

## **Deputy Spruce Requete Survey Results**

This week a Requete headed up by Deputy Spruce was tabled for debate in the March States of Guernsey sitting; the thrust of which seeks to overturn last month's States of Guernsey decision to reject the Suez proposal of mass-burn incineration and to agree to a waste minimisation strategy.

### **Sample:**

The sample is made up of Submarine's contact database. In the main it would be reasonable to assume that the survey sample is made up of office workers, from the ages of around 30-55 with daily access to the Internet.

### **Totals:**

538 respondents

### **Response:**

- A majority of 77.87% believe the Deputy Spruce Requete should be rejected

.....

### **Previous surveys**

Those of you who have taken a keen interest in the subject will know that we have polled our database on this matter on three separate occasions. For the first time we have incorporated the all the results into one document to allow people to draw conclusions and/or assess voting patterns

### **Conclusions**

It seems reasonably obvious to us that from the three surveys the following can be concluded:

#### *Suez/PSD*

- The Suez/PSD proposal has been firmly rejected in all three surveys

#### *Kerbside Recycling*

- An overwhelming majority want kerbside recycling
- A majority accept a charge for the service

#### *Incineration*

- A majority accept that incineration will form part of the solution\*

\* This may not immediately square with the rejection of Suez but we may be able to conclude that those who responded were against the mass burn and/or size of the proposal as opposed to incineration as a concept.

### **Notes to Editors:**

After each question we allow users a free form 'sand box' for their own personal commentary on the subject. This is a public document and all recipients are free to disseminate how they see fit.

## March 2010

### Survey results published prior to the Deputy Spruce Requete debate

Should the States support the Deputy Spruce Requete?

Response	Percentage
Yes	18.85 %
No	77.87 %
I don't know	3.28 %

#### Comments

Response
This Deputy can't even draft a Requete that makes any sense! As for Mike Garret, I assume he wasn't first choice.
"It is better to make a bad decision then to make no decision at all." The States need ot govern on the basis of what they perceive to be right for Guernsey and stand or fall by their decisions. Constant consultation may allow them to hide behind others when unpopular decisions are made, but it does not lead to good government or decisions. We need more deputies like Francis Quinn. I may disagree with many of his views, but he speaks plainly and votes with his conscience.
This is damaging and entirely unnecessary. The decision has made. It was the right decision, please do not drag this back up.
The vested interests of a few businessmen should be dismissed instantly
I believe we finally have the right result and it was heartening to see how strong the vote for waste minimisation was after the incinerator was lost. Prof Connett said 'the people are not the problem' and he was right. Even if it costs more in the long run, which I doubt, it is obscene to be turning the resources our children will need into toxic ash.
Guernsey will be a laughing stock they cant make a decision and stick to it can they!
How long is this fiasco going to run? Or do we simply keep going until everyone gets bored with it and forgets about it? Then the States can slip the whole thing in without anyone caring. This 'government' is painfully out of touch and we need some wholesale changes sooner rather than later. Perhaps your next survey should ask the question: 'Do you think that any of our elected representatives have received 'back-handers' over the incinerator debate (debacle!)? I don't think you would need a 'No' button!!!!
The States have already made one u turn and shouldn't be allowed to do it again against the wishes of the majority of the population
I do not altogether disgaree with the introduction of a waste facility, I am sure this may well be in the best interest of Guernsey. However, bringing this back only serves to highlight the lack of cohesion in government and potentially sets a precedent for future results where a deputy puts forward a requete because they are not happy with the original outcome of a vote? Where does it end?
Its an absolute disgrace and another example of amatuer Governance. If this is allowed to proceed, what are we going to do, set a precedent whereby all decisions can be challenged by way of a requete until the bullies get their way?
There was major Public opposition in July 2009. It grew even greater in February 2010. Never in my 24 years here have I seen such opposition from the voting public to a States proposal. Hello Deputy Spruce, are you listening???
Yes with no debate!! They should ALL vote on such an important subject as this with no abstentions (Environment hang your heads in shame)!
More Waste, (of time). Islanders don't want it, so who is Spruce representing? Islanders want a recycling reduction of waste system with Green credentials, not a burn and to hell with the

