



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 13th December 2019

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

Volume 8, No. 37

ISSN 2049-8284

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, C. N. K. Parkinson, L. C. Queripel,
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 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, M. H. Dorey

The West

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

The South-East

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

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representatives S. Roberts and A. Snowdon

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

S. M. D. Ross, Esq. (H.M. Senior Deputy Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Procureur);
Deputy M. K. Le Clerc (*indisposée*); Deputy M. J. Fallaize (*relevé à 9h 55*); Deputy N. R. Inder
(*indisposé*); Deputy B. J. E. Paint (*absent de l'île*) Deputy J. P. Le Tocq (*relevé à 9h 55*)

Business transacted

Evocation	3163
XXVIII. Bailiwick Security Policy – Debate continued – Proposition carried	3163
XIX. The Telecommunications Supply Chain Security Framework – Approved as amended	3193
XX. Schedule for future States' meetings – Approved	3199
Season's greetings	3199
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.12 p.m.</i>	3200

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Senior Deputy Greffier

EVOCATION

COMMITTEE FOR HOME AFFAIRS

XXVIII. Bailiwick Security Policy – Debate continued – Proposition carried

The Senior Deputy Greffier: Billet d'État XXIV. The continuation of the debate, Article XXVIII, Committee for Home Affairs – Bailiwick Security Policy.

5 **The Bailiff:** As Deputy Trott said, let's get the sursis motivé done. (*Laughter*) So proposed by Deputy Tindall, seconded by Deputy Merrett.
Deputy Tindall.

*To sursis the Proposition until after the Committee for Home Affairs has:
undertaken an analysis of the threats to and vulnerabilities of the Bailiwick
undertaken an analysis of the implications of the proposed security policy for the liberty and
human rights of residents of the Bailiwick
considered other regional, national or international security strategies and policies (including
policy frameworks)
considered the role of effective social policy in creating a safe and stable society, and mitigating
risks to Bailiwick security
identified the Bailiwick Law Enforcement's business objectives and priorities
and has returned to the Assembly (which it is directed to do before the end of this political term)
with the Committee's recommendation for a co-ordinated and coherent overarching security
strategy that sets out the policy framework which governs decision making on security in the
Bailiwick including setting out core security values and principles.*

10 **Deputy Tindall:** Thank you, sir,
Could I ask the Deputy Greffier –?

The Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Greffier.

The Deputy Greffier read out the sursis motivé

Deputy Tindall: Thank you.

By laying this sursis motivé, sir, we are seeking the support of the Assembly to defer the decision to endorse the Home Affairs Bailiwick Security Policy and to ask that Committee to revisit it to return to the States with a document befitting the extremely important topic, that of the security of our Bailiwick.

None of us here, sir, consider this subject to be one which we should take lightly. We all support the institutions which are at the forefront of protecting the Islands making sure that the Bailiwick is a safe and secure place to live and work. We thank them wholeheartedly for their service and acknowledge the difficulties they face. In order to support them we should not create more difficulties but assist them with their work. I do not believe that this Bailiwick Security Policy provides such assistant, hence why this sursis motivé is laid today.

When I gave my maiden speech it was about the opportunities of Brexit but we wake up on Friday 13th to a majority Conservative government to the likelihood of the fourth US President in history being impeached, so the threats to the Bailiwick become sharper.

Whilst there are many opportunities enabled by the good relationship established by members of P&R with the UK government, an imminent Brexit is now real, replacing the greater threat of a constitutional attack by Westminster. But we must not let these momentous events belittle the importance of Guernsey's role and the way we present ourselves to the international community.

This debate is important because this document will be on display. Home Affairs has not only chosen to publish it but it will continue to be distributed.

Sir, after the nature and tone of the debate over the last two days I want to make it absolutely clear that this sursis motivé is about the content of what is styled as a Bailiwick Security Policy not about which committee presented it for endorsement. I hope that most, if not all, in this Chamber will acknowledge that I will take issue over any document which I thought was substandard, no matter the author. I do so because I consider it in the best interests of the Bailiwick and for that reason I believe this policy document should be rewritten, and for no other reason.

In the press release on the publication of this document Deputy Lowe states that it lays out, underpins and directs decision making on security in this jurisdiction, setting out our core security values and principles, and further that it will provide the platform on which more detailed plans about specific issues can be built.

Yesterday Deputy Lowe advised us that they had considered the UK, Jersey and Isle of Man versions and as a result it is a document styled as a Bailiwick Security Policy. This document was approved by the Committee for Home Affairs and is now presented to the Assembly for endorsement. In the view of myself and Deputy Merrett it does not do any of these things.

There is no platform, no clear and concise framework which has the structure and clear direction even at a high level. That platform is fundamental for the development of the policies underneath and without that it does not, in my view, adequately support those who are protecting this Bailiwick.

Instead, the document is reminiscent of the Committee's submission to the P&R Plan rather than a policy or strategy a set of statements and assurances, not a framework on which to build.

In the priority policy area update June 2019 at appendix 1H, security and cyber security, it stated:

The Committee for Home Affairs is working with Bailiwick Law Enforcement to publish a strategic plan that sets out Bailiwick Law Enforcement's business objectives and priorities which the Bailiwick Law Enforcement will use to inform a revised service delivery plan. This will also serve as a high level statement from the Bailiwick of our jurisdiction's commitment to keep Islanders, visitors, and businesses safe and secure.

Neither this policy nor the policy letter contains such a strategic plan, nor the Bailiwick Law Enforcement's business objectives and priorities. We are still awaiting this document despite its production being one of the eight recommendations in the HMIC FRIs report published in November last year – a report compiled after inspections during 2017 and 2018. Instead, we have this document which I sincerely hope is not also intended to be the strategic plan for the Bailiwick Law Enforcement.

60 In 2018 Bailiwick Law Enforcement's annual report released in October this year sets out the many activities that they do to protect us but that is not a strategy or overarching plan either, and that is what we need, that is what *they* need.

So why does the list of confirmatory platitudes concern me? Firstly the description in the policy letter. Paragraph 3.3 describes it as:

... a high level statement of [Home Affairs's] commitment to keep islanders, visitors and businesses safe ...

65 In paragraph 3.1 and the conclusion it says it is a high level statement from the Bailiwick of our jurisdiction's commitment to do the same – whose commitment is irrelevant but at 3.3 it says that the high level statement will be supported by more detailed plans and 3.4 also advises the policy and sets out the security framework currently in place. There are brief outlines of such but there is no golden thread. No means identified by which the Committee *for* Home Affairs will bring together all of the activity required to protect the Bailiwick, there is no cohesion in the strategic plan or
70 policies identified to implement it.

Sir, having identified why I believe this is not a strategic plan or policy, I explained what I think should have been produced by Home Affairs by briefly explaining what I think is important. Firstly, that is whether it should be a policy or a strategy. Some may ask why this is important as, to be fair, whatever ultimately it is called is irrelevant if it does what is needed, but I think it is relevant because
75 it goes to the content.

So should it be a strategy or plan? A strategy is a high-level plan describing long-term aims and the means of achieving them including how to structure the overall framework so that all its parts create more value together than they would do individually. A policy is described as a cause or principle of action adopted or proposed and is intended as a means to provide operational decision
80 making and help to determine what is to be done in a particular situation. Most importantly, policies are made to support strategies.

As we have no national security strategy I believe Home Affairs should set that out first and then consider the more detailed policies, frameworks and plans that are needed to fulfil the objectives of the strategy.

85 So what should be in the national security strategy? I found that the view of the Atlantic Council's Think Tank on the subject a reasonable starting place as it contains useful guidance. They believe that there are certain basic elements that are common to all national security strategies without which the strategy is either incomplete or incoherent. These start with the endorsement by the head of government, which presumably is why Home Affairs has submitted the policy to the Assembly
90 for just that. However, interestingly the Atlantic Council does not presume that the national security strategy will be published at all, but that said Home Affairs has decided to do so and therefore I will accept that decision and go on to consider the next two elements for inclusion and that is an accurate reflection of national values and clear articulation of national interests.

These may seem to be airy fairy notions but actually there is a purpose for their inclusion.
95 According to the Atlantic Council a national security strategy must take into account and reinforce a nation's values in order to appropriately prioritise threats and interests and if it is not sufficiently connected to national values it will be difficult to implement. This is because: (1) it will not likely be easily understood by the elements of government charged with implementing it; (2) the nation will not likely have the right kind of resources or government structures to support it; and (3) the
100 priorities it contains will not be an accurate reflection of what is actually necessary to safeguard the nation.

National interests are specific ideas that both derive from and support the broad concepts contained in national values and are then translated into a finite list of goals which can reasonably be accomplished within a certain timeframe.

105 I refer to one of the actions we are asking Home Affairs to do before returning to the Assembly with the revised document, and that is to undertake an analysis of the implications of the proposed Security Policy to the liberty and human rights of residents of the Bailiwick. For example, one of our

values, which I sincerely hope is recognised by this Assembly, is the belief that a society that is secure because it is at peace and trusting is better than if it is locked down and secured.

110 The next element is a declaration of strategic vision. Many in the Assembly do not approve of such things but we have a vision and it is in the P&R Plan and it is under the theme Our Quality of Life, namely that Guernsey is a safe and secure place to live. However, whilst this vision is mentioned in the policy as something that must happen, it is not articulated as a strategic vision following by a finite set of goals that will enable its realisation.

115 The further elements for national security strategy are the identification and assessment of future challenges and a risk assessment. The Atlantic Council say that national security strategies are, by nature, forward-looking documents intended to enable governments to prepare to manage issues that may arise in the future. Any national security strategy that echoes such sentiments wastes the paper it is written upon because absence and identification and assessment of future challenges, 120 the strategy merely becomes a needless repetition of previously stated interests.

Another requirement for Home Affairs we are seeking is just that, to undertake an analysis of the threats and vulnerabilities of the Bailiwick. Some may say that we should not publish such a document, although we are of course eagerly awaiting the publication of the national risk assessment in respect of the threats and vulnerabilities of Guernsey in facilitating money laundering and terrorist financing. We are not seeking publication of the risk assessment for national security 125 purposes, just that the national security strategy should be based on an assessment and more importantly, the strategy responds to it.

This also ties in with the other element which I have already referred to and that is in respect of social policy. Not only should the values element be acknowledged but also that there is an essential 130 tension between security and the civil liberties and fundamental freedoms of the population and then ensuring good social policy reduces risk upfront.

The Atlantic Council's Think Tank concludes that all good strategies also need to have an overview of required resources, an effective timeframe, measures of effectiveness, and basic implementation guidance.

135 Which leads me to the last element of the requirements in the sursis motivé, and that is for Home Affairs to consider other regional, national or international security strategies and policies including policy frameworks.

The UK's national security strategy 2015 sets out how they will deliver their vision of strategy through the three national security objectives. It summarises the UK's unique strengths, the 140 changing national security contexts and the implications for the future. It sets out their detailed strategy, the policies which they will pursue and the capabilities which they will invest. It sets out how they will implement their strategy including new work to increase joint working and efficiency across government and to ensure that they have the most agile crisis response and early warning mechanisms. They also summarise their national security risk assessment also concluded in 2015.

145 National security objective 1 describes how they will protect their people at home, in their overseas territories, and abroad, and protect their territory, economic security, infrastructure and way of life using the full spectrum of their national power. They state that government's most important duty is the defence of the UK and overseas territories and protection of the people in sovereignty. Unfortunately they have not mentioned their responsibilities for defending the Crown Dependencies, maybe someone should remind them. This objective includes their approach to 150 threats to the broad-based international order. The threats of climate change and resource scarcity, energy security, global health security, serious and organised crime including in particular modern slavery and child sexual exploitation, biosecurity, diseases and natural hazards and threats to critical national infrastructure and the threat of flooding – some things that are not in this policy.

155 I will not go through, you will be pleased to know, all the sections of the 98-page strategy, especially as that includes a strategic defence and security review which obviously is not relevant. But suffice to say there is plenty more detail, including how they would reduce the likelihood of threats materialising and effecting the UK and seizing opportunities, working innovatively and supporting UK industry.

160 There is a summary of the 2015 report but annual reports have been issued since and also a previous national security strategy of 2008 which also has plenty of material and is also an excellent example of a strategy. The final three pages worthy of note contain the summary of their national risk assessment – also something worthy of inclusion in Guernseyfied form.

