in just over a week's time, that I should indeed invest their money in kerb side collections, but I do not think I can then ask them as taxpayers, and of course many of them are, to foot the bill unless indeed it is a bargain as the Minister says, for this enormous project. Not unless I am satisfied, as a States Member, this really is in economic terms the best and indeed the only option to the Island. One of the other things that came out of yesterday's meeting with Juniper was several times they referred to themselves as auditors and they said: "We simply have not, as auditors, had enough information to give the green light to this particular capital project." It is after all, and I hope Members will forgive me for emphasising this, an enormous amount of money. It is now over £100 million and that is only the capital cost. That does not include the revenue costs and nor significantly does it include the opportunity cost of the land take at La Collette that it will require. It does not presumably include some of the associated costs either which will be knock-on effects, if we go ahead. I think we know that the public feel hard-pressed at the moment. It is not just our fault. We are to blame as a collective Assembly for G.S.T. (Goods and Services Tax), but it is not our fault that household prices have gone up so high. I have to ask Members whether they can take what I think is tantamount to a cavalier approach to accept the expenditure of well over £100 million at a time of community belt-tightening and, significantly, when the latest consultants to review the financial side, the financial pace, have said they are not yet satisfied. I know I could not go to my ratepayers next week with my accounts if my auditors were not satisfied with the trawl that they have been doing, and are doing, at the moment through Parish accounts and I do not believe we should be going to the public to say: "We want to buy this piece of kit" when the latest analysis is suggesting that there is more work to be done on the cost of this particular solution. So, is it the best economic option for Jersey? It may be, but I do not believe the case has yet been made. We need to see more sums. We need to see more alternative costs. It is all very well for the Minister still keeping a very level, and I hope serene approach to this debate, the Minister was rather dismissive of the latest prices given by Scrutiny in terms of shipping recyclables off Island. He said it is cheaper and wiser to avoid shipping. Well, we recently had a Scrutiny hearing and I

am sure other Scrutiny Members will give more details about this, but in a nutshell what we heard from our carriers who supply our Island with everything that we require coming into it, have an awful lot of empty space going out of it. They are more than willing to work with the States and to find cost-effective solutions that will fill up their space, that will effectively improve their carbon footprint as hauliers, as carriers, and which will allow us to export the recyclables. Members will know that I have recently been talking to a French company about doing just that for the Parish because it is obvious that if we can get our recycled materials baled here and sent over to France to be collected from the quay at Saint-Malo, that is a much shorter journey to undertake than sending them up to the U.K., but I do not think we have begun to explore the potential of exporting our recyclables and I certainly indicated that the Parish of St. Helier, if I have any say in the matter, is going to do this because my conscience will not allow me to send things that can be re-used into the incineration stream. Of course we are talking not just about now with the problems of Bellozanne, and we are all anxious to sort those out, but I am talking about 2011 when this new incinerator is destined to be ready. I do not want to be sending anything to that incinerator, if I am still at the helm of the Parish of St. Helier, that can be re-used and recycled. I think this raises an interesting point which has not yet been touched on by the Minister and perhaps will be picked up on later. There is no contractual obligation for the Parishes to send their waste to the States to process. Now, what that means in my book is that if the Parishes were to decide, if the Constables were to decide collectively that they simply did not believe it was right to be burning cardboard, paper, plastic, and other things which can be reused, tyres ... tyres are still currently being burnt, beds, wood and so on. If the Constables believe that those things should be recycled and they came up with co-ordinated ways of tackling the problem then the question I have for the Minister is: what will you burn in the incinerator in 2011? We could indeed get to the situation in 3 years' time where recycling has become such an important target for the Island, and interestingly of course we know that the political pressure on the Island will increase to move down this road, that we will be left with a wonderfully architectural incinerator at La Collette but with nothing to burn in it. This, for me, is a bit of a nightmare scenario because maybe some of the Ministers supporting this today will not be in the States in 3 years' time, but it is something we are going to have to live with. Are we telling the public we are so confident that in 3 years' time there will be 105,000 tonnes of burnable products; that must mean plastic, cardboard, wood, rubber and so on, old beds, are we so confident there will be 105,000 tonnes to burn? I am not so sure we are and I think Members really need to think hard about what could happen without the contractual obligation. Is the Council of Ministers going to come forward and pass a law that forces the Parishes to take their waste to La Collette? I do not think they will. So, that is my concern and I flag it up for that reason. I think, finally, I am concerned about the lack of public involvement in this process. There has been an enormous amount of P.R. (Public Relations). We have been inundated with high quality printed material and large ring binders that most Members would have needed to come to the States by car today, if they were to carry the weight of reports with them. But the fact is that I do not detect in the public a real buy-in to this particular solution. Of course the public are desperate that we sort out the Bellozanne situation and, of course, the public are desperate to recycle. Those 2 things are givens, to my view, but I do not detect in the public an enormous "yes" to this project. Not only because of the cost, not only because of the environmental doubts people have about burning recyclable products, but because of the location. There is deep concern along the south coast of the Island, not just in St. Helier, but in St. Clement and the other southern Parishes as well. There is deep concern about what this is going to look like and it is perhaps worth concluding with another concern, which I think ties into that, that we have not really ever debated, at least not since I have been in the States, the future of La Collette and the strategy for material imports was never debated. The future of La Collette could be quite different from what it appears to be today and I know there are people involved in Government, at officer level as well as politicians, who feel that to put in another piece of industrial equipment into La Collette actually seals its fate. It can only ever be then an industrial estate for the next 25 or 30 years, whereas it may be that La Collette has a better future than that. Marine leisure in particular has been suggested. So, I am not just there speaking

for the residents of Havre des Pas, who I am sure will be pleased to hear that the Minister wants to build the hill a bit higher around the incinerator, but I think the question has to be asked, has the public been involved fully enough in discussions about the future of La Collette? Has the public been involved fully enough in discussions about their waste? I do not believe they have and so it is for those reasons; the environmental concerns, the economic concerns, and the lack of public involvement that I cannot support this proposition.

1.1.2 Senator F.E. Cohen:

I will not address the main elements of the proposition being debated. I conditioned the “in principle” consent, effectively making it undeliverable until this debate is concluded. Therefore this debate is material to the planning consent and indeed much of the detailing of the design is conditioned, pending the outcome of this debate. Consequently, I will abstain in the vote. I will, however, comment on the architecture. The first design proposal for the Energy from Waste plant I saw was of a curved roof with a steel structure. I accept that any architectural assessment is subjective, but I am afraid I asked T.T.S. to reconsider the architectural principles and deliver a simple design, based on proven successful architecture. The latest design is drawn by Hopkins Architects. The design has evolved from Sir Michael Hopkins’ earlier schemes. The evolution of the proposed design began with the Greene King racking plant in Bury St. Edmunds. This won both the R.I.B.A. (Royal Institute of British Architects) National Award for Architecture and the Financial Times Award for Architecture. The principles of the construction are based on Sir Michael Hopkins’ Paterra Building System. This system is the holder of a structural steel award and an architectural project award. The construction concept was also used in the design of Hopkins’ own offices in London. The design of the Energy from Waste building is a simple box with a wrap around steel envelope and glazed gable ends. The roof structure is an express steel lattice frame placed outside the external envelope of the building. This reduces the external mass of the building with consequential savings in materials used. Rather like the Fly Tower for the Glyndeborne Opera House the express structure makes for a far more interesting distant view of the building. Glyndeborne is one of Hopkins’ most acclaimed projects and won a R.I.B.A. National Award for Architecture, a Civic Trust Award, and was the Royal Fine Arts Commission Building of the Year. In essence, Hopkins have designed a very simple building, but the refinement of its proportions and detailing will set it apart from normal, mediocre, industrial buildings and give it a dignified architectural bearing which belies its industrial function. Its success will be in its fine detailing. I will be insisting on high quality materials and standards of finish. This will be complemented by a requirement to appoint a leading landscape architect. We cannot pretend that such a building will not change our coastline for ever and it will be seen from afar, however, if we are diligent about the detailing it can be a good building and it has the potential to be an award winner, given the necessary investment in construction and finishing materials.

1.1.3 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I think that last speech really demonstrates why it is time that we separated the ministry from Environment and Planning because the Minister is hopelessly tied by his quite right declaration that he is unable to contribute today because of his consideration in the future from the planning side of things. But I would have expected, given the environmental concerns and the environmental health concerns and the Ramsar site concerns, that the Minister, or at least hopefully the Assistant Minister, would have prepared a significant contribution for today’s debate ...

Senator F.E. Cohen:

If the Deputy would give way for one moment. I did distribute some notes from the Environment Department to States Members only a few days ago.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I think we have seen those and we have also seen the Environmental Health Impact Assessment, the second of which has been concluded, which speaks about the health impact to those who will have breathing difficulties in the proposed location and the need for the untested and uncertain emissions from these modern plants that need to be concurrently extremely well monitored and reported upon into the future, so that the communities that are commissioning these plants can have cognisance of the actual harm that they may be emitting into the communities that they will be sited in. In particular, the second Environmental Health Report that has been presented to us recently, another paper, not the one the Minister referred to, does talk about the residents in the vicinity and has been already pointed out by the Officer for Environmental Health for Jersey, the Medical Officer of Health, those people who are in most need of improvements to their health are those residents in St. Helier, who by demographics are surrounded by the main pollutants this Island emits and also by their own socio-demographic positions in terms of financial ability to pay to be healthy, or to afford to be healthy, are less able to look after themselves. So, it has already been identified by the Medical Officer of Health that more needs to be done to support those residents in St. Helier. If I can just stay on the health side of things when I continue. I want to speak in support of a modern gas cleaning plant and its capability of negating concerns for health because it would be remiss of us to try to say for some political reason this morning that this plant is going to be bad for the health of Jersey necessarily. I would just like, to say that I think and I believe that while we have had suggestions only recently that there should be a Ministry for Children, and that has been negated by Senator Walker because we cannot increase ministries, I think the position of new ministries needs to be considered by the States and the allocation of Assistant Ministers' time to head up those new ministries needs to be considered in very short order so that we can employ those more talented Assistant Ministers in meaningful roles within our community, such as the Environment Minister, because I believe that while he is an extremely capable and thoroughly diligent, hardworking Minister for Jersey, Senator Cohen, unfortunately in my personal view, is unable to commit the type of execution that I would like to see him commit into the environment because he is bound by his planning concerns. I scratch my head when I hear him speaking about the merits of a building from an eminent designer when we really want to hear somebody in this position in our Island speaking about the environmental concerns, climate change, *et cetera*, because those are all things that the vast majority of people in Jersey are crying out for. If I can proceed to the health issue. As a Deputy for No. 1 District, which La Collette is obviously in, where the plant will be sited if the States agree today, the residents of St. Helier have been complaining, and it has been noted by the Medical Officer of Health, for years about the impacts upon their lives and their living standards and their ability to enjoy their homes because of the industrial emissions from La Collette. Now, the problem with shutting down a process in La Collette has been that we have not been able to source out one emission from another and as there are, and have been, reported leaks of all manners from La Collette into the locations of Havre des Pas and town and into St. Clement's and even as far as Grouville, the environmental health officers are unable to identify and determine the source of the irritation, the source of the smell and the source of the ill health, particularly to a particular process to close that process, or to bring that process to book, and that is also where and why in the future we need an Environment Minister, because the current fiasco of the Constable of St. Helier trying to close the compost site through the courts and then the Health Ministry saying: "Oh, we will take it forward. It is not our responsibility to say it is okay or not. We will take the Transport and Technical Services Department to court" and then them sitting down together prior to doing that, regardless of the concerns of the people in St. Helier: "Oh, hang on, we do not want to have to pay for all the costs of all this if we lose, so let us just put all that on hold until we have that bit sorted out." It is a nightmare. It does show, in my view, that the States of Jersey are more concerned about protecting the Executive and the costs to the Executive than the people of this Island. Now, on a more positive note. Yesterday, at the meeting for Juniper, I, together with many Members of the States Assembly and the Ministers, heard quite conclusively, contrary to what had been spoken about on the radio which were health concerns, that you can put as much money as you would like into the back end of an incineration

facility and you can capture practically anything and everything that can cause harm to the most reasonable extent. The proposed plant by the Minister for Transport and Technical Services at a cost of £106 million does include flue gas treatment, which the current Bellozanne plant does not have, and a significant portion of the cost of the plant is going to be in capturing the emissions. So, there is no doubt in my mind, as a representative for St. Helier, although I do not wish to have this occurring in La Collette obviously and I do not wish to have it necessarily for Jersey, if it is approved by the Assembly I think, and I believe, that the concerns of the residents that will be affected by this plant will predominantly be to those who have breathing difficulties such as asthma and pre-existing conditions, heavy smokers, *et cetera*. Those are not my concerns and my words. Those are the concerns and the words of the second environmental health impact paper that was given to us, commissioned by the Waste Strategy Steering Group or the Transport and Technical Services Department. So, those are not my concerns put to Members; those are the concerns of the health professionals. As I said, they needed to be mitigated against into the future but we then must have cognisance of the fact that there will be people who will be affected. This morning we heard about the people that are being affected and I do not think there is one single Member in this Assembly who could stand up and be re-elected, or justify their position in this Assembly, if they believed for one minute that the Bellozanne incinerator should continue operating. That is my strongest belief. I think that most Members would agree with me that the Bellozanne facility should be closed and closed as soon as possible. The likely reality is that will not occur for 3 years; 3 more years of this only failing plant in Europe. Significantly failing plant in Europe, in the words of the Medical Health Officer, in the letter that has just been passed to us: This incinerator is the worst in Europe we are being told. That may not sound very good for Europe, but it certainly is bad news for people living in Jersey and it certainly is bad news when you go to the schools that sit opposite the chimney stacks and you see just how close those schools have been sited by this Assembly to that badly polluting emitter, with the full knowledge that they were siting that school right next to that badly polluting emitter. One scratches one's head. What were the States of Jersey thinking when they sited that school at that location prior to that facility being closed? I have been a couple of times now to the school that sits opposite the Bellozanne Plant, Haute Vallée, and I have been very impressed with the facilities there. I think we can all say that we have been very impressed with the pupils, students, activities and teaching staff there. The only thing that I would say is that I have not been impressed by what they have to look at when they go to school because industrial facilities have an impact upon people when they live near them, and a significant part of their mental health has to be taken into account when one is considering an environmental health impact. What was happening when this decision was made to site the school there? Because these children are going to that school and they are looking across at that chimney as if you could reach out and touch the top of it. Not long ago we had the Assistant Minister for Education, Deputy Fox, talking about ash falling from the chimney on to the students in the playground, obviously causing great concern among the community and it has been driving the desire to site this new plant at La Collette and the constant and continued talk - and that is all it has been - about the emissions of this current facility, has driven into the very hearts of the people that live in those districts and those areas; fear for themselves and fear for their children and we have had representation to the Environment Scrutiny Panel that the emissions from Bellozanne, whether it be sewage, or whether it be the chimney, have caused people to have great, great concern for the welfare of their families and their children and their properties. So, what were the States of Jersey doing? What are the States of Jersey doing to continue to allow this plant to operate until it is crippled, until when, until it collapses in upon itself before they decide to commission money to sort it out? Before they decide to give money to recycling efforts to mitigate some of these conditions? We all saw recently Deputy Ben Fox from St. Helier bringing a proposition to the Assembly to support the great efforts, and I mean great efforts, of the Transport and Technical Services Department in their recycling initiatives and it was not supported by States Members. Did not want to give them the money. No, did not want to give them the money, but will stand up one after the other today and talk to us all about the failing plant and the terrible emissions. We are going to get it until we are sick up to here

today about Bellozanne. We are all sick of Bellozanne, especially those of us that live in town. Those of us that have young families in town. What have the States done about it? They have commissioned studies. They have commissioned in-depth work in looking at the alternatives for the replacement of this plant and had we on the Public Services Committee in 2000 run to the States at that time and said: "We need £60 million for this new plant because it is going to fail in 20 years' time, although it could be failing by 2008." If we had said that in 2000, which we were saying and the officers were saying, we would have been told one thing: "Go away. Put your plans together. Put them before the capital priority projects before the States Assembly. Put them in the Strategic Plan, see if it gets permission. See if we all agree with it. See if you have done your environmental impact assessments yet. Tell me if you have looked at all the alternatives. Then we will decide, as a whole, whether or not it is a thing we want to do with the States money." No. The States do not do that. They do not address the things they need to address. It puts money away in its funds for a rainy day and it meets with its parishioners in its Parishes and keeps the rates down and it mitigates costs here and it mitigates costs there and it scrimps and scrapes its way by, while everything else from its housing stock suffers to its infrastructure on roads, sewers and incinerators collapse. Then those very politicians who still sit in the Chamber today, who are now Ministers and the Council will tell us: "Oh, well, you know, we had no money. Did not want to introduce environmental taxes." Because if they had introduced environmental taxes they acknowledged that they would find it difficult to get G.S.T. through. Now, environmental taxes, everybody thought were a good idea. The vast majority of people thought it was a good idea to charge the polluter. Polluter pays principle. User pays principle. We all thought environmental taxes were a fair cop but, no: "If they just go for environmental taxes we are not going to get G.S.T. through. Let us get G.S.T. through first and then we will bang them on the head with environmental taxes when everything else falls apart in a year or 2 from now." The very beginning words of the Minister's speech were that Members had contrived by their failure to make an executive decision over the years to make this happen. Contrived, yes, but where do you look when something has been contrived? To the decision makers. The money holders. The Finance and Economics Committee. The Policy and Resources Committee. All of these committees ended up as the Ministers and the leading Members of this Assembly that sit in this Chamber today and no doubt, as I said before, we will be getting it in the ear about the emissions from Bellozanne. Well, everybody is sick of Bellozanne, but this proposal today will not close it for 3 more years and why are we still putting tyres in it? If the States Assembly agrees with this proposition today and supports the Transport and Technical Services Minister in his attempt, and it is a genuine attempt to improve the emissions from treating waste in Jersey, then we have to go a lot further because he states it quite clearly that his mission will not be successful unless we support a very, very strong recycling programme. So, it is no good saying: "Well, there is your incinerator. We do not have the money for this recycling facility next year or in 3 months' time because we are feeling a bit of a pinch. You know, we have to put some more money in the airport and we have a new school to build next to the sewage plant next year." No. All of those other ministries and all of those other States Members that are still in this Assembly next year have to back the Minister for Transport and Technical Services in rolling out a progressive recycling system in conjunction with the Parishes because the Parishes and the Constables are doing their bit and the Transport and Technical Services Minister and his Assistant Minister and their officers are doing their bit. The problem is ... and the Constable of St. Helier is doing his bit as well. The problem is that the Executive, the Minister's fellows on the Council did not give him the cash. It is disgraceful. The Minister spoke this morning about siting it at the new location and much has been spoken about the benefit of the new location to those people in Jersey that would want to meander upon it on a Saturday or Sunday afternoon with their little dog and fly their kite and show the kids the lovely boats. It is not going to happen. It is not going to happen for the same reasons we are trying to empty out the facilities in La Collette. Those social activities are not going to be condoned. Just like they were not condoned when you built the big wall opposite Elizabeth Castle to return the vista to people and then suddenly drug smugglers started chucking drugs at each other and the Port Authority said: "Okay, sorry cannot go on that wall any

more.” For the same types of reasons, executive security reasons, the States of Jersey will not allow into the future people walking along those amenities, and those have been sold to us as part of the reason why it would be of great benefit to the people in La Collette. I am sorry, but the Buncefield position changed all that and if you cannot have a compost reception facility you certainly cannot have a kite-flying gathering either. So that, which we are being told this morning on the edge of the Ramsar site which will probably ... and this is where it gets snuck in, they will settle that curve. They will settle that height - 7 metres above the existing wall were the proposed heights of the existing mounds. We are being told today that those 2 mounds could not be built any higher. That was the first thing, from an engineering perspective, because of their base they could not physically be built any higher. So, now we are being told we will just round off that curve there into the Ramsar site, spread it a little bit wider and pile it up, in the words of the Minister, much more extremely higher. I could not exactly remember the words; I did not write it down quick enough, but something of a significant increase in height. Now, most people that look at this facility in the future, whether it is designed by Hopkins or whoever, are going to be looking at the loss of the horizon and the feature that they will have to stare upon when they look at the horizon when they are in Jersey. The vast majority of people going back to their cars when the boats come in are normally, these days, either to do with visiting car rallies or Jersey residents returning home. So, they are not going to stay up on deck and admire La Collette. They know it all too well. The vast majority of us who live in Jersey will be looking at this building from all corners of the south coast and it will have a significant impact upon the south coast, and the only way that building will not have a significant impact upon the south coast is if the curve is rounded out and a significantly extended mound is built to hide it. So then we will not be looking at a significantly, fantastically designed Hopkins design. No, we will be looking at a Transport and Technical Services designed hill. So, what is the point of having all the high classed architects in the world designed buildings that are hidden by thousands of tonnes of ash-lined pits? £90,000 a pit. £90,000 a pit and where are we going to put them? Well, we have started to hear this morning. They are going in the Ramsar site, or at least a part of them are, and that is obvious as well because the other thing that is a problem is the fact that having ... because we have been in Scrutiny and we have been speaking to the people who are concerned with this, the Fire Department does not want all of their bods, if they choose to do anything about it anyway, if there was a fuel issue that they had to turn up for, they might just think it is better to stand back and let it burn, but if they decided to get involved and tried to tackle a portion of it they need an exit road and the exit road that they need is not there. So, it is a pre-existing condition. We have spoken on the Environment Scrutiny Panel with the people that run the fuel company and not only are there options for the town facility, which could have an impact upon the town park and the existence of the fuel tank there, but there are also opportunities for the States of Jersey to support the company that provides those facilities and works in those areas in pipelines which are in the energy document that we are all still waiting for to be tabled to the States of Jersey, support a pipeline to France, if you want to keep up with gas, because you can argue about nuclear electricity being cheaper and all the rest of it, but what is the point of importing nuclear electricity and ignoring the domino effects that having done that are going to have on these types of issues, because we are talking about an Energy from Waste plant. So, what is the point of creating an Energy from Waste plant unless you are going to tackle 2 issues; energy and waste. So, in looking at the 2 issues, which they are 2 issues, well, there are 3 actually. I think I have covered the health issue; it is abysmal and we need to close Bellozanne as soon as possible, not 3 years from now. I think we could close it a lot sooner and I think we should close it a lot sooner. That leaves us with 2 other issues; energy and waste. So, if there are issues about the fuel farm then there are also present opportunities. We have conducted reviews, met in confidence with the fuel companies, met with the Council of Ministers and explained those opportunities, and we have been requested by the Council, through Senator Vibert’s intervention, to submit a paper to the Council on what we have been told. What we have been told represents exciting opportunities for mediating the risks and securing the long term supplies of all forms of energy if we get our act together as the States and look at energy in a holistic form. Because nuclear energy may be one of the cheapest energies

to purchase, but it is certainly not one of the cheapest energies to have to deal with, and the money that goes into creating nuclear energy purchasing plants, and has been admitted recently with £175 billion needed to clean up the U.K.'s emissions from nuclear energy into the future. You have to start scratching your head when the claim is that nuclear energy is the cheapest. From the environment's perspective, from the earth's perspective it is not. Gas, and there is a gas company in Jersey, with a lot of people who have appliances in their homes, and that is a cost, they cannot just switch off their appliances because there is no gas any more. That is a cost to them in their homes and when you compound those costs over the community it is significant. The services that provide energy to Jersey need to be supported across the board and we need to also mitigate those dependencies by having our own in terms of energy that we can make from tide and wind, *et cetera*. So, when we looked at the issue of whether or not the Energy from Waste plant was going to provide us with 60 per cent of the Island's electricity, as has been claimed, we spoke to the electricity company and again we met in confidence so I am bound by a lot of that. We spoke to them also about the chimney and whether or not they would be using the chimney and what their plans were for the future and surprise, surprise, oh my, oh my, what they told us, what they told us, what they told us. Of course we cannot tell you what they told us because we were told in confidence and that is how they share information with Scrutiny, they give it to you but then they package it up in a box you cannot open; but nevertheless we know what they have told us and we know that they have told the Minister and we know that they have told, if not the Minister, his department, and Jersey Electricity purchases its electricity in blocks from nuclear energy, from Europe. It purchases them in blocks and it uses them in blocks and there are peak demands and there are troughs and there is a great demand upon energy, as one would expect, in the morning and there is a great demand upon energy, as one would expect, in the evening. During the day it middles out but overnight there are great lapses in the demand for energy, as one would expect. We do not have any heavy industry pulling upon the power. So, the problem that represents for an Energy from Waste plant, when one is pulling all of one's electricity from a chief energy source in Europe and has more than one wants anyway, and it is dirt cheap, is: what will they give us for the energy that we create from an Energy from Waste plant? Do they really want it? Do they really want the energy that we are going to create? Well, the first thing is they arguably do not want the energy that we are going to create and if they do take it they are only going to take it at the same cost that they can buy it from France for nuclear energy. So, having an Energy from Waste plant will mitigate some of our dependency but it certainly will do nothing to achieve cost reduction of electricity. It will do nothing to achieve improvements or the ability to run an extra appliance here or there. So, we get on to ... we have done the road, we have done the chimney, we have done the health, we have done the Bellozanne. I would just like to speak very briefly, if I could, about our consultants, Juniper. We commissioned our consultants ... it is unfortunate during speeches we are getting papers circulated to us by the department's consultants. So, if Members would not mind for a second, because I think I would be at a disadvantage otherwise, I will just pause for a second and précis what it is we are getting from the department's consultants at this time of day, 11.30 a.m., during the third speech or fourth speech of the debate. It is a letter to Senator Walker on 7th July ...