consequences attitude.
This is ridiculous, Deputy Spruce should drop this now and avoid further embarrassment and time wasting for the States. I wonder if he has some personal benefit from the Suez deal going ahead!
Have you omitted something? the last sentence does not make sense!
Waste of more time and money we don't want this system end of.
Why can't they make a decision and then stick to it...ever.....
do what you're paid to do which is represent the electorate and stop wasting your time which we are paying for!!
Absolutely not - I consider the "weasel words" of Spruce's Requete paragraph 9 are there to convince any fence-sitters that supporting Suez now would still allow a get-out option for the future, but I firmly believe that if this requete was agreed it would then become virtually impossible to back out of the most extravagant waste of financial and material resources it is possible to imagine for this community.
Definitely not! This would be a tragedy when everyone was just ready to start working together on improving our island.
Compulsory attendance for ALL States members for the once & for all FINAL meeting. All States members must vote and let that be the end of the matter.
This Suez option needs to be dropped once and for all and a new approach brought forward. This Requete is simply wasting time. States need to make sure a suitable Waste Management Committee is set up combining States Deputies and members of the public who have useful and experienced input. Time to save money going forward and cut losses with Suez - which will go massively over budget and the island can't afford it and come UK / EU directives on pollution it will only have a shelf life of 10 years max before it is "illegal" for GSY to create so much smoke and pollution.
This waste merry-go-round has gone on for far too long. Most Guerns appear to support the Rodney Brouard common sense approach of a shared waste-to-energy resource with our Jersey cousins. The eye-watering sums of taxpayers' money required for the Suez solution will put us 'ickle braying donkeys up to our tiny hocks in debt for generations to come. A problem shared is a problem halved. I share it with Jersey!
let it go to a people's vote, then we'll see what the whole island thinks, not just the states. After all it's our environment not just a handful of people
Enough is enough. Move on (Yawn)
I'm torn between my thoughts that the original vote was perhaps not entirely the will of the House as a whole and my dismay that a sensible decision to ditch Suez could be reversed. At this stage I think a referendum is the only way ahead.
It's too big & too expensive, & possibly dangerous to one's health. Most of the population have said so many times, WE DON'T WANT IT. Are these deputies so thick they don't hear??
Enough is enough!!!
You always get individuals who abstain during a vote for whatever reason and this was no different. To attempt to overturn the decision because a few deputies abstained, is like the Irish government continually holding referenda on the same subject until they get the answer they want!
shocker
The non-voting of States members on such an important issue was a disgrace. If a secret States meeting was allowable, then a secret vote should have been taken.
It's finished move on. Someone is making profit from this!!!!!!
I think all states members in favour of reopening the debate should publicly state whether they are receiving any personal benefit from the proposal and if not, should explain why they seek to ignore public opinion and scientific evidence
Environment members should not have been excluded from the vote.