165 I have to say that through reading their 2008 version I am more impressed with the content and this may say something about the government that was in power at the time it was written, even though it was not a Corbyn government, and I would just like to quote a few things. It says:

National security was understood as dealing with the protection of the State and its vital interests from attacks by other States. Over recent decades our view of national security has broadened to include threats to individual citizens and to our way of life as well as the integrity and interests of the State. The broad scope of this strategy also reflects our commitment to focus on the underlying drivers of security and insecurity rather than just immediate threats and risks.

It says further:

A single overarching strategy bringing together the objectives and plans of all departments, agencies and forces involved in protecting our national security.

There is one particular statement that stands out and it says:

No State threatens the UK directly.

170 I have to say I think that may be a cut-and-paste but slightly amended to say what it says in this Bailiwick's security policy, which says:

No States will be allowed to threaten the Bailiwick.

Strong stuff! For me it does actually conjure up the image of Deputy Lowe dressed as Boudicca on the round top stores in full regalia but I will leave that thought with others.

175 Unfortunately, I could not locate a national security policy online for Jersey or the Isle of Man. I assume this is because they have chosen not to publish it, although both have published their cyber security strategy and Jersey have published a security policy framework which relates to the security of assets such as data and documents and not in relation to national security.

Deputy Lowe advises that her Committee has reviewed these documents from other jurisdictions but we are asking the Committee to reconsider this document in light of this debate.

180 Deputy Lowe referred to the consultation undertaken so I will explain why I ask colleagues to consider voting for the sursis motivé despite having seen the document through the consultation exercise. As in response to the consultation certainly in respect of the letter from HSC in my view – which I might add I did not influence, having not been at the meeting – was written from the perspective of the Committee's mandate, the HSC Committee's mandate. I would suggest the committee's responses were not written from the perspective of what Home Affairs should have produced under their mandate.

185 However, I also understand that feedback has been given to Home Affairs by various Members not from the viewpoint of their committee but those comments have also not been incorporated.

190 Whether or not Members have seen it in Committee, today we are being asked, sir, to consider it as the Government to collectively agree that this document represents a quality national security strategy and one we can be proud of. Personally I cannot say that and hence the sursis motivé.

I did consider rewriting it myself but to be fair, as I have explained, the information that I would need is not available to me.

195 Deputy Lowe has also said why she believes it should be endorsed today and there should be no delay. I can understand to some extent her concerns to avoid delay or rather avoid amendment because unfortunately this document has been shared with Jersey despite not having been endorsed yet by this Assembly. But simply because there is the need to share this policy means it should be of the right quality.

Deputy Lowe may also consider that defeat of the sursis motiv   is vital as all subsets of the Bailiwick Security Policy cannot proceed with such endorsement. However, I do not agree as the policy simply says that the Committee will seek to set standards for cyber and telecommunication supply chains security on behalf of the States, nothing more. So there appears no reason why the telecommunications supply chains security framework needs this one to be endorsed first.

More pertinently, we already have the cyber security strategy because it was issued in 2017. I should add that in my view both were good pieces of work, in particular the cyber security strategy as it considers the environment, makes commitments, sets strategic roles and objectives and provides an overarching aim. It is just a shame that such a well written document was not used as a basis for this poor excuse of a national security policy, which in my view can better be described as a dog's dinner.

So, sir, it just leaves me to thank Deputy Merrett for her support and assistance and, as always, to Deputy McSwiggan for her invaluable input, and ask the States to support the sursis motiv   because I believe that before we endorse a Bailiwick security policy we should be satisfied with it and I, for one, am not satisfied with this document we see before us today.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Merrett, you second the sursis?

Deputy Merrett: I do, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputies Le Tocq and Fallaize, you wish to be relev  ?

Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe, do you wish to speak at this point?

Deputy Lowe: Yes, sir, thank you.

Sir, I think the easiest way of me saying it is not often that I am lost for words but this sursis brings me pretty close.

As I explained in my opening speech, the Bailiwick Security Policy is a high level statement of where things stand in terms of security. It summarises that as a matter of policy the States of Guernsey is committed to keeping those who live and work in the Bailiwick safe and secure.

I could go on in some detail as to why this sursis is unwise and inappropriate, but in the interests of us being efficient with the Assembly's time I will just pick up on three main points.

First, it is that it will become just another example of provocation by this States in delaying a debate and decision – the very thing that frustrates so many Islanders.

Second, despite the assumption by the proposer and seconder that fulfilling the sursis will not cost much, it most certainly will both in terms of time and money. To deliver in the timeframe would require contracting additional staff for which we do not have the funds. On the amendment, sir, it actually states, Rule 4.3, and I will read from it and it says – this is from the proposer and seconder:

It is believed that there are no additional costs associated with the Proposition as set out in this Sursis Motiv   and confirmation is being sought from the Committee *for* Home Affairs.

Well there was no consultation with the Committee *for* Home Affairs, we have not been approached because if we had been approached we would have explained there are additional staff costs and it will require funds.

Deputy Tindall: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall, point of correction.

Deputy Tindall: I emailed Deputy Lowe and her Committee asking for such information, albeit it was just after the lodging of the sursis hence the comment in the explanatory note.

250 **Deputy Lowe:** I have not got that email, sir, and none of the staff have. I actually checked again this morning with the staff and there has been no contact with staff at Home Affairs.

Third, and this is the most important aspect, the sursis seeks to direct us to do what no other government does, which is to openly report on the Bailiwick's security threats and vulnerabilities. The States is an open forum recorded in *Hansard* and broadcast live via radio and attended by the media. Apart from in general terms, it would be highly unusual to discuss threats and vulnerabilities in this way. In the UK the national T01 threats are known and published: cyber, terrorism, large scale natural hazard, or accident military crisis between the States. However, the key threats and vulnerabilities that lie behind that and the associated intelligence are not placed in the public domain.

260 Of course in the UK there are forums such as COBRA and the Joint Intelligence Committee where security cleared officers and senior politicians who sign the Official Secrets Act are briefed. In our local context the Civil Contingencies Authority with its sworn Members receive threat information where appropriate. The States also has a Bailiwick Risk Register which is reviewed regularly.

On the amendment at the back it states:

Whilst it is not believed the document needs to be of great length, it needs to articulate these elements succinctly so that the States understand the threats and vulnerabilities of the Bailiwick and the way in which the Committee *for* Home Affairs intends to protect the community against them.

265 To be reporting openly on security threats and vulnerabilities would be unwise in the extreme. If the proposer and seconder had come to talk to us in advance we would have been able to explain many of these points to them and given advice on the cost implications. But they decided not to.

The sursis, the proposer and seconder I am sure feel, is well intentioned but it would be a singularly unhelpful for the security of the Bailiwick and its residents of which we are required to make sure they are safe and secure.

270 Sir, I therefore ask the States to roundly reject this sursis.

The Bailiff: May I just remind Members that debate must be limited to the sursis.

Deputy Leadbeater.

275

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

As Vice-President of the Committee *for* Home Affairs I have to advise Members of just how dangerous and irresponsible this sursis motiv   is. Security details of our Bailiwick are not something that should be debated in this Chamber or for that matter anywhere else in public.

280 This sursis directs the Committee *for* Home Affairs to bring back to this Assembly information such as a report containing details of an analysis of the threats and vulnerabilities to the security of the Bailiwick.

Sir, as Deputy Dudley-Owen highlighted yesterday, the deliberations of this Assembly are broadcast around the world to anyone who may be interested. If we are to highlight any vulnerabilities or threats we may have to things such as our critical national infrastructure or our borders, for example, the stuff that underpins our Government, economy and our entire community in public it would be nothing short of madness. Airing the Bailiwick's sensitive security details in public, as this sursis asks us to do, will without doubt make us vulnerable to threats such as cyber or terrorist attacks and, quite frankly, it is alarming that we are even having to consider this today.

290 The Committee *for* Home Affairs is obviously privy to sensitive information regarding national security but we do not discuss it in public.

What I am getting at, sir, is that we would not release or discuss our sensitive Committee papers publicly but this sursis might as well ask us to do just that.

295 What we have produced is a high level statement as is referenced as being required in the explanatory note of the sursis 4.1 in the report states:

This will serve as a high level statement from the Bailiwick of our jurisdiction's commitment to keep Islanders, visitors and businesses safe and secure.

And that, sir, is just what it is.
Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

300 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, this is the worst sursis I have seen in my 10 years in the States. It is completely pointless. What is the point of it? What kind of resources is it going to involve the Home Department having to engage in, as Deputy Lowe has said, because it will cost a fortune; it will take a time; it will be pointless; it will be a talking shop; and it is completely unnecessary?

305 We are not England, we are not the United States, we are not France; we are Guernsey, we are a tiny little place. Our community, including the other Islands of about 65,000 people, and what we are asked to produce if this sursis is successful, which I very much hope that it is not, is something that would be a learned treatise for some no doubt academic sociologist in some ex-polytechnic in England.

310 In relation to this, this is an appalling – an appalling! – piece of parliamentary waste of time. Please reject it.

The Bailiff: Deputy McSwiggan.

315 **Deputy McSwiggan:** Sir, if there is any danger, if there is any irresponsibility in this then it is the Committee *for* Home Affairs that opened the door to it and it is the Committee *for* Home Affairs that has brought it down on our heads. Because it is the Committee *for* Home Affairs that has decided to bring a security framework to this parliament. We cannot have a security framework telling us how we are to be defended against the risks to the Bailiwick unless it has some idea what those risks are. We cannot as a Government decide how we are to allocate our resources in a sensible and cost effective way to tackling the things that most matter to the Bailiwick's safety and the security of its citizens unless we know what those things are.

The Committee *for* Home Affairs are taking issue with the movers of the sursis motivé for telling them to do what they should have done in the first place.

325 Sir, if a piece of work is worth doing, and the Committee *for* Home Affairs clearly believe that it is, it is worth doing well, and it can only be done well if the kind of thought processes are put into it that this sursis motivé asks for.

330 Sir, the choice that I have today is between voting for this sursis motivé and asking for a good, well-rounded, balanced security policy to be brought back to this Assembly or throwing out the security policy that we have between us. Because, sir, I believe strongly that one of our most fundamental roles as a parliament is to defend the liberty of our citizens and we have to defend it on both sides both from the risks that threaten us from outside and from claustrophobic closing in of those who believe that the only kind of security is locking down the freedoms of society.

335 Sir, this security policy focusses only on control and keeping out risk and not on the upstream focus on peace and trust and the creation of a safe society that Deputy Tindall focussed on in her opening speech.

Until we have a security policy that truly recognises the tension between civil liberties and fundamental freedoms of our Island population and the measures that are necessary to protect them that is no security policy that I can vote for.

340 **Two Members:** Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

345 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Thank you, sir.

I shall not be supporting this sursis.

Whilst I think it could be possible for us to consider risks, meet *in camera* and we would have to do so, I think, to do that. Sir, in my mind ultimately this is a matter that should be just really for Home Affairs and this Assembly should not really consider in that way.

350 On that basis, sir, I am willing to trust that those that we have put in that position will take this seriously. Obviously they need to consult with others, but it is certainly not something that I would like to see happen where we consider and debate the risks that we have to prepare for in a public arena, that would be self-defeating. Furthermore, sir, I think we need something like a Guernsey version of Official Secrets Act if we were going to undertake that sort of thing.

355 So, sir, I agree with some of those who have already spoken and said that this sursis is misplaced. Sir, I accept that the policy letter with the security strategy on it, which is a first in any case, probably does not go far enough for some Members here but I think it is a matter, bearing in mind the subject nature, that really should not be debated by this Assembly in any case.

360 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop has stood a number of times.
Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you.

365 Well I am a bit at sea on this because part of me does not want to put the Home Affairs Committee to additional expense – although I do not think that is necessarily a given in this sursis because in theory the resources and the knowledge are already there.

We have heard from Deputy Ferbrache that this could become a rather fruitless investigation by a sociologist academic from a polytechnic type university – or it could be a criminologist I suppose or a security consultant. But I did not think that was where it was coming from. I did not see it as
370 another professorial type of consultancy report that we talk about.

Nor did I see it as worryingly as Deputy Leadbeater and Deputy Le Tocq have seen it, as some rather misguided publication of secret ideas and maybe even pointing to individuals on the most wanted list or anything like that.

375 I do not think that was the purpose of the sursis. I could be wrong. I think really the central paradox here, because Deputy Le Tocq is right you could hold debates *in camera* and the States of Jersey do more than we do, but I do not think it calls for a debate on huge security specific risks and I do not think we are talking about confidential information; although we did promise as an Assembly to be much more open and transparent over many things.

