

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

WEDNESDAY, 17th APRIL 2024

PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption	2
1. Offshore Wind (P.82/2023): amendment (P.82/2023 Amd.) - resumption	2
1.1 Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John:	2
1.1.1 Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South	3
1.2 Offshore Wind (P.82/2023) - resumption	5
1.2.1 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:	5
1.2.2 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	6
1.2.3 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:	8
1.2.4 Deputy P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:	9
1.2.5 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:	9
1.2.6 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:	12
1.2.7 Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour:	13
1.2.8 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central:	13
1.2.9 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	13
1.2.10 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:	16
1.2.11 Connétable D. Johnson of St. Mary:	17
1.2.12 Connétable M. Labey of Grouville:	18
1.2.13 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	18
1.2.14 Deputy L.J. Farnham of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:	20
1.2.15 Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier South:	20
1.2.16 Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin:	22
ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS.....	27
2. Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central (Vice-Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):	27

[9:30]

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

Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:

I wonder if I can apologise. I will be absent from the Assembly later this morning for a time to attend a medical appointment. Thank you.

PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption

1. Offshore Wind (P.82/2023): amendment (P.82/2023 Amd.) - resumption

The Deputy Bailiff:

We now resume the debate on the amendment lodged by Deputy Warr to the Offshore Wind proposition.

1.1 Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John:

The Minister for the Environment confirmed in his opening speech that he and all Ministers are committed to working with Jersey Electricity and fully recognise the value they bring to the Island and will bring to this project. However, the amendment is premature. Having spoken about risk and derisking in his amendments, I do not believe that the amendment itself recognises the potential serious consequences and conflicts of interest that it could cause, and the potential risks it raises. The time to formally define J.E.'s (Jersey Electricity) role in any project is at a future point when full consideration has been given. Currently, Jersey Electric have everything in place for the distribution with their existing network. It is hard to imagine that a duplicate network would be created to distribute power around the Island. Structured as they are as one company, I think this could also cause us issues, and work needs to be done in this respect. As Deputy Bailhache said, they cannot be both the seller and the buyer. Anyone who has looked at generating solar power on a commercial scale can tell you the challenges there are and, sadly, what appears to be disincentives rather than incentives to do this with the current arrangements. There is also the potential risk this amendment could present to J.E. themselves with their existing suppliers. Jersey Electric pride themselves on their strong relationships with their French partners. Would this amendment strengthen these relationships or could it actually weaken their position? Given the length of time required to build a wind farm, could this leave us needing to generate our own power on Island? Last year, France imported electricity for the first time in a long time. This was due to water shortages during the very hot summer. Water is needed to cool their nuclear facilities. Should they think that Jersey Electric are given an unfair advantage with this amendment, could they choose to stop exporting to us if they have, again, issues with generating enough power for their own? Yes, there is experience on the Jersey Electric Board, with some Members holding multiple position; something we discussed in an earlier debate during the sitting. That in itself could cause us problems, given their own existing declared interests in other energy-based businesses. What will be the response of those organisations that board members are connected to? Could this amendment, if successful, actually destabilise the Jersey Electric Board? As has been stated by most speakers, Jersey Electric are not wholly-owned by us. As the proposer of the amendment said, they are mostly owned by us; 62 per cent owned by the Island. That means that more than a third is not. The Minister for Treasury and Resources reminded us that we need to be mindful of the minority, and I do not believe that debating this amendment is wise, given the organisation is listed. In closing, like others, I would pay tribute to Jersey Electric and the team. Yes, they should be thanked for their contribution to the Island and their hedging in the past. Yes, they are doing some good work around solar power on-Island. But I will not be supporting this amendment and urge other Members to vote against.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak on the amendment? In that case, I call upon Deputy Warr to reply.

1.1.1 Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South

Sorry, I pick up my screen here with trepidation. I thank all those Members who have taken part in the debate. The thing that has struck me so much from the general comments is the inability of those who have spoken to step back and look at the bigger picture of what is being discussed here. Too much of this debate has, in my view, been stuck in the long grass, fear of losing control because of a minority stake in our most important utility company. I am disappointed that the jibe from the Minister for the Environment that Jersey Electricity may well have written my amendment, whereas the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development believes I just made the amendment up. Gentlemen, you are better than that. I remind the Members that my amendment is about keeping control of our destiny. The Minister for the Environment's comments that we only own 62 per cent of Jersey Electricity, but have 84 per cent of the voting rights, makes it sound like we have a minority stake in the organisation. Do the maths. Would Jersey Electricity really do something for the 62 per cent that was not also in the interests of the other 38 per cent? Honestly? If anything, they would be in trouble if all they were considering were the 38 per cent. I also remind the Minister for the Environment that they are not just another partner. I would hope I had made that point in my speech. We are fortunate that we have the controlling interest and the expertise in the energy business at our fingertips. I was told after debate that what has happened in the U.K. (United Kingdom) could not happen here. I rated Margaret Thatcher, but I am sure if she could see today the results of the privatisation policy, she would turn in her grave. We need to learn the lessons of history. Deputy Tadier brought up the idea of buying out the minority stake. It is not something I believe will be necessary, but we are in a position to do so, if push came to shove. Deputy Bailhache, I believe, said it would be unthinkable that policy would be developed without the knowledge of Jersey Electricity. That sounds like exactly what is going to happen. I talked about loading the dice. We need to make sure this Island's interests are given primacy. Deputy Scott, like so many others, talks of Jersey Electricity as if they are another energy supplier. They are not. Jersey Electricity are an incredibly important strategic partner of this Island. If they get it wrong, we cannot even boil a kettle. Deputy Millar and Deputy Renouf both spoke about conflicts of interest. Absolutely, there are conflicts of interest. But that is everywhere. I spoke about how conflicted are the major utility companies operating in the U.K., and how that conflict has become so untenable that they may even be renationalised. The Connétable of St. John had reiterated a point made by many; too early, my timing is wrong. Who are the experts in the Island? It may be a first that Jersey Electricity helps to deliver policy alongside government. I am very relaxed with that, given our relationship. What is the alternative? Develop the wrong policy and leave Jersey Electricity to pick up the pieces? The comments around scaring off investors. How? If there is money to be made, investors will come. We just need to make sure that we look out for the people of this Island. That is who I worry about. I remind Members that investors are not interested in the well-being of the people of this Island. This is a business deal, not a social contract. With Jersey Electricity, we get the best of both worlds. I brought this amendment not just hoping to get the support of this Assembly, but to put down a marker in the sand. The Assembly may be against me, but I believe history is not.

[9:45]

This is an opportunity to keep control of our future, to deliver energy security for this Island and her people. Let us not squander it. I call for the appel.

Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin:

A point of clarification, please, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Are you prepared to accept a point of clarification?

Deputy D.J. Warr:

No, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce the amendment has been rejected: 2 votes pour and 41 votes contre.

POUR: 2		CONTRE: 41		ABSTAIN: 0
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet		Connétable of St. Helier		
Deputy D.J. Warr		Connétable of St. Lawrence		
		Connétable of St. Breilade		
		Connétable of Trinity		
		Connétable of St. Peter		
		Connétable of St. John		
		Connétable of St. Clement		
		Connétable of Grouville		
		Connétable of St. Mary		
		Connétable of St. Saviour		
		Deputy G.P. Southern		
		Deputy M. Tadier		
		Deputy S.G. Luce		
		Deputy K.F. Morel		
		Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat		
		Deputy S.M. Ahier		
		Deputy R.J. Ward		
		Deputy C.S. Alves		
		Deputy I. Gardiner		
		Deputy L.J Farnham		
		Deputy K.L. Moore		
		Deputy S.Y. Mézec		
		Deputy P.M. Bailhache		
		Deputy T.A. Coles		
		Deputy B.B.S.V.M. Porée		
		Deputy H.M. Miles		
		Deputy M.R. Scott		
		Deputy J. Renouf		
		Deputy C.D. Curtis		
		Deputy L.V. Feltham		
		Deputy R.E. Binet		
		Deputy H.L. Jeune		
		Deputy M.E. Millar		

		Deputy A. Howell		
		Deputy M.R. Ferey		
		Deputy R.S. Kovacs		
		Deputy A.F. Curtis		
		Deputy B. Ward		
		Deputy K.M. Wilson		
		Deputy L.K.F Stephenson		
		Deputy M.B. Andrews		

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Those Members voting pour: Deputies Doublet and Warr.

1.2 Offshore Wind (P.82/2023) - resumption

The Deputy Bailiff:

We now return to the main proposition. Who would like to speak next on the proposition?

1.2.1 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:

I would like to start by congratulating Deputy Warr on quoting Miley Cyrus: “Best of both worlds.” That throws back some memories from when my daughter was young, but there we go. I want to get something clear from the beginning when we talk about a wind farm. We are often lobbied by many, many different groups. For groups who have a very set view on the way the world should be there is very little I can say or do to change their mind. That is the nature of lobbying. So any group that simply does not believe climate change science, we are not going to convince that this is in any way a good project: “Because this is not necessary, we can carry on the way we are.” I think that is a very important context in terms of lobbying groups and where we are from. But, there is an unfortunate truth here about this wind farm, and that is the best time to do this was probably 20 years ago, and those brave decisions were not made at that time. We disregarded the notion of looking at renewable energy at that time and the investment that would have been required then. We then bought into French Electricity, which is increasingly from renewables. I hope there is not a point of clarification here because I cannot verify this, apart from going back through Radio 4, yesterday I think it was. I was listening to the radio ... it might have been this morning, actually. Time is a relative thing nowadays. Where it was said that one day last week, 52 per cent of the U.K.’s energy was made from wind energy offshore and onshore. That is a hugely significant amount, if it is true. It may have been one of the lobbyists from the renewable energy group who owned the wind farm, so we will take it with a pinch of salt. But certainly, the amount of energy being generated from renewables is significant both in the U.K. and across the world. So we have a choice today and it is a very simple choice, do we say we are quite happy to go and look into how we may benefit from this? This is a very general proposition that says let us look at whether this can work for Jersey, how it will work, and come up with a system to develop this. Or do we say now, as we did 20 years ago: “No, we are not even going to look at that. It is not for us. That is for somebody else.” I remind this Assembly, this is not new energy. This is not new science. It is actually quite old now. We are picking this up late. The technology is there and is developing rapidly at a pace. We either buy into this or get involved in it and look at this, and I think we should do so more rapidly personally. I think this should become an issue at the next election in terms of what type of energy future we want for this Island. Do we want stability? Do we want access to a generation of energy for this Island, or do we not? Our move away from fossil fuels is more than just climate change. If we want to look at the economics of this, we have had the most unstable energy market for many, many years, and it is not going to increase in its stability. Look around the world at what is happening at the moment. In

