

very clear, is it not? Then you can look for ways that will nurture. Finally, I wish to share something that everybody knows: the environment of this earth and of our beautiful Island is not a question of economics - it really is not. It has been created for everyone and the environment does not wait for us individually or as a government or as a corporation to decide whether we are going to nurture it, because as you will see from the climate change the earth is bringing her own climates and environment into balance. It cannot wait for governments and us as humanity to start to care for things, so I offer these as ideas.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

All right. Thank you very much. Powerful words and comments at the back.

Mr. M. Tadier:

Hi there. My name is Maufont Tadier. I live in Les Quennevais just up the road in the parish. I would just like to endorse what the last lady said, or at least how I interpreted it. I think she is saying we all need to take responsibility for what we do with our rubbish; the amount we use. We need to be consciously reducing. For example, when you go to the supermarket, do you need to use a plastic bag? If you are just buying a J.E.P. (*Jersey Evening Post*) I know I have been offered that in the past and I have found that quite strange. But obviously that does not mean the Government does not have a responsibility to put in place the proper legislation to encourage people to do things, because I think we are all the same. If recycling became easier, if there was a system in place of collection, for example, as I know has been tested in some of the northern country parishes, people would be more inclined to do it purely because it facilitates doing so. I think another point that the lady made which I agree with: we are putting the cart before the horse it seems in the sense we seem to be saying: "Well, let us look at the economics of this and if we can afford to do it then we will do some recycling." Conversely, the opposite of that proposition would be: "We cannot afford to do it, it is not really worthwhile so let us just keep on throwing our rubbish away" which is ultimately unsustainable. So I think we need to have the political will to say: "You are recycling something; we need to tackle one way or the other, it is not going to go away" and if we can do this in a way which is sustainable economically that is going to make us money, all the better, but if it is not and it is something that we need to invest in then we just have to bite the bullet and do

that. So I think that is all I really have to say on the issue, and I will pass the microphone on to the next person.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Okay. Thank you.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

Can I just come in there?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Quickly.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

Yes. I would just like to come in there when you say: "Yes, we have to find the alternatives" and I am not being negative for one moment at all, but it is interesting to hear what you said about you have to find alternatives and the Government should be moving forward. I think we all agree with that situation. We have been trying to put it across to a lot of the other Members as well in the States, and the lady says: "We have to be responsible; all responsible people." Beautiful, if everybody was responsible, but unfortunately there are irresponsible people, and it only needs a few irresponsible people to make life very, very difficult for all the rest as well. So one has to get the balance between the 2, and I think this is where I have been trying to get it - or we tried to get it - through the Connétables and such like to be able to do that as well. So, yes, it gets thrown back. We are bringing these suggestions through all the time to Transport and Technical Services and such like through the States and all the time they are going to say: "Well, what alternatives are there?" We try and explain to them and they say: "Well, are they proven? Are they proven alternatives?" This is what is happening all the time that we are finding they are not willing to look further. They are going back or continually going on to the incineration side without looking further afield to bring these alternatives forward. This is the problem that I find, and I would like to think that my colleagues would 8:14:03 (inaudible) and Deputy Le Claire would agree with me this time.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I do this time.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

We are trying to bring these alternatives for people to see so that there are alternatives to be using. When I said that recycling costs money, it depends on how it can be construed. I am not saying we cannot do it because it costs money; I am saying: “Yes, it most probably will do” but for the sake of all the recycling, we would much prefer to see - I would - even if it was a question of the same amount of money being spent rather than an incinerator be used for recycling facilities to be able to do it. We are trying - I would like to think we are - to introduce recycling as well as not having to spend as much on a huge incinerator at the same time. This is why there are different aspects all the time to look at. But one has to be realistic when I say from the collection side and such like it is to educate, re-educate or certainly educate people into that syndrome. It is very hard to do.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

It is very funny how Jersey is willing to grow new potatoes on some of the most steep, sloping pieces of land in the world and create a potato that is renowned throughout the world because of a unique way of doing something, and demonstrating that we can take a challenge and come up with a unique solution. The problem that I have with all of this is 18 years ago I came out of my flat in Toronto and there was a blue box on my doorstep with a leaflet in it, and there was a blue box on everybody else’s doorstep with a leaflet in it. On Tuesday the rubbish van came around and it picked up the rubbish, and on Wednesday the rubbish van came around and it took away my blue box. In one week the blue box had tin cans and paper and then the next week it came around on Tuesday, picked up my rubbish, and on the Thursday it came by and picked up my plastic and my glass. This is 18 years ago. So there are solutions and I think what will happen, and I think we will see it quite soon, is that commercial companies will step in - they have been trying to get in already. They will step in and they will demonstrate that there is money involved and that is where we will see more people like the Hunt Brothers creating their own people down at reclamation, et cetera.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Right. Two questions: one at the back and then the lady to the left.

