



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 31st March 2017

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

Volume 6, No. 9

ISSN 2049-8284

*Published by Her Majesty's Greffier, The Royal Court House,
St Peter Port, GY1 2NZ. © States of Guernsey, 2017*

Present:

Sir Richard J. Collas, Kt, Bailiff and Presiding Officer

Law Officers

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

People's Deputies

St Peter Port South

Deputies P. T. R. Ferbrache, J. Kuttelwascher, D. A. Tindall,
B. L. Brehaut, R. H. Tooley

St Peter Port North

Deputies, J. A. B. Gollop, L. C. Queripel, M. K. Le Clerc,
M. P. Leadbeater, J. I. Mooney

St Sampson

Deputies L. S. Trott, P. R. Le Pelley, J. S. Merrett, G. A. St Pier,
T. J. Stephens, C. P. Meerveld

The Vale

Deputies N. R. Inder, M. M. Lowe, L. B. Queripel,
J. C. S. F. Smithies, S. T. Hansmann Rouxel

The Castel

Deputies R. Graham L.V.O, M. B. E, C. J. Green, B. J. E. Paint,
M. H. Dorey, J. P. Le Tocq

The West

Deputies A. H. Brouard, A. C. Dudley-Owen, E. A. Yerby,
D. de G. De Lisle, S. L. Langlois

The South-East

Deputies H. J. R. Soulsby, H. L. de Sausmarez, P. J. Roffey,
V. S. Oliver

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representatives L. E. Jean and S. D. G. McKinley, O. B. E.

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

A. J. Nicolle, Esq. (H.M. Deputy Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Procureur)
Deputy C. N. K. Parkinson (*absent de l'île*) Deputy M. J. Fallaize, (*relevé à 9h 42*);
Deputy R. G. Prow (*absent de l'île*),

Business transacted

| | |
|--|------------|
| Evocation | 643 |
| Billet d'État VII..... | 643 |
| VIII. Population Management (Miscellaneous Provisions) Ordinance, 2017 approved | 643 |
| IX. The Population Management (Guernsey) Law, 2016 (Amendment) Ordinance, 2017 approved | 644 |
| X. Open Market Housing Register Ordinance, 2017 approved | 647 |
| XI. Open Market Housing Register (Guernsey) Law, 2016 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2017 approved | 649 |
| XII. The Open Market Housing Register (Part D Cap) Ordinance, 2017 – Debate commenced | 649 |
| <i>The Assembly adjourned at 10.18 a.m. and resumed its sitting at 10.24 a.m.</i> | <i>657</i> |
| XII. The Open Market Housing Register (Part D Cap) Ordinance, 2017 – Debate continued – Ordinance approved | 657 |
| XIII. The Image Rights (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2017 approved..... | 658 |
| XIV. Insolvency Review – Amendments to the Companies Law – Propositions carried | 660 |
| XV. Schedule for future States' business approved | 662 |
| <i>The Assembly adjourned at 10.38 a.m.</i> | <i>662</i> |

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Deputy Greffier

EVOCAATION

Billet d'État VII

COMMITTEE FOR HOME AFFAIRS

VIII. Population Management (Miscellaneous Provisions) Ordinance, 2017 approved

Article VIII.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled 'The Population Management (Miscellaneous Provisions) Ordinance, 2017', and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

This proposition has been submitted to Her Majesty's Procureur for advice on any legal or constitutional implications in accordance with Rule 4(1) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

The Deputy Greffier: Billet VII, Article VIII, Committee for Home Affairs – Population Management (Miscellaneous Provisions) Ordinance, 2017.

5 **The Bailiff:** Is there any request for debate, or any clarification? No.
We go straight to the vote. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.

COMMITTEE FOR HOME AFFAIRS

**IX. The Population Management (Guernsey) Law, 2016 (Amendment)
Ordinance, 2017 approved**

Article IX.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled 'The Population Management (Guernsey) Law, 2016 (Amendment) Ordinance, 2017', and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

This proposition has been submitted to Her Majesty's Procureur for advice on any legal or constitutional implications in accordance with Rule 4(1) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

The Deputy Greffier: Article IX, Committee for Home Affairs – the Population Management (Guernsey) Law, 2016 (Amendment) Ordinance, 2017.

10

The Bailiff: Any request for debate, or any clarification?
Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, yes.

15

Briefly, during yesterday – during, in fact, the day before – I think, the Debate on Deputy Roffey's amendment. He raised the question of the possibility that with the Birth Right Regime that there was a risk that some individuals might not be able, for example, to accept jobs elsewhere, and I wanted to cite one example that had been drawn to my attention by a parishioner. This is something that I have drawn to the attention of the President of the Committee for Home Affairs.

20

This example is that, despite being born in Guernsey, to Guernsey-born parents and with four Guernsey-born grandparents, the two children involved will not attain residential qualification on 3rd April as others in their position will, because they will not be ordinarily resident in Guernsey on that date.

25

This is because the family have been persuaded to accept a job for a couple of years in Australia on secondment, helping to expand that Guernsey business. Those parents do intend to return to Guernsey and in due course, of course, the children would expect to accumulate the number of years that are required to attain the permanent residence. But if, of course, for any reason that did not happen then they would otherwise lose the right to reside, or so they fear.

30

However, it is my understanding – and I think it would be useful perhaps for the President of the Committee for Home Affairs to confirm my understanding – that there is flexibility within the Law. Section 82, I think, is the Section which H.M. Comptroller drew to my attention, allowing the Administrator to make decisions which could support those ... enable those kind of situations, and there is I believe an agreed absence policy that would cover this kind of situation.

35

I think, given that the issue was raised by Deputy Roffey in the previous debate, in the context of this Law it would be helpful if the President in responding to the debate could perhaps just provide that confirmation, which I think would give reassurance to this particular family, but no doubt to others who either are in a similar position or may in the future find themselves in a similar position.