Having made their decision the States should now move on to examine viable alternatives.
Deputy Spruce should explain why he voted for Waste Minimization and then has the gall to bring this requete. Is he standing down at the next election?
Enough time has been spent debating, lets get on with installing a system that is both people friendly, economic and viable and the most eco friendly for the island.
I believe this to an exceptionally bad idea and I am totally against this being debated further in the States.
It is no longer a question about the suitability of the Suez option but a question of whether the States are able to run the island.
What a load of codswallop _ I believe Mr Spruce's argument is the 'waste' of £10M or something (or the fact the the Vale parishioners will have to put up with Mon Cuet for a while longer?). Both of those options are surely preferable to the huge cost - both financial and environmental - that the incinerator would produce. I know I could never stop or reduce my recycling - I don't think I could physically put a glass bottle in a bin now!
Although it might come in handy to build incinerator to put the wasterful states members in but as you know shit dont burn
What's the betting that if the requete is passed, there'll be another requete from Mary Lowe - etc, ad infinitum
The decision made 12 days ago made total sense and was in keeping with the vast majority of the Guernsey population. An incinerator was never wanted and Public Services never came back with other options. Deputy Spruce's requete is oportunist and will create antagonism between public and States. Again!!!!
This Requete does nothing but confuse matters to an even greater degree.
Yes it was going to cost too much and the solution didn't suit a lot of dogmatic vested / fashionable interests. It is a project of such public importance and has been made into an unnecessarily emotive issue by the Press, The States should have published all the information about the Suez Proposal, regardless of whether it had planning permission. The largest part of the scheme was a recycling facility. I think that the majority of Islanders do not have the stomach for the type of in the home sorting, storage and recycling required by 'waste minimisation' or in reality the space do carry it out effectively.
We need to consider a full states vote and not have 7 members declining to vote which represents 12% ? of the house then lets get on with the result.
Absolutely not.. incineration is not the solution for Guernsey. Zero waste is the best option for Guernsey and the whole planet.
In future, should the States approve something which later goes back to the States and the decision overturned, no further vote should take place in the States (within say 5 years), but only by public referendum. The current mob of deputies are a complete shambles and a waste of time and money. Surprised Suez have not stuck two fingers up yet, must be short of brown envelopes by now!!
What does it take for the politicians to realise that the electorate DO NOT WANT incineration. They need to look for an acceptable alternative at a considerably lower cost.
move on!!!!
The outside World with think us (Guernsey) quite crazy
Did not realise that the whole thing was being re-debated. Just thought that the vote to go with suez or not, was the point of the requete. Hence not as simple as first thought
My understanding was that the Suez decision would be postponed in order to give time to properly assess the alternatives put forward and in particular Rodney Brouard's eleventh hour proposal. I was surprised to see Suez thrown out altogether with no realistic, long-term alternative in prospect.
The States should reaffirm its 38-2 vote and move forward with a waste minimisation strategy.
The States of Guernsey seems to be totally incapable of making and adhering to a decision on this most important subject. In view of its cost and effect on the lives of everyone living in

Guernsey the people of Guernsey should be allowed to vote in a referendum. It should be kept as simple as possible, i.e. Do you agree with the Suez Incinerator Project? Options should be either YES or NO.

It is important that all Deputies get the opportunity to vote. This is democracy is it not?

I can't believe that they are doing this. Will there be a re-quest every time a vote goes against what some deputies want? If they thought that the fact that the Environment ministers weren't going to vote they should have debated that fact on the day. They were arrogant in their belief that the vote would be pro-Suez that's why.

Ridiculous! The island doesn't want it so leave well alone.

I am appalled. Deputy Spruce is absolutely determined that he has listened to countless consultants and civil servants and he will not change his mind. In my opinion the problem is that the civil servants in PSD are known to favour incineration, they made sure consultants were appointed who favoured incineration - so an incinerator we get. Deputy Spruce undoubtedly has not listened to the 3 International Waste Management Consultants who have been to the Island recently who are all totally against incineration. The fact that the People's Panel on Waste Management were dismissed by PSD - obviously because they did not agree with PSD, makes me very disquieted and nor do I like the fact that there is a powerful lobby of business men with a vested interest in Suez. How worrying is that. I haven't even touched on the costs of the incinerator nor the disquieting remarks made to me by our new Environmental Health Officer to the effect that the chimney will be so tall it will not affect my health. I am 71, am I likely to be worrying about my health - the health of future generations is my worry and nor am I a member of any environmental group.

How ridiculous, how many times do they have to go back and discuss this, I don't know one person who actually want the incinerator.

he obviously has his own (financial?) agenda. stop wasting our money and just ship the rubbish to Jersey

Room for another urinal in the brewery!! Make a decision for the right reasons and stick with it!

Democracy my eye! A vote was made and a decision reached but there are Deputies that do not like it so, following the European Union precedent on referenda etiquette (i.e. if you don't like it get them to vote again in the "right" way), they want to repeat it because of abstentions. What would they say if the Lowe amendment had been lost by 1 and the boot was on the other foot. Sorry Dep Spruce but you and Mahy have just lost my future Vale vote.

I am absolutely stunned at the brazen hypocrisy of Tony Spruce: the final vote a couple of weeks ago on the amended re-quest was 38 for and 2 against, and he was one of those that voted for a new waste minimisation strategy! Six of the seven signatories are in precisely the same position... How can we ever trust anything that they say or do again?! This re-quest also makes a mockery of States protocol and sets a dangerous precedent: how many other votes where members have had to abstain because of a clear conflict of interest will be effectively declared redundant after this? The deputies in the Environment Department could have voted if they so wished, as long as they were prepared to remove themselves from the planning application process (which is where the conflict of interest arose), so it's disingenuous of Tony Spruce to suggest that the previous vote was in any way invalid or undemocratic. I hope the clear majority of deputies reject this disgraceful display of toy-throwing and resoundingly back (again) the most sensible decision they've made on the subject in years - a waste minimisation strategy. Only then will I be proud of my island and my politicians.