Female Speaker:

I think that one of the most important things that States Members have to consider when they are debating this is the problem that if they decide to go down the incineration route, then that it is going to make recycling virtually impossible, because I know that the incinerator needs a certain amount of cardboard and plastic and all the other things for the combustion. The thing is, you cannot really have a foot in both camps, because obviously the reluctance to spend too much money on recycling and the technology, I think, by the time it is built will probably be old-fashioned anyway because as Constable Le Brun said the technology in the last year as regards recycling has just gone on such a pace and I think it will continue to do that, because every society is having problems with getting rid of their waste and I think the incinerator will almost be rather a dinosaur.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

So it is quite interesting, I put in an amendment in 2005 to the Waste Strategy to the effect that what was promised at the outcome of the debate was that when the Transport and Technical Services decided they were coming to the House for the final decision there would not just be one thing put on the table, there would be 2. So there would be a large incinerator and then the 32 per cent maximum recycling; that would be one option. But the second option would be a smaller machine of some type and description and substantially higher recycling. At the moment, I have to admit I have not seen too much of the second option and, in fact, it appears to be going in the direction that the favoured machine is almost 100 per cent over capacity. I think your comment about driving out recycling is probably well made. But the debate will be had in July. The report that we are doing at the moment is fleshing out the economics and the costings and the other ethical side to the argument, and all these arguments will be had in the right place and hopefully it will get a sensible outcome. Thank you. The lady who has been waiting a while.

Ms. L. Baudains:

Lorraine Baudains. I live in Tower Road, so I am well used to being blown over by the incinerator and the stink and the gases, et cetera. But what I want to say is that ...

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Can you speak into the microphone?

Ms. L. Baudains:

Sorry. You are telling us about all these firms that could dispose of these things for us. Well, we cannot get hold of these firms, but you can, so you tell us where to put the stuff and we will do it. We can supply our own boxes; you do not have to supply them. If you educate people more - I know there are always going to be people as the Constable has mentioned that do not bother - but surely we can all try and encourage, even our streets, our roads, our lanes, and people will do it. I mean, I take stuff up to Bellozanne but not everybody can do that. I take any paper or cardboard or glass to the bottle bins, but also the glass cannot go in the bottle bins if you have broken glass. In St. Helier we do not have a glass collection ... we have to do it ourselves.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Yes. It might well be coming back.

Ms. L. Baudains:

Which is fine, but it is just where you take it. Not everybody can go to Bellozanne. Not everybody has a car or whatever.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

We had a meeting with the Constables recently collectively and we went to see the 12 Constables and we went the same time with another private company that wanted to come in and do a trial in Jersey, and they are still interested in making an appearance. But they are one in a number of people now that the Constables have asked us to put them in touch with. We are beginning to put the Constables now in touch with these people, and we are trying to encourage the Constables to see the alternatives other than just sending it down to Bellozanne. I think one of the things about Bellozanne is that it has a great facility if you use it, if you have a car, but is it not interesting that there are no signs directing you to go there, because I do not think they could handle it if we all wanted to use the thing anyway.

Ms. L. Baudains:

No. No, because it has very difficult access.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Yes, it is an interesting point in terms of ownership, and I am glad you have raised it, perhaps indirectly, but raised it nonetheless. When we all purchase our bottles of water, or whatever it is, and we pay part of the cost towards the wrapping, we own that. We have purchased it; it is ours. We then decide to dispose of the items in our waste bins and through the Parish Assembly we asked the Constable to take some of our parish rates to collect those materials, so at that point in time we still own the rubbish. Thereafter, if the Constable is told through the Parish Assembly to deliver waste material to Bellozanne, it then, and only at that point, becomes a States problem and taxpayers' money is used to dispose of the items in the refuse collection to whatever effect. But there is nothing within the law at the moment that would prohibit a Parish Assembly convening in order to tell the Constable: "Look, we do not consider that you should be continuing to send our dry recyclables collection that we are paying for through our parish rate to Bellozanne to be burnt in future, we would rather you sent it to Mr. Recycler A, B or C" and that is quite within the power of the parish to instruct the Constable to do that. To be fair, I think a lot of people do not realise the democracy of the situation. The Parish Assembly is probably the most democratic form that we have in the Island of Assembly and, sadly, I think its opportunities are not used as much as perhaps they could be. So, in effect, what I am saying is that you are absolutely right: if the public generally would wish to see more recycling all they have to do - and it sounds simple - is to convene a Parish Assembly meeting and instruct the Constable to deliver the mixed recyclables or whatever through your parish rate to whichever company you want to send it to. Simple as that.