380 I see this in a different way. We all know, some of us stayed up or got up early, that you have a provision in the United Kingdom and some other places for snap general elections, of which the UK has had three in four and a half years, which in a way resolves crisis of leadership and perhaps there are some Members in this Assembly who have a different view of how Home Affairs should be conducted than the present Committee. I see that as probably more central because what Home Affairs have done is they have gone away, they have come up with a security policy that they sent
385 helpfully to some committees; and to a degree the policy is a selection of obvious statements of not exactly sound bites but of principles and underlying motivations, and could have come from a policy planning summary.

390 What I think we are looking for – perhaps not everybody here is looking for because we have too many large strategies some would say – is a document that is much more expansive on the issues and actually goes into greater depth balancing the human rights ideas, looking in broad terms at threats and vulnerabilities, environmental issues, human resource cost and effective social policy; because, for example, one of the things that shouts *[inaudible]* security policy is there is not too much discussion about what probably is a rising tide of drug addiction problems and there is not too much ... somebody mentioned human slavery which has had a lot of coverage in Guernsey

395 recently, but here is a favourite one of mine, there was perhaps unhelpful speculation on social media and some other quarters about the odd mysterious death that takes place on the Island. Now although there is no evidence one way or the other on many of these points of view, I think it would be helpful to know exactly how well we are working with international policing and border agencies across the *piste*.

400 I think that is really what is required – a kind of, not a four-page document but something more akin to a 24-page document that actually looks at not the operational issues so much but at the resource issues and the policy issues and the legislation issues that come out of it, and I may have a follow-up speech if and when we get to cyber security, because there are issues there.

405 The other concern I think I have a bit – perhaps it is just me, and Deputy St Pier, Deputy Le Tocq, Deputy Brouard and other Members who are more expert in these areas than I am, let alone H.M. Comptroller, would possibly say I am being misguided here – but when you read through the Bailiwick of Guernsey Security Policy there are a lot of statements about UK has 'constitutional responsibility for the defence' –

410 **The Bailiff:** Are you moving on to general debate on the security policy itself rather than the sursis?

Deputy Gollop: Well, I would say that because we have not had enough analysis in the report as to exactly what Guernsey is responsible for and what is part of our international identity and what we might share resources with other territories and what we do with the UK that is another reason, I think, to support the sursis, even if it is not explicitly stated.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

420 **Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.

When I came into this debate, well the meeting on Wednesday, I confess that I had not given as much thought as I should have to this issue and overnight as I sat watching the television, becoming more and more depressed and listening to that stupid man Mr Lansman explain how he has destroyed the Labour Party, for some reason my mind turned to this sursis and I started thinking about the effects of it and about the policy letter itself, and I think I reached two conclusions which are relevant to this sursis debate.

425 The first is that I do not think the sursis does require the Committee to come back to the States with all of the things listed in the bullet point – may I just borrow this? Thank you – and I do not think it requires the States to debate all of those things, because it says, 'to sursis the Proposition until after the Committee has' done all of those things, 'undertaken an analysis of' blah de blah de blah. It lists five things, 'and has returned to the Assembly with the Committee's recommendation for a co-ordinated and coherent overarching security strategy' blah de dah de dah. So it does not actually require the Committee to set out all of those things in the bullet points in a policy letter.

430 I will give way to Deputy Ferbrache who is looking puzzled and confused.

435 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Well because what Deputy Fallaize says does not have any sense at all because if they just come back with those five bullet points and say there are the recommendations those that have brought the sursis and have voted for it will want to have all the detail debated otherwise they will say how can we make that conclusion. Perhaps he should have gone to sleep earlier in relation to the election debate which has given Guernsey certainty for the next five years rather than moaning about the demise of his friend Jeremy Corbyn.

Deputy Fallaize: If Deputy Ferbrache knew anything about British politics he would realise that what I said about Mr Lansman revealed that Mr Corbyn is not my friend at all, he is just as responsible for ruining the Labour Party – but anyway we can discuss that another time.

445 No, I think Deputy Ferbrache, I mean he is assuming that the proposer of the sursis wants to see all of these things in a subsequent policy letter, but that is not what is set out in the sursis. The proposal in the sursis is –

Oh, I will give way to Deputy Leadbeater.

450 **Deputy Leadbeater:** Sir, I thank Deputy Fallaize for giving way.
The explanatory note sets out what Deputy Tindall wants out of this sursis.

Whilst it is not believed the document needs to be of great length, it needs to articulate these elements succinctly ... [to the States] so that the States understand the threats and vulnerabilities of the Bailiwick ...

Deputy Fallaize: Well the first thing is we are not voting on the explanatory note. I do not like explanatory notes, they are normally quite unhelpful because the thing that comes back does not bear much resemblance to what is in the explanatory note.

455 But the Proposition itself does not require – by the way I am not speaking in favour of the sursis, so the Members who are trying to defeat it need not continue interrupting my speech. *(Laughter)* What I am saying is that the Proposition does not require the Committee to come back and set out in great detail all of the things which are set out in those five bullet points. What the sursis is proposing is that the Committee should come back to the States with a co-ordinated and coherent overarching security strategy.

460 So my assumption is that the criticism of the supporters of the sursis is that what is laid before the States is not a co-ordinated and coherent overarching security strategy and so they want the Committee to consider these things in the bullet points, which they obviously feel have not yet been considered adequately, and then come back to the States with what they call a co-ordinated and coherent overarching security strategy.

465 So I do not think the sursis is proposing quite what has been claimed for it.

But I am inclined to vote against the sursis and then to vote against the policy letter because ... the actual text which the States are being asked to approve runs to a fraction over two sides of A4 and I do not think really gives me any –

470 **The Bailiff:** Are you moving away from the sursis?

Deputy Fallaize: I do not think so, sir. I do not think I am, sir, but I will make sure I do not. I only have a minute or two left.

475 But I do not think that the policy letter really provides the States with any material that is sufficient to vote in favour of it. But I am not that fussed about that because it seems to me that this matter ought properly to be dealt with at the level of the Committee. I think that it would be better if the States rejected the sursis, rejected the policy letter which is before them because it is just inadequate *(Laughter)* to provide any kind of assent to. We just do not have adequate information before us to vote in favour of it, and accepted the principle that if the Bailiwick needs a security policy of this nature then the Committee for Home Affairs should be able to establish it within the terms of the Policy & Resource Plan and all the other kind of overarching strategies, too many of them, which the States already have in place.

485 So I am explaining, sir, that although I think I will vote against the sursis it is because I just do not think it is necessary. I actually do not particularly want the States of Deliberation to do any more work on this, I want to vote against the sursis, I want to vote against the policy letter, leave the matter to the Committee *for* Home Affairs.

Thank you, sir.

490 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, yes, well I find myself in a similar place as Deputy Fallaize on this.

As it says in the policy letter in inverted commas, Health & Social care was consulted on a draft version of the security policy and at the time we made two specific comments. Firstly, we were surprised that the policy made no mention of risk because we believed it should be driven by relevant risks. This version still does not, the word 'risk' is not used anywhere in the policy letter and I do not know how you can judge the security that you require unless you understand the risks in the first place and then how you address them. So that was the first point.

Secondly, for us it appeared to be just a statement. It did not resemble a policy document and we assumed it would be fleshed out more fully as a result of the consultation, but it has not been. It speaks a lot about the importance of security but does not define it; why we need it; what generic threats are to it; what we are doing to address it; other than high level meaningless statements.

So Deputy Lowe says she is limited on what she can say because of security but she does not say that actually within the policy letter and there is one thing being high level ... there is high level and then there is on the top of a mountain as high as you can get and I just think this is far too generic but it does not even consider generic threats, it is just a series of statements and for me it does not provide any assurance at all. I mean it really does not seem to be for me, and Deputy Tindall said it was a dog's dinner and I just do not think it is worth the paper it is written on and I cannot see it giving any assurance to the public that they will be kept safe and secure.

So for me I struggle supporting the sursis for reasons of extra work, I understand, although I do not have the same concerns as Deputy Ferbrache; it does not actually say that the requirements are that Home Affairs comes back and provides all the list of threats and everything in that policy letter, but for me I just cannot support this policy letter because it is not a policy at all, it is just a set of meaningless statements.

515 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Merrett, as the seconder of the sursis.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir.

My choice, sir, after reading this, I will say I was too lost for words when I read the appendix 1 – I was indeed lost for words, I was actually looking for the policy and realised that was meant to be it. I would say that it is not the worst sursis motivé before this Assembly. I think this is the worst policy letter I have ever seen before this Assembly. I have seen poor policy letters in draft but I have never endorsed them at a committee level and let them come into the Assembly.

So I could not endorse, as we are asked to do, this appendix. So I have a choice, as many Members do, I either just say, oh, I am just going to speak against it and try to vote it out or I am going to try to be a little bit constructive and I am going to try to give some sort of direction of how the Committee could return to the States because it may well be, sir, that they have undertaken an analysis of the threats and vulnerabilities of the Bailiwick; they could have done, that I do not know, maybe they have done that. If they have then I struggle to see why there is not anything in the appendix, which is the title of the policy, that actually discusses environmental threats really, there does not appear to be much in there of anything.

The other thing I noted was that once again this policy paper says that only three Members were present at the meeting so Deputy Oliver and Deputy Smithies again were not there, and they have highlighted this or the Committee has tried to highlight that. So actually there were only three

535 Members of this Assembly that have signed off on this policy letter and that to me is quite a small number of this Assembly.

Now when Deputy Lowe opened I believe she said it was a broad and fast changing but there is nothing in here that says anything about anything being fast changing. In fact I will come on to that again in a minute. In fact Deputy Lowe did say it was assertions and it was styled as a policy, it was
540 styled as a policy, it is not ... If this was an appendix and these were assertions or statements well that is fair enough but I cannot see how it is a policy.

I am going to take it that Members have actually read appendix 1 and I am grateful for Deputy Fallaize for taking the time to do so, even if it was after the date for submissions for amendments or sursis motives, but I am glad that we have now done that. But I will take it as read because I do
545 believe that Members should read every policy paper before the States and, if and when possible, if they cannot agree it rather than just chuck it out try to be constructive and give the reasons why and act accordingly.

I concur with Deputy Tindall in that there was a possibility of trying to rewrite it but really two Members or Members trying to rewrite something that really is within the remit of Home Affairs
550 would not be particularly wise and so we decided what other options do we have, try to vote it out or try to sursis motivé it, and those were the options.

It is a perfectly normal, regarded, it is in our Rules, parliamentary privilege, so please, Members, if you do not like the parliamentary mechanism then ask for a change in the Rules but do not criticise the proposer and seconder for using a perfectly legitimate parliamentary mechanism.

555 So why is it not a policy? Well if we do look at it, in my opinion, sir, from 1.1 to 1.6(e) we literally have statements. The statement:

In recent years there have been rapid and profound changes to the international 'landscape' which has given rise to new security challenges.

Okay, it is a statement, it is not policy, that is just a statement. Again, I go on:

Technology has delivered ... benefits with wider choices of goods and services, increases in capital flows and trade opportunities, and increased productivity and wealth.

That is just a statement. How is that a policy? So that is fine, we have statements but they are not really a policy, are they? Then we move on to assertions. So we have assertions:

Providing security for the Bailiwick of Guernsey ... to safeguard our citizens and our way of life will remain a critical responsibility of the whole of government.

560 Well, yes, that should be pretty much unsaid and I am pretty sure it is in the mandate but that is fine.

Then from (f) onwards everything in there is 'remain committed', 'will continue', 'will continue', 'will continue', 'will continue'. So as Deputy Lowe opened, it was broad and fast changing but it looks like there is nothing ... we are just going to continue doing what we have done because that
565 is what we have always done. That to me does not really set a policy or any strategic assertions for the future security of the Bailiwick.

Okay, so I think someone has said this and I try to avoid using repetition but when Members were speaking we had quite a few Members passing notes, giggling, sighing and tutting, so I will actually say it again and hope that because we have a quieter Assembly now that maybe they will
570 actually be in a position to listen and engage with what the speaker is trying to say.

So statements, assertions, there is really limited comment in here on any policies regarding social inclusion, harmony, peace, safety of our community on a daily basis, on our streets, very limited on anything on environmental threats, on health risk or threats. We are not going to make ourselves vulnerable by putting our hands in the air and saying we have environmental threats because we
575 are an Island and we should be concerned about climate change and raising sea levels. That is a threat. That is a threat to the security of the Bailiwick. It is not there.