those moments when we sit down and listen, it is really very scary. Anything that brings stability, and anything that brings stability to Jersey, we should not be dismissing out of hand day one when we come forward to look at it. The proposition in front of us does very little in terms of detail. It says we will investigate leasing of the offshore seabed that we have access to and then systems of how we are going to fund that. Personally, and I am pretty sure we will talk about this as a party, we believe that we should have more say in that, more buy into that, because there is more money to be made for Jersey. There is a social side to this. This is about providing energy for people's homes. We can deal with a cost-of-living crisis by having access to our own renewable energy, making that affordable for everybody, that improves people's lives directly on this Island. That is a social side of this investment, and there are social sides to investment, particularly around green energies and a transition and an equitable transition to renewables. We all recognise that. But this is a tangible example of how that could work. But instead, we may be sitting here today and saying: "Oh no, we are just going to dismiss it out of hand." I urge Members to support the proposition as it is, but read it carefully. It is not doing that much, apart from saying we are going to start the process of looking at what we want to do into the future. That is a very important process indeed. The very notion of ... I do not really know how to explain this. The very notion that the energy you produce will be solely for Jersey and it will not go anywhere else. They are not Jersey electrons. They do not have a Jersey passport in order to transmit their voltage with a special stamp on their electrons per coulomb. A little bit of science there. It does not make sense. We are part of an energy network throughout Europe and the U.K. By being able to generate and supply to that when we do not need it, use it when we need it, that is exactly the way that we should be heading. We have an opportunity here. I urge Members, let us not dismiss that opportunity out of hand on day one before we have even looked for it. Let us come back later and have the debates; the intelligent, informed, considered debates based upon the principles of where we want to go on the detail of what comes forward to this Assembly, but that will come forward into the future. That was made clear by the Minister for the Environment at the beginning of this debate. I urge Members to think carefully and let us give the support and move on.

1.2.2 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

My first half of the contribution I will be responding as chair of Scrutiny of the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Panel. The proposition, as Deputy Ward has just said, is about policy intentions for location and scale of development. As this is an in-principle proposition with much more work ahead of us, the E.H.I. (Environment, Housing and Infrastructure) Panel mainly reflected on what they would like to see the Minister do next in the proposition, if this proposition is passed, to ensure deeper consultation, transparency and to enable and welcome strong scrutiny. I would like to thank the Minister for replying already to our recommendations and laying out his intentions and response to our recommendations, and we welcome this open dialogue that has commenced and hope this will continue. We need a more detailed timeline of proposed dates when further propositions will be lodged, to ensure Scrutiny has sufficient time to fulfil its necessary role. We wanted to highlight the concerns raised in the consultation process on the environmental impacts of such a large infrastructure project. It is understood there will be an extensive environmental impact assessment, which must meet international best practice and how it will be carried out, and so it will be important that this is robustly scrutinised. Therefore, the panel recommends a clear consultation roadmap be published outlining the next steps, providing a timeline of key intervals to give the opportunity for stakeholders and the public to engage and express their views. The panel recognised that the biggest unknown is what our direction as an Island is, weighing between benefits versus risks, and we have requested that Scrutiny be presented with a draft business case at the earliest opportunity to be able to start scrutinising the benefits versus risks of various options and scenarios under consideration. And to remind Members that the Scrutiny Liaison Committee has, in principle, agreed to set up an offshore wind review panel to specifically look at the significant amount of work that will be undertaken going forward, and to keep asking those questions that many have raised but have yet

been answered. As the Minister said in one of our panel briefings, the answers will stem from the level of risk tolerance acceptable for Jersey and for the private sector interested in developing the wind farm. A terms of reference for the review panel will be developed as quickly as possible, and a call for membership out before the end of the month. Therefore, I urge eligible Members to think about joining this review panel. I would like to turn now to a few points of my own. We have a legal obligation to meet our net zero targets, which means our need for more green, clean electricity will only increase. Why I highlight our legal obligation is because not only have there been a number of domestic court cases that have been taken by citizens against Governments around climate change in the last few years, a week ago, the European Court of Human Rights ruled that countries must protect their citizens from the consequences of climate change in a landmark ruling that sided with a group of 2,000 Swiss women against their Government. This debate we are having is about a long-term vision. It is about placing ourselves into what we need in 10, 20, 30 years' time. One thing we know will happen, even if we continue as business as usual, is that our demand for electricity will increase, and we will need to buy 2 to 3 times more than we currently consume. I said many times before, we have been protected from the power price volatility experienced across Europe and the U.K. because of our hedge contract with the E.D.F. (Électricité de France). Consequently, we currently only pay about 20p per unit of electricity, whereas France consumers pay the equivalent of 22p or 25p once the Government removes the price cap, and the U.K. pays over 35p. That means we pay 10 per cent to 25 per cent cheaper electricity than French consumers. Do you really think that is going to last? With the new contract to be renegotiated soon, it is folly to think that Jersey consumers will be able to pay less than a French consumer when it is their generated energy, with their tax money going to tax breaks and subsidies to their energy producers. It is inevitable that our bills will keep getting higher. The French also have their own net zero legal obligations and has already been taken to court over non-compliance. So will be focusing much more on delivering their own decarbonised electricity to their own citizens, rather than selling off excess to their neighbours. This again, will affect the price. With this single market point, we are and will be exposed to volatile and increasing energy costs. Or we could become one of the players. The French, also focusing on diversifying even more of their energy mix, have ambitious plans to build an enormous amount of wind farms; 40GW by 2050. This is clearly laid out in their submission to the consultation. If you look at the map they have published, it circles Jersey at least 2 sides of our rectangle Island. We will be seeing a lot more wind farms from our cliffs, whether we like it or not. The French have only just reversed their policy to phase out nuclear, which means they have not been investing in their ageing fleet or developing new sites. The sites E.D.F. have been developing are not going so well; massive delays and quadrupling of costs. This has happened in both France's Flamanville 3 reactor and also Britain's flagship Hinkley Point C nuclear plants. We have to remember this when we are thinking about our own energy mix, but we also cannot forget there are also still concerns with nuclear. A friend of mine in Belgium works on how to dispose nuclear waste, and he always jokes that he has chosen the best job in the world because he will always be needed and he can charge huge fees for his knowledge, because it will continue to be a continual dilemma of where to put nuclear waste. This will never go away. Even if new facilities are built, even more waste will be generated and need to be stored somewhere, which also, of course increases the risk of leaks and terrorist targets going forward for future generations. Also continuing using fossil fuels not only has a huge impact on the climate change, but there are huge environmental risks all the way along the supply chain and including when they become decommissioned. Just because most of this happens out of sight of Jersey and affects other communities far away from us, does not mean we should discount this huge environmental cost into our discussions when weighing up what we should do. But Jersey has not been immune to this risk. The Amoco Cadiz oil tanker ran aground off the coast of Brittany in 1978, and we had tons of oil and tons of fuel from the ship leak into the sea, causing huge loss to sea life just in one incident. Its impact on the environment was catastrophic. Maybe some of you in this room will remember it. Fortunately, it was before I was born. But this could happen again. Researching oil spills, I came across a Wiki list of recorded oil spills around the world, and there is an average of 5 to 6 a year

causing huge environmental damage. Only recently, there has been one in the Caribbean that still is unknown who actually owns that, because it was a barge overspill, and it is having huge effects on some Caribbean Islands and into Venezuela.

[10:00]

So offshore wind farms can have both positive and negative impacts on the environment and local communities as well. Their development requires careful planning and analysis through a process which cannot be rushed. But without a robust environmental impact assessment banks will not lend money to fund projects, and without that they cannot be built. So Jersey will have to follow a process and meet global best practices. As the letter from the French Government says, there are many complex challenges, particularly in management of marine resources, preservation of biodiversity landscapes, cohabitation with other maritime uses such as fishing, and so learning from their experiences and leaning on what they have done with Sambrès, for example, will hopefully inform a solid, expert-led environmental impact assessment for Jersey. Jersey can also dictate what fiscal, environment, economic and social benefits we want from this large infrastructure project. These benefits can be realised through setting out clear objectives in the government policy, enacting them through a framework of legislation, regulation and agreements required to underpin a project. This is for us, as States Members, to decide what benefits we want from this project. It is for us to decide. Most important is to safeguard local benefits. Too many large infrastructure projects, funded by private sector around the world, have been able to negotiate away the local benefits. There are many examples to pull from, and the Government needs to ensure it is doing its due diligence. It is clear about the rules of the game, with open and transparent consultations, and develop strong mechanisms to protect Jersey from unintended consequences and the private sector not complying with its commitments and obligations. What is most important, is to build trust. Trust that we, as an Assembly, support in principle this process. Trust that the Government has the capacity to develop necessary safeguards, consistent public policy, clarity of permitting consenting processes and expertise to ensure Jersey gets the best of any deal, and trust that Jersey can build partnerships that will withstand any turmoil and make good decisions on risk tolerance, whether that be with our neighbours, the private sector, local stakeholders or financiers. Jersey's future is a decarbonised electricity system that is more sophisticated than it is now. This is about starting that journey, not placing our heads in what happens now, but what the future will have to be. More decarbonised electricity, more mix of renewables, battery storage, new consumer behaviours and our homes and cars being more net contributors. Of course, most important, that we also ensure that we are more energy efficient as well.

1.2.3 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:

I am pleased to follow the previous speaker who brings a wealth of knowledge, and I feel like I learned a lot from that speech. I will be supporting this, and I will be supporting it on the basis of my commitment to children's rights, the U.N.C.R.C. (United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child) states that children have the right to a healthy environment, and so we have a duty to provide that for them. We are even more so compelled to do this following the U.N. General Comment number 26, which was issued in August last year. This focuses on children's rights and the environment, with a special focus on climate change, and explicitly addresses the climate emergency, the collapse of biodiversity and pervasive pollution, outlining countermeasures to protect the lives and life perspectives of children. It specifies that states are responsible not only for protecting children's rights from immediate harm, but also for foreseeable violations of their rights in the future, due to states acts or failure to act today. In my view, this should compel all Members to support this proposition. Our children deserve to have a future on this earth, and it is our actions that will decide what that will look like. Please support the Minister's proposition.