40

The Bailiff: Does anybody else wish to – ? Yes, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: We are talking here, aren't we, about the miscellaneous provisions. I think probably the provisions that are made in respect of prisoners on remand or prisoners held are fair.

45 But, we bring up again the complicated issue of students from Alderney and Sark who are
resident here for purposes of education. I think we have made progress on that issue in a number
of respects. But, it should be noted that this does effectively point out that students in legislative
terms, students who are resident here from Alderney or Sark will not be treated as if they are
50 ordinarily resident even though they may be lawfully resident. In the future, we were told – at least
by the previous Education Department, not this one – that we would have a federated system of
schools and there would be the possibility, if not the probability, of students from Alderney, and
maybe Sark, who required specialist education of one kind or another, or facilities that are not
available on such a small Island, to transfer to the Island, and I think we should bear that in mind,
65 that we could end up ... we talked a lot about equality the last couple of days, with students
sitting side by side each other in a classroom and having very different rights when they reach 16
or 18 –

The Bailiff: Is this to do with the (Amendment) Ordinance that we are debating at the
moment, Deputy Gollop?

60

Deputy Gollop: Well, we didn't spend long talking about that one did we?

The Bailiff: This is the Population Management (Guernsey) Law, 2016 –

65 **Deputy Gollop:** Some of those points apply to this because no student who is resident on the
Island for maybe nine months a year will qualify under this either.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

70 **Deputy Roffey:** Still on the point that Deputy St Pier said, I would certainly be grateful for that
assurance, because I have not got it in front of me. I went back and looked at the Projet de Loi
and the section on agreed periods of absence and they seemed to be limited to fairly specific
instances, things like going travelling for between one year and two years, being at university. I
am not sure. My reading of it was just going away and getting a job elsewhere for a period of
75 time was not one of the categories that was covered by agreed periods of absence. So, I will listen
with great attention to the answer from the President.

The Bailiff: Deputy Merrett.

80 **Deputy Merrett:** Thank you, sir.

I also appreciate confirmation, I am a bit confused with the retrospective elements of this
transitional arrangement. So, for example, if Deputy Lowe could be so kind, if a child was born in
Guernsey prior to 3rd April with the relevant ancestry... and they get divorced, and one parent
leaves and takes the child, can I get confirmation of what would happen there, please?

85

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Well, sir, just picking up on the St Pier/Roffey point, obviously we will hear
from the President for Home Affairs in a moment, but I cannot see how it could be – how they
90 could say it is an agreed absence if you go and work in London as an accountant for two years or
whatever it may be, or a civil engineer. So, I would be grateful, if the President for the Committee
for Home Affairs says that is wrong, on what basis that is wrong.

The Bailiff: Would you like the Comptroller to give any ...? I think we need to be careful in this
95 Assembly about giving any assurances on individual cases, because that might mislead ... there
may be circumstances that we are not aware of, so I think any advice needs to be given very

generally (**The Comptroller:** I agree.) rather than in a way (**The Comptroller:** General.) that may lead a particular family to think they have got some reassurance from what has been said on the floor of this Assembly and then may be quoted in Court as being a precedent, or something or other. Do you wish to give any general advice, Mr Comptroller, or do you want to leave it to the President to answer?

The Comptroller: Sir, I will defer to the President if she wishes, but there is a section, Section 82 of the Population Management Law. I will read it out. This is:

82.(1) For the purposes of this Law, an 'agreed absence' is a period during which a person is not ordinarily resident in circumstances where the *Administrator* has agreed in writing to treat that period as an agreed absence for the purposes of this Law.

I think one thing to emphasise is the Administrator is an independent office holder. A very important aspect of this Law, I think is that there is that independent office holder appointed. I understand there are some policies. I confess I have not read those policies. Perhaps the President would be able to expand upon the policies that are going to be used for guiding the Administrator in the exercise of that power.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, Mr Comptroller.

Yes, that is right, and the Administrator is a statutory role as well, which is completely independent.

There is an agreed absences policy, and on the policy that is actually set out it is for secondments; it is for gap year; it is for training periods; it is for higher or further education; it is for caring for relatives living elsewhere. Also there is a space in there – or will be because it cannot be released until this has been approved and then the note will be on the population website – there is also a space in there to apply for a type of absence that has not been thought through, or thought of, and you can actually apply for that. It also covers the person, anyone going with them and anyone who joins the family, whether that is a partner or children while that person is away. So it is quite encompassing to make sure that we actually look after those that are going away for secondment, or other areas of their work, or the areas that I have listed. But, there is that flexibility that you can apply as well if it is not listed there.

The Bailiff: Does that answer your question, Deputy Merrett?

Deputy Merrett: Yes, thank you, sir.

I have also had written confirmation from who I believe will be the independent Administrator going forwards, so I am very appreciative of that.
Thank you.

The Bailiff: There is no further debate, we vote therefore on –

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, may I be relevé please?

The Bailiff: Oh yes, sorry, Deputy Fallaize, I did not see that you had arrived.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize may be relevé.

We vote on the Population Management (Guernsey) Law, 2016 (Amendment) Ordinance, 2017. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

145 **The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.

COMMITTEE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

X. Open Market Housing Register Ordinance, 2017 approved

Article X.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled 'The Open Market Housing Register Ordinance, 2017', and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

This proposition has been submitted to Her Majesty's Procureur for advice on any legal or constitutional implications in accordance with Rule 4(1) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

The Deputy Greffier: Article X, Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure – Open Market Housing Register Ordinance, 2017.

The Bailiff: Is there any request for debate?

150 Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Sir, do we have, as it were, to declare our interest again and again on anything to do with the Open Market during this particular States' session? If we have, nothing has changed from what I said yesterday. *(Laughter)*

155

The Bailiff: I have not got the Rule in front – I think the Rule just says you have to declare it before you vote. Well, if you have already declared it, then you have declared it before you – and before you speak – but if you have already declared it I do not think you need to declare it again. Let me just refer to the Rule, when I can find it. It is Rule 17(15) I think:

A Member who has a direct or special interest in the subject matter etc. etc., shall ... before he or she speaks on the proposition; or if he or she does not speak, before a vote is taken ... declare the ... said interest by disclosing it to the Meeting.

