



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 23rd July 2021

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

Volume 10, No. 19

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

R. J. McMahon, Esq., Bailiff and Presiding Officer

Law Officers

M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Procureur)

People's Deputies

S. E. Aldwell	A. Kazantseva-Miller
C. P. A Blin	J. P. Le Tocq
A. H. Brouard	D. J. Mahoney
Y. Burford	A. D. S. Matthews
T. L. Bury	L. J. McKenna
A. Cameron	C. P. Meerveld
D. de G. de Lisle	N. G. Moakes
H. L. de Sausmarez	R. C. Murray
A. C. Dudley-Owen	C. N. K. Parkinson
J. F. Dyke	R. G. Prow
S. P. Fairclough	L. C. Queripel
S. J. Falla	P. J. Roffey
P. T. R. Ferbrache	H. J. R. Soulsby
A. Gabriel	G. A. St Pier
J. A. B. Gollop	A. W. Taylor
S. P. Haskins	L. S. Trott
M. A. J. Helyar	S. P. J. Vermeulen
N. R. Inder	

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representative E. A. J. Snowdon

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

S. M. D. Ross, Esq. (States' Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

Deputies Meerveld, St Pier and Taylor (*relevé à 9h38*);

Alderney Representative Roberts (*relevé à 10h36*);

Deputy Leadbeater (*relevé à 10h45*)

Business transacted

Evocation	1295
Billet d'État XV	1295
1. Government Work Plan 2021-25 – Debate continued	1295
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 1.15 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.</i>	<i>1340</i>
1. Government Work Plan 2021-25 – Debate continued – Propositions carried as amended	1340
Billet d'État XIV	1355
X. Secondary and Post 16 Education Reorganisation – Item deferred	1355
XI. Dates of States' Meetings 1st September 2024 to 31st August 2025 – approved as amended	1357
Emergency Powers (Coronavirus) (General Provisions) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (No. 8) Regulations, 2021 approved; Emergency Powers (Coronavirus) (Vaccine) (Limitation of Liability) (No. 8) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Regulations, 2021 approved	1363
XII. The Guernsey Financial Services Commission: 2020 Annual Report and Accounts, approved	1372
XIV. Schedule for Future States' Business, approved	1376
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 4.45 p.m.</i>	<i>1376</i>

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The States' Greffier

EVOCATION

Billet d'État XV

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

1. Government Work Plan 2021-25 – Debate continued

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

5 **Deputy Prow:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I rise, briefly, on behalf of my Committee. The Committee *for* Home Affairs is supportive of prioritising the work of Government and the development of an action plan which is owned by the Assembly.

10 The Government Work Plan is ambitious and it is important that we collectively appreciate that. Whatever version of the plan is agreed, it will be after this debate is over that the real hard work begins. This document will represent an agreement of our political direction; of equal importance is a commitment that we work together to deliver it.

15 Home Affairs is content with how its strategic priorities are represented in the Government Work Plan. Of course, as a Committee, we would like to do more: deliver quicker and invest in those opportunities today that could transform the delivery of justice services in the future. However, as a Committee, we accept the need to prioritise and phase work and, as a Government, we need to develop an ambitious but achievable plan. Simply saying that these are our priorities is not enough, however; we must work collaboratively to deliver. Essential to delivery is delivering at a pace where our community will realise the benefits of our actions

20 Allocation of resources: the Plan provides the potential financial solution, but critical will be the allocation of the human resources, the people power to deliver. Without the necessary resources, the Plan will lack the tools for actions. Delivery of this Plan must not be at the detriment of Committee responsibility to fulfil the obligations of their mandate. While service delivery may be the responsibility of operational leaders, Government has a duty to ensure that those services are
25 appropriately resourced and supported to deliver, whether that is front-line operations or the policy development that supports them.

30 Home Affairs is committed to working collaboratively, making the best possible use of resources by focusing on what will become the Assembly's plan and fulfilling its mandated responsibility for keeping the Island safe and secure. I say this in the knowledge that circumstances can change. New information may come to light that means a change of course is justified, and as a Committee, we

will look to work with Policy & Resources and, where appropriate, to advise the Assembly where there are opportunities or risks that impact on the priorities of Government.

As an Assembly, let us be disciplined when seeking to divert scarce resources, whether that is money or officers' time. Let decisions be evidence-based in the best interests of our community as a whole. The best chance the Plan has of delivering real change for our community today and in the future is if we all pull together in the same direction.

Finally, sir, I would like to say something on a personal level and perhaps venture into an area I normally leave well alone. For the avoidance of doubt, I must bust a myth – or more actually, squash a falsehood – Deputy St Pier, whose abilities I respect and know, as I worked with him last term on oversight boards and the Brexit Sub-Committee, wrote in his very privileged regular *Press* comment opportunity, only afforded to two sitting Deputies, he made the following emphatic and unambiguous statement, under the headline, 'What's in the Plan?', he alluded to certain Propositions and says:

I will do my darnedest to persuade colleagues to amend these propositions but I'm afraid you should expect them to be approved on the back of the Van Party/Guernsey Party coalition whipped vote.

This statement is completely false. He has no reason to make it, no justification for it or ability to evidence it, because it is untrue. There is no such thing as a political 'Van Party,' there is no coalition, there is no whip. This is utter nonsense. Whilst I completely support the freedom of the press, in my humble opinion, cheap, gutter opinion journalism should be reviewed by the *Press* editorial. Sir, I ask this: does this public statement offend Nolan Principles? Instead of fixating on others in this Assembly, perhaps he should shed some light on his own opaque party. How do they operate and organise to debate? (**Two Members:** Hear, hear.)

All this, sir, inhibits my plea for the States to pull together around the Government Work Plan. Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld, Deputy St Pier, Deputy Taylor, you have all arrived during the course of that speech; is it your wish to be relevée?

Deputy St Pier: Yes, please, sir.

Deputy Taylor: Yes, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much. We will mark the three of you as present. Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Thank you, sir.

This plan is extensive. £650 million requirement? The budget requirements, before detail of projects and detailed costings, it will take generations to do all of this, and asking for a blank cheque, essentially, it all has to be reduced down to what we can afford and what is reasonable to run with. More borrowing will not, actually, sit well with the public. Borrowing an extra £200 million, when £160 million of the last £330 million bond has not been placed. And then last year in April/May time, another £250 million was borrowed. This can be paid back any time, but the £330 million bond is not repayable and requires £11 million year-on-year to service the debt, as we were told by Deputy Helyar yesterday.

As I see it, sir, the Policy & Resources Committee indicates that approximately £450 million could be funded through existing reserves; that is including the utilisation of the balance of the States Bond Issue of £160 million, plus £225 million from the General Revenue Reserve. Surely, that is enough to be getting along with without going out for further borrowing.

It is one thing to borrow, it is another thing to pay back loans of the magnitude of £200 million and more. Taking on more debt, sir, is putting a huge mortgage around future generations, plus higher taxes for us now and into the future. Families are strapped with taxes and charges now

without making things worse. We are living in very uncertain times, as well. Many have lost their jobs, others are having their pay supplemented by the States, others have had to settle for less, with part-time work to make ends meet. Companies have gone out of business, others have had to make adjustments to cut back hours for employees. There is not the work and there is not the demand, currently.

It is a framework that we are being presented with, which sets out the Government agenda over this term, but in reality it is going to take a few terms to carry this out. So I think we should be responsible and determine exactly what we are able and capable to do and put out the detailed project costings of those areas that we want to push forward before talking about borrowing more money and getting ourselves deeper in the hole.

When I look at the short term, the six-month project list, which is about 10 areas: housing; education; skills; digital; children; population; finance and tourism; regeneration; transport; and health recovery, there is an awful lot there to begin with. And what it does not spell out is what some of those areas are already getting from the public purse.

For example, a lot of money is already going into finance from the States. For the benefit of new Members, it is important they know how much the public are paying, through taxes, to promoting the Guernsey finance sector and the tourism effort. For example, Economic Development contributes £800,000 per annum, with an additional £400,000 per annum coming from the Future Guernsey Economic Fund. The finance sector promotional activities add up to £1.2 million. In addition, £300,000 was set aside in 2020 from the Future Guernsey Economic Fund specifically to fund a green finance workstream, following a resolution of the States. So that is £1.5 million a year going into finance. That needs to be clear. Also, Economic Development funds tourism promotion already, to the tune of £2.5 million each year. Together, those two are taking over £150 per year, per household, in terms of public support. That is a lot of support already. And we need to have this information before deciding on going through with these gigantic numbers of a £650 million requirement for the States. Let's scale it down, take it cautiously. There is no way we are going to be spending that sort of money this term. When you think of it, the capital budget has been spending some years at only £8 million a year; I know that was a very low year, but to spend £20 to £30 million a year would be a good year. So what is all this about going after such a huge amount of £650 million?

Let us be responsible, not irresponsible, and realise that all this money has to be found, and it is all going to increase taxes, charges, to people that cannot afford it and that have limited spending beyond paying for the basics at the current time.

I ask the States to look very cautiously at what is being proposed in these Propositions in front of you.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Sir, thank you.

Sir, Members of the Assembly, really, today, I am going to speak to the Assembly in my role as President of Economic Development, also to the wider industry, which is in our mandate, all Committee members, to support. I will provide an overview of the economic recovery initiatives that have been proposed by the Committee in the Government Work Plan.

In looking at what we can do to support the economy, we have had to find a balance between what is needed, what we can just about afford, and what we have the resources to deliver. In that regard, given the fact that we have had two patients, the COVID patient and the economic patients, we have to box far more clever with the money we have had, and it is actually right and it is actually sensible, within nine months of us coming to this Assembly, that Policy & Resources have recognised that and put that into what is a much shorter and snappier and deliverable Work Plan than I have seen over previous terms.

We have got 10 action points, really, and they start from page 8, under 1.8. I am just going to run through them, what has been happening, what has happened.

Before I start, sir, Members, what I am going to do is thank members of HSC, members of the Home Department, Deputy Helyar, Deputy Ferbrache, and myself for working extremely hard to get the MoU delivered. Overnight we have had emails from Alderney, from the players in the market, thanking us for all the work that has been done. It is going to bring millions of pounds into this economy over the next six or seven months. The MoU changed everything, it allowed the players in the market to talk to their financiers; they have actually signed the deal and we have started an industry. That is diversification, that is what it looks like, and that happened under this Assembly in the first nine months.

Deputy de Lisle mentioned investments in promoting the finance sector. Well, sir, Members, and all the financial sector leads and the workers out there in this great Island, the finance sector continues to be both Guernsey's largest employing sector, accounting directly for one in five jobs in the Island, and one of the main pillars of the economy, 40% of the total gross value added. The sector demonstrated flexibility and resilience during the COVID pandemic but was not immune to the economic impact of the pandemic, suffering decline in employment of almost 5% in Quarter two, 2020, at the height of the first lockdown. I will remind Members that it is the one sector that took no money from Government coffers. It was the most resilient sector that we have in the Island and I am here, as the President of Economic Development, thanking all of those hardworking people out there who have kept this economy afloat over the last 16 or 18 months. They are worth every penny that we spend on them and I will continue to support them.

The main action item from our Committee is to promote the recovery and growth of that financial sector. We have invested, via Policy & Resources – myself; Deputy Moakes; and Deputy Falla, as a Board member – in the refinancing of Guernsey Finance to promote Guernsey's finance sector in the period 2021–2024 and it is absolutely the right thing to do. After 2024, if they come again, and if I am still in position, I would give it to them again.

Looking at accelerating the digital economy, there has been much talk about digital infrastructure. Having worked with Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, Deputy Bob Murray, Deputy Helyar, myself, Deputy Ferbrache, again, action today, being done in the first nine months, the action that did not happen in the previous Assembly. It will be one of the critical success factors of our tenure. In September/October, we will be bringing a policy letter—I think it is fairly ready to go. Members of the Assembly, the business out there, will see that a policy letter will be coming to this Assembly in September/October to look at how we develop the fibre and the infrastructure. The three key actions to accelerating the digital economy are investing and enabling in the infrastructure, including Fibre to the Premises. The Committee will shortly be bringing forward that policy letter jointly with P&R, asking the States Assembly to invest in our digital infrastructure, and it does have a price to it.

Off the back of that, led ably by Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, it is likely to increase the skills and employment in the digital sector and the wider economy. Driving that digital transformation and promoting entrepreneurial growth, this is what we do. This is under our mandate and this is what we will continue to do. Again, sir, Members of the Assembly, and the wider community, everything comes at a cost. I think it was Deputy de Lisle who mentioned there has been little or no capital investment over the past four years, if not eight years; this is capital investment writ large.

Fostering entrepreneurial activity, we need to offer a compelling package that fosters enterprise and innovation. This should include: access to finance, advice, mentoring on all stages of business growth; access to affordable and flexible premises; access to appropriately skilled employees attracted to our standard of living; high-quality public services, housing, and environmental credentials; an open-for-business Government; and reliable transport links.

Members, as I said when I took up the position, Economic Development does not have the levers on all areas of the economy. I note, and I hope, Deputy Roffey and Deputy de Sausmarez, under the ... I think it is HAG, the Housing Action Group, plus other bits and pieces that Policy & Resources are working with. I hope, priority for me anyway, is 1.8:

Housing: Scope and deliver urgent measures necessary to address housing pressures;

They are live, they are real, and we need to act on them today. We need to give the people of this Island hope. Even if we cannot deliver it today, we need to give them a promise that they will eventually have affordable housing and I encourage those on HAG and Policy & Resources to move on this as quickly as possible, because that is the hope that this Island needs.

Investing in the visitor economy, revitalising tourism, again, Deputy de Lisle mentioned this; while things have changed quite considerably since, under his Committee, they did not actually do too much for four years. It was the 'same old, same old' formulaic process and having banged the drum and getting nowhere, it is only now that I am in the position, with this Committee, that I have managed to move this forward, led ably by Deputy Simon Vermeulen.

The local tourism sector has received substantial economic support, both financial and through local incentive schemes. There is no two ways about it: funds totalling something in the order of nearly £7 million and it has been one of the biggest receivers as a sector, so we accept that. What I can tell you, sir, is that things are starting to change and they are starting to change rather quickly.

Our key objectives in the short term are to restore visitor numbers to at least the 2019 levels through appropriate marketing and connectivity. I cannot give too much detail now but things have changed massively and we will be reducing the overall cost of the tourism budget. That is not just because we are slicing it through; it is because this Committee has found efficiencies and we will work better, faster, wiser, with less money; that is what we will do.

In the medium term, to improve the visitor experience it will be through better-quality visitor accommodation, good transport links, and quality tourism products, including visitor attraction events, with an emphasis on developing heritage, art, and culture offerings. Again, nothing ever happens as quickly as it needs to in my world; I was hoping to do something by September. The accommodation strategy has been started in part between ourselves and the DPA, looking at some exemption, but there is more work to be done. We will be going out to a wider consultation and we will be asking the visitor sector what their likely plans are for the next 10 years. Out of that, probably, will fall some winners and some losers.

I think, as Deputy Vermeulen has said before, we need an accommodation sector of volunteers, not conscripts. We recognise that because we are practical and pragmatic. We will not hold people in a sector that they want to get out of, but we have to be mindful that we cannot have a rout. It is a difficult area for us to dance in and it will not be easy.

The key short-term objective is to develop and implement the tourism plan and that marketing campaign. That marketing campaign is in place at the moment. Planes are filling up, boats are filling up, and people are coming into and out of the Island, so that looks like action today. This is what happened, and this has happened under this Committee and the support of all members of that Committee. I will not go into the detail now, I have got a page and I am almost boring myself. **(Deputy Prow: Hear, hear.)** Thanks, Deputy Prow!

Talking about secure transport connectivity and infrastructure, this work includes an action to include exploring the potential benefits of extending the Guernsey Airport runway to at least 1,700 metres, taking account of post-COVID-19 market conditions. That work has not stopped, we are under direction to come back to Committee. Again, I keep referring to Deputy de Lisle. Within that consideration, we are going to review the EMAS and the RESA options and we are going to try to see, along with the CCA, working with the leads at the STSB, the director, to see if that is possible because I believe that one of the most practical and pragmatic ways of doing it, the most publicly acceptable, and probably with this Assembly, is working within the bounds of the existing airport. **(Deputy de Lisle: Hear, hear.)**

That work is ongoing and next week we have our first ... not our first meeting, we have put a little bit of budget towards Frontier Economics, who reviewed the work that was conducted last year, along with the new methodologies, new ways of building runways that have come in. I can assure Deputy de Lisle and those that are interested in it we have not sat on it; we have been

working quite hard on it and we have had a presentation from various people, so again, work is carrying on.

235 Really, sir, in conclusion, we have put a number of initiatives forward in the Government Work Plan that will enable our economy to recover and grow; that is our main focus. If the Assembly supports the Government Work Plan, and I hope they do, almost certainly we will get speeches asking people to defeat certain Propositions, but I would be very careful of that, as mentioned by Deputy Helyar, especially on the finance part of it. We have either got a Government Work Plan or we do not have a Government Work Plan. And we are in quite a danger of having a really good
240 front cover on the book but no meat in the empty pages.

If the Assembly supports the Government Work Plan, we will invest in the promotion of our finance sector, because we are already doing it; we will accelerate investment in the digital economy and that policy letter will be coming in September/October of this year.

245 Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, as lead on the Skills Strategy, I have said to her – and as far as I remember it has been agreed by the Committee – one of the dangers in this Assembly is creating reports and they end up on a folder on the Government website and we think that we have done our job. What I have asked the Committee to do, because I think the Skills Strategy is so important, is actually to turn it into a policy letter, something that is owned by the whole of the Assembly. By I believe May of next year ... and I have done this before, made a promise but not quite made it,
250 but we are looking at May of next year, between ourselves and Education, we will bring a policy letter to this Assembly which will ensure that the Skills Strategy is embedded as part of our constant stream of work.

I noted somewhere Deputy St Pier is likely to bring up the matter of 2-REG, he did mention in one of his pieces, and I cannot see it now, but there is a line in there about the Aircraft Registry.
255 Nine months ago, when I took the job, I said I would be back to the States in six months, and then the next time I stood up I said I would be back to the Committee in three months, and I have missed both of those deadlines. Unfortunately, that is not always down to the people who are trying to lead it, it has been a heck of a struggle between myself and Deputy Moakes to get people into a room to get some decisions on how we are going to move it forward. I am hoping that by
260 September of this year, we have a paper for the Committee part-written and there are decisions that our Committee will have to make and some of it will have to be approved by the Assembly. Some of them are not going to be particularly easy for us, as a Committee; or we just carry on doing what we are doing at the moment.

265 But in short, sir, I can assure Deputy St Pier, again, as I keep trying to, that I am trying work on it, but sometimes time gets in the way of what I would like ... No, I am not giving way because I am about to finish. Time sometimes gets in the way and the lack of resources gets in the way of what we are trying to achieve.

I think this is a good Government Work Plan. Again, I will thank the HSC and Home for delivering the MoU. I think we have got to be far more positive about this. We have got to get out of our own
270 silly little entrenched views of what we think of each other, but do not ever come at me because I will always come back at you. *(Laughter)*

Thank you.

275 **Deputy Taylor:** 26(1), sir?

The Bailiff: Deputy Taylor wishes to move a motion pursuant to Rule 26(1).

Can I invite those Members who wish to speak in general debate on the Government Work Plan to please stand in their places?

280 **The Bailiff:** Is it your wish, Deputy Taylor, still to put the motion?

Deputy Taylor: It certainly is, sir, sorry.

The Bailiff: In that case, Members of the States, I am going to put a motion to you all that debate on the amended propositions of the Government Work Plan be brought to a close now, subject to hearing from Deputy Soulsby, as the Vice President, to reply to that debate Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Contre.

The Bailiff: I will declare that lost.

Deputy Queripel: Recorded vote on that, sir, please?

The Bailiff: Greffier, can we have a recorded vote, please, on the motion that I have just put to Members?

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 13, Contre 20, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 5

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Taylor	Deputy Prow	Deputy Queripel	Deputy Dyke
Deputy Vermeulen	Deputy Roffey		Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Aldwell	Alderney Rep. Snowden		Deputy Oliver
Deputy Blin	Deputy Soulsby		Alderney Rep. Roberts
Deputy Dudley-Owen	Deputy St Pier		Deputy Trott
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Brouard		
Deputy Haskins	Deputy Burford		
Deputy Helyar	Deputy Bury		
Deputy Mahoney	Deputy Cameron		
Deputy McKenna	Deputy de Lisle		
Deputy Meerveld	Deputy de Sausmarez		
Deputy Moakes	Deputy Fairclough		
Deputy Murray	Deputy Falla		
	Deputy Ferbrache		
	Deputy Gabriel		
	Deputy Inder		
	Deputy Kazantseva-Miller		
	Deputy Le Tocq		
	Deputy Matthews		
	Deputy Parkinson		

The Bailiff: Members of the States, I am satisfied that the motion was still lost. Alderney Representative Roberts, is it your wish to be relevé, just in case there is another vote and you might want to vote on it?

Alderney Representative Roberts: Thank you, sir. Yes, please.

The Bailiff: We will mark you as present.

Just by way of explanation, Deputy Oliver has a proxy vote, pursuant to Rule 26(3A): it is Deputy Mahoney. But it does not apply to a motion like that, which is why it was not called. Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: Thank you, sir. I will try and be brief.

Sir, listening to Deputy Inder's speech makes me think he may be taking lessons from Deputy Trott. It reminds me of that apocryphal story, I think, of an old man who served at church for many years, was very humble, and the church gave him a medal for his humility, but they had to take it

away because he wore it. (*Laughter*) Nevertheless, sir, I am probably going to stray into that area myself.

315 But I want to quickly highlight something that has not been discussed through the amendments and may not be discussed, so I want to ensure, sir, that we have it on register here, that it is part and parcel, very much, of our Government Work Plan.

Since I was first elected, sir, over 20 years ago, I have been associated, probably, with two political positions. One was public sector and negotiations, terms and conditions and human resources, those sorts of things. Sir, there was not ever a very long queue of people wanting to do that job, so when Deputy Mahoney came along, I had my arm twisted to give it up so that he could do it; (*Laughter*) those that understand that will find that funny.

320 The other one, sir, was international relations and external affairs. After the election in 2012, I became Deputy Chief Minister. We did not have a Minister for External Affairs at the time; that was delegated around the then-Policy Council. I was given that remit and was very pleased to represent Guernsey. In those days, sir, the role was not very busy, particularly, but by the end of that period, it had become busy. When I eventually became Chief Minister, we realised in the reforms that were going to take place for the next States that we needed to have a lead for External Affairs, so I served that in the last term and I find myself in the same position here.

330 Brexit, sir, obviously, has increased our need to ensure that we are well-represented and well-prepared for what is ahead. Under Proposition 11, the first pillar of those funding priorities reads as follows:

Managing the effects of Brexit and meeting international standards (ongoing expenditure) over the period 2021–2025 for the specific initiatives detailed in Appendix 11.5;

People say, 'Ah, but hasn't Brexit not been done? Isn't it over? Are you telling me that it is more complicated than that?' I am glad you asked that question. Because it is. In these waters that we are now in because of the decision made by the UK, which a whole generation have not navigated and, in some senses, are uncharted for many, the likelihood is that we will come across, very regularly, unforeseen reefs, rocks and obstacles that those who thought Britain leaving the EU would not be there actually are, and we are caught up in that, we may not like that, but we have to navigate them.

335 Certainly, sir, there are wonderful opportunities as well, and new vistas. I am involved in some of those trade talks where there are opportunities for Guernsey to have new links and new business to emerge out of that which could be very positive for us. That is a busy part of my responsibilities as the delegate in P&R for this part. But also, sir, there are unforeseen things. Just this week, sir, I was absent yesterday, for a time, because we are in the midst of negotiating a maritime security treaty between France and the UK and we are caught up in that because those vessels will pass through our territorial seas and we want to ensure that the liabilities and the understanding of communication within all the three jurisdictions within the Bailiwick of Guernsey are well understood by both Britain and France. So, yes, it is more complicated than it seems.

340 When I took on the responsibility first for External Affairs in 2012, we had a staff of two and a half, I think it was, at the time. We have tripled that size. I make no apology for that; we have needed that. In fact, I know it was the case that, at the time that the TTA was agreed by this Assembly in December of last year, people praised the team that had been part of that, but I would like to praise them as well because in terms of value for money, if you look at the per-capita costs compared to other islands and jurisdictions near us, we do very well indeed out of the team that serves us, and I include in that the trade team at Economic Development as well.

355 We work together and that will continue, sir; in fact, it cannot be something that is side-lined because it is both a facilitator, an enabler, but also something that can help us to horizon-scan and see where the difficulties lie ahead and prepare ourselves for doing that. I am so glad that in 2012 we did a proper horizon-scan for what the options were if Britain chose to leave the EU. We were well-prepared, and we need to continue to be well-prepared for these uncharted seas ahead. I just wanted to underline that point particularly so that it is well-understood.

360 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, the record of the vote in respect of the motion pursuant to Rule 26(1) proposed by Deputy Taylor is that there voted Pour 13, Contre 20, 1 abstention, 5 Members were absent, and that is why the motion was declared lost.

365 Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

370 Recognising that the Government Work Plan has been developed as the Assembly's approach to recovery this term and provides a framework for determining, developing and resourcing the most critical actions to be completed by Government, I would like to start by acknowledging the many workstreams within the Plan that seek to deliver the transformation of Health & Social Care and support the aims of the Partnership of Purpose; this is very much welcomed by the Committee for Health & Social Care.

375 The inclusion of the review of the Children's Law and the progression of the Outcomes Report as one of the immediate priorities is particularly welcomed as a means of tackling delay and duplication within the family justice system.

380 The Committee also looks forward to working with other principal Committees and partners in the third sector to support the health recovery of Islanders through the SOHWELL Phase 3 programme and the launch of the mental health pilot, which has been afforded priority status in the Plan.

It is also reassuring to see full consideration being given to the broader social determinants of health when prioritising the recovery actions in both housing and education, which will help underpin positive mental health and physical wellbeing.

385 While there is always more that can be done, we must consider which actions will have the greatest impact for the most people. Consequently of critical importance to the Committee is addressing the backlogs and waiting times in some areas, which have largely arisen due to the pandemic, so it is only right that an action should be taken forward to improve access to care for Bailiwick residents.

390 The Plan also seeks to deliver on significant projects underpinning the transformation programme, including the Hospital Modernisation Programme and the replacement of electronic patient records. This is in addition to important policy initiatives, such as the implementation of the Capacity Law and the scope and developing proposals for a funding and delivery model for primary care, amongst other things.

395 We are pleased to see the review of alternative and non-punitive approaches to the possession and use of small quantities of illegal drugs in the Plan (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and look forward to working closely with the Committee for Home Affairs to move this forward.

400 Furthermore, only last month, States' Members were made aware of the challenges associated with the delayed discharges of care from the Princess Elizabeth Hospital (PEH), bringing to the fore the importance of progressing the States' resolution attached to the Supported Living and Ageing Well Strategy, which are also highlighted.

405 We are pleased that responding to the pandemic will continue to receive priority resourcing, as this is essential to managing the associated public health risks and keeping our community safe. The Committee is, however, mindful of the broader pressures that arise from COVID-19 which have significant impact for the full range of services across Health & Social Care, including within our hospital and in the delivery of our community services. We should not underestimate these challenges. As the pandemic continues to unfold and as we learn to live responsibly with COVID-19 in our community, we may need to look more closely at how we can best maintain business as usual in these circumstances on a sustained basis.