Surely if there are health risks or threats – what I mean is by international things, aviation etc. these are threats that we cannot control, we are not going to make ourselves vulnerable by saying we have health risks and threats and this is what we do. That is a policy. I am struggling with it completely. I really do believe it is the worst policy letter to ever come before the States in my political term, but that is only three and a half years so goodness knows what we have seen before.

Now States' Members will recall in 2020 the Budget had ... there was a bit of toing and froing, continuous tries from P&R to try to amend or re-amend the Proposition regarding counter economic crime for £1.3 million. Members may also recall that P&R regarded strong governance is required over development of this and these functions. I actually cannot recall how many times it went backwards and forwards, we had another vote, another vote, another vote. They tried to revoke what the States decided, then we changed it again, and we carried on voting on it, but eventually Home Affairs, it landed on that they would have full responsibility for it and that is what this Assembly decided, but again it is £1.3 million that is touched on, but anyway ...

I believe that this policy is literally hopelessly flimsy. I am not going to use the 'dog's dinner'. I try to remain parliamentarian in my tone, I try my best but I do think it is hopelessly flimsy and I think there is an absence of the basic fundamental value of good social policy in reducing the risk in the first place. As other Members have said, and I am really pleased because Members do appear to be at least a bit quieter, but I would like a policy where we are discussing the peaceful trusting and tolerant community versus, as Deputy McSwiggan and Deputy Tindall said, the sort of lock down attitude of just lock it down. That is having a secure community.

There is no clear acknowledgement in here of civil liberties, fundamental freedoms. I really struggle with this completely.

Now Deputy Lowe said in her opening speech that the policy will be reviewed periodically. Again, great, but we do not know by who and we do not know 'periodically' meaning what? Periodically meaning every year? Meaning what?

I will support the sursis motivé, clearly. If Members decide not to support that and then we go on to endorsing the ... I will not endorse this. I am quite prepared if necessary to go through and meet with Home Affairs if it is any use if this is not endorsed today and I do thank Deputy Fallaize for at least reading the sursis motivé and understanding it. I mean if Members had read it – I am sure they all have, but undertake an analysis; undertake this; consider this; consider this; identify this. If Home Affairs could say today well we have undertaken that actually, and we have considered this, and we have looked at that, that may give Members some comfort and they may feel well if Home Affairs have done that then fantastic. But if you read the appendix 1 it is difficult to imagine that that work has been done because it is just not in there.

So I urge Members to support the sursis motivé. If they do not want to do that then I could not with any conscience endorse this.

So it is up to Members to decide but I do hope going forward in this debate that we can try and be parliamentarian and we can listen to others and not be passing notes and whispering and tutting and sighing. We are here to be in debate, we are here to try to listen and try to find some commonality and certainly my intention, and I believe Deputy Tindall's, was to help aid what the expectation is by doing a sursis motivé rather than just standing up and trying to vote the security policy out.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir.

I feel partly responsible for the debate we are having today because I had the privilege of attending a national security and cybercrime conference at Westminster and I had the honour to represent the Island back in March 2017. It is on the basis of the learning from that conference that I ask this Assembly to throw out the sursis.

At that time I circulated a document which I did adapt for a Guernsey audience but I took the principles that the conference agreed with at the end. There were nine, what were described as, learning points, and I only refer to two of those. I did circulate this back at the time to all States' Members and I have to say it was well received.

Two of the learning points on this and this is relevant to the sursis ... The first learning point is security of our citizens is the first duty of government. The conference emphasised this: it is a duty shared by all parliamentarians, whether in power or in opposition or members of National, Territorial or Crown Dependencies Assemblies. So from that learning point it is a matter for all of this Assembly to look after at a high strategic level the security of our citizens and this is what the Committee for Home Affairs have attempted to do in the policy letter.

One of the other learning points was all parliaments must ensure that it has in place and constantly reviews all legislation and contingency planning which impinges on national security issues. Jurisdictions cannot afford to be reactive in the implementing of such initiatives after a security incident. This includes legislation which counters terrorism funding, our international financial crime enforcement capabilities and our prevention of terrorism efforts at our borders.

Now, sir, when the President of Home Affairs opened this debate I picked out some key words from her statement to this Assembly, she talked about this initiative being one to adapt and build; she also said not at the end of the journey but the start, (*Interjection*) and we have to start somewhere.

Sir, I think it is not right for this Assembly to sursis this and put it back to square one. I think what we should be doing is endorsing this as a start of a process.

Sir, I no longer serve on Home Affairs and, as Deputy Soulsby has alluded to, it was discussed at Health & Social Care and if I had been on Home Affairs perhaps I would have tried to influence it in some of the points – not all of them – that have been made. I would have much more sympathy with a constructive amendment which actually steered this Assembly, if it so wished, in some of the directions that we are being told. But to sursis this I think is wrong and dangerous, and I agree with what Deputy Ferbrache said on that.

I would also refer to the policy letter and it is I think, again, relevant. It does point out that all the committees of the States were consulted, as were Alderney, as were Sark and the external bodies were consulted. Now I accept that I do not know what the outcome, apart from Health & Social Care, of the consultation was, but the idea that Home Affairs have done this in a vacuum clearly is not the case.

What I would ask this Assembly to do and I think what my learning from the conference was is that at a very high level we need to be able to look at what the security implications are, where we need help and assistance from United Kingdom and globally, but to have some sort of indication to the wider world that we understand the implications of security and although we are a small jurisdiction that we have thought about it at a parliamentary level as well as thinking about these things at a more practical level.

One other thing I do not think any of the speakers so far have alluded to but I will, is that the cross-border elements of this as far as law enforcement obviously had a voice and have contributed to what we have in front of us and the policing aspects. The external bodies were consulted, the Competition Regulatory Authority and the Guernsey Financial Service Commission, the Office of Data Protection Authority, so whilst I might have a view on whether the document that we are being asked to agree is the best that we could produce, what I would ask the Assembly to think about is this is a start of a process and provided we get the assurances, which we were given at the opening, at the end of this debate that the high level strategic vision of how we handle security which is proportionate and relevant to this Bailiwick is going to be underpinned and worked upon and improved, and if instead of trying to kick this into touch or back to square one ... we have had no amendments laid which I think would have been much more helpful, there might have been amendments I could have supported, but that is not the case. We have the policy letter in front of us and we have the statement as it is.

So I would urge every Member of this Assembly to throw out this sursis.

680 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir.

685 Clearly there are some very polarised views this morning regarding this matter between those who do not want to create a handbook that we publish for those who may wish to perpetrate ill towards us and those who want to really explore issues around social justice etc. and have far more detail.

I sit in the middle. I understand both points of view, though I find it very difficult to contextualise the civil liberties and fundamental human rights threat versus our national security when we are talking about Guernsey. I understand that in the context of the US, I understand that in the context of European countries where terror threats are very high in the minds of governments. I find that more difficult to contextualise for us in Guernsey where our vulnerabilities revolve more around financial crime.

695 I think that actually probably more of a threat to civil liberties at the moment is us as politicians, our views, no platforming for denying people freedom of speech – I think is a really big cultural threat at the moment in our part of the world. So I think that national security threats are less of an issue for civil liberties than us as individuals and what our response is to the cultural changes at the moment.

700 One area that has really concerned me, and I do not hold the view that some do that a sursis motivé is a terrible thing to bring, I think actually that it is a useful tool, I have used it myself along with Deputy Prow and we had the same view as Deputy Merrett has put forward. If politicians in this Chamber do not like it then start to change the Rules. It is a really useful motion to bring.

705 But what I am not happy about is the Rule 4(3) because I do feel that the committee should have a view of what it is going to cost. The Committee for Education Sport & Culture had a view of what our sursis motivé was going to cost and that should have been sought from the Committee for Home Affairs before the sursis motivé was laid, not after. I do not think that you can come to this Chamber and say that confirmation has been sought after the event.

710 I am sure that a lot of work has gone into this motion and a lot of work has been done in terms of researching it and I actually find the explanatory note very helpful and I think that every single motion should be accompanied with an explanatory note because it gives colour to the intention of those who have laid the motion. But the thing that really lets this down is that it does not have a cost associated with it and inevitably there will be a cost.

715 So I would like further clarification both from the President of Home Affairs about that matter and also – oh, sorry she has already spoken, I do apologise – but from the layer of the sursis motivé.

Also if there is any other information that Home Affairs Committee can let us know if any other research has been done in this regard, just by email I am sure would be helpful to Members once we have finished this debate in response to what Deputy Tindall has asked for, about undertaking analysis of any threats and vulnerabilities and other information that might be considered useful. I would be very grateful.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

725 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Thank you, sir.

Just a couple of points resulting from the debate. I was interested in what Deputy Soulsby said about not seeing the word 'risk'. Well what does security mean? Well it is almost synonymous with safety, and what does safety mean, how do you define safety? It is risk management – simple as that. Whatever you look at it is risk management. So they could have defined security as risk management. Why do you have to keep seeing the word risk? This is what it is all about, you do not need to see the word risk, so I do not have an issue with that.

Secondly, Deputy Merrett pointed out that in the policy letter they are just statements. Well a policy could be a single statement. We have got plenty of those in a lot of our policies. Make this the happiest place in the world, that is a statement but it is a policy. I do not have an issue with that.

735 It may not be comprehensive and I hear some noises coming from my right and this is the other issue I have with this sursis is this is another attempt at what I call micro management and I do not like it because I think I have the confidence in Home department to do this job and if this policy letter is all they want to bring at this time whether it is comprehensive or not I really do not mind. If you do not like the way Home department are doing it then the next step is a vote of no
740 confidence and remove them.

So I am really on the same page as Deputy Le Tocq on this: I trust them to do this, I have no reason not to. So I will not be supporting the sursis and I am going to support the policy letter.

Thank you.

745 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Langlois.

Deputy Langlois: Thank you, sir.

When I read the sursis motivé the bullet points scheduling work asking for work to be undertaken appeared to me to be fundamental preparation for developing a security policy, particularly the first
750 bullet point which is:

[Undertake] ... an analysis of the threats to and vulnerabilities of the Bailiwick.

I mean you could not get more fundamental than that, and if a Member of Home Affairs had stood up and said this sursis motivé is a waste of time because obviously we had to do all this work before we could come to the States with a security policy I would have been reassured, but what has happened is Members of the Committee *for* Home Affairs have stood up and said, no,
755 undertaking this work, which appears fundamental, is going to take an awful lot of time and incredibly expensive, which leads me to believe that they have not undertaken this work before coming to the Assembly with this, what is being described as a, very thin policy letter –

Sorry, I will give way to Deputy Lowe.

760 **Deputy Lowe:** Thank you, Deputy Langlois, for giving way.

I think I just need to remind Members what has just been said again by Deputy Prow. I said it in my speech. This is the starting point and there is a huge amount of work involved with security, and security is being looked at on a daily basis, that is part of the work of Home Affairs. For us to be able to list everything that needs to be done and how much it is going to cost is how long is a piece
765 of string, because it just does not stop with just one item.

We have got the next policy letter which, I would hope once this security strategy has been approved here, is just another one that drops out from having the security. It is important we have it, it is important for our community, but for everything to be in just one and for Members to be asking well we want to know what the risks are, well those sort of things ... and there are certain
770 things you can put in the public domain but equally there are other things you just cannot put in the public domain.

Had the proposer and seconder or any other Member – how many times have I stood up in the States and said if anybody wants to know anything about Home Affairs the door is open, come and talk to us, and here is a prime example where if the proposer and seconder had actually come and
775 spoken to us we would have been able to help them.

Deputy Langlois: I have to say that sounded rather condescending to me.

The sursis motivé is not asking for this information to be divulged and put into the public domain that seems to exercise some Members of this Assembly. All it asks is for the work to be done and
780 then the security policy to be revisited.

As I said in my initial speech, I would have been reassured if Home Affairs had said they had undertaken this work anyway because it is fundamental to producing even this initial security policy. But nobody has actually said that so I assume that this work which appears fundamental has not been done before this security policy letter was produced, and the thing which makes me believe I am probably right in that interpretation is the very nature of the policy letter which appears to be scattered and not really co-ordinated and no thread running through it, which is something I think Deputy Tindall picked up on in her opening speech.

In other words I have no real confidence in the way that our security policy is progressing from the policy letter presented by Home Affairs.

I will be supporting this sursis motiv   as I do believe that there needs to be a better base framework before we can agree a security policy, not obviously divulging various aspects which are best kept under wraps.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tooley.