Ms. L. Baudains:

Okay. Hopefully you can encourage the supermarkets to stop - and the shops - covering everything in plastic.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

Could I just come in there as well, because it was mentioned that if you make it too easy for collection then it will just be incinerated and will not be able to do any

recycling. Coming back from what that lady just said, and certainly there is another gentleman in the audience as well, we visited Cardiff to see how they go about it, and I know that other places do it very similar as well, because I have 2 daughters that live in England, and they have that as well, and a lot of you most probably realise that as well. But certainly the Cardiff one was a bit more. They have what they call the “black sack”. The recyclable black sack, an extra strong one that comes around, or the collectors come around, once a week. In that black sack you put all recyclables. All recyclables: cardboard, paper, all tins, plastic, glass, the whole lot in there. Then the rest of it is just then the waste, the refuse, the household refuse as such in there. That is just the 2: one bin; one black sack. Then that black sack gets delivered to one place and it gets completely sorted out all in one go and then it is then bulked, packed and such like already done. So that is a weekly collection of all recyclables in one. Now, one would have thought that that would have been a good way for the Transport and Technical Services to go down, to see, to do that if it is a centralised place to be able to do it. Then it is all sorted out and it saves a lot of less hassle for householders and such like to do, allowing even for estates and flats and so on to do as well. At the moment the pressure is being put upon the parishes and the Constables to do a separation at kerbside, so that you will do the separation yourselves virtually beforehand, and then that will be readily done as well. So it is asking you to do it, and this is what happened at St. John, this is what they are looking into at St. Mary, but it would mean to say they would have different collections for different items at different times of the month, and not a weekly thing. I am assured it is working reasonably well at St. John, but they do have the boxes which I have seen as well. They do not seem too big, but that has to last a month, so I know there are some people who have more newspapers than fill up that box, but I am assured most of them do not. But I know for a fact that what happens is that after about 3 weeks when they filled up their box with newspapers, they then started just throwing the newspapers in the weekly refuse collection bin. So, it kind of defeats the object in the sense of having to replenish or fill up as well. But there are different ways and different systems, and I think we, as the Scrutiny Panel, as I say, we are not an opposition party, and we are not in business. It is a question of providing this information to everybody and to Transport and Technical Services and to the other States Members so as to try and make the right selection hopefully.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Right. Another question?

Male Speaker:

A couple of issues there that are raised. With the separation, I am sure most householders will be happy to separate if somebody comes to collect it, but if you are going to look at the big picture, what is the environmental impact of 10,000 people driving down with 4 different bags to wherever the collection point happens to be to put their bags in and come back home?

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

You do it on your front door.

Male Speaker:

Yes. But then you have to split the refuse collectors - like Constable Le Brun was saying - it makes sense if you have 3 Parishes if somebody collects one lot of things, somebody collects another and someone collects the third. Householders will be happy to separate it if it is collected separately and it is recycled properly. But in the past we have washed out our glass jars and glass bottles and all sorts, seen it get crunched up and thrown in the thing. Like you say, it goes down to the reclamation site. Well, why are we going to waste time, the water and everything else to clean it out to know it is going to be thrown down the reclamation site anyway? You do not do it. Another classic was I would suspect that 95 per cent of all green waste is produced in the countryside, so where do the powers that be put the composting heap? The other side of town. So, all of that green waste has to be driven through the most congested part of the Island and inevitably all of whatever is produced has to be driven back through the congested part of the Island to be put back in the countryside where we had a perfectly good functional composting site near the airport, and I only live within 800 yards of it and it has never caused us any problems. If there were even 3 places like that in the countryside, you have a lot less pollution with people taking their garden waste to and from, the stuff can be processed there and gone straight back. So, with this carbon footprint, or whatever the terminology is for it now there would be ...