410 The Committee welcomes the underlining approach of the plan to prioritise the business of Government and recognises there is much to be gained in the health and care space. In emphasising HSC's commitment to the Plan, I make the point that the allocation of resources must follow the prioritisation of the recovery initiatives if we are to deliver on this ambitious agenda and move forward as intended.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

I had not particularly intended to come in this early, but having experienced recently that once a guillotine is laid once, it tends to come back like a boomerang, I decided I had better get up now.

Before getting into what I want to say about the document in front of us, I have to say that it is, this should be, an absolutely seminal debate. We are talking about what we as an Assembly want to do for the next four years. I find it absolutely extraordinary that barely one hour – taking last night and this morning – into debate that almost half of the Assembly, including some members of P&R, say, 'That is enough. We do not want to talk about this anymore.'

It may be said that we have talked about it for hours and hours because we have debated the amendments, but be careful what message you send. Because if we have big seminal policy letters and once we spend days on amendments, we say there is only going to be next to no debate in general debate, the message you are sending out is, 'If you have concerns about anything in that policy letter, the only way to make sure it is discussed is actually to bring an amendment on it.' Because actually when you get to general debate, you will probably be cut off at the knees. You are going to end up with twice as many amendments as you get now, so I really hope that we allow this, what I think is an extraordinarily important document, the outing that it deserves.

Mr Bailiff, I am going to speak on behalf of both of the Committees I am President of, and then personally after that.

Starting with ESS, I have to say we are absolutely delighted that several of our key areas of policy have been prioritised within this document. The implementation of Phase 1 of the equalities legislation is a top priority; the policy work on Phase 2 is also a priority within the four years. We regret, as Members will now be well aware, that equal pay for equal work of equal value is not included in that, but nevertheless, taken as a whole, we are delighted with the fact that P&R – and the lack of any amendments tends to suggest this Assembly – recognise the importance of that work.

Likewise with secondary pensions, which will be absolutely crucial to delivering some sort of restraint on welfare payments in 20 or 30 years' time. I know it is difficult for 'here today, gone tomorrow' politicians to think in that length of time, but I think you sometimes need to and, just as importantly, on reducing pensioner poverty.

But perhaps what we were most pleased with was to see housing absolutely come out front and centre in this report, and I thank P&R for recognising that. Of course, ESS does not have the housing mandate, it does not; we are only responsible for one small part of the housing market, if you like, which is social housing. But of course, it is all interconnected; the more strain there is on the general housing market, the more people are not able to accommodate themselves, either through rental or purchase, in the general housing market, the more they fall back on applying for social housing, and we are seeing alarming levels of demand in there. It really does have to be a top priority, not just for ESS, not just for E&I, not just for P&R, not just for the Housing Action Group, but for the whole of this Assembly to put front and centre over the next few years.

Sadly, there are going to be very few really short wins on it. We were looking for where we possibly can, but the reality is, it does tend to take quite a lead-in period in order to actually get the supply-side, which is the real problem here, actually sorted. But with the best will from *all parts* of this Assembly, then I think within the lifetime of this Assembly we can start to make a real difference in that respect. It will be partly be money, but it is not just money; it is also the bureaucracy that sometimes gets in the way of moving quickly and the need to absolutely minimise that.

Moving onto STSB, I have to say we were slightly more alarmed when we first became aware of the content of the Government Work Plan. We were surprised and concerned to discover shortly before the publication of the Plan that the future Guernsey Dairy Project was no longer to be considered a priority in this current phase of capital expenditure. We were surprised because the

previous Assembly had agreed the Dairy Project's inclusion in the last capital portfolio. We already have considerable work that has been going on over a period of time to progress this project. However, up until two days before publication of the draft Government Work Plan, there had been no consultation with STSB over the plan to reprioritise.

470 We were also concerned because if, as is proposed, it becomes a pipeline project – and it will do; we have not brought an amendment, so it will be a pipeline project – in theory that means delivery could be pushed back by as much four years. That is a real concern, given that any delay is likely both to be costly, financially, but just as importantly, will add significantly to the risk of a very serious failure of the current facility.

475 Sir, although the draft Government Work Plan does say that development funding is available to progress pipeline projects, it does not give much detail about what that entails, so I would welcome more detail in the Vice President's summing up. Specifically for the Dairy Project, it did not really set out in the Government Work Plan whether the work currently being undertaken on this project could proceed at this time in the light of the proposed revised delivery portfolio. I did
480 note the draft plan said in Annex 5, paragraph 6.5, that, quote:

Should the schemes develop faster than anticipated and the States wish to see them moved into the delivery portfolio, this should be enabled ...

However, there is no real explanation about what the mechanism and timing for any such prioritisation may be.

Having been quite alarmed, there has been quite a great deal of discussion between the STSB and the Policy & Resources Committee, both initially at officer level and then at political level, since
485 the publication of the draft plan.

I want to put on record that we are extremely grateful for the categorical assurances we have now received from Policy & Resources and the confirmation that we should continue developing the business case for a new or refurbished Dairy. Once that current phase of work is complete, there will be an opportunity to review whether it should still be considered a pipeline project, or whether
490 it should be moved into the delivery category. We really cannot ask for more than that, because the approval last year was not for the final funding of the new Dairy, but just to get on and develop the business case to the point at which we would be ready to go out to tender for construction.

Sir, we have made considerable progress, reflecting the urgency of the project, and we have recently appointed a specialist firm to help us identify the optimal design and specification for a
495 future dairy facility, hence why we needed Policy & Resources' assurance that we are able to continue with this work.

I have to say that Policy & Resources also indicated that they would wish to see some further work, alongside the work on the Dairy itself, to reaffirm the existing States' policy as far as the local dairy industry is concerned; that is more a matter for E&I, really, than STSB, but we believe it can be
500 done concurrently while we continue to develop the business case. Personally, I have no doubt at all the conclusion will be exactly the same as that which the previous States reached last year, which was to endorse the current policy that ensures that we maintain our Island's agricultural heritage, our green fields, our earth banks, and our precious and iconic Guernsey cattle breed. To do that, it is the unfortunate truth that we do need to have a dairy.

505 Sir, I am not going to go into all of the reasons why I believe that that policy will remain the same; we will have a chance to argue that later on. But we do need to have a dairy if we are to maintain our dairy industry. The current one is in a chronic state. Over the last four years, we have spent £2.6 million on priority repairs, maintenance, and equipment replacement and a further £2 million is planned over the next two years. But there is a much longer list of requirements, including
510 further significant capital spending on critical production machinery, like the milk packaging machine that was bought second-hand in 1999 and is believed to be more than 35 years old. To replace that would cost a further £2 million. That is currently being held in abeyance in anticipation that the project for the new dairy was proceeding on the expected timescales. But if it is going to be put back into the next Assembly, then there will be an increased risk of catastrophic and costly

515 failure, which could threaten the continuity of fresh milk supplies and see farmers pouring away milk that cannot be processed.

Sir, we, or rather, the Dairy Management Board, are going to have a very difficult decision to make if this project is delayed to any great extent, whether it continues to carry that level of risk or whether to press on and replace the equipment sooner. If it is the latter, that will mean buying
520 similar machines to the current ones that will fit inside the footprint and layout of the current Dairy. But those, in turn, are unlikely to be suitable for the new facility when that does materialise, so it really would be throwing good money after bad.

Irrespective of what the Dairy management decide to do, there is still a need to address the fabric of the existing facility. The Dairy currently has a 3-star hygiene rating, but in recent years that
525 has fallen as low as 2 stars, which stipulates improvement being necessary. That reflects the age and condition of the current Dairy, which is increasingly challenging and costly to address. There are regulatory requirements which are simply not at the discretion of either the Dairy Management Board or the STSB.

I am not going to labour the point much more, apart from the fact that we do believe that the
530 case will be made, when we have finished the outline business case, to move forward from pipeline into delivery the Dairy Project. That is problematic, of course, because that is not currently within the cost envelope of what we are being asked to approve today. And, I have to say, I really do not envy the task that Policy & Resources have been faced with in having to identify and prioritise a capital funding programme for the next four years.

535 However, experience tells me that I really cannot believe for one moment that all of the projects that have been included in the proposed delivery portfolio are actually – and I agree with Deputy de Lisle, to some extent, here, but maybe for different reasons, just for practical reasons – going to be delivered within these four years. Previous experience of States capital spending tells us otherwise, so I am feeling confident there will be scope for the inclusion of the Dairy Project within
540 the overall spending provision which has been identified and the business case will underline, once again, the urgency and necessity for that project.

Sir, I think that is really what I have to say on behalf of my two Committees. I want to just make a few general comments on the Propositions. There are three that concern me, I think, out of the Propositions that we will be voting on shortly, or maybe not so shortly; we will see how long the
545 debate goes on. One is number 6. I know this was subject to amendment yesterday and the amendment failed, but Proposition 6 does still concern me, and I think Deputy Simon Fairclough did say that he had concerns over this as well.

The setting-up of these new oversight bodies sounds, to me, incredibly similar to something that I knew some time ago in this States, which were Policy Council sub-groups. To be honest, they
550 sounded like a good idea, they sounded like they were going to bring cohesion and group working; the reality is they were an absolutely dysfunctional level of bureaucracy, and I do worry we might be doing to the same again. I am not saying there is not the need to set up any oversight groups for any of the workstreams; I think some of them, there should be. On housing, we already have the Housing Action Group; actually, it started off pretty much in line with the strict criteria set out in
555 this policy letter, but it seems to be growing like Topsy, rather. We started with three politicians on it, we have now got five. Who knows where that will end? Maybe if we can get 39, we will really get some action going. *(Laughter)*

But I do think it is just horses for courses. We have a Committee system of government and some of these workstreams ... I do not think any of them are absolutely discretely within an
560 individual mandate but there is very clearly a lead Committee in many cases. In other cases, it is clear the lead is between two various Committees; and in other cases, it is completely cross-cutting and I completely see the need set out in the policy letter to set up a new body to oversee it. I know it says there may not be a need in all cases because existing systems exist, but I actually think, very often, the existing system will just be a Committee driving it or two Committees together driving it.
565 I do think this slightly undermines our Committee system and I really do not want to go back to the world of Policy Council sub-groups.

The other one of two that concerns me is number 14. The amendments on this having failed, I am in something of a dilemma because I actually do believe that if we want to get on and get things done, some enhanced, delegated authority to P&R to act is actually, probably, quite desirable. But I am afraid the failure of those amendments means unlimited discretion, not only to spend in the traditional fashion, but also to spend money through alternative delivery mechanisms. I may be actually cutting off my nose to spite my face; some things I care about may be held back slightly by curtailing the ability to delegate, but I just cannot cope with that. It is just too far, it is abrogating my responsibility as a Deputy, and I will be voting against 14.

The other one, I think I may be the only person in here that is probably going to vote against this, but I think I am going to vote against Proposition 21, which is about the Rule 4 stuff. It is not so much that what is being proposed is over-the-top in its own right, it is just the narrative I have picked up over the last nine months. It is a narrative of control-freakery; 'Let's make it a little bit more difficult to ask questions; let's deter questions slightly; let's make it a bit more difficult to put amendments; let's deter amendments slightly; let's make it seem irresponsible, unless you have jumped through fifty hoops, to actually put an amendment.'

Well, as the President of two Committees, I can find questions really quite annoying at times, but I do think it is a really important part of the democratic process and amendments that sometimes clearly have not been thought through and talked through with people can be annoying, but I would rather have a few annoying ones and dismiss them on that basis than actually pile in rules to the extent that people are actually, 'Oh, I have not got time to go through all of these hoops to put the amendment I want to put. I am not going to put it.' This does not insist on it; it just makes you say whether you have done it or not. But I recognise a staging post when I see one. I just have picked up far too much of an agenda of control of individual backbenchers, to use a colloquial term here, and I am going to put a stake in the ground by voting against Proposition 21 in that respect.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you very much.

I have found a lot of common ground in what Deputy Roffey said and, like him, I do not want to milk the topic too much, but we need to move on to a new Dairy. I am pleased, at least, the cheese has come back because I think the Dairy, actually, is an outstanding example of a States semi-commercial entity that has made do for many years. It is part of our Guernsey brand, of our Guernsey identity, and I personally – when you look across to Alderney and Sark, who on a small scale, have achieved a lot in this sphere – think it is an ideal opportunity for the new-style Policy & Resources Committee to look at what amounts to a partnership or a private finance initiative or some form of cooperative idea, so there you go.

Deputy Inder said he did not want to go on too long because he would end up boring himself. I do not bore myself; I just bore other people, but never mind. I noted the strong speech by Deputy Prow, and it is true that we need to very much focus on working together in order to make things happen.

I think, though, that when you look at the priorities here, there are some concerns. For example, if one looks at page nine, one sees the 10 critical recovery actions and decisions. Well, four of them, to a degree, if not five of them, revolve around education: education, skills, digital infrastructure and children are all clearly on that field. But when we come to transport, and the President, of course, of the relatively inactive States' Transport Licensing Authority, you have here the Board policy of:

... set out a clear and co-ordinated transport connectivity and infrastructure policy and further develop the general and commercial aviation sector

Of course, we on the Transport Licensing Authority are just charged with maintaining the current guidelines and policies, which may change, so I will not set out an opinion on that. But it does not

mention maritime transport, which, in some ways, is a more pressing issue. Nor does it mention internal transport.

In fact, although on page 22, section 5.22, there are passing references to the environment, you would not really guess from this list that our sister island of Jersey declared what amounted to a climate change emergency. There really is not much about the environment along these considerations.

Nor, specifically, is there much work on inclusion. We heard from Deputy Lester Queripel yesterday about what younger voters and younger people think; this does not altogether reflect that and, in any case, the ten themes are rather broadly based.

I actually voted to curtail the debate, unusually for me, because I think we are under pressure in managing, perhaps, the way we are structuring the Assembly when we have the key education debate and this all in the same time and I think that that is a constraint.

It actually draws me onto another topic, really, that part of the four themes are reshaping and right-sizing Government. I am pleased to see a strong reference to SACC within that, that the Policy & Resources Committee wishes to work closely with the States' Assembly and Constitution Committee, and whether as an official member or an unofficial contributor, I would very much like to contribute to that.

But of course, it does cover a whole range of areas. Here, the topic addressed includes, for example, things like electronic voting, which, although important, is not, perhaps, as crucial as working out the most effective machinery of government.

Although I entirely accept and, in part, agree with what Deputy Ferbrache said yesterday about the fact that in no sense is that Plan trying to create a framework of executive government, there are potential consequences with Proposition 14, which seeks to enable Policy & Resources to, effectively, agree to capital sums well beyond £2 million, £5 million, or even £10 million, potentially for much larger sums. Because, rightly or wrongly, the States have been kind of an executive; the government, we are all in government in that sense, and we all agree to the dispersal of the capital. If that role is going to be lessened, we have not necessarily thought through the consequences of that and how decisions of that magnitude will be made and the accountability thereof and the scrutiny and the public accounts functions and, perhaps, reports being written in a more timely fashion and the governance.

Although, actually, I like the direction of travel of more executive action by a successful, fewer number of Members that, perhaps, maybe, we have entrusted with that, I think it is premature, within the context of this Plan, to give permission today. I would prefer to see it contemplated, perhaps, in a standalone policy letter or within the budget. Or, as Deputy Helyar pointed out, some of the issues that have not made the cut this time could come up in a future year, in fact, next year's plan, and I think that might be a better time to consider that, because it does seem to me to have un-thought through consequences, unforeseen consequences, and a potential redefinition of the role of States' Members and of the public. And also, it possibly puts Policy & Resources up to fail, curiously enough, because you might therefore get, perhaps, too much political questioning of what was going on, rather than the relationship of trust that we all believe in and enjoy. I think that I do like the concept of right-sizing government, but we need to be restrained in what we would like to do.

Another area which is not clear in this report, perhaps because we do not really have a focused view on it, despite the good speech by Deputy Inder, is we do not really have a view on how far we are going in terms of micro-investment in Guernsey businesses. We are still very much stuck on creating a good environment for business, with digital infrastructure, skills and education.

Education is put very broadly. When people say they want to grow knowledge and skills in our community, that is actually quite a vague role because are we focused on improving literacy? As it said, skills and literacy, on page 7, well, of course, we are. But we actually, probably, want a higher aspiration than that as well: very much to hothouse our high achievers and gain the best possible potential and opportunities from all of our community. Because if we are going to survive as a dynamic, relatively low-tax, successful economy, we have to be better than many other places, and

I think it is very important that we work on that. I suspect that we will need higher taxation and, in some respects, a bigger public sector, but that does not mean to say we want wasteful public expenditure.

There are some other issues that members of the community would like to see more strongly raised as topics which perhaps are not as prominent as they could be. One would be, for example, inclusivity, which would also include moving forward with community policing, legal reform, and the Sexual Referral Assault Centre, that is very important to members of the community. Another area, as we saw on Wednesday, is criminal justice reform and perhaps a more focused understanding of the best way forward in dealing with issues of medicinal cannabis, drug addiction and potentially, in some areas, possibly, decriminalisation. Indeed, the fact that I have been told that there are now a thousand people in Guernsey receiving prescriptions for medicinal cannabis from outside the Island, shows we need to look at that in a health context as well.

Deputy Leadbeater: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Just a minute, Deputy Leadbeater, you are not entitled to raise a point of correction because you have not been relevéd yet.

Deputy Gollop to continue.

Deputy Leadbeater: My apologies.

Deputy Gollop: Anyway, perhaps we will hear a speech from Deputy Leadbeater on that matter. With all of those points, I will support most of this report, but I have not entirely made up my mind on Proposition 14 because I think that is a testing area and one that I think we need further consideration on, not just financially, but in terms of our system of scrutiny and corporate governance.

The Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater, would you like to be relevéd? I do apologise for missing it earlier.

Deputy Leadbeater: Yes, please, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.
Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

I think Deputy Gollop made some very good points about Proposition 14 and the unlimited delegated authority. I am not against the principle of the GWP in any way, in fact, I support it. Each assembly needs a document setting out direction and a general consensus, but it is impossible not to see this iteration as more of a straitjacket and power transfer than ever before.

The projects lack detail, and that is not a criticism, it is not surprising given the timescale in which this document was produced. The detail will emerge but the Assembly will have less input than ever before, as much work will be orchestrated by P&R, with some involvement from the relevant Committee. While we all might agree on the title of a particular workstream, the likelihood is we will all have a very different view on how it should manifest itself but a reduced opportunity to do anything about it.

We can argue all day about the cart-and-horse nature of the tax review and the GWP, and I can see merit in both options – that is, deciding what we want to do and then looking at how we can raise the money, or looking at how much we want to spend and then seeing what we can buy with it. We are going for the first option. Nevertheless, I do remain concerned at our ability to accrue capital repayments for borrowing and at loading debt onto our children.

Moving on: in Annex 3, under the heading 'Delivery principles,' we have the requirement to—

... partner appropriately to re-shape government;

720 There is, of course, much in the plan that is about the euphemistically-named 'reshaping of government.' It has a priority all of its own, and pages 105–112 give a useful list of items mostly related to the public sector.

725 However, on page 112, an action calls for a review into how the structure of the States and the legislature works. It is no secret that some in this States, with a concentration in P&R, would wish to see a move to a more executive system of government and a move away from the Committee and consensus system. I am firmly in the consensus camp – no secret there – although I do think some of the 2016 changes have proved unhelpful: the reduction in the number of principal Committees and in the number of Deputies, for a start.

730 In addition to the obvious purpose of the review being a push towards executive government, I am equally concerned by the fact that we never stop rearranging the deck chairs for long enough to let any system adjust and sensibly evolve. To always be in a state of almost perpetual revolution, rather than evolution, is to always be spending considerable resources on change itself, and this is highly inefficient. Just think what else we could do with those significant resources to benefit our community.

735 Of course, the soundbite of reform is good and lands well with the public, who hear repeatedly how inefficient the public sector is. And although it can always be improved, as can any organisation, it actually functions well and at a reasonable cost compared to other similar jurisdictions. I fear the costs of constantly trying to reorganise are greater than the savings ultimately made but, of course, by the time that becomes apparent, this Assembly will have moved on.

740 I will be voting against Proposition 6. Two specific effects of Proposition 6 will be that, in practice, in lots of areas, the influence of the principal Committees will diminish and the influence of officials largely servicing the Policy & Resources Committee will greatly increase. No committee of five can adequately manage the sweeping powers that Policy & Resources wish to accumulate; they will have to delegate more and more to their officials. Anyone who votes for Proposition 6 needs to understand and accept the inevitability of more and more of Government's priorities and policy development, in practice, being done by the civil servants who report to Policy & Resources.

745 I agree with Deputy Roffey that this recreation of another layer of governance does closely resemble what was known as the Policy Council sub-groups, there was one for fiscal policy, in competition with the then Treasury & Resources, one for social policy, in competition with the then Social Security & Health, and one for environmental policy, in competition with the then Environment Department. At the last review of Government, almost all contributors, and there were a lot, agreed that this layer of governance was not just unnecessary, but dysfunctional, and often slowed, rather than facilitated, policy progress.

750 But my very biggest concern with this policy letter remains Proposition 14, and specifically, the proposal to give undelegated authority on capital spending to P&R. Yesterday, 18 Members voted against that proposal in an amendment, and I truly hope that those 18 will remain steadfast in voting against this substantive Proposition, that it, Proposition 14, and that they will be joined by others who were wavering or a little uncomfortable. One Member said we should give P&R a chance; I am all for giving chances, but I do not want to start with a figure of £500 million.

760 In each of the things I have mentioned so far, P&R says it will work with sponsoring Committees, and I am sure it will. But the decision-making and the authority ultimately lie with P&R and its delegates, and not with the Committee and not with this Assembly. If we are to move at some point to executive government, then it needs to be done properly and in a considered way with the engagement of the community, not by the back door and not without setting up the vital checks and balances that are needed to balance the power.

765 In summary, the main problem with this policy letter is that its aggregate effect takes a multitude of powers which currently and historically sit with this Assembly and this Assembly's Committees and transfers them wholesale to the Policy & Resources Committee. There are arguments for and against reforming our system of government, but vaguely-worded and often euphemistically-

worded Propositions in a Work Plan debate are a highly improper way to change our constitutional arrangements.

I urge Members to vote against Proposition 6 and, in particular, Proposition 14. This will not stop any workstreams in the Plan, but it ensures governance and scrutiny by this Assembly. Policy & Resources will say that things may not move as quickly, but, sir, speed is only an asset when one is confident one is going in the right direction.

Please vote against Propositions 6 and 14. I will request a recorded vote on those Propositions. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

Sir, Deputy Prow mentioned me in the closing part of his speech; I am not sure his comments were directly pertinent to the subject of this debate, the Government Work Plan, but I will respond to them nonetheless. I accept that there is no such thing as the 'Van Party', it is certainly not one that is legally registered but if it looks like a duck and quacks like a duck, in my experience, it probably is a duck. So I am not going to take any lessons from Deputy Prow on opacity.

As to the voting of members of the Guernsey Partnership of Independents, I can advise him that there is no discussion amongst its members on how to vote in this Assembly, and I am sure other members of the Guernsey Partnership of Independents will be happy to confirm that.

I would also like to congratulate Deputy Inder and others on concluding the MoU, following the work commenced in the last term, and look forward also to receiving the policy letter on connectivity, also begun in the last term. I think finishing off work after nine months, begun by others, is probably not what most people understood by 'action this day,' but so be it.

Sir, the main focus of my comments is – perhaps unsurprisingly, given my previous roles – on Annex 5, the financing and investment plan. This is the most fiscally incontinent plan I have seen in my nine years in the States. To drain £258 million from our reserves and borrow an additional £200 million, both as part of what is described as:

... a temporary solution only and a way of managing but not removing the underlying structural deficit.

With millions added to spending and almost nothing cut from it, it is, indeed, depressing.

In the workstream described as 'unlock enterprise' there are some large spending commitments planned. First, on page 192, there is £2.4 million to, I quote:

Identify actions needed to successfully grow knowledge and skills to reach our potential and build resilience in people...

What does this mean and what is this money going to be spent on?

On page 194, we have put aside £1.25 million to:

Scope the options for Guernsey enterprise zones.

Well, in an Island of 25 square miles, I am not quite sure how many zones we might have but, more seriously, how on earth can it cost £1.25 million to scope options? Given corporate tax or VAT breaks are the main features of such zones, I am not clear what it can offer, maybe TRP or Social Security breaks, or how it could possibly cost so much to scope. If it is a scoping exercise, it should largely be a desktop exercise. It is very alarming that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, in a debate on a previous amendment, stated she had no knowledge of how these numbers had been arrived at.

Just below that, we have £450,000 to 'enhance the Guernsey Aircraft Registry', and I am grateful to Deputy Inder for addressing this when he spoke. I am sorry that the work is behind schedule and I am sorry that he did not give way, because I wanted to ask him – and perhaps Deputy Soulsby or Deputy Helyar could address if and when they speak and respond – whether or not this funding in this line of the report is subject to the satisfactory completion of that work; I presume that it is, but I would be grateful for that confirmation.

815 Whilst on page 194, it is worth noting that the plan envisages £26 million of spending, but note in the middle of that page, £11.7 million of that is recurring. In other words, additional annual expenditure which we are adding to our baseline. This is government getting bigger, not smaller.

I am curious also to see another red tape audit on page 194 and would welcome comments from someone, anyone, on how that is to be conducted in a way such that it will produce different results from the most recent one that, of course, yielded very little.

820 On the opposite page, 195, we have another £26 million being spent on transformation to re-shape government, but below that is the real disappointment, yielding only £7.4 million of savings. As Deputy Kazantseva-Miller said in an earlier debate, it is notable that this Plan has so few savings planned. That is no great surprise to me, because I have saying for years there are fewer savings to be had than most people imagine. When Deputy Helyar spoke yesterday, I felt that he has, perhaps, learned that quite fast. This Plan accepts that and it bakes it in, but it does stand in stark contrast to the rhetoric and language of many manifestos, and indeed, from Deputy Ferbrache in an earlier debate on this Plan, where he said there is much waste and bad practice everywhere, apparently. And yet the generic is never specified, and if it does exist, nothing is being done about it in this Plan.

830 Whilst talking about savings, it is worth drawing attention to page 183, in which we are told that we are working to an assumption that only:

...60% of the savings forecast will be achievable.

Now, that may be realistic, but it is disappointing and tells you all you need to know about the level of confidence of delivering savings.

835 Also, on page 182, again, a key sentence that could be lost:

There is a significant risk that costs will be higher or lower than the financial estimates [calculated] in this plan.

Finally on savings, it is worth noting on page 151, paragraph 4.54, it says:

Savings approved in the 2021 Budget Report are not expected to be achieved within the year and it is now forecast these will not be fully realised until 2023.

More alarmingly, it goes on to say:

Savings have not yet been allocated to specific budgets.

840 Why on earth not? I can tell you now that if they have not been allocated by the end of July, there is not a cat in hell's chance of any meaningful savings being delivered in 2021. They have gone, kiss goodbye to them. Policy & Resources have been asleep at the wheel and clearly have no serious intent of delivering those savings this year if they have managed to do nothing to allocate them by the end of July. It is shameful

845 Whilst on page 195, can I draw Members' attention to an unfortunate error? I was told that it would be corrected in debate, but I have not heard that it has been so far. In Table 11.7, entitled 'Revenue impact of capital expenditure' (RICE), the total line reads 'Total additional savings'. These are not savings; they are an additional £1.7 million a year of recurring annual expenditure which arises from those capital projects.

Whilst in this part of the Plan, I want to go back to page 192 and draw attention to the £2 million put aside to:

Implement the recommendations of the nasen Report on SEND provision.