It is a ridiculous re-quest.

A waste strategy based on minimising the residual waste is the way forward for Guernsey. Longue Hougue should be developed into a recycling and re-use center with reclamation and salvage yards. There would be room for some 'Fred in the Shed's' down there too, and the whole area would generate rental income that could be used to subsidise kerbside collections. The money would stay within the Guernsey economy and we would have a waste system for which we could feel justifiably proud.

He's an idiot and should resign. I think he was the knob who was obnoxious at Rod Brouard's presentation. If I'd been there he would have been told to show respect and if he didn't I

would have dished out some capital measures to teach him manners.
This is Yo Yo Government
They have had the vote, which was undertaken in a manner recommended by legal experts - what was wrong with that? I thought that it had been acknowledged that there was a very strong public feeling against Suez - why do they not accept this?? The people of Guernsey are those represented by the Deputies - why do they not listen to the voters??? Maybe the Welsh Audit Office were right when they gave our States 0/10!!!!
There are three reasons why they shouldnt: 1) The Suez solution makes no sense economically or environmentally 2) The people who voted for the 38-2 vote and then changed their mind would make the States look ridiculous, and they would be exposed as being duplicitous personally 3) Would all previous votes on which deputies abstained on due to conflict of interest would then have to be revisited?
Listen to the populace: We didn't want an incinerator in the first place. We still don't want an incinerator. We don't want the States to debate it any more. We don't want it brought back. We don't want people in the States who think that we should have an incinerator. We don't want people in the States who think that it should be debated any further.
The whole thing is a nonsense. Will he bring a requete everytime a decision of the States doesn't suit him? The Suez option is too expensive, ties Guernsey to it for 25 years and does not encourage recycling.
This will make us seem like a banana republic! The House took a second decision by a huge majority to reduce waste, which goes directly against bringing back the Suez scheme. is that to be overturned too?
We owe it to the next generation not to spend such a huge sum on a project utilising outdated (and potentially hazardous) technology. With the decision to scrap Suez, Guernsey has now entered the 21st Century.
A complete WASTE of time. I can only believe that these deputies must have some vested interest in going for the incinerator.
Ridiculous to tell deputies that they cannot vote because it might prejudice a planning application.
Times have changed and so has behaviour and attitudes towards waste. A policy based on minimalising waste is now appropriate. Get on with it and stop debating the matter
Been there, got many tee shirts and already made a decision. Stick with it and get on with what at the end of the day 38 Deputies agreed to do ie get behind PSD and their new instructions. The Requete is a bad move and likely to increase the negative Press we are getting already. Re-install dummy, take the brake off the pram and move on.
Definitely not! This island is fed up with this whole issue! We will not be bulldozed by this powerful company with its other local associated companies none of whom have our interest at heart. Money is their sole incentive and they care nothing for our health or prosperity. In spite of overwhelming public support for waste minimisation and recycling which had been approved democratically in the States Deputy Spruce has succeeded in finding enough other like-minded deputies to force yet another debate on this subject. Quite absurd and bizarre! He is on some kind of sinister ego trip!
The population has made absolutely clear that they want a zero waste strategy. There are no further issues to discuss.
There was something not right. There was a secret meeting before the vote was taken. Some Deputies appear to have been advised not to vote. I do not believe that the majority of the population do not want the Suez scheme. Those who wanted the scheme would not have considered organising a petition to have that scheme when the States had previously considered all available information and had ,at that stage ,voted for it.
They have nowt else to do, do they! They are just bored people trying to find a reason for their being!!
The States have now made a decision, rightly or wrongly, the members behind the vote to reject Suez should now proceed with some urgency to find a revised proposal that meets all

of the requirements of Environmental legislation, and does not force the Island to compromise on any health requirements just to satisfy the Greens. Realism is needed as zero waste will not be attainable for many years, but waste minimisation can be promoted. They must remember that recycling is not necessarily the most environmentally friendly way to proceed as recycling paper or plastic to the UK might be environmentally friendly, but if it is exported again to China or Africa then it is not. They should also remember that there will be a cost involved and this must be kept into proportion.