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

This is part of our work already that we have demonstrated that there needs to be 3 sites and the actual process that they are doing at the moment, it is not the people's fault that are doing it, because they are doing an excellent job of what they are doing, it is just the actual process that they are using. They are using an open windrow process. We argue that instead of spending £800,000 a year doing an open windrow process that creates less than £45,000 worth of product, invest in some in-vessel technology which is basically just big boxes, you can put it in, you can add food waste, you can add sewage sludge, treat the compost, you can have maturation times reduced by a lot as well, and you can spread the compost in parks and gardens in amenity land. It does not have to get anywhere near the food chain. The trouble is that trying to argue these things away from a States department in my experience, I said in debate when it came to recycling for Ben Fox, the Council of Ministers are all acting very corporately in saying "no" to Ben Fox today, but tomorrow they will be back asking for environmental taxes. But what is the point in putting environmental taxes on a car that emits so much rubbish from the back of it when you are forcing them to drive through the Island twice to drop off 2 twigs? It is a nonsense. So I have said that unless they are going to start to spend their money giving us the environmental solutions, then I personally cannot support environmental taxes until I can see that they are doing something environmental.

Male Speaker:

Yes. The lady that was on about looking at the big picture, you cannot continue to waste the earth's resources and surely putting the resource back in the ground, I mean, nature has been recycling itself since evolution began and for these people to suddenly think they can just throw everything away is utter nonsense. But I am sure the vast majority of ordinary people will be more than willing to help in the cycling process if the tools are available, and that really is all that most ordinary people would like.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

It is important for you to tell us that, because we are being told that repeatedly by everybody that they want to do it.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

The gentleman over here.

Mr. J. Hanley:

Hi. John Hanley. I just want to ask the panel members' views on the privatisation of a waste disposal facility using one of these emerging new technologies and what possible impact that might have on the States of Jersey workers, in particular the Transport and Technical Services Department.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Do you want to answer that, or shall I answer it? I will go first if I can, because I think if you privatise the refuse there is going to be certain elements of it that I think the States will resist being privatised and the hazardous waste site I think will be an obvious one. Also, the liquid waste - the sewage and things - I think they will want to keep a definite control on that. But in terms of the actual collection services of waste, at the moment it is effectively privatised by the 12 parishes that own it anyway, so we are all just sending it down there. I think, personally ...

Mr. J. Hanley:

Sorry, Paul, I meant a disposal facility.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

A disposal facility? Yes, I am getting there. I think if you can do away with a toxic-smelling, burning facility that is all falling apart, and this is what we have been told by the Ministers: it is collapsing. Okay, well, turn it off then. Spend the money, invest it on something else, or let one of these companies in, help them fill out the environmental impact assessments, let them do it; keep the workers. It is funny, because when they did it in Cardiff, the union was worried that the workforce would get laid off, but the workforce travelled. They dealt with 300,000 people's recycled material. They broke into profit after the first year of investment. The union was delighted, because it had 3 times as many members in this scheme. So I do not think there is anything to worry about from a States workers' perspective, other than people who are operating the plant that we are being told is no longer functional, and I would imagine that those people probably planned to phase out shortly anyway. Unless we

are going to build another one, and we need more of those types of skills, I do not know what kind of people we need to be employing. I think we need the people at the top, but how many incinerator operators do you need if we do not have an incinerator?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Yes, a quick comment there. I think that there are a whole host of government departments operating in areas that really need to be looked at very, very closely. I think the automatic assumption is that if government does it, the government is the best placed body to be doing these things. Well, I do not agree with that one bit. I think if we did look at a number of these departments a little bit more closely and were not as precious with the resources that we have, then I think the whole system would flow a little bit more smoothly. Constable? No? Another question at the back. Do you have one?

Deputy S. Power of St. Brelade:

Hi, I am Sean Power. I would like to suggest that the approach to waste disposal is, in the U.K. (United Kingdom) and in Jersey, a slightly back-to-front thing. We are dealing with it as a municipal problem. We are dealing with it as a centralised problem. If we leave out green composting for a minute, and leave out liquid waste, if you take the 4 elements that we all identify as being recyclable: paper and cardboard, waste, electronics, plastics and tyres, I notice in France and in Germany and in Austria what they have done is they have privatised the processing of these waste products. So you have one company in France who will specialise in collecting glass or collecting plastic, and they have gotten away from this municipal approach. The U.K. is the dirtiest country in Europe and it has the worst record in recycling, and we tend to copy what the U.K. does. But other European countries do it a different way. So my suggestion, and the problem is the Transport and Technical Services have a captive market on the Island that people are very willing to recycle, but they are not being given the lead to recycle the way we can recycle. The gentleman up front here said that people living in blocks of flats have difficulty in composting, but as you have seen and I have seen, in France and in Germany and these high density cities, Austria particularly, they have recycling centres in the basement or in the car parks of these blocks of flats where you do take your compostable waste, or you do take your glass, or you do take your plastic. So you can live in a high-rise or a block