850 To be clear, we are agreeing today, in that one line, to add £600,000 to Education's baseline annual budget. This did surprise me, as the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture had told us earlier this year that the reason for increasing class sizes in the secondary sector was to reallocate

resources to accommodate the SEND recommendations. And in the media release when the nasen Report was published, Deputy Ferbrache was quoted as saying:

I know the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture is currently looking at decisions it can make to free up additional resources. This is crucial as it's clear to everyone that the States does not have a magic money tree ...

855 So apparently, we have found the magic money tree.

I want to speak for a moment to the 'Core Assumptions' in the Plan on page 137 and the 'Sensitivity Analysis' which follows on page 152. The key assumption is perhaps the first, 'Keep services "as is"'. In paragraph 4.26, it is assumed that staff pay costs will rise in real terms by 0.5% per annum. But if Members turn to paragraph 5.9, on page 155, they will see that a 5% increase for
860 nurses and medical consultants would add £4.1 million a year to our annual baseline expenditure. Given that the last P&R increased nurses' pay by 10% in 2020, and this P&R increased it by a further 5% in 2021, it strikes me as wholly unrealistic to think that nurses' pay will be contained at 0.5% real-terms increase for the rest of this term, given, apparently, everyone's commitment to ensuring that the Agenda for Change group of workers should receive fair pay. It is very likely therefore that
865 pay will become a negative variance against the Plan as time passes.

It is also worth noting paragraph 4.27, in which £2 million a year is for the Public Service Obligation for the Alderney route. This, of course, is a new addition to our baseline expenditure.

In paragraph 4.32, we are told that the Ports have borrowed £5.3 million in 2020 and forecast a further £7.2 million in 2021. This, of course, is largely as a result of the reduction of business through
870 COVID, and provision has been made for writing this off. I did raise this in the last budget debate to point out that a write-off would be inevitable; so here, my prophecy does come to pass. To be clear, by accounting for this as a loan, rather than a grant, in the budget, the budget deficit for the year was £13.5 million lower than it should have been, and when that write-off takes place, the deficit in the year of write-off will, of course, increase by whatever the amount written off is.

875 Turning, for a moment, to the capital delivery portfolio, I am genuinely surprised that there are almost no new additions to it, other than, from page 207, the Havelet Slip, a Clinical and Animal Waste Solution, the Fermain Wall, the Castle Cornet Bridge, and Guernsey Registry IT. All are described as 'must do', but frankly, I was expecting more from what I thought was a commitment to invest in our national infrastructure.

880 When it comes to an examination of the Propositions, many of them are more political aspirations than firm direction. Propositions 1, 3, 8, 9, 10 and 20 could fall into that category and, consequently, leave me, personally, indifferent as to whether they pass or not. I think it really makes very little difference either way to the work of Government during this Plan period.

I will not be supporting Proposition 5 because I am not happy that a number of items in Annex
885 2, on page 113, have been put into abeyance: the Green Economy work, the primary education review, and coastal defences, for example.

I too, like Deputy Burford and Deputy Roffey, will not be supporting Proposition 6 for the reasons they have set out, but also because I think these governance arrangements, as described in the policy letter, are too vaguely defined to have my support. P&R's letter of comment on the
890 amendments said that the proposals had been informed by the previous experience of cross-Committee political governance groups, such as those established by the Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP) and the Supported Living and Ageing Well Strategy (SLAWS). Now, given their chequered performance, I am really not encouraged at all that that is a reason for forming these groups, and I cannot see that the case has been made for another set of talking shops in the
895 governance model for the Plan.

I certainly will not be supporting voting for the tax increases in Proposition 12. With an annual income of around £500 million a year, an increase of £1 million is neither here nor there. It is P&R's job to bring budget recommendations to us annually, based on the circumstances then prevailing, so I will wait to see their recommendations on tax rises each year before deciding whether or not
900 to support them when looking at the budget as a whole.

I cannot support the unamended Propositions 13–18. In particular, I remain deeply concerned by granting unlimited delegated authorities over both the financing and delivery of the capital portfolio in Proposition 14, for reasons set out in the debate on that, the amendments to that Proposition that were lost and for the reasons set out by Deputy Roffey as well.

905 Sir, I would like recorded votes on Propositions 6, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 18, please.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Thank you, sir.

910 I hope Deputy St Pier feels better after that. (*Laughter*) And of course, there was that very funny thing which went round on social media where there is me and Deputy St Pier saying, 'I can do everything better than you,' 'No, you can't!' 'Yes, I can!' 'No, you can't!' That is not the purpose of any of this because we should be moving on.

915 Deputy St Pier said there were certain Propositions, and he named them, which he said were aspirational. Well, yes, they are. Shouldn't a Government Work Plan setting out what we are hoping to achieve over the next four years be aspirational? Can it be entirely accurate? Of course it cannot. Can it have faults in it? Of course it can. Can it be the same at the end of the four years or will it be the same at the end of the 4 years as it was at the beginning? No, it will not, because things change. This is a living Plan, it is to be reviewed every year. There will be things that will pop in, there will be things that will pop out.

920 As to the financial matters, and for Deputy St Pier to say a headline now, it may be a headline in a few weeks' time and articles appear in the paper by himself and Deputy Roffey, or ex-Deputy Graham; I do not know, we will have to wait and see. But I do not think a headline should be saying this is the most financially incompetent, almost *incontinent* financial plan that he has ever seen, because there have been many that I could comment on previously that have met that; we have discussed the ill-fated bond loan before. But there is no point in that; let us move forward. Let us have a look at where we are in relation to it.

930 Admittedly, it appears in a dystopian programme called *The Handmaid's Tale*, and it is a phrase that would probably come better from the lips of Deputy Le Tocq than me, but can I say, 'O blessed day'. Let's say that. Because this is a day when we should say at the end of it, when we take the votes – and there will be recorded votes on several Propositions – we can say at the end of it we have got a Plan we can work to. We have got something that we can seek to achieve. And I commend the work of the Vice President, I know she has got two children, this was almost her third child and she produced it in record time, I think –

935 **Deputy Soulsby:** It was not quite that painful! (*Laughter*)

940 **Deputy Ferbrache:** In relation to that ... and I am not going to name them because I fully accept the quite proper comment the Bailiff made yesterday about not naming civil servants but there are certain senior civil servants and others who have devoted hours and hours and days and days (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) of considerable work and time to this document. It is meant to be a living, breathing document. It is meant to be something that we can look forward to. It is meant to be a plan. It is meant to be practical.

945 We have had talks about governance and we have had talks about this, that, and the other. And, of course, governance is relevant; we are the States of Guernsey, we are the elected body, we represent the interests of the people of the Bailiwick. But people want us to get on with things, they want us to do things.

950 Deputy Roffey mentioned the Housing Action Group. That has met several times and I think that will come up with some housing action, albeit, none of it will be immediate, in the sense that the problem of solving houses – and that is one of the key housing difficulties in Guernsey – has been around for years and will take years, but at least we are having a go.

I would say that in relation to the five politicians that he mentioned, Deputy Roffey is the Chairman; I chaired it last week when he was on holiday, and the meeting lasted half the time that it does when he chairs it! (*Laughter and Interjection*) But never mind, that was just one of those things, different Presidents have different approaches and perhaps are slightly more direct, and talk less than others. But in connection to all of that, let us move forward, let's move forward together. Let's put aside, 'This is terrible, I'm better than you! You're better than me!' I am not sure anybody is better than anybody. But let's move forward with something that is a concrete, workable document that we can look forward to. Let's not snipe at it. There are some amendments that have been successful and those should be fully adopted and they are now part of amended Propositions. I will certainly be voting in favour of those, even though I voted against a couple of the amendments, because we have discussed it, we have debated it, and we have come to a conclusion.

I would ask that we carry on with this debate. I agree with Deputy Roffey, we should not be cutting it short, albeit we do not have to repeat everything all the time. But what we should be doing is saying, 'The future is out there, it is challenging. Brexit is challenging.' As Deputy Le Tocq said, it is not going to go away. I was sad when he was ill and I was very grateful when he got better because I had to cover that for a period of time, and I know how much work that takes. The work that Deputy Le Tocq has done both previously and in this Assembly in relation to external relations is to be commended in the extreme. That is with us not only for the next four years, but probably the next 40 years. We are still dealing with COVID and we are going to be dealing with COVID for years; it has changed our environment. We have got our recovery actions.

We are talking about the reshaping of Government. Reshaping in an evolutionary way, not a revolutionary way, because the way that we have conducted Government before – and that is not a criticism of any individual or any particular Assembly, but it is a fact – has been too bureaucratic, too slow, and ill-suited for the 21st century.

I commend the Plan to you all.

The Bailiff: Deputy Falla.

Deputy Falla: Thank you, sir.

I view the Government Work Plan as something of a political straitjacket, although we have seen a few Houdini amendments in this debate which have successfully freed themselves from it, to some extent. The Assembly's input into our Plan during this debate was important and necessary if it is to be *our* Plan, and that is also why it would have been regrettable to guillotine this debate.

As Deputy Ferbrache noted, I am sure that Deputy Soulsby and others have shed blood, sweat, and tears over this document over recent months. My own copy of the Plan is actually quite battle-worn and has lost a few pages. However, this is because I found it to be the perfect weight and proportion to swat the vexatious Vasalerie flies that are plaguing St Andrews once again.

But more seriously, sir, I would like to draw Members' attention to the second part of paragraph 4.7 on page 13 of the report, which reads:

Additionally, discussions have continued with the Guernsey Community Foundation and the Association of Guernsey Charities, centred primarily on the enhanced future partnership working envisaged by a commissioning model.

This is important, sir, in the light of the high level of public spending we are contemplating and in terms of getting the best value for money. As we all know, a huge amount is achieved by Guernsey's third sector, much of it reliant on the generosity of Island residents who support local charities and the many people who give up hours and hours of time to volunteer. A survey in 2020 into local charitable giving concluded that Islanders donated £22 million that year, that was in 2020. Guernsey being the most generous of the Crown Dependencies, averaging £420 of giving per head, compared to £380 in the Isle of Man and £360 in Jersey.

Sir, we have talked a lot about resource this week. In many cases, charities have built up considerable expertise in their areas of interest. Particularly with public finances getting tighter, it

1000 makes huge sense to increase the partnership between the public and third sectors. However, this needs to be done on a fair basis that values the input that charities can bring.

My understanding is that there is still some way to go in defining our interpretation of commissioning. What it is definitely not is getting the third sector to take on public sector responsibilities for free or on the cheap, but it can deliver exceptional value for money. Commissioning is different from commercial procurement, but we cannot expect the third sector to take on these roles without being properly funded.

I think there is work to be done on both sides: the States need to place the right value on the third-sector contribution and the third sector, indeed, might need to undergo some upskilling in order that commissioning can be truly effective. For our part, sir, there is an onus on the public sector to demonstrate that it is serious about this model of service delivery. That might mean resourcing the commissioning function with a dedicated officer, or at least, part of one, and defining and communicating clearly what 'commissioning' means and defining and clearly communicating a blueprint of how it can work. There is no doubt that the public sector can benefit from pursuing this model further, because the third sector is not interested in profit and is not interested in doing anything less than a proper job. We need to respect that benevolent approach.

Commissioning might not save money, but if done properly, it will give the States better and expert value for money and potentially reduce the size of Government. I would ask that the Policy & Resources Committee pledge to better resource commissioning and the development of a sound and robust commissioning model so that it can deliver mutually beneficial results for both the public and third sectors.

A Member: Hear, hear. Good speech.

The Bailiff: Deputy Matthews.

Deputy Matthews: Thank you, sir.

As individual Deputies and Committees, we have spent quite some time contributing to this Plan. We have debated the various amendments relating to primary schools and CCTV, among others, and their place in a prioritised list of actions.

One thing we have not debated is the item listed in the middle of page 17, which is 'Priority 1: Responding to the COVID-19 pandemic.' Indeed, there has been very little debate on this subject, as nearly all of our pandemic response has been legislated through the CCA using the Civil Contingencies Law. This law allows regulations to be made with immediate effect and approved by the States in retrospect. During the onset of the pandemic, this was unsurprising; the sudden arrival of COVID was an emergency that met the definition and swift action was required. Each day, or even hour, of delay to impose restrictions could have cost lives.

The case for using the emergency laws is less strong now; thankfully, we are in a very different position today. Guernsey has been fortunate to be included in the UK vaccine allocation. The vaccination programme has been successfully administered by HSC and today, 95% of the over-18 population has been vaccinated with at least one dose. We know that vaccines work: hospitalisations and deaths amongst the elderly have dramatically diminished.

To illustrate this, I can relay one story I know of. My partner, Natasha, and I have a friend who lives in Madrid in Spain. In the days when foreign travel was not restricted, we would go over on holiday and stay in her apartment and visit nearby sites of the city. There is an ice skating rink nearby, which we do not have in Guernsey, and it is a nice place to go and take friends to cool down and enjoy this large ice rink, the size of a football field. We, of course, could not visit last year because of travel restrictions. When the pandemic struck, Madrid endured one of Europe's harshest lockdowns; people were not allowed to leave their apartments at all. There was no exercise allowance and adults could visit the nearest local shop once a week only; children could not leave the house at all. And that was enforced; local police patrols would arrest and find anyone breaking lockdown. The ice skating rink was requisitioned and used as a temporary morgue because the city

had run out of mortuary space. This followed some quite harrowing events where, in some cases, the city had to send the military into residential care homes to recover bodies; the care home staff with limited medical training and a shortage of PPE had been, quite simply, terrified of what they had experienced with the new disease and abandoned their positions. As part of the recovery actions, people are now calling for the skating rink to be redeveloped to avoid association with the recent past events.

We are very fortunate that our experience in Guernsey has been very different. Firstly, in no small part, I would like to thank Deputy St Pier and Deputy Soulsby for their work last term; and I would like to thank, of course, our Director of Public Health, who I was very happy to see won a quite astonishing court case, or had it dismissed; and our Medical Director; and of course, all our healthcare workers and essential workers and the people of Guernsey for the 'Guernsey Together' spirit that got us through the initial pandemic; and, of course, the current CCA for avoiding the worst of the second wave this year.

We are one of very few places in the world that had a successful zero-COVID result. If not an intentional policy to achieve it, we kept our freedoms internally. I am sure everyone knows and appreciates the lack of restrictions we had experienced behind our border controls, compared with other countries. For example, our Teams meetings with UK colleagues, where they bemoaned the almost continuous lockdowns and social distancing and looked on in envy at the freedoms and liberty we enjoyed in Guernsey.

While the UK has had a series of confusing and not always entirely effective responses to the pandemic, some of which have contributed to a very high level of cases, the vaccination programme has been amongst the best in the world and we have been very fortunate to be part of the UK allocation. But the pandemic is far from over and around the world cases and hospital admissions continue. While we should not see hospital admissions that we had expected before the vaccination programme, for the first half of this year, overall, we have been successful at achieving low case numbers; our case numbers have been incredibly low in international terms and compared with the UK. We are so lucky that the response by our people and our geography have meant that we have been able to close our borders and keep the virus at bay.

It amazes me that the most significant political challenge to affect the world since World War II has received so little discussion in this Assembly. The Government Work Plan lists our pandemic response as its number-one priority, and if you turn on your TV to watch the evening news, you will quite often see debates in another place between Boris Johnson and Keir Starmer, for example, about the UK response to the pandemic. Internationally, it is sometimes observed as a left-right debate, with figures on the right, such as Boris Johnson and Donald Trump, favouring opening up their economies, while figures on the left, such as Jacinda Ardern and Joe Biden, favouring greater measures in responding to the debate.

In Guernsey, however, things are different. It is not a left-right debate, or it should not be, keeping cases low is popular with the Guernsey public. It has been said that our success in eliminating COVID was not a specified aim; it just worked out that way. Our zero-COVID results could be considered an asset; we are much-admired on the world stage, people specifically want to come here to live here because of it. Guernsey has been spoken of favourably around the world: the French magazine *Paris Match* described us as 'The Island that COVID Forgot.'

Our success in maintaining low case numbers during the pandemic has been almost unique. Talking about that word, in an entirely different context, I had a conversation with Deputy Mahoney, who I am sure has a quite more astute business sense than I have, and explained that, in that context, 'unique' potentially meant 'valuable.' Indeed, my feeling is that our uniquely successful COVID response does present an opportunity that could be capitalised on.

But with the opening of the Blue Channel on 1st July, we faced renewed risk of higher case numbers, not, to be hoped, hospitalisations or mortality, but high case numbers. There are those who say case numbers do not matter; I do not agree, cases *do* matter. There is a sense that we are moving towards synchronising our pandemic response with the UK and that our idea of 'endemic' will match that of the UK. Indeed, if you click the link on the footnote on the bottom of page 72, it

1105 goes to the UK Government definition of what an 'endemic' means. We could see high numbers of cases, as Jersey and the Isle of Man have done, this could lose our unique status and may jeopardise some of the health and economic benefits we might achieve.

1110 Of course, it is understood that very high rates of vaccination mean the risks of hospital admissions and mortality are greatly reduced, if not removed completely. Unvaccinated individuals and the immunocompromised still face risks. The under-18s, which have not been included in our vaccination programme, are at much less risk of serious illness than older groups, but still face negative consequences from the disease; it may be less serious for younger people, but it is not nothing. Even in its milder, moderate form, it is not a disease people want to catch. Young people feel like they are in the frame. There are further concerns that may arise from high case numbers; long COVID can affect people even with mild or moderate symptoms. There is no doubt that this is
1115 a real condition; some people suffer persisting fatigue, muscle ache, and temperature dysregulation. It is not, as some have said, a psychological effect, as if to dismiss it as unimportant.

High case numbers from community spread could have negative effects beyond the disease itself. People who have to isolate face disruption. Families with children are particularly affected by isolation requirements and trying to work from home and manage childcare at the same time. The
1120 self-employed have less to fall back on too.

For some, there is a feeling that the Bailiwick bubble has burst; it does not feel like 'Guernsey Together' as much anymore. We could squander some of the gains that we have worked so hard to achieve. Young people feel overlooked and wonder if this Government really cares about their interests.

1125 There is some real frustration and anger in the community. Some of this is expressed on social media. Sometimes, people call out the CCA or the President, Deputy Ferbrache, for criticism. I will not repeat the strongest criticism; he might sue me. I do not believe for 1 minute that there is any undue influence on our policy exerted by members of the CCA, but I do feel that, sometimes, advice that suits the UK needs greater adaptation to our local considerations. We do not know how long
1130 some restrictions from COVID might be with us; it might be all over by Christmas, but it could go on for years to come.

If we are to live with COVID, is it not now the time to transition away from emergency powers to normalise our legislation and move to a more open and democratic approach?

Thank you.

1135 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Bury.

Deputy Bury: Thank you, sir.

At some point over the last few days, Deputy Moakes referenced his membership of the GWP
1140 Sub-Committee, and I think what he was saying was along the lines that, because he was a part of that process, he could support the Plan in full and did not need to support any of the amendments, and I apologise if I have got that incorrect, but I think that was the gist of it. I was also a member of the Sub-Committee but found the experience a bit different, so I thought it was pertinent to share a different point of view, and I think it is a similar one that Deputy Fairclough alluded to in his speech
1145 on an earlier amendment.

I was very pleased to have been asked by Deputy Soulsby to be part of the Sub-Committee. I thank her for her belief that I would be a valuable contributor. I do wonder if she may have regretted it, choosing me, at some point, but she graciously maintained that that was not the case and had wanted challenge and robust discussion, which I duly provided on a regular basis. I was keen to be
1150 part of the Sub-Committee, in part because I wanted to be in the thick of this important decision-making process for this term, and in part because, in all honesty, when the GWP began, I was struggling to get my head around it a bit with it being so vast and with my being new to the Assembly, so I thought it would be a good way to get a better understanding of it.

And it did, indeed, help me understand it more, but there was a lot about the process that did
1155 not sit well with me, and I think it important to share those, but with the important caveat that I

believe Deputy Soulsby, and all of the officers involved, were doing everything to their absolute best and to do it in a transparent, robust, and democratic way. It really was just the enormity of the task, to try and reach what is a very laudable goal, that possibly hampered their efforts.

1160 It has been said by other Members over the course of the last few days, and I mentioned in an earlier speech on the NICE TAs, that I felt we were doing things the wrong way round. That really is one of my remaining concerns around the GWP. We decided what we wanted to do very early on in our tenure, including the resolution bonfire, which I honestly do not believe that new Members in particular can have really understood fully. Then we attempted to figure out what resources we have, and it is worth noting on that point that officers have said that we do not really have a robust
1165 system of doing that, and then, in a few months, we will know what money we will have in the long term to do the things and pay the people.

It really has felt a bit back-to-front. It has felt a bit like going to the supermarket to do my weekly shop but before knowing what money I had available, what I needed to replenish, or checking my diary to see if I was free to go at that point.

1170 But that is the GWP as a whole, which everyone will have had their own experience of, so I wanted to share, in a bit more detail, some of the concerns I had specifically in reference to the Sub-Committee, as that is not a process that everyone got to go through.

My first concern was when Deputy Soulsby gave me the list of members of the Sub-Committee and I noted that it was all new Members of the Assembly. I was concerned about that because, while
1175 fresh eyes and new perspectives are valuable, having little in-depth political knowledge – or I think they call it ‘corporate memory’, which is not a phrase I love, but I will use it – it seemed unwise to me, considering the vast array of topics that we would be covering and asked to prioritise.

I asked if having all new Members was purposeful, and Deputy Soulsby gave me a very reasonable explanation that no, it was not purposeful, but that it had not felt wise to have
1180 Presidents, and that took a lot of experience out of the running, and in addition, that they had ideally wanted representation from all Committees, so people that were on dual Committees or more than two were best-placed. As I said, I found that very reasonable. But despite the reasonable explanation, the consequence remains the same, and that was a lot of inexperience politically, and when you combine that with the second issue, which I will come onto next, it was compounded.

1185 My next major concern was time. As we all know, the GWP has gone at absolute breakneck speed, and again, I understand the reasons given for that too. The previous plans have taken 18 months and we need to get cracking, action this day, etc. And as a person who is naturally action-oriented, I get that too. But again, the consequences are not changed by the reasonable explanation, and the consequences were that the members of the Sub-Committee, all new to the Assembly,
1190 often had little time to read and absorb the papers and really understand the details of each item up for prioritisation.

Sir, just to make sure that Members are clear, the focus of the work of the Sub-Committee was the prioritisation and phasing of the recovery actions, under priority 3, and the details, which are in
1195 Annex 1. Those little boxes and few-sentence action descriptions really do not do justice to the magnitude of each of the items, the history behind them, and the consequences of doing or not doing them.

While members of the Sub-Committee may have known details of the actions that fell within their own mandate – and the important word there is ‘may’ as they did not always, due to being so new to their Committees – when they did, they were able to share those details with other Members.
1200 But as I say, that was not always the case, and even if they had known, there absolutely was not time to get into the level of detail that would have been needed to really understand the impact and ramifications of doing or not doing each one.

These issues, sir, I think are exactly why we have a Committee system: because it simply is not possible for everyone to be across everything in the level of detail one would expect in order to
1205 make these sorts of decisions.

I would like to be very clear that when it said in Section 4.5 of the executive summary that (a) the Sub-Committee recommended a set of proposals and (b) developed a set of criteria to develop

those proposals that I do not wholeheartedly feel that that phrase reflects the process. It does not sit great with me that that is being attributed to me, because essentially, these are the recommendations of the senior officers and the Sub-Committee really did not have enough background knowledge or time to apply themselves to it properly.

Away from the Sub-Committee and onto the GWP more broadly: in Section 3.3, it mentions that the States recognised in stage 1 of the GWP that there is a virtuous circle. But I have to admit, sir, that I do not believe that is completely true, not in its purest form, at least. In this context, the virtuous circle is supposed to shift the traditional idea of starting with the finances as the priority, and then when you have got enough money, you can look after people. It moves it to if you actually use more of the money you have to invest in your people, then the economy will benefit. I think Deputy Queripel was making a point along these lines yesterday, and I have to say that I agree with him. I do not doubt that many of my colleagues do not agree with me in the Assembly.

I do not think the description in the GWP represents that point of view either. It says:

... the urgent need to recover and enable further economic stability and prosperity will provide employment and secure the revenues to fund important social and environmental policies;

It then goes on to say:

implementing those social and environmental policies supports Guernsey's resilience and competitiveness, which in turn supports economic recovery.

And, yes, I suppose in a sense, that demonstrates that one feeds the other, but it still starts with the economy. What if the economy never gets to where it needs to be to be deemed that it can support the social and environmental policies? If that becomes the case, then I guess we will just have to hope that our human and environmental resources do not run out first.

I do recognise that, of course, there are priorities included that are both economic and social, and I am obviously pleased to see that. But it is worth noting that those actions that did not make the cut are weighted towards the environment and social. As far as I recall, which I and other members of the Sub-Committee raised at the time, there were no economic priorities that were culled.

When talking about it in broad terms, there are some things that we have not seen at all and do not seem to be anywhere. They are not in the priority list and they are not even noted as *not* being on the priority list. One that springs to mind is the resolution relating to gender-neutral legislation drafting, which sits with P&R, and that was raised, I think it was last week, but I have lost all concept of time now, when ESS brought the updated health and safety legislation last week. I know that that is of absolutely no importance to some people in this Assembly, but it is important to me. And I ask others to ask themselves – through you, sir – are they 100% sure that there are not things that *are* important to them on this invisible list somewhere? Are they BAU, perhaps? I do not feel, throughout this process, that we have managed to reach a definition of BAU. In the regular GWP workshops, Deputy Prow has asked that question quite a few times, and I thank him for that, but I am not sure that we ever got to a conclusion, unfortunately.

Moving onto the Propositions specifically that we have to decide on today: I would say the first set are fairly benign, but there are a few that bother me. Proposition 9 states that:

... funding should not be made available for non-prioritised service developments.

This feels very restrictive. And while I understand that the whole idea of the Plan is to make sure we lay out what we can deliver, allowing no wiggle room for unexpected happenings or great opportunities to be grasped seems short-sighted.

Proposition 12 seems to mean almost nothing in the grand scheme of things and I really have no idea what the figure of £1 million is based on or by what means P&R will be achieving this. I am not sure that we need to direct P&R to include this in the Budget; surely, they just would include it

1250 in the Budget and we would vote on it then. I would be grateful if Deputy Helyar or Soulsby could explain that a little more when they respond.

As has been said, Propositions 13–17 seem to represent a radical shift in our spending and our approach to our fiscal responsibilities. I, too, share the concerns aired yesterday by Deputies Kazantseva-Miller, St Pier, and de Lisle, among others, that we are setting our future governments and generations up for a huge amount of debt with real plan to pay it back.

1255 Proposition 14, although I did not speak on this in the amendment debate yesterday, I will absolutely not be voting for this Proposition. This is an unprecedented handover of power to P&R. As was discussed yesterday, this is not about trust and it is not personal but when I stood in the election, while I was very careful not to make too many outlandish promises to the public – knowing that, as just one Member, that is a very unwise thing to do – what I did promise was that I would
1260 scrutinise, challenge, and question to ensure that the right decisions were being made and that their money was being spent in the best way. This Proposition removes the ability for me to do that in a very significant way. To quote a colleague, ‘You could not get me to vote for that if you dragged me kicking and screaming.’

1265 The final Proposition, regarding the changes to Rule 4, I will also be voting against, for the very reasons that Deputy Roffey stated, and so can reassure him that he will not be the only one. I, too, feel that this one is designed to constrain and is taking us down the path of restricting Members to be able to challenge and lay amendments where they feel it necessary.