160 Well, you have already disclosed it in the meeting, so I do not think there is any need to disclose it again. Unless the Comptroller is going to advise otherwise? No.

I think those who have declared an interest already in this meeting do not need to declare it again.

Deputy Brehaut.

165

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you, sir.

Just a clarification for States' Members. If they have the earlier brochure it would have assigned the next three Ordinances to the Home Affairs Department, but with the review of Government the general housing market – or general housing policy, I beg your pardon – now falls under the E&I mandate. So that is why I will be responding, if there is any discussion on Part D, because that element now sits under our mandate as opposed to Home Affairs.

170

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

175 **Deputy Gollop:** I have got a couple of points to raise.

The first is that the very brief Ordinance refers to use classes, which is interesting, because I should have flagged up that earlier in this session – it seems a long time ago now. We actually approved a streamlined version of 28 use classes and 12 C generous use classes, but here the use classes are more specific as to whether you are expanding effectively into two or more properties, or contracting from two into one. Although the use classes are mentioned and the extra duty on Open Market residents, or owners rather, is that they have to put in writing any such change to Environment & Infrastructure in the context of maintaining this Register. It does not necessarily specify in the Ordinance that the actual use class will be identified, because as we know, generally, planning classes are not specified, so that is an anomaly.

185 The other one, if she will forgive me, Deputy Tindall raised in the Legislation Select Committee, as she often does, pointing out very fascinating and detailed points that some of us are apt to overlook. The particular instance here, which has relevance to the work we did last month on the Register of Interests, in relation to our global and national responsibilities in beneficial ownership, is that the Register shall contain the following information in respect of each dwelling inscribed in it. Its Cadastre number; its register reference number; the part of the Register in which it is inscribed; its address; the name of its owner – which presumably could be owners or corporate owner, of course, because of the number of properties that are owned by companies, or even partnerships, I suppose – the address of its owner, and any additional information or remarks in respect of its inscription.

195 Now, in the old days the Register which has existed for many years, maybe since the 1960's, was in a sort of rather dog-eared metal file at the top of the steps in The Market, and I used to snoop up there to find out things back in the, I do not know, 80's and 90's. Times move on, this Register is not necessarily indicated that it will exist in a paper or conventional envelope form at all, but will be very much an online facility on the Government website; consequently anybody in Guernsey, or Alderney, or Sark, or Jersey, or come to that, Russian, Sweden, Brazil or anywhere else in the world, potentially, will have access to see the owners' particulars. Have we thought through the consequences of that in terms of freedom of information, and are we happy with that. Of course, it goes more towards an open and transparent direction, but I do think it is a material change of policy that we possibly should have considered at an earlier stage.

205 **The Bailiff:** Anyone else?
Deputy Dorey.

210 **Deputy Dorey:** Sir, we debated this just at the last meeting, and I think I said that the electronic version has been available for the last eight years. So this has been something that has not changed, it is something that has been done for a considerable period of time without any complaints, so I understand.

215 **The Bailiff:** I do not see anyone else.
Deputy Brehaut do you wish to reply?

220 **Deputy Brehaut:** I think Deputy Gollop may have been absent at the last meeting, as was I, actually, but the physical register was viewed twice in one year. Once by a potential, I think, Open Market resident and the other occasion by a States' Member. So to have a physical register and having that owned by someone, when in fact it is referred to twice, when it is available online, is the rationale behind that. So it has, over time, become redundant.

With regard to other points he has made, I am afraid I do not have that depth of understanding or specific references that he made to be able to respond to those.

225 **The Bailiff:** We vote then on the Open Market Housing Register Ordinance, 2017. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.

COMMITTEE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

**XI. Open Market Housing Register (Guernsey) Law, 2016 (Commencement)
Ordinance, 2017 approved**

Article XI.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled 'The Open Market Housing Register (Guernsey) Law, 2016 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2017', and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

This proposition has been submitted to Her Majesty's Procureur for advice on any legal or constitutional implications in accordance with Rule 4(1) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

230 **The Deputy Greffier:** Article XI, Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure – Open Market Housing Register (Guernsey) Law, 2016 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2017.

The Bailiff: Any request for any debate or clarification? No.
We go to the vote. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.

COMMITTEE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

**XII. The Open Market Housing Register (Part D Cap) Ordinance, 2017 –
Debate commenced**

Article XII.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled 'The Open Market Housing Register (Part D Cap) Ordinance, 2017', and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

This proposition has been submitted to Her Majesty's Procureur for advice on any legal or constitutional implications in accordance with Rule 4(1) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

235 **The Deputy Greffier:** Article XII, Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure – Open Market Housing Register (Part D Cap) Ordinance, 2017.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

240 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, this relates to Section 16 of the Open Market House Register Law. Clearly it makes sense that we have just voted to commence the Law because the two, both
Population Management and the Open Market Laws, need to go together. But what Section 16 of
the Statute says is that you cannot exceed Part D capping once that is in force. This Ordinance
caps it, if we implement it, at a maximum of 205. That can be changed, obviously, from time to
245 time, increased or decreased or whatever. The only point I make is that, and I may be a lone voice,
but I am going to vote against this particular Ordinance because, at the moment, we just brought
in, by decisions we made yesterday and today, dramatic changes into an Open Market that is
already having some difficulty, and therefore I believe that this is unnecessary at this time. It can
be brought in at any time. The power exists under the Statute to cap at whatever the appropriate
250 rate is after the Law has bedded in and we are aware of how economic circumstances will pertain.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

255 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Sir, I am going to vote against it, and I just want to quantify the sort of
losses that have been accrued to the Treasury as a result of the current state or the state of the
Open Market.