of flats and have it recycled. So my suggestion, and it kind of links into what Deputy Troy said, is that we have got 13 different departments on this Island collecting waste, and that is 12 Parishes and then we have T.T.S. (Transport and Technical Services) doing it as well, and to me it is nonsense. What we need to do is approach it from a private point of view and privatise as much waste recycling as possible, and then I will finish by asking you a question. The question is: if we take out all the high combustible stuff, we are then left with the squidgy stuff; the wet stuff: the potato peelings, the carrots, the baby's nappies. If we can separate the baby's nappies from what I call the by-products of the food industry, what happens then is that Bellozanne is essentially turned into a giant kettle, because you are taking stuff at an 85 or 90 per cent water content and you are boiling it. That does not seem to me to be very logical. So can I ask you to explain to the room what are the E.U. (European Union) and U.K. laws on food waste composting and very simply what are the options for that?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Yes, sure. Briefly, food waste composting, there have been some new standards which allow food waste, that is food that was destined for the kitchen table, or to the restaurant, whatever, to be co-composted with green waste under in-vessel composting techniques and then applied to land. The Europeans have probably gone even further than the U.K. at the moment and it is probably true that the E.U. is leading the U.K. in this regard in suggesting that there is a soil directive. A lot of the European soils have become depleted in humus and the organic materials, particularly the southern soils in Spain and other Mediterranean countries. So there is a soil directive which is basically suggesting that as a long-term proposal the idea of burning food waste does not really make a lot of sense, because it is wet and you have to dry off a lot of the water before you can get to the burnable components of it and the calorific value, the energy value, of the material is fairly low. So they are suggesting that the better way forward would be to square the circle, so to speak, and to use food waste with composts and put them back on to the land. That is pretty well where they are coming from. It can be done. There are some problems that could manifest themselves with it depending on where the food comes from, but we are not talking about abattoir wastes and spinal columns and things that cause the B.S.E. (Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy) outbreaks: we are talking about the plate scrapings from food that we all eat. So the key issue is that one of the arguments is

that it is being suggested that all food must be treated in a separate fashion and not put back on to the land because there is a risk of having hazardous components. But the key counterproposal to that is if we are being fed out of spinal columns and processed food and things that would give us the human equivalent to the B.S.E. then the food industry is completely up the creek, and we are all being poisoned in that direction, which is ridiculous. So there are quite clear standards that are being laid out. There is a category 1, 2 and 3: food waste that is destined for human consumption and kitchen use is category 3 and that can be composted and put back on to the land, and we think it perhaps should be.

Deputy S. Power:

Can I ask what is the solution to disposable nappies?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Disposal nappies, that is quite an interesting one. A number of European countries, the Scandinavian countries, are having collection services and it is probably not the best thing to be talking about, but they spin dry the soiled napkins. Basically the kids' faeces are taken by a wrapper. If we have had children you know you put a liner material in the napkin and then any faeces go into the toilet into the sewage system at the moment, and it is just the urine that is contained in the napkin that causes the problem. So what they are doing is they are taking those soggy napkins which consist of plastic liners and material on the inside which absorbs the urine, and it is being re-spun in a giant spin dryer, whatever, and then it goes through a further processing system and the materials are re-used in further napkins. That is one way. The other way that is being looked at at the moment is to encourage private enterprise moving along the lines of what was being suggested before that you do not have to have a municipal or State approach, and people are being encouraged to set up nappy launderettes and the idea being that you have a delivery, just like you have a delivery in hotels, of clean napkins and towels and things every morning. You can band together in nappy clubs and there is a similar facility, and it is very, very cost-effective to run these things. So you bundle up your soiled napkins in a bucket, they go to a central launderette, they are cleaned and processed and disinfected, and then you get a clean set on your doorstep the same day. So the key with all these things is you know the saying: "Where there is a will there is a way" and if people apply their

minds creatively, picking up on the lady at the front's point of view that you are asking whether or not the things you are doing are going to benefit the planet and the environment in some way, then you will tend to kind of move in those directions. Really, I think that is probably the better way that the Island should be going in. Just before we come back - yes?