Sir, in closing, I would like to return to where I started and say that, although I probably just
1270 come across as very negative about the Plan, I do truly appreciate the amount of work and commitment that Deputy Soulsby in particular has applied to it, along with the officers who have played a key role, and I do appreciate the intention behind it. It is a mammoth undertaking and to get it to where it has gotten to is no mean feat.

However, I feel it was important to highlight that when we have something as vast as this in front
1275 of us, it becomes almost too easy just to nod it through because to get into the detail is too overwhelming. But I think that is very dangerous and it is important that the magnitude of it does not mean the detail gets lost, and we, all as scrutineers of the Assembly, have to be aware of what we are signing up to and the consequences of it.

My fear from the beginning of this process was that it would be used as a stick to beat us with
1280 over the term, i.e., if it is not in the Plan, it is not happening. That is particularly worrying when we take into account the fact that there simply has not been enough time to input and scrutinise as much as one might have liked. We have had assurances over this past couple of days that the Plan is fluid and can be amended, which I really hope turns out to be the reality, as none of us knows what might be just around the corner; the last 18 months has shown us that. I hope that this is
1285 remembered as the term progresses, but I fear it will not be.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Mahoney.

1290 **Deputy Mahoney:** Thank you, sir.

Bogeymen everywhere. That is how someone listening in for the first time would imagine that it is. We have had, so far, Deputies Roffey, Burford, and St Pier, and, I bet, a few more yet to come, telling us that there is a spectre hiding under every Proposition, a total P&R plot, ‘It is all a nefarious fit-up, guv.’ There is no P&R skulking in the shadows, waiting to spend everyone’s hard-earned cash
1295 and plotting to launch massive PPP incentives. This Plan was not cooked up with an eye of newt and wing of bat thrown in; all of the ingredients were added by the people sat here today.

Sir, as referenced by Deputy Bury, for many of us, this was our first whole-of-Government debate, and it was quite an experience. Most of us, in one way or another, had a part to play in its drafting, and its contents are the result of an unprecedented level of cooperation with all of the Committees;
1300 no one was left behind in this process. By the way, if anyone is feeling left out or does not have

enough to do, come and speak to me, and believe me, it would be welcomed. One Member already has and P&R are delighted to be drawing on their experience.

1305 Sir, I am now understanding how being in Government can be likened to the old saying that, 'There are old pilots and there are bold pilots, but there are no old, bold pilots.' In the same vein, Government can be good or it can be easy, but not both. But I did not sign up for easy, so that is okay.

1310 Although some in here and, naturally, in the media, have tried to paint this Plan as a P&R plot to not take responsibility for anything, I hope that Members see that this is nonsense. It has been built by the Committees and the clue is in the title. For those across many Committees that have engaged with us, I genuinely believe and hope that it was worthwhile. I have sat with reps from every Committee and discussed a plethora of matters to find the solutions; it is a two-way street.

1315 There are a lot of workstreams in this Plan and we could all go through each of them – I am not going to – and pick our favourites, but these are the workstreams added by the Committees responsible for their specific areas. The only way to get through them is together. Let's get this signed off and get on with doing some stuff.

Sir, I will end with a brief quote that I hope resonates with some, but it will not with all:

It's not about perfect. It's about effort. And when you bring that effort every single day, that's where transformation happens. That's how change occurs.

I have signed up to it and I hope there are many others sat here with me that feel the same way. Thank you, sir.

1320 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: Thank you, sir,

1325 First, I would like to thank Deputy Soulsby and her colleagues for putting together what I believe is a pretty good paper. I do not think we could have a better thing before us that would hold us all together, and hopefully, we will vote for it.

1330 I am going to vote for all of the paragraphs in it. I have got a slight hesitation on a couple of them, which I will perhaps mention. One possible criticism that I would make is possibly there has not been quite as much emphasis as I would like to have seen on cost savings in the public sector. We have talked about downsizing, which was good; then we talked about right-sizing, now we talk about reshaping. What we do not want is to reshape it into an enormous, massive blob.

1335 Over time, I think we do need to address the numbers. We have tried, over many years, to get numbers in the civil service down, but it never seems to quite work out. I think we should try harder on that. We are going to have to look at the public sector pension plan, which we tend to overlook, but it is an elephant in the room and I am glad to see that Deputy Mahoney is going to have some responsibility in that area.

We cannot be sanguine about the inevitability of raising taxes. I do not regard it as inevitable and I am probably not on quite the same plain as Deputy Helyar on that point. We must try very hard not to put up taxes for our people. People are struggling and we must do as much as we possibly can to keep our costs down.

1340 There are some specific areas: Deputy Queripel, in what he called his 'rant' yesterday, made some interesting points about the cost of endless reviews. Deputies Soulsby and Dudley-Owen have referred to the fact that we have spent over £10 million on education reviews, (*Interjection*) whereas, for less than that sum, the Ladies' College has undergone a major revamp—new buildings, new everything—and the actual sum was a lot less than £10 million; as I understand it, it was £6 million.
1345 We must do better on that.

And we must try and pick off the easy fixes as quickly as possible. Deputy Queripel referred to GP11. I have been thinking about that, we have been talking about it on Development & Planning and really, a quick fix for our problematic housing sector would be to get rid of it. When you

1350 intervene in a market like this, when you effectively impose a tax on building houses, you will get fewer houses. As Ronald Reagan once said, the scariest words in the English language are:

I'm from the Government, and I'm here to help.

We tried to help with GP11, it was a mistake, and that needs to go, and that is a quick, easy fix. We need to do more of that.

1355 Perhaps I could just address a couple of the paragraphs that have been discussed and some people are not too happy about. Paragraph 6, which is the paragraph dealing with arrangements for workstreams, I was tending to agree with Deputy Kazantseva-Miller on that. We do have Committees with responsibilities. We have been working together now for nine months, we are used to each other. I do not think the Committee structure, as it stands, should be overwhelmed with other arrangements, but I suspect that this is not the plan, that other arrangements will only be put in place where strictly necessary, and I hope that is the case.

1360 Paragraph 9 is the paragraph that says, unless the work has been prioritised, then it will not be funded. I think we have to say that; if we have got a prioritisation programme as to what we are going to spend money on, then we have to stick with what we are going to say.

1365 Paragraph 12 is curious; that is the paragraph that suggests, for the next four budgets, there should be an increase in revenues in real-terms, so that is, inflation plus £1 million. That is an interesting projection, if that is a projection, of what we are going to need to raise, and that seems quite reasonable to me.

1370 Then we have got paragraph 14. This is a big deal. The delegation to P&R of control. It is not unlimited control, but it almost is: up to the £568 million. It is a new departure. On balance, under these circumstances, I think we have to do it, and I am conscious of the fact that this will help, I think, with procurement, because figures will not be floating around before tenders are dealt with. So on balance, although I have some reservations on this one, I think we must vote for it. If it does not work out, if we do not like it, we can delete it again and vote against it.

On balance, my recommendation is we vote for all of this and wish P&R, who have taken on a hell of a lot of responsibility, the best of luck in dealing with it.

1375 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fairclough.

Deputy Fairclough: Thank you, sir. I will be brief.

1380 As Members will know, I have been involved in the work of the Government Work Plan Sub-Committee, aided by some political colleagues, along with some excellent officer support, and I commend them and P&R, and Deputy Soulsby in particular, for bringing forward this Plan in unprecedented times, and relatively quickly, given everything else that has been going on, let's face it.

1385 Our work was focused on delivery recovery actions, and so I take full responsibility for my part in helping shape the proposed recovery actions for delivery. As Deputy Soulsby has explained previously in workshops, that does not mean that every Members has agreed with every action and its phasing, as my support for some amendments will show and as Deputy Bury has explained. However, I cannot claim to have had any input on the proposed governance arrangements, an area I would politely suggest is ripe for some close scrutiny, as I alluded to yesterday.

1390 I should say that I fully support and commend the work in priority 1, 'Responding to the COVID-19 pandemic,' and priority 2, 'Managing the effects of Brexit and our international obligations.' Once again, I thank all of those involved in all of that ongoing work.

1395 I am broadly supportive of priority 3, 'Delivery the recovery actions,' but less so of priority 4, 'Reshaping government'; and I hear what my colleague Deputy Dyke says in that regard. Here is a piece of work which does not sit under any one Committee and needs some appropriate governance; and yet, we do not have proposals here yet for how this will be done. Deputy St Pier

beat me to it but I think it is worth repeating: we are told the reshaping of Government will require some £26 million over the next five years, with just £7.4 million of cumulative savings.

1400 It is still unclear to me, having read the Government Work Plan, what is planned on public service transformation. So I think I need more detail on the reshaping and transformation of Government, more than that in paragraph 10.8 at least. I hope this Assembly is kept up to date regularly on progress in this area and I would be grateful if Deputy Soulsby could give this reassurance in her summing up.

1405 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Thank you, sir.

1410 I want to start by saying I was a bit disappointed by the motion to curtail the debate. I can only assume it was driven by two things: the desire to get to different agendas, and I accept that. We still have quite a lot, obviously, to debate, but if that is the reason, to me, it is a reflection of how close the Government Work Plan States meeting and the States debate last week was set. I think P&R should pay much closer attention to the setting of the dates, I believe there are amendments
1415 proposed exactly on those lines so we do not have the same problem next year, where, actually, GWP meetings were, again, only a week apart from States meetings.

This partly links me to Rule 4.3, which I will talk to later. Because if we are here to provide that level of scrutiny in building amendments and in engagement we really need to allow for time to do so, and just having one week apart is really not appropriate, especially that being the last day of
1420 school. I think that is really, slightly, a failure of planning, in my opinion.

If the second reason for curtailing debate was that, actually, there is nothing else to be decided because it has all been decided and it does not matter what people say. Well, I have been elected to come and represent the views of people who have voted for me. I believe it is absolutely my duty to be continuing to stand up and to raise concerns and scrutinise what is happening and this is the
1425 platform to do so, and I will continue doing so, even if all decisions are decided before that.

I want to move into reflecting a little bit on the process of the Government Work Plan, which has been explained in much detail by Deputy Bury in terms of the Sub-Committee. We know, of course, the process has been very quick, and there has been a desire and a reason for that. From a Deputies' perspective, I think we probably had between 10 and 15 hours of meetings or engagement,
1430 including the crucial meetings we had at the beginning with Committees in November to come up with what we thought would be the proposals. Those meetings, in my experience, were about an hour and a half.

In sum, I would say I spent quite a little amount of time in terms of actual input into this process, and this is just a reflection. Some of the tools used throughout this process were, originally, a
1435 spreadsheet where we were asked to evaluate all the priorities according to criteria which were given to us, followed by engagement sessions, where we were given Post-it notes to put on the walls of things to prioritise or not prioritise, what to delete or not. At that meeting, the attendance was actually lower; by the end of that meeting even more Deputies had left. I think, as officers and Deputy Soulsby later explained, we could not possibly make any statistical inferences from any of
1440 those engagement exercises. Designing a Government Work Plan by spreadsheet with criteria and Post-it notes presents certain outcomes, and this is just a reflection. That is the process that has been chosen but it will have its downsides. The way, the speed with which it has been compiled means more detailed considerations could not have been taken.

I believe one area where one of the downsides has been is that this Plan has not really engaged
1445 with the community in any shape or form, and I think that has been reflective of, really, the lack of feedback and engagement from Islanders on the Government Work Plan, except in relation to some of the amendments that were put forward and some of the feedback we received from Islanders. Apart from that, a lack of participatory engagement with the community and coming up with this fundamental piece of work which is also requesting the largest amount of borrowing commitments

1450 and capital programme in recent history of governance—we have done that without, really, any, I would say, engagement with the community.

My second point is in regard to savings; I have obviously explained that a little bit more in my previous speeches. That relates to Proposition 10 in the policy letter, which is:

To agree that the Committees of the States are collectively responsible and accountable for delivery of the savings set out within the Funding & Investment Plan ...

1455 Again, there are two elements to it. The first is I really, fundamentally, do not think we are being ambitious enough in terms of showing the savings and really doing the hard work behind the scenes that will lead to that transformation. I know it is on the agenda but it simply does not translate into numbers in the finance and investment plan. We accept that it is a living document so I hope it is going to be that. Perhaps in a year's time, once further details of more work, more commitment, are known, perhaps we can become more ambitious on savings.

1460 There are parts that are also missing, I believe, in this Government Work Plan, for example, in relation to property, and unfortunately, Deputy Mahoney is not here in the Assembly right now to hear that. The whole property portfolio and property management, has been, really, a black box in relation to Deputies' understanding what is happening there. I have requested, several times now, officers responsible for training to deliver induction training or deliver further information on that.
1465 I am sure Deputy Mahoney is doing a lot of work behind the scenes to try to figure out what do with that.

But again, I think the Government Work Plan actually completely fails to reflect any plan in relation to what is going to be happening in the property portfolio, especially with regard to the savings side of things. Property rationalisation features in the capital portfolio but as something we have to spend on. What I would really like to see, in terms of the transformation of property services that we are delivering, is how does that translate into savings? I do hope that in the next iteration of the Plan, that is something that is going to be reflected.

1470 Also, I understand the collective responsibility. But at the same time, I am not privy to what other Committees are doing. I can sign up to the savings of the Committees I am on and I have at least some level of scrutiny, but I am not sure how I can sign up to the collective savings, especially when I just do not agree that they are ambitious enough. So Proposition 10 I am minded not to vote for it on that basis.

In terms of the savings aspect and doing the hard work to actually get efficiencies in the Government, an analogy that was coming to my mind in this whole situation is, we are really
1480 choosing the easy route; we are choosing to spend without a plan of how to repay it and without actually doing the hard work to achieve the efficiencies and the savings to counterbalance the additional spending. To some extent, I think it is a bit like with environmental commitments: you can choose the easy way, you can choose to go by offsets now, and you will achieve net-zero in your environmental commitments today, but that is the false way to do it. I just believe we are
1485 choosing that way, to do it easy, to spend, borrow, but not do the hard work.

Proposition 12 talks about the Budget; we are asked today to commit to a real-term increase of £1 million in terms of the Budget for the next four years. No figures have been given to explain why £1 million is the right number; is it too low, potentially? Maybe too high? I am not sure why it is really coming through this Government Work Plan process; it should be something that, really,
1490 comes through the budgetary process as something that reflects the situation of that annual Budget, rather than something we can plan for today, so I am minded to vote against Proposition 12.

This takes me to Rule 4.3, Proposition 21, I can see where it is coming from and the need for it, but it also comes with ... to do that, Deputies and Committees need more time. Because of, again,
1495 how quickly we have a schedule of States meetings, there is the five-week deadline in policy submission, it simply is just not enough time to do the good work.

This, again, goes a little bit to the way States meetings are set, and perhaps we should consider that important policy letters should be published with, actually, more timelines and that five weeks

1500 is, really, not enough. In those cases, I, again, find it unacceptable to have very significant States meetings within a week of each other. So I think if we want to do more work, we need to allow for more time, which does mean publishing policy letters more in advance than five weeks before the deadlines, especially those that are controversial, potentially, and important in nature.

1505 I think, overall, P&R is going to have more responsibility; if we are going to vote for some of the Propositions here today, especially the financing one, that is what is going to happen. They did say wanted to take it, obviously, seriously. I understand it is quite common for the P&R colleagues to receive 800-page Committee reports and I can only imagine that those numbers will increase. To be honest, I really do not envy colleagues; if what you are suggesting is further delegation of responsibilities to P&R, it will come with further responsibility, it will come with more paperwork. I am actually concerned for you, as only five colleagues, responsible for all of those areas, there is going to be a lot on your shoulders. When you receive 1,000-page reports, I always ask whether you will have enough level of personal scrutiny to be able to really dedicate the right time for that.

1510 What we keep talking about is, 'Let us do more of this, more Rule 4.3, more responsibility for P&R.' But then there is the flip-side, to do those things properly, it comes with resources, it comes with the need for more time. At the time of the election, when I was deciding whether to stand or not, I asked an experienced Deputy, 'Would machinery of Government be something we should really do?' This experienced Deputy actually said, 'It was never about the deck chairs; it was actually about the people.' And I think Deputy Burford reflected on that; we can continue moving the deck chairs and think it is going to really solve everything, but actually, it is really all about the people and ultimately, I guess, working together.

1520 I do hope that I keep coming back to this Assembly feeling like what I say matters and I will continue turning up in my Committees, doing my best to drive the projects I am doing. Ultimately, I do think it is about working together, and I do still look forward to the next four years ahead.

1525 I will be voting against a few of the Propositions, especially the ones in relation to finance, so those are 14, 15, 16, 17, 18. I am minded to vote, actually, against Rule 21; against the Budget Proposal, 12; and against the governance rule 6, as well.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

1530 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you, sir ... tech drama, sorry!

1535 I, too, will start by thanking Deputy Soulsby. I know the trauma, the blood, sweat, tears, the sleepless nights, and the gruelling hours that have gone into this by Deputy Soulsby in particular. I would add to that the political members, particularly those on the subgroup, they, too, have my thanks, and the officers, who never get the credit, but do get a lot of complaints. I know that they have had to work at, sometimes, uncomfortable speed, and I certainly commend everyone who has put the hours in to enable us to have this debate today.

1540 Speaking of that, I know the effort to guillotine debate has been discussed, and I share, very much, the sentiments of those that have spoken on this in debate before me. I would just add that there is one further consideration, and that is the ability ... this is the only chance some Members will get to put their views on record and I think it is important they have that right. I have never yet supported a guillotine motion, but I certainly would not support any efforts to guillotine a debate of this magnitude and this importance. I do think it is important that anyone who has a view has the ability to put that view on record and for their colleagues to hear that view and take it into account in terms of voting.

1545 This is, of course, a policy letter that will affect every single one of us as individual States' Members and it will affect every single Committee, and it will shape the work of Government; that is what it is designed to do over this political term.

To the guts of that Work Plan: I will speak first of all, I suppose, in capacity as President of the Committee *for the Environment & Infrastructure*. There are, really, three recovery actions that

1550 engage E&I very directly and those are: investing in nature and the natural economy; securing future energy requirements; and meeting the Island's housing needs.

Under the natural economy, we have got updating the Environmental Pollution Law and preparing and implementing updated animal welfare legislation, both of which have been going on or have been intentions, worthy aspirations for some time and they really need that focus, so I am really glad to see that they are included.

1555 The blue economy: I know this is a phrase that gets bounced around a lot. I am not going to talk about it in any great detail, but what I would say is that, generally, it is about understanding what resources we have, obviously in the blue economy this is about our marine natural resources, and being able to map them out and plan around them. I think one of the benefits that people might not always recognise is that that certainty, it is not just an exercise for its own sake, it is actually something that very much enables and facilitates and accelerates progress in respect of that.

1560 If you think about, for example, someone wanting to come along and put in some marine renewable energy, for example, if we already have done the work, we have already mapped out our natural capital, we have already done the work around our spatial use of that area, and a renewable energy business wants to come in, we can say, 'Yes, we have already thought about this. The best places for you to consider would be here, here, or here,' then that is going to make their job an awful lot easier and they are going to be much more inclined to invest in the Island, in the Bailiwick, under those circumstances than they would be if there were uncertainty around that. In fact, if they thought there was a risk of uncertainty, especially relating to planning processes and public acceptability, then they are much more likely to go to a jurisdiction that has already done this work. So the blue economy work really is an enabler.

1570 And I would say that the green economy work is exactly the same. It is also a key enabler in many respects. I, too, share and, probably massively amplify Deputy St Pier's disappointment that some of that workstream has been held in abeyance in this, but I will give Members and members of the public the reassurance that we will be very actively looking for operational synergies, as they are now known, and we will be pouncing on those operational synergies in order to progress any parts of that green economy workstream that we feasibly can in this political term. So I do think it is very important.

1575 In terms of securing our future energy requirements, generally speaking, the focus of this is on supporting the transition to decarbonisation, and I am sure I do not need to explain why that is important. Climate change is obviously one of the driving factors in this and there are various workstreams that we need to do, one of which, actually, may well come up today; we do not really know, in terms of the policy letter on tariffs. The next significant piece of work chronologically is our Electricity Strategy, which aims:

... to create an environment which fosters a dynamic, innovative and competitive energy market and which helps the energy market to transition to decarbonisation without risking the security of supply for Islanders and whilst keeping energy costs affordable and maximising opportunities for economic diversification.

1585 It touches on so many different aspects, it is absolutely key, and I really glad that it is a focus. Certainly, E&I is very much champing at the bit to get on with that one.

Deputy Roffey has also talked about the recovery action of meeting the Island's housing needs, and he is absolutely right that that does not sit solely in ESS's mandate. General housing does, of course, fall into E&I's mandate. And, as he has already talked about, and Deputy Ferbrache also has, there is a very tangible political focus and action-focused effort through the Housing Action Group to tackle these very pressing problems. I think Deputy Roffey was right to warn that we cannot expect the quick wins to be particularly quick, but we are making every effort to streamline those processes, to do things differently and better to make sure that we can see results as quickly as possible. This is not a problem that is going to go away, it is a problem that deserves attention and we are throwing everything we have got at it.

1595 There are various other workstreams in some of the other recovery actions which touch very directly or which are owned by E&I, I suppose, not least the future supply of aggregate. Of course,

we have already published a policy letter on that; that is due for debate some time in the next few months. Inert waste, the Bridge Strategy, and I will just say: with the Bridge Strategy, that area is the most important in terms of our coastal defence work, that is another aspect that we really need to focus on, that is also a very important element within that, Future Harbours policy, obviously, and seafront enhancement. There are so many really big opportunities in terms of the public realm, just for a start, but so much else as well, when we are talking about resilient and sustainable infrastructure and connectivity, that really goes to the core. E&I will be taking, and already are taking, a very active role in those workstreams.

One of the, I suppose, technically smaller ones is mention of a Nature Commission, and I was glad Deputy Falla talked about the role of the third sector and the role of commissioning. I certainly think that this is a really good opportunity, not just to improve what Government does by extension on the ground, but to really maximise its effect. But the important component is supporting the third sector, especially in the realm of nature or biodiversity, whatever you want to call it, we are very dependent upon the third sector to actually deliver this Government's objectives and it is so important that we can support them in doing that.

So in discussions around a Nature Commission, it is absolutely critical that those are driven by the third sector and that the third sector's views are taken into very careful consideration in the formation of that Nature Commission. I am hoping that if we can get a Nature Commission up and running, we can really maximise our bang for public buck and vastly improve the delivery of the things that really matter to people on the ground.

Climate change: the Government Work Plan does make, very correctly, the point that this is a long-term pressure, and it is only going to become increasingly challenging. Anyone who has turned on the news – and I know some people might not have had much time to do that; I have only managed about three times in the last few weeks – but certainly every time I have turned on the news, there has been another climate change-related event that has actually even managed to knock COVID off the top spot. We have seen the devastating flooding in China, the heatwave in North America, wildfires, etc. We are becoming all too used to this, sadly, but it does underscore the point that climate change is increasingly a very real component of our reality. And it affects us locally, too; it really does. It affects the way we have to think about our coastal defences. It affects the way we have to think about our long-term water management. It affects the way that we have to think about our land management and various other things. It really is already affecting us, but those effects are only going to become more pronounced.

Climate change is not given its own individual subject header in this and Deputy Soulsby did do a good job of persuading me not to bring an amendment to the previous iteration of this policy letter to try to bring that into being. She assured me that climate change is threaded throughout the Government Work Plan, and it does manifest itself in many of the workstreams, especially many of those that I have already mentioned, in fact.

I will be holding P&R's feet to the fire on this and the rest of the Assembly, because we cannot just let it stay as words; this is important. Climate change is going to fundamentally shape this Island and the Bailiwick for the younger and future generations that have a far bigger stake in that future than those of us sitting in this Chamber, so it is important that we do turn those words into reality. Although climate change does not have its own subject header, I very much hope and expect that it will be a material consideration in a lot of the work that derives from this.

One of the actions that we are actively working on right now is securing the extension of the Paris Agreement on climate change to the Bailiwick in our own right, as opposed to the current situation, where we are considered under the umbrella of the UK.

Deputy Bury has already explained how the virtuous circle can very easily become a vicious circle when everything is predicated on economic objectives, as it does appear to be. In fact, I would expand on that slightly and say that I am not convinced it is a circle at all; I still think it is an old-school linear economic model dressed up, not terribly convincingly, as a circle. I do think we are going to need to work to make that a reality.

1650 Environmental sustainability and economic sustainability are by no means mutually exclusive, and indeed, there are countless examples where the two are mutually inclusive, as I have often spoken of in the past. But it is also true that there can be tensions between the two.

I would like to just read out paragraph 3.3, which says:

In the stage 1 Policy Letter the States also recognised that there is a virtuous circle: where the urgent need to recover and enable further economic stability and prosperity will provide employment and secure the revenues to fund important social and environmental policies; implementing those social and environmental policies supports Guernsey's resilience and competitiveness, which in turn supports economic recovery.

That is a description of the virtuous circle as it works on paper. But if we also take paragraph 5.27, we see a potential tension creeping in. Paragraph 5.27 says that:

The types of businesses that we most want to grow and attract are 'scale-ups' in high value-added light footprint industries – that is, those businesses seeking to expand, achieve new investments, and seek new market opportunities. The types of people we want to attract actively to the Island are ambitious entrepreneurs who want to take advantage of the work/life balance Guernsey offers – a high quality of life in a safe, conveniently-connected location with a low-tax and professional environment, with good health and education services for families and a strong sense of community.

1655 Now, I cannot argue with any of that, of course I can't, but I do think it underscores how important it is that we bare the first paragraph I read out in mind when considering paragraphs like that one, because it would be all too easy to focus on the economic objectives without any regard to the policies that those decisions may well be undermining, and I think we need to be on our toes to guard against that.

1660 Debt: debt has been a theme of debate across the various amendments and in general debate. Deputy Roffey described himself as having stood accused of being a 'flat-capped Guernseyman'; I am not sure if it is my Guernsey genes or my Scottish genes which are more influential in this, but I have always been uneasy about debt, and I am particularly when I think of it with the longer view in mind. There is, with the taking on of significant amounts of debt, an intergenerational equity/fairness issue to square. I am really not comfortable supporting the Propositions that relate to debt, given the sequencing issues that have been discussed over various amendments, that is specifically Propositions 15–18.

1670 Like others, I will certainly be voting against Proposition 14, because when we are talking about public money, we do need to uphold robust levels of scrutiny and accountability, and I am worried that this Proposition prevents this Assembly from doing that. I do not think we would have the necessary level of scrutiny, and beyond that, I think it actually invites reputational and actual risk.

Deputy Dyke has pointed out that it is not an unlimited ability; it is just a mere half a billion pounds, give or take, so no big deal then. He says that if we do not like it, we can delete it; I say to him, 'Good luck with that!' Deputy Helyar also had a stab yesterday at defending this Proposition by describing it as self-expiring. It might be self-expiring on paper, but I do not really think that once that genie is out of the bottle, it will go back in any time soon. I think it is important that we vote on Proposition 14 with our eyes open and in the full knowledge of what the implications could be.

1680 I share Deputy Fairclough, Deputy Roffey, Deputy Burford's, and others concerns over Proposition 6, as well. I thought Deputy Burford did a really good job at describing the dysfunctionality that arose from a similar governance structure through the Sub-Committees of the Policy Council. I think it does cloud Committee accountability. But I have got a further concern in relation to this Proposition. I think other people have done a really good job of articulating some of the concerns around Proposition 6, I have a further concern, and that is that it does not increase the staff resource, the personnel resource or the human resource to do this. My concern about this is, I think we are already so strapped in some quarters, certainly, the ones that I am involved with, particularly relating to E&I. We have got far too much key-person dependency as it is. I am really worried about our succession planning and about our resilience within that system. I think our resources are spread far too thin. I have lost count of the number of times I have had meetings at 10 o'clock at night with officers because that is the first time that they are available all day; you just

cannot get meetings with these people for love, nor money. And it is going to fall under the Proposition before us today; that responsibility is going to fall to the same group of people. We are not planning to increase the resource and that really concerns me.