Some four years ago I went to Policy Council, in place of Deputy St Pier because he was on
other business, I brought in a small paper, one page of A4, highlighting the issue of loss of
revenue because of decreased sales, and not only that but increased values, and this was about
260 four years ago, and the amount that I identified, which was not challenged, was about £2 million a
year in revenue to the States. So over the last five years not much has changed, so we have lost at
least 10, and we continue to lose revenue compared to the time when things were a lot better,
and that is unfortunate because that revenue then has to be made up by the rest of the
population. So it is costing everybody.

265 Another issue was that I was the Chairman of the Construction Sector Group as part of my duty
as a member of T&R, and every single meeting for four years the same issue came up. When are
you going to sort out the Open Market because as far as traders were concerned the demand had
vanished, because in the past when people used to buy Open Market they regularly ripped out
the kitchen even if it was a year old. That area of our economy was depressed, and continues to
270 be depressed, and this is the issue. There is an economy based around the Open Market, a micro
one maybe, something on a par with our fishing industry, which is also under some tension at the
present time. Now, that is unfortunate. Now, supporting this particular amendment will not
enhance the position. It will make the Open Market even less attractive than it is now, purely
because of the options that are being removed.

275 So, for that reason alone I am not going to support it at this time, and as Deputy Ferbrache
said, it is something that could be brought in a bit later. I would much rather see it happen as and
when hopefully the Open Market does recover in a substantial way.

Thank you.

280 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: Yes, thank you, sir.

I would just like clarification please, because as far as I understand it, the number 205 cannot
increase, because it is dependent on the facts of the individual property at assessment date in
285 2013. Therefore the only option really is for the number to decrease not increase. So even if we
delay this Ordinance for say another six months the figures will not change other than go down.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Clerc.

290

295 **Deputy Le Clerc:** Sir, my understanding is the same as Deputy Tindall's, and I wonder if Deputy Brehaut has the information of how many houses were in multiple occupancy Part A and will move across to Part D, if he has the numbers already ... because my understanding is that that may be incorrect, that actually we have not even got sufficient to meet the 205 at the present time. So, that would be interesting to know. So, I think there is some flexibility already within that 205 number.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

300 **Deputy Gollop:** Yes, taking on board the warnings, Sir of maybe H.M. Comptroller gives, one should be careful about misleading people. But, it raises a number of issues, this. As you can see, I am not keeping up on every aspect of all of this, and when we first voted for the Open Market cap the figure was somewhere around 140, 150. It has now gone up to 205, for reasons I have not fully understood. We do know that certain residents have lobbied – and I notice it has been Open
305 Market residents – about the perceived difficulties that can exist in areas where persons live next door to houses that were once single occupancy and are now multi-occupancy, and their point of view, which I am sure others would rebut, is that it consolidates into legislation what some have termed a loophole. I think it was more an omission in the Law combined with changing market
310 circumstances. But I also take on board the wise words of Deputy Ferbrache and Deputy Kuttelwascher that we live in a period of economic uncertainty.

Only last night when I got home I heard that there was a warning from the hospitality and tourism sector in the United Kingdom that there could be a shortfall of 60,000 skilled workers in the catering and allied industries. We do not want to see that here. It does seem to me, and again I do not want to mislead people, a possibility exists that some residents who are currently in the
315 multi-occupancy Open Market sector might choose to move to the Local Market sector in as much as it *might* not make a material difference to the licence rights, and they *could* get a lower rent, we have discussed that in past times. That in turn would then lead to some issues with these properties, and have knock on effects of who would come to them in the future with the more restricted rights.

320 I bring out another scenario that will confuse Deputy Le Clerc, although I hope not, but you could get a situation where somebody on grandfather or grandmother rights who stays on in the Island would not be eligible for certain forms of welfare if they live on the Open Market, but could be if they managed to stay in the Local Market and existed here for more than let's say five years.

325 So, for lots of reasons, we are living in a period of uncertainty. I am happy to agree most of the extra provisions we have done today, and I support now Deputy St Pier's review, but I cannot see the urgency of bringing in the cap at this time, because there has been a lot of uncertainty across both the hospitality and tenancy sectors, and the property ownership sector, and I think it is premature to put a cap on it for reasons we do not fully understand and for consequences which we cannot fully foresee at this juncture.

330

The Bailiff: Deputy Mooney.

Deputy Mooney: Yes, as I am the new construction political representative, I too will be voting against this.

335 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Yes, sir.

340 This certainly adds to the uncertainty, as Deputy Gollop was mentioning. I think yesterday I mentioned the fact that this specifically affects those who own Open Market property in multiple occupancy, and the owners will not be able to use their properties for income and maybe forced

to sell and further depress the market. I think we have to be aware of that, if there is not the flexibility that the capping undermines. Some tenants also will be unable to remain in their current place of residence, and just where are they going?

Sir, I think we have to look very carefully at what we are actually implementing here at this particular time.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir.

I have a couple of questions I would like to ask Deputy Brehaut, please.

My understanding is that you can move your property A to D within the next six months as of automatic right. If so, surely we should be waiting at least those six months before we try to decide on a cap.

Also I am led to believe that this is a fluid figure, but it would have to come back before the States to have this figure amended up or down, which is yet another barrier, more paperwork, more time, to come to the States.

I am also concerned, sir, I was led to believe there would be environmental health legislation in place regarding multiple house occupation. I would suggest that that should be put in place at the same time as any cap. Because I am assuming, rightly or wrongly – and hopefully Deputy Brehaut can help me out here – that legislation will actually advise people how many people they can put into a multiple occupancy house, how many bathrooms, how many parking spaces, etc. That is my understanding. So without that environmental health legislation in place how do we know, how can we assume, a cap?

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Sir, I do support the concept of a cap. There are, what, about 1,600 Open Market properties in Guernsey, and their traditional role – I know it was not actually what they were set up for originally, but their role from very early on – has been to provide a gateway for the well-to-do rentier section which it would seem would be of benefit to this Island. I have no problem with that, there are a certain number of them who have gone over to houses in multiple occupation. It has been a response to a demand for labour etc. but I do think that we ought to put some sort of control over that, because I do believe we have to maintain a housing stock for its original purpose.