The Maha Cohan:

Just one point to add to that: could it not be helpful here in Jersey, because Jersey can lead the way, it only takes one person to lead the way, could you not have an expert on the environment, whomever, to come to these public meetings and to show that whatever is proposed is caring for the environment: the air, the water, whatever, so that all the other people here who are caring, want to do something to help, so that they could speak like with yourselves, but someone who is a 8:44:10 (inaudible), because they may not know themselves 8:44:14 (several inaudible words) shall we say?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Yes, that is a valuable point.

The Maha Cohan:

Just move the focus into something that encourages to look in that way.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Two questions at the back.

Mr. N. Le Cornue:

Thank you. Nick Le Cornue. Where there is a will there is a way. That is very interesting. In fact, what is very clear is there is no will in Jersey. But you have some really great ideas among you in that panel there that should be implemented, no question about that. Sounds great, let us have all this recycling, but it is not going to occur through individual action. By changing our lifestyles, yes, but that has to be done collectively, and what is really absent from your discussion is about State action. It needs policy change by the Government in Jersey. Like so many things in Jersey, it is backward, it is sclerotic, it is ossified, and you can see that in another policy area:

the failure of the States to reform itself on constitutional matters, one small area where it could deal with things very easily, much more easily than the economy and the environment. What is needed is a change of policy by Government, and I am surprised you are not arguing for that. You are trying to convince a lot of people who are complete dinosaurs, who have no interest in recycling, have no interest in the environment; they are living in the past. Those people need to go. There needs to be a new government with new ideas and a populace that supports them to implement the ideas that you have. Otherwise it is never, ever going to happen. You are going to have these same meetings in 5, in 10, in 20 years and a government that has built a huge incinerator and is burning everything. That is the issue to you, the public, here tonight: change your government if you want to see environmental policies. Perhaps the panel will come back on that.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Yes, I certainly would like to. I think that is probably overly pessimistic, and perhaps you do not know as much as what is happening with the Environment Scrutiny Panel. We are in the middle of a third review on waste management. In our view it is a vitally important area, not so much for the monies that may well be spent, but certainly for the other issues about moving the Island forward into a more environmentally-enlightened State. But that said, what we are doing is the third piece of work that is about to come to fruition; will be published towards the middle of March, or the end of March. That will quite clearly show the costings and the other alternatives in a very clear light, and the intention is to hold a public exhibition of some of these alternatives at the Town Hall in St. Helier. Following on from that there will be a presentation to all States Members in order to educate the “dinosaurs” as perhaps you are suggesting, and after that, obviously it will be opened to the public to come along in the way that you have come along this evening to make your comments felt. But we see this as the pre-cursor and the pre-runner of work that has to be done before we get to the debate in July. At that point, and that is the point where the debate will take place, that will be when the policy will either be set in stone, so to speak, or set in fire, or whatever the right metaphor is for what we are talking about. But it will be decided at that point whether or not we are going to march forward with a new incinerator of some description for the next 25 years or, indeed, whether or not there should be a resounding “no” to the Minister to say: “No,

your policy is not the direction that we wish the Island to be going in and things will have to change” and so that is happening in July.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I think, because we are running out of time, but just very quickly if I can, I can appreciate your frustration, Nick, but I would say in defence of States Members who sometimes I find frustrating is that a lot of them are new now; there are a lot of new people in there, and as with anything in life, we are a different generation, and maybe our elders find it quite irksome for people like me to say this. I remember when I first went into the States, I spoke and one of the Deputies said: “Well, if this is the kind of person that is coming in here, then they can just forget it” and I pointed out to him it was not a private members’ club and it was something that happened because the people had sent me there. Rather than changing or keeping on banging on the drum about having to get rid of the dinosaurs and all the rest of it, I think it would be more productive if instead of changing the States Members and having to re-educate the ones that keep coming back, it would be better for us now, as Robert said, to change their information base, and change their knowledge, and let them help to make the changes as well. Then you can monitor, hopefully, whether or not, once we have presented the evidence, they are willing to change their minds. Then it is up to you in October and November whether or not you want to change them.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

One at the back and then one here.