Deputy I.J. Gorst of St. Clement:

Perhaps I could give the Deputy a couple of moments to have a look at this letter, but I wanted to ask him for a point of clarification because I was not following exactly what he was trying to tell us, and I know he felt confined regarding the price of electricity because at one point he seemed to be saying that electricity generated by nuclear power stations was much greater in cost than the bottom line and then at the next point he seemed to be saying that any electricity created by an Energy from Waste facility would not be on a level playing field because it would cost more to produce because nuclear electricity was cheap. I am not quite sure what he is trying to say to us and I am not quite sure whether he is indicating that he feels we need to go into camera to disclose pieces of information. So, I wonder if he could clarify that point for us.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I think it would probably be better for us, rather than me suggesting I take the Assembly into camera to discuss items that may be of a technical or confidential nature, that I allude to those issues now and if the States Assembly wishes to go into camera further into the debate I would recommend that our Chairman from the Environment Scrutiny Panel leads that move if it is going to occur, because he is far more au fait with the issues and the numbers and the technical details than I am. I do have copies of the transcripts that we have in confidence from the shipping companies and it is an issue that I think Members would benefit from in an in camera debate, and there are issues to do with Jersey Electricity, and there are issues to do with the gas company, that cannot be discussed in open forum and they could have a significant consideration. I do not think it is going to change the outcome of this debate, but the outcome of this debate is one that is determined by the requirement for an increase in our recycling activities and the outcome of this debate is not simply just to purchase a new machine, it is also to do with longevity of supply, energy from the new machine and also the closure of the Bellozanne facility. So, I think that if it is deemed appropriate, the Chairman of the Environment Scrutiny Panel when he comes to speak can maybe propose that we go into camera and those issues that I have alluded to this morning, which he is more than capable of speaking to Members about and answering questions, can be discussed. In particular, because I was trying to put across a complex set of arguments from confidential sources and it probably is not coming across very clearly to those that have not benefited from the briefings we have benefited from. What I was trying to explain to Members earlier in relation to the costs of energy was where we purchase energy from today, which is a nuclear source, and why we purchase it, how the electricity company operates. In fact, the Jersey Electricity Company has a unique arrangement in that it can sell back electricity to the European grid, and sometimes fires up its boilers to generate electricity and sells it back to you when it needs it. A bizarre thing that they could burn oil and make more money out of the electricity that they generate from burning heavy oil, but they have been doing it. Some of the issues in relation to the chimney and the turbines and the future of the company, Jersey Electricity, I think are probably best kept in camera, together with the proposals that have been put on the table to us and shared with the Council of Ministers by Jersey Gas. Those probably should be better done in camera. I do not think they are going to have an outcome necessarily on people's views in this debate, but I think it is very important that we take cognisance of those because we are talking ... and it has been alluded by the Minister, we should not be speaking about the location but, heaven help me, he spoke about the location just after he said that at great length. It is going to be the location where the flipping thing is going to be. Let us go into camera at that point, if the Deputy wishes to. All I am saying is we are looking at 3 issues: primarily health, energy and waste and the effects upon our community, the costs, both in terms of finances and the cost both in terms of environment health and human health. I know that Members do listen on the radio when they are downstairs typing away and keeping up with their ministries and the businesses they have to achieve, but if we have got this really badly emitting source of disease-ridden plant collapsing around our ears, it is a real pity that we do not have the Ministers and their Assistant Ministers and the other Deputies and Constables in the Chamber. We have some - we have some - but we do not have many and we have already been in quorate in what is probably one of the biggest debates, even before lunchtime. Spend £100 million, but do not bother to be part of the debate. It was unfortunate because only 13 Members of the Assembly bothered to turn up for our presentation at the Town Hall that we did on the alternatives. The letter that I was referring to that has just been passed to us is, in fairness to them, a letter requested by the Chief Minister from them yesterday - timing is everything. Surprise, surprise, the department's consultants were requested yesterday afternoon by the Chief Minister to supply us with some information that would help us understand. Here it is, 11.30, during the debate being circulated for Members to read while they are not listening to me. The fact that I have spent with the Environment Scrutiny Panel hundreds of hours in what the States of Jersey calls the 'Safeguards' of Scrutiny looking at the issues, they would rather read a paper from the consultants egged out by the Chief Minister yesterday afternoon. It may make for better reading than listening, but it behoves

the system that we have created, this system of Scrutiny, which is a complete and utter waste of time. I thought the speech from the Minister was quite balanced this morning and I thought that he had put together and presented his case with remarkable constraints and his usual flair for having a go. I applaud and congratulate him for that and I hope that he can keep with that throughout the day, even if other Members do fall into the trap of it becoming a personality issue. Because it is not going to be responsible of us, is it, really - we have got all these people that live in States housing in this area and all those people that go to these schools in this area and all those people that live in this area - if we just dismiss contributions from States Members. I certainly have worked extremely hard with the Environment Scrutiny Panel since I joined them just over a year ago in this issue. We have met so many, many times for so long looking at all of these issues. I am afraid Members will just have to forgive me for making a longer speech than I would have liked to have made in relation to this issue because of the actual issues that are involved with this proposition. We are not talking about school milk, with respect. We are not talking about 7 or 8 houses and a Parish scheme, with respect. We are talking about a new road, an extremely elevated new mound, and emissions in a new location to residents that are not currently having to put up with it. One of the really bizarre things that troubled me - there are a few - but one of them was the fact that we thought when we employed our Scrutiny function that it was going to be taken seriously by the States of Jersey. We thought the public were being sold that idea as well. We thought that when it was set up, although we did not think it was going to work, we clung to a bit of hope that maybe, just maybe, with this new Scrutiny system we will still be able to add value to the debate. Unfortunately, what we found is that when we employ our consultants they are frustrated by departments. Unfortunately, in one instance, our consultants, Juniper, who spoke yesterday in some detail about this, felt that their reputations were impugned to their detriment for having come and conducted an audit role. The Minister yesterday apologised if he had said something during the course of a debate or a contribution on the radio, or wherever it occurred, to the consultants; it was not his intention. Nevertheless, it does send out a signal to those companies that would want to be employed, or are considering being employed, by the States of Jersey in the future. If you have companies that have experts that are going to be derided through the political process and the jurisdiction, it does not take long for those experts to speak to their friends in other companies and ward them off from bothering. Our consultants, Juniper, are not people that jump on the internet and do a little bit of research here or there; they are extremely professional, as are Babbie Fichtner, who have been employed by the Transport and Technical Services in these fields. We brought them in and we asked them to conduct a review about the size of the plant. Is the plant that is being proposed, 126,000 tonnes, too big? That is what we employed them for. If we were not on the right track, why are we debating 105,000 tonnes this morning? If their concerns were not on the right track, why, over the last couple of weeks, have we seen a reduction in that tonnage? Why have we seen a reduction in that plant, unless there were some merits behind their conclusions? In defence of the consultants, Juniper, I would just like to, for the record, say that it is important that we understand the role that they conducted when they were employed by us to review. That was not one of proposing an alternative, and that certainly was not one at looking at the Belloc facility. That was one looking at, from an audit perspective, the decision that the Transport and Technical Services Department had made in opting for an incinerator based upon the information, the numbers and the knowns that were being presented to us as politicians during the course of that decision. There has been, unfortunately, an unhelpful exchange about what was said, when it was said, how it was said, what was supplied, when it was supplied, how it was supplied, if it was supplied, at the time. Really, and truthfully, all of that falls by the wayside because if we went back now to re-employ them to look at those values and to look at those statistics, it makes not one bit of difference because we are not talking about the same size of plant now. We are not comparing apples with apples. The only thing that they were left with was this feeling that they really did not want to be employed by us in the future. They did say that they would be happy to be engaged for a short period of time to help us tick the boxes that we were making the right decision, but their overall message was when they normally go to different countries to speak to different groups of

people that are commissioning these types of plants, or investors that are putting up money for these types of plants, when this kind of capital expenditure is on the table, they would normally expect certain boxes to be ticked. They could not tick the boxes. They did not say the technology was wrong. They did not propose an alternative. They did not look at Bellozanne. What they did say was that with the information they were presented for the case that was being made, the bottom line was, just for those Members that are interested in Scrutiny - really interested in Scrutiny - in their view, the case had not been made for this choice. That is what they were saying. They are not saying the case has not been for 105,000 tonnes; that is a different thing all together. They are not saying that the case had not been made that the incinerator was falling apart around our ears; that has got nothing to do with it. In their view, they were employed to look at the purchase that we were making based upon the refuse that was being collected, is being collected, and likely to be collected into the future. They wholeheartedly agree with many, many things that the Transport and Technical Services Department has said. They agree with some of the things that the Environment Scrutiny Panel has said. They disagree with some of the things that both we and the Transport and Technical Services Department have said also. They were completely able to say what they want in the manner that they wanted to. When they presented to States Members on Friday, 25th April, 13 States Members in attendance; that was disgraceful. I am often derided about my attendance at things that are more to do with propaganda than anything else. Here we have something that is of significant importance and most Members that deride me normally were nowhere in sight, maybe because it was a Friday afternoon and the sun was shining. Our consultants, Juniper, are extremely busy. With the recent increase in fuel and with the recent increase of oil exceeding 130 dollars a barrel and climbing, many, many countries and many, many companies are very, very interested in looking at waste-derived fuel; energy from waste. This company of experts, which are highly regarded, are now well overbooked into the future, yet they were prepared to work with us and they were prepared to work with the Transport and Technical Services Department and they still are, albeit they were shying away from it yesterday afternoon, in all honesty, because of some of the comments that have been made about them. I think those concerns were in some way settled yesterday afternoon, personally, between the Minister and the company and I think the company was grateful for the words of the Minister and grateful for the words of the Chief Minister in that regard. I think it would have been negligent of me and the Environment Scrutiny Panel not to have raised this in debate today because Juniper, together with Babbie Fichtner, are some of the world's - if not the world's - experts in these areas. To deride them puts the States of Jersey at risk of having world experts in the future think twice about working for us. One of the things that I could not understand is how the compositional analysis of waste had been done on a factual basis. I suggested to the Environment Scrutiny Panel that perhaps one of the angles we could take is to do some forensic accounting on the waste that is being achieved. In Scrutiny hearings at the Town Hall we were told that they have done 2 compositional analyses on the bulky waste, the couches, the beds, the divans, the chairs, the tables; the bulky waste, which contains some of the worst elements, in some cases. The compositional analysis of that has been done. One of the points they made to the tonnage arising from the compositional analysis of the bulky waste was that it is kept outside, it rains, the rain soaks into the furniture, the furniture becomes much, much heavier, therefore you are talking about a greater degree of weight that needs processing than you would have done if you had thrown a shed over the top of it. The same can be said, and has been said, in the words of the Medical Officer for Health this morning in her report tabled to States Members about the compost factors at La Collette; not only does it add weight - and we do deal with these issues based upon weight, tonnes, 105,000 tonnes - these weights have to be calculated also with the thermal energies and the calorific values that are determined by these different sources of waste when one commits them to an incinerator. Those issues have to be considered by the experts. One thing is for certain, while our compost is out in the rain and our beds and furniture are outside in the rain, it adds significantly to the weight. What we asked was: "Was any compositional analysis done on the black bags?" We were told: "No, because the black bag waste is a typical U.K. black bag." Interestingly, yesterday, when I brought

this point up, we were told by our consultants, who sometimes do not agree with us, that it was a good point because every single council that they have had experience with in the United Kingdom that has done a compositional analysis upon their black bags have all found, to their amazement, that the compositional analysis of their black bags was not the same as the U.K.'s black bag waste. This U.K. notional black bag waste has not been met by anybody that has done a compositional analysis. Their views were: "Why should ours be the same as a U.K. black bag waste when no other council that has done a compositional analysis has found that their's is? Why should ours be any different?" That is the issue because if we are going to commit to higher recycling levels, which are predominantly the stuff that goes into the black bags, into the backs of the lorries, if we are going to increase those levels then we are going to have a significant impact, in my view, if we commit the money to a modern recycling initiative, which is being called for. If we commit to removing the value within those black bags then we are going to commit to questioning the tonnage that is arising and we are questioning the tonnage that is evident and we are questioning the tonnage that needs to be burnt, aside from the fact that what is in that black bag may contain anything from a television to a battery or a car tyre or a bike tyre.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier:

On a point of clarification, do the black bags, in so far as it has been possible to draw general conclusions to their contents, include a greater proportion of recycled material, or a lesser proportion, the U.K. and the Jersey black bags?

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

There is a perfectly reasonable question from a perfectly reasonable Member of the States of Jersey who has, I would put to Members, enough experience to ask a sensible question in the States of Jersey to deserve an answer. Would Members expect me to give him an answer? Yes. Should I give him an answer? The answer is we cannot give you an answer because we were not given the answer; we asked the same question you are asking me, through the Chair. We tried it through the chair, we tried it through the wardrobe, we tried it through the bed, it did not work. None of the questions we asked were forthcoming in that respect because the analysis of the black bag waste was not done. It has not been done. That is everything that goes into the resident's rubbish. It may go into a wheelie bin at the moment, but that is still determined as the black bag waste. That is the waste that goes into the back of the lorry, the back of the Parish refuse lorry, and gets carted off to the incinerator. The incinerator is a very inflexible and flexible device at the same time. One of the points that was brought up yesterday was the umbrage that the Transport and Technical Services Minister's consultants took, and their officers took, with the insinuation from Juniper in their report that the system was somehow inflexible. What they meant was, and what they mean, that you can turn up to an incinerator and chuck virtually anything in it, as we have been doing for years, and it will go in. It will go in the bunker because the bunker is - we have all seen it - 3 times the size of this room. Chuck it all in there, it all gets scooped up and put in the fire. It is what is coming out the other end in the ash that we have to put into the £90,000 pits and it is what is coming out of the chimney that we should have concern for, that should have us concerned about what it is going into the bunker. We have no concern, or at least the department has no concern, we are being told, about what is in the black bag waste because we are told it is U.K. black bag waste. It has got the same things in as the U.K. black bag. The U.K. black bag waste has yet to be met, we are told by our experts, by any of the councils that have done a composition analysis of that waste. If, as with other councils, they suddenly start to find that there are things in that black bag that can be recycled and that have value, the weight of that black bag which makes up the thesis for the need for this plant will be called into question. The operational difficulties of operating a 2-stream incinerator depends upon how much one can put through the first stream before one starts to ignite the second stream. It gets all very technical about how much you can burn and what you cannot burn, but that basically has determined the questions we have had about the size of the plant. Quite right to question it, were we not, because it was 126,000 tonnes. Today, just a matter of weeks after

Juniper concluded their report, we are being told it is 105,000 tonnes. None of the work that Juniper did for us, and none of the work that we conducted in this regard, is of any use today because we have not looked at the 105,000-tonne plant. Our experts have not had the opportunity to scrutinise the 105,000-tonne plant, so their work is really negated. It is a moot point. What concerned me, and has still not been answered, is that when we employed a company on Island to forensically account for how the department was making up their figures in waste, they got back to us after we had employed them, about a month afterwards, and said: "Sorry, we cannot work for you. We cannot get the numbers out of the department. We cannot get the figures we have been requesting." That shot us in the foot. We had already been shot in the foot on the other side of things because they had changed the dimensions, but now the actual waste horizons have been shot in the foot because the financial experts that we had commissioned were unable to get the figures. A similar complaint had been reported by Juniper: "Unable to get the information from the department." Yet, within days, we see another financial company commissioned by the department as their independent financial assessors presenting a report to the States of Jersey about the strength for their argument, just as we see today this letter, 4 pages long, from the experts of Transport and Technical Services that have been in Jersey working on this project for some 8 years, 5 years. Years and years and years and years and years and years they have been in Jersey advising the Transport and Technical Services Department and we get a letter today at 11.30.

Senator F.H. Walker:

If I may just clarify that, because the letter is addressed to me and it was written at my personal request yesterday having met with both Babbie Fichtner and with Juniper.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I was just saying, through the Chair to the Chief Minister, and other Members, that while I appreciate that it was only written yesterday, it was a letter that the Chief Minister had requested of them, the department's technical people, and it appears today on Members' desks to be shared with all Members for this debate.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

If I can say, Deputy, I think you have made that point several times. Members will take their own view on whether it was a timely or appropriate way to proceed, but I think you have made the point 3 or 4 times about the letter.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I was just responding to the Chief Minister's intervention. I was not talking about it at the time. I was talking about the fact that our consultants had been frustrated in trying to achieve the evidence that Scrutiny is meant to go out there and get. I was talking about the fact that both Juniper and - I should not be mentioning, but I have mentioned, so that is an error - our technical advisers of that company I have mentioned a few times, and our other company, which I have been trying to keep from mentioning, were both reported to the panel that we could not get the information from the department. What is the point of Scrutiny unless to blandly go along with and support everything that the Minister has come up with because otherwise it is a complete waste of time. Unless you can pat them on the back you are not welcome. The dimensions of the new plant, as designed by Hopkins cannot be mitigated in any great deal other than by what has already been proposed; I think a reduction of some 20 metres in length or something, because of the fact that incinerators operate in a certain way and they need that certain height of the building in order for them to achieve the processes that they need to achieve. If we go for an incinerator this morning we will need to have that building at the height that it is in order for it to operate, regardless of whether or not we went to a 97,000-tonne plant or a 126,000-tonne plant. The shipping charges and the waste and the recycling opportunities that we have looked into threw up some extremely interesting facts and figures. For example, one company out of the 3 that we have spoke to had enough spare

capacity ... well, they do not like to call it spare capacity, but they call it: "We have enough capacity" - it is not spare but it is there - 150,000 tonnes available on one ship that they operate to France every year. On the same ship, 150,000 tonnes available capacity to the U.K. every year. Today, we have 75,000 tonnes of waste a year and we are being told by one shipping company that one of their ships currently operating has enough capacity out of the 3 companies we spoke to for 300,000 tonnes. That is why the numbers that we were presenting to the Assembly were justified. Just to be absolutely certain - this was maybe why we will, or talk about, going into camera later - we conducted a final Scrutiny review with the shipping companies because of the amounts of times that we were derided for the costs that we were being told that we could achieve. We wanted to be absolutely certain that the costs that we were being quoted were realistic. We did that, we dragged the shipping companies in, and they all testified that not only could they take it away from Jersey and happy to do so, they have even been asked by the department to transport it from Guernsey to Jersey, in some cases, and to cost it. These prices were available and they are ready to do business with the States of Jersey if the States of Jersey wishes to. One of the problems with the Transport and Technical Services Department achieving the costs for shipping of waste that they have so far received has been due to the fact that the Transport and Technical Services Department has commissioned inquiries on limited amounts only. It is a bit like anything; economies of scale. If you talk to somebody, the usual answer is: "The more you buy, the cheaper it gets." Load it on the truck until it is free, I say. In terms of shipping waste, we have been told this morning that it would be unlikely for us to receive permission because we would have to demonstrate that we had no other way of dealing with it and that also, in the words of the Minister, we had environmentally sound disadvantages in handling it the way that we were. Yet, with the Medical Officer of Health's report this morning, we are being told that the stockpiling of waste could potentially cause risk to our water supplies and increases in vermin and disease, which need urgent remediation. I do not, for one minute, believe she thinks 3 years is adequate. I do not think she does. If she has got that kind of concern this year, what will she be saying next year? She is talking about an urgent need to address the issue. That is where we hope, as with the fuel farms, Scrutiny will add value. We have told the Minister, we have told the Council of Ministers, about the gas options, the fuel farm options. We have told them about the shipping options and we have got the evidence and it is there for them to read. Anybody doing anything about it? No, because, I would submit, just like the environmental taxes' argument, if we go for the environmental taxes now we go for G.S.T., and if we go for the recycling now we cannot have the incinerator. The incinerator may be the best thing for Jersey today, but, if it is, it is only because of the failure of the States of Jersey to deal with its situation over the last 20 years, its failure to deal with the situation over the last 2 years, its failure to deal with it over the projected next 3 years, and its self-admission by purchasing this equipment that for the next 25 years it also waives that as well. There are no costs in here for the dismantling of this plant into the future. There are no costs in here for the remediation of that soil which is contained within the ash pits for the future of Jersey. The technology of incineration, if you talk to the experts, is not the technology of the future. There are burn technologies, such as gasification, which takes waste and turns it into a much greater proportionate generator of electricity with a by-product of building aggregate and charcoal, which the charcoal can be re-burnt. There are companies that have walked away from Jersey because of frustrations that the Constable of St. Helier has spoken about that seek business in the United States and elsewhere that generate products from emergency shelters for disaster zones and plastic shelters to a waste-derived fuel and a waste-derived compost with very, very, very, very little left after the recycling has been worked into their processes. Some of those processes include a gasification and some of the plants and some of the technologies and some of these choices are being made by councils in and around the United Kingdom today at a cost of less than £40 million. Less than £40 million. We are being derided for not taking a £60 million decision in 2000, yet we are standing up and saying that that work has now meant that we can go for a different option of £40 million or less, £35 million, today. We are being held up as the people that are holding back while the Minister and his department are

embracing the future. They are not embracing the future; they are embracing the past. All of the States Ministers and all of the public are being conned into thinking that is the case.