1695 There are clear interdependencies here with the reshaping government priority, as it is now known. I have been disappointed by how that transformation has progressed, or not progressed, so far this political term. Certainly, its lack of progress is often cited as the main barrier or the main reason for the inability to resolve the various resourcing problems that we face at Committee level. Paragraph 5.31 says:

This priority will accelerate the pace of targeted public service transformation, focusing on the how the public service is organised, the approach to technology, workforce planning and the use of property. Repurposing, digitalising and working differently across all the Islands to minimise the overall cost of public services is critical to the longer-term success of the Bailiwick and will release workforce for deployment in critical, under-resourced areas.

1700 I really hope that that particular workstream, that particular priority, will be properly prioritised and, ultimately, properly resourced.

I do not agree with Deputy Mahoney that Members are presenting some of these Propositions as some kind of P&R plot, far from it. I am not really sure that was a particularly helpful suggestion either. It is absolutely right that the debate is an opportunity for Members to articulate things that they are not comfortable with, things they might be concerned about, things they have questions
1705 over. I have not heard anyone accusing P&R of some dastardly plot. Actually, I think this debate is really useful; it gives Deputy Soulsby a reply to the debate to answer some concerns, perhaps. But I think, more generally than that, this debate is a really important opportunity for us, collectively, to benefit from that collective scrutiny and analysis that this Assembly provides—fantastic.

1710 I am really glad that we have had a chance to debate this properly and that debate was not curtailed. I hope there is more debate to come. I was really pleased to have heard from Deputy Bury and Deputy Fairclough; I hope Deputy Moakes will also take the opportunity to speak, to give us his perspective. I did share some of Deputy Bury's concerns over the process as a whole and I am really glad she articulated those.

1715 I think it has been uncomfortably fast. My specific concerns have been around the lack of detailed information behind some of the decision-making; that has been my concern over the process, but I completely appreciate that we have had to make pragmatic compromises in order to get the policy letter in for debate in this particular timeframe. So I do commend those that have been involved in it and I look forward to hearing any further debate.

1720 **The Bailiff:** Can I just get a sense from Members as to how many people are intending to speak in general debate? Deputy Moakes has just stood up.

Is there any wish at this stage, Members of the States, because it is coming up to half past 12, to extend the morning session by, say, up to half an hour, at this stage?

1725 I will put that motion to you, that we continue sitting, but no later than one o'clock, and then we break for lunch and we work out what time we are coming back after lunch at that point. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

1730 **The Bailiff:** I will declare that carried.
Deputy Moakes.

Deputy Moakes: Thank you, sir.

1735 I thank Deputy de Sausmarez for inviting me to speak. I actually did my speech the other day; it was at the back end of the day, but nevertheless, that was the speech I intended to deliver on the GWP. I think Deputy Bury also referred to that earlier on.

The reason I am standing up, actually, is just because of a couple of comments that people have made during debate today. As finance sector lead, I feel that I really needed to stand up and respond to a couple of those speeches.

1740 I recommend that anyone who questions why we are supporting our finance sector should read the 'Guernsey Facts and Figures' book, it is the little green book you can find in many buildings, and if you have not read it, I am very happy to get you a copy. It is a fact that our finance industry is not only the Island's biggest employer, but also the biggest contributor of GVA. And let's not forget the thousands of other jobs that are dependent on that finance sector; it is critically important to the Island's success. (A Member: Hear, hear.)

1745 By supporting the finance sector in the ways outlined in the Government Work Plan, we do a number of things. We first of all recognise its importance to the economy; we help to support existing business already on the Island; and hopefully, by being positive, we encourage new businesses to come to the Island, which will bring both new jobs and new revenues, which we so much need at this moment in time.

I make no apology for supporting the finance industry, both on a day-to-day basis in my role in Economic Development, but also through pushing all of the economic things that you see in the Government Work Plan to help support the Island. There is no magic money tree; if you want to invest in the Island's future, you need to generate revenues, and the finance sector is core to that.

1755 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Aldwell.

Deputy Aldwell: I am going to be brief, sir. I just wanted to make a comment.

1760 As Deputy Bury explained, we all had a different experience on the Government Work Plan Sub-Committee: for me, it was an opportunity to understand the different Committees' mandates. It was extremely useful to have the input of Members from each Committee giving their thoughts and priorities put forward and asking questions which gave a greater understanding of what was before us and what the knock-on effect would be for each Committee. I learnt a great deal from Deputy Fairclough, with his E&I hat on, and Deputy Moakes with his finance.

1765 Deputy Dudley-Owen also stated that ESC only put forward three priorities which were requested from P&R, while others cheekily put in 20. We had an independent, non-voting Committee Member who also advised us as to what was actually possible within a term, having been Chief Minister in the past. Deputy Soulsby enabled us to challenge the priorities, which we did, and we had a huge amount of input from the officers who had working knowledge of each Committee. Yes, it was a huge amount of work to undertake, and we learnt to make some very hard decisions. I have a huge respect for the dedication of the officers who worked on the Government Work Plan, which was brought at an incredible speech to this Assembly.

1770 This is a liquid plan. We are only at the start of our journey, we really need to get off the starting blocks, and I shall be voting for this Government Work Plan.

1775 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Helyar.

1780 **Deputy Helyar:** Thank you, sir.

I really enjoyed Deputy de Lisle's speech because, as far as I am concerned, really, he is the only one that has actually hit the nail on the head. This Plan is about defining what we want to do and how much it is going to cost. Some of those things are a long way away and they are uncertain, so their costs are more uncertain; some of them are very near and already in train.

1785 This Plan is about not having our cake and eating it. A number of Members, unfortunately, have stood up and said, 'We must save money,' but they voted for NICE drugs yesterday with no back-up, no clinical advice, no data, and no costings. You cannot have your cake and eat it; it is not possible. That is what this Plan is about. It is the first time the States of Guernsey has ever been able

1790 to produce a plan which is costed at the same time; it has never happened before. It is a very difficult task. I thank all of those who were involved in creating it, particularly the officers. I thank all of those that were on the Committee, even those that are now disowning its content.

1795 Sir, there was a famous Second World War plan called 'Operation Fortitude.' As part of that plan, the Allied forces created a fake army – completely false – inflatable tanks, false radio traffic. They even appointed Gen. Patton as the general in charge of the fake army, the army which never existed, and its whole intent was to hide the real intention.

1800 I spoke earlier about costs. One of the things which has been going on, Deputy Mahoney mentioned this, Baba Yaga, the Bogeyman; so many people standing up and saying, 'Rule 14 is all about P&R taking control. It is about us having unlimited spending power.' Well, of course, it is not; it is limited to the amount that is in the Plan, we can only spend that money on the processes and plans which are in the Plan itself. And it is not us spending the money; it is the Committees who get the money that will be spending it. The purpose for that Rule 14 amendment is very clear.

1805 For those Members who are not previous States' Members and are not familiar with the process, what would normally happen is that there would be several iterative plans; eventually, something would be agreed, but that Committee would have to come to the States for approval of a vote, a vote for a sum of money. This is the discussion we have had: we cannot play poker by showing everybody our hands – that is the first point. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)** The second point is that, unfortunately, and it is a bit of an elephant in the room, there is quite a bit of competition between Committees and their staff, and there certainly has been in the past, in terms of the Government structure; it is not a criticism of anybody but as soon as the States had approved that vote, Treasury loses control of cost control.

1810 What this Section 14 allows us to do is, once a particular project has been approved, it allows Treasury to continue to keep control of the process. That is really important, because the purpose of doing that is to save money; it is not to spend more. That is the whole purpose of it. It is not a power grab; it is to ensure that power is not distributed to Committees who wish to spend their own money from their votes as they wish to.

1820 I mentioned the slight paradox. The Assembly is a paradox, isn't it? We live in a paradoxical system because we are constantly in balance, in a metastable state. In science, a metastable state is one that moves very quickly from one to another without you noticing it. The climate is a metastable system; it flips from one state to another very quickly, in geological terms. The paradox we have in our system is that everybody in this room, all 40 of us, want to get involved in everything, but at the same time, we want to make sure that Committees are able to get on with what they do. There has to somewhere be a balance, an equilibrium, between what we are willing to delegate and what we are not willing to delegate.

1825 I was really pleased that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller was concerned about the amount of reading we have to do; I can reassure her that that has diminished significantly since the election. We now have a different approach to the way in which we are presented with decisions. It does not make any difference, really: the process will not change the amount of work we have to do; we have to do that anyway. It all has to be read, it all has to be considered, because it all gets paid out of Treasury anyway. It does not make any difference to the workload.

1830 I find it really strange that, on the one hand, a States' Member can stand up in debate and say, 'I think P&R should be much stronger with the budgeting. I think you should cut everyone's budgets by 20% next year,' while in the same breath, saying, 'I do not want to be supervised.' These things do not fit together. They do not fit together and they cannot fit together; it is not possible to not be supervised and then have P&R tell you what to do. It just does not fit. I do not know if other people have noticed this as well, but some of this stuff is really difficult to follow; logically, it just does not make any sense. Why would we want to do this?

1835 Members, I urge you – and this is a real opportunity – to support the Propositions. This is a revolutionary plan and it has a real opportunity for the people of Guernsey for us to be able to demonstrate that we can deliver, not talk.

1840 The *Press* complained about there being public engagement, there was a lack of it. The public is not interested in reading door-stop documents, it is not interested in strategies. It is interested in whether stuff gets fixed, schools get properly sorted out, that we make decisions and get on with it and that we live with the consequences of the decisions we make. I am not afraid to do that; a lot of other Members seem to want to have their cake and eat it, and it is not possible to afford that any more. Principles cost money.

1845 Members, I urge you to support the resolutions.
Thank you.

The Bailiff: As no one else is rising, I am going to turn to the Vice President, Deputy Soulsby, to reply to the debate; we will the adjourn for lunch and we will do voting after lunch.
Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, sir.

I would like to thank Members for a long debate. I think it has been very useful, being able to have that challenge, and I think it is important. Now it is time for me to reply to it all.

I will start with Deputy Queripel. I think Sgt. Frazer from *Dad's Army* came to mind when I was listening to him, 'We're doomed! We're doomed!' It seemed as far from 'Revive and Thrive' as you can get. (*Laughter*) He talked about reviews, how we do not need any of these reviews and that we should not have all these reviews, we should do stuff. But he cannot forget that he was a signatory, as he made out yesterday, to a requête that was calling for a review and the review was done. It works both ways: when you want something this way, we do not need a review; if you want it another way, you do not need to review. We see that all the time and it might come up a bit again in a minute.

He did go on and on about how we are treating people, about needing passports to go into pubs, clubs, shopping, etc. Well, none of that is in play. To be honest, it really is not for me. He asked me what my views are. It is not my decision; that is something for CCA to consider. But at the end of the day, it is up to businesses who they want to admit to their premises or not; it is not for Government.

Deputy Dudley-Owen, I thank her for her comments. Deputy Aldwell referred as well to the three points that the Committee brought forward, and they did. But Members will note that on the list, within Education, there is a lot more than just three actions and, of course, we had that debate the other day about why we would not put primary education back in, because there are many other things that Education are looking at, not least of which is the Education Law, and SEND as well.

I thank Deputy Prow for being supportive of the Plan and being very corporate and trying to make things work throughout the process, and I thank you.

Deputy de Lisle talked about the need for caution; he is absolutely right. As Deputy Helyar pointed out, Deputy de Lisle really got to the nub of things here. What we are saying is that is exactly why Proposition 14 is important: because this is not about a power grab; it is about having control of our finances, making sure we are not spending more than we need, and making sure we are not showing our hand before we go out there and try and get people to do what we need to do, particularly at this present moment in time, when we know it could be quite overheated in the construction industry. We really do not want to show our hand. That is what is behind this; it is not about any power grab from P&R.

This is something I have believed in for a long time, actually, having gone through the process, through the hospital modernisation. The numbers being put in there, we knew that they were a guess, they were educated, because we had no idea ... you have the optimism bias and you have the contingency. I was saying to Deputy de Lisle, we have got a big figure for capital here, but the whole aim of Proposition 14 is to keep that right down so we are not having to spend all that money on contingency and all that money on optimism bias. I hope that gives him some assurance.

We know we are going to have to do these projects. Deputy St Pier said he wanted to see far more capital in here! But we are not doing that. We are not just going, 'Right, we will spend this and

we will do that, we will build this huge great thing somewhere or other'. We are actually saying we are investing in the things we actually need and we know we do because we have not spent anything for years, nothing tangible, nothing great. The last thing, I think, was the Oberlands Centre, the mental health centre; that was the last thing, and that was 2015, or 2016 when the tape was cut and it was opened. That was the last big proper project that we had.

This is enabling us to be agile but be in control and keep those costs right down on the things that we absolutely have to build. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Deputy Roffey talks about the importance of housing; he is so right. That is why we identified very early on the importance of housing. You can see it runs right through this Plan and the number of actions required for it. So there is a lot of focus on that now.

On the Dairy: P&R did provide a letter of assurance to him and it is worth me going through a few of those, what was said in there now. We confirmed our position and what Deputy Roffey says is absolutely true. We have acknowledged that important work is ongoing in respect to further developing the proposed solution for the Dairy ahead of the preparation of the outline business case. We understand the current project plan is aiming for completion of the project development work to be able to document the outline business case by the end of this year and I think it is currently on track to do so. We have agreed that the project development work underway should be concluded and we will need to ensure that the solution fits with any revised strategic objectives.

We have been advised that, as of the end of May 2021, the project had spent a little over £180,000 and committed a further £309,000; we have also been advised that completion of the project development work may require a further £100,000 of funding, and we have agreed to support that. The work on ensuring the States' Dairy strategy is up to date and that it reflects the challenges and opportunities we have will be done concurrently and in collaboration with STSB and E&I. At the end of 2021, when all this is done, we can discuss and evaluate whether the Future Dairy Project should be re-categorised from 'pipeline' to 'delivery' and what the impact of any change will be in respect of other projects and funding. I hope that gives the sense of clarity that Deputy Roffey was asking for.

He is, of course, right: there are huge challenges in starting to deliver the capital projects. He was saying it is unlikely we are going to get through all of these anyway, because we have not done before; he might be right, but the aim of what we are trying to do and the Propositions we have set out is to try and address those problems, while we have been completely constipated when it comes to capital projects for so long.

He references governance boards, and I think a few others have said this. 'Oh, gosh! It is going to be like those big social policy council committees that they used to have.' It is not like those at all. They were three different huge, great things that were kind of there to bring things in but were not. These are specific boards. They will be different depending on which different workstreams there are, focus on those actions within those workstreams, making sure things are going on track, and supporting those Committees to enable things to happen. It is not about adding this whole new governance structure at all. Neither is this a power grab; I think we have spoken a lot on that already.

Deputy Burford also expressed concerns about, 'It is another P&R power grab!' But, of course, as Scrutiny Management Committee President, she has already got the opportunity to hold P&R to account, as she very well did before we had even got this far on the Government Work Plan, and I am sure she will do more after that. That is what democracy is all about.

To me, it is not about what the form of government is. There are those that love to look at the whole philosophy of politics, 'Oh, should it be an executive-style system or a consensus-style system?' I have been labelled somebody who support executive-style government. All I want from government is for it to work more effectively; that is all I am asking for. And I do not think it does at the moment.

Going back and saying, 'It is okay, we can have Committees, they can run all their governance. It will be great, won't it?' Well, it has not been. I have seen it over the last eight years since I have been in the States, that governance, that efficiency definitely is not there. That is why, fairly squarely, we

need those governance boards, so we can gel things together. Very much, that is what it is for me. It is not about power; it is making sure we can work more effectively.

She said, 'Speed is an asset, but only if you are confident in going in the right direction'. We love all that, don't we? Assurance. We have so much assurance that we have got to come back again and have more detail because we need that assurance. We put in more detail, but then that is not the information we want, so we want more detail! And then nothing happens because we bring back and we want more detail. I think I will go on more about that again in a minute.

Deputy Falla talked about it feeling like a straitjacket. We are not saying that what we are doing now is set in stone; we are saying, 'Here is the next 18 months, here are the actions we are going to do, the top-10 actions, and here is the funding for it, let's go ahead.' If we do not have that we do not know what is coming around the corner and we cannot manage stuff. This is for the first 18 months, and then we will come back next year and look at what we want to do then, or perhaps to not do anything. Perhaps we might say, 'We do not want to do all those capital projects now, we are in a different situation, we are not going to do anything at all'. Or we might want to do something really great like, I don't know, build a heliport down in the harbour; why not? What we am trying to say is, we have got to get direction, and that is one thing we have not had for so long is a sense of direction.

On commissioning, I totally support Deputy Falla on this. Commissioning is something I hold really dear, I think it is something we can really make a difference on. You might like to know that I have had a lot of discussions, papers have been written on what we can do on commissioning, but because, at the moment, we have got staff who are all bothered, doing absolutely everything out there, and have not got a sense of direction that they will get from the Work Plan, we have not been able to go any further on that. But once the Work Plan is in place, we can really hit the ground running on it.

I have had a few conversations with the Association of Guernsey Charities and the Community Foundation, who I know are really supportive of what we are trying to do, and we will be working with them as we go forward to make sure we have got that structure in place, as we have said in the policy letter. So I agree with all he says about that.

Also, the same with the Douzaines, and that is what the Douzaine Working Group will be about, seeing how we can support Douzaines as much as the third sector: help support them in training; understand some bits of Procedures, Rules, and how Government works to really help them in doing their job.

Deputy Matthews talked about transition for the CCA; yes, absolutely. This is something that has been discussed and we absolutely see the need as we move, probably towards the end of the year, into a position where we can trace the pandemic as endemic, which is what we are looking to do now, so it becomes more of a BAU, if that makes sense.

Now we come to Deputy St Pier. I thought it was very interesting to hear all the comments from him, but given he did not attend a single GWP briefing since the last policy letter, or a workshop, I find it disappointing, to be honest; so many of the questions he asked here could have been dealt with during those sessions.

He complained about the Plan being 'aspirational'. I think it was in one of his columns where he talked about how it had no vision, at that time, so I do not know how you square *that* circle.

I will not take lessons from him over savings either. We looked at public sector reform, which Deputy Kazantseva-Miller has talked about and Deputy de Sausmarez, and really, as a Committee, we were not happy about where it was going, the structure of it, and all of the political oversight there has been on it, and we have changed. Members, as I said in my opening speech, will hopefully be seeing some changes happening in the next month or two to demonstrate that action is being had.

Deputy St Pier talked about enterprise zones and, 'How can they cost £1.5 million just to scope?' Well, it does not just include scoping; it also includes potential cost to the Exchequer of any potential tax breaks, and that has been put in their as well so it is not just about scoping.

1995 There was a question on education, about it is another £600,000 for SEND. Deputy Dudley-Owen might be able to correct me here, but I understand that is not new money. The aim is to rebalance within that Committee's budget. I am happy to give way if she wants to add any more.

2000 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Yes, I would be pleased to clarify; thank you to Deputy Soulsby for that.
I do not want anybody to take away from Deputy St Pier's comments that the Committee has been in any way disingenuous around this reallocation work. It is really vital for us in view of the fact that we have had emerging priorities that have materialised in this term, especially the SEND Review. No one can underestimate the impact of delivering those recommendations. The first chapter of the budget reallocation workstream focused on looking at class size tipping points and a phased adjustment of the pupil-teacher ratio in Sixth Form.

2005 The action is not funded through existing budget or potential sources of funding identified, which Deputy St Pier spoke about, but there is an ongoing piece of work around this budget reallocation to ascertain what funds might be able to be relocated but, of course, those do not happen overnight. As Deputy St Pier said, there is no magic money tree which we have shaken in order to realise those funds; this is a safety net more than anything.

Deputy Soulsby: I thank Deputy Dudley-Owen.
Deputy Bury: Yes, I did value Deputy Bury's contribution on the Government Work Plan Sub-Committee. I know her constant concerns are of, 'I need more detail, I have not got all the detail on everything,' but again, I have addressed that, how much detail do we need? At the same time, we have Deputy Kazantseva-Miller saying, 'We have got far too much information, we cannot get through this in these months.' There has got to be a balance somewhere ... I will not give way to Deputy St Pier.

2020 I will comment on Deputy Inder, to respond to his question about the 2-REG, so Deputy St Pier getting up is quite useful. Deputy Inder has clarified that the additional funding outlined for 2-REG is contingent on the completion and conclusion of the review paper, which he referenced in his speech.

2025 Deputy Bury is talking about the detail. She says everybody on that Committee was a new member. I think she has forgotten one person on there who very much was *not* a new member, apart from me, and that was Deputy Peter Harwood. I am sure Members know who Deputy Harwood, not *Deputy* Harwood –

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby, he is not a Deputy.

2030 **Deputy Soulsby:** Not a Deputy anymore; *Advocate* Peter Harwood, who was a Deputy – a very valued Member of this States; he was also Chief Minister. He has been on a number of different working groups: he worked on SLAWS, helped support Carers Guernsey, I believe he has been a non-States member on Home Affairs. He is everywhere. He is highly sought after, and I was delighted when he was happy to accept being a member of the Committee, and I think Members will agree that he did contribute a lot. I see Deputy Aldwell nodding away, and Deputy Moakes in particular.

2040 I do feel damned if we did and damned if we did not with this, 'We should have started with the money and then determined what we do,' or, 'We should start with what we want to do and then we deal with the money.' But if we were to say, right, we start with the money. What money do we start with? Where is the starting point? As newer Members of this Assembly, we have to look at what it is we are trying to do and then prioritise.

2045 Remember, we are not just saying, 'Oh, we are doing this and we are going to find all the money to do it.' We are not; we are saying that we have costed the Plan on the money that we have got now so that 18 months is completely covered. It is not about anything other than what we have done. The right way around is to prioritise things, and that was the hard task of the Sub-Committee. In fact, it is very hard, because I think anything we try to move, one or another will say, 'No, you

cannot move that; we have got to keep it there.' So there was very little that we ended up actually being able to change.

2050 Deputy Bury spoke about how nothing in the economy got changed, but there were lots of other elements of the economy that were not included even in the shortlist that Deputy Bury saw. Also on top of that, Members might remember the work that was done ... early on we had a workshop where we asked Members to look at their priorities. The highest amongst those was making sure that we could revive our economy and really focus on the economy; that was very much at the forefront of our mind and that is how it worked out.

2055 She did say about, 'Well, I was on there but I did not agree with everything' and then said 'We need governance boards where it works like the Committee system,' but not all Committees agree; it is consensus all round. This Committee asked in the same way as every other in saying not everybody agrees with everything, but the majority did, and so that is how we ended up with the recommendations going to the Policy & Resources Committee.

2060 She also talked about the hundreds of resolutions not listed; they are not aligned to the Plan and we could have made that clearer. I have talked about detail and I have talked about the 18 months.

I thank Deputy Dyke for his comments talking about the public sector and I think I have answered that about the work that we are doing on public sector reform ... Yes, I will give way.

2065

Deputy Inder: Thank you, Deputy Soulsby, for giving way.

I just have a note from officers on enterprise zones, which might help, just to read verbatim:

The £417,000 p.a., £1.25 million for three years in the entrepreneurship workstream relates to the estimated investment required to deliver enterprise zones. This could be, for instance, start-up grants, TRP relief, or other incentives to kickstart development in these zones. This is a very high-level estimate at the moment because the more detailed thinking on enterprise zones will come in the next phase of the project.

I hope that clarifies the enterprise zones.

2070

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you.

Just to speak again and follow up other comments from Deputy Dyke. We are looking at new terms and conditions and that is being led by Deputy Mahoney, who is like a Rottweiler on these things and getting to the heart of that area.

2075 Recruitment: yes, it is interesting on that. I am talking about recruitment because Deputy Dyke was saying we are going to need to cut the number of civil servants etc. Parking that aside, the Committee for P&R did say we were concerned about particular recruitment of expensive posts and we said, 'Look, we want, through Deputy Mahoney, to look at these posts coming through and be able to challenge them, put that challenge in', and the moment we did that, 'Oh, it is a P&R power grab!' You cannot win. One moment, people go, 'We need to make the savings' and the next minute, 2080 'Do not touch. This is our area, there is nothing to see here.' You cannot win, really. So yes, I totally agree with Deputy Dyke on keeping the costs down, he knows very well, as we have worked together on PAC, what seems like a generation ago.

2085 I keep raising the issue about governance boards and I think I have explained this is not about more and more bureaucracy; it is about making things work more smoothly, knowing what is going on, being able to then deal with issues as they arise and feed that all through into the next plan so things work smoothly.

2090 I thank Deputy Fairclough, another valued member of the Sub-Committee. There is a Portfolio Board established in terms of transformation which will include the whole public sector transformation; it includes Deputy Mahoney and myself on that so there is already a governance structure in place there.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, I disagree with her comments on engagement; we did a considerable amount of engagement. We also went round to all Committees and spoke to them about where

things were going. We have had challenge and briefings and workshops with the third sector, with the private sector, and I have done a few briefings with various members in the community.

2095 Deputy de Sausmarez reiterated a number of Deputy Bury's comments; one of them was about the virtuous circle. I was really quite disappointed by the cynicism in it, actually. I remember Deputy Bury, when we showed the virtuous circle in the Sub-Committee, saying, 'You have got economy at the top, that means economy is the most important thing.' It is not; it is a circle! Just because it is at the top there, you could turn it round and it would be at the bottom. We said it did not matter and that is why we changed the circle so it did not show that the economy was at the top, so I am disappointed in that. I would have thought those Members would know that was not something that was at the top of my mind, there is not evidence to back that up.

2100 Again, Deputy de Sausmarez, one minute says, 'We need more resource and we have got all these people until 10 o'clock,' and then talked about all the savings we need to make. It is trying to get that balance, you get mixed messages.

2105 Then we have the concerns about the lack of time, and this is something that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller mentioned; do not blame P&R for that. Education, Sport & Culture lodged their policy letter when they could, the States' Trading Supervisory Board lodged their policy letters according to their schedules. That was not controlled by Policy & Resources. And, of course, the States agreed this meeting in its debate in March on the Work Plan, so if Members did not like it then, they could have changed it and extended the time.

I would finally thank Deputy Moakes and Deputy Aldwell for their contribution, very much, again, valued members of the Committee.

2115 I will just finish, in closing, sir, you will be pleased to hear, to reiterate what a lot of Members said in their speeches. Since the beginning of the term, a lot of hard work has gone on to get us here. This is an incredible amount of work and I think there are very few jurisdictions who could actually get that far, quite frankly.

2120 I would like to thank the Director of Strategy and Policy and the team who have done an amazing job in supporting Members since the beginning of this term, and helping to put together the Plan we have in front of us today. As I have said a few times in this debate, whilst Policy & Resources brought forward this policy letter, we have very much acted as facilitators to come up with the Plan, but this is not the Policy & Resources' Plan; it is the Assembly's plan. It was important that we had amendments to test key areas and that has been done. A direction has now been give and we must now press forward with certainty.

2125 The debate is over but we are going to keep the conversation going. Policy & Resources' mandate is to be responsible for the leadership and coordination of the work of the States, including developing and promoting the States' overall policy objectives, and leading the policy planning process. We will do that, but it is up to every Committee and every Member to work together as we keep the focus on implementing the Plan's priorities.