After a long, sustained period of opposition to mass burn I really am not sure now. Suez could be our best bet but it could equally be something we might come to regret. I'm confused!!

From people I have talked to the majority of the public would prefer a non burn solution.

The substantial opposition to an incinerator solution means a complete re-think of waste management on the island is required. A one day debate will not suffice to "cap" discussion. The bitterness of Deputy Spruce is understandable given the defeat, however the poor judgement of the politicians tasked with steering policy is really at the root of this failure. RECYCLE, REUSE, EXPORT GARBAGE TO JERSEY or UK.

Just for once the States should accept that they've come to a decision, without trying to revisit it umpteen times.

This is sheer madness and Tony Spruce should resign from PSD. The amended proposition was supported 38 - 2 votes (including Dep Spruce!). Isn't that democratic enough for him!

If the requete simply bullies through the Suez "preferred option" then absolutley !NO". As an Island we can be an amazing test bed for the fulfillment of a zero waste strategy. Technolgies exist. Let's be brave and confront our waste problem head-on. Recycle, recycle, recycle is the only fporward solution world-wide. Let Guernsey be the at the forefront (yeah, I know, the Pioneers were always shot first!)

The Suez scheme is only preferred by some because the Brouard proposal requires the taxpayer to be in business with Mr. Brouard, and they have crossed swords with him so often at planning level. It is hardly surprising that they do not wish to do business with him. There must be a better and more economical scheme which does NOT involve being in business with him or anybody else.

Whether or not the States made the right decision, Deputy Spruce is bringing the whole process of government into disrepute. Could this sort of action ever be seen in any other democracy? I think not.

The debate at the end of February reached a clear decision by a very wide majority.

Deputy Spruce should stand by his commitment given in the States that he would support investigating and instigating alternative waste strategies instead of trying to cause more upset and debate by going back on his word and introducing this requete.

Both my husband and I as well as his two brothers his parents and extended family all believe that the Suez option is not the way forward for Guernsey. Too many misinformed individuals are confusing the issue. We are vehemently opposed to the Suez proposal and any incenerator at all.

As far as I am concerned all the deputies that were PRESENT participated in the vote, even if they abstained! For whatever reason they abstained, has that reason disappeared?

It is not that anyone wants an incinerator but Guernsey definitely needs one. We can't go forward with any other scheme, we don't want to send waste to Jersey or France as has been suggested, it will mean we are reliant on whether they can take it or not and we are also dependant on Jersey's charges for receiving it, plus there will be a huge cost, we would need a recycling centre (Not as a loan but a capital cost), which would cost millions not necessarily as a loan, but from capital expenditure. Let's face it 100% recycling will never be possible, there are those on this Island who will never recycle because they can't , they may be the unable, elderly, infirm, people who live in flats, businesses, others who just say 'I pay my rates which includes refuse disposal why should I do more?' As a family we recycle everything we can, we have reduced our refuse output to half a bag, How many of us realize that the Energy From Waste plant is also a waste sorting and recycling unit. The burn is what's left. However I believe that we need to take responsibility for ourselves, so let's have the Suez development, it pays for it's self, repays the loan. So let's be our usual independent