1.2.4 Deputy P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:

Unlike previous speakers, I find myself deeply agnostic, if not sceptical, about this proposition, supported by a rather thin report which states that the possible benefits are environmental, economic and strategic. It was that last element, the strategic element, which caught my attention because I remember as if it were yesterday, the infamous remarks of a French Minister of the Sea threatening to cut off Jersey's electricity supply on the misunderstanding that French fishing interests were threatened. If we were to gain energy security, that would be a very powerful reason, in principle, for supporting the establishment of a wind farm near the Minquiers. But the more one reads, the less certain one becomes that the intention is to land any electricity in Jersey. The Government's feasibility study itself states that it is more likely that the electricity will be landed in France. If that is the case, what is the point? We would be engaging in a highly risky enterprise involving engagement with huge commercial interests, way beyond the power of this Assembly, and the possibility that at the end of the day, Jersey might be left to clear up the mess by decommissioning the engineering detritus. I would like to be assured by the Minister in his reply that there is still a desire to gain energy security. For my part, it is close to being a make or break issue. But perhaps I can press that a little further. I do not wish to be kept in the dark about where the cable will land, until we are so far advanced down the road that it is, practically speaking, impossible to withdraw. If this proposition passes and work proceeds on a law to give planning consent and an option for leasing the seabed is developed, I would like some clarity on whether the landing site will still be uncertain at the time when we are asked to commit to a lease. As I say, this is probably, for me, a bridge too far, and I would want the option to be conditional upon a commitment to land a cable and at least part of the power in Jersey. I am, however, in the generality, reassured by what the Minister has said, that the adoption of this proposition is not to be taken as some form of approval in principle of a wind farm. It is, in the words of the proposition, an agreement to pursue the opportunities arising from the development of a wind farm. In short, it is an agreement to carry out the work which will enable an informed decision to be taken in due course. For my part, I think that the obstacles are substantial: economic obstacles, environmental obstacles and strategic ones too. But with those caveats, I am content to support the Minister's proposition.

1.2.5 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:

The Minister for the Environment made a strong speech clear about what the vote is and is not about, and I also want to acknowledge the thanks for his acknowledgement about the work of the previous Ministerial team. I agree with his central point that this is about whether or not we go to the next stage, but I intend to take a slightly different tack in this speech, because I also think it is important to remember that something big is at stake. The potential opportunity is huge, and I want to talk a bit about that opportunity. This is a vote that asks us to use our imagination. It is about imagining what might be, about weighing up risk and reward, having a vision about what Jersey could be in the future. So let me try and create a picture of what the future could look like. One possible scenario: let us put ourselves 10 years into the future and picture this scene. The Chief Minister and Deputy Chief Minister are sitting disconsolately down at El Tico, looking out to sea. In the distance they can see Guernsey's wind farm beginning to take shape. A second French wind farm is also under construction behind La Rocco Tower. A supply ship is chugging from St. Peter Port to the French wind farm. While closer to shore another ship is laying a new cable to bring electricity from Guernsey's wind farm to Jersey. In the Chief Minister's hands is a press release from the Isle of Man Government announcing the imminent opening of their 2GW wind farm, including exports to the U.K. and Ireland. The Deputy Chief Minister turns to the Chief Minister with head in hands and asks: "Where is our wind farm? How did we miss out?" The Chief Minister lets out a world-weary sigh. We remind ourselves of that fateful day in 2024, when the States voted not to proceed with a wind farm. So I guess that is one scenario that could materialise. Jersey misses out while others cash in. But there is another option, and I will come to that at the end of my speech. There are many forces that will shape the future of Jersey, shape the Island that our children and grandchildren will

inherit. Many of those forces are beyond our direct control: genetic modification, artificial intelligence, geopolitical destabilisation. None of these are likely to be significantly influenced by Jersey. So we will have to adapt, as we always have, as technology, politics and business move on. For me, one of the strongest arguments for a wind farm is that it gives us the opportunity to take control of one significant part of our future. Jersey has always been good at taking advantage of the hand that nature has dealt us, whether that be farming on soils enriched by ice age, windblown dust, or by leveraging the political power that comes from our geographical location on the front line of Britain's long conflicts with France. However, our physical resources are limited. We have no metal ores, no coal or oil, and so we have been importers of all these commodities. Now we stand in a different position. It turns out that nature has given us a helping hand after all. To the south-west of Jersey, the prevailing wind blows strong, as we all know. The ocean is open all the way to the eastern seaboard of the Americas. Not only that, but the sea is shallow. These are ideal conditions for one of the great economic growth sectors of our time; offshore wind power. It is growing at great speed. Globally installed capacity is growing at well over 10 per cent a year. The truth is that thanks to our geography, we happen to have at our disposal one of the most sought after resources of the 21st century, a source of zero carbon electricity, clean energy. The basic resource on which the economy of the future, and therefore the lives of our children and grandchildren, will be built on our doorstep. The question is: how should we respond to the good fortune that accidents of nature have delivered into our hands? Which brings me to the proposition before us. It asks that we, as an Assembly, agree that we should pursue the opportunities that a wind farm of up to 1GW may provide, and to prepare the next stages in that process. This is not, as many have remarked, the final decision point. It may not make the greatest rallying cry of all time, but forward to the next stage and onward to law drafting is basically what we are about. The final decision point is still some way off. I should say, in all honesty, that I do not know myself that I would support that final go ahead. I agree with the Minister. It will depend on the details. What kind of a deal do we have? How much benefit do we get? At what cost? But what I can say unequivocally is that, yes, I am in favour of the principle of an offshore wind farm, assuming that we can make it work for Jersey. When I look at the feedback from the consultation exercise, that is what I get from the report.

[10:15]

“Yes”, the public say. “We like the idea. Yes, we want more detail. We would like to know more about how it will benefit the Island”, and if we are worried, it is mostly because it might have a negative impact on the local environment; but strong support for the basic idea. Let me look a little more closely at the arguments against the wind farm. The one that comes up time and again is if it ain't broke, don't fix it. We already have cheap, low-carbon electricity; why would we mess with that? The answer to this question means returning to my point about looking into the future because, as Deputy Jeune said, the trouble is the status quo is not an option. The current contract between J.E. and E.D.F. is up for renewal in a couple of years' time, and already the electricity market is very different to when the previous contract was signed. J.E.'s current deal was negotiated in an era of surplus French nuclear electricity, which meant J.E. got a good price. Those days are gone. A combination of a decline in French nuclear output as the power stations of the 1960s ran out of time, plus the war in Ukraine, which has meant that the whole of Europe is after low-carbon electricity to replace Russian gas means that prices for French electricity will surely rise. Therefore, the relevant comparison is not the cost of power from a Jersey wind farm versus today's J.E. contract, but with the future cost of French electricity. We can be reasonably sure that electricity from Jersey's wind farm would be cost competitive with French electricity in the future for one simple reason: the French are building wind farms too. As we have heard, they plan to build up to 40GW of wind power, including another wind farm off the west coast of Jersey in the next 25 years. In other words, in 10 years' time, a contract with E.D.F. will be in significant measure a contract to buy French wind power. Because that is much of what they will be selling. We can buy French wind power or we can buy our own wind power. Either way, it is unlikely we will pay more for electricity from our own

wind farm than we would if we were buying power from France. Now let me turn to this question of whether power is beached in Jersey. I know there are some who have argued that it may not be a good idea to bring electricity from a Jersey wind farm offshore in Jersey, because it adds to the expense. I agree with Deputy Bailhache; I think we should try and beach power in Jersey. It would give us greater energy security in an uncertain world, and that is worth a lot. Put bluntly, we do not know who will be in the Élysée in the future, nor can we predict with certainty the state of E.U. (European Union)-U.K. relations, both of which might impact on future energy supplies from France. The positive case for beaching power in Jersey is strong. It does not give us and will not give us energy independence, but it would give us much greater security. In a world of huge uncertainties, having control over a significant portion of our energy supply would be a strategic benefit for which I believe we would be very grateful. As an aside, what is more, a cable to Jersey need not add much to total energy costs in Jersey. J.E. will have to replace one of their 3 cables to Normandy in the next 10 years or so. So with careful planning, that money, which will have to be spent anyway, could be used to fund the cable to the wind farm from Jersey, which could then be used to import from France, as well as carrying power from the wind farm to Jersey. I think we should try very hard to try and beach power in Jersey. What of the other arguments against the wind farm? The public is rightly worried about the impact on wildlife, on seabirds and sea mammals. This is precisely, of course, what the next stage of the process will deal with. I would just make these points. It is interesting the point about birds being killed by wind turbines. The key comparison here is not whether they will be killed by wind turbines. I expect some will. It is probably unavoidable, although far fewer than the lurid headlines we sometimes see. What is more, the designs of wind farms are getting better at reducing bird strike. The key point is that wind farms displace fossil fuels, and fossil fuel production kills far more birds than wind turbines. The production, distribution, and consumption of fossil fuels all involve the death of birds. By the way, the same point holds for the argument that a wind farm involves concrete and steel, which creates a carbon footprint. Again, yes, but far less than oil rigs and tankers and pipelines and refineries. As for fish and sea mammals, these days clever design means wind farms can be a net positive in terms of marine productivity. Yes, there is disruption during construction, but the latest work says that fish come back and in greater numbers than previously because the jackets on the seabed essentially become reef structures. In terms of fishing, that can be a net positive as well because fishing is not banned around wind farms these days. Bottom dredging is to protect the cables, but there is very little of that by our fleet out in those waters. The visual impact, of course, is unavoidable. A wind farm will be visible from the Island. The design can, to some extent, mitigate that in terms of how you align the turbines and so on, but it is unavoidable. But of course, we can see a French wind farm already. The choice really is between do we have a visible wind farm that we benefit from or do we have visible wind farms that we do not benefit from? Let me finish as I began, with a vision of the future. What kind of story do we want to tell about ourselves? What kind of Island do we want to create for our children and grandchildren? Do we want to embrace the net zero future, or do we want to be dragged there reluctantly? To me, a Jersey wind farm could be part of something bigger. It is an opportunity to change Jersey for the better. I like the idea of Jersey playing a significant role in creating a more sustainable future for the planet because any wind power we generate will displace fossil fuel. But just as importantly, more importantly, a wind farm would symbolise Jersey's commitment to a sustainable future for Islanders; sustainable environmentally and economically. More attractive to business, more attractive to creative talent as in entrepreneurial people. But you do not have to believe in any of this to vote for the proposition, because a wind farm would also be a straightforward piece of economic diversification. It is economic development without needing new fields for building. It is a future beyond finance for our children. It is support for jobs in ports, infrastructure, training. It is greater energy security. Let us imagine again a scenario 10 years in the future. In this scenario, the Chief Minister, indeed, all States Members, are at La Collette for the official opening of Jersey's wind farm. Nearby, another new facility is taking shape. Jersey's first green hydrogen producing plant is being built. The hydrogen is destined to fuel a new fleet of zero carbon, non-polluting ferries and aircraft. Government