2130 Our conversation will also continue to involve key stakeholders in business, health, social areas and the environment. Their involvement will be instrumental as we forge new ways of working and delivering what Islanders and the Island need, and we will communicate with Islanders throughout this term as we work together to deliver its actions.

2135 I believe wholeheartedly that action is what Islanders want to see, and soon, as we get to work. The preliminary work is already underway and our top-10 list of recovery actions will move at pace. Islanders want visible, tangible progress and that is what this Plan can deliver.

2140 We have spoken a lot about the need to prioritise resources to ensure we focus on key actions that will make a really positive difference to Islanders' lives, and that is very much what this Plan is about. But it is more than that: this Plan is a means for the public, for the first time, to clearly see what we say we will do, track whether we are doing it, and hold us to account when we are not. That is what makes this Plan important.

We talk a lot about openness and transparency, but the public do not see it. Things pop out of the woodwork and they do not understand why. Things are not done and they do not know why.

2145 This Plan is about demonstrating openness and transparency to Islanders, in a way we have not done before.

The vision of this Plan is clear: work in partnership to recover our economic prosperity, build on our inclusive community values, and capitalise on our many strengths to make Guernsey a safe haven, based on sustaining health, wealth, and community.

2150 Sir, this is an ambitious, aspirational Plan. There are many things we say we will do. If we are to succeed, we need to be disciplined to make sure we focus on what will be the Assembly's Plan, not be afraid to make difficult decisions. But most importantly, we must work together, between ourselves, with our partners, and our community as a whole.

I ask Members to support all the Propositions.

Thank you, sir.

2155 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, before we take the luncheon adjournment, I would just like to check that I have got my notes right at the moment. The requests for recorded votes: I have got Proposition 6, Proposition 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 18. That would be seven discrete recorded votes. I have got notes that there would be separate votes requested for Proposition 5 and Proposition 21, but no request for a recorded vote on those, and therefore, I am minded, in those circumstances, to take Propositions 1–4 together at the beginning, unless anyone asks for a separate vote on any of those Propositions, and then Propositions 7–11 together, and possibly 19 and 20, if I can.

Deputy Queripel, have I missed anything?

2165 **Deputy Queripel:** I take on board that there has already been requests for certain Propositions to be recorded votes, but I would like a recorded vote on all of them, please, that have not been requested as yet.

2170 **The Bailiff:** But can I therefore take 1–4 together, 7–11 together, and potentially, 19–20 together, and then we will do all the others discretely?

Are there any of those ones for which there were requests for recorded votes where they could be taken together? I am looking particularly at you, Deputy St Pier, I am afraid, because it was you who came up with the biggest shopping list. Were they all discrete, single-Proposition recorded votes?

2175 **Deputy St Pier:** Yes, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.

2180 In that case, there will be recorded votes on everything, but they will be done in blocks, where that is appropriate, unless anyone then asks for them to be done separately.

It has now just gone ten past one, I am minded to adjourn until half past two to allow people just over an hour to take that break, unless there is any counterproposition.

2185 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Sir, I was going to ask whether Members would be minded to come back at quarter past two, a little bit earlier, to give Members a clear hour for their lunch, but also to give consideration to sit late this evening, until seven.

The Bailiff: Let us just deal with the luncheon adjournment at this stage.

2190 The suggestion is that there might be an hour for lunch so that we resume at 2.15 p.m. I will simply put that motion to you, Members, to see what your appetite for that is, or your appetite for lunch is, and that is, resume at 2.15 p.m. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Contre.

2195 **The Bailiff:** I will declare that lost; we will resume at 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 1.15 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

**1. Government Work Plan 2021-25 –
Debate continued –
Propositions carried as amended**

The Bailiff: Members of the States, as I indicated before we broke for lunch, the proposal is to take, first of all, Propositions 1–4 together, and there has been a request each time for a recorded vote.

Greffier, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 35, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3

POUR

Deputy Prow
Deputy Queripel
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Deputy Roffey
Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Taylor
Deputy Vermeulen
Deputy Aldwell
Deputy Blin
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Burford
Deputy Bury
Deputy Cameron
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Dyke
Deputy Fairclough
Deputy Falla
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Haskins
Deputy Helyar
Deputy Inder
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy Matthews
Deputy McKenna
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Moakes
Deputy Murray
Deputy Oliver *

CONTRE

Deputy Gollop

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Trott

* denotes Member who voted by proxy

The Bailiff: Members of the States, in respect of Propositions 1-4 there voted Pour 35, Contre 1, 3 Members were absent when those votes were taken, and therefore all four Propositions are declared duly carried.

2205 The next vote is on Proposition 5 alone, and Proposition 5 has been amended by Amendment number 4; but you have got an updated version of that anyway.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 33, Contre 4, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Prow	Deputy Burford	None	Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Queripel	Deputy Bury		Deputy Trott
Alderney Rep. Roberts	Deputy Cameron		
Deputy Roffey	Deputy St Pier		
Alderney Rep. Snowdon			
Deputy Soulsby			
Deputy Taylor			
Deputy Vermeulen			
Deputy Aldwell			
Deputy Blin			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy de Lisle			
Deputy de Sausmarez			
Deputy Dudley-Owen			
Deputy Dyke			
Deputy Fairclough			
Deputy Falla			
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Gabriel			
Deputy Gollop			
Deputy Haskins			
Deputy Helyar			
Deputy Inder			
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller			
Deputy Le Tocq			
Deputy Leadbeater			
Deputy Mahoney			
Deputy Matthews			
Deputy McKenna			
Deputy Meerveld			
Deputy Moakes			
Deputy Murray			
Deputy Oliver *			

* denotes Member who voted by proxy

2210 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, the voting in respect of Proposition 5 was: there voted Pour 33, Contre 4, 2 Members were absent, and therefore, Proposition 5 is also carried.

The next vote will be on Proposition 6 alone.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 29, Contre 8, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Prow	Deputy Roffey	None	Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Queripel	Deputy St Pier		Deputy Trott
Alderney Rep. Roberts	Deputy Burford		
Alderney Rep. Snowdon	Deputy Bury		
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy de Sausmarez		
Deputy Taylor	Deputy Fairclough		

Deputy Vermeulen	Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Aldwell	Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
Deputy Blin	
Deputy Brouard	
Deputy Cameron	
Deputy de Lisle	
Deputy Dudley-Owen	
Deputy Dyke	
Deputy Falla	
Deputy Ferbrache	
Deputy Gollop	
Deputy Haskins	
Deputy Helyar	
Deputy Inder	
Deputy Le Tocq	
Deputy Leadbeater	
Deputy Mahoney	
Deputy Matthews	
Deputy McKenna	
Deputy Meerveld	
Deputy Moakes	
Deputy Murray	
Deputy Oliver *	

* denotes Member who voted by proxy

2215 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, in respect of Proposition 6, there voted Pour 29, Contre 8, 2 Members were absent, and therefore, Proposition 6 is also declared carried.

I am going to take Propositions 7–11 collectively. (*Interjection by Deputy Bury.*) No, I am not, Deputy Bury.

2220 **Deputy Bury:** Apologies, sir, but on those ones, I would like to vote in different directions on some of them.

The Bailiff: Can I group any of them?

2225 **Deputy Bury:** 8, 9, and 10?

The Bailiff: 8, 9, and 10. So we will take Proposition 7 ... no, Deputy de Sausmarez?

2230 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Yes, sorry, I am just trying to keep track, I am trying to read my notes. I thought we had, earlier in debate, a request to take 9 and 10 separately; I could be wrong.

The Bailiff: It is just Proposition 7, then, to start with, isn't it? So a vote on Proposition 7 alone, please, Members of the States—once again, recorded.

Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 38, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Prow	None	None	Deputy Trott
Deputy Queripel			
Alderney Rep. Roberts			
Deputy Roffey			
Alderney Rep. Snowdon			
Deputy Soulsby			
Deputy St Pier			

Deputy Taylor
 Deputy Vermeulen
 Deputy Aldwell
 Deputy Blin
 Deputy Brouard
 Deputy Burford
 Deputy Bury
 Deputy Cameron
 Deputy de Lisle
 Deputy de Sausmarez
 Deputy Dudley-Owen
 Deputy Dyke
 Deputy Fairclough
 Deputy Falla
 Deputy Ferbrache
 Deputy Gabriel
 Deputy Gollop
 Deputy Haskins
 Deputy Helyar
 Deputy Inder
 Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
 Deputy Le Tocq
 Deputy Leadbeater
 Deputy Mahoney
 Deputy Matthews
 Deputy McKenna
 Deputy Meerveld
 Deputy Moakes
 Deputy Murray
 Deputy Oliver *
 Deputy Parkinson

* denotes Member who voted by proxy

2235 **The Bailiff:** In respect of Proposition 7, Members, everyone voted Pour, all 38, 1 Member is absent, and therefore, Proposition 7 is also carried.

Can I take 8 and 9 together? No? 8 and 9 have got to be separate?

Just Proposition 8, Members, now.

Greffier.

2240

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 33, Contre 4, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Prow	Deputy Burford	Deputy St Pier	Deputy Trott
Deputy Queripel	Deputy Bury		
Alderney Rep. Roberts	Deputy de Sausmarez		
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Kazantseva-Miller		
Alderney Rep. Snowdon			
Deputy Soulsby			
Deputy Taylor			
Deputy Vermeulen			
Deputy Aldwell			
Deputy Blin			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Cameron			
Deputy de Lisle			
Deputy Dudley-Owen			
Deputy Dyke			
Deputy Fairclough			
Deputy Falla			
Deputy Ferbrache			

Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Haskins
Deputy Helyar
Deputy Inder
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy Matthews
Deputy McKenna
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Moakes
Deputy Murray
Deputy Oliver *
Deputy Parkinson

* denotes Member who voted by
proxy

The Bailiff: Members of the States, the voting on Proposition 8 was that there were 33 votes in favour, 4 against, 1 abstention, 1 Member was absent, and therefore, Proposition 8 is also declared carried.

2245 Just Proposition 9? Or 9 and 10? 9 and 10 together? We will take 9 and 10 together, then, please, Members of the States.
Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 34, Contre 2, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 1

POUR

Deputy Prow
Deputy Queripel
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Deputy Roffey
Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy Taylor
Deputy Vermeulen
Deputy Aldwell
Deputy Blin
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Burford
Deputy Cameron
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Dyke
Deputy Fairclough
Deputy Falla
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Haskins
Deputy Helyar
Deputy Inder
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy Matthews
Deputy McKenna
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Moakes

CONTRE

Deputy Bury
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy St Pier
Deputy de Sausmarez

ABSENT

Deputy Trott

Deputy Murray
Deputy Oliver *
Deputy Parkinson

* denotes Member who voted by proxy

2250 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, in respect of Propositions 9 and 10, there voted Pour 34, Contre 2, 2 abstentions, 1 absence, and therefore, Propositions 9 and 10 are also declared duly carried.

I think we are on Proposition 11 alone at this stage, Members of the States, so another recorded vote, please, on that Proposition on its own.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 38, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Prow	None	None	Deputy Trott
Deputy Queripel			
Alderney Rep. Roberts			
Deputy Roffey			
Alderney Rep. Snowdon			
Deputy Soulsby			
Deputy St Pier			
Deputy Taylor			
Deputy Vermeulen			
Deputy Aldwell			
Deputy Blin			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Burford			
Deputy Bury			
Deputy Cameron			
Deputy de Lisle			
Deputy de Sausmarez			
Deputy Dudley-Owen			
Deputy Dyke			
Deputy Fairclough			
Deputy Falla			
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Gabriel			
Deputy Gollop			
Deputy Haskins			
Deputy Helyar			
Deputy Inder			
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller			
Deputy Le Tocq			
Deputy Leadbeater			
Deputy Mahoney			
Deputy Matthews			
Deputy McKenna			
Deputy Meerveld			
Deputy Moakes			
Deputy Murray			
Deputy Oliver *			
Deputy Parkinson			

* denotes Member who voted by proxy

2255 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, in respect of Proposition 11, there were 38 votes in favour, none against, 1 absence, and therefore, I declare Proposition 11 duly carried.

The next vote will be in respect of Proposition 12 on its own.

Another recorded vote, please, Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 32, Contre 5, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Prow	Deputy Queripel	Deputy Bury	Deputy Trott
Alderney Rep. Roberts	Deputy St Pier		
Deputy Roffey	Deputy de Lisle		
Alderney Rep. Snowdon	Deputy Kazantseva-Miller		
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Leadbeater		
Deputy Taylor			
Deputy Vermeulen			
Deputy Aldwell			
Deputy Blin			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Burford			
Deputy Cameron			
Deputy de Sausmarez			
Deputy Dudley-Owen			
Deputy Dyke			
Deputy Fairclough			
Deputy Falla			
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Gabriel			
Deputy Gollop			
Deputy Haskins			
Deputy Helyar			
Deputy Inder			
Deputy Le Tocq			
Deputy Mahoney			
Deputy Matthews			
Deputy McKenna			
Deputy Meerveld			
Deputy Moakes			
Deputy Murray			
Deputy Oliver *			
Deputy Parkinson			

* denotes Member who voted by proxy

2260

The Bailiff: In respect of Proposition 12, there voted Pour 32 Members, Contre 5 Members, 1 abstention, 1 absence, and therefore, Proposition 12 is also declared carried.

Proposition 13 is the next one to be taken in isolation; that Proposition, of course, has been amended by Amendment number 9.

2265

Another recorded vote, please, Greffier, but this time, for Proposition 13.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 32, Contre 6, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Prow	Deputy Queripel	None	Deputy Trott
Alderney Rep. Roberts	Deputy St Pier		
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Burford		
Alderney Rep. Snowdon	Deputy Bury		
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy de Lisle		
Deputy Taylor	Deputy de Sausmarez		
Deputy Vermeulen			
Deputy Aldwell			

Deputy Blin
 Deputy Brouard
 Deputy Cameron
 Deputy Dudley-Owen
 Deputy Dyke
 Deputy Fairclough
 Deputy Falla
 Deputy Ferbrache
 Deputy Gabriel
 Deputy Gollop
 Deputy Haskins
 Deputy Helyar
 Deputy Inder
 Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
 Deputy Le Tocq
 Deputy Leadbeater
 Deputy Mahoney
 Deputy Matthews
 Deputy McKenna
 Deputy Meerveld
 Deputy Moakes
 Deputy Murray
 Deputy Oliver *
 Deputy Parkinson

* denotes Member who voted by proxy

The Bailiff: Members of the States, in respect of Proposition 13, there voted Pour 32 Members, Contre 6, 1 Member is absent, and therefore, Proposition 13 is declared carried.

2270 Proposition 14 had that typographic amendment by Amendment number 10; the subject of that is as it was at the beginning.

Again, a recorded vote, please, Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 21, Contre 17, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Prow	Deputy Queripel	None	Deputy Trott
Alderney Rep. Roberts	Deputy Roffey		
Alderney Rep. Snowdon	Deputy St Pier		
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Brouard		
Deputy Taylor	Deputy Burford		
Deputy Vermeulen	Deputy Bury		
Deputy Aldwell	Deputy Cameron		
Deputy Blin	Deputy de Lisle		
Deputy Dudley-Owen	Deputy de Sausmarez		
Deputy Dyke	Deputy Fairclough		
Deputy Ferbrache	Deputy Falla		
Deputy Haskins	Deputy Gabriel		
Deputy Helyar	Deputy Gollop		
Deputy Inder	Deputy Kazantseva-Miller		
Deputy Le Tocq	Deputy Leadbeater		
Deputy Mahoney	Deputy Matthews		
Deputy McKenna	Deputy Parkinson		
Deputy Meerveld			
Deputy Moakes			
Deputy Murray			
Deputy Oliver *			

* denotes Member who voted by proxy

2275 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, in respect of Proposition 14, there voted Pour 21, Contre 17, 1 Member is absent, and therefore, Proposition 14 is also declared carried.

Proposition 15 needs to be taken on its own, and we will once again have a recorded vote in respect of that single Proposition, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 30, Contre 7, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Prow	Deputy Queripel	Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Trott
Alderney Rep. Roberts	Deputy St Pier		
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Bury		
Alderney Rep. Snowdon	Deputy de Lisle		
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Falla		
Deputy Taylor	Deputy Gollop		
Deputy Vermeulen	Deputy Kazantseva-Miller		
Deputy Aldwell			
Deputy Blin			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Burford			
Deputy Cameron			
Deputy Dudley-Owen			
Deputy Dyke			
Deputy Fairclough			
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Gabriel			
Deputy Haskins			
Deputy Helyar			
Deputy Inder			
Deputy Le Tocq			
Deputy Leadbeater			
Deputy Mahoney			
Deputy Matthews			
Deputy McKenna			
Deputy Meerveld			
Deputy Moakes			
Deputy Murray			
Deputy Oliver *			
Deputy Parkinson			

* denotes Member who voted by proxy

2280 **The Bailiff:** In respect of Proposition 15, there voted Pour 30 Members, Contre 7 Members, 1 abstention, 1 absence, and therefore, Proposition 15 is also declared duly carried.

Proposition 16 is next, taken in isolation for a recorded vote, please.

2285 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Sir, is it possible to vote on (a) and (b) separately or not?

The Bailiff: No, it is a single Proposition. If it was to be taken as two separate votes, I think it should have been separated out during the course of debate, so it is a single Proposition.

Greffier, please.

2290 *There was a recorded vote.*

Carried – Pour 30, Contre 8, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Prow	Deputy Queripel	None	Deputy Trott

Alderney Rep. Roberts	Deputy St Pier
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Burford
Alderney Rep. Snowdon	Deputy Bury
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Taylor	Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Vermeulen	Deputy Falla
Deputy Aldwell	Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
Deputy Blin	
Deputy Brouard	
Deputy Cameron	
Deputy Dudley-Owen	
Deputy Dyke	
Deputy Fairclough	
Deputy Ferbrache	
Deputy Gabriel	
Deputy Gollop	
Deputy Haskins	
Deputy Helyar	
Deputy Inder	
Deputy Le Tocq	
Deputy Leadbeater	
Deputy Mahoney	
Deputy Matthews	
Deputy McKenna	
Deputy Meerveld	
Deputy Moakes	
Deputy Murray	
Deputy Oliver *	
Deputy Parkinson	

* denotes Member who voted by proxy

The Bailiff: In respect of Proposition 16, there voted Pour 30 Members, Contre 8 Members, 1 absence, and therefore, Proposition 16 is also declared duly carried.

Proposition 17 has to be taken discretely as well, please, so vote just on that single Proposition. Greffier.

2295

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 31, Contre 5, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Prow	Deputy Queripel	Deputy Burford	Deputy Trott
Alderney Rep. Roberts	Deputy Bury	Deputy de Sausmarez	
Deputy Roffey	Deputy de Lisle		
Alderney Rep. Snowdon	Deputy Falla		
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Kazantseva-Miller		
Deputy St Pier			
Deputy Taylor			
Deputy Vermeulen			
Deputy Aldwell			
Deputy Blin			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Cameron			
Deputy Dudley-Owen			
Deputy Dyke			
Deputy Fairclough			
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Gabriel			
Deputy Gollop			
Deputy Haskins			
Deputy Helyar			
Deputy Inder			

Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy Matthews
Deputy McKenna
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Moakes
Deputy Murray
Deputy Oliver *
Deputy Parkinson

* denotes Member who voted by proxy

The Bailiff: Members, in respect of Proposition 17, there voted Pour 31, Contre 5, 2 abstentions, 1 absence, and therefore, Proposition 17 is also declared duly carried.

2300 Proposition 18, taken on its own once again, please.
Recorded vote, Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 29, Contre 9, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1

POUR

Deputy Prow
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Deputy Roffey
Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy Taylor
Deputy Vermeulen
Deputy Aldwell
Deputy Blin
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Cameron
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Dyke
Deputy Fairclough
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Haskins
Deputy Helyar
Deputy Inder
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy Matthews
Deputy McKenna
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Moakes
Deputy Murray
Deputy Oliver *
Deputy Parkinson

CONTRE

Deputy Queripel
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Burford
Deputy Bury
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Falla
Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Deputy Trott

* denotes Member who voted by proxy

The Bailiff: In respect of Proposition 18, the voting was as follows: there voted Pour 29 Members, Contre 9 Members, 1 Member is absent, and therefore, Proposition 18 is also duly carried.

2305 I am hoping that we can take 19 as amended and 20 together; does anyone want separate votes on 19 and 20?

Deputy Bury: Yes, please, sir.

2310

The Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Bury, alright: 19 on its own.

Proposition 19, Members, just to remind you, was amended by Amendment number 1.

Recorded vote, please, Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 36, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Prow	None	Deputy Brouard	Deputy Trott
Deputy Queripel		Deputy Bury	
Alderney Rep. Roberts			
Deputy Roffey			
Alderney Rep. Snowdon			
Deputy Soulsby			
Deputy St Pier			
Deputy Taylor			
Deputy Vermeulen			
Deputy Aldwell			
Deputy Blin			
Deputy Burford			
Deputy Cameron			
Deputy de Lisle			
Deputy de Sausmarez			
Deputy Dudley-Owen			
Deputy Dyke			
Deputy Fairclough			
Deputy Falla			
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Gabriel			
Deputy Gollop			
Deputy Haskins			
Deputy Helyar			
Deputy Inder			
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller			
Deputy Le Tocq			
Deputy Leadbeater			
Deputy Mahoney			
Deputy Matthews			
Deputy McKenna			
Deputy Meerveld			
Deputy Moakes			
Deputy Murray			
Deputy Oliver *			
Deputy Parkinson			

* denotes Member who voted by proxy

2315

The Bailiff: In respect of Proposition 19, there voted Pour 36 Members, no votes against, 2 abstentions, 1 absence, and therefore, Proposition 19 is also declared duly carried.

We move swiftly to Proposition 20 on its own.

Recorded vote, please, Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 36, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Prow	Deputy Gollop	Deputy St Pier	Deputy Trott
Deputy Queripel			

Alderney Rep. Roberts
 Deputy Roffey
 Alderney Rep. Snowdon
 Deputy Soulsby
 Deputy Taylor
 Deputy Vermeulen
 Deputy Aldwell
 Deputy Blin
 Deputy Brouard
 Deputy Burford
 Deputy Bury
 Deputy Cameron
 Deputy de Lisle
 Deputy de Sausmarez
 Deputy Dudley-Owen
 Deputy Dyke
 Deputy Fairclough
 Deputy Falla
 Deputy Ferbrache
 Deputy Gabriel
 Deputy Haskins
 Deputy Helyar
 Deputy Inder
 Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
 Deputy Le Tocq
 Deputy Leadbeater
 Deputy Mahoney
 Deputy Matthews
 Deputy McKenna
 Deputy Meerveld
 Deputy Moakes
 Deputy Murray
 Deputy Oliver *
 Deputy Parkinson

* denotes Member who voted by proxy

2320 **The Bailiff:** In respect of Proposition 20, there voted Pour 36 Members, Contre 1, 1 abstention, 1 absence, and therefore, Proposition 20 is also declared duly carried.

Proposition 21 comes next.

Another recorded vote, please, Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 27, Contre 10, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 1

POUR

Deputy Prow
 Deputy Queripel
 Alderney Rep. Roberts
 Alderney Rep. Snowdon
 Deputy Soulsby
 Deputy Taylor
 Deputy Vermeulen
 Deputy Aldwell
 Deputy Blin
 Deputy Brouard
 Deputy Dudley-Owen
 Deputy Dyke
 Deputy Fairclough
 Deputy Ferbrache
 Deputy Haskins
 Deputy Helyar

CONTRE

Deputy Roffey
 Deputy St Pier
 Deputy Burford
 Deputy Bury
 Deputy Cameron
 Deputy de Lisle
 Deputy de Sausmarez
 Deputy Falla
 Deputy Gabriel
 Deputy Kazantseva-Miller

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Gollop

ABSENT

Deputy Trott

Deputy Inder
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy Matthews
Deputy McKenna
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Moakes
Deputy Murray
Deputy Oliver *
Deputy Parkinson

* denotes Member who voted by proxy

2325

The Bailiff: Members of the States, in respect of Proposition 21, there voted in favour 27 Members, against 10 Members, 1 abstention, 1 absence, and therefore, Proposition 21 is also declared duly carried.

2330

And last, but certainly not least, we come to Proposition 22, which was inserted by Amendment number 11.

We will have one final recorded vote on this special meeting, please, Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 38, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Prow	None	None	Deputy Trott
Deputy Queripel			
Alderney Rep. Roberts			
Deputy Roffey			
Alderney Rep. Snowdon			
Deputy Soulsby			
Deputy St Pier			
Deputy Taylor			
Deputy Vermeulen			
Deputy Aldwell			
Deputy Blin			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Burford			
Deputy Bury			
Deputy Cameron			
Deputy de Lisle			
Deputy de Sausmarez			
Deputy Dudley-Owen			
Deputy Dyke			
Deputy Fairclough			
Deputy Falla			
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Gabriel			
Deputy Gollop			
Deputy Haskins			
Deputy Helyar			
Deputy Inder			
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller			
Deputy Le Tocq			
Deputy Leadbeater			
Deputy Mahoney			
Deputy Matthews			
Deputy McKenna			
Deputy Meerveld			
Deputy Moakes			
Deputy Murray			

Deputy Oliver *
Deputy Parkinson

* denotes Member who voted by proxy

2335 **The Bailiff:** In respect of Proposition 22, there voted Pour 38 Members, with 1 Member absent,
and therefore, I declare Proposition 22 duly carried, which means all Propositions have been carried.
Isn't it nice to end on a note of unanimity! You have just decided that you are going to have an
extra meeting in September, effectively, because I could not have convened the meeting for 29th
September otherwise; you must like it in here so much. (*Laughter*)

2340 Members of the States, we would normally close the special meeting and then, in light of the
decision taken – was it only last Friday? – last Friday, we would then open the ordinary meeting to
resume again this afternoon. What I am going to do is give you the motion that I have given in the
past, which is that we dispense with closing the special meeting, we dispense with opening the
ordinary meeting, and that we mark every 38 Members who are here present for that purpose; 37
2345 Members are present here, but Deputy Oliver's proxy will carry forward into the ordinary meeting
for these purposes. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

2350 **The Bailiff:** I declare that motion duly carried, and we will invite the Greffier to tell us where we
are to, please, on the ordinary meeting.

Billet d'État XIV

COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

X. Secondary and Post 16 Education Reorganisation – Item deferred

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the policy letter, dated 28th May, 2021, they are of the opinion:-

1. *To agree that from the earliest date practicable, States' maintained secondary education should be delivered through an 11-18 learning partnership across three 11-16 schools and a Sixth Form Centre located on a site separate to those schools, and Le Murier and Les Voies Schools and St Anne's School in Alderney.*
2. *To agree the three 11-16 schools will be located on the existing school sites at Les Beaucamps, Les Varendes and St Sampson's and the Sixth Form Centre in a new building at Les Ozouets Campus co-located with The Guernsey Institute, the development and implementation of which is estimated to have:*
 - a) *A capital cost of £43.5m as set out in table 8 in paragraph 9.4; and*
 - b) *An ongoing revenue cost which will not, in the medium term, exceed the current revenue costs associated with these phases of education.*
3. *To approve 'Secondary & Post 16 Education Reorganisation' as a project in the capital portfolio, subject to ratification by the States as part of the Government Work Plan debate.*
4. *To delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee, following approval of the necessary business cases, to open capital votes of up to £54m, (which includes an allowance for optimism bias as described in section 9.8) to fund the model for the reorganisation of the secondary and post 16 education infrastructure agreed by the Assembly, subject to ratification by the States as part of the Government Work Plan debate.*

The Greffier: The next Item, sir, is article X, the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture – Secondary and Post 16 Education Reorganisation, with continuation of the debate.