Deputy Tooley: Thank you, sir.

I think there are speeches being made which present this almost as a binary choice that we can either write a handbook for those who would wish to do us harm or we can accept that this is all that we want to have out in the public domain and therefore we should just back off and leave it alone.

I do not think this is really a binary choice in that way. I think there are ways in which we can look at this and explore it and which would not require either of those things to be the position.

I am not sure how I feel on the sursis motiv  . I am not sure of the right way for me to vote on it, I will be honest, because there is a dilemma if the sursis does not carry, because the dilemma that leaves me with then is that I cannot endorse a policy which I do not believe does what it sets out to do.

Had the Committee *for* Home Affairs presented us with a draft of the direction of travel they were taking and the method which they were setting out as the way in which they would start to build a security policy and said please confirm that this is the direction of travel that you would like us to take then I would be more than happy to endorse it.

If I vote for the sursis or if I vote against the policy letter if it is laid, it will not be because I do not trust the Committee *for* Home Affairs to do the work. It will be because what the policy letter is asking me to do is to endorse this as the Bailiwick's security policy and for me this is not what I need to see as the Bailiwick's security policy. So it is not that I do not trust the Committee *for* Home Affairs to get on and do the work, it is that this is not what I think it needs to be, and that is not the same thing.

So I am not sure how I am going to vote on the sursis motiv  , but this is not what it needs to be and actually for me the ideal would be for the Committee *for* Home Affairs to request permission to withdraw this from debate and to come back at a future date. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld has stood quite a number of times.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.
I would like to invoke Rule 26(1).

The Bailiff: Rule 26(1) – I thought you were standing to speak.

Will those who have not spoken and wish to do so please stand in your places. Three people. Do you wish to go ahead? Okay well I put to you then the motion that debate on the sursis motiv   be terminated. Those in favour; those against.

Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.

The Bailiff: I think that is carried, but we have a request –

Deputy Lester Queripel: Recorded vote, sir, please.

The Bailiff: – for a recorded vote.
Recorded vote on the guillotine motion.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 18, Contre 17, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 4

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Leadbeater	Deputy Gollop	Deputy Prow	Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Mooney	Deputy Lester Queripel		Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Trott	Deputy Merrett		Deputy Inder
Deputy Le Pelley	Deputy Fallaize		Deputy Paint
Deputy St Pier	Deputy Lowe		
Deputy Stephens	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
Deputy Meerveld	Deputy Dorey		
Deputy Smithies	Deputy Brouard		
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel	Deputy McSwiggan		
Deputy Graham	Deputy de Lisle		
Deputy Green	Deputy Langlois		
Deputy Le Tocq	Deputy de Sausmarez		
Deputy Dudley-Owen	Deputy Roffey		
Deputy Soulsby	Alderney Rep. Snowdon		
Deputy Oliver	Deputy Tindall		
Alderney Rep. Roberts	Deputy Brehaut		
Deputy Ferbrache	Deputy Tooley		
Deputy Kuttelwascher			

The Bailiff: Well, the voting on the guillotine motion was 18 in favour, with 17 against and 1 abstention, so debate is closed.

Deputy Tindall may reply to the debate.

Deputy Tindall: Thank you, sir.

I want to start by addressing Deputy Lowe's, Deputy Le Tocq's and Deputy Leadbeater's comments, although adequately, in fact very substantially, rebutted, the question about airing our threats and vulnerabilities, I absolutely made clear in the speech that, as highlighted, this is a question of consideration by the Committee, not airing any – and it is not just threats and vulnerabilities, because to be honest I think they are generally understood, it is how we deal with them that is the thing that you should not air because that is giving a way in and defeats the whole point.

But that is not what I am asking for. Deputy Langlois was very clear about that. We need to know that it has been done. It does not appear to be done, so therefore we ask for it to be revisited.

Deputy Langlois also pointed out that this is really all the defence from the sursis motiv   that we had from Members of the committee who did speak.

Now for me the other point is the question of publication. Again, as I said in the speech, it was the choice of Home Affairs to publish this, it is not something that they have to do; again, it is within their mandate, but they have chosen to publish it. So therefore it is for us to endorse and therefore it is, as Deputy Prow quite rightly pointed out as one of his learning points, it is our responsibility, it is the whole of us here who are responsible to ensure it is what it is. Again that is why I consider it is not up to Home Affairs to go back and to actually rewrite this, as Deputy Kuttelwascher implied, let them get on with it, I am not really interested. That is my phraseology.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Sir, point of order and correction.

865 I never said I am not interested, and I really reject that comment. If I was not interested I would not have said anything.

Deputy Tindall: The lack of interest was not in the topic but in the content and that is why it is my phraseology.

870 From my perspective, Deputy Kuttelwascher made it absolutely clear that he felt it was up to Home Affairs to decide on the content and therefore it is up to them whether they add to it or... and that to me is the implication that I came to.

875 Anyway the other aspect that was raised by Deputy Lowe and also Deputy Ferbrache was the costs. Now I would like to just briefly read from an email I sent on 3rd December at 3.02 p.m. 'Dear Mary and Committee, My apologies for the delay,' – and that actually was due to an IT problem which I add my grateful thanks to H.M. Comptroller who actually ended up sending the sursis motivé to be lodged because my computer died the whole day. So I am very grateful to him but I continue: 'Please find attached the sursis motivé in respect of the Bailiwick Security Policy. I have forwarded this to the Law Officers first thing this morning but unfortunately have not heard from them yet.'

880 Now that was also true although that did arrive shortly after and again I apologise for the delay in getting it to the Law Officers: 'Although we do not believe that it has, for completeness, please can you advise whether or not you consider it has a financial impact?' That was my question. So in response at 16.51 the same day from Mary I got a reply. Unfortunately because of this problem with my computer I got a reply from Mary saying: 'Sorry Dawn...' [*inaudible*]

885 So the request was received, the request was sent and 10 days we have had to have that information to inform the Assembly.

For me though, however, I still stand by the comment that actually the cost is not material as implied because the information should be and is available. Deputy Lowe implied that in one of her interjections.

890 Also there is plenty of information already prepared by other jurisdictions, hence we would ask for that to be included as well.

The point really and I think I want to head towards is what this point is about. We did not ask for this policy to be presented. As it is presented we do not ask for a discussion in public on these threats and vulnerabilities. I refer to the three-page summary in – I am not giving way – in the –

895 **Deputy Leadbeater:** Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Leadbeater.

900 **Deputy Leadbeater:** Deputy Tindall says that she does not want to discuss the threats and vulnerabilities but it might not say that in the Propositions but she certainly refers to it in her explanatory note, so unless somebody else wrote this explanatory note for her that must be her intention.

905 **Deputy Tindall:** Sir, that is not a point of correction, but the point is the threats and vulnerabilities to be assessed and how they are dealt with is something that we could deal with *in camera*, Deputy Le Tocq has mentioned it; we could actually come back here as a Committee. So for me we have got all these options, we can do what this Assembly feels is appropriate, and I am very grateful for many of the speakers who have understood where I am coming from, where Deputy Merrett is coming from – that we are not happy to endorse the content of this document. Of course that is an option. We have had some who have said that they might not support the sursis but they cannot endorse this document.

Now for me – and I thank Deputy Fallaize for his assistance with this because we did discuss it several weeks ago; in fact I think it was about four weeks ago, we discussed the possibility of laying

915 an amendment, we talked it through – very briefly I have to say, we arranged to talk in greater detail
and that did not happen – but fundamentally I did think about laying an amendment, but I do not
have the information available. I have asked a colleague in the Isle of Man, I asked a colleague in
Jersey to send me their national security strategy or policy. I have not had a reply, okay, yet; we are
all on a bit of a short timeline because of the two close together States' meetings, but again it is
920 not for me ... if it is not on their website, it is not for me to go sorting this out. I do not think it is
something that should be drafted by an individual without the resources of a committee. So I thank
Deputy Prow for pointing that out but for me the best thing to do is to ask the Committee to
reconsider in the light of the points we have raised.

In the light of the many issues that I have raised in my speech and has been reiterated that are
not included, climate change, health, these are things that the Assembly have asked all committees
925 to consider when bringing policies to this Assembly – just two to mention, *just two*, as I say.

Now I think the point about not going into greater depths and consideration of wider issues was
summed up succinctly by Deputy Fallaize.

But I would like to go back to Deputy Prow and his learning points, because to be fair, those two
learning points – and he kindly sent me as part of this conversation, reminded me of his attendance
930 and sent me the document again, and this is the curious thing, the two learning points that he
mentioned were actually in my speech. They were in the Atlantic Council's Think Tank, they were:
security of citizens is the first duty of parliaments, yes it has to endorse, it is all our responsibility;
that is what I said. It should not be reactive and should not deal with issues after they have arisen,
it should adapt and build. Yes, that is the point, but his conclusion is that this document is a good
935 starting point. It is not my conclusion, because there is no point in it, and this is why I think it needs
to go back and deal with it again.

Now I did mention also in my speech about what we were told it was going to be, and this is the
Bailiwick Law Enforcement, the business plan element – I am sorry, I do not think it was called
specifically that, but it was put in the P&R Plan as to what exactly –

940 **Deputy Leadbeater:** Sir, point of order.

The Bailiff: Point of order or point of correction?

945 **Deputy Leadbeater:** I think it is a point of order.
I think this is another speech instead of replying to debate.

Deputy Tindall: I am summing up.

950 **The Bailiff:** I think Deputy Tindall is replying.

Deputy Tindall: I am. I have referred to every single person by name and I will continue, sir. Is
that okay?

955 **The Bailiff:** You may reply to the debate, yes.

Deputy Tindall: Thank you, sir.

So as I was saying, these two points that Deputy Prow raised are indeed covered and what I said
in the report, and for me the Home Affairs element is what they have said they will do, is also
960 something that needs to be looked at and it is clearly not in there because we need to support and
build on something.

I think the other element is that we are not dealing with this in a vacuum, that is not again what
Deputy Prow said, and I do not think that is the point because there was consultation and the
consultation responses, as has been highlighted by Deputy Soulsby, were not necessarily taken into
965 account. They may have good reason but I do not agree.

So to actually look at the different types of policies and strategies, again this was not actually something that was particularly picked up on but again what Deputy Lowe said in another interjection, she was saying, 'Well it was a starting point. A huge amount of work has been looked at. What needs to be done? How long is a piece of string? We have to have security.' That is not in dispute; what we are talking about is how we do it. That is what is missing and it is this golden thread that Deputy Langlois referred to again in reference to my speech and I think that is an extremely important element to support the people on the ground who need this in order to be able to fulfil the requirements.

The one thing I think that I will leave on is the points made by several people about not voting for the sursis but also not voting, not endorsing this Bailiwick security policy. Deputy Tooley even referred to the possibility of withdrawal and, to be honest, that was a possibility because the reason we put in – I have explained why we did not put in an amendment – but the reason we put in a sursis is because it is embarrassing if we do not endorse a public document that is a national security policy. I wanted to give them a chance to go back and look at it again. But I think we will have to. If you do not give that direction with a sursis motivé and approve the sursis motivé we will have on record that we did not endorse this national security policy produced under the mandate of Home Affairs, and that is shame.

I hope my colleagues here will realise that I have given them this way out, with the help of Deputy Merrett, and I hope that they support the sursis motivé and we come back with a document that is worthy of its name.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Members, it is time to vote on the sursis motivé proposed by Deputy Tindall, seconded by Deputy Merrett, and we have a request for a recorded vote.

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 12, Contre 25, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3

POUR

Deputy Gollop
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Merrett
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel
Deputy Dorey
Deputy McSwiggan
Deputy Langlois
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut

CONTRE

Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Trott
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Tooley

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Inder
Deputy Paint

The Bailiff: Well, the voting on the sursis motivé proposed by Deputy Tindall, seconded by
995 Deputy Merrett, was 12 in favour, with 25 against. I declare it lost.
So we come to general debate.
Does anybody wish to speak in general debate? Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Sir, thank you.
1000 I support and endorse the Committee for Home Affairs in taking this initiative in the area of
Bailiwick security forward at this time, because as I see it, it will serve as a high level statement from
the Bailiwick of our jurisdiction's commitment to keep Islanders, visitors and businesses safe and
secure.

I understand of course the concerns of the sursis and the frustrations perhaps of some of the
1005 people that put that forward and the people that supported that because this is an area where one
would like a lot of additional detail. On the other hand, we have been blessed with so many
strategies of recent time that have taken so long to produce and basically they have not come
forward, the Discrimination Strategy, the SWBIC piece, they go into such detail that you never get
a start.