Ministers are in celebratory mood, ready to market Jersey as an eco-friendly, low-carbon jurisdiction, not just doing its bit for the environment, but nurturing new economic sectors attracted to the supply of clean energy, creating high-value jobs in a diversified economy, proud of the Island's growing reputation for sustainable economic growth. The Chief Minister gets ready to make a speech thanking all those who made it happen. Just before he stands up, as an afterthought, he turns to his Deputy: "Who was that short-lived Minister for the Environment who kicked the whole thing off? Name escapes me." "No, I cannot remember either", the Deputy Minister murmurs, "but I think he used to work for the BBC." The wind farm project has been on the runway for a while now. Let us at least see if it can fly. [Approbation]

1.2.6 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:

So many Members have already spoken well on this proposition that I have little to add. Recently the *J.E.P. (Jersey Evening Post)* featured an article regarding this proposition. It argued if it were not for international policy or treaties, wind farms would not be built, as fossil fuel production is cheaper. This ignores the reality of international agreements favouring renewable energy to reduce fossil fuel burning. It is like saying if we did not have police, the costs of policing would be cheaper. Deputy Rob Ward suggested that this proposition should have been debated 20 years ago. History will probably indicate these international treaties should have been made more than 20 years ago, too. Even if relations with France continue to be cordial and manageable, electricity demand is expected to triple globally by 2050 as a result of transitioning away from the burning of fossil fuels. At the same time, Jersey, like other countries, has committed to reducing its own consumption of fossil fuels. Jersey currently imports nuclear energy from France, which is cheaper than renewable sourced energy. This is not regarded as offsettable clean energy for the burning of fossil fuels under international treaty, I believe, owing to the radioactive nature of nuclear energy waste. We will need to import renewable source energy ourselves down the line, and it does cost more than nuclear energy. But do we want to build our own nuclear reactor or look to other countries to do so? Whose problem should the management of nuclear waste be? As has already been mentioned, there has been massive expansion of wind farming in France already to meet its own treaty obligations. To what extent can Jersey reasonably expect France to keep expanding these, or building more nuclear power plants on its own territory to supply us with electricity, to meet our own treaty obligations? While Jersey exercises a policy of N.I.M.B.Y.ism (not in my backyard), or to expect a country like France not to prioritise its domestic market over exporting to places like Jersey. Our additional electricity from renewable resources will cost more, which will need funding. In addition to the costs of supporting an ageing population, a number of whom cannot afford to support themselves. Along with the cost of training our population to adapt to new technology and the cost of Government acquiring new technology. The proposal of leasing the seabed to support renewable energy production offers to help pay for Jersey's future economic and energy needs. Decommissioning is covered by the proposition itself. We need to be clear this is more than a proposition for Government to create a feasibility study. This is direction setting with details yet to be filled in. I have a slight difference with the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding our perception of the attractiveness of wind farms. I already have a few wind farm turbines. I regard them as industrial machinery. But what is being proposed would be far less intrusive on our own coastal views than wind farms already constructed in many areas of Europe and in the U.K. Jersey needs to do its bit. For those who point to China and say China should be doing more, China has invested in much renewable energy already and its own plan to manage its treaty obligations in light of the size of its own population, which is so much more massive than Jersey's. I am mindful of the concerns of our fishermen. There remains work to be done to create a level playing field with the French fishermen in fishing in each other's territories, I suspect, and I hope to work with the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development and other relevant Ministers in supporting our fleet.

1.2.7 Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour:

I will be brief, I will not repeat anything that has been said previously. This is an in-principle proposition so I think we need to explore this. We already have many cables - we have at least 3 cables running to Normandy already - so landing on-Island would not be a major problem. In my previous iteration as a Minister you can imagine the conversation I had with the then Senator Farnham who was then heading up tourism, that I may need to close part of Grève de Lecq for 3 months during the summer to lay a new cable. We did it with the minimum of disruption, so a very large cable was laid to Guernsey. We do have lots of on-Island infrastructure already handling that. I have always believed in security for the Island. I am not a flag-waving environmentalist, I am not trying to save the world, just the Island for now. I believe that we should have more resilience, we know what it is like when we have a bad storm and the boat does not come in, that fresh food disappears off the shelf.

[10:30]

We need resilience generally with food and fuel, be it electricity and whatever. Should we lose the link to France, obviously the J.E.C. (Jersey Electricity Company) can self-generate on-Island probably just for a matter of months, then obviously the fuel tanks would need to be topped up. If we want to be cleaner and greener then this is the way that we have to go with renewables, but I am also very aware that we have instability around the world. I know that France, I believe half of their nuclear reactors are under maintenance at the moment, and I think France is struggling to keep the supply up to the whole country. We are aware of conflicts in Eastern Europe, not to mention the Near East, Far East and beyond, things are very unstable, so I believe the Island must be resilient, as resilient as possible, and I would like the idea, as has been suggested, of landing a cable in Jersey as well as France. I will leave it there.

1.2.8 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central:

If done in the right way, the wind farm could bring many opportunities to the Island. We could benefit from security in our power supply, stable pricing, clean energy, tax and leasehold revenues and employment opportunities, depending on the contract, but there are also valid concerns. I will mention 3 of these now. Firstly, I ask that there be serious consideration given to compensating local fishermen whose catch is affected during the building process operation and decommissioning of the wind farm. I understand that this is fairly normal practice by consortiums in other jurisdictions. Secondly, if the seabed lease model is the chosen way I also ask that serious consideration be given to the establishment of community bonds allowing Jersey people, companies and/or our own Government on behalf of the public to invest in a stake in the wind farm should they so wish. To minimise risk this should only be available when the wind farm is operational. This would also not prevent a private consortium from the seabed lease model, allowing a small percentage of outside ownership of the value of the wind farm with very small risk to the public. Thirdly, but no less importantly, is the subject of biodiversity. Any adverse impacts evidenced in the environmental impact assessment must be addressed as well as they can be with consideration given, for example, to the building of artificial reefs or any other biodiversity offsets. The success of this project for Jersey will very much depend on the contract. Should this project go ahead, we must ensure that there is clear benefit to the people of Jersey, while ensuring all risks are fully addressed in the contract.

1.2.9 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

Thank you for what has been also - I feel like I am summing up - what has been I think a thought-provoking speech up until now. I think it is good to see the new Minister for the Environment, who has taken a period of time to reflect, to come into Government and then, after being briefed, and I note in an area he has been interested anyway, decided to keep on the work that has already been done. That is, I think, good constructive politics and we need to see more of that in future. It is difficult to know where to start with this and I will start with some personal comments and then, I

suppose, similar to Deputy Jeune, make some comments on behalf of the panel because we have thought about this quite a lot and issued a comments paper as well. The first thing that I came across when doing some initial research, when typing in “wind farm” into the States Assembly website, was I came across a proposition from 2005 that had been lodged. If I just bring that up, it was quite interesting, because I had not known about this; I suppose I was not really following Jersey politics very closely in 2005, I would have been out of the Island. There was a proposal lodged by the Policy and Resources Committee in February 2005 which said: “To agree that the French Government be requested to consult with the Island authorities on the proposal to construct an offshore wind farm in French territorial waters off Saint-Rémy-des-Landes, Normandy, before any final decision is taken.” There are probably one or 2 Members of this current Assembly who were there at the time and remember that debate. We will ask Deputy Southern when he comes back in if he remembers that debate. I am sure it is very vivid for him. The interesting thing is, when you look at the proposition you realise how outdated it sounds in a lot of ways because it starts from a point really of a great deal of scepticism, and essentially I think there is an element of N.I.M.B.Y.ism in it. Also we look at the scale of energy being developed, or proposed to be developed, by the French and we realise how fast and how quickly technology has moved on in the space of less than 20 years. So what they were proposing back then and what the report says is that: “The actual scale of the proposed wind farm is considerable. It is understood to consist of a plan to generate 80MW of power, from 20 to 23 wind turbines with a hub height at 90 metres above mean sea level, and rotor blades a further 60 metres in length.” Of course, what we are proposing today in our blue-sky thinking is much more than that, it is more than 10 times the capacity of that. The comments that we hear from the committee is that: “The possible effects on aviation are of particular concern, due to the height of the turbines which would clearly be a hazard to aircraft flying at low level, and would require a restriction area to prevent collision. The turbines would need to be conspicuously lit with flashing strobe lights for safety reasons.” I will leave that there but essentially the tone is one of, I think, scepticism and if only, I guess, we could have had a slightly different conversation with France back then saying: “We noticed that you are rolling out wind farms and we think this is a really interesting technology. We use electricity ourselves, strangely enough, as an Island and we already buy electricity from you.” Then it got me thinking about the opening comments, and we have heard them before, we have heard the comments in the past about what is the best time to plant a tree? It is 20 years ago. The next best time is now. I also know it is slightly different with energy because of course as technology evolves it might be that now is the best time to invest, not 20 years ago, because it is more feasible and it is more viable to do that now. So whatever the right time is, I think that is also an interesting consideration. I look back at maybe an environmentally-sustainable energy source that we know from our own experiences not so far away from us which is the Barrage de la Rance just between Saint-Malo and Dinard and that was opened in 1966 and it was commissioned in 1963. I have got some statistics on that briefly, if anyone is interested. So the barrage generates 240MW and the output from that barrage in one year is 500GW a year. I hope those figures mean something to somebody. The next thing I would note then is that the Rance has been generating electricity, the barrage, for over 50 years now and who owns the Barrage de la Rance? Who built it? Who owns it? It is the E.D.F. Who owns Électricité de France? The clue is kind of in the name, it is France; the French state own it. Therefore, who gets the benefit and the financial benefit from that? It is ultimately the French state and of course the people of France. So I would hope that in maybe 50, 60 years’ time that Jersey is in a similar position where it also has its own energy supply which it can generate and, who knows, maybe sell to the north or sell to the south or to the south-east of our Island. But of course that does need the preliminary work to be done in the first place, which is what is being proposed by the Minister. I have been here a long time but I have just realised how inopportune these desks are to using a laptop and reading off it at the same time. I think I will turn to the comments that I would like to make on behalf of the Scrutiny Panel before perhaps giving some final considerations. I will talk to the recommendations; we have made 4 recommendations. Members are of course at liberty to review the comments paper that we issued, if they have not done already.