Mr. M. Tadier:

Yes, I am going to be very quick. It is very scary, Nick said pretty much exactly what I was going to say and I was going to start off with the political will part as well. I do not think there is a political will part. There is with you, but I am pretty sure that in the future when it comes to the House they will say: “We do need a bigger plant.” They will fudge over the actual facts and they will say: “Daddy or big brother knows best” and then they will just get the majority that they have in the House to jump. I hope I am not doing a disservice to the 2 Deputies here, but I will be interested to see how they vote if they are told: “We do need a bigger incinerator.” It is commonsense.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Yes, it is.

Mr. M. Tadier:

Okay, good, I am glad to hear that. Okay, you have reassured me, it has restored some faith. But it seems to be saying: “We need a bigger incinerator” while at the same time commonsense is telling us we need to waste less. So if we are getting less waste, commonsense says we do not need a bigger incinerator; we do not need one at all. My fear is that we will be back in a situation like Nick says and it will only be when external pressure from Europe or the U.K. says: “Jersey is an embarrassment. It has the lowest recycling figures in Europe” and that we are made to change things in 10 years’ time when we should be doing it now. I am not having a go at you on the panel, because you are the ones coming forward with the ideas. I am just saying I do not think that the system is set up at the moment ...

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Private enterprise would not allow it to be the way it is in 5 years’ time. Private enterprise is getting very anxious to get involved.

Mr. M. Tadier:

Well, I know one of them has been turned away has it not, that part which is set up in the U.S. (United States) to recycle everything?

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

No, there has been a number of companies, and there are a number of companies, who are expressing interests in Jersey, and by the end of the year I imagine we would start to see those people appearing over the parapet, but to suggest one of them in front of another would be wrong for us. We are just going to present them all; show what they can do and let the Constables and let the States decide if they want a great big incinerator or if they want to form partnerships with these companies and form contracts with these companies on recycling schemes that return revenue to the parish, for example, and provide electricity in some instances.

Mr. M. Tadier:

I hear what you are saying; our point is just that the States, since when have they listened to commonsense?

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

No, this is our rubbish; it is not the States rubbish. I can take this from St. Brelade and I would ...

Mr. M. Tadier:

No, but the States are the ones who need to show the political will, that is what we are making. We do not need to quibble whose rubbish it is. If the States say: "We are not going to support recycling; we are not going to pay for rubbish to be collected." it does not matter which level it is at. If they say: "We are not going to provide the will" then ...

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

That is why I said that you need to decide in October and November if they have not changed their minds after they have seen the evidence, then in October and November then it is up to us to decide whether or not we change them.

Deputy S. Power:

There is a mindset in the Council of Ministers that is set on incineration.

Male Speaker:

Yes, that is my point.

Deputy S. Power:

It is set on incineration, and we do not need it.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

A question on the right.

Mr. P. Ellison:

Yes. I have listened very carefully tonight. Nothing has convinced me that this panel is nothing more than the Nero Panel: it fiddles while Bellozanne burns, and you will

still be fiddling in 4 years' time. I will be coming back here and Bellozanne will still be burning. I go back to the previous speaker's point which I think is excellent. What we need is vision and I do not think scrutiny is a way of getting things done in Jersey. We need a Parliament representing the people. We have no Senators here tonight. We have a collection - no disrespect - I think you are all coming from the right place, but I am afraid we do not have any of the Island Senators here, so you are fiddling, and we are losing time and what we need is vision. Everyone on the floor here wants things to happen, but it is not going to happen through the constitution of Jersey. Your point was very well made: we need to change the constitution and get a system that works for the people. This scrutiny business, I am sorry, it is not working. It is too slow and it is not working quick enough. Bellozanne will still be burning in 4 years' time - I will put money on it.

Male Speaker:

Because we have a government that does not want to change, do not blame scrutiny.

Mr. P. Ellison:

Well, scrutiny is just slowing the process down, I am afraid. Scrutiny is slowing the process down. We have people here and they are not able to change the Government. We need a government that represents the people and scrutiny is not an effective form of challenging things. It is not working. We can see that.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Well, thank you for that vote of support. Another question here.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

Can I just ask that gentleman there that you are on about? Do you favour an incinerator or recycling?

Mr. P. Ellison:

No, I favour a vision of action.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

Yes, but what is your vision? Can I ask what your vision is?

Mr. P. Ellison:

All I see is the State arguing and nothing happening.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

But can I ask what your vision is?

Mr. P. Ellison:

Well, my vision is exactly the same as your vision. It is recycling and moving things on and closing Bellozanne down. But we have known now ...

The Connétable of St. Mary:

Thank you. That is what I wanted to know where it come from.