Deputy S.C. Ferguson:

I do not think that is parliamentary language.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Unless I am requested to withdraw it, I would like to leave that stand.

Deputy S.C. Ferguson:

I would request that it is withdrawn then.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

All right then. In my view, seriously ... I do not think misled is the right word either; I think seriously fooled, in my view. They are being treated not in a misleading way; they are being treated as fools. I make some speeches that endear me to States Members and I make some that do not, and I am sorry that this is not one that endears me to States Members, but I am not here to please States Members. I am here to try to do my job and that includes giving my best to this topic, which is what I have put my time and effort in over the last few years. I am trying to add value. I am trying to get Members to where we need to be. I accept the Bellozanne plant needs to come down and stop operating. I would like, and will be presenting, a standalone proposition within the next 10 days, if nobody else does, that the Transport and Technical Services Minister stops putting tyres into it. Then I will start asking what else we can stop putting into it and I will try to bring that plant to a close earlier than the projected 3 years. Do I think the case has been made for the current proposals? My experts, who I have to rely upon in a Scrutiny-led system of government, have told me the case has not been made. I am standing up to States Members today to try to right the information that has been put out to them and to the public over a drip, drip, drip, drip marketing effect over the last 5 years to sell us on this £103 million plant that will require £90,000 pits, a new road, an extremely new high mound, a detrimental effect upon those that have got ill health in the poor parts of St. Helier already. I am trying to say something more environmentally friendly can be purchased for less than £40 million. Unfortunately, in the gasping, dying words of the Minister, who, I said earlier, thinks that he is embracing the future: "If I thought a better solution existed I would be recommending it to States Members." I am sorry, I am not convinced that the Minister has been out there and done the work that was necessary to look at the different technologies, and I do not believe that the Minister, or the Ministers themselves within the Council of Ministers, who would not accede to our request to come to look at the plant - the Chief Minister in particular after his green speech in the States Chamber - months before, by Deputy Troy, had requested that in questions without notice. The only response we got was: "They should have asked us a lot earlier. They should have asked us a long time ago." Then we tried to employ Scrutiny funds to take Members to see some of the mechanisms that make up parts of these alternatives, we started to be told: "You cannot use money like that; you are trying to influence people politically and that is an abuse of Scrutiny funds. That is an abuse of the public money." What is certainly an abuse of the public money is to fool people into thinking that £103 million is going to make this Island clean and green. This Island, based upon its actions, has now determined that we must act today because of a crippled plant, crippled by our inactivity and crippled by our lack of support for the Transport and Technical Services Department when they cried out for it, at the time they cried out for it. No money, nothing. We are going to let it go until it falls apart and then we will just build a huge machine on La Collette and be done with it. It is a lot simpler, is it not? There is a saying that you can fool some of the people some of the time.

1.1.4 Deputy J.B. Fox of St. Helier:

Setting aside the many other arguments for alternative energy from waste and increasing recycling I would like to say from the very start that I am fully committed to recycling, and my family and I

have been doing so for years. We have the finest growing tomatoes in the back streets of St. Helier due to our composting, but, unfortunately, we are not able to get rid of all our green waste and therefore use the facilities and, indeed, the other waste facilities that are available. However, today, I am going to concentrate as being one of the 4 deputies that represent the Bellozanne and the surrounding areas of St. Helier's No. 3 and 4 district where the current Bellozanne Energy from Waste incinerator is at the end of its life. We have heard a lot about that today, so I do not propose to go into it, except for just a brief résumé, if you would indulge me. It was originally commissioned in 1979, some 29 or 30 years ago, and because of the growing demand a third stream was added in 1992. Since 1996, the plant has failed to meet the highest air pollution standards and does not meet the Aarhus and Basel conventions and has no flue gas treatment and, therefore, does not meet the Waste Incineration Directive. The plant, therefore, is one of the most polluted in Europe and because of its dramatic decline in condition it is now only available for use 60 per cent of the year. As a result, up to 10,000 tonnes of inert waste has to be stored at La Collette waiting for disposal during the year. Both in April this year, the whole plant had to be closed down for the first time to carry out repairs to the crane rails. Again, in June, significant damage to the chimney forced the plant to close yet again. Clearly, from the residents' point of view, they had been very patient and understanding, knowing that a decision for replacement of the existing plant was in its final stages. If, for argument's sake, this proposition was not successful today, or tomorrow, or possibly the next day, the demands from the residents will escalate, and I think you will agree that would be pretty obvious. I think it would be useful for the House to consider what an alternative scenario could be. If the residents, for argument's sake, force the closure of Bellozanne incinerator by way of a Royal Court action through public health issues - and today we have just received a letter and the annual report which you will see on pages 51 and 52; I will not go into it, because you have got it in front of you - and I think it would be useful if the House consider the alternatives. Due to the severe deterioration and condition of the plant, the Island would have a massive problem overnight. I think we all agree that. T.T.S. would continue to export recyclable materials, push very hard to increase the recycling rate to 36 per cent. After that, and given that the Parishes do not have kerbside collections set up as yet, the Island would have major difficulties as the remaining material after recycling would be contaminated. The only option, T.T.S. advise, would be to store it in lined pits at La Collette. T.T.S. cannot estimate accurately the timescale that this could continue with this procedure. After that, the only option T.T.S. would have is to bail the material and wrap it and store it in a lined quarry somewhere in the Island. However, T.T.S. could look at mobile machines, which has already been indicated in the past. I am not aware of any of them that are available at this time for the Island to purchase in a short or interim measure. In any event, if a supplier could be found, it would need flue gas treatment and the necessary Planning and Environment requirements would, of course, have to be met. T.T.S. advise that the likelihood of getting such a temporary facility up and running would take at least 2 years, but believe that the timescale, in reality, is unrealistic. Finally, T.T.S. believe that to get any of these alternatives up and running would take at least as long as building a main plant. Technical advisers also agree to this option. In reality, I submit, the Island, with its deteriorating condition of the present incinerator, has no option but to proceed to accept and agree to build the new plant as proposed. This would require the existing Bellozanne incinerator to be kept running for another 30 months and that would not keep the residents happy, or the wider area where the pollutants are. Keeping Bellozanne running by continuously running repairs, I would suggest, the preferred option than going into a completely unknown of trying to get some form of temporary equipment that has no track record and which will cost the Island considerably more in the long term. To conclude, the residents at Bellozanne and those in the wider community surrounding the area have expressed for some time that this incinerator should be closed down immediately because of the health hazards and the resulting pollutants that permeate across the far greater area across the Island. Up until now the residents have been exceedingly patient with the process that a new incinerator will be built and this incinerator would be closed down. I look forward to positive measures to be given to the residents of the Island and the Island will once and for all resolve this problem and make a right

decision. We have run out of time looking at other alternatives. Therefore, we have no option but to accept this proposition as it is the only one that has been laid down today that will give us the positive results in the shortest possible timescale and, indeed, dare I suggest, at the only price that we can afford at this moment in time as I gather from the speech I heard earlier on from the Minister that the proposed supplier of the Energy from Waste plant is not likely to remain patient for much longer.

1.1.5 Deputy J.A. Martin:

It is probably one of the 3 speeches or 4 speeches we will hear from the Deputies of No. 3 and 4 district, one of them being the Minister. I am not going to talk about the location, but I do have some serious questions for the T.T.S. Minister and I would like some answers. I had to leave early yesterday at the Juniper meeting because I was going off to run through a second draft of another Scrutiny report, but I did have some serious concerns when it was reported and asked by, I think, Deputy Mezbourian why certain - and it is on page 4 of the independent review - relevant information was never released from T.T.S. to Juniper. It says: "A formal quantity of up-to-date modelling of mass flows into E.f.W.s under a range of scenarios, financial analysts and formal risk analysts of consequences of wrongly predicting the quantity and the nature of waste over the lifetime of the plant." Secondly, they go on to say that: "A particular concern, their officers seem only to be concerned with the problems of the plant not being big enough." The Minister started his speech today saying that this has been going on since October 2000 which was the first time it was presented to the Public Services Committee. I was elected in 2000 and one of my very first committees was Public Services, but I think it was not in this debate in committee level, but I was certainly there when the recommendations came back and we did say to the consultants and the Chief Officer: "Not good enough. Go back and find out some more." We already knew then that things were changing. What Juniper did say to us yesterday, while I was able to stay there, I think Deputy Le Claire has mainly covered a lot of it, that there are certain things that have not been taken into account that nowadays, even supermarkets, E.U., their packaging is treble what it needs to be and there are directives coming that this has got to go. In fact, I unpack some of my over-packed stuff and leave it down at my local supermarket for them to get rid of, especially now they charge me extra for buying bags, so I do not take all the rubbish that they try to inflict on me. They do not have a problem, but it is one way of dealing with it and it is one way ... if a lot more people do it, carry on. I really have a serious question, and obviously the Minister has got technical people on hand. He made a great play on we are getting an Energy from Waste plant. I do not know if we have all read this, but I am reading it because it is nice, big writing, and it is very clear: The Right Solution for Jersey from T.T.S. It is from a leading industry supplier with a proven track record: "It will conform to the highest European environmental standards. It will deal with increase in waste predictors as the number of households in the Island rises." Just let me deal with that one first, the predicted number of households in the Island. We also have a piece on that, the Statistics Unit brought out from 38,000 households in 2007 to 46,200 households in 2005. I know a lot of people did attend the household survey by the Statistic Unit. A lot of these are not new people. They are living here now, they are living in what they describe as a 'concealed household', which would be me, my husband, maybe younger children, and possibly an adult child with a wife and maybe a child. That second family, as it will be concealed by the Statistics Unit, will need one of these houses. I would suggest, they are probably producing rubbish now. More rubbish in one household. Divide the people into 2 houses, are you trying to tell me it is going to double the waste? I do not think so. Then we come to this right solution for Jersey and it is an Energy from Waste plant. It will produce up to 7 per cent of the Island's electrical needs in a sustainable way. Again, the Minister spoke about this in his opening speech and said: "No, we have not got an Energy from Waste plant because we can do the 105,000 tonnes, but we can easily go down to 36,000 tonnes." My question is quite straightforward, if it can produce up to 7 per cent of the electrical, what will it produce at 36,000 tonnes? Will it be worth turning on my light bulb, or will it even trigger my light bulb to turn it on? I really need that question answered. It is not an Energy

from Waste plant and we must remember that if we are going to believe what the Minister is telling us. That again, was covered very hopefully by the letter we got from the T.T.S.'s adviser just a few moments ago. On the same subject they say that the recommended option is environmental and can do 36,000 tonnes, or, alternatively, up to 105,000 tonnes. They also go on at point 5 in their letter we have just received: "The importance of the point above is that you are not locking yourself into a solution which means you have to feed the Energy from Waste plant. Clearly, having spent a large sum of money on an asset, you will want to use it and you would make best use of it." Which one contradicts the other there? I am not an expert, but it seems to me we need to at least run at 105,000 tonnes per annum to produce up to 7 per cent of our Island's electricity. This is what we are buying. I despaired yesterday when I heard the Juniper experts in the room saying that they had to work on this report with at least one hand tied behind their back. Obviously, there are things that the Scrutiny Panel know and are very confidential. It is even to the point they cannot even recommend the type of kit we are getting is compliant on all grounds. The 3 gentlemen there yesterday seemed to have an expert knowledge on 3 separate areas. I was very impressed with what I heard, but they were not even given, the criteria, what the plant will be, what it will do and what the costings were. That is the plant that we are going out ... the piece of kit we are going out to purchase. They said they asked for it on highly confidential ... obviously, these are top consultants; they are not going to leak anything. They may have said: "Kit okay, some problems with kit." That is as far as they could have gone, probably, in a report if they had been given this information, but they were not given it. As I say, I am not sure about any of these figures. I am not sure now which ... I am sure that the people who were supposed to be scrutinising them ... again, we have this word "scrutiny". It comes down to what were we expected to do when we have got the ministerial Scrutiny? We have now got 2 supposedly world leaders as advisers; one for T.T.S., who seemed to have been brought in quite late, but in different parts their remit seems to have grown over the last few years when there has been a problem. Then we have got the other experts - and I think the qualifications across the board on both sides are very good - who have been denied vital information. I cannot support something that when experts are asked to make a judgment, they may well have come out and agreed with the other expert, but I do not know that. As they suggested, they do not know that. We have moved from a 126,000-tonne plant down to 105,000, which is also, we are told, capable of only needing to do 36,000 tonnes a year. I have just heard from Deputy Fox that we basically are where we are and this is the only solution. Let us get on with it because if tomorrow the residents of No. 3 and 4 districts start complaining they will have to shut down the incinerator and we will have nowhere to go. The Minister for T.T.S. has got a back-up plan? No. It seems to me that the Scrutiny Panel are going to bring a little back-up plan: stop burning the rubbish that is making these fumes so poisonous. Put them somewhere until we do get a new plant or whatever we are going to get and deal with this issue now. It could have been dealt with in the last 2 or 3 years. There has not been a willingness from T.T.S. to do anything, really. All we keep being told is: "It is on its last legs." I do not disagree that it is certainly past its sell-by date. There was one other telling ... where this is like ... we are not like, you know, compare ourselves to turning around a big ship. In the Minister's speech he said: "Of course we have got to go for this; we have been doing this for 30 years." His words were: "Can we afford to squander the skill we have acquired over those 30 years in the workforce?" No, I am sorry, we cannot afford to squander the skill, but things move on. I really do wish we had a Minister for Transport and Technical Services who really, to me, had convinced me. He says alternatives have been looked at. I am not convinced that anything from when he took over from the previous committee president ... that the department has always preferred the tried and tested. That is another reason because I do not know how many workforce and skills we had, I do not know the age range, but I hope there are people being trained up, if this is the way we are going to go. This is not just a hundred and X million for one payment; it is going to need work over the next good few years. I am not sure that everything has been looked into. I cannot support this proposition. It is in a world of 'let us go green'. I seem to have a Minister who is green in political terms and a Scrutiny Chairman whose policies are green and seems to know more what he is talking about. I am sorry, the Minister has

tried to ... did a very passionate speech, normally one that will always get through this House: "We must do it today, we must spend £110 million, we must employ this company or the whole world will stop turning and we will have nowhere to put our rubbish." He has not got a fall-back plan, so I am not going to be politically blackmailed into doing what T.T.S. tell me and not giving other people proper reports and things that then I find out that: "Sorry, we were paid this money but we could not do our job." There was one telling issue that apparently the Energy from Waste plant is suitable for certain types of waste and if we change our waste stream over the next few years, this could become a very costly exercise. Again, that could not be explored because Juniper were not given information. What are we being sold? The case has not been made for me. When I asked at planning, when I went to do the objection to the planning application - and that is getting into the area, but that is a bit different - it is a terrible place to put any massive plant, and it is the gateway to St. Helier. But let us forget about that. I mean, we do not really care about what the visitors see, do we? I mean, let us not worry about that. There will be 2 green hills faraway, according to the Minister for T.T.S. As long as you have your glasses on and you are sitting in the car deck and you cannot see out of the window from the boat, you are all right. I think that is what he meant. Just one last word: when I asked what capacity was the 126 tonne, I could not ask about the 105. That was of the population of up to, I think, 130,000 people over the lifetime. Now, to me, that says it all. It is too big unless you are going to grow the population to 125,000 people. It is not the right tip. I will leave it there, and I am not voting for this proposition. I think I have made that quite clear.

1.1.6 Deputy C.J. Scott Warren of St. Saviour:

Think of a number. 126,000? 105,000? These 2 figures are the previous and latest proposed capacity in tonnes for the incinerator - that is, until today, when the Minister mentioned 96,000 or 97,000 tonnes. Was the first figure correct? Is the second figure correct? Is the latest mentioned this morning by the Minister correct? Will we ever know? Sadly, the answer will be "No" if Members support this proposition today. No, at least until the plant has been built and is up and running, by which time, I suggest, it is too late. Could we have known more fully about the correct figure of the tonnage in advance? Yes, certainly we could. Juniper were prepared, if requested, to go the extra mile and ascertain by working with Transport and Technical Services whether the revised size for this plant is appropriate for the needs of this Island. Juniper, still, believe that an audit is required. Members know that I always speak my mind, and that I am not easily influenced by others of either left or right persuasion when I make a decision. I believe that all Members agree, that the current incinerator is well past its sell-by date, and that there is now a priority in replacing it. This, is therefore not the issue. I note the letter from the Medical Officer of Health, but, I believe that she would not want to have an oversized Energy from Waste plant. In the proposition, in the conclusion, under the joint heading of Jersey T.T.S.D. and Fichtner, I would like to read. It says: "Building a smaller plant and taking a substantial risk does not appear to be a sensible option for the Island unless there is strong evidence that waste arisings will not increase, which there is not. It is noted that introducing an intensive kerbside collection scheme, handling and transporting the additional recyclables as required by the solid waste strategy assumptions will still be a costly exercise." That last phrase, "Will still be a costly exercise" in my opinion clearly indicates this Minister and department's thinking and their approach. I do not believe that the weeks which Juniper, who are totally independent, would have required in order to carry out an audit on the revised size incinerator would cause anything other than a minimum delay. In fact, if T.T.S. is totally confident that all their department's calculations are thorough, are rigorous, it, if you will excuse the expression, beggars belief that yesterday the Minister did not respond to Juniper's offer by saying words to the effect: "Yes, by all means go ahead with an audit of the proposed incinerator, as we are confident that you will support our findings." So, I ask Members, why did the Minister not agree and support Juniper's offer? Why, indeed? Of the many key advantages that Juniper sees in building a smaller Energy from Waste plant, 4 are among the bullet points in their report on page 57 under 4.5(1). I know this has been said, but I think it should be

said again: "If waste minimisation is successful, avoids a white elephant built far too big to meet what may seem in a few years time to be old-fashioned ideas about waste treatment, rather than resource recovery." Another bullet point: "Does not act as a disincentive for recycling." Another one: "Does not commit the States to capital investment until it is sure that it is required." Another one: "Ensures that any new capacity is optimised to the requirements that pertain at the time. For example [and it goes on to say] the need perhaps of biological rather than thermal processing capacity." When Juniper came to Jersey yesterday, the word "optimal" was one they emphasised several times. Juniper spoke about the change of packaging by U.K. supermarkets, which will affect the tonnage and the average energy content of waste. They also stated that they wanted more evidence regarding waste growth and the underlying assumptions. Most importantly of all, in my opinion, Juniper emphasised that an analysis of population growth, recycling rates, factors such as these, need to be modelled as a sensitivity analysis; and I bolt this phrase on, just to say these are crucial on an investment of this magnitude. They said words to the effect that this would be standard practice anywhere else. I repeat these words: "An investment of this magnitude." Can we afford to get this wrong? How will the public respond to such a decision going ahead without the necessary audit that Juniper has offered to carry out? I noted the letter today from the Fichtner to the Chief Minister, and if there had been a similar letter from Juniper to the Chief Minister or to the chairman of Scrutiny saying that they were happy and supported these proposals, I could have supported this proposition. So, I ask Members to say today or tomorrow, whenever this debate ends, to the Minister for Transport and Technical Services, if you are right about this requirement for the 105,000 tonne Energy from Waste plant, get the audit from Juniper done over the coming weeks, and then bring back either this or a revised proposition in early autumn. I urge Members to reject this quick-change incinerator proposition. Let us make sure that we get this decision right.

1.1.7 Connétable S.A. Yates of St. Martin:

The trouble is that world economics and modern technology are progressing so quickly my brain cannot keep up. I was just getting used to the idea of oil reaching the heights of 100 dollars a barrel, and now it is approaching 150 dollars, and my thoughts are: "Why burn plastic in order to buy more expensive oil?" The G8 (Group of Eight) summit in Japan at the moment - the world is trying to react to tomorrow's problems today. We find that food prices worldwide have risen, caused by the manufacture of bio fuels. In whose interest is maintaining the price of oil at a very high level? It seems to be the oil companies, plus the agriculturalists as well. It is not really a situation, and I think really this debate, although it is about probably old-fashioned technology, because I have a feeling that in the 8 years of research that T.T.S. has done, the same economic situation does not apply today as it applied 8 years ago. We have got the whole world. So, we have really got to look at where we are going to go in the future, because I have got a feeling we are going to have to sort of take steps to readjust our lives, because I am afraid that the economies of China and India are not going to go away. They are going to be still maintaining a great demand upon the world resources, and we have got to try and save the resources. Recycling. Now I am completely with the Constable of St. Helier on this - completely behind him. I just want to refer to a couple of items in the briefing notes supplied by T.T.S. The first one basically is the bar chart, the non-inert waste growth 2001-2007 recycling and residual waste. It shows in the bar chart, 2007, burn 84,000 tonnes, recycle 26,000 tonnes; and having a look at the bar chart, without happening to be a mathematician, the recycled section of that certainly does not look like 30 per cent. So, one thing I would like to ask the Minister, what is the criterion for setting recycling percentages? Because if you scale it off at 26,000 tonnes of recycled materials, 26,000 tonnes of a total of 110,000 tonnes is not 30 per cent - it is more like 24 per cent. Are we massaging the figures to make us feel good? Are we recycling 30 per cent? I do not think so. Current and proposed recycling, bring bank service, 1,600 tonnes recycled in 2007. The re-use and recycling centre, 1,300 tonnes recycled at Bellozanne in 2007. St. John's kerbside collection service, 90 tonnes were collected in 2007. Now, this is all usable stuff and it can be recycled and made into other stuff. It is not going to be put into an ash pit. Basically, this is stuff that can be melted down