Having said that, I question about how necessary this cap is, because to be honest, the other change that has been made to our Population Management Regime has made the attractiveness of Open Market houses in multiple occupation much more limited than it was before. Because the big attraction was that you could stay longer in an Open Market house in multiple occupation than you could under a short-, medium-term licence in the Local Market. It has now been agreed basically, five years whether you are living in an Open Market house in multiple occupation or not.

So, I suspect that the steam is going to come out of this micro economy that has actually been built up. But still, in theory, I do think we would not want to get to a stage where we lost say 3, 4, 500 of our Open Market houses from the purpose for which they were originally intended. So, the concept of a cap I do support.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Sir, it might be a bit of an unfair question for Deputy Brehaut because it kind of ties in a little bit with the actual Population Management Law which is a question I probably should have asked yesterday.

395 There seems to be an oddity in the 205 figure. I am keen to understand what this means in terms of bodies in beds. I mean if it was 205 single bedroom properties that is 205 people; if it is 205 two-bedroom properties it is 410 people. It is not clear to me where the 205 came from in terms of managing the people within the new Population Law and framework, and I accept it might be an unfair question to Deputy Brehaut.

400 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Perhaps I can help Deputy Inder, sir, in answering that.

405 As I understand, when the States debated this in June 2013, the new Population Management Law, they identified the number of properties that were in multi occupancy. I think there was a date set, and that was in the report. They also added to that the lodging houses which were existing in Part D, which was completely different, where you need Housing Licences. So they added up what was in use as Part A multi occupancy with those which were existing Part D, as it then was, which were lodging house, which were then restricted to having people with licences living in them.

410 Subsequent to that, and that is probably my disappointment, they have identified a number of other properties which were missed at that date, and those are what is called two-plus-two, where two unrelated couples or families live in an Open Market house. So the original number, as I understand it was 174. These additional two-plus-twos took it up to 205. So that is where the cap has come from. If that, hopefully, helps Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: It does, sir, and I thank Deputy Dorey.

420 **Deputy Dorey:** I personally am disappointed that the Policy Council, as then was, when they identified these additional properties did not come back to the States. That is history now, and I think they should have come back at that stage, because the numbers were very clearly in the 2013 report.

425 As I understand, there is, as has been said, the six-month period so people who were in multi occupancy at the original date of the report, have, if they have come out of multi occupancy, they need to get back into multi occupancy, and they have got a six-month period from the start of the new Commencement Ordinance to do that, then they will be registered.

430 So, as within the States' policy, all those houses which were multi occupancy and the two-plus-twos will come up to 205. So, potentially, if all those people want to carry on in multi occupancy they can. Obviously, the difference now is that they are limited to people having five years, while it was unlimited in the past. But there are grandfather rights for those who are over five years so they can continue to live in them. So, they are outside, effectively, the employment permit system.

Sir, I think there is a need for the cap, and it is referred to in the Law and I hope the States' Members vote for it.

435 There were comments about the loss of income. I just looked at some figures and compared 2007 to 2016 – the number of transactions in the Open and Local Market. The number of transactions in 2016 was 62% of the number of transactions in 2007 for the Local Market. The Open Market is what 43% compared to in 2016 to 2007. So, yes there has been a greater drop, but they are of similar range. You always consider that there are new Local Market properties being built which add to that number.

440 I think the argument that the Population Management Law has affected the Open Market has been over egged considerably, because it is really the economic situation which has affected both markets and that is why the Local Market is of a similar amount down to the Open Market.

I think that covers the points I want to make.

445 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Sir.

450 I would just like to make a few comments, regarding this Proposition.

I broadly feel very similar to Deputy Roffey in regard to this matter, and I have been contacted over the last few weeks by a number of Open Market property owners, who have represented their concerns, and I am sure that other Deputies have also been contacted in this regard. I have also seen the anonymised advert in the newspapers, the aims of which I am personally not sure of.

455 Many of the individuals who have contacted me have taken the opportunity to invest in multi occupancy property over the years, and the cause for their concern is the reduction in value in their investment portfolio. I have genuine sympathy with these individuals. Their fear is that many of their tenants within the properties as many of them via their employers will be granted permits under the new Population Management Law. The individuals then will be eligible to live in Local Market property. Well, this in my view is a positive thing, the transactions in our Local Market property market have been in decline almost to the state of stall over the last five years. Though we have seen a slight upturn in the last quarter.

460 A healthy property market underpins a healthy economy, and therefore a salve to our Local Market property sales and rental provided by the movement of people from multiple occupancy Open Market property to the Local market, I think, will help in the long run both markets and overall this will be a good thing for Guernsey.

The Bailiff: No one else?

Deputy Brehaut.

470

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you very much, sir.

Deputy Dorey is quite right; the States that sanctioned the initial report would have been far more restrictive than on the 205. It would have been the 174.

475 Now, when the legislation was presented to E&I earlier in the year, Deputy Dorey made a very strong representation to those drafting the policies, and I think it is fair on his part to say that he was of the view that there had been far too much drift from the 174 to the 205, but it was too late in the day to do anything about that, and that this States, although people are unconformable with the 205, it is far more permissive than the original 174 that was identified.

480 Now, sometimes when you are moving forward with policy it just pays to take a glance in the rear view mirror. This may not seem entirely relevant but I think it is. If you look back at the origin of the Open Market, if we look back to the 50's and 60's and 70's the then Advisory & Finance Committee said around that time – late 60's, early 70's:

The wealthy resident attracted by the Island's fiscal advantages plays a worthwhile role in providing States' revenue, by way of its income tax contribution and then given a continual economic stimulus by way of its expenditure on goods and services. The continued immigration of rentiers to the Island should be encouraged and it [That is the Advisory and Finance Committee] is actively exploring the ways to facilitate this flow.