selves.
I think Deputy Spruce should resign as well as Deputy Flouquet. Flouquet stated he would resign if the Suez plant was rejected - Come on then Bernard show us your word - we would all welcome it. I voted deputy Spruce in, in the last election and certainly wont again if he ever decides to stand. A reverse decision would make the Island look like a laughing stock. I thought only children threw all of their toys out of prams ! Full door to door sorted recycling is the only way forward in a world that is becoming more and more polluted as time goes on. On a small Island we need to have clean air.
the new waste strategy was a 38/2 overwhelming majority vote. if the solution of Suez was changed at this stage shorly that would break the tendering process? and leave Gsy open to liable by the other unsuccesfull bidders and would require a hole new tender process to keep it proper and transparent. Suez will not be out of pocket and so should show the rest of the world that they are not sore lossers and a company not to worry doing business with. a grace full retreat would do their reputation fare more good.
I CANT BELIEVE IT IS EVEN BEING CONSIDERED. THE WHOLE THING STINKS. THERE ARE PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN BROUGHT OVER HERE TO WORK ON THIS SUEZ SCHEME WITH THEIR FAMILIES, EVEN BEFORE IT WAS CUT AND DRY
its the only way to go
<b>DELETED</b>
This requete is trying our patience one step too far. There was a huge sigh of relief when we all thought that it was over, even from those of us who previously supported the Suez solution! We felt briefly united in our single purpose to prove that there simply has to be a better way forward.
I cannot believe that this is even being considered. Do we just keep going round in circles till some of the states members get the decision they want!! Absolute farce and all we are missing is the theme tune to the muppet show !!
WHY REINSTATE THE SUEZ SCHEME ISN'T IT TIME TO LET IT GO AND SEARCH FOR ALTERNATIVES
Government is about making difficult decision - these are not always popular ones. Decision should be informed and based on sounds advice not at the will of emotion. No one wants and incinerator - thats not the question that is being asked. we cannot turn consumer culture round on our own. but keep promoting recycling, we will never reach zero waste, we need to fight to stay still on recycling let alone grow
Deputy Spruce says he is concerned about the island's reputation. I think he is doing more to undermine that reputation than anybody. He appears to think it is right for deputies who will be reponsible for an impartial planning decision to participate in the decision on whether it should proceed. This is so patently wrong that it begs the question as to whether he and the deputies supporting him are fit to be in government. Predetermination is a ground for judicial review in the UK. So much for Guernsey's reputation.
In the interest of democracy the previous Mary Lowe resolution needs to be rejected.
This completely undermines the States and their reputation. It shows a at worse a dictatorial streak amongst a minority of Deputies who are determined that their way is the best way despite the wishes of the people who voted them into office being contrary to this.
Probably as I think that we need closure on this but understand that a one vote majority, the voting of which did not include all states members for one reason or another, is not the basis upon which to proceed with action that: 1. involves the tax payer in unnecessary costs from the states coffers ( cancelation costs etc ) 2. Leaves an immediate void where alternative strategies have not been offered to the States for dabate and 3. Does not enjoy public confidence. In short it's been another example of how our government is ill equipped to formulate effective strategies to cope complicated issues. The sooner we move towards some form of political party system, the better.
Tony Spruce changes his mind with the wind. Say Non to Suez; look what happened to the canal of the same name!
ABSOLUTELY NOT.