1010 This is a good start, it is crisp, it is short, it is readable. Now whether it does everything is another
matter! (*Laughter*) But it is a good start and I would like to continue to say that the security policy
sets out the core overarching security framework, if you like, which we need to elaborate on.

This is a high level statement, as Deputy Lowe has stated, and it is that Committee's responsibility
to keep Islanders, visitors and businesses safe and secure.

1015 I note, however, that there has been some given assurance that Jersey has been shared in with
this particular high level statement and I just feel also that summary document should be passed
on to the UK, unless they already have it in terms of the work that you have been progressing with
them. But I think it is important that they see it too. Also that it is developed of course more fully
than what appears to be in the summary position.

1020 Sir, this to me is a very high priority, as Guernsey is so open to the outside and we have had
recent, of course, military occupation here and as such that particular element is referred to in the
document that is before us through 1940-45.

So, much depends really on the UK, sir, and I am pleased that the Brexit situation was brought
up because really some might fear that with Europe there was some great element of security across
1025 the Islands, but as Britain goes on its own, as the UK goes on its own forward, perhaps some may
feel that security across Europe with our tie into the UK and our experiences during the last War
might be less (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) comfortable to a number of people.

So I think it is all a matter of sleeping well at night, isn't it really? I think some of the ladies that
were putting forward the sursis, like myself sometimes, feel a little insecure from that point of view,
1030 and I will not go into it in too much detail but there is an element of losing sleep sometimes.

So I think that is important to put forward that this is a very important area for consideration
and for elaboration, sir, and I hope that that will be something that will come forward in perhaps
more than general terms in the future.

The other point I make from a western Deputy's point of view is the fact that while you can hear
1035 all the sirens (*Interjections*) belching away in Town we do not hear them in the west and what with
all this business of Island-wide this and Island-wide that, (*Interjections*) I think that we do not want
to be seen to be cut off, we want to be integrated. (*Laughter*) The fact is that we have lost our sirens
in the west and I think that is important because it is an early warning system for should anything
happen at night or any other time, that we are quite well within the loop and at the moment I would
1040 say this might be a first stage to see that everybody is secure that they hear any particular calamity
out there that needs to be addressed to the Island as a whole, well let's hear it in the west as well
as everywhere else. (**The Bailiff:** Dep)

With that point – (**The Bailiff:** Oh, sorry!) (*Laughter*) With that point, I would like due
consideration and support given to this policy letter, which it is, and I call on Members to support

1045 it as it has been referred to by Deputy Lowe, as a high level statement and something worthy of further development.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tooley.

1050

Deputy Tooley: I was not going to speak and I have been brought to my feet by Deputy de Lisle.

I find I have become more and more of a feminist the longer I have spent in the States (*Laughter and interjection*) and I think it is because my eyes have been increasingly opened to the difference in the way women and men are treated generally in society, far more than when I was living in my, I suppose, protected bubble of just being a woman in society.

I want to talk briefly about the fact that actually when we have women in government policies are made which are different to the policies that are made when women are not in government. I can see some frowns and it is wondering why I am saying this but they are; there is a difference between what women do when they are in government and what happens when only men are in government.

But I really resent the implication that this is being raised as an issue, as a sursis and as a discussion topic, because there are women who are ladies more likely to be quaking in their beds worrying about our security than anybody else! I resent that implication because I think all members of our society, be they male or female or whatever point they are at along the not wanting to be gender specified, have reason to be concerned about the security and safety of our Island.

We have reason to be concerned and to want to be assured that somebody somewhere has asked the big questions and come to conclusions about what the level of risk is and what the need for balancing that risk is with the need to be open and inclusive and so on. We need to know that somebody is looking after that, and that is not to suggest that we are lying in our beds hoping somebody somewhere has got a baseball bat to go down the scary stairs because we have heard a noise. That is not what this is about. This is about the fact that we as elected officials, some of whom are men, are in a position where it is our responsibility to check on behalf of our populous that somebody is doing that.

I have always believed and believe that the Committee *for* Home Affairs are responsible for doing that and that the Committee *for* Home Affairs will do that, and I am happy to believe that.

But when someone says to me, 'I just want you to sign off that you are happy with what I am doing,' and they hand me a piece of paper and I look at it and think this is the point where they are saying to me, 'I want you to share responsibility. I want you to say that what I am doing is enough so that if something happens and everybody says, "How on earth could this happen?" I can say but we all agreed it.'

Well, I cannot agree this. I cannot agree that this answers those questions, because there is not enough detail in there to tell me that those things have been considered. I do not need to know in a public forum what was considered and what the outcome of that was and what the balance was but I need to know it has been considered, and it is not there, so I cannot endorse it.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut and then Deputy Smithies.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you, sir.

That was a very good speech by Deputy Tooley. I do not want to detract from it at all but I will be quaking in my bed under Island-wide voting knowing that I could be canvassed at any time by Deputy de Lisle! (*Laughter and interjections*) I am sure he will venture out of the west on that occasion.

Can I just thank Deputy Lowe first of all for not voting for the guillotine (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and when people are about to speak possibly in favour of the sursis she was still prepared to let it go and I just make an observation I do not generally vote for guillotines but I did yesterday,

but the prevalence of and the repetition of that Rule I think is something that SACC might want to look at at some point.

1100 But Deputy Lowe yesterday used language such as 'open and transparent', 'protect the community'. She referred to external relations, she spoke about 'safe and secure'. Yet Proposition 6, with regard to the SACC policy letter, spoke about having external observers on our election to say that it was secure, that it was unhindered, that it was a free and fair election and that any security considerations could be covered off by people who were independent. Deputy Lowe on the *aux voix* was the only person to vote against election observers.

1105 So there is more than one interpretation of safe and secure and we should not always see it with such a narrow focus, because sometimes you can be a little too possessive, a little too insular, and in doing so actually introduce threats if you are not too careful.

1110 Deputy Soulsby said the policy letter was so brief to the point of being meaningless. I think it was brief, I think the average Christmas cracker comes with a longer explanatory note than the policy letter, which is unfortunate because there could have been a bit more detail in it that could possibly have avoided the sursis.

1115 But I just want to make a very general point, regardless of the incumbents or the Members of Home Affairs, there is always a risk when politicians join Home Affairs they essentially become virtual policemen. It has happened before, the role they take on they see the information they have, the information they are given, the papers that they see, the conversations that they have, they become sort of virtual policemen.

1120 On that other Liberation Day, 2nd May 1997 in Sedgefield when Tony Blair romped home – those were the days – he said that he was tough on crime and the causes of crime, and I think this is what is lacking in this type of security; it is the causes of crime, it is the social justice, it is the social policy, we do not want you to have to deal with so much crime, so deal with the causes. And that is the problem I think at times, is that the virtual policemen role, the safe and secure, seeing the threats, rather than let's eliminate the threats by doing things in a slightly different way and even eliminate some of the policing.

1125 I come to this Assembly time and time again talking about coastal defences and we share with you, E&I, on a regular basis the threats to security, for example, through failing coastal defences, so we know environmentally there are other threats out there and it is the very narrow focus on safe and secure that needs to be broadened out when we have these discussions, sir.

I will not be supporting this policy letter.

Thank you.

1130

The Bailiff: Deputy Smithies.

Deputy Smithies: I would like to assure the Assembly and anyone else who might happen to be listening that I am not any sort of policeman, virtual or otherwise! (*Laughter*)

1135 I rise simply to confirm my support for the policy letter and in so doing to seek to correct an impression which may inadvertently have been suggested by Deputy Merrett that the policy letter was endorsed by only three Members of Home Affairs. My name is appended to that policy letter so clearly I do endorse it.

1140 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, I was undecided about this whole issue when I walked into the Chamber this morning. I did not know if I was going to support this policy letter or not. I did not know if I was going to support the sursis or not.

1145 But once Deputy Tindall had pointed out that what is lacking from the policy letter is a much needed golden thread, and once Deputy McSwiggan had made what I thought was a absolutely superb speech nailing all the weaknesses in the policy letter, I then knew I needed to support the

sursis, because if the sursis did not get the support it needed to succeed then we are left with the policy letter.

1150 It is because it lacks that golden thread that is needed and it is because it has numerous weaknesses and flaws, as already pointed out by Deputy McSwiggan, I am afraid I cannot support this policy letter.

Thank you, sir.

1155 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: Thank you, sir.

I want to ask Deputy Lowe a question which I would appreciate if she could respond to. She said in her opening speech and in the reference in the policy letter that she had referred to the UK, Jersey and Isle of Man. I have just been informed by Jersey: 'Our Head of Justice & Home Affairs here has confirmed that there is no such equivalent document or policy in Jersey.' So I would just like confirmation as to what document she actually saw and maybe it was the document I saw, which was the strategic policy framework which deals with just assets and not national security. I just would like clarity on that please from Deputy Lowe, because to me this does come to the point that was raised as whether we need one or not to be actually endorsed by the States no matter how good or bad it is, which we have had that discussion.

1165 I should also like to say that I did take issue with what Deputy de Lisle said as well about us quaking in our boots, and I also took issue about, 'Oh, that is not what he meant!' which is what were the comments and mutterings around.

1170 We must be extremely careful with what we say. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) (*Laughter*) We must careful with how it is interpreted because we have people listening and we must also allow people to be able to ensure that they are not misinterpreted, because that is also an inference that is unfair; and I think that that is something that we should be very much more aware of than in our average daily lives as the effect of what we say and how it can be interpreted.

1175 So for me I am not going to repeat –

Deputy de Lisle: Sir, on a point of correction.

1180 **The Bailiff:** Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Sir, I was speaking of my own fears that were reflected in what I had heard other people saying.

Thank you, sir.

1185 **Deputy Tindall:** Again, *Hansard* is something that we wait for for a while but may give Deputy de Lisle reflection on what we were talking about there.

As I say, I obviously will not repeat all of the reasons; it is shame this Assembly did not take the opportunity to defer. I get the drift that a lot of people, whether it is a majority or not, will choose to reject this request for endorsement, but I really do feel that this should have been done with an eye on the purpose and also to fulfil what was in the P&R Plan, what they said they were going to do in respect of providing this framework for the Bailiwick Law Enforcement. As no one from Home Affairs has commented, I am assuming that they are doing that as a separate piece of work and have changed their mind and they are not doing in accordance with the P&R Plan, they are not doing it having looked at other jurisdictions because they would have realised that obviously the risk assessment was a summary in the UK version of three pages and not the full gamut which is what seemed to be the impression and also –

1195 I give way to Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you, sir.

1200 Just to confirm that Home Affairs are looking at that as another document, it is not this, it is another document.

1205 **Deputy Tindall:** I am grateful for Deputy Oliver, considering that is the only indication that we have had from the P&R Plan of what we were intending to expect. That clarification, it is a shame that all of these golden threads were not brought together when it was initially presented, but we get there in the end.

But there are elements that I would be grateful for, for Deputy Lowe to clarify what actual international or local documents of other jurisdictions have been reviewed. But for me, I too am unable to endorse a document that although is an international document, I just cannot do so.

1210 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Merrett: I will be quite brief, sir.

1215 Two things really, the first thing is I think there are some lessons to be learned to have something in the public domain before this Assembly has actually endorsed in the first place. I think that gives me some cause for concern, if that is indeed the case. I will look forward to Deputy Lowe summing up and advising us if that is the case, and if that is wise going forward.

1220 The other thing is I have been listening quite intently to the debate and I heard some Members saying about, and I think also the President saying, it is a first step in this process and we will build on this document – I will be brief – I fear houses that are built on sand, and I do not think this is a good enough foundation to build anything on, and therefore I cannot and will not endorse this appendix 1, titled a policy.

1225 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Laurie Queripel.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

I just wondered if Deputy Brehaut was referring to the Tony Blair that went to war on a false premise, but I am pretty sure that he was.

1230 Sir, during the sursis debate I think the most interesting exchange that took place was between Deputy Langlois and Deputy Lowe, because Deputy Langlois made some good points but I think at the core of his contribution was a question to Deputy Lowe and I think Deputy Lowe sort of answered it but it was not a clear answer.

1235 I think what Deputy Langlois was saying was can Deputy Lowe assure us that the work listed in the sursis was taking place, is taking place. She did say something like, 'These things are constantly under review,' but I think if the Assembly could get a very clear unambiguous assurance that all these works have taken place, are taking place, and will continue to take place, it may provide the Assembly or the Members that have supported the sursis and are concerned about the policy letter light, it may provide those Members with some assurance.