2355 **The Bailiff:** Has anyone got a suggestion as to what we do next? Deputy Dudley-Owen, I will look to you, shall I?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: My cue, sir.

2360 Sir, over lunch recess, you kindly invited myself, Deputy Soulsby, and Deputy Meerveld for a conversation, following which I spoke to both Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Leadbeater about this afternoon's proceedings and the probability of getting any substantial business done within the time left remaining, even if we were to sit until seven o'clock, which had been my suggestion. On balance, and taking into account the very helpful email that was sent round by our Greffier, Mr Ross, yesterday to gauge the ... I should not have named our Greffier; apologies, that is what threw me, 2365 to gauge people's availability next week. It transpires that there is an awful lot of us away from the States and not available to make it. We discussed some creative ways around that, such as maybe trying to get people a proxy or changing the States Rules, etc.

2370 However, the most pragmatic and practical thing to do, disappointingly – and we will put this motion to the States – is sadly to defer the Education debate until the first meeting we have in September, despite all efforts to try and avoid that. But we are where we are: in between a rock and a hard place. So my suggestion to my colleagues would be that we defer the Education debate so that we can all get a really good airing of this with everybody who is for and against Propositions and so that amend-ees have the opportunity to be able to state their case in the Chamber back in September.

2375 Thank you, sir.

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

2380 **Deputy Gabriel:** Thank you, sir. I was standing for Deputy Dudley-Owen to give way but she did not see me. I was wondering what implication that may have for the implementation of anything of in secondary education if we are going into September, and missing a school year perhaps. Is she able to elaborate on that? Do the Rules allow?

2385 **The Bailiff:** Well, let's just see if there are any more comments, first, on this motion.

The motion is effectively, Members, going to be to defer resuming this item of business until the meeting to be convened on 8th September.

Deputy Murray.

2390 **Deputy Murray:** Thank you, sir.

There are implications, just to answer Deputy Gabriel; we are hopeful that we can overcome them. If this goes on too long, we may actually find ourselves in a position whereby we can find the secondary has got out of step with the TGI, because the TGI has a separate timeline that we are trying to catch up to; there would be a substantial financial implication if that was to go on for too long, but we are hopeful that we can actually overcome that by meeting early in September and resolving where we are. There may be some interim funding needed to maintain the momentum but we can speak to P&R about that as a special allocation.

Thank you, sir.

2400 **The Bailiff:** Any other comments before I put that particular motion to Members?

It is, Members, most unfortunate, perhaps, that time is defeating us during the end of this month, but that is the motion coming from Deputy Dudley-Owen, which is *not* to resume debate with Amendment number 5, which is to be proposed by Deputy Le Tocq and seconded by Deputy Brouard, but simply to defer this item of business to the meeting that will be convened for 8th September. As you know, it will be the first substantive item, effectively, in that meeting. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

2410 **The Bailiff:** I will declare that motion duly carried, which effectively means that this just goes to the end of the business for this meeting now and it will be deferred in due course.

2415 **The Bailiff:** Could we just ascertain, Members, what that then means for the remaining business? Is it the wish of the President of the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee that we deal with Item XI at this meeting, which is the dates of States' meetings for 2024-25?

Deputy Meerveld: My hope, sir, is that there will be a very short debate and it would be nice to get that off our plate.

2420 **The Bailiff:** And then, thereafter, the Guernsey Financial Services Commission's annual report, Deputy Ferbrache?

Deputy Ferbrache: Deputy Helyar.

2425 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Helyar?

Deputy Helyar: Yes, sir.

2430 **The Bailiff:** Yes, we can deal with that, and then we will see where are to for Electricity. Is there a desire to get on with Electricity?

2435 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Well, it is always nice to put energy into anything, whether it is a debate or anything else, because sometimes, that can happen. But thankfully, I was expecting this – although I am prepared to proceed – to be delayed until September because of the Education. And there is an amendment proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez and Deputy Haskins, so I would have thought that we are looking at two to three hours overall, I would have thought.

The Bailiff: Shall we see where we get to on the first two debates? That is the sort of indication being given at the moment.

2440 Greffier, the next item of business, please.

STATES' ASSEMBLY & CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE

XI. Dates of States' Meetings 1st September 2024 to 31st August 2025 – approved as amended

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the policy letter entitled "Dates of States' Meetings – 1st September 2024 to 31st August 2025" dated 27th May 2021, they are of the opinion:-

1. *To agree that the dates on which States' Meetings shall be convened in the period from the 1st September, 2024 to the 31st August, 2025, and the statements to be made under the provisions of Rules 10(4) and (5) by the Presidents and, in the case of the States of Alderney, the nominated Alderney Representative, shall be as follows:*

[The table of proposed States Meeting Dates can be found inside the Policy Letter, which is available to view in the downloads section at <https://gov.gg/article/183858/Dates-of-States-Meetings---1st-September-2024-to-31st-August-2025>]

and to add the above table to Schedule 1 to the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

2. *To:*

- a) *change the special meeting scheduled for the Policy & Resource Plan Phase 2 Report on the 29th September 2021 to an ordinary meeting.*
- b) *move the meeting from 13th to 20th October 2021.*

c) *amend references to the 'Policy & Resource Plan' in the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees to 'Government Work Plan'.*

3. *To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to return with a proposition, further to consultation with the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee, setting a date for consideration of the 2025 Government Work Plan as part of the 2024 Government Work Plan (Annual Report).*

The Greffier: Item XI, The States' Assembly & Constitution Committee – Dates of States' Meetings 1st September 2024 to 31st August 2025.

2445 **The Bailiff:** I invite the President of the Committee, Deputy Meerveld, to open debate.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

2450 The Propositions and policy letter are submitted in accordance with a resolution requiring the Committee to report to the States by July 2021 proposing the dates on which States' meetings shall be convened in the period from 1st September 2024 to 31st August 2025.

There is also a Proposition to update references to the Policy & Resources Plan in the Rules and to direct the Policy & Resources Committee to work with the Committee in setting a date for consideration of the 2025 Government Work Plan in the future.

2455 I have submitted a short amendment to Proposition 2, which I would like to lay now, which seeks to delete Proposition 2b for the reasons I will explain.

Amendment 1:

In Proposition 2 to delete Proposition 2b and redesignate Proposition 2c accordingly.

The Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Meerveld, why don't you talk to Amendment number 1 first, then, please.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

2460 Further from two representations from Members, the Committee has agreed the Propositions should be amended to delete Proposition 2b, which originally sought to move the meeting scheduled from 13th October to 20th October 2021.

The Committee has listened to the feedback received and thanks Members for constructively raising their concerns with the Committee regarding changing the date.

2465 The Committee accepts that all Members will have already made commitments, taking into account the meeting had been scheduled on 13th October and there is no pressing need for it to be moved.

I ask Members to agree the amendment without debate.

2470 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Queripel, do you formally second that amendment?

Deputy Queripel: I do, sir.

2475 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, if nobody is rising in respect of Amendment number 1, proposed by Deputy Meerveld and seconded by Deputy Queripel, I will put it to the vote, but I will explain that because paragraph a and paragraph c of Proposition 2 have already just been decided as Proposition 22 of the Government Work Plan debate, a simpler solution would just be to vote against Proposition 2 when we get to it, without it needing to be amended; if we lose that bit, it does not really make a lot of difference.

But I will still put the amendment to you. Those in favour; those against.

2480 *Members voted Pour.*

The Bailiff: I declare Amendment 1 duly carried.

2485 Deputy St Pier, you have submitted Amendment number 2 to insert a new Proposition into these Propositions.

Deputy St Pier: Yes, please, sir, and I will read it:

[Amendment 2:](#)

To add a new Proposition:

"4. To agree that the dates of the Meetings currently scheduled to start on 21st June 2022, 28th June 2023 and 26th June 2024 shall each be moved by one week to 14th June 2022, 5th July 2023 and 3rd July 2024 respectively."

2490 **Deputy St Pier:** I accept that this amendment goes beyond the Propositions but I am grateful for the engagement with the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee, who I understand support this amendment unanimously. It is really just borne out of experience of this month, with having an ordinary meeting separated by only a week from the Government Work Plan meeting. It is, I think, a self-explanatory and common-sense amendment to give Members a little bit more time to prepare for those meetings in 2022, 2023, and 2024.

Thank you, sir.

2495

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld, do you formally second that?

Deputy Meerveld: Yes, sir.

2500 **The Bailiff:** At the moment, I do not see anyone rising to speak to Amendment number 2, which would have the effect, if carried, of inserting a Proposition 4, so I will simply put that one to you as well *au voix*, Members. Those in favour of Amendment number 2, proposed by Deputy St Pier and seconded by Deputy Meerveld; those against.

2505 *Members voted Pour.*

The Bailiff: I declare that carried.

We return to general debate.

Deputy Gollop.

2510

Deputy Gollop: Sir, Deputy Meerveld and his colleagues on SACC know that I can be quite vociferous at times in commenting on diverse matters; indeed, I am also the conduit too of viewpoints.

2515 It is fair to say that some Members of the States and people outside the community would like to see a bit more inclusion in the States and that might mean being more conscious of Members with diverse needs: some Members are carers, some Members have young children or older children to look after. There are issues sometimes about the choosing of dates and the need for SACC, where possible, even looking further ahead to be family-friendly. And that can apply to hours, we can suddenly find, at short notice, our lunch two hours are shortened or we are going on to seven
2520 o'clock or whatever. I suppose, we do need, within the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee, more dialogue on that and maybe the need for breaks when we go from one major item to another.

There is a lot to look at here and I think it very much informs our Members and other stakeholders to present their views to the States' Assembly.

2525 But I am satisfied with this policy letter and also with the recommendations that we are going to continue with statements and question time. You can see in the detailed schedule that, right up

until the election in June 2025, the Presidents are due to give statements. They are not necessarily six months apart, but there will continue to be open and transparent accountability until then.

But if Members have more ideas about schedules ... because for some reason, schedules were extremely controversial in the last term and we often changed our minds. But I hope we support the policy letter today.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Sir, just briefly: if we remember, at the end of the last week, I tried to make a motion to move this to Monday; I am fairly sure there will be people in the States that may wish they had taken that job.

There is complete nonsense, and it is increasingly showing, that starting our States' meeting in the middle of the week, which almost certainly is going to hit the buffer of Saturday, is increasingly causing us problems; and this will not be the first time, this will not be the last time. I would ask SACC at some point to give serious consideration to looking at either moving us to a Tuesday or finding spare days earlier in the week when this can happen. Today, what is going to happen—and it was absolutely predictable last Wednesday, and we are here because I knew exactly where we would be here.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Sir, I rise on a similar issue to Deputy Inder but with a slightly different solution. I think some of us do obsessively try and plan any absences from the Island around published dates for States' meetings. Unfortunately, that sometimes goes wrong when an extra meeting is called – not that I feel at all aggrieved that I am paying for a holiday home in Alderney at the moment while sitting here, debating the Government Work Plan, or have been until recently: I am sure my family are enjoying it.

Having said that, if we really try to plan our breaks around States' business, it is very useful to know the meeting dates; what we do not have any more is predetermined spill-over dates. If we really are earnest in trying to be here for all States' meetings, that is an issue. I do not agree with starting earlier in the week; I think other States business needs to be done on the Monday and Tuesday. I also think sitting for four or five days continually usually leads to a lower quality of debate. But I do think that, rather than just getting to Friday afternoon and saying, 'Oh, we have run out of time, where do we go next?' And I apologise to the President of P&R if I made him choke from something that I have said! *(Laughter)*

Deputy Ferbrache: I am grateful for the sympathy that Deputy Roffey has never extended to me before. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Roffey: There is a first time for everything, and probably a last time as well! *(Laughter)*

I do not have any quibble with the dates that are set out in the policy letter, but I do ask SACC to look at the idea of having dedicated spill-over dates for when business is not finished so that we can try as well to avoid those when been planning our trips abroad or to the UK or, indeed, just having any other business in our diary, because otherwise, I think, we will always run into the point where we get to Friday afternoon and you, sir, ask, 'Who is available next Wednesday?', and some of us are and some of us are not so I think it does need to be formalised.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: Sir, I rise just to underline that point as well. I do not think it is just to do with booking holidays or the like of normal business. But when we first started in this new Assembly, sir,

some new Members said to me, 'We get through really quickly, don't we?', and I said, 'Just you wait.' And we are at that stage now where this clearly is happening.

2580 Sir, I could cope if SACC came back and said we are going to meet on Sunday afternoons at 5.30 and we are going to meet all night; as long as I know in advance, I am fine. I can book my responsibilities around that. I am not the only one in this Assembly – it is not just getting off-Island, because none of us have done a lot of that in the last year or so, but that is likely to increase, particularly in my role. It is not just that, sir, as I mentioned in previous debate, we have engagements with others outside of the Island, and at the moment, often in the States, we have to
2585 organise around our meetings, and that is not always possible, anyway.

I would just ask that we find a mechanism – and I think the President of SACC has got a few ideas around this – where we do not have the last minute, 40 people trying to coordinate their diaries all in one go. Just stick to the dates that have been chosen; have enough of them so that, personally, from my point of view, if we have one and we do not need it, we could cancel it. That
2590 would be far better. But certainly not to have the situation where we get to the end of the day and do we continue into the evening or do we start early? There are so many different possibilities that it really is a ridiculous way of doing business, with an Assembly of this size.

Can I just ask that we try and put some more discipline into it so that those of us who have got to fit other things around that are important, and often it is Government business, can be absolutely
2595 assured and do not have to go and try and rearrange things at the last minute?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

2600 Myself and Deputy de Lisle a few times have suggested that we have States' meetings at the end of the month; it worked well for *many* years. In those days, we used to then have the spill-over days in the middle of the month. We then moved to this three-week almost rolling programme and the spill-over day is the next time that the States sit. That is how it was solved to myself and previous Members: the spill-over day is the next sitting of the States. I totally agree with Deputy Le Tocq, it
2605 is very frustrating for different persons at different times—

The Bailiff: Can I just interrupt you very briefly, Deputy Brouard, and bid farewell to our Alderney Representatives who will travel back to their Island. I hope things are going well up there for the summer and I wish you an enjoyable summer. We will see you again in September.

2610

Members: Hear, hear.

Alderney Representative Roberts: That is greatly appreciated, sir, thank you.

2615 **The President:** Thank you.

Please continue, Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you.

2620 So the spill-over day at the moment is the next month. Every one of us, at certain times, will always get caught out, because there will be an evening meeting we have to go to and we have got childcare issues; there is always something when we try and mess about with the diary.

My suggestion to SACC is two-fold: have enough dates for States' meetings in the first place so that we have them every three weeks, so that we use it that way. And the second thing is probably one of discipline for ourselves. I listen to some speeches that are very long and I have difficulty in
2625 trying to get the meat out of it (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) whereas if you spend, perhaps, a little bit more time honing it down, you can get your message across to people like me a lot easier when they are short, they are sharp, and I get the point. When I have to wade through nearly 40 minutes of monologue, I find it difficult to try and find what it is you are actually saying. The point you have

2630 got may be brilliant, but you have got a really good chance of losing it. So perhaps that is something that we all, together, should try, just hone down our speeches and really get to the meat and put it across, as I have tried to do just now.

Thank you.

2635 **The Bailiff:** As nobody else is rising, I will invite the President, Deputy Meerveld, to reply to that short debate.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

2640 I thank Deputies Inder, Roffey, Le Tocq, and Brouard for their contributions and I wholeheartedly agree. I think the issues we have faced in the last couple of weeks, with the meetings and the overflow of work, clearly illustrate there are issues with the way we schedule the business of the States and allocate time.

2645 I certainly support the idea that we should have spill-over dates or designated dates we mark in our diary to reserve to continue debate when necessary. We were facing a situation where, next week, we potentially would be holding a meeting with a significant number of Members not able to attend and that has democratic issues with it. You may end up with decisions being made on important issues which are based more on who can be in the Assembly room at that time, as opposed to the will of the aggregate of the States, and you also have many people with strong opinions who will not be there to express them in the debate which may influence the debate.

2650 I can assure everybody that we will be taking a look at this and seeing how we can organise it better to ensure that we have clear dates in our diaries that all of us can reserve and, if necessary, spill-over dates are held back as well to enable us, hopefully, to conclude the business in the future going forward within set time periods and within all our expectations of when we are available.

Thank you, sir.

2655 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, although I am tempted to put all four Propositions to you together, because you have already approved what is left of Proposition 2, I will take that one separately.

2660 So I am going to do Proposition 1 first, which is the dates for 2024 and 2025 for that last year of this term and into the start of the next term. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare Proposition 1 carried.

In respect of Proposition 2, those in favour; those against.

2665 *Members voted Pour.*

The Bailiff: Ideally, that should have been negative, but never mind; I will declare that one carried as well, for what it is worth.

2670 Propositions 3 and 4: those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare those two Propositions carried, so they have all been carried.

2675 In my excitement to get cracking, I completely forgot that I had given permission to the Chairman of the Civil Contingencies Authority to put two Rule 18 Propositions before this meeting of the States. So we will interpose those before we then come to the Guernsey Financial Services Commission report.

If the Greffier can just announce the items, please.

CIVIL CONTINGENCIES AUTHORITY

**Emergency Powers (Coronavirus) (General Provisions)
(Bailiwick of Guernsey) (No. 8) Regulations, 2021 approved;
Emergency Powers (Coronavirus) (Vaccine) (Limitation of Liability)
(No. 8) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Regulations, 2021 approved**

The States are asked to decide: -

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the Emergency Powers (Coronavirus) (General Provision) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (No. 8) Regulations, 2021.

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the Emergency Powers (Coronavirus) (Vaccine) (Limitation of Liability) (No. 8) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Regulations, 2021.

The Greffier: Propositions laid pursuant to Rule 18 of the Rules of Procedure: Civil Contingencies Authority, Emergency Powers (Coronavirus) (General Provisions) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (No. 8) Regulations, 2021; and Civil Contingencies Authority, Emergency Powers (Coronavirus) (Vaccine) (Limitation of Liability) (No. 8) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Regulations, 2021.

2685

The Bailiff: I invite the Chairman of the Authority, Deputy Ferbrache, to open debate.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, I am grateful to you for allowing us to lay these emergency Propositions.

2690 As regards the second set of regulations, those about limitation of liability, we are just going through it until the draftsman can draft the appropriate legislation, so there is nothing new at all in relation to that.

The other regulations, the General Regulations, No. 8, they were made on 16th July, they have to be laid within a certain time, they are only applicable for a certain time. They are explained in the explanatory notes, sir, and I ask the States to approve them.

2695

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, thank you.

2700 This obviously presents an opportunity to raise a few COVID-related issues, some of which flow from these regulations. The vaccine certificate passports, whatever is the right terminology, clearly, there are some challenges around having the recognition of those outside the Common Travel Area, and I would certainly be interested to hear Deputy Ferbrache's response, in replying to the debate, whether there has been any progress on that in terms of obtaining those recognitions from outside the CTA, and if not, on what sort of time frame is he expecting that progress can be made?

2705 The second, related question, that has come from the community is for those that have received the limited number of batches from the so-called 'Indian vaccine', the Indian batches which have caused some consternation in some jurisdictions, and the extent to which that may be causing some difficulties for some people travelling –

2710 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sorry, could you just wait for the vehicle to pass? It is not your fault.

2715 **Deputy St Pier:** – the extent to which those that have received those doses of those particular batches may be experiencing or fear they are going to experience difficulty travelling, and again, what the response is to that. I know a number of those have been in direct contact with either members of the CCA or Deputy Soulsby, seeking some kind of reassurance which, again, the Authority may be struggling to be able to actually provide at this stage, but I think it would be useful, whilst we have the opportunity to debate the matters, if Deputy Ferbrache could address that.

2720 Sir, I think my main point, probably, is in relation to where we are generally in the use of these regulations. Obviously, we recognise that the Civil Contingencies Law is very prescriptive about the definition of an 'emergency' and the threat to life and health and so on, but at the same time, using the language that Deputy Ferbrache has used, the community is now learning to live with COVID. We, not only here in Guernsey, but many other jurisdictions, have recognised that it is now an endemic virus, and therefore, it is making that transition from emergency to normality, and

2725 obviously, the travel restrictions are merely a part of that journey to normality.

But equally, of course, we need to make a transition in terms of our governance as well back to normality. One of the challenges is how we do that, given that the recognition from both this Authority and the previous one is that, actually, the Civil Contingencies Law and the regulations do provide a very effective mechanism to allow the management of this particular emergency for the

2730 Bailiwick, rather than having to enact – as we have discussed in previous meetings, sir – separate legislation.

However, I do think that, in a sense, to coin a phrase which we have had in the previous debate, we can't have our cake and eat it, in that we need to recognise that if we are moving out of emergency to normality, then equally, we need to make that transition as well. Of course, one

2735 method, or one possible route, for that would be to return to the position we had *ab initio*: namely, that, actually, it was the Committee for Health & Social Care that was taking the lead in relation to the management of some of the health-related issues. Actually, of course, the next set of regulations, which will presumably come to the Assembly at its meeting in September under this Rule or under another Rule, may well provide an opportunity for us to be starting to make that

2740 transition.

I really raise the point because we have touched on it before but the day is getting closer. Deputy Ferbrache has made clear, both in this Assembly and elsewhere, that he does not wish to continue the use of the Authority and the existence of the emergency for any longer than it needs to be, and that, in itself, is a judgement call, but I would certainly welcome Deputy Ferbrache's comments on that when he responds to debate.

2745

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

2750 **Deputy Gabriel:** Thank you, sir.

I touched on this a while ago, when I was questioning the CCA, and I would like to take this opportunity again, perhaps the President of the CCA can give the Assembly an update on the availability, free of charge, of self-test lateral flow kits to the population of Guernsey?

It is my understanding, given today's announcement – I did not catch it because I was in the

2755 Chamber – that a lateral flow, or PCR test is required for inbound travellers, and some of those inbound travellers, of course, will be residents returning to the Island, so they may want to take advantage of a lateral flow test. I understand those are available free of charge in the UK, but if they were not able to procure one, they could perhaps take one with them from Guernsey. So if he could update us on that availability. Of course, I understand there is a cost, and whether that cost will be

2760 borne by the CCA, the Government, etc.

Again, on the other side of that, it may well give some security to the self-employed as well, because they will be wanting to assure themselves that they are not at risk to their customers, and vice versa: their customers do not want to be at risk to contractors coming into their property, especially the very small businesses of perhaps one or two people, because again, if they are

2765 exposed or potentially exposed to this virus, then they will be required to self-isolate for a period of 13 or 14 days, which can be very restrictive to small businesses. I know that there is a sickness benefit available of £168 per week, but for a self-employed person, that is hardly a drop in the ocean, although very welcome. I do understand that Deputy Helyar, through P&R and CCA, has made a statement saying that other support is available upon request.

2770 Of course, small businesses and the Guernseyman do not necessarily always want to make that request and are quite proud, so this, of course, may well help them, these self-test kits, if they were available. I know pharmacies are selling them in Guernsey and that there is a demand for them, certainly, and they are not necessarily taking advantage of them, but having come from a family-owned business, everyone is out there to help themselves in business, and they are charging significant amounts for these self-test kits.

2775 So if at all possible, if the President of the CCA could update us if those self-test lateral flow kits will be available free of charge to the Guernsey population?

Thank you.

2780 **The Bailiff:** Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Thank you, sir.

2785 I would also like to ask for a little update on the deliberations on the radio earlier with recall to changes that have been made to the whole process of combatting the virus in this Island. I have called for a more cautious, measured approach in the interest of public health several times. I know that it has become even more critical currently, with the opening up in the UK on 19th July, and the surge in the virus in Jersey, and now also in Alderney, with a number of new cases also in Guernsey.

I think it is a matter, also, of trust with regard to the population locally in the CCA. Even Dr Bishop, Guernsey's consulting psychiatrist, is quoted as saying:

2790 ... there [also] appears to be a tendency toward mistrust towards the team that have actually supported us through this pandemic.

He made that point just recently. So it is a matter of giving everybody comfort and confidence in the Authority and trust in the Authority, and I am hoping that the measures that have been taken today might be a way of providing greater trust in the Authority from this day on, given the increased incidents in the pandemic in these islands.

2795 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

2800 **Deputy Gollop:** Sir, I think, as has often been the case, Guernsey has been managed extremely well by the CCA, and we are still doing very well. When last I looked at the figures, we had 49 across the Bailiwick, of which perhaps about half were in Alderney.

2805 Nevertheless, I have called for in the past, really, as a way of providing information, rather than fear, that it would be useful for arrivals to Guernsey from, perhaps, Jersey and the UK—not necessarily Alderney, although that might apply now, to be tested on arrival. I was told by members of the CCA there were logistical difficulties in that, in terms of money, people and wise use of resources. But I think both as a way of gaining information, preventing what we have seen in Guernsey, an escalation of a community spread, and of setting the minds at rest of perhaps half of our population, such testing would be useful.

2810 Although I support the vulnerable, I am more on the side of living with COVID and opening ourselves up if safe and proportionate. But I do think one does need to protect our community from some of the escalations we have seen elsewhere, and I think testing at the border, not necessarily isolation, but isolation, of course, if somebody is found positive, is a way forward.

2815 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Matthews.

Deputy Matthews: Thank you, sir.

I agree with Deputy Gollop that, if possible – although it was very welcome, the announcement about the requirement for testing pre-travel that was made today – I think that there would still be

2820 an advantage to having testing on arrival as well; it might be a belt-and-braces solution, but I think it would help to reduce, potentially, the numbers of cases that we might see. I am looking at the cases today: I think the Isle of Man is just shy of 2,000 and Jersey is up to 3,000. If we can avoid getting high numbers of cases in Guernsey, I am sure the population would very much welcome that.

2825 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Thank you, sir.

2830 I wanted to share an extract from an email I have just recently received from a good friend, actually, in relation to what effectively is discrimination and social restrictions based on vaccination status. The extract says, 'If we go in the direction of some other European states – applying further social restrictions based on vaccination status, restricting access to venues and public spaces – I will be forced to stay away from the places where I can work for an indefinite period of time or take the vaccination via coercion; the latter is not an option, based on principle alone. This could be the final straw for me in my desire to continue to be a part of this community. I am already locked down on the Island and am unable to travel with the required isolation period, whilst other double-jabbed individuals move freely on and off. I can see why there are mass protests in Europe, where these measures have been introduced, noting that protests are often supported equally by the vaccinated and the unvaccinated, by people advocating choice and personal freedoms aligned to the previous societal values we once enjoyed.'

2835 That mention about, really, the social restrictions based on social status, that can become much more complicated down the line if we go down the different levels of who can access what. Because ultimately, it will not be just social restrictions; it will affect the ability of people to work, which will represent, obviously, a significant burden for us, potentially, financially if we have to support those people if they are unable to work because they are not vaccinated and cannot access certain places.

2840 I want to perhaps hear a little bit more in terms of our thinking of how this might develop. Hearing that a close friend and members of our community are potentially considering leaving the Island based on that is quite serious.

2850 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Taylor.

Deputy Taylor: Thank you, sir.

2855 I am quite intrigued to see a bit of a debate here going on about COVID; it seems until now it has been left to Deputy Queripel to ask a few questions and everybody has sat perfectly quiet for fear of saying anything.

2860 I would like to pick up on a point made by Deputy Matthews, and I wonder if Deputy Ferbrache may be able to give me the information. I find, as a citizen, I often hear numbers, and people say, 'But there is 2,000 people in Jersey who have got it and there is 6,000 people here who have got it.' And I honestly do not really know what that means in real terms, other than that there are 2,000 people who have COVID. I wonder if Deputy Ferbrache may be able to give an indication, not as a way of scaremongering or to create any panic, but what it might look like today if we did have 2,000 cases here in Guernsey.