<p>The states should move on, accept the vote and realise the public do not want mass burning. They should allow a speedy trial of the Rodney Brouard option and any others who wish to show an active system. Further more there should be a completely honesty and open declaration of ALL the costs, not the major ones and then drip feeding the other costs out into the open...</p>
<p>This is ridiculous if for no other reason than the fact that spruce voted with the majority for a waste reduction policy !</p>
<p>The States have made their decision and Suez is DEAD.</p>
<p>a democratic decision has been taken in the States to abandon the Suez proposal, furthermore all but 2 of the States members voted to support waste minimisation. Waste minimisation and incineration are mutually exclusive. It is time that Deputy Spruce recognised that the world has moved on and taken Guernsey with it. Incineration represents an obsolete, dangerous, environmentally unsound, unimaginative and wasteful solution. In fact it is not a solution at all. The days of being profligate with the earth's resources are over.</p>
<p>The Suez solution, or something along those lines, is the only practical way forward. The idea of producing "zero waste" is pure fantasy. We might as well vote to have the rubbish pixies take our refuse!</p>
<p>We no longer have a government that we can look up to, that can keep to a decision what ever that may be. They will loose all credibility if there is yet another re-run of the Suez proposal. And we still do not know what Jersey will accept. Elsewhere a General Election would be called for, pity we cannot have one here but the rules do not permit that. Come back the old timers who governed us all and not just themselves.</p>
<p>I think that the states should get on with building the energy from waste plant and stop talking about it all the time. The decision has been made twice let us stick to it. The tabloid style Guernsey Press has a lot to answer for with it's biased anti_incinerator stand point. Rosie Dorey and her cronies are like a dog with a bone, zero waste is absurd.</p>
<p>i don think that the states sould allow this requete. the decision has been voted on. i feel that there is an element of it being a done deal and decisions being made before we, the public are aware. suez have relocated a family into the island for the purpose of building the incinerator! i have concerns that it will prevent us being able to recycle. also it is very NIMBY (not in my backyard!) attitude that the states have...with regards to this and our sewage pollution. i would rather see a more environmental and economical solution found!</p>
<p>I think it's high time Mr Spruce comes to his senses and resigns from the states, does he think for one minute the people of this island want to borrow that kind of money which is going to take long after he has gone to pay back, we don't want an incinerator poluting this lovely island, sending us back to the dark ages do us all a very big favour and resign.</p>
<p>I still cannot believe that the States are still considering spending nearly £100 million that we do not have. Time will provide a much cheaper alternative. We do have time we do not have money.</p>
<p>They just need to do SOMETHING! It can't be left as it is!</p>
<p>What a load of codswhollop. Deputy Spruce is wasting more time, other peoples time and cost.</p>
<p>Definitely not. The states shouldn't be backtracking.</p>
<p>It can only be dropped if someone has a practical, costed alternative solution that uses proven technology and does not make unrealistic assumptions about the willingness of the local population to change their lifestyles.</p>
<p>Without wishing to drag this out, should an island-wide referendum on whether we want the Suez incinerator or an alternative be the next step?</p>
<p>If the States do look at Suez again then we should sack them.</p>
<p>Complete waste of time. Go with the Rodney Brouard suggestion, it doesn't cost anything and if it goes wrong then we can try something else.</p>
<p>Its ridiculous to rebate something again so soon, we need to make a decision and stick to it. Its obvious that the people of Guernsey don't want an incinerator.</p>

If the incinerator goes ahead it will stand on the headland as the largest Monument to Bad Government seen in the Channel Islands history. The Press survey suggests that 76% of the population are against its construction so I ask exactly who these 7 deputies think they are representing? The people or their own egos?

there are many alternatives that were not around when it was rushed through last time, as we are in economic crisis lets look at the others who want to pay for it with very little cost to the people of guernsey.

The wording does seem confusing - but either way I don't see the need to reopen the debate, given that the vote was 38 to 2.

The Suez Scheme has been voted on and lost. This is called democracy The States now need to get on with the alternatives available today and make the best decision in an intelligent and well researched way, leaving behind all past personal bickerings amongst the assembly. This requete by Deputy Spruce smells of a bad loser.

**February 2010**

**Survey results published prior to the Deputy Kuttelwascher Requete, Lowe and Matthews Amendment debate**

Should the States approve the Deputy Lowe Amendment?

Response	Percentage
Yes	57.28 %
No	31.07 %
I don't know	11.65 %

Should the States approve the Deputy Kuttelwascher Requete?

Response	Percentage
Yes	55.22 %
No	31.34 %
I don't know	13.43 %

Should the States approve the Deputy Matthews Amendment?

Response	Percentage
Yes	58.13 %
No	31.53 %
I don't know	10.34 %

If I were King of Guernsey I would.....

Response	Percentage
I don't know	1.93 %
Sign the Suez contract and be done with the subject	22.71 %
Purchase Les Vardes quarry and fill it in for the next 80 years	9.18 %
Change our Waste Strategy: kerbside and more segregation	59.42 %
Other	6.76 %

**July 2009**

**Survey Results published prior to main Suez States Debate**

Should the States of Guernsey introduce an island wide kerbside recycling scheme?

Response	Percentage
Yes	79.84 %
No	15.65 %
I don't know	4.51 %

Do you accept it is right to charge for mixed domestic waste to help fund kerbside recycling?

Response	Percentage
Yes	64.27 %
No	26.13 %
I don't know	9.60 %

Do you accept that Guernsey's waste solution will include some form of incineration?

Response	Percentage
Yes	65.51 %
No	19.52 %
I don't know	14.97 %

Do you have any concerns regarding flue emissions?

Response	Percentage
Yes	57.82 %
No	29.44 %
I don't know	12.73 %

Do you believe that the States of Guernsey should accept the PSD/Suez proposal?

Response	Percentage
Yes	18.13 %
No	66.67 %
I don't know	15.20 %