1240 So I think if Deputy Lowe or any other Member of Home Affairs who has not spoken can say very clearly these things are, and have been, considered and are under constant consideration, then that might help, I think.

1245 But the other puzzling thing about that would be when Deputy Lowe opened debate she said if all this work took place it would come at a considerable cost. Now it has got to be one or the other. If this work is taking place then that is a business-as-usual type of situation and therefore there must have been some money spent on that work. If it has not taken place or if it could take place without too much cost, I think we need to know that as well.

1250 So when the sursis said that it did not think there was much in the way of cost implications in regard to this work I think that we need some clarity on that. Is this work taking place, is it coming at a cost, or is it included in the budget of Home Affairs as business as usual, or will there be some costs to the work if it has to take place. So I think we need some –

I give way to Deputy Leadbeater, sir.

Deputy Leadbeater: Sir, I thank Deputy Laurie Queripel for giving way.

1255 I can give him reassurance that the work to undertake the analysis reflecting vulnerabilities etc. is something which is constantly ongoing at Home Affairs, constantly ongoing.

So I think the cost implications come in when we have to put everything together into a report and bring it back to the States. But you can rest assured that all these pieces of work, all these things are constantly going on. It is not something which you just do this piece of work and you walk away from it, you constantly re-evaluate your threats and your vulnerabilities.

1260 Thank you.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: I thank Deputy Leadbeater for that contribution, sir.

1265 So what we need is some assurance I think that all this work is taking place, he says that it is, but it is being pulled together in a cohesive package to create a proper policy and strategy.

I give way to Deputy Prow, sir.

Deputy Prow: I thank Deputy Queripel for giving way.

1270 I can no longer speak on behalf of the Committee for Home Affairs but what I can speak to the Assembly about is from my background. As far as Law Enforcement is concerned, their bread and butter is assessing risk and mitigating making that risk.

If you take financial crime, for example, which is a threat and risk in this Bailiwick there are clear strategies. What was missing and what is the learning point I found from the conference I attended is that it was not endorsed at a high political level by Government and by parliament. Now what I believe is that this is the start of that process, so I think the bread of butter of what we deliver around security which is appropriate to this Bailiwick is being done; risk assessments are being done and are being mitigated against on the ground.

1275 Although it is a long time since I had a proper job, I can assure you that that process goes on. What has not happened is that there is a high level strategic endorsement of it. I believe that this is the beginning.

1280 I do not know if that helps.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: It helps to some extent, sir. I think we could do with Deputy Lowe just confirming those points that have been made by other Members.

1285 Also, sir, I was very interested in the points made by Deputy McSwiggan during the sursis debate as well, because yes, I want the Island to be safe and secure and I want appropriate measures and safeguards in place to ensure that, but I do not want the unnecessary heavy hand of Law Enforcement to be laid on the citizens or the population of this Island that would inhibit or impose upon normal and acceptable civil liberties and rights.

1290 So anyway those are my points, sir. I am just looking for Deputy Lowe just to flesh out or confirm some of the points that have been made by her colleagues, or ex-colleague in Deputy Prow's case.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater.

1295

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

I am just going to read out some parts of the policy letter that should explain exactly where we are and what this is all about.

The Committee's primary purpose is to ensure that our Bailiwick is a safe and secure place to live and do business. This is reflected in our key governmental priorities as set out in the Policy & Resource Plan. The Policy & Resource Plan (2017 Review and 2018 Update) advised that the Committee would be producing an overarching 'Bailiwick Security Policy' which would serve as a high level statement from the Bailiwick of our jurisdiction's commitment to keep Islanders, visitors and businesses safe and secure. The Bailiwick Security Policy is a high level statement of our Committee's commitment

to keep islanders, visitors and businesses safe and secure. The policy objectives highlight the broader security environment and will need to mature over time. These high-level policy objectives will be delivered in conjunction with stakeholders within and outside of the Committee, and will be developed and supported by more detailed plans.

1300 So just setting out, sir, this is a high level statement and there will be more details to follow it, and it is all there within the policy letter.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe will reply to the debate.

1305 **Deputy Lowe:** Thank you, sir.

I will start by covering the area where Deputy Laurie Queripel wanted that assurance. I can assure Members that actually many of the issues that have been considered are covered in the sursis but what we are actually saying here – and what I can do, I can send something offered by email to Members, but equally it may be that Members would like a briefing, in which case I am more than
1310 happy to put that on and invite Members to a briefing to be able to assist you, because what is in the sursis can and does take place; but for the amount that they are asking for in that sursis is actually a larger project and we do not have the resources to do all of that, it extends further than the everyday and the updating. As I say, we could explain that to you either by email or, as I say, I think we can probably go into a little bit more detail if you would like to attend a briefing.

1315 But it is important that it is recognised. This is high level and it has been repeated by quite a few in this Assembly that they recognise this is high level: you have not got that detail in there because the clue is in the word it is high level. But we are doing lots more.

The next report, as I said just before, is one of those that will fall out from this strategy. We have lots of different strategies that are taking place. There is a lot of work going on which I mentioned
1320 in my statement two days ago for the justice policy which will be coming before you; security is part of that as well, there is an element of that. It is a huge report. So we do have a lot going on, but we have to be realistic. For the amount of work that was looked at in the sursis – which we take on board and we recognise there is still more to do – we have not got the resources. Most of you are on committees, you are all fully aware you have got to prioritise. We do prioritise, security is right
1325 at the top of that prioritisation, but it is managed on a daily basis and being able to do projects picking them off at a time of what needs to come to the forefront.

So I do ask Members, those that have said that they will not actually support the strategy, it is high level and I do ask that you do that, you do support it because it is important that we have got the top high level strategy in place and the other things drop down from that. It would be wrong
1330 for us to come here with a strategy that had absolutely everything in it, because if we did that it would not be now, it would be in the future because we would not be able to do everything; we cannot do everything now to actually have it in front of you.

So I am grateful for Deputy de Lisle who was quick on his feet to point that out as well, right at the very beginning there. I am grateful as well for Deputy Smithies pointing out to Deputy Merrett
1335 all five Members signed this Report. As you know, it was criticised or there were comments made, I think it was the last debate or last month or month before or whenever it was, why we had it when they were not absent. So if we are all there it is very clear we are all there. They are on a different page, Deputy Merrett, you were looking at page 4. If you look at page –

Deputy Merrett: Sir, could I remind the Mother of the House to speak through the Chair, please?

Deputy Lowe: Pardon?

The Bailiff: She has asked that you speak through the chair.

Deputy Lowe: Yes, certainly I will do.

In reference to Deputy Merrett, it has got three of the names on page 4, but if Deputy Merrett was to look at page 5 it has got Deputy Le Pelley and Deputy Smithies, nobody absent or marked absent with this. They all signed off this Report. An easy mistake to make when you see it is on a different page.

The question was actually said by Deputy Tindall about Jersey. Yes, Jersey do have a strategy but it is a – hang on – it is a Jersey States' strategy for the States of Jersey; it is not and does not go beyond looking at when you are talking about the likes of the military defence – none of that is in that. It is a very small strategy that they have got in place for the States of Jersey. It is not –

Deputy Tindall: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: I have been told that they have not got a strategy. They have a strategy on assets, documentation. It is not the fact that they have not got the information, it is they have not got one.

Deputy Lowe: That is what I have just said. They have not got a strategy that covers the whole Island of Jersey and beyond for all the security because it does not cover military, but they do have a form of a strategy. That is the information that I have been given from the States of Jersey via our staff. I am more than happy to go and have a look and come back and assist you with that one if it is any different.

So as I say, sir, I do not think there is much I can add to this. It really is a high level strategy. I just ask Members to bear with us. Those that have been on Home Affairs previously, as Deputy Le Tocq mentioned earlier on and I thank him for his support on that. It is completely different and we will be carrying on with that work and we will be bringing other reports back to this States. You have got the big justice one coming after this, if you will kindly support this strategy now, we have got the Telecoms one coming. It is vital that we have got that Telecoms Strategy in place and to be able to do that we must have the high level one in place as well.

Nobody should be dismissing the high level one when you think about how telecoms affects everything in Guernsey and our Bailiwick.

I ask Members to support the strategy please.

The Bailiff: We vote then on the Bailiwick Security Policy (*Interjections*) with a recorded vote.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 23, Contre 13, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 3

POUR

Deputy Gollop
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Trott
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy St Pier

CONTRE

Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Merrett
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel
Deputy Dorey
Deputy McSwiggan
Deputy Langlois

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Laurie Queripel

ABSENT

Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Inder
Deputy Paint

Deputy Stephens	Deputy Soulsby
Deputy Meerveld	Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Lowe	Deputy Roffey
Deputy Smithies	Deputy Tindall
Deputy Graham	Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Green	Deputy Tooley
Deputy Le Tocq	
Deputy Brouard	
Deputy Dudley-Owen	
Deputy de Lisle	
Deputy Prow	
Deputy Oliver	
Alderney Rep. Roberts	
Alderney Rep. Snowden	
Deputy Ferbrache	
Deputy Kuttelwascher	

1385 **The Bailiff:** Well the voting on the Bailiwick Security Policy was 23 in favour, with 13 against and 1 abstention. I declare it carried.

COMMITTEE FOR HOME AFFAIRS

XIX. The Telecommunications Supply Chain Security Framework – Approved as amended

Article XIX.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the 'Telecommunications Supply Chain Security Framework' Policy Letter dated 28th October, 2019 they are of the opinion:

1. To endorse the Telecommunications Supply Chain Security Framework.

The Senior Deputy Greffier: Article XIX, Committee for Home Affairs – Telecommunications Supply Chain Security Framework.

1390 **The Bailiff:** The President, Deputy Lowe, will open the debate.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

1395 As a community the Bailiwick has become reliant on digital technology both in business and private life, it is a backbone to all modern communications. Ensuring digital connectivity is one of the Policy & Resource Plan's top policy objectives. Also one of the three key objectives of the Committee for Economic Development's the Future of Telecoms Strategy is the provision of the next generation mobile technology in line or earlier than the UK.

1400 However, the range of security risks and threats that the global threat to environment poses to telecoms networks is expanding. It is therefore in the Bailiwick's economic and reputational interest to ensure that the telecoms network operates to the appropriate standards of security.

The responsibility for the management of pan-Island telecom security and resilience risk is currently shared between the States of Guernsey and the Channel Islands Competition Regulatory Authority (CICRA) and the licenced telecom operators.

1405 CICRA is responsible for ensuring that telecoms operators take appropriate measures to safeguard the security and resilience of the Bailiwick's telecoms network and services.

The proposed Telecommunications Supply Chain Security Framework approach has been developed in liaison with stakeholders to set Bailiwick telecoms security standards and guide CICRA

and the licensed telecom operators in their requirements and responsibilities, particularly in the context of the integrity of the equipment and software they use.

1410 This framework will align with the UK government's position regarding the use of new technology and will seek to ensure that security standards in the Bailiwick are, in as far as possible and practical, as high as those in the UK.

1415 It will need to be revised and updated as necessary over the course of time. The introduction of 5G is expected to transform the way we live, work and travel and deliver significant economic and social benefits. However, this rapidly changing technology world makes it even more critical for the Bailiwick to ensure the underpinning infrastructure is safe and secure.

1420 The intent is that any spectrum allocation licensing must have regard to what is good practice in terms of the telecommunications systems components. The telecommunications infrastructure security guidance document that sits below the framework will set out in more detail the security requirements of telecom providers.

It should be noted that without approval of the Telecommunications Supply Chain Security Framework and associated guidance documentation, it will be extremely problematic for supply chain security standards to be set for telecoms operators. This will directly impact on the ability of CICRA to rely on these when it is dealing with spectrum allocations in 2020 or thereafter.

1425 Sir, the Committee asks the States to support the proposed approach in respect of setting supply chains standards for telecom operators.

Thank you, sir.

1430 **The Bailiff:** We have an amendment to be proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez, seconded by Deputy Merrett.

Deputy de Sausmarez.

Amendment.

In Proposition 1, immediately after the word "Framework" to insert:

", noting that this endorsement shall not be construed as support for any given policy direction on 5G or telecoms"

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

1435 This amendment is brief and I very much hope that the debate will also be brief bearing in mind the proximity to lunch apart from anything else.

It quite simply adds in a clarification to the Proposition which is to endorse the framework and the addition that the amendment suggests is to note:

... noting that this endorsement shall not be construed as support for any given policy direction on 5G or telecoms.