Recommendation 1 is that should this proposition be adopted, the Council of Ministers should clearly outline the level of prioritisation it places on each of the potential benefits of the offshore wind farm project, and this should be completed prior to any further debate or by December 2024. The second recommendation we make is that a clear cost and risk-benefit analysis of offshore winds should be produced prior to any further debate to allow sufficient consideration by Scrutiny and the Assembly. I will just talk to that point very briefly. I suppose if we are to be the critical friend that the Assembly wants us to be and that Government expects us to be, is that one of the criticisms, I suppose, is that this particular proposition does not talk a lot about the risk profile and the possible risks that are associated with the development of the wind farm, but we obviously also accept that this is an in-principle decision, and it is simply to take us to the next step. We are not being overly-critical when we say that in the comments, simply that of course at every stage of the decision making I think it is important that Members and Ministers are mindful of what the ultimate benefits and the potential risks are of any project, including of any involvement that the States or the Government may have as an owner or shareholder in that. Recommendation 3, and there are only 4, should this be adopted confirmation of ongoing Ministerial roles and responsibilities within the offshore wind farm project should be provided to Scrutiny and States Members, and this should be done within 6 weeks of the successful adoption. We obviously hope that is acceptable to Ministers. The real driver for that is I think it is really important in this, while it is a collective project in many ways of the Council of Ministers, presumably backed by the Assembly later today, I think it is quite important, and we think it is quite important as a panel, that there is a clear line of responsibility as to who is driving the project. It may well be that it is the Minister for the Environment, it might be the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development. They may disagree, they may say that it needs to be a joint project and we will listen to their arguments. But on balance at the moment, the panel thinks that it is important we have that clarity of direction, and I would say also at some point the clarity of vision because I think the proposition, if you are being critical, you could say that it tries to be all things to all people. I think at some point it needs to be clarified what the main driver of the wind farm will be. Is it environmental? If it is environmental, I would suggest that there are many counterfactuals which we also need to consider because I think there are lots of ways that Jersey could decarbonise very efficiently if the Government and the political will were there which did not involve the construction of a wind farm. We know that there are other benefits which are more than fringe benefits, which involve the future economy and more sustainable energy, not just in Jersey, but regionally and globally. The fourth recommendation is that should this be adopted, the relevant Minister should ensure that future consultation on the wind farm project provides information about both benefits and risks, so again, similar to what has previously been mentioned in such a way as to allow informed views to be expressed. I am just going to give some personal thoughts now, I guess, if that is okay. I will do it all within the 15 minutes. It is great, you get to wear 2 hats but you divide your time between both. Some of the comments we hear I think are absolutely valid. I had a call yesterday from a constituent who knows a lot about energy and he is not one of those who is typically, I would say, eco-sceptical. He is talking very much about the future of tidal power, and I suppose one of the considerations that we all need to bear in mind, and I think the Minister should be and would be aware of, is that, like I said at the beginning of the speech, technology moves on so fast. One of the risks is: what happens if we get to a certain point where we have invested a lot of energy and time or someone has invested a lot of money in the construction of a wind farm to find out that in 10 years, just as the wind farm is opening, that a new form of technology has arisen and that now tidal power is more cost-effective and more feasible than a wind farm?

[10:45]

I guess that we could argue that we are not reinventing the wheel and that risk has already been taken on by other countries. The way I would look at that of course is the fact that the wind turbines will still be there and they will still be generating free electricity. I do think we need to be mindful of that, and certainly that is what some constituents have been telling me about, their preferences for

tidal. I do not think it is an either/or and I do accept the evidence that we have had from Ministers that at this point in time wind energy is the most feasible and the most viable. A lot of the objections that we have come about aesthetics, and these make me chuckle because I think we see some of those in the 2005 comments from the Policy and Resources Committee. The first thing to say is of course it is relative and aesthetics are subjective but you can imagine a scenario, I suppose, when Corbière Lighthouse was being built and people said: “What? Why on earth are you going to put a lighthouse there? It is going to be a ‘expletive’ eyesore. We do not want that there.” When you explain of course the reason it is there, is to save lives and because progress dictates it, and it turns out being an iconic symbol that we have on our 20 pence piece and it is also a tourist attraction. I did, I think, leave a comment somewhere on social media about: what do they do in the Netherlands? I am sure that their countryside is literally littered with lots of old windmills that no longer are used to make flour for bread anymore but you do not see anyone asking for those to be decommissioned or deconstructed. I am not saying for one moment that a turbine is aesthetically pleasing and that they should remain in the water after they should have been decommissioned, but we will wait and see in that regard. I suppose to not be outdone by Deputy Ward who likes to cite musical references, sometimes quite tenuously, I would have to add, because it has been quite a dry speech up until now, the cultural reference I am reminded of is that we cannot get away from the fact that there are people who just do not like wind farms because they like the status quo and that there is still an element in, not just in Jersey society, but through the world who just like fossil fuels and they love consumption. I am going to refer to one of my favourite films from 1989 which is called *How to get Ahead in Advertising* starring Richard E. Grant, and there are a couple of nods going on. Just to explain very briefly the premise in the minute that we have got; he is someone who is in advertising, has a mental breakdown, and therefore he has got a split personality which manifests itself in a boil on his neck and he is arguing with it and the boil calls him a “communist”. He says: “That is a typical communist statement.” He says: “I am not a communist.” He says: “Yes, you are. You want to take everyone’s car away.” Richard E. Grant says, his character: “I do not want to take anything away from anyone, I want to give them a choice of something better.” “Oh, yes, what?” “Trains.” “Trains? They are no good, they are old-fashioned. I hate trains, they are rotten.” “Only because they do not consume, only because they are already there and they do not eat up more and more. That is why you hate them, that is why Government hates them and that is why they are old-fashioned and rotten.” So, I think wind farms, great potential if they are up and running. They can create free energy for us but let us be realistic **[Interruption]** ...

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy.

1.2.10 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:

I am pleased to follow my colleague in the Parish and will just pick up on his point about Corbière Lighthouse, which is of course 150 years-old this year. Moving on to the proposed project, we are not good at big projects, I think we all have to admit to that. We have seen various iterations of big projects come and go, so we must be mindful of the electoral process which we have to adhere to and the risks that these processes can have on such a project. I would be wrong if I were not to say that I am sceptical for, I think, many reasons which have been outlined by the public in their various communications. But of course this is what this proposition is doing, is proposing to answer the scepticism from members of the public. It is fair to say that we have to consider the insatiable demand for electricity driven by the need of modern technology, and that cannot be ignored. We cannot bury our heads ostrich-like in the sand and think it is going to go away. I suppose one of my chief reasons for scepticism is the view from my Parish of St. Brelade in the south-west corner of the Island. While some will say they are pretty, the aeolians, others would differ, and they will certainly have a more marked impact on the skyline over the St. Brieuc wind farm, which we presently see in the distance. They will be higher and closer, so that is inevitable. One question which remains unanswered, and I

hope this proposition, if accepted, will draw that out, will be the commercial benefit to the Island. I think other speakers have mentioned there has to be some benefit for Jersey residents otherwise why do it? We need to see that benefit translated into their bills at the end of the day, and there may be a future relationship with Jersey Electricity to develop that. The landing of the cable of course is a fundamental issue, and we see the cables from France being landed on the east of the Island. Once that has been done, and the work in getting the cable ashore obviously is significant, but who knows even where some of these cables come ashore now? The switch gear where they are landed is fairly unobtrusive so I think, as time goes on, that would be lost. I think it is quite an important point because the necessity for commercial or for electricity independence I think would dictate that a landing into Jersey would be of a priority. The fishing industry, as was mentioned by Deputy Curtis, is important to me, and of course in the rollout there will be an effect on the fishing industry, although the area of concern is not heavily fished by Jersey fishermen, but our fishing industry is tenuous and it does not take much to reduce that to nothing; I am very conscious of that. Of course, the effect on sea life generally, apart from our fishermen, but sea life generally and the bird life is of great concern. We spend a lot of effort trying to protect our sea life and bird life, so we cannot ignore that work we are doing on one side and then create hazards on the other. I am cognisant of French activities which will continue regardless of whether we agree with this or not. I have seen the factory, for want of a better word, in Cherbourg where certain elements of the aeolians are built. It is not far away and those of you who might have caught a Condor over to France during the time when they were landing there will have seen that. It is absolutely enormous and the investment by the French Government or those concerned with the production of those elements is certainly significant. The other point is, with regard to French activity, we are surrounded. We have seen them to the south-west of Cherbourg. You have only got to drive through France, particularly northern France, where aeolians are prolific in the fields as one goes up. I did note the implementation of the Fécamp wind farm; it created much dissent locally, the local newspapers were full of concerns. I suspect it will settle down. I think we need to watch what those particular areas do and how they perform and what the results are so that we can learn from any benefits or disbenefits which may have been created. I do question, on the basis of reports from other places, the financial viability of wind farms. One reads of many differing opinions. There is no doubt about it, are they successful? Because a failed wind farm will inevitably land back in our laps in Jersey and do we want that? So we need to have some degree of certainty of the financial probity of whoever picks it up. The aeolians are, I suppose, subjective. It was mentioned earlier, 2 or 3 centuries ago we had lots of windmills. We regard them as pretty now, only one or 2 left in Holland and we have none here. Well we have a watermill operating but no windmills, so maybe it is something future generations will look to but we must not be naïve, and while we desperately are independent, we want to remain independent. We risk being isolated if we do not read the room and understand what is going on in the close area around us. In conclusion, I feel we have to support the proposition to understand the answers to the questions which we are all asking, so I would urge Members to support it.