2865 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

2870 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Would Deputy Ferbrache agree with me, and perhaps make some comments when he responds, that the overriding emphasis – and this touches on some of the points made by Deputy Taylor – is to ensure that we do not have our hospital inundated with serious respiratory

COVID cases? And at the moment, we are seeing a success in that; never mind the number of people who have caught COVID.

2875 But also, there is beginning to be a greater emphasis on treatment, rather than just prevention. Obviously, prevention is really important, but treatment of the condition, where, particularly, that treatment could stop someone from needing to have to go into hospital and they recover in their own home is also an important part of it, and I believe that Dr Rabey touched on this a while back in one of the media presentations.

2880 Would it be possible to see a greater emphasis, particularly through our medical professionals, on that type of treatment, as well as the very helpful information and precautions that are being put into place by the CCA as time moves on?

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

2885 **Deputy Roffey:** As this seems to be turning into a slightly general debate about COVID and Guernsey's response to it, I will have my two pennies worth as well.

I am really happy to comply with any sort of restrictions that are necessary in order to keep our community safe; let me make that quite clear at the beginning. But there is something that has been puzzling me slightly over recent weeks, and I am just interested as to whether I could be illuminated over it. For double-vaccinated people, we have now removed the need to isolate if you are travelling from the Common Travel Area, albeit now that, after the weekend or whenever it is, there will be the need to have tests. That is fine, but you still have to isolate if you are coming from a country with much lower infection rates than the UK, Jersey, or elsewhere, albeit probably you have travelled through Gatwick or Heathrow or whatever because there are not that many direct flights; I accept that. Maybe there just is no way of arranging the regulations to be entirely logical, but it just seems odd to me that if you are coming from a region of the UK which really has got quite high infection rates, you are free from isolation, but if you are travelling in from a country with much lower infection rates, then you do have to isolate for two weeks, or whatever it is. Maybe I could have an explanation; if there is none, then I suppose I accept that.

2900

The Bailiff: Deputy Queripel.

2905 **Deputy Queripel:** Sir, everybody knows my views. I thank Deputy Taylor for referencing me in his speech for consistently questioning and challenging the regulations put in place by the CCA. I have the utmost respect for everyone in the CCA; I have always said that. Just because I challenge them does not mean to say that I justify being referred to as a doom-and-gloom merchant, as I have been in this chamber by some colleagues and out in the community.

2910 Does Deputy Ferbrache not agree with me that if we have concerns, as Deputies, we have every right to ask those questions and challenge? It does not mean to say just because we ask questions, we are being negative or doom-and-gloom-mongers. Does he not agree with me that, as long as those concerns are expressed in a civilised and respectful manner, as I always try to do, that is the correct thing to for Members of this Assembly?

2915 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

2920 Would Deputy Ferbrache agree with me that one of the concerns that was raised by Deputy Roffey – and I am not being clever here; I am just repeating what I can remember that Dr Brink said at the lunchtime briefing – was that the difficulty we have from some of our friends coming from abroad is that there are different variants of concern elsewhere in the world and we have not the infrastructure to know exactly what is happening in those countries, whereas we do have a much closer handle on what is happening in the CCA, so we know what variants we have got and where they are?

2925 The second part is that we have no real method of verifying certificates from other countries at the moment; this is something that we are obviously looking at, but we do not have a way of facilitating that confirmation that it is a genuine certificate. I hope he would agree with that.

The Bailiff: As no one else is rising to speak in this debate, I will invite the Chairman to reply to it, please. Deputy Ferbrache.

2930 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Thank you, sir. I will start with Deputy Queripel but then I will come to Deputy St Pier.

2935 Deputy Queripel will confirm, I am not asking him to physically stand up and confirm, that I have said to him both publicly and privately that I welcome his questions and his comments; I have never criticised them. He expresses his views on behalf of a number of our community and that is his job, and he does it well, so he gets no criticism from me. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

2940 Deputy St Pier and I have shared the same role over different times, well, we have not shared it yet ... and I know that he and his colleagues at the Civil Contingencies Authority discharge their duties in a splendid manner. They regretted having to make the decisions they made, each and every decision they made, they regretted making it, and they wanted to pass the baton on responsibly as soon as they could to get rid of the duties of the Civil Contingencies Law; I would like to do exactly the same.

2945 To answer his general question, there is an intent, legislation is being drafted, to alter the way that this operates. That is going to take, we have been advised, six to nine months. In the interim, there will be some ordinances that can be made under existing legislation which can deal with the situation. Just at the moment, at this particular time, there clearly is still an emergency, there is still a need for the Civil Contingencies Authority, but he is absolutely right: as soon as is practicable, because it is becoming an endemic disease, rather than a pandemic, and Dr Brink said at the briefing today that we are going to be with this disease for years and years to come. It is going to be like – and I do not mean to make a facile analogy – it is going to be like flu. We live with flu in our community and we are going to have to live with COVID in our community and other communities too. Hopefully, that answers his general question.

2955 As regard to vaccination certificates, I am grateful to Deputy Brouard for taking that up. Again, it is a very valid question because it has exercised our minds. The answer is the international community has not come to an agreement yet as to something that can be universally accepted. Therefore, we have got to deal with the British situation because we have got that sorted out. We would like to move to a more general 'You can accept this certificate from America or France or wherever it may be' that is nothing to do with Guernsey; we will cooperate and we are cooperating, but that is the position.

2960 As regard to the Indian doses, that is being looked at. What I can say is nobody's health is at risk, but it is being looked at and people are being contacted and that is being processed.

I give way to Deputy St Pier.

2965 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, I am most grateful to Deputy Ferbrache for giving way because I am actually going to throw a fourth question at him, which I should have done when I originally spoke. It was prompted, really, by a number of other people speaking, including Deputy Le Tocq, identifying the issue that, actually, the focus is about minimising hospitalisation and death, and obviously, there is great success with the vaccination in achieving that.

2970 However, clearly, one of the other experiences from elsewhere is that one of the biggest challenges right now is not so much the number of people who have contracted COVID, but those that are forced into isolation and the ripple effect that that has on families, mental health, operation of businesses, particularly small businesses, and so on.

2975 I do genuinely apologise to Deputy Ferbrache for not allowing him notice to think about this in responding to debate, but I am sure he will be able to do so. If he is able to give any further information on thinking about how the isolation rules may change to ensure the minimum effect

on the community as a result of the isolation that is required and is, quite possibly, a bigger impact than the number of cases?

Deputy Ferbrache: I can deal with that point; I am grateful to him for raising it.

2980 The position in relation to that is that that is under close scrutiny, close investigation, now; in fact, as he knows, we are not allowed to discuss anything that we discussed in CCA unless we come to a decision that we can announce publicly but I can say that is being considered. He is absolutely right: the isolation for 14 days, or whatever the appropriate period may be, creates the kind of problem that Deputy Gabriel talked about – people losing income, they cannot go to work, the kids
2985 cannot go to school, all that kind of stuff. So that is under consideration and as soon as it can be ‘reduced’ it will be, but I cannot promise that that will be tomorrow.

Deputy Gabriel said about free lateral flow tests and could it come out of the CCA budget. The fact is it would be paid for by the taxpayer. If it is done the CCA has not got such a big budget that it could suddenly just say we are going to write off £100,000 or £200,000 worth of costs, or whatever
2990 the costs may be, it could be significantly more than that.

The point in relation to lateral flow tests, as my able colleague, Deputy de Sausmarez, has written me a note, which I will read, says, ‘We should stress that the pre-travel requirements stipulate that lateral flow tests *must* be supervised. It is an important distinction in respect of everything else.’ In other words, it is not just taking it, you have got to have it supervised because we have got to be
2995 absolutely sure that if somebody is relying upon it that it has been verified. I am not saying people are going to be ... I will give way in just a minute, if I could just finish this, but I will give way. In relation to it, we are not alleging people will be fraudulent, but people can make mistakes.

I will give way.

3000 **Deputy Gabriel:** Thank you, Deputy Ferbrache, for giving way.

There seems to be a little bit of confusion—or not clarified—as to when or what period of time the self-test or the PCR, in fact, can be taken before travelling back. Perhaps it has not been decided yet, and I know we are not bringing these regulations in until Thursday, but if possible, could you clarify that?

3005

Deputy Ferbrache: I could do that. More detail will be given around Tuesday lunchtime, but at the moment, it is 48 hours before. So two days before you travel, you have the appropriate test.

I think I have dealt with Deputy Gabriel’s points generally.

Deputy de Lisle talked about combatting the virus generally; well, that is what everybody is going to do. The original intent, day one, I am sure, was that you try and eliminate the virus. Well, that is just going to be impossible so we have got to live responsibly with the virus in our community. That does not mean we open the doors and we suddenly have, as Deputy de Lisle ... and I will come to his question in a moment, we have got 2,000 cases and what are we going to do with it? Obviously, you try and restrict it as best you can, because we have got the hospital services that both Deputy
3010 St Pier and Deputy Le Tocq have referred to, which must not be overburdened.

Just to say in relation that, the consistent advice we have now received over a period of time is that they are not at threat at all. We have not only not got anybody in hospital, although the hospital is full at the moment, that is people having surgery and all the other things that people need to go to hospital for. If necessary, which it will not be, if there was a real crisis tomorrow and we needed
3020 20 beds, we could provide them. So I do not want people to think that that is not instantly available.

Clearly, as Dr Brink has said, and this is just an example she gives, if all of a sudden, there was a variant that the vaccines could not react to, they could not repel, we may have to make a completely different decision to the ones we are making now. Thankfully, that has not happened.

But we are constantly ... When we announced the blueprint some months ago, we said 1st July we would open in the sense that we have opened up. We have had to restrict that in relation to Jersey and we now have had to restrict that in relation to other areas, as we have announced today. We also said we would have a review on the 14th, then we put that back to the 19th but again, that
3025

review as to whether we were going to go – not *a bit* further, we just take a different step – we have pushed that back and we have not got a specific date for that because of the changing circumstances.

I will give way to Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: What I was getting at and the question that I would like to pose is with respect to testing at the border. Because a number of people have contacted me who have only gone to Southampton or London for a day, some of them, others for a week, but on coming back they are afraid, then of joining their families without having a test, and they just feel that it would be useful to have that test as they come into the Island, either by sea or by air. But they are also calling for everyone, of course, being tested at the border.

There is also the problem of business tunnels that I would like Deputy Ferbrache to bring forward, because a lot of people are concerned that people come in for one day, marketing or whatever they are doing, and then they leave but they have not been tested while they have been here, and that is of a concern as well.

So those two areas: testing on the border and coming in and also that issue of business tunnels, together with, of course, the implications for people that do get COVID in terms of later on.

Thank you.

Deputy Ferbrache: I was going to answer the testing at the border problem, because other speakers have raised it. In relation to it: if you are not double-vaccinated plus the 14 days, so if you are just partially vaccinated or not vaccinated at all, you are tested on arrival. If you are 12–17 years of age, you are tested on arrival.

We are responsible – and I make that point – we, the politicians, are responsible, we must accept or reject the advice that we have had. But we have accepted the advice that we have had, which is that the better way of doing it, making it safer for our community, the phrase that has been used; it does not have any technical term is ‘smart testing’. We use our facilities, we use our testing capacity, in the way that I have said, at the Airport and at the Harbour, but equally, we use it for testing people who live in Guernsey, symptomatic people, etc., we test accordingly. We use our facilities as best we can.

Nobody can say that Guernsey has been parsimonious in the way that it has dealt with COVID; it has spent large monies on COVID, it will continue to spend large monies on repelling COVID. But it has only got finite resources, it can only do so much.

The best way, we are advised, of protecting the community as best we can, and it will not be perfect because COVID will get into our community, is taking the steps that we have. If there is a change of advice, if there is a change of circumstances, we will react to that.

As for the business tunnels, again, we are going to give further advice, we are going to give further recommendation and we are going to give further information on Tuesday lunchtime or thereabouts which will cover the topic that Deputy de Lisle has said.

Deputy Gollop, testing on arrival, I have dealt with that; Deputy Matthews, testing on arrival, I have dealt with that.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller raised a good point, an excellent point, about her friend who sent her the email or whatever it was. The point in relation to that is that the advice that we have received, and I do not think it is just in Guernsey; it is probably worldwide, is that the best you can protect your community is by having as many people as possible vaccinated. What you must not do though, and it is a point that Deputy Queripel has made on quite a few occasions, you must not frighten people in relation to saying, ‘If you are not vaccinated, you are a second-class citizen.’ He has never used that phrase, but I think that is a fair way of summing up what he has said.

It is a balancing exercise. I am sorry that your friend is thinking of leaving, and I would ask you to try and persuade her not, or him not to, but the issue in relation to that is it is all a balance, it is a judgement.

I am standing here today, telling you what I know, telling you how we deal with it. It could change tomorrow, it could change next week or it could change in a month's time. I have never dealt with anything in my professional or public life that has been as fast-moving and as changeable as dealing with COVID. For example, this week, we have had three CCA meetings, which have gone on for a fair period of time, discussing various aspects in relation to COVID; hopefully, we will only have one or two next week, but you never know. It is a fast-moving, fast-changing situation.

Deputy Taylor said, 'What about' – and he gave an example of 2,000 cases, it would depend, really. There is no number. We have not got a thing saying, 'If it goes above 500, we will do this; if it goes above 1,000 ...' It depends how it can be controlled. I very much hope we never get 2,000 cases, but I certainly cannot stand up and say we will not. I do not want people then saying, 'The Chair of the Authority is saying that there could be 2,000 cases,' because I am not saying that. It will depend on the circumstances, it would depend on what can be done. It will be monitored carefully.

I mean, if we had 2,000 cases of the flu, the Island would be in a serious position, because flu is a serious disease: it can kill people, it makes you very ill. It will depend on the circumstances.

Of course, it depends on ... some people get COVID and it is an inconvenience; other people get COVID and it is much more than that. Indeed, one of the questions asked at the briefing today was, 'Where are we with our results in relation to long COVID?' and Dr Brink said, 'We just have not had time, with everything else, to detail that yet.' But that will be something that is an important piece of work that will be carried out. It is being carried out elsewhere and it is only due to lack of resources because people like Dr Brink and her team are working 18 or 19 hours a day, seven days a week. I think she has two days off in the last ... I give way to Deputy Taylor.

Deputy Taylor: Thank you, Deputy Ferbrache, for giving way.
Just to say 'the Director of Public Health' as opposed to Dr Brink.

Deputy Ferbrache: I think I have answered the question, I do not think I can go any further in relation to that.

I certainly agree with Deputy Le Tocq's point; I do not think I have got anything to add.

Deputy Brouard has, really, dealt with the point that Deputy Roffey has raised, which lots of people have raised, and that is something that, again, Dr Brink and her team are looking at. As soon as it is practical, as soon as it can be changed ... Deputy Roffey, that is twice in a day he has been right again! So it is a special day for him. (*Interjection*) But seriously, he is right. There are, I would not use the word 'illogicalities' in the system, but there are inconsistencies; there are bound to be with the resources we have got, the challenges that we have got, and the fast-moving situation that we have got.

I think I have dealt with everybody's point, if I have not, then I apologise. It has turned into a much longer debate than I think we all anticipated so I am very glad we did not start the electricity debate because we may have run out of time. I would ask people to approve the regulations.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, there are two Propositions before you for consideration. The first I am going to put to you is whether you are minded to approve the Emergency Powers (Coronavirus) (General Provisions) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (No. 8) Regulations, 2021. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare that Proposition duly carried.

The second is the Emergency Powers (Coronavirus) (Vaccine) (Limitation of Liability) (No. 8) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Regulations, 2021; are you minded to approve those? Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare that Proposition carried as well.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

**XII. The Guernsey Financial Services Commission:
2020 Annual Report and Accounts, approved**

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter dated 11th May, 2021 of the Policy & Resources Committee, they are of the opinion to note the annual report and accounts of the Guernsey Financial Services Commission for the year ended 31st December, 2020.

The Greffier: Article XII. The Policy & Resources Committee, the Guernsey Financial Services Commission: 2020 Annual Report and Accounts.

3135

The Bailiff: I invite Deputy Helyar, on behalf of the Committee, to open debate.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, sir. I will be brief.

3140

The Proposition is merely to note the accounts. Members, if they do not note them, the accounts will still exist; it will make no difference whether we note them or not.

As they are the accounts of an independent body, I am somewhat on a sticky wicket if anybody wishes to ask me detailed questions about their contents, but I am very happy to field those to the extent I am able or to pass them on and to seek answers.

3145

I would, sir, though, in standing, take the opportunity, because this is the last set of accounts that will be signed off by Dr Schrauwers, who is the Chairman of the Commission, just to pass on the thanks of the Policy & Resources Committee and, I hope, Members of the Assembly generally in his retirement. He will be ceasing to be Chairman at the end of this year.

3150

He joined the Commission in 2008, which for those who work in the finance industry know was the year that the sky fell in, and became the Chairman of the Commission in 2012. I have to say, sir, since 2008, the world of regulation in financial services has changed very significantly, so it has been a major undertaking for commissioners and for the Commission itself to keep us up to standard and to keep the industry which pays most of our tax up and in good standing with several international regulatory organisations; I am talking particularly about regulations to do with anti-money laundering, to do with regulation of funds, fiduciary services, and insurance. During that period, there have been many inspection visits by the IMF and Moneyval and others, all of which, I am happy to say, we have passed ... not always with the best flying colours, but certainly enough to maintain a healthy industry. I would just like to thank Dr Schrauwers and wish him well for the future.

3155

Thank you.

3160

The Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Sir, I just wanted to make the point that the Chairman, in his statement, which is a sort of foreword to the Accounts, makes a note and makes a very useful point to us as a regulator: he states that:

... the "status quo" is rarely acceptable in a business context.

3165

Then he says:

Things must constantly evolve to enable jurisdictions such as the Bailiwick to remain competitive and thrive.

He also says that Guernsey, quite correctly:

... has always prided itself on its fleetness of foot in dealing with new challenges ...

But he says:

... to keep ahead in financial services, the Bailiwick needs to up its game in terms of its processes whilst fully embracing new challenges and opportunities to innovate.

He is making the point here that progress appears now to be much less timely than it once was.
3170 And the observation that Guernsey appears to have become less fleet of foot.

So what that brings back to us is that, particularly as he stresses the fact that new challenges and opportunities to innovate need to be looked at very closely in order to march ahead or with the competition.

3175 The point that I was making earlier with regard to financial services in our last debate was that, in reality, if we are to support further – and I gave some indication as to the amount that we are supporting the industry currently as a Government – but in the future, we need to see innovation of new products and services, and that is where we should be actually looking to funding. If we can see that we can promote new products and services to remain competitive in financial services, that is where we should be putting our money. I think that is a very useful piece of advice to us by,
3180 basically, a regulator that has, of course, seen a lot in Europe and beyond and has been with us for a number of years.

There is also the suggestion by the Director General that they would require more staff in the future, particularly with the Moneyval deliberations upcoming and so on and so forth. But I notice in the *Press* just recently, too, that they are asking for a 10% increase in fees, which is something
3185 that they believe is well below the type of increase that the Isle of Man and Jersey have gone for in the past year or so. That is something to be expected but I think, personally, it would be best, given the current environment and the uncertainty, to keep those increases, as far as possible, with inflation, rather than going over inflation.

There are a few useful points in the accounts in terms of the Director General's statement and
3190 also the Chairman's statement and I thank them both for providing us with those pieces of information and advice.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

3195

Deputy Gollop: Sadly, things have been so busy and hectic recently I missed all of the Guernsey Financial Services Commission conferences and also, I believe, their presentation to States' Members this year.

3200 But I have heard Dr Schrauwers and others speak very interestingly at various meetings and I would build on what Deputy de Lisle says, that the outgoing Chairman did have reservations about Guernsey signing up to too much legislation and social regulation, but I do not necessarily agree with him politically on every point. Nevertheless, I do take on board the argument that we have to be smart and agile and move forward and evolve.

3205 Really, what struck me again this year was the Guernsey Financial Services Commission, given that last year was such a disastrous year for some sectors, had a good year. But it was very much a year when perhaps they marked time, rather than particularly changed. I notice the number of employees has remained the same, maybe gone up by one permanent to 120. I note that costs have gone up between 1% and 3%. Fees receivable have not gone up by 1% and 3%; I am afraid they have gone down by 2%. But the financial penalties imposed have quintupled. Bad debts recovered
3210 went down. And of course, salaries rose a little bit.

I think my point is that there is a sense that we are doing our bit, but that is not as exciting as it could be. There has been a positive swing in the number of funds administered but in other areas there has been a slight shrinkage of business.

3215 I suppose my message to Guernsey and to Economic Development and Deputy Moakes – who, like Deputy Helyar, reminded us of something we should all consider: the extreme of importance of the financial services sector to our economy (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) that we not only have to look at appropriate legislation, deregulation in some areas, maybe population management in some other areas, but we do have to ensure that we remain a competitive jurisdiction and that we do not see a trend of the number of licenses issued or activity lessening. Because although we have seen growth in legal services, in digital services and in funds, we have actually over the years, as most of 3220 know, seen a significant decline in the number of banking licenses, for example.

I hope that the next stage of the Guernsey Financial Services Commission, when we will see Mr Winsor, I think, have a Chairmanship role, will also be good for Guernsey and good for the GFSC and that we will see innovation and maybe a greater attempt at cost containment to both the 3225 industry and the Commission as well.

The Bailiff: Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Queripel: Sir, thank you.

3230 Sir, I am a great supporter of the finance industry and of the GFSC, but there was a time when their annual costs and overheads were spiralling completely out of control, and it was the previous Assembly that I had to point that out to them and rein them in. I led the charge on that occasion. Word got through to the GFSC office, because it was not long before some of the Directors appeared in the Public Gallery to listen to the debate. The GFSC needed a wake-up call, they got 3235 that wake-up call from the previous Assembly, and they responded admirably, and I want to commend them for that.

Having said that, I am also somewhat concerned about the recent increases referred to by Deputy de Lisle and Deputy Gollop, and I think we as an Assembly need to keep a close eye on that for the good of the Island and the good of the community.

3240 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: As no one else is rising, I will turn to Deputy Helyar to reply to that debate, then, please.

3245 **Deputy Helyar:** Thank you, sir. I am not sure there are any specific points there, really, that I can respond to.

The 'fleet of foot' comment was something that I had noted, Deputy de Lisle, and you have had a very strong day today, I think, in terms of being absolutely on the point. That is very true, and certainly was something that the Commission mentioned to P&R when we met them for the first 3250 time at the tail end of last year. Deputy Moakes and I do take part in the finance sector forum every month; we have a regular meeting and the Commission does play a part in that.

We have committed, particularly because of the forthcoming Moneyval visit, to ensure that we are absolutely match-fit when that happens, and that is going to need a bit more resource put into it before they arrive, and not just in that area, but also in terms of the Home Department and its 3255 enforcement capabilities, in terms of fraud and financial crime.

So we are doing everything that we possibly can to ensure we are providing adequate support to the industry and we will try to be a bit more fleet of foot going forward because I think that is an important characteristic; it is one of the best characteristics about being a small jurisdiction and if we get rid of that, we lose one of our main fighting strengths.

3260 The powers for the Commission to set its own fees I believe were removed in 2014. The position at the moment of the recommendation,, and it is quite a significant hike, I would agree with Deputy Queripel; I think it is over 10% that has been recommended. The background to that, and I am not

here to specifically speak, obviously, on behalf of the Commission, but they would say, I am sure, were the Director General here to speak in his defence, that their rises for fees in the last nine years have been below inflation, so they have got a little bit behind. And, of course, this is a consultation. Industry will be able to say, 'No, we definitely do not want to pay anything else', and so the fees will be considered once we have been through that process. But absolutely, you are quite right: we should be keeping a close eye on it.

Sir, I would just ask Members if they are happy to note the content of the accounts.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, there is a single Proposition: those in favour of it; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare that Proposition carried.

Fifty minutes to go until half past five, Members of the States. There are three items of business left once we have deferred the continuation of the Secondary and Post 16 Education Reorganisation debate, the first of which is Guernsey Electricity, Interim Amendments For Tariff Regulation. I doubt that is going to be capable of being completed with that time. The next one would be what was deferred from the previous meeting, which is the General Election 2020 debate, and again, I doubt that that could be completed within the time.

So the proposal I am going to put to you is that, rather than start something else and get partway through it, we simply move to the schedule for future States' business now and then close this meeting; that is the motion. Those in ... Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: I understand that there might be a possibility that E&I would, in order to get the principal proposals through and the Electricity policy letter, consider not actually placing the amendment; I bow to the President of E&I to find out if that is correct or not.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez?

Deputy de Sausmarez: It is quite complicated, as you will be aware, because of various complicating factors, but I wonder what the Assembly's view is on whether there would be enough debate if we did not lay the amendment to get to the...

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, there is still going to be a debate, a general debate; that will take more than another 45 minutes, frankly. I do not think anybody is in a mind to really have a late sitting.

The Bailiff: Once again, I am going to put the motion to you, Members of the States, that we simply move now to the schedule for future States' business, which we have to do to conclude this ordinary meeting. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I will declare that carried.
Greffier.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

XIV. Schedule for Future States' Business, approved

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the attached Schedule for Future States' Business, which sets out items for consideration at the Meeting of the 8th September, 2021 and subsequent States' Meetings, they are of the opinion to approve the Schedule.

The States' Greffier: Policy & Resources Committee, Schedule for Future States' Business.

The Bailiff: Is there anything to add to the schedule?

3315 I am simply going to put the schedule that you have all seen, Members of the States. Obviously, it is going to be affected by the interposition of three extra items at the beginning of it as a result of deferring them from this meeting. Those in favour of the schedule; those against.

Members voted Pour.

3320 **The Bailiff:** I will declare that schedule duly carried.

Members of the States, before we rise, can I take this opportunity, first of all, to thank you all for your patience and good nature both this week and last week, which have been quite significant debates so far for this Assembly.

3325 This is now the parliamentary recess, believe it or not, for the next six weeks or so, and it is an opportunity for all of you to have some time with friends, family, whatever you can do, and to return after the recess feeling suitably rested and refreshed.

3330 During that time, I think there is an important message for us to pass to our community, and that is to be grateful to them for their compliance with the various restrictions that are still imposed and to encourage everyone, on behalf of this Assembly and the Island community, to think about the consequences of what they do; if there are gatherings, especially indoor gatherings, to be conscious of what that means, particularly if there are some younger people around; to exercise good respiratory etiquette; and to keep up this perpetual hand-washing and sanitising throughout, because that is one of the ways that we are told that we can do our level best as individuals to ensure that our community remains as safe as possible.

3335 If anyone is considering an outdoor event over the next two days after the days that have been spent in here, there is the Torteval Scarecrow Festival (**Members:** Hooray!) if I could give that a little plug, to enjoy; hopefully, the weather will not be too bad.

3340 For those who want to stay inside and watch television, the Tokyo 2020 Olympics have just started, and I am sure that all Members would want to join with me in wishing those who are representing the British team from this Island – that is Heather Watson, in particular, and Cameron Chalmers – the best of success in their endeavours, and I think we should extend that to Sark's Carl Hester, who is riding his horse once again.

3345 **Members:** Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: And maybe the post box over in Sark will get an extra lick of gold paint as a result of that.

So it is an opportunity to say thank you to everyone for their good conduct over the last two weeks. Enjoy your summer and come back and feel rested and recuperated in September.

3350 Greffier, we will now close the meeting, please.

The Assembly adjourned at 4.45 p.m.