1440 I would really like to stress this is not an opportunity, or it is not the right forum, to launch into a debate on telecoms policy or 5G or anything like that. This is a very simple point of principle, I suppose, and it really comes down to an issue of governance.

Deputy Green is often reminding us that this States, we all of us share responsibility for scrutiny and I just think it is important that we do not inadvertently wave a policy through the back door without giving it that scrutiny that it deserves.

1445 I make absolutely no comment on policies that have already been published, I am simply making the point that the policy has not been debated or endorsed by this Assembly and I think certainly that is a matter for another day, but I think this just adds in a useful clarification that endorsement of the Telecommunications Supply Chain Security Framework is not the same thing as an endorsement of the telecoms policy that it cites.

1450 So it really is a simple as that. I really would like to urge against getting into an uninformed debate without the proper information (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) in front of us today. It really is a very straightforward issue of governance and I very much hope that it will be supported and I am pleased to note that the Committee *for* Home Affairs is not opposing this amendment.

Thank you.

1455

The Bailiff: Deputy Merrett, do you second the amendment?

Deputy Merrett: I do, sir.

1460

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe, do you wish to speak?

Deputy Lowe: Sir, I do.

1465

I just want to confirm – Deputy Lindsay de Sausmarez has just mentioned it – by a majority the Home Affairs do not oppose this amendment. But security in this particular area is more important than ever with our near total reliance on the internet, mobile phones and related telecommunications solutions.

1470

We know, for example, that 5G connectivity is already being trialled with a potential for rollout locally in 2020. It is recognised that 5G brings out optimism and trepidation in people in seemingly equal measure. It is in many quarters seen as essential to our future digital connectivity and the ability of the Bailiwick to keep pace with other economies and our competitor jurisdictions. However, and I need to emphasise this point the Committee *for* Home affairs is neutral on the choice of technology. From Home Affairs' perspective we mind not whether it is 3G, 4G, 5G or 6G or whatever; our focus at Home Affairs must be in accordance with the policy before you today that the Island puts in place a framework that ensures Bailiwick security is integral to our telecommunications infrastructure.

1475

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Smithies.

1480

Deputy Smithies: Thank you, sir.

It will soon become clear why it is not by a majority of Home Affairs; I think I am the minority.

1485

I find this amendment another waste of time, it is a mischievous amendment in that it seeks to turn a straightforward policy letter into a prejudicial document. The amendment introduces a negative slant to 5G implementation, it had better never have been laid but a more even-handed neutral approach would have been, to use the phrase, support for or opposition to any given policy.

It requires a particularly and peculiarly partisan interpretation of this security related policy letter to read into it any endorsement of 5G technology.

1490

As Deputy de Sausmarez acknowledges, the policy letter does not speak for or against 5G. This amendment clearly speaks against it and is politically motivated. We will debate 5G introduction in due time. This is not the place or time to anticipate the outcome of that debate. The amendment is unnecessary and should be rejected.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

1495

Deputy Kuttelwascher: I am just going to stand to say I support the amendment.

The Bailiff: Nobody else is rising to speak.

Deputy de Sausmarez will reply.

1500

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

I am not sure there is an awful lot to reply to except the one issue that Deputy Smithies raises.

1505

I would actually like to say and put on the record that certainly I very much hope that this is not loaded politically but I think on the surface the request for a more neutral phrasing is a reasonable one and I agree with that. I certainly would not like to imply any particular take on any policy but I think including the words 'opposition to', 'does not imply support for or opposition to' the

framework would not make sense in the context because the framework cites that very policy, so it just would not make semantic sense to include it. I know Deputy Smithies is in the same high bracket as me with his semantic pedantry – (*Laughter*) and I say that in the most complimentary sense. He and I have some conversations I am sure no-one else would find interesting, but yes, maybe we can discuss – Oh, and Deputy Le Pelley is adding himself to the gang, so!

But, so I do take his point and I would like to say for the record this is not a politically charged statement and it certainly does not confer any of my personal opinions and I would hope anyone who chooses to support it, it is simply a point of principle and I very much hope that the Assembly resoundingly supports it.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: We vote then on the amendment proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez, seconded by Deputy Merrett. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.

General debate, does anybody wish to –? Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I had a couple ... although I think probably people were generally more pleased about this States' Report than perhaps the other one.

The thing is it is certainly hard to understand Blockchain ideas and Telecommunications Supply Chain Security Framework is, and there is an argument to discuss this in a wider context, as Deputy de Sausmarez has already intimated in one, in relation to telecommunications strategy.

Two points that I pick up from the Report though. The first is – I am being pedantic now, a bit like Deputy Smithies and Deputy Le Pelley and the others – but in paragraph 2.1 of the Report, the opening report, it says:

The ... [Committee for Home Affairs] primary purpose through all its policies is to ensure the Bailiwick remains safe and secure. However, safety and security takes various forms. No longer is security determined by the height of fences, or the strength of the ... [paddock] or the might of the security guard but it is increasingly associated with the need to protect data, digital connectivity and telecom networks generally, and minimising any vulnerabilities.

It sounds a bit like a narration to a sort of TV documentary with a gravelly voiced actor reciting it, but the thing is in reality there are still security issues which are determined by the height of fences. One could think, for example, of a certain cultivation of a plant in various parts of the Island or strength of the paddock, might of the security guard, and people are still warned by insurance companies to think of security at many different levels. So I think it is rather a sweeping statement for a document of this nature.

The other point is perhaps more of a debating argument that the document very much wishes Guernsey to be tracking, benchmarking, keeping up with technological advances and also cyber security being, if not necessarily ahead of the game, on track; but there is always a balance between libertarianism, freedom to trade and barriers to trade, and I am not entirely sure where we put that balance, because a security minded person would take one perspective, somebody more focussed perhaps on economic development or innovation would take another, and I think if we are looking at States-wide ideas we need to somehow marry and balance the two.

But I do support the document.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: Thank you, sir.

This is a policy letter and framework which in my view has structure, clearly identifies the concerns and how the specific concerns will be addressed. For me, it does what it says on the tin – and in just over five pages.

The only question I do have which I would like to be assisted with is while the policy letter advises us that this is a subset of the Bailiwick Security Policy, it also says that the Bailiwick Security Policy is the key strategic document from which this States' approach to telecoms supply chain security is derived. I would be grateful if the President of Home Affairs can explain what parts of the Bailiwick Security Policy this framework is derived from. I see no link to the policy other than the confirmation that the Committee will seek to set standards for such telecommunication supply chain security. If this is the only derivation then I have to refer back to Deputy Heidi Soulsby's comments about how high the mountain is.

Otherwise, as I have said, I think this is a framework which is clear in its aim and I will support it.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir.

I only have one quick question for Deputy Lowe and she may or may not be able to answer it, which I full accept of course because I only want an answer which she is obviously able to give with the integrity and knowledge if she so possesses it.

It is on page 3 on 2.6, it says and I will quote it, sir, for the ease –

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Sir, I do not know under what Rule I can bring this but I do feel there is a point of order maybe to bring about what Deputy Merrett has just said and I do not think she quite intended to put it that way –

The Bailiff: I am not sure I properly heard what she was saying.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: She called into question Deputy Lowe's integrity and stated, 'If she has integrity she may be able to answer this question'. I do not know if Deputy Merrett quite intended that statement but it will be recorded as such and she may wish to rephrase that.

The Bailiff: Deputy Merrett, sorry, can you say again because I am afraid I did not hear properly?

Deputy Merrett: I cannot remember my exact words, sir, but all I was asking is, I do not know and I have not forewarned Deputy Lowe of this question, therefore if she cannot answer it in full and with integrity in full advance of notification of the question then clearly she cannot answer it, is what I was saying. I did have no intention of bringing anybody's integrity into dispute and I do not think I ever have, but if that was the impression that some Deputies had then clearly I regret that and withdraw any, if I have – but I do not honestly believe I have, to be fair. But anyway the foundation of what I am saying is if Deputy Lowe cannot answer the question I will understand that. So the question is on 2.6 on page 3 it says:

Telecommunications operators are licensed to ensure their systems, policies, procedures and the technology used provide integrity ...

– maybe that is where I got the word integrity from because I was about to read the word integrity. Maybe that is where the confusion is, in my mind anyway –

... reliability and security ...

It does not mention there public health about telecommunication operators licensing. So that is why I think maybe Deputy Lowe cannot answer the question, but if she is able to I would appreciate

1595 it. I go back to the word integrity again, rather unfortunately, maybe the integrity is meant to allude to public health, I am not sure, but it is just not mentioned and that is why I raise the question.

So if Deputy Lowe is able to answer it I would be appreciative.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

1600 **Deputy Parkinson:** Thank you, sir.

I rise simply to express the Committee *for* Economic Development's support for this policy and to outline our interest in it.

1605 Clearly, the sub text in all of this is Chinese technology and while this is an open question at the moment, it is a problem for not only the Committee but also CICRA and the telcos, a problem which does need to be resolved sooner rather than later. Some guidance from the Committee *for* Home Affairs on whether or not Chinese technology or specific Chinese technology is a security risk and should not be used by local telcos would be very appreciated and we look forward to receiving that guidance from the Committee *for* Home Affairs as soon as they are able to give it.

1610 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe will reply.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you.

1615 Yes, indeed, Deputy Parkinson, our Committees are working very closely together, as you will be fully aware, on this item, as indeed the Chief Information Officer from Policy & Resources who has been extremely helpful and covers the security area of the States of Guernsey and indeed our Bailiwick.

1620 The question was raised by Deputy Tindall asking about the part about health. This is not about health, this is about security for the telecoms so it is not a health – Was it not yourself, Deputy Tindall, sorry you are shaking and pointing your head. I thought you mentioned health, I wrote down health alongside your name, maybe it was Deputy Merrett, in which case I apologise. But it is not a health issue for us, this is about the security of the telecoms.

There are not any other questions so I just ask Members to support this Report.

1625 **The Bailiff:** We vote then on the Proposition to endorse the framework which of course has been amended by the successful amendment. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

**XX. Schedule for future States' meetings –
Approved**

Article XX.

Whether, after consideration of the attached Schedule for future States' business, which sets out items for consideration at the Meeting of the 15th January 2020 and subsequent States' Meetings, they are of the opinion to approve the Schedule.

1630 **The Senior Deputy Greffier:** Schedule for future States' meetings.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: I have nothing to add, sir.

1635

The Bailiff: I have not had notes of any amendments so I put the Schedule to you for approval. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.

Season's greetings

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

1640

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

Before you close the meeting, it seems Christmas is getting closer – although the last few days it feels like it has passed! Anyway on behalf of the States' Members, sir, I would like to wish you a very Happy Christmas and a peaceful New Year to you and to your family and be kind enough, if you would, to pass it on to His Excellency and Lady Corder. **(The Bailiff: Absolutely)**

1645

We thank you for your patience in looking after us during this year yet again. And publicly yet again thank our staff because it is always so important I think at this time of the year to recognise that our staff have been extremely supportive for us right across the States – over 5,000 of them, none of which we could actually function without any of them; they are all important to making this Island work and operate, and I thank them publicly on behalf of the States of Guernsey and wish you all a very Happy Christmas, sir.

1650

Members: Hear, hear.

1655

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe, thank you for those remarks and I just reciprocate on behalf of myself and all the staff and wish all of you and your spouses, loved ones, partners, families, a very Happy Christmas and an exciting New Year; *(Laughter)* 2020 is going to be an exciting year. Can I just say –?

1660

Alderney Representative Roberts: A Happy Christmas, sir, sorry –

The Bailiff: Thank you. Can I just say –?

Alderney Representative Roberts: Happy Christmas from the States of Alderney, sir!

1665

The Bailiff: Thank you and a Happy Christmas to everybody in Alderney as well, and particularly this Homecoming weekend, our thoughts will be with you over the Homecoming weekend.

1670

Can I just say I hope you all come back refreshed. I think there is a lot of work to be done in the final months of this term if all the policy letters that have been promised, that have not yet emerged, come along. So I suspect we will be spending many hours in this Chamber and I just invite people to think long and hard about how they can make the best use of their time here. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) I ask that as always you ensure that debate is always conducted in a good spirit with respect and courtesy to all Members. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

1675

With those thoughts I wish you well and whatever may happen in 2020, whatever your wishes may be, I hope your wishes are fulfilled next year.

So with that, I wish you all a Happy Christmas.

The Assembly adjourned at 12.12 p.m.