1.2.11 Connétable D. Johnson of St. Mary:

I shall not be troubling the timekeeper today. I would like to begin by thanking the Minister for the Environment for delaying this proposition in the order of business and for the Members for accepting that. This was essentially to allow the chair of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, Deputy Jeune, and, less importantly, myself to both attend the B.I.P.A. (British-Irish Parliamentary Assembly) conference in Ireland the last few days, and to be here in the closing stages of the debate. Coincidentally, one of the orders of business in the B.I.P.A. conference was to receive reports being carried out, or much had been carried out, by its 4 committees, one of which was the Economics Committee - C Committee - of which I am pleased to be a member. Their review over the last year was entitled *Government Energy Strategy and Consumer Energy Policy*, and if anyone wants it I will be pleased to furnish them with a copy of the 40-odd page report. The recommendation in that report was: "The Governments of the B.I.P.A. jurisdictions should make it their mission to foster and grow

the industries that will transform their economies into net zero economies. To do this they must set clear long-term strategies that encourage investment in renewables technology and infrastructure by identifying the energy needs of tomorrow.” That did give me the opportunity, not only in the committee meeting we had the previous day, but in the full plenary session to draw attention to that, and I think it is fair to say that the members of B.I.P.A. representing the various jurisdictions received that very well and were pleased to know that we are taking our obligations seriously. That I think is something to recognise, that Jersey does play its full part in the international framework of things, and I would like to think that that attitude and sentiment will be displayed again in the meeting of the British-Irish Council, which I think is due to take place in a month or so. That said, personally and as a member of the Environment Scrutiny Panel - and I think there needs to be a review panel specifically set up for this, I am not sure about its membership - I do take on board the various concerns and caveats mentioned both by Deputy Jeune and Deputy Tadier. This is not an open-ended contract, we are not giving them a blank cheque to carry on *ad infinitum* without reference to the financial consequences. I think that was made clear at the presentation given by the Minister to the 2 panels collectively. I am pleased to hear that the new review panel will have certain safeguards and signposts where they will want updating and I think, with that in mind, that is the safeguard which I think the Members do need to hear. I also fully take on board, and particularly the sentiments expressed by Deputy Bailhache, as to security. That again was a point picked up by the chair of the B.I.P.A. Committee noting the problem we did have a couple of years ago. That is very much on our minds and it has been reflected in other comments as well. So with those caveats, on the basis that the review panel will very much monitor progress and ensure that the Assembly as a whole is kept fully informed, I shall be supporting the proposition.

1.2.12 Connétable M. Labey of Grouville:

I have spoken at length about renewables in the past and I fully support this proposition. I too am worried about where the power is going to be landed. I think that is part of this debate and what is going forward, but I have asked a senior engineer from the J.E.C., when we were debating within the Roads Committee of my Parish about the cable access to the new solar array at the north end of St. Clement or the south of my Parish, and I asked him a simple question.

[11:00]

I said to him: “If every car and every vehicle in the Island was electrically powered and we all had electric heating in our houses and removed all the fossil fuel versions and had air-source heat pumps, ground-source heat pumps, how many more cables would we need to bring in from France and from E.D.F. to supply that?” He did a bit of research and came back to me and said: “The answer is 7 new cables.” Whether that is true or not, that was his reply. It is my lucky number. It did not feel particularly lucky at the time because I know that my dear Parish is probably going to be where most of it is landed and our roads disrupted for a great deal of time. So I am glad to hear that part of this proposition may be considering landing a cable in St. Brelade perhaps instead, come in through the Corbière Lighthouse which would be permanently illuminated as a direct result, and also the foghorn going permanently, which I am sure Deputy Tadier will absolutely adore. I really am concerned about that part of this whole debate, and I am sure the Minister for the Environment will be dealing with that, but I fully support this proposition.

1.2.13 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

I must say I am heartened by listening to the debate this morning. I have read in the media, as many people have, some of the scepticism around the wind farm, and I absolutely hear concerns around the environmental impact. That is absolutely one of the issues that needs to be looked at carefully and is something that I see as genuine concern around the wind farm. I understand people’s concerns about whether this will help with our energy security or energy independence or not, that is entirely valid. What I do not like and what I have seen a lot in the paper is those, often sadly, former States

Members who just seem to be saying: "It is different. It has got something to do with climate change, therefore, we do not like it" and that is really sad because that denies a future for our children. The reason for that is because primarily, in my view, this is not about climate change. This is not about hugely displacing fossil fuels, though it will have an impact on that. Whether we sell it or use it locally, there will be a displacement of fossil fuels. This is primarily about the economy and this is primarily about helping our Island move into the future. So when I see people just saying ... they read a few too many pages of that awful U.K. newspaper and they just say: "It is bad." They want a culture war, they want something to shout against and they want something to rail against and just because it is linked somehow to climate change, but it is not. I really want to reassure the Assembly that the idea of a wind farm is one that has been generated through the future economy programme; it is there as one of the potential links in the future economy programme. The future economy programme talks about having 5 main areas which affect it. One is resilience. Well this potentially can tick the resilience box. Two is innovation. This is innovative and will be using the latest technology. Three is about being skilled. This will offer jobs, about 900 skilled jobs during the construction phase and over 100, 120 thereabouts jobs ongoing after that. Different jobs, different careers for young Islanders so that they can think of doing different things in this Island and living their whole lives here. This is about fairness, and the future economy programme is about fairness, and this will help deliver higher-paying jobs to the Island. Yes, they always ask questions about income inequality. This is, in one small part, part of that sort of answer, driving new higher-skilled, higher-paid jobs into the Island. The fifth and final part of the future economy programme is about being international. By its very nature, this is international because to make this work economically at least some of this energy should be exported, whether it is to Europe or it could even be to the U.K., but it is really important to understand that, that the real economic benefit comes from that export. We believe this could be up to £300 million added to G.V.A. (gross value added). Over £40 million potential tax take and that is at prices like 6 pence or 8 pence a unit, so that is not huge prices, it is not pushing things up. We even believe financially this works at 1 pence a unit, so even if prices were to tumble that far, we believe that this will still work and still create benefit to the Island. I am really heartened that while some people, some Members, have reservations, and I understand that, the general feeling in the Assembly has been one that, yes, we do need to investigate this further because again this proposition is all about investigation and all about finding out is this the right way forward? We do know, and I was fortunate to go to St. Brieuc and meet with the developers there, the préfet there, people who have been involved in the development of the St. Brieuc wind farm, there are absolutely ways of engaging the fishing industry, really interesting ways. They can help work on the wind farm, their boats are useful and can be used in that way entirely. One of the reasons the area has been chosen to the south-west is they are not particularly fishing grounds that are used. So in that sense compensation may not be of such importance, but providing new work for fishermen in different ways, that is something that is really interesting as well. We do know, and it was mentioned by Deputy Renouf earlier as well, the creation of 60 wind turbines creates 60 reefs in the sea. That creates nurseries for fishing grounds and so there is likely to be a positive environmental benefit as far as marine life is concerned. These will be looked at in the round, but I think there are significant benefits around this. So for me I would just like to say I wholeheartedly support this. We, as an Assembly, really need to understand the challenges that lie ahead of us and those challenges mean that we cannot act, as Deputy Tadier was referring, to back in 2005 where we kind of dodged that and perhaps timidity stopped the States Assembly of the day - though, like Deputy Tadier, I was not following the debate - from taking the step forward. We are not in a position where we can be timid anymore. Our economic situation requires us to be bold; we cannot be timid. Our economic situation requires us to find solutions so that young people can choose to live their lives in Jersey because if they do not, then older generations will not get the health and social care that they need. That is the situation we are in: if we choose to be timid then we fail this Island. Now is the time for being bold. While I accept 60 wind turbines off the south coast of Jersey is quite bold, I also said, as I said to the media recently, they are also temporary; unlike Corbière Lighthouse, unlike Elizabeth

Castle, unlike Mont Orgueil. These were big engineering projects of their day and they are here 400, 500 years later, 150 years in the case of Corbière Lighthouse. They are not going anywhere. I imagine if you asked the Islanders of the day, the St. Brelade parishioners of the day, what they thought when they looked out at Elizabeth Castle being constructed in St. Aubin's Bay, they were probably not too pleased themselves. They would not have had any Planning Committee back then, they would have just had to deal with it, but 400, 500 years later Elizabeth Castle is still there. In 400, 500 years, in fact, 40 or 50 years, the entire wind farm could be dismantled and taken away. It is temporary so we are not talking about permanently putting something in the view of the Island. Almorah Crescent was seen back in the 1850s as being a blight on the landscape of St. Helier. Almorah Crescent is now much-loved by people in this Island as a great and classic example of fine Victorian architecture. I, like many people in this Assembly, do want the Minister for the Environment to take this forward. For me, as I said, this ticks 5 boxes - resilience, innovative, skilled, fair and international - of the future economy programme. I think it is through an economic lens that this wind farm is best looked and observed. I think to look at it purely through an environmental lens would be a mistake because that is not where the majority of benefits will be gained.