and recycled and made into new plastic bottles or fleece jackets. Yesterday I got some prices from recycling values. This is U.K. prices: newspapers £75 a tonne; mixed paper £60 a tonne; aluminium £720 a tonne; steel cans £300 a tonne; plastics, high-density polyethylene £325 a tonne; P.E.T. (Polyethylene Terephthalate) which is the drinks bottles £170 a tonne; mixed plastic £155 a tonne; glass £12 a tonne. Now, the stuff that we recycle has a value, and I keep on hearing that we cannot afford to do it because it costs so much to get it off the Island. I do not accept that, because I think if it has got a value people will come here and fetch it. Taking up from the Constable of St. Helier, I think the extra costs of recycling at kerbside will not be falling on the T.T.S. - it will be falling on the Constables. I must say, as a Constable, I do feel that the parishioners of St. Martin and, I am sure probably in every other Parish on this Island, are in fact keen to embrace the concept of recycling, because they are worried about the situation that the whole planet is in. I think, quite frankly, that apart from the Constable of St. John and the Constable of St. Helier, the other 10 Constables at the moment are not really engaged in this yet. But I think they want to be engaged, and I think we are going to have to talk to our parishioners, and we are going to have to tell them that: "Yes, to recycle kerbside recycling is probably going to cost something." I think in our Parish it probably will cost another £20,000 or £30,000 a year, but I am sure that they would be very happy to pay in their rates that amount to enable 2 extra collections a month of a specialised truck that they can put the plastic bottles in one part, paper in another part, the cardboard and so on, so that it can be kerbside recycling. It will be high quality separation. With a certain amount of persuasion or regulation, there should be a high quality of recycling component. Going back to the bar charts, I have looked at a couple of pages further on. I am looking at the 26,000 tonnes of recycled that T.T.S. claim. In 2007 there is a multicoloured bar chart here and it would seem that of that 26,000 tonnes, 15,000 tonnes are green waste, which is recycled into compost which they have difficulty to get rid of because they have got to pay farmers to get rid of it. 8,000 tonnes of glass, and when you add on the 3,000 tonnes of plastics that the Parishes recycle, or the T.T.S. Recycling Centre recycles, that comes to about 24 or 25,000 tonnes. I think this can be vastly improved, and I think, with the Constables driving the kerbside recycling, that we can improve the efficiency of this particular issue. I would certainly like the Constables to be talking about this, and I shall certainly be talking to the Constable of St. Helier following up on his lead on this, because I am quite keen. I know my parishioners are quite keen to save the planet. Just turn to a page further back. Talking about the design of the actual plant: "The design is of high quality, being designed as a beautiful building with features to lessen the visual impact from medium distant views", and I say: "What?" Yes. It looks all sort of ethereal, transient, like an ice palace. Unfortunately, it is massive. In fact, if you look on the front page of that, you will see that it is higher than South Hill. I do not mean Mount Bingham; I mean the cliff at South Hill. When you drive round, the height of that cliff is where the height of the incineration plant roof will be, and I am afraid it is a monstrous carbuncle. When my granddaughter in a couple of years' time, 3 or 4 years' time, says: "What is that, Papa?" I say: "That is the recycling plant." "Well, who told them to put it there?" I do not think, that I should be able to say: "Well, I was partly to blame, because I voted for it." I am afraid that is not going to be part of my legacy to my granddaughter. Finally, I would just like to make a few points from the health impact assessment. What is quite interesting is, it is very, sort of, vaguely worded. You can read almost anything into it: "The health impact assessment is concerned with improving health and reducing health inequalities. The aim of the health impact assessment is to inform and influence policy decision making by enabling decision makers to consider health implications of their policies. It considers which key health determinants, for example, air quality noise, will be affected, and how this will in turn impact on the health and wellbeing of the population. The assessment considers whether the project will affect our physical, emotional and social wellbeing as well as possibly affecting ill health." Turning the page: "New evidence from the literature was gathered and distilled. Stake-holder data collected by the Delphi techniques, a 2-stage telephone survey involving over 700 Jersey residents: telephone interview with key workers in both community and organisation stakeholders. There is always necessary compromise between brevity and rigour in any study. In this case, the time and resources available prevented a wider

range of methods being used.” Now, they scored it with a plus or minus, and I think it is: “And the subsequent effect on health outcomes, direction of change: a plus sign means a health gain, a minus sign means a health loss.” Then you have got: “Likelihood of impact and latency.” Now, there is a whole list; there is about a page and a half of a list, and there are 10 plus signs - air quality operation, air quality construction, traffic operation, traffic construction, visual amenity, health and safety operation, social capital, noise operation, noise construction; and there are 10 pluses and 17 minuses. So, they are not making a big noise about this, but it would seem to be that the air quality is going to get better, but the traffic around La Collette is going to get worse. The one that was quite amusing, I thought: traffic operation - this is a plus: “Some increase in active transport; e.g., walking and cycling associated with energy from waste development.” I did not quite understand that. Then, underneath that, another plus: “Increase in physical and mental health and wellbeing associated with increased physical activity.” So, you feel better doing the walking - you are going to feel better because of it. So, really speaking ... Visual amenities which I must mention: “Reduction, visual amenity from the Waterfront: minus sign - possible. Reduction in mental wellbeing for a minority of Jersey people: minus sign - speculative.” Well, that means there are only a few people that live there that might not like it. But I can tell you one thing, when I come in from the east every morning, it is going to hack me off no end; and I think there will be people coming from the west as well. So, really speaking, there is only one other thing: “Visual impact of the site is a clear concern of a majority of the community. Stakeholders accepted it”, and there is: “Although there is little evidence of the relation with ill health, it is important to engage the community in decisions about how to make the Energy from Waste facility more attractive to residents and reduce this anxiety for them.” Mitigation: “Minimise the size of the facility and assess the practicality of sinking part of the structure.” That might be a good idea, but you would have to sink it 18 metres, because then the top of the structure would be the same level as the top of the power station - the generating hall. If that is practical, I would vote for it; otherwise not. So, that is about it. I am not particularly enthralled with this particular thing, for the reasons I have stated. I think the whole thing is that the world needs to take stock of itself, including the population of Jersey. We have got to sort of look at our life and change.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

The adjournment is proposed. The Assembly will reconvene at 2.15 p.m.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

1.1.8 Deputy S.C. Ferguson of St. Brelade:

I listened to the Constable of St. Martin just before lunch, and he talks about the growing economies in China and India and so on. In actual fact, the economies there are getting extremely wobbly with the current credit setup. Vietnam has imploded, and they reckon that China and India will probably follow suit. Anyway, I must compliment T.T.S. on a comprehensive supply of information. Like the Minister, I now know a great deal more about garbage disposal, and just about every variation in techniques available. This morning, Constable Crowcroft talked of a test plant. Can we assume that the process has not been running for 2 years on a commercial scale? If the Connétable was in the States he could probably tell me, but he is not. I can agree that it is a very good thing to be ahead of the game, but experience has taught us that total innovation can backfire. What about the Comet? That was way ahead of its time, but it did not stop it exploding. We cannot play with possibilities; we must deal with certainties. A superlative recycling route is fine, but how realistic is it? Will we achieve it at the expense of great pollution in China and Africa? I am all in favour of recycling, but that is merely part of an integrated waste strategy. Just about every authority or country, certainly in the developed world, is installing some form of incinerator. In fact, Switzerland, with some of the cleanest air in Europe, has 280 of them, and they are not pygmies either - the latest is 144,000 tonne plant near Lausanne. I am also concerned about

the bandying round of various terms without defining what these terms represent. I have heard concern that the generating plant will only have an efficiency of only about 24 per cent. Well, it is a known fact that no straightforward generating plant using steam can achieve much above 30 per cent anyway. C.H.P. (Combined Heat and Power) plants can operate higher than this, but these are not particularly relevant in this case. We have heard all sorts of things about efficiency. Energy efficiency can reach 65 per cent. But the problem is we have been hearing people talk about different types of efficiency, and they are equating them all together; and frankly, you know, in science and engineering there is a definition of efficiency for just about any process you can think of. It does seem to me from the proposition, that T.T.S. have considered just about very type of waste disposal plant currently in existence. As far as I could gather, one of the recommendations from Juniper was for a smaller plant of about 80,000 tonnes, with a possibility of adding a 40,000 tonne plant later as an extra stream. I do take it this is the same Juniper which figures extensively on the website of the company manufacturing these plants. Moreover, this particular company only makes plants up to a maximum load of 80,000 tonnes. Now, the marginal cost of 106,000 tonne plant over the 80,000 tonne one is £11 million, but if we adopt the other approach, one 80,000 tonne plant with the ability to add another if we need it, then the additional cost is £30 million.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Sorry. Can I just ask the speaker to give way, please? Just as a point of information.

Deputy S.C. Ferguson:

Yes. It is a company called ener-gy.com.

Deputy S.C. Ferguson:

No. I would like to ask a question of the speaker, if possible, please.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Is the speaker prepared to give way?

Deputy S.C. Ferguson:

Yes. Oh, sorry. I will sit down.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire

The speaker mentions a company whose website she believed, as she spoke, has a company on it identified as Juniper, and she seems to intimate that this company may be the same company that we employed and then, it seemed to me, seemed to impugn their work because they were not supporting anything less than 80,000 tonnes. Is she going to categorically deny that that was her statement, or is she going to continue to have us believe that that is what she said?

Deputy S.C. Ferguson:

I will quote what I said. I said: "I take it that this is the same Juniper which figures extensively on the website of the company manufacturing these plants." I do not know. I am asking, perhaps, if the chairman of the Scrutiny Panel can enlighten me. We have got to the marginal cost of £30 million. Alternatively, you can look at it that with the T.T.S. version you get 33 per cent more capacity for 13 per cent more cost, compared with the other alternative where you get 33 per cent more capacity for 56 per cent more cost. Does this really make economic sense? Where is the margin for error? As I have said before, there is a cautionary note to be struck with recycling. Much of the recycling, the electrical equipment, is being sent to third world countries, or to China or Africa, and it is polluting their countryside and water sources. In fact, I understand Switzerland are keeping themselves pure exporting to Senegal. I do not think we can delay any more with this. I think perhaps the cost of the new plant has thrown people back on their heels a bit, when you consider that the euro has dropped by a third over the last couple of years. Well, that explains part

of it. We cannot do with a plant that is about to fall to pieces. We cannot do with piling up rubbish. We must, I think, vote for the proposition and go ahead with this plant.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire

On a point of order, may I ask, although it was a very cleverly worded contribution by the chairman of the Scrutiny Panels Chairmen's Panel, the chairman did allude or seemed to impute the integrity of Juniper in her speech; she certainly did appear that she was imputing their integrity. I wondered, whether or not you were ruling on that?

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Unless I missed it, I did not hear that. But if the Deputy wishes ... which particular aspect of the speech ...

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

In asking her question, she said: "Is it the same company that appears on the website of an incinerator company that produces incinerators less than 80,000 tonnes", therefore or thereby implying that these consultants may be trying to sway the debate into purchasing some ... you know, it is quite clear to me what the implication was.

The Bailiff:

Perhaps the Deputy would like to clarify. I think the point is clear. Do you wish to add anything, Deputy?

Deputy S.C. Ferguson:

I do not want to add anything more than I have said. I merely asked if it was the same company.

The Bailiff:

Perhaps the Chairman when he speaks can clarify that point. The Deputy of St. Peter.

1.1.9 Deputy C.H. Egré:

Some 15 years ago while researching detail for a thesis that I wrote for my Master of Science degree entitled: "Risk analysis and emergency management in Jersey", I noted that the La Collette site, especially the site of the fuel farm, was by far the highest risk of any site on the Island. I made reference to that in my thesis which I gave to Members of the States at the time. What has changed? Well, since doing that research it would appear that we have spent time building further systems, further industry, around that site. There has been some vast improvement on the safety management of that site since I made my initial research findings. But, having said that, the risk is still the highest risk on the Island site. Some time ago, when I heard that there was the possibility of siting the waste disposal site there, I made an appointment to see the Director of Planning and Environment at that particular point. I was early for my appointment, so I drove round and waited near the Connex site. Dressed in a suit, I was a bit obvious, and the fact that I was looking at the fuel farm, it was even more obvious that I might not be the normal mechanic down at Connex. So, I was approached by 2 of the mechanics there. When I explained what I was doing they were pleased to share information with me. Part of that information was that when refuelling was taking place at La Collette, there is a vapour release from the tanks. As you are putting fuel in the tank there is a vapour release that comes out of the top; and at that particular area at that site, which is away from the actual fuel plant - only by several metres, but still away from the fuel plant - they said that they were picking up droplets of fuel when this was taking place - which really reinforced my concerns that this was a high risk site. It is essential that we resolve this problem. It is essential that we do something about our waste. Part of that waste, I believe, is in setting up an incinerator. I think we just cannot get away from that particular fact. However, to site a £106 million investment in an area which is of the highest risk on this Island, I find, goes beyond being strange. There must be other sites which could have accommodated the incinerator plant. I think I heard the

word: "Where?" Not there, is the point I make. I enforce what I have just said. It is the highest risk area on this Island. In the Atkins report, which I believe covered the risk analysis on the current site, there is a view taken that it is of acceptable risk. Now, that is of acceptable risk for people working on the principle, if there is an event at the fuel farm and there are 10 people working around that site, and 10 people get killed, it is sad for them, it is sad for their families, but from a risk perspective, it is not that huge. If the figures start to build up after a period, if you had 100 people there, that risk is then deemed as not acceptable. I am not just talking about the risk to people which was emphasised in the Atkins report, I am talking about the risk of the investment that we are putting in, in this exercise. It is £106 million plus, I would think. Now, one has to think very hard about where you site your capital investment in this particular project. So, on that basis, I cannot endorse this particular proposition. I can endorse the need for an incinerator plant, but I could not, professionally, put a tick in the box to say: "Yes. That is where you put it" - in an area which I emphasise is of the highest risk on this Island.

1.1.10 Deputy A.E. Pryke of Trinity:

I just question, do we really think of how much waste we produce every day at home - what really happens to it? It is the in thing at present to recycle as much as possible, and everyone should be congratulated on what has been achieved, not only in our homes but in our schools, as well as the introduction of Eco-Active and now Eco-Business who are all addressing this issue. We do aim to increase our recycling to 36 per cent soon, but that will still leave a great mass that is not recycled. So, what do we do with it? Should we export it somewhere else? But that will come at a great cost. As I understand, one of the main components of our waste is food, and it has been suggested that this is dealt with, that we should require some sort of system to deal with it, where to site it and the cost of one of these systems. Then there is the waste put on the fields. I, for one, would never, ever support that, and we have heard from a major supermarket questioning: "Do we really want to jeopardise our royal potato crop for that?" I think we only have to cast back to the dumping of the potatoes at Beauport many years ago, and the leachate it produced and still is producing, I understand. Take it off the Island. But, I also think of the carbon footprints. Mention has also been made of how effective the scheme to recycle plastic bags has been, but that took over 4 years to get everybody on board, and a great deal of pressure from the W.I. (Women's Institute). It does show that it can be done, but it takes a long time; and it is done by education, and with everybody signing up to it. Otherwise it fails from the start. Also, much has been said about supermarkets reducing the waste. I am aware that it is happening, but it is not going to be immediate, and we will still end up with some packaging, because so-called, the housewife needs it, requires it, wants it. Hopefully, recycling levels will increase. But I am also concerned about the emissions from the incinerator, and I would like to ask the Minister to confirm that those emissions will be looked at effectively. Will it be monitored? How often will it be monitored, and by whom? Will the results be made public? As a plus point for this plant, it is said that electricity will be generated and fed into the grid, which could be used as part of a local heating scheme. There are problems regarding living on an Island and how we should deal with our waste. We cannot take it easily 60, 70, 80 miles down the road to be recycled. I think this proposed plant is taking a holistic approach to a major problem, and that Bellozanne is not fit for the purpose.

1.1.11 Deputy R.C. Duhamel of St. Saviour:

I had intended to speak later to give other Members a chance, so to speak, but politics these days are a bit like playing political whist and it is a question of when you play your trump cards, and I think some of the ministerial trump cards are waiting until I have spoken. In 2005, this House decided that it would ask the then Environment and Public Services Committee to look into not just a single solution for waste management problems, but for a 2-tier option. That promise was made by the then President of that Committee which was Senator Ozouf, and it is there in the minutes. Quite clearly when the debate was stopped and discussions took place with myself and Senator Ozouf, chaired by the Deputy Bailiff at the time, we came back to the House and put off the debate

then, because there were a number of concerns from the Ministers that the job had not been done to the satisfaction of all, in providing the House with cross-schedules and all the rest of it. Therefore, a further body of work would be undertaken. What was stated, and it is quite clear in the household record on that date, was that a 2-tier solution would come forward and there would be a high throughput option - high throughput meaning a big incinerator with not much recycling - and a low throughput option. This was agreed, which meant a smaller machine, substantially smaller than is being spoken about at the moment, and high recycling. Before the States got into the position of deciding whatever it was that the department would wish to promote when the time came for them to promote it, that work would be undertaken. This was in 2005. The States also decided at that time, which was quite surprising, that the department were quite free to come back at any point before December 2008 to tell the House of their findings and to explain to the House, or justify to the House, why they thought whatever proposition they were going to be putting forward for the type of kit they wanted, was the best available in all terms. So, that was not just environmental terms, but social terms and economic terms; and that proposal would be able to be compared and contrasted against the alternative for a substantially smaller machine and higher recycling. Since then many things have happened and a lot of water has passed under the bridge. We heard this morning from the Minister for Transport and Technical Services that some element of blame could be placed with the Environment Scrutiny Panel and there appeared to be an implication that we had delayed - or that Committee had delayed - the discussions on the issues. Since that time, what has happened? Well, Senator Ozouf himself had reservations as to whether or not Bellozanne Valley was the best place to site whatever incinerator equipment the department were going to come forward with. Notwithstanding the decision that had already been taken to put any further kit as a replacement for the ailing plant in the same valley, nonetheless he would come forward and suggest to the House, which he managed to do successfully - the majority of Members voted for it, - that La Collette was a better site. Now, he did this and this was shortly before or after - I have not got the figures on my desk but it does not really matter - because world events then kicked into play. Buncefield suffered a huge accident and the whole world of regulation and risks that the Deputy of St. Peter was beginning to get into, suddenly suggested that perhaps the decision that this House had taken at the instigation and suggestions of the then President of the Environment and Public Services ...

The Bailiff:

Just to clarify that, I think the decision was 28th June 2006, which would have been after the start of ministerial government, not ...

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Thank you. Right. But Buncefield happened nonetheless and, having taken those decisions, a further round of delaying talks, or delaying Scrutiny, had to take place in order to assure the Planning Minister and others that perhaps the siting of this proposed piece of incineration equipment could take place at La Collette. Those reports have only recently been finished, and, indeed, some elements of them have not as yet been agreed by this House. We have further requirements by the Fire Service suggesting that if there are safety considerations, and there are in terms of the siting of this equipment close to a fuel farm, then a couple of things have to happen, and one of them must be that there has to be a back way out or a back way in to the site in order to give the States Fire Department and other emergency services the opportunity to deliver whatever services would be required in the event of an accident along similar lines to Buncefield. So, it is very, very clear, that even at this late stage we have the department slipping in the suggestion, uncoded, unspoken about, within their green briefing notes. I will try and find it; it is at the back somewhere. The document is not numbered by page, but we do have a suggestion. If Members turn, it is a couple of pages from the back. There are some pictures of the La Collette site and there is the text next door, and there is just a bare suggestion: "T.T.S. are proposing a new emergency access from Green Street slip to enable fire engines to access La Collette by another route in the event of a major event at the

fuel farm.” How much is it going to cost? Do not know. It is not in the schedule. Has it been agreed as yet? No. Fire Service would require it. What is it going to do? Is it a road in the air going from Green Street slip to the La Collette site that is being spoken about for the siting of this particular plant? Is it going to be one of these aerial roads or maybe a tunnel? I do not know. There will be a requirement for a further small reclamation site in order to take the new roadway from the Green Street slip, across the beach, which is a Ramsar site and was deemed on other occasions to be worth keeping; this is why the reclamation site did not proceed any further eastwards under the Falle Carter scheme to provide their marina facilities or anything else. So, we would be nibbling in with a new reclamation site to provide a surface for a road which is probably required. So, again, it brings into question whether or not decisions that this House took and took on the basis of information that was made available at the time, were sensible decisions. This, really is at the nub of the work which the Environment Scrutiny Panel and, indeed, Scrutiny as a whole, does in order to try and add value to any decision-making that is going to be taken by this House, by the Ministers, or by anybody else. Future-proofing decisions is really what it is all about, so that we are not caught in the position that, having taken a decision - a cheap decision or even an expensive decision - at one point in time, we suddenly find ourselves having to commit to further expenditure 2 years, 3 years, 5 years, even 10 years, or even 15 years into the future. It is bad planning; it is bad financial planning; it is bad environmental planning; and it is really something that the State has got to get to grips with. So, there is going to be another road. Now, what else have we got to look forward to? Even though all this other work had been undertaken, and the Scrutiny Panel has had to decide whether or not, in the absence of having the T. and T.S. ask for suggestions coming to this House, on 20th May we knew that it was going to be, certainly by the end of December 2008. But we need to bear in mind that when the States sit after the summer recess, we are into budget time and financial issues, and there did not appear to be any other time where this major proposition would come forward. So, what were we going to do in the meantime? In the meantime, what we did was, we conducted a number of reviews to inform States Members for the day when this proposition is going to come, in the hope that it was going to be put forward in the terms that this House had agreed to. The proposition was lodged on 20th or 21st May, and to our surprise - and perhaps we should not have been surprised - there was a cobbled, half-hearted attempt to come forward with some cost comparisons and some scenario comparisons; and lo and behold, having produced in the meantime a number of reports with the assistance of Juniper and others, we then found it being suggested within glossy documents that were being passed to States Members and printed in the *Evening Post*, that we were apparently suggesting as the smaller option, an 80,000 tonne machine of the same type that the department wished to procure - a mass burning incinerator - with an additional add-on to be committed to within maybe 3, 4, 5 years. Now, I know it is quite difficult when Members are put into the position of having to read technical reports with which they are not perhaps *au fait*, it does take a bit of effort. But any Members who take the trouble to read the reports that the Environment Scrutiny Panel and Juniper have put into the public domain, would quite clearly see that the option that was being passed off as “the Scrutiny option” was not our option at all. Now, I made on behalf of the Panel, complaints to the Chief Executive which have not as yet been addressed, because it is not really fair that the Scrutiny Panel and the Scrutiny process in general should be painted into a picture whereby it has been claimed that we are making statements when we are not making those statements at all. But it has been done - and not only has it been done, it has probably been ignored. We have tried to redress the issue by making statements, but we have limited resources. At the moment I have one officer; the second officer has not been replaced as she is off ill, and has been off ill since before Christmas. No attempt has been made to supply the Scrutiny Panel with extra staff, so we have done our best. I think we have done a very, very good job under the circumstances. We have not been profligate with the monies that we spent and I think it can be shown that what we have done has been very good value for money, in terms of educating Members and the public as to the real reasons - or some of the reasons, or some of the perceived reasons - why we think the Minister wishes to go in the direction he wishes to go in. Because what he has not done, and what the

department has not done, is what was called for. If you look at the cost comparisons, as I said earlier there was supposed to be a high throughput and a low throughput option. Now, we have instead, the suggestion that there are some 7 different scenarios, and the Scrutiny Panel were not asked whether or not these were the scenarios that we wanted modelling - and I say "modelling" - well, "modelling" in inverted commas really - because the modelling does not go far enough by our consultants. Some of the things that are put in the schedules make misleading ...

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré of St. Lawrence:

May I seek a point of clarification of the Speaker?