485 Now, the change there has been is that now people see the acquisition of Open Market and renting out houses in multiple occupancy as the economy. The idea was that rentiers would come here and generate the economy, rather than anyone moving here and in the acquisition of Open Market properties and the acquisition of properties in multi occupation that would be the economy.

490 It is interesting now how we manage the success of the Open Market or otherwise by how many that sell, or the number of sales, which in itself could represent a failure, if people are not staying, or want to leave and they cannot, or the turnover is less. If people are here and make a long-term commitment to Guernsey then we would see the market, if you like, more buoyant in that regard.

495 Now, I would make an appeal to Deputy Kuttelwascher. We now have ownership of the Open Market policy, and I am sure my Committee of E&I will do all it can to promote, to support, that element and see that element as a potential driver within the economy. I would just ask that my colleagues at Economic Development do the very same thing – that they rally around the Open Market and put a hand out, perhaps, to using some of the language that was used yesterday to get it off of its knees, and for it to become more buoyant and to contribute in its own way.

500 I am actually very reluctant even to say that, because I think it is so important that we do sound optimistic regarding the Open Market (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

With regard to Deputy Merrett, the six-month provision is that, it is a transitional arrangement, so anyone in this situation now has six months to regularise their position. Because the market has been in a certain place it has meant that some people cannot make the move they want because of the timescales available, and that is unfortunate, but there has been a lead in period on this.

505 Of course, Environment & Infrastructure oversee environmental health and we have a body of work, a fairly thorough piece of work, from the former Housing Department, with regard to environmental health, to ensure that standards are improved. That is an observation in itself, is it not, that if you look at the origins of the Open Market, and the expectations of the Open Market, that our concerns now around the Open Market and lodging houses is that they are in such a poor state of disrepair that they need oversight from environmental health. So, let's move away from that. Let's have a cap, and actually this is a Population Law and the control mechanism, the control is a cap on people that live within that section of the Open Market.

Thank you.

515 **The Bailiff:** Mr Comptroller, do you wish to add anything to assist us? [*Inaudible*]
Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir.

520 The other question I did pose to Deputy Brehaut was: is the mechanism for changing the cap ... what is the mechanism, please? I am led to believe there is a mechanism, but it would have to come back before the States. Clarity of that would be appreciated.

Thank you, sir.

525 **The Bailiff:** Right, the lawyer sat next to me, sir, said the provision is under Section 32. But just remember, we are agreeing today the prescription of Part D of the cap, that the maximum number of properties that may be inscribed in Part D of the Open Market Housing Register is 205. So I will be advised by H.M. Comptroller that if that number was to change what mechanism would be used.

530 **The Bailiff:** Mr Comptroller.

The Comptroller: Sir, the power to prescribe the cap in part is dealt with under Section 32, but the main power is at Section 2(1) of the Open Market Housing Register (Guernsey) Law, 2016, which says:

The States may by Ordinance prescribe the maximum number of properties that may be inscribed in Part D, provided that the number prescribed in such an Ordinance is more than the number of properties inscribed in Part D at the time the Ordinance is made.

535 If the States are being asked to make the Ordinance, I think one matter that needs to be clear is how many properties are on Part D, today. I am not sure what that number is. I do not know if anybody has that information. But it seems to me it cannot be made unless that information is available to the States. That is the first point that I would make. It might be useful to establish that at this point.

540

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut, do you know the answer to that?

Deputy Brehaut: I do not have the answer to the exact number at this moment in time, sir, no.
(Interjections)

545

The Bailiff: Well, the suggestion is being made that it is known that whatever the number is it is less than 205.

550

The Comptroller: Well, sir, it seems to me that it would be useful for the States to know what the number is precisely. I mean, somebody must know that.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

555

Deputy Dorey: Sir, the existing Part D is nothing like the new Part D, so if you talk about the Law as it is today, you are talking about what are used as lodging houses which have got licence holders in it. I thought that that was identified in that 2013 report as 26. But that is why there is a six month period for the numbers to be identified, by people swapping across.

560

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, could I ask ...?

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache, yes.

565

Deputy Ferbrache: My understanding is we have always had Part D, but this is a completely new Part D – absolutely new creature. It has just got the same lettering.

570

The position in relation to it is, as Deputy Dorey said, that as the 10th May 2013, which is when the Billet was published for the late May 2013 Meeting, there were I think *circa* 174 properties that would be likely to fall into that category. There have been added another 31, if my arithmetic is right, lodging houses, so I think we have got to that. The learned Comptroller has said there is a specific provision in the Ordinance Section 2(1) which deals with increasing the cap, but of course, there is also a general power under Section 32 to make any Ordinance, the States can come back with a different Ordinance, but they would have to. If they then wanted to decrease it they would then have to amend the Statute, because the statutory provision says you can only increase it. That is my understanding of the Law, but obviously I defer to the learned Comptroller.

575

The Comptroller: Sir, I think Deputy Ferbrache has articulated it precisely, but it does seem to me somebody must surely know how many properties today are on Part D of the Register. Because unless the States are aware then the Ordinance would be *ultra vires*, because it can only be paid provided that the number prescribed in such an Ordinance is more than the number of properties inscribed in Part D at the time the Ordinance is made. I just introduce that note of caution, because I suppose the States could make the Ordinance, but unless they are sure that the number 205 is more than whatever is on now, the Ordinance potentially could be *ultra vires*. I do not know. Somebody must know.

580

The Bailiff: Would it be useful to have a short adjournment whilst this could be resolved between the Law Officers and the Committee.

585

The Comptroller: I mean I am told it is 21, but whether that number is right or who certifies that, I do not know, but it would be useful if the President, perhaps, of the Committee was able to confirm the number.

590

The Bailiff: Would it be useful to just have a 10 minute ...?

Deputy Brehaut: A short adjournment just to establish absolute numbers. But the number 205 must have a rationale and an origin to arrive at the logic of 205.