1.2.14 Deputy L.J. Farnham of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:

On the grounds that the Minister for the Environment is not in the Assembly I will say a few words. They will be quick because the most important areas have been covered in some of the very good speeches we have had today. I wanted to start by thanking the Minister for the Environment for his opening speech, which I think was balanced and reassuring and sought to deal with a lot of the speculation that was in play. It confirmed that this is indeed a fact-finding mission so we can make an informed decision in this Assembly, and I am one of those people, and Islanders, who will need some persuasion. They will need to see evidence, they will need and expect to see a properly-constructed, detailed process that puts us in a position at some time in the future to make a decision, which decision I believe should always be based upon evidence and good facts, as well as innovation, as a former speaker spoke about. I could not help but think, it is quite funny, is it not, that he spoke about Elizabeth Castle, which is one of our great landmarks; you would never get planning permission for that today. I am pleased, we probably did not need it when it was built, but it is a point that new structures that are controversial can also become an acceptable and valued part of our landscape. I am not suggesting for one minute that wind turbines will fall into that category because, I agree with Deputy Scott, I think they are mechanical industrial equipment. I am glad to hear, because a former Minister for the Environment, Deputy Renouf, knows about my concerns around the marine environment, and research now is improving technology on the wind turbines to reduce impact on mammals, especially bird strikes. This was made more, I think, attractive to Members and Ministers as an economic prospect when we started to receive indications from our financial and economic officials and we started to see the potential for income. I think that took the appetite up for the Government to say: "Right, this needs more careful consideration." Members may have seen a letter sent from the French Government to the Minister for the Environment, which explained their position. It outlined very briefly their plans and confirmed, as previous speakers have said, that wind generation is going to be a crucial part of their grid security in the future and they will be investing in it, but careful and considered conversations are needed with the French and our other European neighbours as part of the work we will do on the back of this proposition if successful. To do that with credibility we need the permission and the support of the Assembly.

1.2.15 Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier South:

It feels like the debate may be rounding up soon and I wanted to take the opportunity to be clear about Reform Jersey's position on this proposition and the future of it. Of course we will be voting in support of this proposition and hope that there is a very resounding majority from the Assembly in support of it because of the signal that would send out to the public. Also to those who would be actively involved in helping to deliver a wind farm, that it is a safe bet to get involved in and will not

be subject to the kinds of political difficulties that we have seen in other projects - the hospital obviously being a key one there - and just know that it is a safe bet to get involved in and that the different wings of politics in Jersey are supportive of the concepts, so it is worth engaging without worrying about a future U-turn on it as a project. That certainly will not be the case from Reform Jersey who are committed to the Island benefiting from the opportunities arising from renewable energy, including a wind farm. If there is only a slim majority in support of it, that would, I think, risk putting off people and organisations from wanting to involve themselves in it because of the loss that they could suffer if there was a U-turn on it in future. So to be clear on that, we are committed to this. The long-term project is one we would wish to support but not at any cost. This, unfortunately, is where I have to be negative about the proposition and the background to it, which is I think that in bringing the proposition, a huge opportunity was missed to set out what the vision for renewable energy in Jersey ought to be, what benefits for the public that they could expect to enjoy from it and bring people with us.

[11:15]

Where instead it feels like because of that lack of vision and explanation for how this could be formed, we have allowed space for those who wish to argue against this, some from positions that I do not consider to be legitimate, and by that I mean the climate change deniers whose perspective on this issue I think is as valuable as the Flat Earth Society's perspective in geography matters because they are wrong on the science underpinning this. By allowing space for that, we will undermine confidence in the public and raise scepticism among them that will put them off potentially benefiting from something in the future. There was a comment previously by the former Minister who lodged this proposition about his preference for landing the cable from the wind farm in Jersey. Why is that not in the wording of the proposition to ask us to agree to that because of the confidence that that would have given to somebody like myself who is very interested in the Island benefiting from greater independence of energy. I got the impression from Deputy Bailhache that that was something he was concerned about too, but is not in the proposition. Nothing in it at all to stipulate that the purpose very specifically of this ought to be for Islanders to maximise the benefit that they feel in their energy prices and investment that comes as a result of it. As it is worded, it is possible that we could do as little as simply lease a bit of our seabed to some multinational that has no loyalty to Jersey, no interest in letting the economic benefits filter here and, in fact, could potentially even use it as an opportunity to offset their tax liabilities on other projects that they are involved in; something that would end up as Jersey providing a net disbenefit to the world if we were to do that. If that is the project that ends up arising as a result of this, that ought to be something we say no to because this ought to be primarily focused on Jersey experiencing a just transition when it comes to carbon neutrality and enhancing the development of renewable energy on the Island and the impacts that will have on energy bills. If we were to go to the public with this proposition and be clearer in outlining to them how they will benefit, I think we would have provided more confidence to them and not provided the space for those who I think have slightly more nefarious ideologies underpinning their opposition to this to take ground. That is a huge mistake I think that was made at the outset of lodging this proposition. But we can still be comfortable to vote for it because ultimately this Assembly, and in fact this Government, will not be the ones who hold office at the moment where the final decisions need to be made. Those will come several years from now, and I would have thought even after the next election, so it will be a future Assembly, a future Government and future determination by the public to ultimately shape what happens there. That is why I think it is important for us to state as a party that our ambition for renewable energy and for an offshore wind farm in Jersey would exclusively be one that is based on maximising the benefit to the public, including on energy bills and energy security and greater independence, and that we would rule out politically spending time and money on looking at a project that ultimately serves little other than to provide a nice opportunity to make money for a multinational company with no loyalty to Jersey. I think in being clearer about that vision and ambition we would have probably inspired more confidence by the public behind this

proposition, but ultimately we still need to be positive about it because it does present a hugely exciting way forward. I hope the Assembly will adopt it by a large majority so that we can get on with that.

The Deputy Bailiff:

If no other Member wishes to speak, I call upon the Minister to reply.

1.2.16 Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin:

This is a project of real potential significance for the future of our Island and I am grateful to all States Members. I know this debate has not gone on for maybe as long as it might have done but to me every contribution that we have had today has been absolutely valid. For one, I think potentially Members have managed to make somewhere in the region of 15 speeches without any repetition, which is something to be really grateful for, but in all seriousness what a good debate we have had. I am glad we have had the benefit of the proper debate at this early stage and with the benefit of first-hand understanding of many Islanders' views. We have had some clear direction from States Members here and I am pleased that everyone has realised that there are still many questions to answer and that these will only come after the next stage of work. I hope Members have heard my clear commitment, that I have listened and that I, along with the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development and other Ministers, intend to take forward this work in the interests of all Islanders, both those in favour and those against, and I thank them all for taking time to engage with the consultation. I also want to be clear that I do not see a rush to do the initial stages of this work because we need time to do things correctly and thoughtfully and we need to find the answers necessary to the next round of questions. We will publish a timeline of further work that will allow Scrutiny to engage in, consider and contribute to all the issues in order that we can move forward together. This is in line with a request from Scrutiny that I have already confirmed with them. We, that is the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development and myself, look forward to working with Scrutiny if Members adopt this proposition. This consensus approach is vital to give a project like this firm foundations and to give Islanders and potential investors and developers confidence, should we reach that stage. In doing the work to get this far, the previous Minister's work on the proposition, and I thank him for it, along with his officers and myself, I have spoken and taken thoughts from a broad range of interested and hugely knowledgeable parties. These include the U.K., most especially the French Government, Crown Estate, Members of the States of Guernsey and potential developers and investors, among many others. If we move forward with this project, I commit to continued working with all these parties but most especially our French neighbours and cousins who will be so vital to any successful outcome. Indeed, just recently I have also held separate meetings with the Dutch and Swiss ambassadors, and they both initiated thoughts and personally contributed ideas on how Jersey might benefit from generating renewable energy. In taking all these soundings I have concluded 2 things. First, many knowledgeable and experienced people believe there is a real commercial opportunity here in Jersey. With the right thinking, engagement and decision making, a project could be structured to benefit Islanders and minimise risk in ways we can potentially choose for ourselves. This external reality-check tells me that closing the door at this stage would be an opportunity missed for Jersey. Second, I have concluded that our open collaboration approach is the right one and that we cannot and should not move forward alone. Structured, appropriate expertise and insight at the next steps are critical to bringing evidence-based decisions forward for consideration in this Assembly. I can assure States Members that I intend to work with the whole team involved in this project, together with all other interested parties - those for and those against - to bring forward the best and broadest range of evidence to base decisions upon. I would like now to just address the speakers that have contributed so well to this debate, if Members might allow me a few minutes to do so. We started with Deputy Ward, the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning, who spoke about the best time being 20 years ago. He may be right but there is a significant difference between wind farm development 20 years ago and wind

farm development today and that is one word: subsidies. The technology now of wind farm development allows us to produce energy at the same cost or cheaper than the equivalent fossil fuel energy. At the moment natural gas would be the cheapest way to do it, and that is the significant difference in this that could well be that should we choose to build a wind farm, ours could be first built without subsidy. So potentially, Deputy Ward could be right but also now could be the time to make that change. I thank the chair of my Scrutiny Panel and I just want to say to her, yes, we are going to work with you on this, work alongside you, and we look forward to working together. She made a good point, we have a legal obligation, we have treaty obligations that we are signed up to, and she highlighted the fact that some members of the public across Europe are taking their Governments to task for not doing more. Deputy Doublet, absolutely, young people, this project potentially affects the younger generation far more than it does the old. It is going to be 10 years in the building if we go forward. I think back to a small story from a 9 year-old who was consulted on this who commented, and a very, very thoughtful 9 year-old who said: "Potentially, these wind farms might be gone in 30 years" and that young 9 year-old was absolutely right; they may not have to look at wind farms in the future. Deputy Bailhache mentioned that the report was a bit thin. That is his opinion but he is right to stress the word "strategic". I can say to him the decision on landing the cable in France, in Jersey, a combination of the 2, has not been made yet. This is some of the information we are going to seek and come up with the answers. But if security is a big thing for Members, and it may well be when we make that final decision, there is every opportunity to land this cable in Jersey, and my hope would be in 10 years' time the battery technology will allow us to store enough power so that even if the wind was not blowing for a day or 2, that sustainable energy that we create is still used to power homes and businesses in Jersey, and that would be true energy security. The other thing I would say to the Deputy is that the legislation that we will develop for the leasing of the seabed will come back. It will be given to Scrutiny, it will come back to this Assembly. The framework which will allow us to lease the seabed to potential developers will be in our grasp to develop, and that is work that I look forward to working with the Deputy and all other Deputies on in the future should we move forward. Deputy Renouf spoke about the potential, and he spoke about the future costs, he spoke about the potential positive for the fishing industry and he spoke about vision. I thank him because it was him and his team that first obviously brought this proposition to the Assembly, and I continue to look forward to having his input and working with him on this project into the future. Deputy Scott quite rightly mentioned the increased energy requirement and if we got rid of every fossil fuel burning machine and boiler on this Island, our reliance on electricity would double. It is very, very important that we look at opportunities to create our own electricity. The Constable of St. Saviour has talked about landing power in Jersey, but I would say to him - again, this is an answer that we will get from the detailed work - landing a power cable from an offshore wind is not going to be the same as landing a power cable that comes straight from France. There will be considerable infrastructure required on land in order to facilitate that. But again, this is work that needs to be done and we need to see where that power cable might come ashore. Deputy Catherine Curtis spoke about 3 things, and I agree with her entirely. Compensation for fishing, we will need to look at ways to help our fishermen through these challenges, as wind farms continue to take small areas, because they are small by the time they are finished, but take areas out of their fishing zones that they can no longer fish in; dredging particularly being one of those. The Deputy spoke about public investment, and if I have to say to Members that there was one surprise from the consultation, it was the surprise that I had at the level of public interest in investing their own money in this wind project. I thought they might not want to do that, but there was a number of people that suggested they might like to invest, and that is something that can be looked at.