The Bailiff:

Certainly.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

On the actual minutes, because I was listening to the Deputy on talkback on Sunday, and I went and dug out the minutes of 13th July 2005, a bit of clarification I would like, is the actual amended proposition says: "To recommend a preferred solution for a replacement of the Bellozanne incinerator with an accompanying cost benefit analysis", *et cetera*. My interpretation of that, is to come forward with "a" solution, which is what the Minister is doing, and therefore reference to other options and things like that is all fine, but my interpretation there is that the Minister, or committee of the day perhaps, was to make a decision of the various options and come forward with "a" proposed solution. The clarification I would like from the Deputy is to match that up with his inference that I believe he is saying the Minister should come forward with a variety of options for us to decide between. The States decision was a single solution.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

I have the transcript of the minute, Tuesday, 13th July 2005, and I quote, towards the end. This was after the discussions, I am down as saying: "Thank you. The list of tenderers may well be extended" - so it was part of the considerations that were discussed: "And there is a process that will be undergone to look at that. The other thing that has been agreed is that proposals will be brought to this House on a high throughput and a low throughput basis. That gives me the certainty that the discussions that have taken place and the work that has been undertaken by the Scrutiny Panel will have some bearing on the discussions when they come back to this House. The proposal for my amendment, was to ensure that we did get cross-benefit analyses, a proper full and rigorous justification that we were moving, and if we were moving in a particular direction, in the best way, and why it was the best way, and indeed, why other directions were not as good. If we do not have any agreement to this amendment, the States are not going to get that, and I urge all Members to support my amendment. We had counter-suggestions or, sorry, a quote by Senator Ozouf supporting what was said.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

All I can say, is that what I read out is directly from the amended proposition once Deputy Duhamel's amendment had been adopted by the States and therefore my reading of that is pretty clear, it is a preferred solution. In fact, if you wish, I will read it: "The States adopting the proposition as amended of the Environment Public Services Committee ...", there is a long spiel, but anyway part (iv) of that decision which is as amended by the Deputy: "That the committee be charged to investigate fully alternative and conventional technologies to provide the final disposal route for the residual waste remaining following the implementation of the systems and facilities as set out in various paragraphs above and to recommend a preferred solution for the replacement of the Bellozanne incinerator for the States with an accompanying cost benefit analysis and environmental and health impact assessment no later than December 2008." That is a preferred solution, it was not coming back. As we all know, it is what is in the proposition that was adopted by the States and that, is my reading of the proposition.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

That may be the case, but in that case the consultants who put forward the recommendations that we are seeing today were in a misunderstanding or had the same misunderstanding that appears that I am being put into a position to be accepting. When putting forward their proposals to the Planning Minister it quite clearly states that the States decided that there would be 2 separate solutions put forward. Now ...

The Bailiff:

Deputy, I would say, the statement made by the then President which was the basis on which the committee accepted your amendment does not refer to the 2 ... I think Deputy Le Fondré is correct, it does not refer to the 2 options, it refers to bringing the preferred tender to the States.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Well, I think Members should take the time and trouble to go over the transcripts and read them in full because selective quoting out of context can lead us in directions that perhaps were not promised, and that was my full understanding of it. Indeed, that is why the debate was held up for the discussions that took place. But nonetheless, what has ...

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

Will the Deputy give way?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

No, I would like to carry on, if I may, please.

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

Not willing to give way to a point of fact?

The Bailiff:

It is up to the Deputy.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

If indeed what I am saying is wrong and I do not think it is, then where are we today? We have a proposition, P.72 that appends in a separate schedule done by the consultants of a cost comparison summary of 7 scenarios plus we also have a smaller plant option. Now if the States did not call for any of this, why is it in the report? I think, the answer is quite clear. Because the consultants and, indeed, the department in the many discussions they have had with myself and the Scrutiny Panels over the years were in no doubt this is what was required. Now the whole point of the cost comparison schedules is to show the House how different alternatives that are capable of delivering a job can deliver the job and to show the cost benefits and risks and so on between them. Now if we look at page 24 of P.72 it says, at the bottom, the health warning: "This report does not consider the risks or sustainability of the alternative disposal routes that have been chosen by the department [and they would have been our choices], the preferred solution is the least risky option because it does not require additional land use, raising planning issues on Jersey or indeed to export significant amounts of waste from the Island which is considered to be environmentally, financially and legally questionable." So there is a statement there as to some risks but we have got the report that is stating that it does not consider the risks or the sustainability. There is a contradiction in terms. This, is one of the things that I find extremely difficult to consider as part of the report that is coming forward. Quite clearly there was an opportunity for the department to come forward with these cost options for the different scenarios they have looked at, at any time between 2005 and now and certainly before December 2008 as agreed by this House. But the department have chosen to come forward with them in the form they have come in on 20th May after Scrutiny had delivered a report into other alternatives of equipment that could deal with the Island's waste problem in perhaps a more sustainable fashion or perhaps a substantially less costly option to the public purse.

Those were the terms of remit that we set our consultants and those were the terms of remit for the review, and indeed the comments from Juniper have addressed them fully. It is quite clearly stated in the Juniper report under 1.15 on page 5: "We have identified a range of political initiatives that could be considered by the States which could either enhance the sustainability of Jersey's waste management practices ..." exactly, that is what we are asking them to do: "... or lessen the costs for the public purse." Now what Juniper were not able to do and I was not very happy with the comment made from Deputy Ferguson, and I would ask her to substantiate her evidence for making that particular comment, because it did appear, that she was suggesting that any proposals for a particular piece of kit that Juniper were suggesting - and they were not suggesting any - would have been wrong and that they were tied up commercially with the provision of a particular type of kit to the industry. Now I do not think that is the case, and I think the remark is, as Deputy Le Claire mentioned, should not go unsubstantiated and I would ask the Deputy to bring her evidence for making that remark to the attention of all States Members before we take the vote or to withdraw it and apologise to the company. Going back to 1.15, Juniper have identified a range of items that, in their view, should be considered by the politicians, by the Scrutiny Panels, by all of those working in the area and they said that an optimum approach is likely to include - which is fine - and they have itemised a whole stack of bullet points, some of which might be followed if the political will is there, some of those that might not be and others that we could possibly decide could go either way. So what do they say? Well, they said that certainly one of the things was that a recognition by the administration, that is the department, that practical steps adopted so far are insufficient to deliver and on occasion at odds with the vision outlined in the Waste Strategy. The Waste Strategy says, I have got it here somewhere but I will paraphrase from it. The Waste Strategy says that all in all we agree with the U.K., we agree with Europe, we agree with the rest of the world that we will adopt the waste hierarchy and the waste hierarchy lays out, in black and white terms, that as far as possible we start at the top, which is to reduce, then we work our way down through reuse, recycling, resource recovery and at the bottom we go for disposal. The whole world is going in this direction. The whole world is endorsing this because it makes sense. These are not my words, these were the words that the States decided when Senator Ozouf brought them to the House in 2005 and the Waste Strategy at that point is pretty clear-cut. Juniper having reviewed the intention of this administration which perhaps does include us - the jury is probably out on that one to another date - but the House, in supporting the Waste Strategy then should really be working towards it. In Juniper's opinion there were some things that were clearly contradictory. Some of those things that are contradictory were also aired in the Chief Minister's green speech, his vision on the way to Damascus, or the green equivalent of it, where he suggested that he was going to come forward with the next stage of the strategy which is the greening of the Island, "Keeping Jersey Special; A Vision for a Greener Island." Now I will not go over all of the issues but there was one thing; in the short term: "So what am I proposing", the Chief Minister said: "in proposing the new major initiative, 'Keeping Jersey Special'; which will put the environment at the heart of the Council of Ministers' agenda and be at the core of the next Strategic Plan?" 'Keeping Jersey Special' is designed to deliver a sustainable Island community, at peace with itself and proud of its place on the planet, aspiring to use no more than its share of global resources and achieving, among other things, at least a 60 per cent reduction in carbon emissions by 2050. **[Interruption]** Yes, that is quite right. "So let me just give you a flavour of the sort of initiatives" said the Chief Minister: "that I would expect to see brought forward. In the short term; set up a new energy taskforce, Sustainable Energy Jersey." Absolutely right. We are sitting on huge energy resources, other States Members are lining themselves up to be interested in this particular area for whatever reason, but the interest is welcome and we want to be using our energy sustainably and if it is in our own back garden, so to speak, then it is quite right, or should be right, that consideration be given to using those energy resources first before we go and plunder the oil stocks any further or before we go and spend money on any other technologies which would require us taking resources from other countries. But then he goes on, having started what he said: "Agree to let the contract for the new Energy from Waste plant. We have prevaricated long enough, unsatisfactory emissions from

Bellozanne continue.” Absolutely right but that is because we are doing nothing about it and costs of replacement plant have escalated. You say: “Well, this is in a green speech, ‘Keeping Jersey Special’, blah-de-blah”. Right and then he goes on because I think he probably realised that he had said too much and he says: “But this does not preclude doing more on recycling. I want the Parishes to implement separated kerbside collection of recyclable materials as soon as possible and support Transport and Technical Services in reaching and bettering their new targets.” Now it is only since 20th May that we have heard Transport and Technical Services suggest that perhaps the very, very difficult targets that they were aiming at of 32 per cent, but we agreed in 2005 they were going to be extremely difficult. Happy days, the public have assisted us, the Constables in the Parishes are coming more and more on board and lo and behold we are in a good position to be achieving it. But the Minister says: “No, no, we can go even further. We can ramp up our recycling targets to [wait for it] 36 per cent.” 36 per cent, okay, well fine, if that is as far as we want to go and we are already out of step with Guernsey, we are out of step with the rest of the U.K., we are out of step with the rest of the world because they are ramping up their recycling targets even higher. Not because they particularly want to, but because they are thinking: “This is the public’s part to play in saving the planet, doing their bit for climate change or stopping it, doing their bit to move towards the type of thing that the Minister was talking about in delivering sustainable communities”. So what are we going to do? We are going to buck the trend and we are going to say: “Sorry, 36 per cent is okay.” But the Chief Minister says: “No, we are not going to stop there as T.T.S. have suggested, we are going to take those targets even higher.” Well, how high? Now we heard something this morning pretty similar, right, out of the bag, rabbit out of the hat, the Minister turns round and says: “Right, okay, given that there are strong objections in visual terms, in safety terms, in any other terms, of cutting into the hillside that was supposed to be there as the spine hill ...” and if people are content to look at the minutes and look at all the work that has been undertaken for putting a spine hill which was for safety purposes on the first hand, to put a physical barrier between the fuel farm and the rest of Havre des Pas and the rest of the Island and to allow the eastern side of that spine hill to be used for marine leisure purposes. Now if you look at the proposals for the spine hill, there is a hole in it, there is a cut. Why do we need a cut? We have got to have the fire engines come through, yes? We are told this morning as well that because there were objections when the plans were put to the Planning Minister the wrong heights were proposed. There was a mismatch in the heights that the department was suggesting and a different height on the plans. So we are talking about something that is approaching 40 metres, the screening for the hill was only around the 20-22 metre mark, so you have got another 18 metres or whatever which is quite a lot in old money or old heights poking up over the top. Now we heard this morning: “Well, does this matter?” No, if we have got a Hopkins designed box then fine. But I think, well, we can do a lot better than that. I want us to be thinking outside of the Hopkins box, yes? We can do it. It does not take very much. So the Minister knows that we have got problems because he wants a new road. The screening does not screen the wonderful building that the Planning Minister wants the whole world to acknowledge as an architectural icon, so he comes here this morning and says: “Right, rabbit out of the hat, and I will propose, right, that we will have a raising of the hill.” But he is unable to tell you how high the raising will go. Now just as we are going to discuss on another occasion the setting of nets in gullies where it says if a net is moved in every position slightly it is deemed to be moved, well the same thing could be said to apply to a hill that is raised. So if the hill is raised by an inch the Minister has delivered. Has he delivered sustainably? Well, we are not really interested in that, he has delivered. I think it is wrong. Scrutiny is not being able to do its job properly. Scrutiny is about adding value to the decision making and, I find it incomprehensible how such an important proposition, given that we knew about it in 2005, took until 20th May before we get it. The department knew that Scrutiny Panel were looking at their original proposals for 126,000-tonne throughput plant and then the moment that Juniper report is written they are coming back and suggesting: “Well, hey, wait a minute, what about 105?” We have heard this morning, other Members have referred to it: “Well, what about 96?” Well, what about 80? What about 60? What about 40? Yes, that is the question that we asked in 2005, we

said that when the States were going to be put into a position, bearing in mind all of the work that is moving, if you read between the lines, or even read the lines, in terms of the environmental movement, in trying to move the whole world towards sustainable practices in resource use, we are going to have an opportunity to discuss whether or not a high recycling rate and a smaller machine would be as acceptable or more acceptable in financial terms, environmental terms, social terms compared to what has come forward as the department's prime option. We have not got it. I think it is a fundamental lost opportunity. Now a number of Members will be saying: "Well, you have got what you have got, mate, make the best or make the worst of it." Well, okay, I will have to make a few comments. The 7 scenarios, forget about the 80,000-tonne option for the moment, all assume that recycling is going to take place at the same level for the next 35 years. So I am asking myself how can that be when the whole world is changing, even the Chief Minister's world, and he is suggesting that he is going to be badgering the Constables who really want to do it because they are being badgered by their parishioners, to go to higher recycling rates and yet none of these 7 scenarios mention any higher recycling than the recycling levels that we were talking about before? The maximum would be 36 or thereabouts. So do we have 2 policies that are headlong competing for supremacy? I think we do. Another thing that really annoys me is that when you are dealing with financial schedules you can over-egg the pudding and in asking for the details, so that the Scrutiny Panel could be certain with the help from their forensic accountants that the figures that were being put forward were being put forward in a robust way, we were unable to do that. Within the schedules there are certain assumptions that Members have just got to read to ask themselves whether or not they are sensible assumptions. Now at the moment, if you look at the end on page 40 you have got things like the shipping costs. Now there has been a lot of talk about the shipping costs and Scrutiny Panels have for a long while known that there are huge opportunities with the harbours working with the shipping companies, the Harbours and Airports through Economic Development and others to procure the extra, the surplus capacity on our ships at a sensible rate. It is there and the rates have been given, it is all identified between the £20 and £30 for shipping, but at the back we have got £40 shipping. So we have got to add on some money from somewhere. We have also got £20 transport. Now none of these things have been substantiated. Okay, now you might say: "Right, well, we are going to ship some materials for recycling, we are going to take them to Portsmouth, they are going to be bought by a recycling operation at Portsmouth, so we have to put in another 20 quid for transport because the goods are not free at Portsmouth, they are going to be shipped somewhere else." Now where is the assumption to say where we are shipping them? There is not anything. There is just: "Put in another £20." Then there is: "Put in a gate fee." Some of the materials within these options that are being suggested we send to the U.K. include things that we would not want to send to the U.K. It makes no economic sense to send them to the U.K. because there are economic routes or ways of dealing with them within the Island. But if you ask for the details of the schedules, and I have, (a) you will be given them late although you may have some more luck than I did and (b) you will not get any more details than the details that are appearing here. Now the financial accountants took a look at these schedules and they said: "Well, hey, wait a minute, you have had these late 20th May, a fortnight later you are asking for extra schedules." It is taking later to get them through. We had a meeting with the company, we asked them to do a bit of work that we were wanting them to do, but we have only been in a position to do because the department have come forward so late in the day with what they want. We take it to the accountants and they say: "Well, look, how many hundred people do you want us to put on the job and how much are you paying because you are asking us to do something that cannot be done in the couple of weeks before you want the results back for the debate." That is the situation we find ourselves in. So we have to do the second best thing which is to go through, not officers because we do not have a lot of officers to count on, but members of the committee, going through the figures and looking for the anomalies. So we have got other things, what else? We have already heard this morning that anybody can do it, if you go on the metal market, aluminium is quoted anywhere between £700 and £1,000 a tonne. The shipping cost is round about the £30 a tonne mark, so do the subtraction if you are capable and that comes to £200. It does not. Yet when you

read 9.13 on page 40 the 1,010 tonnes a year of aluminium that would be recycled under the particular option, which was autoclave and residue brought into landfill with fibre fraction to Jersey based on Energy from Waste facility, suggest that the aluminium will be recycled for - and it does not say net in this one but it says net on a different page - for a net of £200. We have got people banging on our doors from France, from the U.K., from a whole stack of places who would dearly love to pay the Island for the aluminium. If they can get it for £200 they are going to be laughing because it is worth so much more. Yet, in a proper cross-schedule to States Members, you are being told that it is only £200 net profit. Likewise, we are being told that the 8,000 tonnes a year of plastic and that has gone up from the figures that we were being told because we have already lost quite a lot of our plastic. The light density polyethylene bags that are being used in the supermarkets, they have magically disappeared because sustainability has kicked in and a sensible environmental practice has come to the fore. So we have got 8,000 tonnes a year of plastic is recycled for no net profit once shipping and handling costs have been incorporated. Now we have just heard Members this morning telling us that there is a shortage of oil. Peak oil days are over, well maybe there is not quite a shortage of oil but that does not seem to matter because economics is driving the price up. So it means that plastics which are based on oil are going to become more valuable. Does that worry us? No. Does that worry T.T.S.? No. So they can quite safely say that an overstated amount of plastics that the Island is going to have can be recycled for no net profit because once you have gone through them to deal with the shipping and the handling there will not be any profit and that means that we can disregard any income from that particular element of waste stream at all. Now why does it matter and why is it important? Well, it is important because if we all go back to the Waste Strategy that was decided upon as a starting point in 2005, we said or agreed to 2 things; we said that as a starting point the Island would only wish to recycle a maximum of 10 per cent of the plastic. Now why was that in there? It was in there because the department know, I know, my Environment Panel know and anybody else who thinks about it knows, that plastic is based on oil and oil represents energy and the calorific value of that particular plastic item is quite high. If you are going to be running an Energy from Waste plant at whatever efficiency - and I will come on to that point in a minute - you need high calorific values, materials and plastic is at the top of the list along with rubber tyres and any other goods, and then it goes down the pecking order and you are into papers and cards and then you are into woods and all the rest of it. The department need these materials. Again you would come back to the contradiction in terms between the policies, because on the one hand if the Island is properly espousing this move towards sustainability in order to have its special "Keeping Jersey Special" vision to make the whole world think that we are a greener place, we cannot be putting our plastics into a process that is not necessarily the best way of dealing with them. So you have got 2 policies fighting with each other. Just as the Minister for Planning and Environment this morning realised, and probably not for the first time, that there are difficulties in being the Planning Minister in giving permissions for something on the one hand, in visual terms or amenity terms or whatever, and his environmental responsibilities which sometimes might stop him from giving that permission. But we cannot just turn around and say: "Well, okay, fine", because Transport and Technical Services is telling us they are up against it because the machine they have got at the moment that is doing the wrong thing and has been for the 25 or 30 years' experience that they have been doing it incorrectly, that we have to make a snap decision and go for the wrong plant as a replacement. This is a strategic policy and the strategic policy is embedded in the strategic initiatives and policies that this House decided upon when we first organised our ministerial government. There were amendments that I brought and the Constable of St. Helier brought to put back the economic ... against the economic growth clauses and all the rest of it, the words "sustainable economic growth" and to put in all of the - maybe in some Members' minds - the "touchy feely" things that we should not really be doing. But we did. We put those terms in; they were agreed by the House and in essence this House took several decisions in discussing the long-term strategy, "Into the Future", and we said that we were going to be more sustainable, like the rest of the world. So, it is hardly cutting edge, we are not breaking new ground, we are doing what everybody else is doing and quite rightly. So how can we

be in a position of looking at these so-called comparison schedules when (a) they were not asked for by a Scrutiny Panel; if we were asking for proper scenarios to be undertaken we certainly would have said something that came out of the Juniper discussions yesterday that one of the options to be looked at would have been the case where recycling levels were going up, competing for the materials that are being competed for by T.T.S. because they want to burn them with the recycling options and to determine properly, using all the financial expertise and the environmental expertise and any other expertise we need, 2 schedules to show which is the better option. Not just present ourselves with: "Okay, we said 126, we made a mistake, conditions have changed since 20th May, population is going up but maybe not as high, so we can come down a little bit." What people do not realise is that the nominal value that is being promoted, this 105,000 tonnes, we were told yesterday and it was not for the first time, that the throughput of the machines could be as much as 110 per cent of the nominal. So it means you can get more through the machine than it is rated at.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Can I ask the speaker just for a second to give way, please? During her speech, Deputy Ferguson raised a question that, by its inference, would impugn the integrity of the environmental consultants that we employed, Juniper. She was asked to go out and bring back papers to substantiate that remark or withdraw it. I believe she has those papers, I think we should tackle this question that she has raised at this point.