595

The Bailiff: I think the point is, Deputy Brehaut, there is no policy letter to support this to explain the rationale. I think that is the difficulty. *(Interjections)*

Several people are standing up. We are going to have an adjournment. If you have got questions you want to ask the Law Officer or the Committee, you can do so.

*The Assembly adjourned at 10.18 a.m.
and resumed its sitting at 10.24 a.m.*

**XII. The Open Market Housing Register (Part D Cap) Ordinance, 2017 –
Debate continued –
Ordinance approved**

600 **The Bailiff:** Mr Comptroller.

The Comptroller: Sir, I believe the issue has been sorted out. I understand there are 21 properties currently inscribed on Part D Register. Hopefully, the President of the Committee will be able to confirm that for the States.

605

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Yes, sir.
There are 21 properties on that part of the Register.

610

The Bailiff: Thank you.

The Comptroller: Therefore there is power for the States to make this Ordinance if they so wish, because the number proposed is 205 which is more than 21.

615

The Bailiff: There we are.
We go to the vote then. Those in favour; those against.

Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.

The Bailiff: I believe that is carried.

620 **Deputy de Lisle:** Can we have a recorded vote, sir?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle wishes to have a recorded vote.

There was a recorded vote.

625

The Bailiff: The Alderney Representatives have had to go and catch a flight. They have not been able to change their flight because later flights to Alderney are already booked, so they have had to leave and go back to their Island.

Carried – Pour 26, Contre 7, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 7

POUR

Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Trott
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Inder
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel
Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Yerby
Deputy Langlois

CONTRE

Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Merrett
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Paint
Deputy De Lisle

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Deputy Prow
Alderney Rep. Jean
Alderney Rep. McKinley
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Le Tocq

The Bailiff: Well, Members, by 26 votes in favour and 7 against, that Ordinance is carried. So I declare it carried.

That concludes then the Open Market and Population Management legislation.

630 We move on, Greffier.

COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**XIII. The Image Rights (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment)
Ordinance, 2017 approved**

Article XIII.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled 'The Image Rights (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2017', and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

This proposition has been submitted to Her Majesty's Procureur for advice on any legal or constitutional implications in accordance with Rule 4(1) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

The Deputy Greffier: Article XIII, Committee for Economic Development – Image Rights (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2017.

635 **The Bailiff:** Is there any request for debate or any clarification?
Deputy Tindall.

640 **Deputy Tindall:** Sir, firstly, I would like to advise the Assembly not so much as a specific interest as under the Rules, but certainly my interest in this Ordinance, as I have been a member of the Commercial Group for several years. This Group set up by industry promotes intellectual

property as another string to the bow of the finance and business services industry, to promote Guernsey as a place to do business. I further declare an interest, in that the Code was suggested by me as a means of reassuring the then States to pass the necessary legislation and allay their concerns about any reputational risk. Not only is the Code a sensible step to ensure image rights agents observe the appropriate standards of conduct, but also guidance as to procedures and best practice.

It is also part of a suite of intellectual property legislation that provides a solution compliant with the BEPS, or the Base Erosion Profit Shifting Project, which is aimed at preventing tax avoidance strategies that exploit gaps and mismatches in tax rules to artificially shift profits to lower low tax jurisdictions. By protecting a company's intellectual property including image rights, there is no artificial shifting. It is estimated 80% of a typical business's assets is intellectual property. So the opportunities for Guernsey abound.

I therefore urge Members to approve this Ordinance.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Yes, thank you.

I thank Deputy Tindall for that explanation for how we have ended up with this Ordinance today, because I read it and I was concerned whether this actually meant that we were having issues in terms of developing a number of image rights which were set up back in 2012, I understand.

I just wonder whether Deputy Ferbrache could actually advise us how many image rights have actually been registered since the original Law came into place. If not, if he could come back to Members and advise us, and also let us know how many registrations are live at this moment.

Deputy Brehaut: The answer is 21 – no, it isn't. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: Sorry, before Deputy Ferbrache replies, does anybody else wish to speak? No. Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Well, sir, in relation to that last point, I will have to come back to Deputy Soulsby. I will do so, because she has asked a question which I think she probably knows I do not know the answer to, but many people ask those questions. I mean that respectfully, it is a sensible question and I will answer it, and I was only jesting. Sorry. *(Laughter)*

In relation to Deputy Tindall, I am very grateful for the work she has put in, and others have put in; **(A Member:** Hear, hear.) and she has really encapsulated the benefit of this particular Ordinance in several sentences. It is of considerable merit and benefit to the Bailiwick, and I ask Members to approve it.

The Bailiff: We go to the vote. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.

COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**XIV. Insolvency Review –
Amendments to the Companies Law –
Propositions carried**

Article XIV.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter entitled 'Insolvency Review - Amendments to the Companies Law dated 9th February, 2017, they are of the opinion:

1. To approve the proposals set out in section 3 of the Policy Letter to amend the Companies (Guernsey) Law, 2008 as follows:

- a. to introduce creditors' committee procedures and rules as set out in paragraph 3.1.1,*
- b. to allow administrators to make distributions to creditors as set out in paragraph 3.1.2,*
- c. to allow the Royal Court to permit dissolution of the company in the circumstances set out in paragraph 3.1.3,*
- d. to introduce objectives of winding up as set out in paragraph 3.2.1,*
- e. to require an independent liquidator in a voluntary winding up where the company is insolvent as set out in paragraph 3.2.2,*
- f. to strengthen creditor protection in an insolvent voluntary winding up by introducing the requirements set out in paragraph 3.2.3,*
- g. to allow inquorate final general meetings in a voluntary winding up as set out in paragraph 3.2.4,*
- h. to provide for rules for the establishment of claims in a winding up as set out in paragraph 3.2.5,*
- i. to exempt companies in liquidation from the requirement to prepare audited accounts as set out in paragraph 3.2.6,*
- j. to allow a liquidator to disclaim onerous assets and unprofitable contracts in the circumstances set out in paragraph 3.2.7,*
- k. to authorise the establishment of a statutory scheme for unclaimed dividends and direct the preparation of a further policy letter as set out in paragraph 3.2.8,*
- l. to introduce a statutory power for the Royal Court to wind up insolvent foreign companies as set out in paragraph 3.2.9,*
- m. to introduce a statutory power for the Committee for Economic Development to make insolvency rules as set out in paragraph 3.3.1,*
- n. to require administrators and liquidators to report findings, or suspicions, of misconduct on the part of directors or officers of a company as set out in paragraph 3.3.2,*
- o. to introduce statutory provisions with regard to transactions at an undervalue and extortionate credit transactions as set out in paragraph 3.3.3,*
- p. to introduce statutory powers for liquidators to require statements of affairs and to apply to court for orders requiring the production of such statements and other documents and the attendance of directors and former directors for the purpose of examination, as set out in paragraph 3.3.4, and*
- q. to make ancillary amendments as identified in paragraph 3.3.5 regarding consistency in time periods, utilities and essential services, typographical matters, corrections, clarifications, consequential and minor amendments.*

2. To direct the preparation of such legislation as may be necessary to give effect to the above decisions.

The above Propositions have been submitted to Her Majesty's Procureur for advice on any legal or constitutional implications in accordance with Rule 4(1) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

The Deputy Greffier: Article XIV, Committee for Economic Development – Insolvency Review – Amendments to the Companies Law.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

690

Deputy Ferbrache: Well, sir, I hope Members have brought their sandwiches and their sleeping bags, because I and my good friend, Deputy Lester Queripel, have prepared two of our briefest speeches in relation to this! (*Laughter*)

695

Seriously, seriously, hopefully the introductory paragraph of the brief policy letter explains it. That coupled with paragraph 4, it is a continuing process, we have listened to and gone out to insolvency experts and practitioners, they have told us that we should be making these amendments, and that is the proposal. They are set out in detail, hopefully, in paragraph 3 of the policy letter.

700

The Bailiff: Any debate?
Deputy Gollop.

705

Deputy Gollop: Sir, many of the issues arising in this for the Companies Law and so on are long overdue, but I do support everything, or everything I have understood, within the policy letter, in particular finding mechanisms to deal with company boards who have maybe lost a quorum due to various circumstances, the need to enable and facilitate administrators of these companies to pay all categories of people, including disgruntled employees, as well as the statutory duties that they have, and also their ability to hold meetings with creditors. I think it is a great facility and shows the hard work, below the radar to a degree, that Economic Development are doing on many detailed areas essential to our economy.

710

Now, clearly, company insolvency is a matter that falls fair and square within the mandate of Economic Development, and there is a hint that they may extend that to partnerships and other entities in the future, when the time arises, and resources.

715

But, well I buy all sorts of papers, including on occasion even *The Daily Sport*, but as a committed reader of *The Guardian* on its possible last day ever in Guernsey and the Bailiwick, I question why it is not the overdue analysis and review and reform of insolvency for individuals is not here. Because for years and years both for many constituents, as a client of the Citizens Advice Bureau, as a supporter through Employment and Social Security and the CAB, and as a person occasionally in need of advice for myself or other parties, I think that there has been a gap in our system.

720

I know Deputy Brehaut has referred to this in the past. It goes back to the time when we almost were looking for credit unions as well, of a modern 21st century approach to dealing with what could be personal debts, personal bankruptcies, and the ability for individuals in those circumstances to fairly reward their creditors and start again and rehabilitate themselves. I know many members of the Guernsey Bar are quite keen to see that legislation. It is an issue that has occasionally been mentioned, but it is slightly outside of our mandate on the Legislation Select Committee as its predecessor, and I would hope Economic Development, maybe in conjunction with other States' partners, would look into this as a matter of priority too.

725

730

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall.

735

Deputy Tindall: As is my wont, sir, I do like to speak on the last item on the agenda, and I really had prepared a short speech which basically said what Deputy Gollop has just said, because there are various points in respect of the amendments to the Companies Law which I was particularly interested in, but I will not repeat those because they are unnecessary. However, I was going to conclude as being a Director of Citizens Advice that I was particularly interested to find

out what was referred to in the policy letter at paragraph 4.1 which is in respect of the personal insolvency.

Thank you.

740

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, the points raised by Deputy Gollop and Deputy Tindall about personal bankruptcies, they have interested me since I came back to Guernsey in 1980, because our Law is out of date. It was out of date in 1980 so it is obviously even more out of date 35, 36 years on. I would like to see – but I cannot pretend it is coming up the tracks early, because it is a massive piece of work – insolvency reviewed generally. These reforms deal, as it says in the policy letter, with corporate insolvencies, but I would like to see the personal insolvencies that both the Deputies have mentioned resolved because we do not have a proper Bankruptcy Law. Our Debtors Law goes back to 1930. Those are both out of date. At one time we used to look at the English Bankruptcy Act of 19 – sorry, I apologise, otherwise Deputy Tooley will correct me – the Bankruptcy Act of 1914 that applied in England and Wales, and I never understood it because it was out of date by the time we looked at it. So this is an issue that we should address, but because of resources I cannot pretend it is high on the agenda.

745

750

755

The Bailiff: Well, Members, there are 2 Propositions. I put both of them to you together. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare them carried.

XV. Schedule for future States' business approved

Article XV.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the attached Schedule for future States' business, which sets out items for consideration at the Meeting of the 26th April 2017 and subsequent States' Meetings, they are of opinion to approve the Schedule.

The Deputy Greffier: Article XV, Schedule for Future States' Business.

760

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, I table it but have nothing further to add.

765

The Bailiff: Anything to be added by anybody else? No.

We vote then on the Schedule for future States' business. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare it approved, carried.

Thank you very much, Members. That brings this meeting to a close.

The Assembly adjourned at 10.38 a.m.