[11:30]

Then, of course, the Deputy mentioned environmental impact and of course the impact assessment that will be done will have to conform with all international standards and will be a substantial piece of work. Deputy Tadier mentioned 20 years ago as well, and he mentioned La Rance barrage and

the local benefit to the French economy, and I could not agree more. I think that tidal power is a potential source of energy in the future, without doubt. It is a disappointment to many of us that the technology has not come on at the speed that we had hoped. Members will know that the Port of Cherbourg saw some very heavy development many years ago now, purely with tidal power in mind. That infrastructure has been converted to be used for wind farm technology. But I am sure in the future, tidal power will be something and somewhere we will go, but it may be that it takes a number of decades to get to commercialisation. Deputy Tadier talked about the local benefit; I will come back to that. He talked about prioritising those benefits, looking at the risks and what is the real driver for this. Of course, those will be the answers that will come out with the work. Is it just to make money, as some have said? Is this about creating sustainable energy to reduce carbon? Or is this about security for our energy on the Island? The Constable of St. Brelade, my Assistant Minister, said he was sceptical and some Members may have thought: "Oh, here are the alarm bells ringing." But I thank the Constable because he keeps me challenged. He asks me questions, he asks the team questions, quite rightly, and he keeps that side of the argument going so that we do not get ahead of ourselves. I am grateful; I thank him for that and I ask him to continue to do that because all sides of the argument need to be heard. The Constable of St. Mary spoke about the British-Irish Parliament and the projects that he and Deputy Jeune have been involved with when they have been away in the last couple of days. He spoke about taking our obligation seriously. I have mentioned that, but I would reiterate - and he said it in his speech - this project is not a *fait accompli*; the big decisions are yet to be made. The Constable of Grouville mentioned landing and the number of cables that we might need if we were all electric tomorrow. I am not sure about that, but again, I mentioned that landing cables in Jersey is something we will look at very seriously because there are significant infrastructure implications. I thank the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development and the Chief Minister for giving me an opportunity to step out of the room for 5 minutes, which I was very grateful for. But of course, I would move forward and say that I have always said to the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development that, should this go through today, it will be a joint project between him and I. I do not know, in answer to Deputy Tadier, who will be the official lead, but Members can be assured this is not just a project about the environment; it is not just a project about the economy. This is a project about all facets of Jersey life, and I look forward to working specifically with the Chief Minister and the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development in the future. I would hope that Ministers that take our places in the future will continue that work as well, because this is a long-term project. Finally, the Minister for Housing spoke about the economic opportunity and how a good majority in this vote is important and he is absolutely right. It is important that people who are looking to Jersey... and there are a number of them, significant developers and investors, it is important that they see a clear indication from this Assembly that we are committed to having a really serious look at whether this project has enough benefits from the Island. It is really important that we get the vote today. But the Minister did stress that he was disappointed that there were not enough specifics in the proposition, and this is the conundrum. Between the rock and the hard place, what did we do? Make a number of decisions before we came here today? Make a decision that we were definitely going to land the power in Jersey? Make a decision about how many turbines? It was really difficult. What we wanted to do was to come forward with some very broad generalisations. I know that may not please everybody, but that is what today is about: moving forward to get those detailed answers. The Deputy spoke about landing the cable again and he spoke about vision; I am going to come back to that in a minute. I want to talk briefly about economic concerns, because I understand the concerns that have been expressed over the environmental impact of developing and operating and, most importantly, decommissioning a wind farm. All of the energy we use, be it fossil fuels or nuclear or hydro, it all has environmental impact to a greater or lesser extent. But I have to say to Members that by far the greatest threat to biodiversity and wildlife is climate change. However, I remind Members that the environmental impact of any Jersey projects will be regulated by a law that this Assembly will debate and approve. Together, we can ensure that any development in our waters will meet the highest standards;

standards that account and mitigate for evidenced and identified environmental impact. As technology and understanding progresses, the impact of projects in the most suitable locations can be mitigated and minimised. This is something that is in our hands as the future regulator of any project. I would like to talk about the visual aspect. For some people, clearly they find the visual impact of turbines unappealing, and obviously this is more of an issue for Islanders that have to look at them more often. Other Islanders have said that they see them as symbols of the future and a statement about our commitment to a sustainable future and a commitment to clean energy. I hope that those that find them obtrusive will take some comfort in the fact that it is the impact assessment process established in law by this Assembly that will make sure that the design, layout and technical solutions are used to minimise the impacts from important views. But clearly, the turbines cannot be hidden. On many days, turbines in a Jersey wind farm will be highly visible, just as the turbines in the St. Brieuc array are highly visible. In the same way, we should expect further wind farm developments neighbouring our Island to be highly visible in certain conditions. Our horizon has already changed, but not necessarily for ever. Wind power may, in practice, only form a part of our long-term global energy transition. A Jersey wind farm may last in the region of 3 decades before it gives way to newer and currently emerging technologies. A life cycle quite possibly significantly shorter than that of Rocco Tower and Corbière Lighthouse, other man-made structures familiar to our sunset horizon. I would like to speak briefly about fishing. It is a subject very close to my heart and I recognise that there will be challenges for maritime users like fishers. But again, I commit to working these through with them as part of the next steps. Other schemes in the world have developed ways of working alongside traditional maritime users, allowing them to return to the area once construction is completed. With engagement and constructive discussion, I can see solutions for both Jersey and French fishermen, where perhaps others might see problems. I and other Ministers will listen to the points raised and, if the proposition is supported, will give them careful consideration as we plan how to move forward. Let me remind Members, this proposition does not commit us to building a wind farm. It does not commit us to excessive expenditure beyond what is already in agreed budgets. It does not bind us to any relationships with third parties. Other than agreeing the location and an approximate cap on the size of the development, we can agree the proposition today and keep all the other doors open. Finally, in conclusion, I would like to finish on a note of optimism, if I may. This, if it goes ahead, is a big project for our Island, but it brings big opportunities and big challenges. We can expect to be working with big partners, those whose financial resources far outweigh those of our own. But looking into the future that becomes increasingly uncertain and in which we know lie big challenges, I think this is exactly the scale of project we need to be giving careful and level-headed consideration to. Perhaps the most significant finding of the public consultation was that some of our Islanders already fear that together we cannot make this work. But I do not believe that. I believe that our small Island community has on many occasions achieved big things. We have over many centuries punched above our weight and we have the opportunity here to do the same again. I am not sure where or how we allowed ourselves to lose confidence in our ability, but in this project we have the chance to put that right, to be proud of our Island and the tasks we accomplish. Although we may still choose not to go down this route, I believe that if we want to, we can. We can structure a project that will bring the most benefits to the Island and we have the ability to choose the right, experienced partners to work with. If we do go ahead, we can make a success of this. Whether you want energy security or you want to play your part in producing sustainable energy or if you just want to help start a project that creates jobs on the Island and puts money into the Exchequer, there is, I am sure, something for you in this project. However, we will not know for sure unless we press on to the next stage. As I said yesterday afternoon, this project is not about me or the previous Minister. It is not about the Ministers for the Environment and Sustainable Economic Development or the Council of Ministers or Government or Scrutiny or the States Assembly. It is about Islanders and everyone who lives here in Jersey, most especially the younger ones. However, it is here in this Assembly today that we Members have responsibility for deciding to move forward on this project, deciding to move to the next stage on behalf of everyone

else. We know from the consultation that there is much interest in pressing ahead to find those important answers. I believe that those answers will show that there is a future for a wind farm here in Jersey. A project that can help to do our bit to save carbon. A project that can provide energy security for our wonderful Island in the future. A project that will provide much needed income for our Treasury, income to help the future States do more for future Islanders. This is not about today or tomorrow or next week, next month or next year; this is about looking into the future 10 years from now and being confident in our decision making. With that note of hope, and having listened closely to Members' views, and with much work still to do in front of us, I ask Members to take the decision to move to that next stage. By the "next stage", I want to be clear again that a vote to support this amendment is not a vote today to build a wind farm, but is a vote that shows confidence in what might be, to see what the future could hold. I ask Members to vote in favour of this proposition and I call for the appel. **[Approbation]**

The Deputy Bailiff

Thank you, Minister. The appel has been called for. I invite Members to return to their seats and ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have the chance to cast their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I announce that the proposition has been adopted: 40 votes pour, one vote contre and no abstentions.

POUR: 40		CONTRE: 1		ABSTAIN: 0
Connétable of St. Helier		Deputy M.B. Andrews		
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy L.J Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B.S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				

Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F Stephenson				

The Deputy Greffier of the States

The Member voting contre, Deputy Andrews.

ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

The Deputy Bailiff

That concludes Public Business for this meeting. I invite the vice-chair of P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures Committee) to propose the arrangement of Public Business for future meetings.

[11:45]

2. Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central (Vice-Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):

There has been one change to future business as published on the Consolidated Order Paper. That is the addition of P.22/2024 Strategic Reserve Fund: Long-Term Funding Plan, which has been lodged today and listed for the meeting on 21st May. There is not a huge amount of business scheduled for the meeting on 30th April, but Members should nevertheless have the continuation days in their diary. It may be worth highlighting that there are 2 significant debates scheduled for the following meeting on 21st May, which is the Common Strategic Policy and the Assisted Dying proposition. With that, I propose the arrangement of Public Business for future meetings. Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff

Is that proposal seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the proposal? No. Are Members content now to adjourn? In that case, the Assembly is adjourned until 9.30 a.m. on Tuesday, 30th April.

ADJOURNMENT

[11:46]