The Bailiff:

I do not think so, Deputy. Deputy Duhamel is in the middle of his speech.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

So we have got these schedules and the population projection has changed following the 2035 consultations with the public and another set of statistics were produced. Those statistics only came out late. Those schedules have not been scrutinised, audited by anybody else from the Scrutiny side and I think they should be. Is burning plastic a reasonable option? Or any other material? Is incineration of municipal solid waste a reasonable energy option? Now there are hundreds of papers on the internet and surveys and analyses that have been done. A couple of snippets; this is the energy savings, when you burn a material there are 2 things - we have got to go a little bit technical - there is the so-called intrinsic value within the material, so as you burn it, there is the energy, it is made of paper, it is going to result in so much heat energy coming out. But what it does not show is that the amount of energy that has gone into making that piece of paper in the first place. So when you are dealing with oils and other things there is one heck more energy that has gone into the production of these materials which you do not get back if you just burn it. So some of these surveys are quoting, in order to do the right thing sustainably, stating that if you are dealing with P.E.T. bottles, for example, and we are recycling P.E.T. bottles, but why are we doing it? Because the embodied energy in P.E.T. bottles compared to burning them represents energy savings against incineration of 26.4 times. So it is 26.4 times better to recycle your bottle than to burn it. We go down the list; cardboard, 3.7 times better to recycle it than to burn it. Right, what about paper? Fine paper has got a good market price, 7.1 times better to recycle it than to burn it. Newsprint, why bother recycling anything? Well, newsprint, and we are going down towards the breakeven mark, 2.4 times better to recycle it than to burn it. All of these things should be looked at. Some Members were referring to the compositional analysis. If we do the job properly you would be able to look at all the materials in the waste stream and you would be able to make a choice. You would be able to say: "Right, there is my plastic bottle, given that I can save this amount of energy or do this with it, what is the best route for dealing with the plastic?" These are the thematic studies that have been undertaken by the E.U. and the U.K. through the E.U. to determine what is the best route for each particular element of the waste stream. So we are not going for averages, we are not chucking everything into a black bag and saying: "Right, okay, we do not know what is in the bag so we will assume it is homogeneous, it has got energy of this, that

or the other and we do not really know what is in it, but we do not much care.” No, the E.U. and the U.K. are looking at these things and they are saying: “Right, on the sustainability front, if it makes more sense to recycle a particular material according to the waste hierarchy, then you recycle it. If it makes more sense to reduce it in the first place then even better.” And you work your way through the list until you get to the point of burning things and recovering an element of the heat energy from the materials, because recovery of heat is not 100 per cent efficient. Now I should mention at this stage the efficiency directive, and it was the energy efficiency directive, and I can be blamed, I think, for not putting in my comments report, which I hope Members have had the opportunity to read - although we have had quite a few other things put on our desks this morning - and within our P.72 comments I did refer that the incinerator proposed by T.T.S. will have an energy efficiency of approximately 24 per cent. I should have put electrical energy efficiency, I did not, but the point is still well made. Why is it still well made? Because the E.U. legislation says that it has gone to 60 per cent now and it is going to 65 per cent at the end of the year. If you do the calculations, and we have not had a schedule of proper calculations from the department, and I would have thought, since I mentioned this some 2 weeks ago, departmental officers would have come forward and shown us the calculation which is quite tricky to do because you cannot take just an average heat content of the waste and assume that is going to stay the same for ever into the future. Practices are changing. If we are taking out plastic bags and are happy to do it, and indeed we are picking up from the Constable of St. Martin that he is unhappy that plastic is burnt so it is going to be taken out of the recycle stream, or we have heard from the Constable of St. Helier that he is going to be taking out car tyres and plastic and paper and other things, then we are going to get into a position where the composition is going to change. If the composition of the waste is changing, then its heat value will change and we will be ending up with things that either do not burn at all or burn not particularly efficiently. So we get into a situation again where there is going to be competition for the best burning materials, which is counter to kerbside collection, moving up recycling targets and everything else. It is probably fair, that I just mention a couple of words from the comments; surprisingly the Right Honourable John Gummer, M.P. (Member of Parliament) in his co-authored *Blue Print for a Green Economy* produced by the Quality of Life Policy Group in the U.K. Conservative Party in September 2007 had the following words to state and I think I would like to quote. He said: “Moving to the next cheapest solution for managing waste, is not acceptable.” So it is not just about cost. This merely puts off the important decisions and does little to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We have not discussed greenhouse gas emissions as yet and they are quite large if we are going to continue to burn. It is imperative that material resources are recovered for use in other products where possible. Where this is not possible for either technical or economic reasons, the energy should be recovered. Only smaller scale facilities for energy recovery, so that means incineration units that are smaller scale, probably less than what is being proposed at the moment, should be supported. All facilities will be subjected to a carbon assessment, we have not seen it, that considers the inputs and outputs, i.e. collection logistics as well as process outputs. Incineration should always be subject to the following tests; it must not crowd out waste prevention or recycling so capacity must be made available for non-recyclable materials. Why is the Chief Minister, in his green speech and the department in agreeing with that, adopting the initiative to ask the Constables to increase recycling rates if indeed there is no intention of doing so? Or it is going to pose problems for the machine that is also being put forward because if we do not have the amount of materials of the right type feeding this machine to be burnt, it is not going to be running, it is as simple as that. And he went on to say that there must be energy efficient recovery of at least 65 per cent and preferably 70 per cent using the E.U.’s proposed efficiency threshold calculations. Those, were the ones that I was quoting the other day. But it is quite a technical calculation and it not only requires the electricity efficiencies to be taken into account but it also requires the heat content of the materials that we are burning, the amount of times that the machine is going to be fired or cooled down because every time the machine is switched on we have to burn energy in order to bring it up to an operating temperature. That is a fuel, that is to be burnt and in energy terms all of that has to be taken into the

rating. I went on, to suggest that a number of U.K. authorities have already endorsed the first bullet point, suggesting that waste prevention or recycling should not be crowded out by incineration and I would agree. This really is what is worrying me most. If we go for an oversize plant it will crowd out waste recycling and other initiatives, no doubt about it. The Labour Government has set recycling targets of 40 per cent by 2010. I do not know what planet they are living on but we cannot achieve that, so maybe we should go and ask them how they are going to do it. In fact, overall they have gone even further, 50 per cent by 2020 in line with the E.U. Well, quite clearly we are not going to be able to achieve that, we are not going to be in line with the U.K. or in line with the E.U. by 2020 and this is policy that goes on to 2035, so we are at least destined to be out of date for a major part of it. The Minister of Transport and Technical Services still maintains that his target of 36 per cent by 2018 is ambitious. Surrey County Council - and I was privileged to meet one of the officers who dealt with the policies of their waste management strategy - is proposing 60 per cent by 2025 and even our sister Island, Guernsey, is pledged to achieve 50 per cent by 2010 which shows that there is no specific bar to recycling in an Island community if we want to do it. That is the point. Do we want to do it? The majority of Islanders do. Parishioners do. They are going to tell their Constables to do it. The Chief Minister is asking that this route is undertaken, that we ramp up recycling and yet we have got the T.T.S. and the department suggesting that: "Hey, wait a minute, no, 36 per cent is going to be really difficult to achieve [although the whole world is going higher than us almost from day one] we cannot do it at all." I said, the proposed incinerator will do nothing to encourage waste minimisation. It needs to be fed like some giant hungry cuckoo, it will demand feeding at up to 15 tonnes per hour and crowd out recycling initiatives. So this House has got to decide where it wants to be. It is decision time, it is crunch time. If we want to be supporting the sensible comments of the Chief Minister in his green vision, well most of them anyway, in wanting to put this Island at the forefront of the move towards playing the environmental responsible part, then fair enough. But if we just want to say: "Well, we would rather the world who think that this place is suspect anyway in terms of the monies that come into the Island [I am not saying I agree with those comments] and that we have got more money than sense and we are prepared to blow it on a machine that is too big" is not going to encourage the right way of dealing with things, in fact discourage, then we have got to query our motives. It just does not make sense and it should not be supported on those grounds. Juniper went further and said that a move away from mass burn incineration towards source separation, which is kerbside collection in various forms and in relation to the residual fraction, that is what is left, a combination of simple fuel preparation or sanitisation process and a far smaller Energy from Waste using modular small scale technologies. There are a whole host of different technologies that passed the 2 years working on commercial on M.S.W. (Municipal Solid Waste) and would be suitable for the Island. In fact it is a shame that a number of the smaller tenderers dropped out of the programme. I was lucky to cadge a lift from one of our 1(1)(k) residents and to have a look at his company's plant in Norway, a population of 240,000 people who said: "Fine, we want to go for 85 or thereabouts recycling rates." Put their money where their mouth was, bought themselves a combined heat and power plant which only burns 40,000 tonnes. Now, if you look at our population, I mean, we are being told we are going to be producing for burning 105,000 tonnes by 2035. Does that make sense? Well, yes, it does in some terms; it shows how affluent we are and we can waste more money and, you know, if you take your hamburger or your caviar sandwich or whatever and you do not eat all of it, well you can chuck it in the bin, it will not be eaten by the dogs or the cats, we will burn it. That is fine, we can afford to do these things. We can afford to be profligate because that shows that Jersey is a special place and we are at the top of the environmental credibility league. I do not think so, it is wrong. Other countries are doing similar things. I mean, I had a look on the internet and downloaded some very interesting reports from the Isle of Man. Now the department might say: "Well, sorry, the Isle of Man is not an Island, it is an Isle so we cannot look at it." That is the type of argument we have been having lately, but the Isle of Man Government, what do they do? Well they said ... there was a big argument like we are having today, they wanted an incinerator and the Island was split and they decided to go for a single

stream, 60,000-tonne incinerator. Right, and they did that knowing that they had increasing waste arisings and discussion has now centred on: "Oh dear, we are running out of room." Quite rightly. Now instead of saying: "Well, fine, they are reading these, we should have bought a plant twice the size" - as we are suggesting so that we have got the capacity to burn - what have they done? Well their government have started to box clever and they said in September 2007: "Hey, wait a minute, we will see if we can play our part in the world's stakes for environmentalism and sustainability and we are going to adopt kerbside collections." That is what they are going to do. So instead of saying: "No, sorry", the piece of sea between themselves and the mainland is too big, shipping costs are too expensive, do not want to do it, politicians would rather burn, cannot be fussed, no money in it or whatever, they have taken up the challenge and they are running up with a headline kerbside recycling strategy which will take out valuable materials from the waste stream. Now what are those valuable materials? We have already heard the Constable of St. Martin telling us a few things. Plastics, right? Because plastics can make money, they are based on oil. So the plastics ... and this is the U.K. plastic markets and it is in there suggesting that it is a sensible thing to be doing and it would be making them revenue, making them money, ticking all the boxes to say that they are green, they are playing their part in the world to do their bit for climate change. So they run through the plastics and they have shown that it is pretty economic to collect the plastic through a segregated source-separated collection of some description and there is loads of them, so we will not go there, and you choose the one that suits you best rather than saying: "None of them work", we will find new ways to stop them working and they are suggesting that they take out these materials. Now by doing so it means that they can still operate with a smaller incinerator, they are buying themselves time because they are making capacity space within their system. It is a single stream machine and we have heard arguments from the department we have to have 2 streams because 2 is better than one and you can keep the one with the 2 of them kind of piggy-backing, even though for mass burn incineration we are told that it is a technique or technology that really does require you to have the plant running for 24 hours a day for as long as possible because the more times you switch it off the more problems you get into in cracking of grates and other issues. But these guys have got one stream and by taking out materials through kerbside collection services, which is what the Chief Minister is recommending the Parishes do, they are buying themselves time. Well, if the Isle of Man can do it, why can we not do it? But the answer is we could do it. When could we do it by? We could start tomorrow. We have got a number of companies who the Constable of St. Helier referred to this morning, would be quite prepared to come over starting next week, if tomorrow was deemed to be too early for some of our detractors to take out materials from the waste stream that do not need to be burnt in our crippled ailing plant. Yes, it is, it should be closed down, that is the other alternative. I will talk about that in a minute. But by taking out the materials that are worth money we get a revenue. We do not hammer the ailing plant as much as it would otherwise need to be hammered. That is not to suggest that the plant should be kept going any longer than it needs to go, but we have heard from the department that they intend to run it as far as possible for the next 3 years while we are building a replacement plant. So why do we not do that? Well, I think we should. In fact, I think we should probably go a stage further than that and if indeed the health problems or the difficulties with the maintenance or the running of the plant are so great that the Bellozanne incinerator is deemed to be that crippled that it cannot run, then why not close it altogether? Before people cry foul, why could we not do it? Well, we could but the department wants to bale the soggy materials that the public are not separating or not assisting us to separate. They want to bale them, they want to put them into pits, they want to put them into quarries, they want to just keep the materials there because they know that if they can generate a backlog of materials then the argument for going for such a large machine is perhaps justified. We need a bigger machine because we have got such a big backlog, but there are health issues. Now if they boxed clever and it does not require very much to do so they could, as an alternative, be saying: "Right, well, if we have got these materials why do we not engage with the Parishes, with the public who want to do these things, take out the individual elements of the waste stream that are causing the problems because black bags cause problems,

black bag waste. It is only the mixing it up that causes the problems. If they are separated out you know what you are dealing with and all those individual elements of the waste stream can be dealt with individually in better ways. We cause the problem by putting it in a black bag. So if we had the Parishes pulling their weight, great. The Island moves forward, what a wonderful situation to be in. We have got the government, we have got the Parishes, we have got the people working together on a big green initiative to take out material and to recycle it in order to help T.T.S. Department to run the ailing machine or to close it down before the end of the 3-year period. We send all those materials away. Now that is a realistic proposition. What would you do with the food waste? Now we have heard a number of things and what annoys me, is that this is selective quoting. Now I have been in touch with the supermarkets as well and my understanding of the schemes that are being run for farmers is not the same as being intimidated by the department. Now I take it fully on the cheek, that there may well be farming interests within this Island who would not wish to put anaerobically digested food waste material which we heard from the Minister this morning, he agrees, yes, this material can be put on to land providing it is done properly according to all the rules and regulations, all the rest of it, but not in Jersey. Not in Jersey because - and here comes the flaw in the argument - it would have to only be put on to potato land. Now it does not have to be put on potato land and the department themselves produced a report, the *Land Biosolid Report for Spreading*, I have got it here, I will find it in a minute. One of the conclusions in that report was exactly that, I should really quote from it properly rather than paraphrasing or I will be in trouble. What the report did was to look at all of the land, and the conclusion that comes out of the exercise is that there is enough land to use across the Island, but the will is not perhaps there across the board. Here it is: "So we went through, a good piece of work, looked at all the land, the designations apart from the protected crops, outdoor flowers, grass, temporary lays, rough grazing, potatoes, grass uncultivated, whatever." Now bearing in mind from the Scrutiny Report that we needed of the order of 400 hectares which was somewhere between, because there is an element of flexibility in terms of the nitrogen loading of the material, somewhere between a requirement of 2,000 and say 4,000, by the department's own figures vergées of land required. Now the land base that is available is way, way greater than that. So the department said: "From the above [that is the analysis] it can be seen that there is potentially sufficient land to apply all of the AVR compliant composted kitchen waste arising on the Island, but crucially it can be seen that there is no guaranteed land available for the disposal of any biosolid waste in Jersey." Now the department made a mistake, right, because under the new anaerobic digestion directives the whole essence of the directives is to ensure that food waste - that is specially collected in a clean fashion - is no longer seen as a waste but seen as a product. You do not need to go through any other rules and regulations if you have got a product in the same way as you would do if you are dealing with a waste. Within the biosolid waste that the department were referring to we have things which do cause problems and this is why we have the Safe Sludge Matrix. Food waste, if it goes through the sewers and is contaminated by other things that go in sewers apparently can be put back on to the land and indeed is being done so by the very farmers who are saying that they will not accept food waste if it is not eaten by humans and excreted and passed through the sewage system to be contaminated by other things. It is a nonsense. But that is not the point. I do not want to pick holes in the Health Regs because it is all there, and we heard the Minister this morning agreeing that this material can be put back on to the land. It has been put back on to the land in Europe for a long while and the U.K., late to the altar, are doing the same thing, or wanting to. So if there is enough land and there is enough land just by looking at the fruit and vegetable market, what does it say? How interesting. "This land is suitable for green waste compost and for all enhanced treated sludge. It is also possible that A.B.P.R. (Animal By-Products Regulation) food waste compost will be permitted to be spread on this land. The land is usually part of the crop rotation and therefore permission would be dependent upon the customer protocols and subsequent crop rotations." Fine, and says: "Assumption, green waste compost, A.B.P.R. compliant food waste compost and enhanced treated sludge are possible." How many vergées did we need, bearing in mind that I said it is somewhere between 2 and 4? Fruit and veg, 2,727. That is just one snippet. Take another

one. We have got another 28,000 in a different category. There is more than enough land. So why do the farmers not wish to do it? It is not all farmers, it is some of the farmers. I am not sure. But what I find interesting is that the customer protocols, and they are various, and the one read out this morning was for Waitrose, but Waitrose are only being given a small percentage of our potato crop and it is substantially less than the amount of potato crop that goes to others, notably Tesco, which is getting on for, what, 8, 9 times as much. Now, what do Tesco say? Well, Tesco run their own Nature's Choice policies (T.N.C.). They have been doing so since 1992 and what they are doing is they are teaming up with W.R.A.P. (Waste and Resources Action Programme) and other initiatives and the Composting Association and the British Retail Consortium - I have to mention that one separately because there was misrepresentation in the report, our briefing note that came around - and the Potato Council said: "Seismic shift in U.K. potato growers' costs." Well, where is it coming from? "The value of every drop of water, kilo of fertiliser and joule of energy used by potato growers has shifted dramatically in the last few months." This is 11th June 2008, hot off the press. It goes on to say that what is happening is that there has been - surprise, surprise - a rise in the price of oil. The rise in the price of oil is significant because you do not just run your tractors off the petrol, but it also has an input into the chemical fertilisers that are being produced. People who are potato farmers will know that we need quite high applications of nitrogen fertilisers. So, world economics is saying on the back of price rises based on oil, due to us wasting things - and that is what it is all about - we are having to pay more. What is the knock-on effect? Our food is going to get more expensive and then we are going to have to make a choice: are we growing crops for fuel or are we growing crops to eat? Then we are into the wider picture. So, what is Tesco doing about it? Well, Tesco, surprisingly, have under their customer farmer profiles teamed up with a company called Branston Limited - not the pickle, this is the potato growers - and they have asked their potato growers - note the words "potato growers" - to do a bit of work for them. What is the work? Well, the work, surprisingly, is to apply food segregated composts on to their potato growing land. We heard this morning: "Oh, no, if we put anaerobic digestate material through properly certified codes of practice that they are getting into in the U.K., that they have had in Europe for a while, on to our potato crop, we are going to poison all the potatoes, lose the market and we do not want to do it." Well, yes, obviously we would not want to do that, but that is not going to happen because one of the customer protocols, firm protocols, is encouraging through the U.K. Government the use of these materials on potato growing land and other land. Now, that is not to say that all land is suitable for the same application at the same rate because it is not; that is why we have the sludge matrix for spreading because if you overload certain lands you get into problems. Nobody is suggesting that we are going to or need to spread organic fertilisers on heath lands and thereby kind of detrimentally affect the plants that are growing there, which are part of our cultural heritage. We are not suggesting that. What we are suggesting is, is there enough land for this material to be put on it? The answer is yes. Is there a will? Do not know, question mark, and that is what Juniper said. It might be a challenge, but it is certainly not a show stopper, as is being mentioned by other Members. It can be done. I think it should be done. My Scrutiny Panel will probably agree with that. As the saying goes, where there is a will, there is a way. That does not, explain the comments in order to discourage States Members from making a different decision, and on the page within the briefing document where it was referring to: "Why not compost food waste?" we have the statements from the British Retail Consortium taken as a little snippet out of context, suggesting that we are going to be spreading the fields with blood, bone, meat and entrails. So we will all be rushing off down to the butchers, who do not bring these things over any more, and taking out the paunches of the animals and maybe going down to the abattoir and spreading all these materials on the land. Now, when the British Retail Consortium were asked to make the statement, or make a statement, by the Composting Association ... because there had to be a partnership agreement between those who are making products from food waste through compost and the retail centres who are interested in health and hygiene for food making, they are working together in partnership as we should be doing over here with the government and the Parishes and the departments. When this slightly strange statement came out from the British Retail

Consortium, both W.R.A.P. for the waste resources programme and the Composting Association turned round and they could not believe their eyes. They made very, very quick statements to suggest that the British Retail Consortium did not know what they were talking about because the materials that are being spoken about are on a special list and do not normally get into the food chain. If they do get into the food chain, you have huge problems, and those materials are certified at a very, very high risk. They do not get into composting, they do not get into the type of systems that the Composting Association has been speaking about. So, it strikes me as odd that out of all of the quotes on the internet - and there are billions of them - that could have been used in order to support the composting of food waste, the department pick out this one, selectively quote from it, do not tell the rest of the States Members the rest of the story, which was that the British Retail Consortium was wrong and the statements have been withdrawn, and it paints a negative picture. But maybe, that was the intention. Because what is important is that, going back to the idea about black bags collection, we need an incinerator of the type that has been spoken about because it is a generalist piece of equipment. If, indeed, materials are collected in a separated fashion, then they can be dealt with by more specialised pieces of equipment in more environmentally friendly ways. If, on the other hand, we do have black bag waste and people are not going to make any attempt to take things out of it, then fine, but how can we move from the one system to the other? To move from the one system to the other, most of the materials that could be recycled to a greater degree out of the 44,000 tonnes or thereabouts of Parish waste could be done so in a more efficient fashion if they were in a cleaner state. How can they be in a cleaner state? Well, you do not mix in your food slops. If you do not mix in your food slops, what are we going to do with them? You can home compost, but that is pretty difficult with a flat. Or you can have some kind of collection service, as is being called for by the U.K. Government across the U.K., to take these materials out and to treat them in the specific fashion that not only enables you to get more heat energy out ... because A.D. (anaerobic digestate) plants are deemed to be 85 per cent plus efficient, which is pretty good compared to ordinary incineration. It is a different process; it is biological, degradation rather than incineration, as fire and water do not mix, as you know. There are other products, so why is the department taking the time to come to this House to present pretty pictured presentations in plastic folders to paint the wrong picture? Because they know that if we start to move in the direction that the U.K. is moving and Europe is moving, food waste can come out of the waste stream. If food waste comes out of the waste stream, not only does it provide a better route for dealing with that food waste ... Connex buses, you go to Sweden, the Connex buses in Sweden - and I have seen them - run on biofuel. What is happening, they are taking the food waste, they are putting it through the anaerobic digestion process. They have a small network of collection facilities where they can fill up on the methane component fuel and they are running their bus fleet on it. In fact, Connex have the largest number of buses running in Sweden on this particular fuel. The rest of Europe is starting to say: "Well, hey, maybe we are missing a trick here. Here is a proper energy from waste process which displaces petrol", so there will be an economic cost to the Treasury because it will not maybe get as much tax, but it will be tax in a different way. It could be running our buses or we could be putting it through an incineration process that the department themselves say only makes a difference to them in terms of a 3 per cent capacity change in the plant because they need fixed size boilers, and a 2 per cent in the capital cost because of the low energy value of the food waste. The key thing which is the smart thing to be doing, which is what is being done everywhere else and should be done in Jersey if we are joining the club, is that we should be looking at the individual elements of the waste stream and optimising - in the jargon - on each particular one to do what is best for that material. That is not to say that there will not be things that require incineration as the best use, but it is not the same thing as saying incineration must be applied across the board to things that incineration would not be the first choice of disposal for. To get to that point so that States Members can be in a proper position of knowing whether we should be going for this big machine that does the wrong thing, just burns everything, we do not have the comparisons to go on, so we are stuck. One of the things that was ignored or ... that is probably strong, decided upon very, very early on in all these moves towards providing these solutions that

are being suggested here today, and it was done by Pricewaterhouse in one of their documents very, very early on, was to exclude the D.B.F.O. option. Now, the D.B.F.O. option is “design, build, fund and operate.” Now, this really should be music to the Treasury Minister’s ears because what we are being told ... and there has been a big fudge position going on behind the scenes whereby instead of writing off our capital over the lifetime of the asset, which is over 25 years, when the T.T.S. Department suddenly found out that it was not going to be possible for them to have all their money without paying the cost of that money ... they thought they were going to have it out of the rainy day fund and the rainy day fund is being invested. They thought they can just take a hit and spend it without putting the investment monies that that money would have been making. Now, when they were told: “No, sorry, you cannot do that, that is not the way to be doing things”, they had to go back and there were some embarrassed faces at the Treasury because the carrying cost of the monies over the 25-year period was sizeable. In fact, so sizeable that I think it might well have been a contributory factor in suggesting that perhaps we should have a smaller machine, but maybe I am wrong on that. But what happened thereafter was that a decision was taken that we would not, as is the normal practice, do our funding over the 25 years but we would do it over a shorter period so that the exposure to the borrowing costs or the replacement cost to the investment could be minimised. So we have these cost schedules that have been put together in terms of the cost comparisons which have moved from paying for this incinerator or whatever over 25 years to paying for it over 3. That will be part and parcel of the P.73 debate. Now, what that does is it is not playing by the rules. It is squeezing some of these options in a fashion to perhaps make them appear to be more expensive than they are so you cannot make a proper comparison. I am not sure what is the best way of dealing with our capital projects, but that is another issue. Now, going back, one of the figures on the schedule is to suggest that it is going to cost us of the order of, what, £10.2 million, £10.3 million a year. That is the total annualised cost and that is what the States are going to have to bear. Now, if we ask ourselves how much is being spent on incineration at the moment, it is substantially less. You will say: “Well, you would expect that, would you not?” Well, the department will be telling us that because these machines have gone up in price and burning things is an expensive option. But do we have to do it in this particular fashion? I am not sure that we do. This was one of the things that was looked at by PricewaterhouseCoopers in the early days and they said that one of the ways of delivering machines to the Island is for the department to call in somebody else to use taxpayers’ money or the Treasury money to purchase it and then pass it back to the department for the department to run. That is one way of dealing with it. But they also said at the time, but it was not widely publicised in their report, that another alternative which might well turn out to be cheaper, particularly if you are worried about your capital monies, was to go for this D.B.F.O. option whereby a company would come to the Island and suggest in exchange for a fee per tonne or whatever, they would pay for their own plant. They may require assistance in the States helping them to find a site, though we appear to have done that, and the net result is that in financial terms it could have then and still could in the future turn out to be substantially less expensive than committing to a capital programme when we are all strapped for capital monies and those capital monies may well be better spent in other areas. But this particular option has been discounted and, as part of the cost comparison reports, I would have expected for an option like that to have come forward. So, if you take the monies, I have done a bit of an analysis in my comments sheet, but if you take the £10 million or whatever annual cost and you said: “Okay, we have 105,000 tonnes” ... not that we have at the moment. We will have in 2035; we only have 72 now that are being burnt. This is for burning the residual, so you must not allow yourselves to be distracted into thinking that we should be using the whole of the amount because those items that are being recycled at the moment are not part of the cost comparison schedules. They are being done anyway by the department. So if you take the monies that were going to be put into an incinerator, £10.2 million, and you say that is roughly on a par with your 105,000 tonnes that you are going to be producing at the end, and you divide the one by the other, you are talking about £100 a tonne at the end of the period. If you look at the beginning of the period when we only have 72,000 tonnes to be burnt, then obviously the cost is going to be more