Mr. P. Ellison:

The public has known now, or you have known now for 5 years, that Bellozanne is unacceptable and nothing has been done about it. Nothing.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

How many Senators and how many States Members have you approached?

Mr. P. Ellison:

I have written to you twice, I have written to Constable Crowcroft, I have written to the head of Technical Services, I have written to Frank Walker. I had responses from all of them apart from Constable Crowcroft.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

Right. What have their responses been? For Senator Walker?

Mr. P. Ellison:

One from the head of Technical Services and I have his letter saying the decision would be made by this March. You tell me now we are not going to see it until August, so we have lost another 6 months.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

It was always intended that it was taken in July, right? Question at the front.

Male Speaker:

I have wasted my time going to these ...

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Sorry, can you speak into the microphone, please?

Male Speaker:

I have wasted my time in years by with the make-up of government and all the proposed changes to the way the Government is, but until the public gets the opportunity to vote for who is the Chief Minister of the Island, there will always be enough of the established clique to sort themselves out and get their own way, and you poor souls will carry on banging your head against the brick wall. Until the public gets to choose Chief Minister things will go nowhere and for all the self-opinionated experts within that establishment who say that we know nothing and we would not make the right choice, surely in democracy it is our choice to choose who we think, and if we, the public, happen to choose the wrong person, it is our own fault. At the moment we have absolutely no choice in the destiny of this Island and we are suffering very, very badly because of it.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Well, I think the key thing to do is if you feel very strongly about this issue, and it is pretty clear that you do, the key thing to do is to write to your elected Members, not just one, but maybe to all of them, and lobby them, right? It is an election year this year. A decision taken to spend a sizeable sum of monies, which may well be misplaced spending, is something that is going to raise the issues, raise the heat of the debate on the day, so I think the acid test is how many members of the public are interested to keep us on our toes.

Male Speaker:

Because it will only benefit the public changing the rules there will be no doubt a whole raft of mechanisms within the system that will not enable that change to happen

until 2097. If there was something which enabled these multi-millionaires to keep even more of their money, it will probably go ...

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

The trouble is I took a proposition that the people should be able to elect the Chief Minister and the Bailiff disallowed it because he said: "You would have to go back and revisit the constitution of Jersey. By definition you are proposing a republic" and we were not even allowed to debate that proposition.

Male Speaker:

How would you debate that?

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Pardon?

Male Speaker:

How would you debate it?

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I was not even allowed to put that forward for a debate. But it is interesting, and this is off the subject a little bit, I stood in elections recently as a Senator and lost my seat. Now, perhaps it might have been to do with the political party I was with - who knows? But the fact was I was standing in front of the electorate saying: "I do not want G.S.T. (Goods and Services Tax). I do not want an incinerator. I do not want this. I do not want that. I do not want to increase immigration." I said all the things that I believe in, and I did not get voted in. People voted for people like Terry Le Sueur that said: "I do want G.S.T. I do want ..." so it is up to the people. At the end of the day you may be, as I feel I am, in a minority of people that bother to vote. People that bother to vote.

Male Speaker:

Why do they not bother to vote then? At least go and vote and ...

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

They make sure that their supporters, and they make sure that their friends, and they make sure that their family always vote and they do not buy this idea that it is not worth voting. Because it certainly is well worth voting - it is the most important thing we can do.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Right. Well, it is just past 9.00 p.m. so if anyone feels that they have not had the opportunity to express their opinion and wants to get in quick, I will allow one more question.

Mr. J. Hanley:

Just one last question and it is back to economics and the purchase of an environmental-friendly incinerator. 8:59:34 (several inaudible words) how do these new amazing technologies compare financially 8:59:41 (several inaudible words)?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

No, they are substantially cheaper and the recycling rates can be substantially higher. But all of these facts and figures will be presented in our scrutiny report as I said in the middle/towards the end of March, and there will be a public exhibition for people to come along and quiz us and to get their teeth into the subject. Okay. Right. Well, in that case I would like to, on behalf of the panel, thank everybody very, very much for your attendance this evening. You did St. Brelade proud, so you are about on a par with the other parishes in terms of attendance, which is pretty good. I do not know how it will be reported in the paper. They seem to not be able to count these days, but there you go, and they have downsized the numbers on every occasion, but we know who has turned up. So thank you for your opinions. As I said earlier, they have been taped, it will be transcribed and we will be going over carefully all of the things that you have told us. So, I have enjoyed myself, I hope you have, and thank you for attending.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Thank you for your questions.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

Thank you.