than £100. Now, what are these D.B.F.O. companies suggesting? They are saying: "We will come to the Island, we will put in the capital investment for the plant ourselves, but we would like a gate fee for you to deliver - not for the States to deliver, necessarily, but maybe for the Constables to deliver - those materials to the plant facility to be dealt with." So if we took all the money now, if we agreed we are going to spend £2.7 million and that was the money that people wanted to spend - I think it is a bit big, to tell you the truth, and it should be smaller but that is an argument for another day - we could be saying to ourselves: "For £100 we could afford thinking outside the Hopkins box, we could afford to be paying the Constables £100 a tonne on the basis that they were the authority to get rid of all the material." The Constables say: "We do not want to do that." That is fine, so we could instead be saying: "Let us pay £100 gate fee to somebody else to come and do it." Then we do not have to look at the running costs or the capital costs, it is all rolled up into one figure. As I said earlier, the £100 is too much. There are companies who are bidding for these materials at substantially lower gate fee prices. We have already heard that inherent within the waste stream is a huge amount of value already that could be offset against that particular gate fee charge. So why are we not doing that? I do not know, but because the department I think just want to go forward with the option they want. Senator Ozouf asked at, I think the meeting before last, why was the Scrutiny Panel not coming forward with options, and we did agree then that it was not really right that we should be coming forward with options, but in retrospect we thought, well, if that is what Members wanted and it was something to inform the process, then maybe that is something that we should have done. So we did it. In our R.67 reissued, we did suggest a number of ways forward which would pick up on the Juniper recommendations and indicated through that document to the House that we think ... it has not been properly audited, but there are other companies outside in the market who have spent or who are spending the same amount of money on the package of facilities that we recommended in part. If I can just mention one or 2 of those for those Members who perhaps have not read it, we said: "The Environment Scrutiny Panel concurs with Juniper that there should be a move away from mass burn incineration towards source separation and, in relation to the residual fraction, a combination of simple fuel preparation or sanitisation processes and a far smaller energy from waste plant using modular small-scale technologies. This combination of increased recycling and appropriate treatment of each waste stream has several advantages. Environmentally, it ensures that a much higher percentage of the value of our waste is put to good use through other products. The carbon emissions are greatly reduced by limiting the amount of material that needs to be burnt." Burning things produces carbon and we have to address that and, indeed, some of the comments made by the Minister for the Environment and Planning suggest that the carbon emissions that will be produced by the burning process through this particular plant will be of the order of what is being produced by all our car traffic. "The technologies involved do not require large structures or buildings and can be accommodated within our built environment more easily." It does not require a 40-metre Hopkins-designed box or hill to try and hide it. "The enormous capital cost of the large incinerator is avoided and replaced by a number of smaller capital projects. Not only does this provide more flexibility for funding in the short term, but it also produces major advantages by spreading the costs of replacement technology into the future." That was one of the prime recommendations that Juniper was coming forward with, saying you do not put all your eggs in one basket at the moment and if you go modular it gives you an option to flex and change into the future as we do better or worse at our recycling. "The combination of separate technologies provides a more robust solution which is flexible in its response to the ongoing changes in waste legislation," which are going to change. "The technologies involved in the panel's recommendation are available off the shelf and can be procured individually or as part of a package, whereas the proposed Energy from Waste plant will take up to 3 years to build and commission. These technologies, because they are simpler and off the shelf, can be up and running in a much shorter timeframe." There were 3 or 4 components: in-vessel composting equipment to deal with both green waste and kitchen waste will have a capital cost in the order of £4 million. It is there in the evidence and Members are freely available to read it. That is the rough price. Anaerobic digestion plant to deal with food waste will

have the capital cost in the order of up to £6 million. Material recycling facility of some description for bailing and sorting if needed will have a capital cost of the order of £5 million and some Members have taken the opportunity to view a number of those plants. The capital cost of the residual treatment facility - and this is the key point, this is the smaller Energy from Waste plant of a type to be determined by the department experts at a particular scale - will be in the order of £20 million to £30 million. That is if you bought it separately. The key thing is that because you are doing all the other things, more material is coming out of the waste stream; you are left with less that requires further treatment so you can have a smaller capacity plant which costs less if you go for the right type of technology. Alternatively, if these technologies are procured as a package, the total cost will be in the order of £35 million. There is more than one U.K. authority that has gone for the proposal that we were suggesting there as a package. It would be wrong for me, to identify which county councils because that would go beyond the tendering process and get us into difficulties, if indeed the States decided that it would recommend to T.T.S. that that is the direction they would ask them to move in. But it is quite clear, from the work that has been undertaken by the Scrutiny Panel that if we did move in this direction, the cost savings could be as much as £70 million. Now, in the light of the capital crunch, credit crunch and all the other crunches that are coming, Scrutiny's contribution in part to this debate is given that Juniper have agreed that a more optimal approach could be afforded by a collection of different technologies which would be more in line with environmental sustainability, which is where the Island presumably wants to be in terms of its Waste Management Strategy, then should this not be looked at before we rush headlong into making a decision which I think will end up in having a machine which does not operate at the efficiencies required or, indeed, does not operate. The point made this morning about the ownership of the materials is absolutely valid, and unless the department and the Council of Ministers are proposing to bring forward a law that says that if a householder or resident of the Island goes out and purchases a commodity which comes wrapped in some shape or form, that having paid for that wrapper it is owned by the state and the state will levy a charge either through an environmental tax or through ordinary taxation to dispose of it for them in a way that they would not necessarily wish for that wrapper to be disposed of, then I think that would be a severe test for the politician or the group of politicians bringing forward those proposals and represent a huge waste of taxpayers' money. The public are on our side. The public is suggesting that we should be moving ahead to more environmental sustainable practice. Half of the job, therefore, is done. All we need is for this House to put its combined will behind the Council of Ministers and the Parishes and the Parish heads with the public to move in this direction. The benefits are there for all: environmental, financial and social. It is a robust solution. It means it is flexible. It should be looked at properly so that Members cannot say: "There is Deputy Duhamel and the Scrutiny Panel just telling us to do something that is not going to work." I think that piece of work should be undertaken. It could be undertaken in a very short period of time, but in the meeting that we had yesterday it was deemed by the Chief Minister that perhaps that was not the direction that he wanted to recommend to this House, which is why we are in this position of discussing an incomplete set of proposals which may be detrimental not only to our environmental credibility but also to the public purse. I have probably said enough ... **[Interruption]** Well, I have more.

Deputy J. Gallichan of St. Mary:

I am wondering if the Deputy would give way for a second.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Yes, sure.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

It is just this morning, when Deputy Le Claire was speaking, he did make some references to various amounts of extra information that he thought the Chairman might be willing to give the

House - the confidential information in camera during his speech. I just wondered if the Deputy would comment on whether that might be necessary.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

It is probably not necessary to go in camera. I think I can say it indirectly. Broadly speaking, the electricity company is in the business of importing electricity from France. It is nuclear energy, or generated electricity, in the first place, although there is the facility at some stage in the future for our electricity company to procure electricity that has been generated from greener sources, whether it be hydro power or tidal or wind or whatever. The nature of the business is such that, as was intimated this morning, there are peaks in demand and in running an incinerator with fixed size boilers that means that the electricity generation is constant. So that means that it is not as responsive to the peaks that appear during the day. As a consequence, the electricity company is not as interested in that form of electricity as it is in buying electricity in a fashion that addresses the peaks and the troughs. Consequently, the electricity company as back-up is more interested in gas-powered technologies because gas-powered technologies are more responsive if the nuclear power link is cut and we lose the power link. Then it means that as a back-up we can switch on a gas-powered turbine almost immediately within a short period of time, and that is an easier way of providing that type of electricity response to the buying public than is having to buy or being put in a position where they are committed to buy electricity that is being produced on a 24-hour basis. Now, it might well be that T.T.S., if they do procure this particular type of equipment, will find ways to match the electricity production with the demand, but in order to do that, they would have to be displacing the electricity that is purchased from bigger players in the electricity market and do it in a fashion that I am not sure they will be able to do. That is the gist of the arguments that were given. If Members wish to be privy to anything further, then I am quite happy to take approaches and find ways of passing on any more of the information that I could not otherwise do in this House.

1.1.12 Deputy J.J. Huet of St. Helier:

I have to say I was extremely disappointed when we put on these extra 3 days this week because up until then I had had the great honour to have an invite to Buckingham Palace to represent the Island for Jersey Overseas Aid through the Red Cross, and I can give you one guess which place I would rather be, not that I want to upset anybody. But we are where we are, as the saying goes. So, this debate has the potential to run for many hours or, dare I say, even days as some Members will want to go into minute detail to determine the rights and wrongs of every option that has been put forward. I want to concentrate on some very important facts that have got us to this stage. We must decide what is the right solution for the Island. It has to be a safe and efficient waste disposal system for the future based on sound information. By the future, I am not saying we just buy the biggest plant to deal with our waste because it is flavour of the month. No, waste processing, like our sewerage system, our harbour and our airport, must be robust and must not break down or fail when something changes. It is, after all, there to serve the entire community for many, many years to come. The first report on waste was produced in the year 2000. Yes, 2000. Look how long it has taken us to get to this stage and we still do not have a reliable plant. Far from it. Just look at the events over the past few weeks at Bellozanne. We simply cannot afford any more delay any longer. This House considered and approved the Solid Waste Strategy in 2005 and again in 2006. We debated the location of the new plant and we all agreed by a significant majority that it should go to La Collette. The decision has been made about the location. Some may ask - and I am certainly one who wants to know - why it took from the year 2000 to 2005, i.e. 5 years, to complete the Waste Strategy. From what I have seen, we had a perfectly good solution in 2000 costing £60 million. That was much, much cheaper then. The reason for the delay was the constant review of all these new alternative technologies. They kept coming into the department like there was no tomorrow. The department went on many trips to see these plants and they were confronted by small trial units, only capable of dealing with very small quantities of waste. When they were

challenged, the various companies could not provide full-scale plants. As a result of these numerous offers, none of which at that time were scaled-up to our requirement, the Committee decided that any proposed technology has to have at least 2 reference plants operating for 2 years on a commercial scale on the same type of waste. This definition is most important and although challenged by some in this House it has stood the test of time. Of the many, many experts employed by the Environment Scrutiny Panel I have not heard one speak against it, not one. So much so that the most recent advisers to Scrutiny - Juniper - have their own definition that is almost identical with our wording. So, how on one hand can we have all these experts agreeing with us and then the Environment Scrutiny Panel suggesting some alternative that does not fit the criteria? Well, it comes down to how much risk do we want to take with such an important issue as our waste. I for one want something that is tried and tested and reliable and will stand the test of time. I am not in favour of some new unproven piece of equipment that might last 5, 10, 15 years, who knows, when it has to deal with the many thousands of tonnes that we will be producing over the next 20, 25 years. Can you imagine just how stupid we will all look if we bought a new plant and it could not process all of our waste? The Environment Scrutiny Panel has put forward many types of plant and at their exhibition in April of this year they produced 2 examples, neither of which met the criteria set by their own consultants. How can we trust them to provide an alternative that will safeguard our Island? Maybe it is taking me some time to understand the importance of recycling, but I do now think it is vital for the Island, if we are to meet our new targets and keep the incinerator down to the smallest size we can that meets both the current and future growth in population ... and let us not pretend that we will hold the population figure to the current level when we never have up to now. From what I can see, too many, including the Environment Scrutiny Panel and their recent advisers, Juniper, appear to have completely missed this point that applies to recycling in particular. If we are to provide for our future, then we have to accept some increase in population. The department has taken this into account when sizing the new plant. By all means question us, but please be realistic. We need to set targets that we can meet. The U.K. and Guernsey have set aspirational targets of 50 per cent for recycling. That is fine for the U.K. If they do not meet their figure, they can simply build more incinerators or treatment facilities. Guernsey use landfill for most of their waste, including their food waste. We all know Guernsey face similar challenges to us, and we all know they still put their sewerage out to sea; we saw it on T.V. (television) last week. If we took food waste out of the waste stream, we could add another 9 or 10 per cent to our recycling figure and this would bring it up to about 45 per cent. Can we really afford to build too small a plant now and then have to build something else in a few years' time as recommended by the Environment Scrutiny Panel's adviser? Let us not forget Environment Scrutiny, who do not agree with their consultants, after 2 years of consideration they want 4 different plants. The detail in their report runs to less than 10 lines. Transport and Technical Services is proposing a reliable and tested technology in which Jersey retains considerable experience. Just imagine how stupid we would all look if we have to go back to the public in 5 or 10 years' time and say: "We knew about the population growth, we knew about the waste growth, but we got the figures wrong and now we need to spend many tens of millions of pounds on another plant." Yes, I know there will be a number of Members sitting in this Chamber saying the opposite, but I myself would prefer to err on the side of caution with something as important as waste. If the plant we are proposing is a bit too big - which I do not for one minute think it is - then it will last a bit longer. I would ask Members to cast their minds back to the late 1980s when there were huge stockpiles of waste stored outside at Bellozanne which regularly caught fire. Why? Well, because the incinerator was too small. After only 8 years' operation, it could not cope with the incoming waste. The solution was to build a third incinerator alongside at vast cost, I might say, to the taxpayer. This is exactly what our technical experts are telling us will happen if we build a smaller plant now as recommended by the Scrutiny Panel's advisers. The risk is just too big. Let us learn from past experience and build the right size plant that will last us 25, 30 years. Over recent weeks as we have approached this debate, I am aware of some concerns raised by Members about the new plant in terms of air quality. The new plant is far, far cleaner than our old one. The old one

produces more dioxins than all of the modern U.K. waste incinerators put together, and by a factor of 20. To put this into perspective, one year's operation of our existing plant at Bellozanne is equivalent to 500 years of operation of a modern facility. Now, 500 years was just a bit too big for me, so I broke it down. It comes out that for 31 years for the plant is 3.5 weeks of what at the moment is belching out of Bellozanne. The new plant located at La Collette will have the most up-to-date flue gas monitoring installed and this will be independently regulated by a health and protection regulator. The reports from the monitoring equipment will be made available to the public on a daily basis and, if possible, will be available online. Some people have concerns about reusing bottom ash for aggregates. Many of the modern U.K. and European Energy from Waste plants recycle their bottom ash and that is exactly what we want to do, but it will only be used after it has been tested to ensure that it meets whatever standards the regulators require. Now I want to turn to something a bit more basic. We have all heard about the recent visits to Cardiff. This is the material recycling facility. Now, I am no technical expert but I have one big question which no one from the Scrutiny Panel has answered: why, oh, why, should we put all our recycled waste out in a single box for it to be collected and taken to a materials recycling facility only to be sorted back into individual components? From what I have been told, all these plants like in Cardiff use migrant workers to do the sorting. I have no problem with migrant workers. In actual fact, I welcome them because they support our agriculture and industry; we could not manage without them. They play an essential role and we need them. But why create a new industry when the solution is here in this Chamber? Yes, in this Chamber, the solution is right here with us. We, together with husbands, wives, partners, children, can easily sort our recycle waste into various bins as they do in St. John. The Parishes will empty the bins and take the recycle materials to one of the local companies who are already doing a great job in sending it to the U.K. and Europe for recycling. The St. John scheme is exactly what the Transport and Technical Services Department is promoting for all the Parishes, for recycling clean, recyclable items collected at source. Collected at source. We do not need another scheme or another plant; we already have a better solution in operation now. Let us get on and support the Parishes to set up their recycling schemes so that we can all achieve the 36 per cent target that has been set. Now, is 36 per cent recycling enough? Well, we could go on for ever on this. Some say yes, some say no. But most important for me is that the 36 per cent does not include food waste. If we include food waste, it will take our recycling rate up, as I said, by about another 10 per cent, which will bring us up to, what, 45 per cent, 46 per cent, which will put us right up with the best performing U.K. authorities. This has been debated twice already: once in 2005 and again in 2006. This question is clearly going to be an issue today, but for me the matter is very clear. I am not going to compromise our agricultural industry by putting food waste on their land. I do not care about this standard or that standard. I care about supporting the industry by not damaging their reputation with their major customers, the big supermarket chains in the U.K. Let us be warned: do not underestimate their power. If they do not like the compost that we put on our land, they will tell us. If we are very lucky they will give us a second chance to correct it, but if we are not they will simply buy their spuds from the next bloke who offers them what they want. We cannot afford to compromise this industry. Now is the time to agree that we need a new plant. We have to get on with replacing the old Bellozanne incinerator. It has well reached its sell-by date, which I think we have all agreed. We simply cannot delay any longer. If we put this off to September, there will be another reason to delay this then, and who knows how much longer it will go on. We need to have a decision. I believe enough is enough. This is a big decision, one that is costing the Island a lot of money, but it is to safeguard our future and our children's. We have to have a tried and tested plant, something that we can rely on for the next 25 years. We have to make the decision today or tomorrow, and I urge Members to support this proposition.

Deputy J.A. Martin:

Comments have been made about the Environment Scrutiny Panel by the last speaker which certainly I would like to make clear that my thinking, as a member of the Environment Scrutiny

Panel, is purely that the decisions need to be audited to be an optimal size and I did not feel myself relating to the comments referred to by the last speaker.

Deputy C.F. Labey of Grouville:

Could I just ask for a point of clarification on the last speech? The Deputy said that a population growth had been factored into the size of the new incinerator or the proposed incinerator. Could she clarify exactly what population growth has been factored for because this worries me somewhat?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I do not have the figures right in my hand, but I know even if you just look in the *Evening Post* the births are up against the deaths. That again will tell you straight away that is a population growth.

1.1.13 Deputy S. Power of St. Brelade:

I promise not to speak as long as Deputy Le Claire or Deputy Duhamel. **[Approbation]** I have no doubt that the senior managers and the engineers at T.T.S. are men and women of the highest integrity and I also have no doubt that they believe firmly that their recommendations to the Minister over the past 2 and a half years and the previous Committee President are what they firmly believe to be the solution to our waste arisings. Albert Einstein once said: "Problems cannot be solved by thinking within the framework in which the problems are created." I do not believe for a minute that our waste problem will go away, but I do believe that there are solutions to our waste problem which may in time be proven that there are other ways of dealing with waste. I want to selectively quote very quickly from 2 Scrutiny Reports: the 2005 one which was written before I was in this Assembly, chaired by the former Deputy of St. John, and in section 6 on page 27 the panel that did this Scrutiny Report make 4 points. The first one is since 2000 - and we are now 2008 and this was written in 2005 - the pace of change in the waste management field and waste management technology has increased dramatically with new technologies emerging all the time. That panel had received considerable interest from organisations involved in waste management solutions. One of the things that they felt was appropriate in 2005 was that the modular nature of these technologies provides a more flexible approach to waste management, allowing units to be added or subtracted as waste volumes change. Units can be factory built and construction time is shorter than for conventional large mass-burn incinerators. Capital costs are lower and multiple units reduce the impact of overall downtime. They quoted the United Kingdom Government in 2005 that they organised a showcase demonstrating alternative technology plants between 2005 and 2007 for local authorities to prove the operational viability of these plants. The next thing I would like to quote from the 2005 report was synergies. They said that high recycling rates which reduced the overall residual component of the waste stream would allow the introduction of smaller modular end treatment with lower capital and operational costs with increased flexibility. They also make a point that opting for a fixed size large conventional Energy from Waste plant would need to run at an 85 per cent load factor to run efficiently and that it would have to have a guaranteed supply of waste which had to be treated for the 25-year lifespan of the plant. It was interesting that the Minister - Deputy de Faye - quoted the European Union this morning and said that Jersey was not signed-up to the European Union, yet the department both before the Minister's time and during the Minister's time advertised the request for an Energy from Waste plant in the Official Journal of the European Union, twice in actual fact. So I just make that point because I think it is relevant to some of what the Minister said. Finally out of the 2005 report, I wanted to bring Members' attention to the fact that the Royal Navy in Portsmouth and Bristol City Council opted for a different type of plant, which is the compact power plant which is now situated in Avonmouth. I have a very brief drawing here which shows the size of an original incinerator and the size of the compact power plant which is very, very small. I think it is relevant to what Deputy Duhamel and his panel have referred to on numerous occasions in the last 2 and a half years. I now want to refer briefly to the 2007 waste report from the Environment Scrutiny Panel. The first thing

I would like to refer to is that Deputy Duhamel took some time to explain the treatment of plastics. I want to just briefly make one point and that is the *U.K. Waste Strategy Report* of 2007 noted that burning plastics has a general adverse greenhouse effect due to the gases it releases and the release of fossil carbons. Recycling shows significant potential of carbon and energy savings through displacing virgin materials. That was the first point I would like to make. The second point I would like to make is about food waste. The Americans have a lot less food waste than we do, and one of the reasons they do that is because a lot of them have what they call ... **[Laughter]** garbage disposal units. Food waste and the treatment of food waste has been summarised in the W.R.A.P. report that both Deputy Le Claire and Deputy Duhamel referred to: "Where home composting is promoted intensively local authorities can save money. Many authorities make some effort to encourage home composting through the intensity of the approach and the level of support available." There are some specific examples of that both in the U.K. and in Europe. There is one specific example which is referred to on page 94 of the 2007 report, which is Lancashire. The city of Preston or the town of Preston ... perhaps Deputy Gorst, who comes from Lancashire, will correct me later on ...

Deputy I.J. Gorst:

I believe it was recently made a city.

Deputy S. Power:

Oh, right, there we go, 2 good things have come out of Lancashire, Deputy Gorst and the City of Preston. **[Members: Oh!]** Preston collects its food waste separately and this is how they do it. The food waste collection in Preston involves residents disposing of all cooked or uncooked, including commercial, food waste in biodegradable bags or special caddies. These are collected from 7,500 houses as are the commercial waste and what they do is they process the food waste in a kiln-type operation. The unit receives biodegradable kitchen waste including cooked meat, cooked food and kitchen scraps in a closed, high temperature system and the system has been very successful, so it can be done. I want to refer briefly to what has been already said once, and that is political attitudes. Environment issues are now mainstream issues in both political and everyday life. It is no longer the province of the Green brigade. I quote selectively: "The Labour Party is now taking action to reduce waste and increase recycling and to enable individual households to recycle their waste through doorstep recycling." David Cameron, the leader of the Conservative Party stated in 2007 that he endorses the progress being made in Conservative councils on recycling: "The councils' kerbside collection and green waste collection has increased the rate of recycling in Conservative controlled councils." So it is a live political issue in the U.K. Reference was made earlier on to zero waste, and the concept of zero waste has been growing around the world for many years. I give 3 examples of where it has been proven to work. One is in New Zealand, and I do not know how to pronounce this: "Opotiki District Council is the first local authority to adopt a zero waste strategy. From a peak volume at the time of 10,000 tonnes, waste was reduced to approximately 1,500 tonnes and that was an 85 per cent reduction in 36 months." In Australia: "The objective of Zero Waste South Australia is to promote waste management practices that as far as possible eliminate waste or its consignment to landfill ... advance the development of resource recovery and recycling." Thirdly, Leicester: "Leicester is committed to the principle of zero waste and has set a target of zero waste by 2020." So it can happen and it does happen in different jurisdictions, and that is why I think credit is due to St. Helier for attempting their zero waste trial last year and in 2006. I think the Jersey public want to recycle and I think we have a captive market here. I think the problem is that there does not appear to be a willingness politically to do that. The technology that is being promoted today and for the decision that we have been asked to make today is essentially similar technology to what was put into Bellozanne in the late 1960s. That is a large furnace, a large incinerator, with nowadays improved flue gas treatment, improved electricity output, but essentially the same type of technology. I think if we look around the world there are different ways of dealing with the technologies that are available,

and I just wish that we had been a little more innovative, and we have been in the past. I pose the question: what is driving the rate of technological change in the waste industry? To a large extent, it is the fact that people are now realising that waste is not waste but it is a scarce resource and it is recyclable. I think the other thing that is driving waste technology is the fact that the public perception is that we must recycle. We have been assailed in the media for the past 3 years with what we regard as the fragility of the earth we live in and Jersey takes its place in that. People may say that Jersey is a small place, but when you look at the characteristics of Jersey, it may not be immediately clear but because of our small landscape and our small Island, we have a large impact on the environment. That is because of our standard of living. Jersey's standard of living would translate roughly to 6 planets' worth over the next 20, 30 years if we were to carry on doing what we are doing. I think it is an absolute shame that we are not being more innovative in what we have to do. Today we have been asked again to commit to technology that will take us forward for the next 25 years. To put that in perspective we are now at 2008. By the time this decision is made and this plant is built it will be another 2 to 3 years, maybe even 5 years. That takes us up to perhaps 2011, 2012, maybe even 2013. Add 25 years to that is 2038. So we are making a decision today on how we deal with waste up until the late 2030s. I will be 83 then and I may not ...

[Interruption] [Laughter] Looking at it another way, if you go back 25 or 30 years to the technology that existed in the early 1970s, what kind of equipment was around then? What kind of cars did we drive? I remember my first car. It was a Morris Minor and my second car was a Volkswagen Variant with the engine in the back. So, if you compare to today's cars, things have moved on enormously. So when I am 83 I probably will not be able to drive. I probably will be in a little electric cart somewhere out west. I will not be able to get my leg over a bicycle.

[Laughter] Those are the time perspectives that we are looking at, that the decision we are making today will take this Island forward for another quarter of a century. I am looking for where the innovation is, where the new technology is, and it is not there. We are looking at a mass burn incinerator with an Energy from Waste plant strapped on, some flue cleaning equipment and not much else. If you look at the Island's infrastructure going back 25 years, again looking at the 25-year life going forward, we have built a large Elizabeth Terminal 25 years ago, I think, just about that. We are now looking to replace it. There are many aspects of the Island that we will have to change. I think technologies will change on the way the decisions are being made on how we process waste and I am very nervous of this decision today to commit to an E.f.W. plant. There are other technologies available. There are smaller technologies available. Deputy Duhamel has covered it in exhaustive detail. My own preference would have been something similar to the compact power plants, gas treatment and pyrolysis. It is out there. Sometimes we look inwardly at Jersey as if it is just a Jersey problem when it is not, it is a global problem and there are countries who are doing amazing things with their approach to waste. I think that we should take the initiative from those countries. I have quoted some of them; I have not quoted all of them because I am conscious of time. I do believe that Jersey has had a tremendous reputation for innovation in the past. The most recent example, I think, would be the J.E.C. using the nuclear power link and cutting down the Island's carbon emissions, which the Council of Ministers have taken great credit for. I think 20 years ago the R.R.B. (Resources Recovery Board) - and I wish it was still called that - were highly innovative in their U.V. plant. We have not done anything innovative since, and I think that is a shame. If you go back through history and the history of the Island of Jersey, people have been innovative, whether it was the ship building industry, fishing, the woollen industry, the apple industry, whatever. So, I leave it at that. I cannot support a 32 per cent recycling rate evolving to a 36 per cent rate over a long period of time. Some regions of the U.K. do 50 per cent, some do 60 per cent, some countries are aiming towards 80 per cent, and we are aiming for 32 to 36 per cent. So, I will not be supporting the proposition.

1.1.14 Deputy A.D. Lewis of St. John:

We have had water torture, we have had Waterfront torture, and now we have rubbish torture. I do hope that we come to a conclusion soon. I base my decisions, I hope, on facts. I do not subscribe

to populist politics and I have been given a huge amount of facts on this, by all sides: by Scrutiny, by T.T.S., by independent experts, by health experts, by engineers - all sorts of people. So I think we all have enough information to draw our conclusions and I guess we all will. I hope people have listened to the debate, as I have, and will be influenced partly by that debate, too, not just by their decision they may have come into this House with today. There has been a huge amount of work on this, a huge amount of information provided. In fact, years of work. It sounds to me like more than 8 years of work. We have reports such as P.72 that you almost need to be an engineer to understand, but nevertheless it is a lot of information. I think we have the information to make the decision and I hope that people make their decision wisely based on the facts, not on emotion and not on the basis of politics. I am particularly interested in the arguments about recycling. The scheme that we started in St. John has been referred to often today, and I am delighted by that because hopefully it will inspire other Parishes to do similarly. I am delighted that other Parishes have, indeed, almost agreed to do similar. One of the reasons why they had not to date is because there is a big cost to it for that Parish to set up. We were fortunate in St. John that we gained commercial sponsorship, and I have introduced 3 Parishes recently to another commercial sponsor, to be announced shortly, so 3 more Parishes will be joining that scheme. I am confident that other Parishes will do the same. But that only brings us to the 36 per cent recycling target if every Parish follows a similar scheme. I am disappointed that Deputy Duhamel, instead of criticising the scheme we have run so far and supporting a scheme that is for total waste management... if he put some of his energy - as had the Constable of St. Helier - into a proven scheme that has now been going for 2 years in St. John, which was a pilot scheme done in conjunction with T.T.S., if they put their energy into that we may well have reached our target almost already with the urban areas in particular participating. So I am very disappointed that they have gone down a route, even though our pilot had proved that keeping it simple works and the public are engaged with it and it does work. It is very clear from what the Minister and others said that if we go for total recycling - which is the utopia, yes, it will be wonderful - there is a huge cost to it. Whereas if we burn some of the rubbish and we recycle some we can mitigate that cost significantly. Instead of the nearly £600 a tonne, we are down to something like £200 a tonne and in some cases less. There is a strong economic argument for the scheme that is being proposed. We are a small jurisdiction. Sometimes we have to tailor things to that jurisdiction. People quote selectively about other jurisdictions, but I have not heard one yet, with the exception of the Isle of Man and I will come back to the Isle of Man in a moment ... all the other jurisdictions that have been quoted so far are large jurisdictions. They have the advantage in the U.K., for example, of landfill. Not just landfill; a tax on landfill to subsidise schemes if they so wish. That is why 40 per cent to 50 per cent is realistic in the U.K. and other large jurisdictions. They are simply not possible, or rather very difficult, to pursue in a small jurisdiction. What I would like to have heard from Scrutiny and from others is quoting examples from places like Malta, maybe, that have high density populations and small land available; Bermuda and other small islands that have the same problems that we have. I have not heard those quoted. That is what I would like to have heard from Scrutiny in particular. The Isle of Man was quoted and I have visited the plant in the Isle of Man and it is quite impressive, but I accept it is a lot smaller than the one that is being proposed for Jersey. I am afraid it would appear that maybe the Isle of Man Government made a mistake. Perhaps that is a polite way of describing it. Something with the word "up" in it might be more appropriate. Because it would appear to me that they have grossly underestimated the amount of waste that that community will generate and now they are having to seek alternatives. They are rushing around trying to find a way of solving it. The other advantage that they have, is that maybe they can afford to go for a much higher rate of recycling because they have something called V.A.T. (Value Added Tax). They have a much larger surplus than we have; they can afford, perhaps, to take that utopian step towards greater rates of recycling. Having just been through the G.S.T. debate, I do not imagine our taxpayers would want to do the same. So I do not really think it is a fair comparison to make. There are huge benefits to this particular scheme. The numbers have been crunched well and truly and I draw Members' attention to a table that has been put before you dated 3rd July which gives all the cases,

one to 7, and it is blindingly obvious to anybody making a business decision that the one being proposed by the Minister makes economic sense. It makes environmental sense, too. It has very low emissions. It produces 7 per cent of the electricity for the grid in Jersey. It meets all the air quality targets. There are 130 plants similar around the world that successfully operate using this type of system. These are compelling arguments to say that this is what we should be doing and it is half a million pounds cheaper or more than some of the other schemes that have been proposed. If half as much energy had been put into this scheme rather than all the alternatives that we have been looking at, it would appear, for nearly 10 years, we may well be further forward. The public like us to make decisions. They will not always be popular decisions, but they need to be the right decisions and I think Deputy Huet very eloquently stated that in her speech. We have to make the right decision based on facts for the benefit of the community now, but also the benefit of the community in the future. I really believe that what has been proposed does precisely that and I would urge Members to vote for this. You have had the information. I am sure not all of us have read all of it, although I have tried. We will not have understood all of it, but the principles are clearly understood. The numbers are very clear and I thank those that put these together to make it as clear as they have. Procrastination is not an option. We have seen what is happening at Bellozanne at the moment. It is a worrying state of affairs. The pollution that Deputy Le Claire referred to in the area, his concerns with the schools being nearby, well, I would urge that Deputy and others to move forward with this because that is a major concern of mine, the fact that that plant is still operating and we have built 2 new schools very close by. I do not think the Minister or previous presidents had any idea we would be procrastinating for 8 years on this when those buildings were reconstructed. This smells, I am afraid, a little bit, of poor planning over many, many years and we finally have a Minister that is brave enough to say: "Enough is enough, we have to make a decision." He has gone out with his officers, found the facts, drilled to the bottom of the pile of papers that has been piling up over the last 8 or 9 years, and has come forward to this House with a solution. It is not a 'back of a fag packet' solution. It has been worked on by experienced individuals over a long period of time, information drawn from all quarters of the world, the U.K. and Europe in particular. It is a good scheme. It is not the utopian scheme that some would like and I accept that, but I think it is a scheme that is designed for Jersey, designed for a small jurisdiction that has a high density and, regrettably, inevitably, a growing population. We have to plan for that. If we want our economy to continue, we have to have the infrastructure that meets those demands. I will be very fearful of going for a lesser option and ending up in the same position that the Isle of Man clearly are in 10 years' time. This is an opportunity to show the public that we are going to make a decision based on the evidence, based on the facts, yet still sign up to a dream future by encouraging members of the public to continue to recycle. I am very encouraged by what the Constables are doing now. We will make those targets. The targets are realistic for a small jurisdiction with a limited amount of land and a dense population. I have not seen many figures that contradict that. They have all come from bigger jurisdictions that I do not think are relevant to the Jersey story. It is not spin. It is science and it is practical economics, and I would urge all Members to not be influenced by others that are claiming that it is not good economics, that it is not a good environmental strategy, because I firmly believe from the evidence I have in front of me that it is. I would urge all Members to vote for it, and soon I hope.

1.1.15 Senator F.H. Walker:

This debate, this virtually identical debate, has been going on for more years than I can remember. Certainly, I recall attending Shadow Scrutiny I think it was about 5 years ago and the discussion was essentially identical to the discussion we are having in this debate. The questions are: is Energy from Waste the right way forward for Jersey? Is the proposal of Transport and Technical Services the right size? Or should we be embracing new technology? So those are exactly the same arguments as I heard at Shadow Scrutiny some 5 years ago. The Transport and Technical Services proposal has been thoroughly analysed, thoroughly evaluated and is fully supported by Babbie Fichtner who are ... and we seem to forget this. We spend much time talking - and I have no

problem about this - about Juniper; we spend precious little time, it seems to me, talking about Babbie Fichtner, who have been advising Transport and Technical Services throughout. Without question their pedigree is beyond question. They are one of the world's leading waste consultants. We were told by Deputy Le Claire this morning that we were being treated as fools, we were being fooled. Well, I do not think that statement should be made because I do not think Babbie Fichtner, a firm of world renown, would risk their reputation by so thoroughly supporting the proposition of Transport and Technical Services. I do not believe they would risk their worldwide reputation because of Jersey, a relative tiddler in the world waste marketplace. Babbie Fichtner, along with Transport and Technical Services, have considered the smaller option and they have rejected it. It is very clear in the letter that was circulated earlier this morning - on page 2, paragraph 2 - why they have decided against a smaller Energy from Waste option. They and Juniper absolutely agree that the saving, if we were to go for an 80,000 tonne Energy from Waste plant, which is being suggested by some, rather than a 105,000 tonne, the capital saving would be very small. Now, that is an agreed position between Juniper and Babbie Fichtner. I heard that yesterday from both consultants when I and others ...

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

A point of clarification, if I may.

Senator F.H. Walker:

How long will it take, Deputy? [Laughter]

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

It will take about 30 seconds. The point is taken out of context. What Juniper said was that if the Island were going to adopt the same type of technology, i.e. mass burn incineration, then a smaller machine ... now, that was only 10 seconds.

Senator F.H. Walker:

That is exactly what I said. If we were to go for a smaller Energy from Waste option, the capital saving would be modest, indeed, and that is an agreed position between Juniper and Babbie Fichtner. It might be possible to go to a smaller option if a number of things happen, as Deputy Duhamel and others have suggested. If they happen, it might be possible to live with a smaller option, just might be. But what happens if it is not? What happens if all the research and all the work that has gone into sizing the plant at 105,000 tonnes, what happens if that turns out, as is probably the case, to be correct? Where is the Island then? With an undersized plant that cannot cope with its waste. We have again confirmed from both Babbie Fichtner and Juniper that the cost of adding another stream later would be very high indeed. So it might happen, but it might not. We have heard all sorts of things that could happen, but we have no guarantee, no scientific support whatsoever to suggest that they will, indeed, happen. The probability is that they will not and Jersey would be left then short in terms of its capacity to deal with our waste. There seems to be a misconception about recycling. The 105,000 tonne capacity plant is after the recycling percentages have been increased to 36 per cent and is after kerbside recycling has been introduced. If we do not do that, then we go back to the 126,000 tonne plant and the additional cost that that entails. I have had this discussion with a number of Members privately. There seems to be some misunderstanding on that point. We can only downsize the plant to 105,000 tonnes if we get our recycling up, if we invest in our recycling, including kerbside reduction, kerbside delivery and collection. Thirty-six per cent has been confirmed by Babbie Fichtner as a realistic target - it is in their letter - for Jersey. Incidentally, if you compare like with like, if we measured it in the same way as Germany measures it, for example, that figure would be 46 per cent. Not 36 per cent, 46 per cent. So when we make comparisons and quote percentages, we should be very careful to compare like with like because some speakers and some contributions to the debate have not done that. We heard about the Isle of Man, about to introduce kerbside recycling and so on. Well, I am

not surprised because I am informed, again by Babbie Fichtner, that currently the Isle of Man's recycling rate is somewhere between 10 and 15 per cent, about half what we are achieving ourselves already today. So the Isle of Man can hardly be put forward as a model that Jersey should follow; they are way, way behind in terms of recycling and only now are looking to catch up, and only now wondering whether the plant they built only comparatively recently is big enough to meet their requirements. That is a discussion really on the size of an Energy from Waste plant. What about alternative technologies? Now, again I can go back to my appearances - and it was more than one - at the Shadow Scrutiny Panel about 5 years ago. We heard then exactly the same thing as we are hearing now: new technologies are coming, Energy from Waste is outdated, wait for new technology, that will solve the problem. We are still waiting and we are still having the same debate because the fact is that the 2 new technologies that have been identified by Scrutiny, supported by Juniper - of whom I make no criticism whatsoever - were both asked to tender for the Jersey plant and for reasons outlined again in Babbie Fichtner's letter both declined to put in a bid. So we do not have any scientific ability to turn to new technology at all. It is no coincidence, I would suggest, that in the U.K. 18 new Energy from Waste plants are going to be commissioned over the next 2 years. That is the U.K. alone. Many, many more are going into Europe. Now, if that is outdated technology, why is the U.K. and why are many countries in Europe investing in it and investing in it to the extent that it has now become totally a seller's market? That is one of the principal reasons why for every day we prevaricate the price goes up. So, any suggestion this is out-of-date technology simply is not borne out by the market and borne out by the facts. Some of the other arguments against are that Juniper want to do more work, and they do. I met with Juniper consultants, senior management, yesterday and they confirmed that their role is that of auditors and they would like to do more work. Sadly, what they could not commit to was when they would be able to complete it. The Managing Director told us yesterday that they are now so busy that they could not commit to a specific timetable for doing any additional work for Jersey. He talked weeks but he meant months, I have no doubt at all. We have no idea when they could complete any additional work that they would be asked to undertake for us. They made some very interesting quotes yesterday at the meeting which I carefully noted. Quotes from the Managing Director: "We are not suggesting that there is a better alternative to that proposed by Transport and Technical Services. We are not experts in alternative technologies. We are not saying T. and T.S. have got it wrong." All of those things from the Managing Director. What he re-emphasised was their role is that of audit and they would have liked more time and more information to enable them to complete that work, which is fair enough. Sadly, however, they did not meet with Babbie Fichtner until yesterday. They did not meet with Babbie Fichtner at any time during the process and that was despite requests to do so. Indeed, I have an e-mail, which I have to say astonishes me, dated 28th May from someone who I do not know - I guess he is a Scrutiny Officer - which says: "Good morning ... The panel [Scrutiny Panel] have considered a request from yourself [which is Transport and Technical Services] to have a meeting with Juniper and have decided that they do not want this to take place." Why?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

On a point of information, that was referred to in a statement that I made to the House at least 4 weeks ago. It is properly minuted and the Chief Minister is misleading the House in stating things that are completely and utterly out of context.

Senator F.H. Walker:

Well, it reads pretty clearly to me. What I cannot understand is why Juniper, Transport and Technical Services and Babbie Fichtner did not get together in May to discuss the outstanding questions that Juniper had. I have no idea why that did not happen. Had it happened then we would not be having some of the questions hanging over this debate today. I am sure a number of those questions would have been answered and I just do not understand that. One of the other questions raised is the population forecasts: have they been subjected to sensitivity analysis? Well,

yes, the answer is they have. All the information was provided to Scrutiny showing not just projected waste levels over the next 30-odd years but a very much lower level of waste generated or increase of waste generated over the next 30-odd years as well. It would still come up with essentially the same answer; very, very close to the same capital outlay as is being proposed.

Deputy J.A. Martin:

Sorry, could I ask the Minister for a point of clarification on the population figures? I have been told that the population figures for the incinerator is based on plus 250 heads of households that was the outcome of *Imagine Jersey 2035*. I do not recall debating that figure in the House, or have I missed something?

Senator F.H. Walker:

That debate has not taken place. I also believe - correct me if I am wrong - that is the same figure that is included in the Island Plan, which is probably of far more relevance in this context. Now, we are told that we should recycle more and I have already dealt I think with the percentages, but we had some considerable input on that from Deputy Duhamel on food waste. I have an e-mail from Waitrose to which I think he referred, which basically says: "Do not swap one problem for another." The last paragraph: "Waitrose has good relations with the Island growers but food scares, however small, are not grower-specific and create havoc for all the Island growers." So I would ask again: do you need to take the risk? That is a very big question for the agricultural industry: do we need to take the risk? The answer in my view is no, we do not need to take the risk and, what is more, we cannot afford to take the risk. Also, the British Retail Consortium in summary said: "High level of concern," and this answers another of Deputy Duhamel's points about spreading the output not just on potato fields. The British Retail Consortium says: "High level of concern. We have major concerns on animal-based compost made from either animal blood, bone, meat and entrails which is applied to either permanent graze land or land that is going into grassland. We are also concerned about the application of this type of compost to crops." So, again, pointing out that there is a real risk involved in putting food waste on to the land, a risk that the agricultural community of Jersey simply cannot afford for us to take. That, I would suggest, is basically unarguable. The other point we are told is we can ship waste. Let us have a smaller plant and let us ship. Let us recycle more and let us ship waste. The problem is that the facts again do not marry up. Yes, there is a market for high quality recycled waste of certain types, but the volumes that are being suggested we would need to ship inevitably mean we go down to lower quality recycled waste for which - again Juniper confirmed this yesterday - there is no guaranteed market. So, again, it might happen; it might not happen. Another risk. No guarantees. Another risk. A risk we simply do not have to take. So, I ask again: where are the facts? Where are the facts to enable us to support an alternative solution? We have had none. T.T.S. have looked at alternative technologies. They have looked at smaller Energy from Waste plants of the same technology and they have concluded, firmly supported and again very clearly outlined in their letter by Babtie Fichtner, that the proposition represents the best way forward for Jersey at this time and looking into the future. So a lot of things might happen to the waste market, a lot of things could happen, but what we are getting are loads of ifs and maybes; no facts other than from Transport and Technical Services; nothing to support the view that we should not go ahead. It is the same argument that we had 5 years ago: do not go ahead, new technology is coming, recycling is being increased, *et cetera*, and why then are the U.K. and other countries now investing so heavily in the same technology as Transport and Technical Services are putting forward for Jersey? Very difficult question, I think, for the opponents to the proposition to answer. Incidentally, I have a text message. Shadow Scrutiny was referred to in the debate. I had a text message at lunchtime from the former Deputy of St. John, who was the chairman of the Shadow Scrutiny Committee who said words to the effect: "For heaven's sake, get on with it. You cannot afford to delay any more. Get on with it." Now, that was a former States Member who spent a considerable amount of his time scrutinising these proposals or very similar proposals some years ago. We have already delayed much, much too

long. The delay has cost us a small fortune in capital outlay. It has cost us a small fortune in repairs to Bellozanne. It has cost us goodness knows what in terms of the environment, in terms of the emissions from Bellozanne. We have delayed far, far too long already and we must - must - take a decision. There is only one option in front of us that keeps the risk in acceptable margins. The risk of not going there is far, far higher than the risk of going there, because we have no facts, no certainty, no evidence to back up the alternatives that we have heard so much about over such a lengthy period. So, we owe it to Jersey now to take a decision after years of debate, to take a decision and get on with it, reduce the extra costs that we are faced with already, reduce the harmful emissions from Bellozanne which the Medical Officer of Health has referred to in a letter as well, reduce the risk of Bellozanne collapsing on us completely, which is not so very far away. We need to take a decision. We need to get on with it. We need to support this proposition.

ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED

Greffier of the States (in the chair):

Are Members content to adjourn and reconvene at 9.30 a.m. tomorrow morning? Very well, the Assembly stands adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT