



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 2nd August 2013

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

Volume 2, No. 17

ISSN 2049-8284

*Published by Her Majesty's Greffier, The Royal Court House,
St Peter Port, GY1 2PB. © States of Guernsey, 2013*

Present:

Richard J. Collas, Esq., Bailiff and Presiding Officer

Law Officers

Miss M.M.E. Pullum, Q.C., (H.M. Comptroller)

People's Deputies

St. Peter Port South

Deputies P. A. Harwood, J. Kuttelwascher, B. L. Brehaut,
R. Domaille, A. H. Langlois, R. A. Jones

St. Peter Port North

Deputies M. K. Le Clerc, J. A. B. Gollop, P. A. Sherbourne,
R. Conder, M. J. Storey, E. G. Bebb, L. C. Queripel

St. Sampson

Deputies G. A. St Pier, K. A. Stewart, P. L. Gillson,
S. J. Ogier, L. S. Trott

The Vale

Deputies M. J. Fallaize, D. B. Jones, M. M. Lowe,
A. R. Le Lièvre, A. Spruce, G. M. Collins

The Castel

Deputies D. J. Duquemin, C. J. Green, M. H. Dorey,
J. P. Le Tocq, S. A. James, M.B.E., A. H. Adam

The West

Deputies R. A. Perrot, A. H. Brouard,
D. de G. De Lisle, Y. Burford, D. A. Inglis

The South-East

Deputies H. J. R. Soulsby, R. W. Sillars, P. A. Luxon,
M. G. O'Hara, F. W. Quin, M. P. J. Hadley

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representatives L. E. Jean, E. P. Arditti

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

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

Absent at the Evocation

H.E. Roberts Esq., Q.C. (H.M. Procureur)
Deputies P. R. Le Pelley, L. B. Queripel (*indisposé*), B. J. E. Paint
and A. M. Wilkie (*relevé à 9h 15*)

Business transacted

Evocation 1127

Billet d'État XV

VIII. Statutory Minimum Wage Arrangements – Amendments to come into force
on 1st October 2013 – Debate continued – Propositions as amended carried..... 1127

IX. 'Today's Learners; Tomorrow's World' – The Education Board's Vision –
Debate commenced 1133

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.17 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 2.00 p.m.*

'Today's Learners; Tomorrow's World' – The Education Board's Vision –
Debate continued – Propositions carried *nem. con.* 1161

VII. Strategic Asset Management Plan – Debate commenced and adjourned 1163

Procedural – Business adjourned until 24th September 2013 1204

The Assembly adjourned at 6.08 p.m.

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.00 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Senior Deputy Greffier

EVOCATION

CONVOCATION

The Senior Deputy Greffier: Billet d'État XV, continuation of the debate.

Billet d'État XV

COMMERCE AND EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

**Statutory Minimum Wage Arrangements
Amendments to come into force on 1st October 2013
Debate continued
Propositions as amended carried**

The Bailiff: We still have three amendments to deal with. Deputy Fallaize.

5 **Deputy Fallaize:** Well, sir, given the rather sound thrashing my amendment got last night and the volume of business there is still before the States, I sense that there is no appetite to debate the other amendments to this Article and I will withdraw them, sir. (*Interjections*)

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.

10 Well, Members, then we proceed with general debate, if there is anybody who has not yet spoken in general debate who wishes to do so.
Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you, sir.

15 Sir, Members will recall that during the September 2012 States debate, I referred to the Commerce and Employment Department proposals to increase the Minimum Wage by 15p an hour as an insult to the hard working people of Guernsey, and unfortunately I find myself having to say the same thing about the Minimum Wage proposals laid before us today.

These proposals to increase the Minimum Wage from £6.30 an hour to £6.50 an hour for anyone 18 years and over are an insult to the hard working people of Guernsey.

20 To avoid the possibility of anyone misinterpreting or misunderstanding what I am saying, when I refer to the hard working people of Guernsey, I include all of those people from overseas working here under licence, because anyone working in the Island is in danger of being exploited by employers who pay the bare minimum.

We do have employers who pay the bare minimum. If Members were to visit our Job Centre in Wheadon House, they would see several notices on the board advertising jobs where employees

25 are expected to work 60 hours a week for the current £6.30 an hour. Which equates to £378 a week before tax and insurance is deducted. In my opinion, sir, not only is that an insult to expect someone to survive on such a low wage, but it is also inhumane.

But then, of course, we operate a completely unsustainable system where someone who is not paid enough money to cover their basic living expenses simply goes to Social Security and receives a supplementary top-up. Sir, the funds at Social Security get depleted by having to subsidise employers who pay the bare minimum.

Now, I have been paying Social Security contributions for 47 years and no-one has ever asked me if I agree to my money being paid out in the form of a Supplementary Benefit to subsidise employers who pay the Minimum Wage, and the fact of the matter is I do not agree with that. In fact, I object and have objected to it, all to no avail, and that is yet another insult to people who work hard and pay their contributions. Because all we can do, sir, is accept it, but in my book that is no way to treat the hard working people of Guernsey – another insult.

Another point I want to focus on is that fact that C&E (*Interjection*) (**Deputy Dorey:** Sir?) do not seem to have taken any notice of points made in the recent States Medical Officer's Report –

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey?

Deputy Dorey: Sir, just as a point of correction.

Contributions you make do not pay Supplementary Benefit; Supplementary Benefit is paid out of General Revenue. Contributions go towards the Guernsey Insurance Funds, the Guernsey Health Service Funds and the Long Term Care Fund, none of which fund Supplementary Benefit. (*Interjection*)

The Bailiff: Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Whatever, sir – it is still our money. (*Laughter*) It is irrelevant which pot it comes from, sir. The hard-working people of Guernsey still pay.

So as I was saying, sir, C&E do not seem to have taken any notice of points made in the recent States Medical Officer's Report, because page 567 of that Report tells us that under Article 25 of the Human Rights Legislation, section (1), everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and wellbeing of himself and his family.

And the last paragraph on page 570 of that Report tells us that income inequality does not only affect the health and wellbeing of the poorly paid, but the whole of the community.

It goes on to tell us that it is absolutely vital that every member of society needs to feel valued, that they need to feel as though they are an important part of society and that their contribution to the community is worthy.

Paragraph 2 on page 577 of the Report echoes that message, by telling us that quality of life is not merely measured by food, clothing and shelter, but by having what is needed to be able to participate in society and being valued for the person that you are.

Paragraph 5 on page 583 of the Medical Officer's Report tells us that breaking the cycle of demoralisation and depression amongst the lower paid can lead to substantial health and economic gains for present and future generations.

On top of that, sir, we are also told that the unintended consequence of setting a Minimum Wage too low will result in making poverty worse here in the Island.

I am very disappointed that Commerce and Employment do not seem to have taken any of those factors into consideration, and in fact, by not doing so, have flown in the face of the number 1 statement of aims of the States Strategic Plan, which is to improve the quality of life of Islanders.

Now, that does not mean to only improve the quality of life of employers; it also means to improve the quality of life of employees.

In my opinion, sir, the C&E proposals are the wrong way round, because the proposals are to increase the Minimum Wage for under-18-year-olds by 75p an hour, yet the proposed increase for over-18-year-olds is 20p an hour, so just when somebody might want to set up home and start a family, we are proposing giving them a 20p an hour increase. Which for a 40-hour week equates to £8 before tax and insurance is deducted, and how insulting is that!

Well, actually, it ranks alongside the recent decision to pay States manual workers a below-cost-of-living increase, which I also thought was not only an insult, but demoralising.

And yes, I realise I could have laid an amendment that sought to reverse the C&E proposals, but bearing in mind I was a lone voice during the 2012 debate, I felt that laying an amendment would waste the time of the Law Officers and this Assembly and would of course ultimately waste

taxpayers' money. Far better, I thought, to speak against the proposals and try and take some Members of the Assembly with me.

90 Naturally, sir, I appreciate that C&E have done their best to attain some kind of balance. I am only too aware of how hard Deputy Stewart and his Board work, how committed they are to try and identify new income streams. I wholeheartedly support C&E in almost everything they do, but in this case I think they have got it wrong.

95 All these proposals will do is demoralise over-18-year-olds in the workforce, and I want no part of proposals that demoralize anyone. Therefore I will be voting against these proposals and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

95 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Wilkie, do you wish to be *relevé*?

Yes. Deputy Green will speak next.

100 **Deputy Green:** Sir, Members, I am a strong supporter of the Minimum Wage legislation and I do generally welcome the increases announced today. Setting a Minimum Wage rate is always about striking a fair balance. That is to say balancing the wages of low-paid employees against employment prospects if the rate is set too high, and that can be a fine and difficult balance to get right.

105 Sir, I really do not envy Commerce and Employment's responsibility in this regard. Maybe the Department could have been more generous as regards the adult rate, (**A Member:** Hear, hear) but I do particularly welcome the fairly substantial rise in the young person's rate. I think that sends a very positive message to our hard working responsible young people. I do not really understand why Deputy Queripel would vote against that.

110 The general point is that boosting the incomes of low-paid people in Guernsey will go directly into the local economy. So only a 20p increase for adult employees could be seen as something of a missed opportunity, in my view.

115 Nevertheless, the Department would have been quite wrong to have frozen the Minimum Wage rates this year, as some of the siren voices of industry would have wanted. So I think the Department deserves some credit.

We still have the issue of the resolution of 2010 the policy of this Government which is to equalise the adult and youth Minimum Wage rate as soon as possible. So I am slightly disappointed that only limited progress has been made. Clearly there has been some progress and I think the Minister mentioned that in opening, but I think more perhaps could have been done towards that goal.

120 I have got a slight feeling of *déjà vu*; I think I said exactly the same in September of last year about this resolution. In any event, in the end I will support this Report because something is better than nothing. The increase in the young person's rate is something which is quite significant, although I do think there are some or there have been some missed opportunities for this particular Report, but I will support it.

125

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Thank you, sir.

130 I just wish to pass some comment on Deputy Queripel's comments, because it is a speech we have heard before, and I get the feeling he is confusing a living wage with the Minimum Wage. Now, we do not have a measure of a living wage at the moment, but following the amendment by Deputy Langlois, we should have in a couple of years' time. (*Interjection*) I think, had his speech been made in relation to a living wage, it would have been valid, but as regards a Minimum Wage, I do not think any of the points he has made are relevant actually to this debate.

135

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Does anyone...? Deputy Fallaize.

140 **Deputy Fallaize:** Just briefly sir, I think that that Commerce and Employment deserves more than a little credit, I think that they deserve a great deal of credit for what they are doing with the youth rate, because the Department opposed my amendment in 2010 to equalise the youth rate and the adult rate. The States voted for it but could only set a policy objective because the States has no power to set Minimum Wage rates itself, unfortunately.

145 But this Commerce and Department, since the election of last year, has obviously taken very real notice of that policy objective of the States because they made quite a significant move in that direction last year and now they are proposing another further quite significant move this year.

So I commend Commerce and Employment for that and I hope that they will continue that trend, when they make their proposals next year and because, by that time, we will have had two years' evidence of what happens as the youth rate and the adult rate narrows, the gap narrows, I wonder whether they might give an undertaking to include in next year's report some evidence about any effect that they think that may have had on the labour market in the meantime.

Also sir, I wonder whether the Minister, when he replies, might make a commitment to fulfil the extant States resolution of 2010 for the Minimum Wage rates to be reviewed as to their effectiveness and their impact. That is still an outstanding extant States resolution binding on Commerce and Employment, and I would like the Department to give an undertaking that it will fulfil the terms of that resolution perhaps during this term of the States, if not over the next 12 months.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Collins, then Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Collins: Thank you, sir.

As many of my colleagues know, I left a job before becoming a Deputy, which let us just say had a couple of different numbers at the start of it, northwards. I have been looking for a part-time role for some time, just a couple of extra hours to help towards some costs, as I am sorry to say I am not independently wealthy or have property of any kind or rented property coming out of my ears. I apologise for that comment.

And like many other 32-year-olds, middle Guernsey – a phrase I learned from my dear former colleague sitting next to me – we need to supplement our income, as we get hit from all sides.

Anyway, sir, I am drifting off the point I wanted to make. I saw a job advertised and went for an interview – no names but it is a small company doing some manual work. As I found out, they employ large numbers of non-locals. Why? Well I have found out. They pay just over Minimum Wage.

So I enquired further, why do they get lots of locals applying? Often they turned round and said they do get locals applying, but the locals get better support from the Government and they do not really particularly want to work for Minimum Wage.

Deputy Dave Jones has already mentioned the other day about companies that import non-local labour, the workers do not pay much tax, stay in Open Market for a short time, then leave. What does Guernsey get out of this?

Just one example, sir, the Home Department last year cost us £32 million. The service they supply which you, sir, may not need every five minutes but when you do, you would pay thousands and thousands for a fire-fighter to save our children or our loved ones from a burning house. I am happy to pay for these services, sir, and as I have said, £32 million – that works out at about £1,000 per taxpayer or £500 per person in Guernsey, give or take. The healthcare, that realistically costs us £3,000 per person, if you want to look at it like that.

Sir, in my opinion, the Minimum Wage needs to increase, without doubt, and I wish on this occasion it could be more. Okay, we might close a couple of businesses, but with high employment and low unemployment, Guernsey needs to start making choices – local workers in local jobs with liveable wages.

Please, Members, support the recommendations. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you.

I agree with Deputy Collins in part. It is not easy for us 32-year-olds, that is true. *(Laughter)* Please!

If Deputy Graham Guille was still in this Assembly, this House, he would be saying that an observation he and I often used to make to Commerce and Employment was 'a little less commerce and a bit more employment'. What I think we both meant by that is that whilst they have under their mandate a very clear mandate to support businesses and ensure that people get to pay ETI and we have a thriving economy, with that there comes the balance of the legislation and the regulation that underpins so many aspects of commerce and employment.

When I was an overseer in St Peter Port – and I have started many a speech with that sentence before – I actually did not understand what was happening, when I was a Procureur. I was

bemused at first as to why people who were in employment were coming to the Social Security Department to get what we all now know is a top-up. We need to put so much more work into that.

210 It crossed my mind that if Graham Smith, who is currently a consultant at HSSD, was transferred to SSD and had to have a look at their needs-led, formula-led expenditure, he would be asking questions: why is it that you allow so many employers to effectively receive taxpayers' money, when their business model simply is not the right model? That is what we do.

Not all business is good business. Some businesses only succeed, are 'successful', by ensuring that they pay the Minimum Wage. Some business models simply do not work and should not work on that basis.

215 The only other observation I would make, but I do not know how prevalent it is now, is the smaller companies laying off their entire staff over the Christmas period into the New Year and then employing them again in the January and February. 'The work is going to be tight, lads, we will see you probably around February', and then these people go to the Social Security Department to get paid in the meantime.

220 So, I appreciate the Minister cannot respond directly, but I hope the Social Security Department are aware of those issues.

Thank you.

225 **The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak? Deputy Bebb.

Deputy Bebb: Very briefly, I did not really think that I was going to speak on this one. However, the comments from Deputy Brehaut and Deputy Collins... I understand the difficulties, but my concern is that I see from businesses in the UK an ever-increasing attitude that because of additional bureaucracy that is actually placed upon them – in the UK, there is a need now for companies to provide pensions, there is this requirement of the Minimum Wage, the health and safety is becoming more burdensome and bureaucracy of companies is becoming far more heavy.

230 The temptation... It is not a temptation; the *reality* is that companies do not employ staff any more. They take on staff on contracts and it is an ever-increasing problem that especially in those areas where companies tend to discriminate, wrongly in my opinion, against women, against ethnic minorities, we find that they are even further discriminated against because the thought of taking someone on and then having all the bureaucracy means that it is far more convenient to give contracts.

235 I fear that Guernsey is going ever so slightly down that route, and Minimum Wage is only one portion of it. The alternative model which I was completely astounded as to how effective it is, is over in America, where of course workers have very little rights in relation to their terms of employment and in relation to a whole host of other matters. There is some Minimum Wage in America, however the overall bureaucracy concerning employing someone and firing someone is minimal and as a result companies are far more willing to take on staff, and therefore the contention is that companies being more willing to take on staff because they can just as easily shed them means that their unemployment rates can be reduced fairly quickly, something that we do not see happening here.

240 I realise that unemployment in Guernsey at the moment is fairly low, but it is increasing. I think that it is at the highest level that it has been since I came to this Island, and that is over 18 years ago now. And therefore we should not ignore such a factor and my concern is that the Minimum Wage actually contributes towards this bureaucracy. I do not think that it is the right tool. It is a very blunt tool. You try finding a job that is paying £7 an hour I think that you would be hard pushed to, because the temptation to pay £6.30 or shortly £6.50 is far too great, even £7.50 is actually not a convenient option when £6.50 will do, and supplementary benefit will pick up the additional tab.

255 I would much rather see a model where we will scrap the Minimum Wage, but at the same time we actually empower Social Security to turn to companies and say, 'Having spent this much on supplementary benefit subsidising your company, you have an option. You can either start paying your staff more money or we will start to fine you', and I think that that model would actually address the most egregious examples of exploitation without actually influencing the market rates in the way that Minimum Wage currently does.

260 I know that it is not the easiest example, I see certain Ministers immediately shaking their heads. It is the beginnings of the idea; it is not an idea that is fully formed. But the truth is that the Minimum Wage itself contributes towards unemployment and Minimum Wage is not a living wage and therefore we are forced into subsidising it.

265 I do not think it is a comfortable relationship at this point in time and some other means of addressing the worst cases of exploitation need to be investigated at some point soon. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Langlois.

Deputy Langlois: Thank you, sir.

Sorry, I feel I have to respond to this. This Report, in some ways, is a simple straightforward operating report, an annual event that takes a good look at the general policy that we have already got in place. The purpose of the Minimum Wage was very clearly spelt out on several occasions yesterday and at the moment my concern is that the debate then starts ranging around all sorts of areas which forget the assumption of what the figure is there for, and it is there to stop the worst possible exploitation of somebody doing an hour's work and getting paid £1.50 for it. That is where we started back in 2009.

The Minimum Wage is there; it does serve a purpose. I totally understand, and my Department is acutely aware of aspects of the possibility that it is distorting the very bottom end of the labour market.

There are jobs which are brought to us which are on offer at the Minimum Wage and I agree very much with comments made by two of the recent speakers to say that some employers have stopped thinking about what wage rate they need to pay for the right person in Guernsey to get a job done – because that is how businesses work. You do your business model, you think through how much the business can afford and the skills that you want to buy and if you cannot buy those skills for that price and you cannot run the business at a higher price, you do not run the business.

I think there is a tiny distortion and it a fairly small distortion, the number of businesses at the bottom end of the labour market, but can we please restrict the more fanciful thinking? The concept of the Social Security Department getting involved in fining employers against judgements of the viability of their business and so on would be a hideous interference in commercial markets.

This Island works and its economy is dynamic because people can start businesses, can explore areas and then move on and that is how the economy works. We are there and certainly our mandate is not in that area. So my response to that would be a very solid no.

The Bailiff: Does anyone else wish to speak on the Propositions? No?
Deputy Stewart then will reply to the debate.

Deputy Stewart: Thank you, sir.

I would just thank Deputy Langlois and I will reiterate, the objective of the Minimum Wage Law is to provide a statutory minimum level of pay to prevent the worst forms of exploitation of workers and the rates that we have suggested, we believe reflect that level. That is all the Minimum Wage does.

We have the amendment and the new Proposition which I think will try and establish perhaps what a living wage needs to be in Guernsey, and I think we must not get these two things confused. The Minimum Wage is there to stop exploitation. It is a backstop, that is all it does. To try and then confuse lots of other social policy I think is very, very dangerous. The Minimum Wage is there. Whether it is perfect or not, I do not know.

It has actually only been running for three years, So we probably do not really know the true effects of it, and I do take on board what Deputy Fallaize says, perhaps we can look at maybe surveying some of the businesses that we have on our database.

We did get 65 responses to our consultation on the Minimum Wage, as I say, only five, disappointingly, from Deputies, and we did actually send out four reminders. So I would urge Deputies, if they do feel strongly on this, to respond to the consultations that we put out.

Again I think with Deputy Green, really a lot of the Members are moving towards this living wage debate.

Deputy Fallaize has also asked about the extant resolution. I was not aware of it. We will go back and have a look at that and see how that will fit in with our prioritisation.

I think one of the fundamental problems that we are all having here, and I notice it when a lot of people stand up, is we rely on a lot of anecdotal evidence, and in fact it was Deputy Queripel who mentioned the Medical Officer of Health's Report. During my comments to that Report, I said that a lot of the work that he was referring to was Townsend. Now, this was done before the Corporate Housing Programme.

A lot has changed since 2001, and probably at some point and not for my Department, but perhaps we need to do a wider piece of work. I do not really think we actually understand an awful lot of what is going on. We stand up, we talk about it, we give our anecdotal evidence, bits and pieces we have heard, but we do seem to have very little evidence to talk around some of these larger social issues. Sir, I really make that just as a comment.

I do ask Members to support this Report Commerce and Employment has tried to do the best job it can and within the framework of the Law.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Thank you, Members.

There are three Propositions. Deputy Queripel?

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, could I ask for a recorded vote, please?

The Bailiff: Yes, right. There are three Propositions. The original Propositions are on page 1149, but of course Proposition 3 has been replaced as a result of the successful Deputy Langlois, Deputy Inglis amendment.

Are you, Deputy Queripel...? Well, does anybody wish the Propositions to be taken separately? If not, we will take them together. Deputy Queripel, as a result of your speech, do you wish Propositions 1 and 2 to be taken separately from Proposition 3?

Deputy Lester Queripel: Take them all together, I think, please, sir.

The Bailiff: Take them all together right. In that case, it is a recorded vote on Propositions 1, 2 and 3 as amended.

There was a recorded vote.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

‘Today’s Learners; Tomorrow’s World’ The Education Board’s Vision Debate commenced

Article IX.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the Report dated 13th May, 2013, of the Education Department, they are of the opinion:

(1) To direct the Education Department to pursue the strategic direction for the education service as outlined in that Report.

(2) To direct the Education Department to report back to the States of Deliberation annually on:

- the progress it has achieved in developing the vision and progressing the actions identified in the vision;

- any new actions which have been identified as part of the vision; and

- demonstrate how the community has been engaged in the process.

The Bailiff: While those votes are counted, we will move on with the next Article, which is the Education Report. Greffier, Article IX of Volume 1.

The Senior Deputy Greffier: Article IX, Education Department: ‘Today’s Learners; Tomorrow’s World’ – The Education Board’s vision.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sillars, Minister for the Education Department will open the debate.

Deputy Sillars: Thank you, sir.

I want to begin today by taking you back to a warm afternoon in October 2012. The scene is a school bus where a young girl is chatting to her friends about the events of the day. It had been a perfectly ordinary day but that changed in one sickening life changing moment. There was a commotion outside the bus which screeched to a halt and a man she had never seen before approached the girl, aimed a gun at her head and pulled the trigger. The girl, you will realise, was Malala from Pakistan and the men wanted to kill her because she had written articles about the importance of education for all children.

The rest of her terrible wonderful story you know. She survived the shooting, defied her would-be assassins by proclaiming yet again the value of education for all.

Last month on her 16th birthday she stood before the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York and told the whole world we cannot succeed when half of us are held back. (A Member: Hear, hear.)

We want a schools and education for every child's bright future. I talk about Malala today because when it comes to the primacy of education in our lives she has emerged as a conscience for the world's legislators. Her example and her stirring words coincide with our own efforts in this Assembly to transform education in our small corner of the planet.

It is a once in a lifetime opportunity for all of us here today to shape that future, to place education first and to change the lives of future generations of Guernsey's children. It is a solemn duty and we rise to accept it.

The vision we have laid out for education in Guernsey, Alderney and Herm is codified in 'Today's Learners; Tomorrow's World' manifesto, which forms the basis of our debate today. We ask you to embrace it as the framework of our efforts to rebuild a system of education that is tailored for the demands of the 21st century.

Today is not a day for fine detail; that will come later.

A great debate lies ahead of us, one which involves weighty matters including: selection; the need for new buildings; and the way in which we recruit and keep the best teachers. We will have our disagreements, I know there are fundamental differences of opinion in many of these areas, but my plea to you today is this: let us hold our honest opinions and express them with all the force we can muster, but at every step of the way, we must move together for the sake of the children whose futures are in our hands.

Let me set out just three key elements of the vision: pre-school education; local management of schools; and post-16 provisions.

So much rests on that first element. Starve a tiny child of books, fail to introduce them to the magic world of numbers, deny them the joys of stories and the world of imagination and then send them to a primary school. It is an act of cruelty; you condemn those children to years of fruitless frustrating struggle of under-achievement and alienation. It is only a question of what comes first: the child giving up on the system or the system giving up on the child. Either way, the result is the same.

Deputies, we can do so much to make sure that all our children begin their education with a fair chance to learn. We aim for 15 hours a week of high quality pre-school education for all three-to four-year-olds. It is a modest goal but essential unless we are prepared to accept that for a significant number of Guernsey children, education will remain for ever a closed book.

Education fosters dreams. At its best, education also makes those dreams come true. We have the means in our hands to give every child the chance to nurture ambition, and aspiration in their hearts, as well as a fair chance to make them a reality.

Secondly, our vision embraces a new model for schools, when many more decisions are taken out of the hands of politicians and civil servants and left to the expertise of head teachers, teachers, school governors and parents. Because education is not like other services provided by the States, it is not something that should be handed down from on high.

With education, pupils, teachers, parents must work together to plot their own course, based on their unique requirements. Every child is different; every school is different; every school deserves the chance to shape its own future. The alternative is to put all our schools in a bureaucratic straitjacket. Set the schools free allow them to flourish.

Thirdly, education in Guernsey should not be a tap that is turned off when a student hits 16 or 18, and is pitched into the world.

The coming decades will witness an astonishing pace of change in our economy, as new industries spring up in an instant demanding new aptitudes; new approaches; new competences; training; retraining; relearning; must be available for our workforce, if it is not to atrophy, rendered irrelevant by rapid movements in the world economy beyond our control. Education in Guernsey, Alderney and Herm should be a nurturing spring that never dries up and available throughout our citizens' lives to sustain and refresh.

The alternative Guernsey, an economic and economically irrelevant backwater.

Of course, everyone who serves in this Assembly knows only too well the financial bonds that tie us. Every penny counts and that is how it should be. The implications of the plan for our Treasury are matters of another day, when we come together to examine the fine points that must make our vision a reality. I will not lie to you, it will cost. We will submit, for instance, concrete proposals for the re-build of La Mare De Carteret site to the capital prioritisation process.

The time has come finally to deliver on a promise long overdue (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) the delays have gone on far too long and the price tag for righting that historic wrong will be large, but I do not apologise for that.

The finest buildings on our Island should not be banks, offices, corporate HQs. They should be our schools, bold statements that education is at the heart of our communities that leave no-one in any doubt that education matters deeply to us all.

There can be no clearer declaration that the opposite is true when we allow schools to crumble and rust and ask our teachers and students to do their best in leaky portacabins. No more.

But for today, I say this: it is not so much a question of how much we spend, but how we spend it. Also, let me ask you a question. What will be the cost to Guernsey a generation down the line, when our working population is equipped with obsolete skills, unprepared for the challenges of a new world, unrecognisable compared to the landscape as we know it? It is incalculable; incalculable too the cost of educating only some of our children to the limit of their abilities.

We cannot predict with any precision how the economy of the latter 21st century will look. All we really know for sure is it will be more competitive than ever as nations strive to thrive against the backdrop of ever growing populations, vying for a share of the planet's diminishing resources.

Guernsey cannot survive in that climate unless our people can match the expertise, the knowhow and the enterprise of other nations. Complacency, hoping other others will do us a favour is not an option. Our destiny is in our own hands and that destiny will be shaped by education of future generations.

Building a peerless school system is not a vanity project. It is not a luxury. It is central to the future prosperity and even the independent existence of our Island.

I know that many of you in the Assembly today are, like me, a parent. We know how important education and good qualifications are to the future of our children, and we encourage, cajole and yes, sometimes even threaten them, ever so gently of course, to work hard to pass their exams.

But in the coming months and years it is our responsibility in this States to work hard for them, and for the children who come after, to build a new education system to rival that of any in the world.

That is the glittering prize within our grasp. It is within our grasp. We will not rush into any decision. At every step, we will move forward, taking head teachers, teachers, parents and, of course, this Assembly with us.

We have set out our timetable over the coming months and years when we will add the substance to the vision.

A review of the curriculum including the qualifications framework beginning in September this year. At the end of the year, we will bring a report to the States, seeking approval for the introduction of entitlement to 15 hours per week of pre-school education for all three- and four-year-olds in partnership with private providers. (*Applause*)

Also by the end of the year, a report dedicated to the real improvement of our primary education, as well as proposals for a new approach to post-16 education in Guernsey.

In 2014, a report will focus on restructuring secondary education. For clarity, I confirm that when the Education Department brings its report to the States next year on a new structure for secondary education as referred to in Appendix 2, that report will include a full review of selection at 11, with recommendations arising from that review.

By January 2015, we aim to usher in a Bailiwick form of local management of schools and by the end of 2015, we seek to adopt a new Education Law that will enshrine in statute what we have outlined today in our vision.

It is my honour today to commend our vision of education to you. I urge you to embrace the spirit it embodies and play a full part in the vigorous debates that lie ahead.

I know that our school communities share a deep passion for advancing education in Guernsey, I see it all the time. Everywhere I go in our schools, I see it in our students, in our parents and in our teachers. Let us unite behind one aim that no-one is left behind. We move together.

Malala said it, education is the only solution, education first.

I urge all Deputies to support our recommendations on page 1159.

Thank you. (*Applause*)

505 *Statutory Minimum Wage Arrangements:*
Carried – Pour 43, Contre 1, Abstained 0, Not Present 3

POUR

Alderney Rep. Jean
 Alderney Rep. Arditti
 Deputy Harwood
 Deputy Kuttelwascher
 Deputy Brehaut
 Deputy Domaillé
 Deputy Langlois
 Deputy Robert Jones
 Deputy Le Clerc
 Deputy Gollop
 Deputy Sherbourne
 Deputy Conder
 Deputy Storey
 Deputy Bebb
 Deputy St Pier
 Deputy Stewart
 Deputy Gillson
 Deputy Ogier
 Deputy Trott
 Deputy Fallaize
 Deputy David Jones
 Deputy Lowe
 Deputy Le Lièvre
 Deputy Spruce
 Deputy Collins
 Deputy Duquemin
 Deputy Green
 Deputy Dorey
 Deputy Le Tocq
 Deputy James
 Deputy Adam
 Deputy Perrot
 Deputy Brouard
 Deputy Wilkie
 Deputy De Lisle
 Deputy Burford
 Deputy Inglis
 Deputy Soulsby
 Deputy Sillars
 Deputy Luxon
 Deputy O'Hara
 Deputy Quin
 Deputy Hadley

CONTRE

Deputy Lester Queripel

ABSTAINED

None

NOT PRESENT

Deputy Le Pelley
 Deputy Laurie Queripel
 Deputy Paint

510 **The Bailiff:** Just before we open debate, I can announce the result of the vote on the Commerce and Employment Department's *(Laughter)* amendments to the statutory Minimum Wage: 43 votes in favour, 1 against. I declare them carried.

I am not aware of any amendments to this present Report, so we will go straight in to general debate.

Deputy Gollop.

515 **Deputy Gollop:** Sir, I do indeed warmly support the vision as far as it goes, but nevertheless flag up that there are some contentious elements within it, some of which the Minister has already identified.

520 The 11-plus debate was a bitter one 10 or 12 years ago, and I am sure will provoke strong reactions from various quarters, and also on a more subtle level the post-16 education issue, about the scope and future of further education and to a certain extent higher education will I think engender a lot of debate.

525 There are camps in that there is the Grammar School philosophy; there is the philosophy of the independent privately run learning organisations and training companies; there is the future of what we used to call the Training Agency, the University Centre and where Skills Guernsey fits into this matrix, and whether Skills Guernsey's job is to enhance the skills of those who struggle to find meaningful wages in the employment market or whether its role should be more to enhance the skills of a community that has to be a global leader to survive in our current way.

The vision was well presented, but is of the generalist kind and I want to really focus on three issues today.

530 The first is technology. Many of the videos and facets of the Report emphasise technological change: the role of education delivered online, the global media, social networks and so on, but we still struggle on this Island.

I know the Minister Deputy Sillars and Deputy Stewart have put forward a robust view that we do need investment in telecommunications and perhaps a degree of competitive pricing in that respect. Certainly the interview Deputy Sillars gave on BBC Guernsey indicated that Guernsey is not getting a fantastically good deal at the moment, even in contrast to Jersey, and this is an area that the Policy Council actually have to prioritise as fairly near the top of their agenda for action. I say that because last night I did try to look at the video inserts in the newly revised vision and I could not get them on the iPad, which is perhaps symptomatic of something I do not know, and so that is a key concern.

The second is I am an outgoing member of the Arts Council Committee which is being subsumed and working in partnership in the future with the Arts Commission, which is of course linked to Culture and Leisure, but there is a lot of reference in this vision to the importance of the creative arts, the creative sector of sports, of participation for all, of the benefits that this brings to pupils.

I entirely endorse those comments but there is a kind of mood music around the Island, even amongst some Members of this Chamber, that we need to in some way rationalise our commitment to Culture and Leisure. I regard that as a short-sighted approach because if we are building artistic involvement on a lifelong basis, but especially with our young people and children, those people will naturally wish to continue with their activities, especially if they live in Guernsey, and in many cases will be part of the 200 industries, maybe the 1,000 people involved in the creative revenue earning sector here. I think it is important that education works in partnership with Commerce and Employment, Culture and Leisure and Treasury and Resources to ensure that we have meaningful dialogue, collaboration and communication, to ensure there is a degree of support both moral and financial for the cultural and leisure sector, not just as a pastime or as an activity or entertainment, but as a career structure.

My third and final section is, of course, arguably my specialist favourite subject, on the role of how we are supporting disability and inclusion and the Report certainly emphasises some great aspects of equality for all, opportunity for all, and core values of inclusivity and participation. But of course it has to be more than motherhood and apple pie to deliver that on the ground because significant investment in buildings, in activities, in professional qualified staff and ancillary staff and in money generally, and there is no commitment from the States at this point to make that grade step in going beyond the generally good things we have achieved so far to an even higher level of excellence. We need to get that point across.

Also mixed feelings about the opportunity that has been created by the reconstruction of The Link Centre that Scrutiny looked into in passing during the Deputy Brehaut era and when myself, Deputy Brehaut and Mr Mike Garrett actually looked at the role of exclusion and its link to special needs.

There certainly is a link between exclusion and pupils who underperform later in life and nursery education is only part of that remedy. These young people had as a facility The Link which kept them inclusively within the mainstream sector; but nevertheless, going to The Link. Now they will have their own school which is tailored for social, educational and behavioural needs, the feedback I have had so far from the majority of parents affected, via social network and other areas, is a positive one. They welcome the welcome Les Voies School but they would implore the Education Department to give more information, both privately and publicly.

I myself as Champion have had constructive meetings with the Minister, other professionals including Mrs Zoe Grainger who does a first-rate job, and we are impressed by the progress that has been made, but there are of course arguments by various people connected to disability, especially for example well known campaigner, Mr André Reece-Sherrin that there is a danger of us segregating the needs of people with special needs, rather than including them in a mainstream community environment. I would not go as far as that, but I have sympathies for that view, and I think it is very important that these schools are integrated with the mainstream at every possible level, whether it be with outings, sport activities, creative activities, and a sense of general belonging to the Island, and myself and the two Assistant Disability Champions – Disabled People's Champions will strengthen our team in developing links with the community over the coming months – but it has to be said there is a level of anecdotal dissatisfaction amongst some parents on the Island about the level of resources that they are getting from Education and the linkages with Health and Social Services.

The vision, of course, makes clear that there will be prioritisation of resource into these areas and I am heartened by the positive message that has come across.

However, in the list of responses to the review, 70 have been identified, including not a terribly good take-up from Deputies, but most of the respondents appear to have been teachers or other educational professionals, that would indicate that we have still got a way to go to engage with parents, some of the businesses in the Island, and some but not all business organisations.

So this is great work in progress, but what we actually need are more commitment to best practice resources on the ground and confirmation that the budget will be sufficient to meet the aspirations and vision of the Minister and his team.

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott next, then Deputy Dave Jones and Deputy Le Clerc.

Deputy Trott: Thank you, sir.

Sir, is the Minister aware that there are two spelling mistakes, three grammatical errors and four punctuation errors in his States Report? (**A Member:** Oh no!) No, I am only kidding. (*Laughter*) The look on your face! (*Laughter*)

On a more serious note, sir, picking up on comments made by Deputy Gollop, I would like to pose three questions to the Minister, if I may.

The first is: is he aware that after about 10.30 a.m. in the morning, ICT classes in the States' school sector cannot stream learning modules via the BBC learning site due to insufficient bandwidth? I am almost certain I know the answer to that, sir, because I heard him give a very good interview on this quite recently. But that is just how dire the service appears to be, and that clearly, as Deputy Gollop said, must be a major priority for this Assembly.

Sir, in paragraph 1.4 on page 1150, we are told that the vision endorses looking beyond the UK to other outstanding jurisdictions for innovative ways to develop and improve the education system in Guernsey. I am pleased about that, sir, because – this is question number 2 – is the Minister aware that in the UK, education is moving away, away from the tertiary college model in favour of the 11-18 academy model? In other words, it favours the 11-18 academy model over the 11-16 comprehensive model.

Sir, on page 1153 in paragraph 4.1, we are told that the vision recognises that there are many examples of excellence throughout the education service in Guernsey, and I can think of several myself, sir.

Question number 3 is: does the Education Minister agree with me that the colleges and the Grammar School play an absolutely integral part in the provision of those excellent education services he refers to in the Bailiwick?

Thank you sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dave Jones.

Deputy David Jones: Thank you, Mr Bailiff, Members of the States.

This is actually one of the most refreshing policy reports I have read in a long time. We are usually dealing with issues that we are reacting to or pretty dire heavy going sort of policy that we are trying to get through the States.

Of course, I lived in the days of catapults and slug racing at school; now it is all IT and world-class technology, which was really the only thing that you read in futuristic comics in those days but has now come as a reality. Even my four-year-old grandson can already use an iPad and he has not even started school yet, and it struck me this morning, looking at this, how similar this is to the old slate tablet that was given to pupils years ago in Victorian times with a piece of chalk, but this one is connected to the world. It is incredible how far we have come and it is scary. I get scared for my grandchildren at the speed the world is moving and I wonder what it will be like in 50 to 100 years' time.

I was pleased to see on page 1157 that the youngsters are screaming out for more technology, which really picks up the point of Deputy Trott about the appalling broadband service that is provided on this Island and simply must be addressed.

But this kind of electronic education that the youngsters are eager to get is going to be very necessary in their futures; already car mechanics now need a computer to diagnose the problems with engines. I open a modern car and I look at it and there is a big black computer sitting on the top of the engine and you dare not go near it anymore, because as soon as you do, you know it is going to cost thousands of pounds to put right. What you thought you could fix in two minutes, at one time you could, but not any more. So the whole work of work is moving towards computers and electronic diagnostic systems, even in what we would consider the most basic kind of employment.

The children now live in a world where their phones have voice activated text messages. I was astonished that you can talk to a phone now and tell it to send a message to somebody on your list. You can do it on here, as Deputy Lowe writes out. I do not know how to do that. I do not really want to learn. *(Laughter and interjection)* You would not... and most of the messages I want to send to people would... *(Laughter)* We will move on. *(Laughter)*

Personally myself, I mean at my age and I think all our age groups find this new technology totally baffling and these youngsters I think are light years ahead of our age group when it comes to complex computer systems.

The other thing I wanted to say, I agree with Deputy Gollop, this does contain some contentious issues and I think that selection is a debate we have yet to have, and I suspect it will be just as lively as the last debate we had, although I think I detect in this particular Assembly that the ground has probably shifted slightly towards scrapping the 11-plus, rather than keeping it.

But I again echo something that Deputy Trott has said that the colleges and the Grammar School do contribute a huge amount to our education system, and I think there is room for all of it. When it comes to selection, I do not mind if we have assessment from kindergarten upward. I do not necessarily think that a snapshot at 11 is the best way of judging a child's future, but there will be assessment all through life and it is a fallacy to believe that we can remove it and if we remove it that everything will become hunky-dory, because that is not right.

The last time I remember when they talked about the comprehensive system was that it was very difficult for education to find a comprehensive school and a tertiary college even in the same county that was worth visiting. The argument of selection has always been that inner-city comprehensives do not compare to rural comprehensives and there is a vast difference, and they have improved dramatically over the years.

But I am still reading articles in the broadsheets that tell us that employers in the UK are meeting school leavers who cannot read and write, and it is not just there... A comment from my son, who employs apprentices on occasions, is that when he interviews youngsters, their levels of education are not what he would expect for somebody who has just left the Guernsey education system, so it is not all hunky-dory here either.

I am thankful for this Report and I think the round of applause the Minister had after presenting it was worthy. I hope that we do adopt the future for education. I totally agree with him on the issues of schools.

I saw last night on the television the despotic leader of Zimbabwe has managed to rig another election and the children of that country will suffer terribly, because he does not believe in education or schools and they will get nothing out of this new election at all.

Even though people say it is not the buildings that are important – you can teach children in a field on a warm day with a blackboard and a decent teacher – the environment that we teach our children in is hugely important and having decent schools and decent buildings can only enhance their education, although the buildings I agree are not everything.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Clerc, then Deputies Green and Soulsby.

Deputy Le Clerc: Sir, thank you.

I attended the presentation to Deputies by Education earlier in the year and at that time I was a little bit critical and said there was not much meat on the bones. I am afraid that I still have a couple of questions following the feedback that you have received.

If we look at section 5.5, the feedback was critical of lack of detail, including financial costs and I must agree with this. The Minister has said today that this is not a day for fine detail, but some financial detail, even if they were rough calculations, would have been welcomed.

A review of selection has already been touched on by a couple of my colleagues. This was always going to be contentious, but my concerns are that we are thinking about approving in the capital resources debate the rebuilding of La Mare de Carteret School without knowing what the long-term plans for selection will be, and what style and type of school that will be required to meet the changing needs. So it is bit sort of cart before the horse.

Deputy Gollop and Deputy Trott have already mentioned the tertiary provision and this really is where I have the most concerns and I found the most confusing area of the Report. I do feel that any changes to the premises required for delivery of tertiary education are intrinsically linked to the review of selection and we have got no detail on the secondary selection.

In section 5.3, the Report advises that the majority of responses were from teachers at the Grammar School and the Sixth Form Centre and I am not surprised because that is where I felt there were some mixed messages.

If we look at page 1170 and if I can just read that out to you:

715 'Development of a Tertiary College which will bring together current providers'

and I highlight those words, *current providers* –

720 'of Post 16 education to offer a broad range of high quality, engaging, education and training opportunities which are responsive to individual and community needs including areas identified by Skills Guernsey.'

This indicates to me that the Sixth Form Centre is included in the tertiary education review. Can the Minister provide clarification on what is covered by the words 'tertiary education'?

725 Due to the change in order today, we have not actually discussed the Strategic Asset Management Plan, but if I can give you a brief flavour of that section, page 1106 of the Strategic Asset Management Plan, the Education Department is also proposing that all tertiary education be consolidated at Les Ozouets and at the College of Further Education outpost at Delancey, enabling the College of Further Education site at Les Coutanchez to be vacated and potentially allocated for affordable housing.

730 My concern is that we are discussing disposal of property without actually knowing what the long-term requirements for education will be, as there again are no details in this Report.

Sir, I hope the Minister can provide me with some reassurance that the plans are joined up, as they do not appear to be in this Report.

Thank you.

735 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Green.

Deputy Green: Sir, Members of the States, this vision is very simply an overarching strategy for education in Guernsey over the next 20 or so years, but you will note, page 1175 of this Billet sets out a number of very specific workstreams that flow from it. So I do not think you can dismiss this vision as entirely vague and general, because those very specific workstreams do start at least to put substance and meat on the bone, to adopt the language that we have just heard from Deputy Le Clerc.

745 Sir, Members I have total confidence in this vision – I would say that though, wouldn't I? I am a Member of the Education Board, but the reason why I have total confidence and faith in the document is because it is built on strong and clear values, including the philosophy that it is one of the key duties of Government to help enable the individual to enable their potential and to get on in life.

750 Now on this Island our most precious natural resource is our people and our children. By providing increased educational opportunities to all of our children in our society we will be devising a system of education that not only helps develop the individual, it will also powerfully support our economy in the long run.

755 We know, as the Minister very ably articulated this morning, that the world is changing. Guernsey students and individuals are increasingly competing with others on a global stage, so our education system cannot and must not stand still in that context.

It is true that this document is undoubtedly highly ambitious but in a way it absolutely has to be. There is no real alternative, in my view, if Guernsey is to keep up with the challenges in the world that we face today.

760 The fact is that for an Island like ours to prosper in the global economy, we must invest wisely in education, in skills, in training at all levels and there is much to do. We must ensure in future that we have high quality teaching and learning throughout all of our schools, backed up by strong leaders and a powerful use of available resources.

765 We must rebuild La Mare de Carteret in an affordable way; we must give head teachers the power to control their own budgets under a Guernsey system of local management; we must have pre-schools, primary and secondary schools that leave no child left behind and must provide greater educational opportunities in the most efficient way, and that has not always been the case; we must aim to equip our students with the tools and skills that they will need to truly thrive in a difficult competitive future world and that means our children must be able to utilise modern technology effectively, remembering at all times that information technology must always be used to underpin quality teaching and learning. It is not a gimmick; we must seek to raise academic standards and aspirations for all children in all of our schools. After all, in my view it is standards rather than structures that are the keys to success in this area, and we must also make sure and aim that we really stretch the most ablest of students in the States sector, I think that is absolutely critical.

775 Probably most controversial of all, we must once and for all decide as a community on whether academic selection at 11 is really the most appropriate system for the 21st century. Now, we must make absolutely clear, no pre-judgement of that issue has taken place whatsoever: the review of selection absolutely must be an objective and rational analysis of the pros and cons of the current system. But the issue cannot be ducked or avoided any longer.

780 Achieving all elements of this vision will indeed be challenging, and that is probably an understatement, but in a sense, failure is not really an option for this Island's young people and for its economy. We cannot simply afford to let our young people down by failing to transform education in radical yet sensible ways.

785 Yes, there are many pockets of excellence and magic in our current education system but there is absolutely no room for complacency; there must not be any tolerance or tacit acceptance of any underperforming school, or any underperforming teacher in our system. Yes there will be battles ahead and the details and costings associated with the implementation of the vision will emerge in due course, sooner rather than later, rather than today. I do have sympathy with what Deputy Le Clerc says it is frustrating not to see the details and not to see the finance behind it, but those details will come to this Assembly.

790 I will tell you, if you support extending opportunity to everybody in this community and if you believe that education is one of the best economic policies that you can have then surely we have no realistic alternative but to support this vision.

The hard part of course will be to translate the overarching vision into action, but I think with the current team that we have at Education we will do that.

795 In the future, who knows what will happen to our main industries in an ever-changing and competitive world, but we must proceed into the future with young people who are prepared and ready to meet those challenges we face with strong skills, with real aspiration and a hunger to do well, an enterprising mind-set as well as the academic and technical vigour that they will also require.

800 Now, personally speaking, I, and indeed many of my closest friends, pretty much owe everything to state education, to aspirations and to social mobility and I therefore want that for all children in this Island. I want them all to benefit from the very best opportunities in future.

805 So I look forward to the rest of the debate and I hope that this vision will be supported this morning.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby, to be followed by Deputies Storey and Gillson.

810 **Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, when I read the vision earlier this year, I was struck by how clear the aims of the Department were and the optimism that shone through in the Report. For that they should be praised and I certainly do not want to curb that enthusiasm and sense of purpose here.

I was pleased to see several ideas which align with what I want to see, particularly in relation to pre-school education, local empowerment of schools, and new education legislation.

I also welcome a review of the selective system and hope that any report that goes to the States on this matter sets out clear viable alternatives.

815 I passed my comments about the vision to the Department during its consultation period and I do not intend repeating them all here except in respect of the area of IT in general and digital literacy in particular.

820 The paper makes much of the need to find new ways of learning with particular emphasis on IT options. I totally agree with that approach, however, I think care is required to ensure that the online options are suitable and properly assessed. With the increased use of IT, it will also be necessary for teachers to have the appropriate skills to embrace the new ways of learning.

825 As a member of the Commerce and Employment Board and someone who sits on the ICT Strategy Group and Skills Guernsey Policy Group, I am fully supportive of developing digital literacy in Guernsey. However, I think care is needed in how ICT is taught and promoted in schools, particularly when considering high level skills such as coding and development. This has often been treated as something of a male domain, with girls often feeling it is not for them.

830 Well, I got hooked on ICT when I was lucky to have my parents buy me a ZX Spectrum for my 16th birthday. *(Laughter)* For those who have not got a clue what I am talking about, *(Laughter)* this is now a classic piece of computer hardware, designed by the much maligned Clive Sinclair, that brought computing to the masses. It had 16 kilobytes of memory – that is equivalent of a few emails without attachments now – and which I later had upgraded to a 48k. *(Laughter)* This is a classic piece of equipment which I only sold recently, not on an online auction site – interestingly, for more than it originally cost. Well, I am an accountant after all!

So from that understated box with rubbery buttons, black and white TV and cassette player, I learnt to programme in good old BASIC and realised early on how the computers could change our lives. But I did that in my own time, not at school. It was definitely felt that this was the boys' domain, the boys were surrounding the computers. That was a good few years ago now, I have to admit, but I do not think what I have to say is any less valid. Indeed, I believe what I have to say is more pertinent now than when I was at school.

A report produced by the Department for Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform in the UK, called the 'Women in IT scorecard', commented that only 15% of applicants choosing computer science or IT at degree level are women. Men outnumber women in the IT industry by nearly four to one, with women more heavily represented in occupations such as database assistant and IT user support, and the gender imbalance is getting worse.

The report point out that the gender divide stems in part from the ICT education system, with negative experiences of GCSE ICT affecting future subject choices. But it is not that women are not any good at it – no, those girls who actually take the subject score the higher grades.

IT skills are more important now than ever before. We live in a digital age. Whether some of us like it or not, the importance of ICT to Guernsey's economic future, both directly and through enabling the growth of the wider economy, such as financial services and the creative industries, cannot be understated.

I want to see more women being encouraged to be part of this world, and make IT something everyone will embrace. If more women are encouraged to get involved, I believe new ways of using IT will develop, there will be less groupthink and a new perspective added. It will mean more members of society will see it as something for them, the old, the disabled and perhaps even the odd States Member.

It is for that reason I urge the Education Department to think hard about their ICT provision and encourage our girls to see that they can take IT to the next level a new dimension. It is an opportunity that could really place Guernsey on the map and I would like to say that I am happy to help the Department make that happen.

Finally, and whilst I fully understand and welcome this vision, which has been long overdue, we know that the general public, and parents in particular in this case, will only really be engaged when they find out how it impacts on them.

As the Minister is all too aware, there is concern, which has already been voiced by a Douzaine which he represents as a Deputy, about the talk of school closures. I would therefore request that the Department make it clear sooner rather than later what they see their tomorrow's world meaning in terms of future primary school provision, as soon as they possibly can.

The Bailiff: Deputy Storey.

Deputy Storey: Thank you, sir.

First of all, I would like to congratulate the Minister and his Board for an excellent Report and for their vision. I thought that the presentations were really helpful, so I do thank the Minister for that.

I am also extremely enthusiastic about education. Education is vital for the future, not only for the future of this Island and its economy, but also for the individuals involved who are going through our education system.

At the end of the day, education is the best and possibly the only way out of poverty. I was very lucky: although my father was a manual worker and my mother worked in an office, they supported me and I was able to take advantages of opportunities that came my way to increase my marketability in the world, if you like, through education, and that is really what education is about. It is about helping people to contribute to their economy and to benefit themselves. That is what education is about and we must not lose sight of that.

There are three things I would like to add about the form of education that we have, and the first one is that education really is all about enthusing children for the subjects that they are being taught. The only way that that can be achieved is by having teachers who actually enthuse the pupils about their subject. Although I ended up a scientist, I still remember that my favourite subject in the lower school was history, because of the enthusiasm of the teacher for that subject, and if you do not have the right teachers, then you do not get the right outcomes at the end of the day. So I would urge that more concentration on the right teachers.

The second part is the form of education and the examination timetable, if you like, that we put our pupils through, and I am concerned that children's education, especially at the higher levels becomes too specialised, and it does restrict the choices that children are able to make later on and they effectively restrict those choices before they are able to appreciate what choices they might be

forgoing. For that reason, I would encourage the Education Department to consider more use of the Baccalaureate form of education, which is much broader and leaves it open for children to develop their choices later, when they are able to appreciate the effect of the choices that they might make.

The third point is that what we must not ignore in our education system is teaching our children to be ready for the world of employment. It is all very well for our children to come out of school with academic qualifications, but if they do not have ability to apply those in an employment situation, then we are not doing the children any good and we are not doing the employers on this Island any good, and so to a certain extent the education has been wasted.

Too often when I was a Member of Commerce and Employment Department visiting companies there was a criticism that the children that were coming to them were not ready for employment, they did not know how to fit in to a team, they did not how to deal with customers and such like, and I think that this is an area that we really need to concentrate on as well as the academic.

Now, the Minister in his opening speech – and I am sorry I am going to have to paraphrase this, I tried to write it down at the time, but I might not have got it exactly right – what I believe the Minister said is it was an assault on young children to be faced with their early primary school days without previous exposure to books and stories and the magic of numbers. I agree entirely with him here, that is an illustration: at the time the Minister used that to justify pre-school education and I agree with him entirely.

But I would contend, sir, that the Education Department cannot do it all. It needs parent involvement. Parents cannot just send their children to school and expect it to happen; they need to be part of their education process and to support their children through that education process.

What did concern me to a certain extent was in the Report, it said that you said that you had consulted widely in the community and you had had 70 replies, and when I look down on page 1155, on the feedback, I find no mention of any responses from parents. It may be that they are included in the others, but it does say in paragraph 5.3:

‘The majority of the remaining responses were from teachers with a large number of responses from staff of the Grammar School & Sixth Form Centre.’

So it concerns me, sir, that despite having a public meeting to explain the situation the responses from parents seem to either non-existent or very small.

I really would ask the Education Department to think very seriously about how they involve parents in the work of the schools, and their children’s education.

I can remember I had two daughters and when they entered school, as parents we had to go through a parents’ induction evening, where we told by the headmistress at the time in no uncertain times what our obligations were, in respect of supporting the children and what we would be expected to do and what we would not be expected to do. That is a long time ago and no doubt there is a better way of doing it now, but I would ask the Minister and his Board to consider very seriously how they can involve parents more in their children’s education, because without support at home, it does not matter what happens at school. With children of equal ability, where one has the support at home and one does not, it is clearly evident from what happens at school and the children who have the support at home obviously perform and enjoy their time at school to a much greater degree. So I think it is important not only for the results, but also for the children’s enjoyment of school that parents are involved.

So please, please do take account of that essential element in the education of our children. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Next, Deputy Gillson and then Deputy De Lisle.

Deputy Gillson: Sir, I welcome this review. It is a bold and ambitious vision which quite rightly states as its core values a high quality education is central to the future of Guernsey.

I welcome the document’s emphasis on equality of opportunity. Equality of opportunity does not need to mean a ‘one size fits all’ approach, which is why I am delighted to see the vision document recognises that all learners have different needs, different aptitudes interests and different strengths.

I believe that is what the Ladies’ College and the other colleges can contribute to. In particular with Ladies’ College, a single-sex academic learning environment, in Key Stages 3 and 4 a key element of the Island’s ability to provide those different choices and opportunities.

I cannot not note the proposed review of the structure of secondary education. It is something which I think the Island has to go through. It will be an interesting report when that comes. But I

hope that the Education Board will consider all alternative structures, whereby its aim of developing education centres of excellence will enshrine parental choice and equality of access to schools like the colleges.

960 The Board says, and I believe, that it is committed to the values of equality of opportunity, to friendship learning and breadth of experience. I am confident that the College will be able to play its part in developing such a framework.

965 Sir, I welcome the move towards local management of schools, and as a Governor, I have got experience of what is effectively an LMS school and I have already offered to Education, if I can help them in any way, having a few years' experience of that in the Guernsey's structure, I am really happy to do that.

I am glad that the Minister has talked about physical facilities. They are not the be-all and end-all, but they are important.

970 I am glad particularly to note the Minister and Board are committed to ending students having to work in portacabin huts and I hope that is supported by T&R's Board as well. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

975 I do have a question on La Mare. I fully acknowledge and agree the need to rebuild it but I do wonder how that can come before any decision on selection, and the structure of secondary education can happen, because surely that decision could have an impact on the sizing of La Mare. That is one question.

I echo the comments about IT infrastructure. That is something which is going to be second nature, it has to be essential, we need to have better broadband across all the schools.

980 We as an Island, an Island economy, have very little in the way of natural resources. Our main economic resource are our people and therefore we must have a high quality system of education – high in quality across all stages and all schools and, as Deputy Storey mentioned, that is really important that we have good inspirational teachers, which comes into the population debate we had a few months ago; that we must be able to recruit teachers off-Island when we need them and quickly, because at some subjects you are recruiting not in competition just with the Island or in England, but sometimes internationally and when you have people abroad who are being offered jobs in different places, you have to be able to react quickly, so a population regime which allows Education, across the whole of Education, to be able to recruit quickly is really, really important.

985 Implementing the vision is going to be challenging, particularly in these financial constraints, so it will be interesting to see what the Island is able to afford. But we must remember there are some parts of this which the Island cannot afford not to implement and we must be able to find money to do those.

990 I have in the past few months been very much a critic of plans and strategies of the States, but this one I support. I think I note the particular difference, in that it does have some very specific workstreams and timescales, and that is what sets it apart for me from some of the other plans. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

995 This has got that Appendix 2, which is an excellent summary of workflow, I think it is good. The timescales are great because it is something we can measure against, not to decapitate the Minister over, because I am sure there will be slippage, but it gives targets to aim for, and that I think is excellent.

1000 So I welcome this Report and I commend Education for producing it.

The Bailiff: Deputy De Lisle will be followed by Deputies Dorey and Stewart.

1005 **Deputy De Lisle:** Sir, I too welcome this Report and I am very supportive of the laudable aims provided in paragraph 1.2 at the beginning of the Report for:

‘an education system for the Bailiwick of Guernsey which will meet the challenges and demands of the 21st Century and provide our greatest asset, our people, with the knowledge, skills and tools to face a complex and challenging future with enthusiasm and confidence.’

1010 Sir, I also applaud the vision that endorses and looks beyond our immediate shores and of the British Isles to other outstanding jurisdictions for innovative ways to develop and improve the education system in Guernsey.

1015 I am very concerned, though, that we work through evolution rather than revolution, and there is a suggestion sometimes in this Report that perhaps we might be not always actually appreciating the work that has been done through education in this Island. We talk about transforming education, developing potential and achieving excellence. Well, a lot of that is already being done.

We talk in this Report of transforming radically our education system, and of course that meets some concern amongst teachers who have responded already stating that they already held and worked to these values.

1020 So, I think we have to be careful also that we move, and of course I am very supportive of the Mulkerrin recommendations and the fact that the last Board brought this in and, of course, many of the initiatives that are contained in this Report.

1025 Having worked at all levels of education here and in England and abroad, I can testify to the advantage of the very varied provision that Guernsey provides for such a small jurisdiction, in terms of being supportive also of the colleges and the Grammar School and the high schools and the work that they are doing, the College of Education also and the high quality of educational provision in this Island currently, and I think we have got to take care in terms of change, obviously we want to keep up, and we want to provide the very best, but I think it is true evolution rather than revolution that we go forward.

1030 I have to say that I am supportive of the Mulkerrin Report and proposals for improving what we have I am very supportive of pre-school for all and rebuilding of course La Mare de Carteret School. I think that we have to have a level playing field across the system and updated facilities for all our children across the board. And really rebuilding La Mare has taken a long time. There are 12 years we have been talking about it and I think it is time that that goes ahead.

1035 I am extremely supportive of the high school system, having worked in it here in Guernsey. It is providing a wonderful opportunity for children to enhance their skills and their academic prowess.

1040 I am supportive of local management of schools, and I think that is something that came out very strongly in the Mulkerrin reports, and also the provision of more post-16 educational opportunity on Island.

I think this we can do a lot more of. It is coming, but we want to have opportunity for degree courses even more broadly than we have now to be taken on Island.

1045 I would like, of course, to express my interest in retention of primary schools in the community, rather than extending bus services and bussing children and students out of their immediate areas. I think it is important that those primary schools are located throughout the Island so that children can actually walk to their school, rather than necessarily being bussed large distances.

1050 I think that the educational vision here is something that I certainly can support. I think it is important that we move into the 21st century in education, but I think it is also important that we appreciate the work that teachers and educators have done, and are doing, in our schools across the system, and the wonderful system that we really provide here in such a small Island. It does strike one, when one has worked in schools and universities and educational facilities abroad, as to how on earth we can provide so much educational opportunity in such a small place with limited budgetary facilities as well.

1055 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

1060 I likewise congratulate Education on this vision the HSSD and Education worked well together in many different areas. I think particularly one very good example is at Le Rondin School, where we share facilities and we work well together and I think that is the way Government should work. I hate people who frequently talk about silo, when we do work closely together in many areas.

1065 I support the rebuilding of La Mare de Carteret School, but I think the key thing is it must be fit for purpose and I, like others have mentioned, find it difficult to even design, let alone even start the development, when this Department is going to review secondary education and in particular the selection system.

1070 When the previous selection system was reviewed, there were two different proposals – well, out of the decision, a different proposal was put forward of how we are going to organise secondary education to as it was in that Report. That Report involved fewer secondary schools and also larger schools, so I really find it difficult that we will start even designing our new school, when we have a question mark over what our secondary school system will be. However much I dislike not starting the rebuilding of La Mare, which was only built a few years before the Grammar School, I think we must have that debate first and know what we are going to do with secondary education, before we spend any money on rebuilding that school.

1075

On pre-school education, I look forward to the proposals. Currently, as I understand, with the combination of the private sector and charitable sector, there is less than a handful of children who are not in pre-school education and I think those are by choice, rather than for any other reason.

1080 I think in these financial times, I look forward to proposals, but I think they must not result in that private money which is funding many of the pre-school education for children being lost, and I know that must be a challenge, but I hope that you can bring proposals forward for that.

1085 Having recently visited one of these nurture groups with the Education Minister and seen the very valuable work they do for particular children within our community, I hope that your proposals for the pre-school education also involve the nurture group continuing and perhaps dropping down an age range for the two- to three-year-olds, because I think this is where again Education and Health and Social Services can work together with health visitors and social workers to re-identify those children that need that help at that very young age. I think the work that you are doing with nurture groups can, if we can continue that, even with younger children, I think it would be of great value to our community.

1090 I know when I was at Social Security, the point was made of only a very limited number of school leavers, but we think the point has been made already, about them not being work ready, and they have been a real challenge to the Social Security Department to get them into work because of them not being work ready.

1095 I think one of the themes I think is person centred. I think Education needs to identify those very few children within the education system who will struggle to find work, and give them the maximum amount of help before they leave the education system. So I hope that that sort of person centred theme can help those particular children.

1100 HSSD also welcomed the opportunity to work with Education in the tertiary sector. The Institute of Health and Social Care Studies has been very successful in training health workers, but not in sufficient numbers to meet the full needs of our community. So I think if the two Departments can work together, I would welcome that,

1105 I think that the success that Education has had with locally trained primary school teachers, I think needs to be replicated in other areas, where as I understand, almost all of our primary school teachers are local and through the opportunities of local education have reached the standards they need to be primary school teachers. I think that is a great challenge for education going forward is to identify the needs in our community and give people the opportunity to be – to reach those higher levels within our Island so that they can meet the needs of our community.

With that, I thank you.

1110 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Stewart will be followed by Deputies Lowe and Luxon.

Deputy Stewart: Mr Bailiff, can I say to the Minister of Education that I fully support this vision, and many Members have risen to comment on the importance of technology and broadband to education, and I think this is part of that vision.

1115 Clearly a lot of Members will know about the Khan Academy in the United States, the distance learning there is a huge wealth of knowledge out there that we can now access and how our children can benefit. But it is not just the children and one thing I would say to the Minister is age should not be a barrier to learning, technology, should not be a barrier to learning.

1120 If I do actually give the instance of my father who, just a couple of years ago, aged 78, decided that, to get away from my mother, he could start taking up woodwork in his vinery and he started downloading all these instructions and watching YouTube videos, and actually taught himself woodwork – not that well, because I did actually have to take him to A&E three times, *(Laughter)* but bless him, he tried!

1125 The point I make is, this is the way that some of the teaching will be done. The way that we teach will change and technology is going to be vital to that.

1130 What I will say, with the current state of the broadband – and in many ways, I was writing papers about this before I became Minister, because I recognised some of the challenges we have now as a Bailiwick, and I want to give this Assembly and the Minister of Education some assurance, because I know we have spoken at length on this – I realised it would be a bumpy ride, which is when I formed the C&E ICT subgroup. I formed it with three Ministers, the Home Minister, Treasury Minister, myself and the Chair of PAC, and we have worked very well together.

1135 The first year we have done a huge amount of work. We have engaged, we have tried to get as much information as we can to try and start to form policies. CICRA have been very co-operative. They have just carried out a consultation on business broadband and they will be following that through with a full investigation to understand why in some cases a connection that would cost a

school or a business in the UK, Dublin, Ireland or, let us go outside of the EU, Geneva £25,000 would cost well over £400,000 here.

1140 Now, unfortunately, all of the networks are all in private control, some with more than others, but I can assure that this is the highest, highest, highest priority that we can give it at C&E and working with the other Departments, that we do need to understand how we can have cost-effective, fit-for-purpose broadband to allow this economy to grow, for our children to learn and for other areas – the digital literacy that we want to see across our whole society.

1145 One of the problems we are encountering – and I think it is fair to mention this, because I come away from some of my meetings with Telco sometimes frustrated, sometimes even angry – but on the radio the other day, the new chairman of Jersey Telecom said, and I paraphrase slightly, the prices are high because we do not have the volume. I was screaming at the radio, ‘Well, reduce the prices and you will get some more volume!’

1150 This is so important. Even in the lunchtime recess, the Deputy Minister and I met with the States economists to start looking at some of the areas of policy. We will explore at Commerce and Employment every policy option – and by ‘every policy option’, I mean *every* policy option. Because for our children the education, the wider education and for our economy we need broadband that is cost effective, and fit for purpose, and I will make sure that Commerce and Employment deliver that promise.

1155

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

1160 I too want to join many that have spoken by congratulating members of the Education Department for this Report.

It is a good Report, it is a vision, it does include some matters that are going to be controversial but that is good. It is an honest vision that we have got before us. Well done, Education Department!

1165 I also want to declare, sir, I am President of La Mare de Carteret High School Management Committee and for that reason, and hearing some of the speeches today, I want to take a moment to say, please do not start treating La Mare de Carteret rebuild as the Cinderella of the service. This is long overdue. The States promised that building years ago and they have not even put a digger in the ground yet to start developing that site.

1170 It is a credit to the headteacher that we have at the school now, how she has turned that school around and working in some conditions that are really not fit for purpose in this day and age. Some of the classrooms are so small that the children are sharing a desk here which will take four youngsters at a desk, where there should only really be two. As I say, the credit to those involved for helping and doing the best for those youngsters in that school and those conditions, but please do not start parking the rebuild to the side, because it is going to be needed, regardless, for those youngsters on that site.

1175

1180 Just a couple of other comments really, from some of the speakers that have spoken already, and it was said about IT and how perhaps it would be good to have more IT and young women involved in it. Again, down at La Mare, this is where a good public and private partnership is taking place, where the businesses have got involved through the industry, the Guernsey... I cannot remember the industry title now. I think it is GFI or something like that. They were involved and they supplied the computer equipment for a lunchtime scheme. It is for any age group and it is about programming to ensure that we can encourage as many youngsters as possible to stay on Island and be involved with the businesses at this early stage, with the businesses themselves coming in at the lunchtime club which has turned out to be a huge success.

1185

Also what has happened in picking up the point from Deputy Storey, there is very much a parent involvement at the school, and a fun involvement, so if some parents are struggling with how to assist their young children at the high school, they are encouraged to come into the school and there are evenings that are fun evenings, to go through how the youngsters are being taught and how to assist them at home. That is sending out a sort of ripple effect with many parents, more and more attending each time, that they do not feel intimidated or feel that they are inadequate because they struggle to help their youngsters, so that is sending out a good message as well, to parents that it is not just the children and young people that they are helping at the school. It is also the parents to make sure that parents are involved and to do whatever they can to help the youngsters in the school.

1195

Great news to hear about there being more bandwidth or a better IT system. It has caused huge problems at the school and bearing in mind that is the modern way of learning, it is so important that we have a good system in there and it causes a lot of frustration.

1200 The only other thing I wanted to finish with, it is last but certainly not least, this Government needs to send out a big thank you to the parents and the PTAs of all the schools who raise an enormous amount of funds to assist the schools operate, and without whom there would be an enormous bill added, an even a higher bill to the Education Department. So I want to place on record my thanks to the many parents of all the schools and the PTA who are helping this
1205 Government to contribute towards the funds.

The Bailiff: Deputy Luxon, to be followed by Deputies Inglis and Conder.

Deputy Luxon: Thank you, sir, just briefly.

1210 What an excellent opening speech from the Minister, I do know how much Deputy Sillars looks forward to these occasions, so I congratulate him. *(Laughter)*

Sir, 'Today's Learners; Tomorrow's World': what a cracking perspective focusing on the needs of our children now, so they can become able and value adding prepared individuals into the future for our society!

1215 Sir, for me the vision links good education now to enable a good outcome later.

I too, like Deputy Le Clerc, attended well in fact two briefings, read the vision with interest and indeed the States Report and I took great pleasure in pummelling away at my iPad one morning to give my feedback to the Education Board Members, which was quite exhaustive, fundamentally to congratulate them for what I thought was an excellent vision. Yes, it is a framework and yes, it is light on detail and lots more detail will need to come back, but sir, I
1220 implored them and I implore them now to be bold and to bring some of these really key and important pieces of the jigsaw back to us as soon as possible

Sir, there will be difficult choices. We all know that. We all know how much fiscal constraint we have. I just hope that the Assembly will be able to be as supportive to those reports that come back over the next two years and eight months as we are able to be today. Today is relatively easy because we can all comfortably support what feels like a very good vision and report but obviously it will be when we have to make decisions about resources and finance that really our
1225 mettle will be tested.

Sir, the Education Department are setting out their vision for the future education of our children, preparing them to play a part in Guernsey's future wellbeing, and these children will become adults themselves and, of course, parents.

On page 1178 of the Billet, of the Report, the Education Department have looked at the vision but with action, and I commend those three paragraphs which for me demonstrate that the Education Board Members have really applied a sense reality check. This is not just a vision devoid of any understanding of the wider implications and indeed the complexities, but it recognises the critical need for speed and progress. It also recognises the need of difficult choices, so again I applaud the Education Board and, indeed, their Department officers for focusing on and giving us assurance that this just is not a vision that is mother and apple pie, but they recognise the hurdles and that they will pursue.

1240 Sir, last year and indeed early this month, we saw the Olympic legacy which was admirable and we could all have been proud of. I do hope the Education Department are able to take this vision forward as a real education legacy for Guernsey and one that they, we, the children and indeed their parents can be proud of and I fully support it and welcome those reports coming back.

1245 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inglis.

Deputy Inglis: Thank you sir.

1250 I like everyone else would like to commend the Education Minister and his Department for their vision of the future. It is certainly refreshing to hear Members putting in elements that are clearly important in educating our young people.

I respect what he said about not talking about the minutiae. I think now is not the time. I just wanted to ask that the Department looks very strongly beyond the actual education barrier and look into industry and commerce in how education can interact there.

1255 Deputy Stewart has indicated about the development of the broadband. I have been very much involved in CGI. I see now there are quite a few Members in here who I managed to get publicly

humiliated with lots of water, and it is certainly something that the CGI appreciates involvement with Education.

1260 What I would like to see is Education push other associations to get involved, because there are lots of learning skills that young people can develop as a result of mixing with an older peer group, which gets them very focused on what does happen after the education door stops, in terms of the school, but the bigger education picture is when they go out in the working world.

1265 So I would very much support what has been said and, as Deputy Luxon said, this is a vision and I hope that the vision is maintained, because Members in the Assembly here will be putting that vision under very strict focus and will make decisions that may be offsets the vision, but from the early perspective it certainly looks very good.

Sir, thank you.

1270 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Conder and then Deputy Queripel, Deputy Sherbourne and then Deputy St Pier.

Deputy Conder: Thank you, sir, colleagues.

1275 In opening my few words, I would like to, as so many have, thank our Minister, my Minister for his excellent speech; it was truly inspiring and made me very proud to be associated with this vision and this Department. I commend and thank him for introducing our vision so effectively. Sir, just before I get to the meat of what I am going to say which is essentially about higher education on this Island, I want again to emphasise how proud I am to be associated with this vision.

1280 In a long working career in education, I have been very privileged to be in a number of institutions which have had visions and have grown. Well over 30 years ago, I joined a tiny institution called the Dorset Institute of Higher Education as a junior lecturer. They had a vision and I grew that, with that Institution, which became the Bournemouth Polytechnic and is now Bournemouth University. I have been invited and have joined the Board of that University and I am very proud of my association with that.

1285 I came to Guernsey right at the start of the last decade as the first Chief Executive of what was then the Training Agency, and then was subsequently accredited as the University Centre – the only institution in the offshore community so accredited. I was very proud of my association as Chief Executive of that institution and remain so.

1290 But sir, in terms of everything I have done in a long life associated with education, I would have to say that this vision, this opportunity, fills me with at least as much, and I think more pride than anything I have done before. It is, I think, the best thing I have been associated with and I keep using that word, very, very *proud* to be associated with being in at the start of this vision and to give this Island the opportunity to see a change in the way we provide education.

1295 Sir, as I said, I am going to say just a few words about the role and nature of higher education as part of our vision and our aspiration to create a tertiary institution, which indeed itself could morph into something more in the way that I described my early experience at Dorset Institute and create that institution on this Island.

1300 However, before I focus on higher education, I should say that higher education is just part, of course, of this overall vision and as I have already indicated, I am truly committed and enthusiastic about all parts.

1305 This is truly an epoch-changing moment for Education in Guernsey, which has the potential for securing the education and training aspirations of all – all of our fellow citizens. We need to just remind ourselves this vision is for all of our citizens. We have rightly focused upon children, but education and lifelong learning never stops. So it is for all of our citizens for many years to come and will, of course, allow this Island to compete on an international stage and provide a world class education for all of our fellow citizens.

1310 Sir, higher education, what we would traditionally have thought of as a University Education is no longer an elite or exclusive part of any national or international education system. It is an integral part of an education process which starts as soon as a child is born and remains with them throughout their life.

Higher education enables individuals to expand their knowledge and expertise, explore specialist disciplines and prepare themselves for high level careers.

1315 Every advanced and many developing economies are making major investments in higher education infrastructure, recognising that for future economic success will have to be based upon developing and sustaining advanced knowledge based industries.

Guernsey is, and will in the future be, increasingly dependent upon knowledge based high income generation industries. For these, we need a workforce educated to the highest possible

standards and equally importantly we need to encourage such expertise to return or remain on our Island.

1320 Sir, most western and developing economies aim for before 40% and 50% of their population, not just 18-year-olds, to have access to and experience higher education and this will only increase. For our society to thrive, we as a community have to at least match that commitment and must find ways of encouraging and enabling as many of our community to experience the benefit from engaging in higher education.

1325 However, like every investment society makes such a commitment, it is not without cost. Most of you will know that the cost of UK HE is increasing year on year and Guernsey has very little ability to control such costs, other than through negotiation. It is *inconceivable* that that cost that the UK government imposes upon us for access to their HE system is not going to continue to grow.

1330 Sir, the Education Board is committed to enabling all those who are qualified to have the opportunity to access UK, or equivalent university education. At the moment, that is circa 800 students in any one year in United Kingdom Higher Education institutions, costing the Guernsey taxpayer £6.5 million per annum, a very significant cost, and investment, to the Guernsey taxpayer.

1335 So how do we address the conundrum we face, in terms of our needing to increase access to higher education whilst being inhibited by the cost of traditional patterns of delivery? The reality is that all economies are facing this dilemma and are recognising that the delivery of HE must be more diverse. Over the next 20 years, patterns of access to higher education are likely to change, with more emphasis upon part time, local, flexible and distance modes of learning and access at different stages of life.

1340 The University Minister in the UK, David Willetts, recently pronounced that he foresaw and encouraged as many post 65-year-olds entering university as possible, and I really look forward to the day that I enrol my very dear friend Deputy Jones onto his BSc Hons. in computer literacy (*Laughter and interjection*) I look forward to that moment, and even more I look forward to the day he graduates with his mortar board on.

1345 Sir, the UK government has recently shared the criteria for accreditation as a university; this is significant and has expanded the number of institutions designated as universities. This has meant that a number of new non-standard institutions are now recognised as universities and old shibboleths about what a university is are no longer valid.

1350 We in Guernsey must respond to and facilitate demand for HE at all stages of life, and consequently there is certain to be a demand for more on island provision of HE both through partner universities and custom designed programmes to match the needs of Guernsey's economy.

1355 We in Guernsey are very lucky that, through the vision of an earlier generation of politicians, business leaders and educationalists, we have developed embryonic institutions which already offer a range of HE programmes delivered on-Island, and providing specialist vocational qualifications which support the development and success of our economy and social infrastructure, institutions such as the College of Further Education, the Institute of Health and Social Care Studies and of course, the GTA University, all deliver higher education programmes and have an enviable reputation for offering the people of Guernsey the chance to study on Island.

1360 The proposed development to create a Guernsey tertiary institution foresees a much closer collaboration between those three institutions, the CFA, the Institute and the GTA in expanding the range in qualifications available on Island.

1365 The concept of a tertiary institution as the capstone of the Island's education infrastructure, owned and resourced by the States of Guernsey offers us the possibility of a significant level of self-sufficiency in expanding opportunities of higher education, with the added benefit that those who study on Island are likely to remain on Island and contribute to the development of our society and economy. It is an exciting development which will play a significant part in expanding access to and benefit from HE in the Channel Islands over the next 20 year and into the future.

1370 Sir, I commend this part of the Education Department's vision and indeed the whole vision to the Assembly. We will need your help and support as we roll out its constituent parts over the next month and years. There will be difficult and contentious issues which we will have to grapple with, which we will argue over, and which we will have to convince you about, but as I said, sir, it is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to create change and develop our education system for the benefit of all of our fellow citizens. I commend the vision to this Assembly.

1375 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you. Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you, sir.

1380 In general, I support the direction of travel, and I am sorry that I have to start by focusing on some of the terminology in the vision. But there are some points that have been brought to my attention by three fellow Islanders currently working in Education. Sir, there seems to be a possibility that someone already working in Education might get somewhat demoralised reading some of the terminology in this vision, as already mentioned by Deputy De Lisle.

1385 If Members turn to page 1153 and read point 4.2, they will hopefully see what I mean. Because 4.2 tells us we will provide an inclusive, personalised, engaging education. There is a danger that stating that 'we will provide' implies that we do not already provide. (*Interjection*) Would it not have been far better to have said, 'we will continue to provide'.

1390 Another example of the terminology can be found directly below at 4.3, which reads 'we will need excellent leadership at all levels'. Again, that seems to imply that at the moment we do not have excellent leadership at all levels. Would it not perhaps have been better to have said, 'We will continue to provide excellent leadership at all levels'?

So I would like the Minister's thoughts on some of the terminology, please, sir, and an assurance that in future perhaps alternative terminology may be considered.

1395 Again, on the same page under 'excellent staff', we are told we must recruit, retain and reward creative staff across the service, including teachers, teaching assistants, support staff, premises managers and caretakers, and several questions spring to my mind in relation to that.

1400 Firstly, what guarantee can Education offer the teachers working here under licence that they will be retained? How will the Department actually reward their staff? I apologise for not being up to date with the latest developments sir, but did I not read somewhere recently that there is a possibility that the Department may have to review the caretakers' role and possibly outsource caretakers' duties?

1405 If Members turn to page 1154, they will see that the section headed 'High Quality Support Services' tells us that:

'we will provide a range of high quality support services employing specialist practitioners who will provide expertise and also build capacity within school through coaching and mentoring.'

1410 My concern regarding that is how will the Education Department pay for these specialist practitioners, when they are supposed to be making millions of pounds' worth of savings under the FTP and we, the States, are told on a daily basis that there is no spare money in the pot? The reality sadly is that we are severely restricted by lack of finances and a severe lack of resources in general.

1415 However, Education have proved by presenting this vision that they have locked into a direction of travel, and I very much want this vision to work. But the question that always springs to my mind, where any vision is concerned, is how, because the goals of any vision have to be attainable, even though the detail comes later.

1420 Point 7.2 on page 1158 tells us that the Department has tried to set out its vision for an informed transformation of the education system. The Board recognises that it will take hard work and dedication from everyone involved in education.

1425 Also, I apologise if I misunderstood the Mulkerrin Report, but the way I understood it was Mr Mulkerrin identified several problems at Board and Department level, not actually with teachers and tutors. So can the Minister please tell me what has been done to address the problems identified at Board and Department level by Mr Mulkerrin, apart from the election of a new Board obviously?

Can the Minister please tell me the difference between a transformation and an informed transformation? I apologise for not realising that difference, sir.

1430 Picking up on Deputy Storey's point regarding consultation, if Members turn to page 1151, point 2.3 tells us that senior officers from the Department consulted with headteachers, college principals and heads of service. Point 5.3 on page 1155 tells us that the majority of the remaining responses were from teachers with a large number of responses from staff of the Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre. But several teachers have told me, sir, that they were not aware of the opportunity to engage and that they were not consulted. So can the Minister please confirm that all teachers and tutors Island-wide had every opportunity to engage and feed their ideas into the vision?

1435 In conclusion, sir, I want this vision to work and I know how much the Board themselves want this vision to work. I know how passionate the Board are about education and how committed they are to the cause. In fact, I do not think we could wish for a better Board. (*Interjection and laughter*)

1440 But I do have concerns about this vision, and my great fear is that this vision becomes merely a list of aspiration that gets hamstrung by a lack of funding and various other restrictions, and that would be absolutely tragic.

1445 Unfortunately, there is a very real danger that this Assembly becomes known as the States that promised a lot but, because they were severely restricted, were able to deliver very little. That will also be tragic, because I know how hard Members work trying to resolve all the problems and introduce new initiatives to benefit the community.

So as much as I welcome this vision sir, I am afraid the Minister is going to have to convince me that the intentions within it are actually achievable.

1450 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sherbourne.

Deputy Sherbourne: Thank you, sir.

1455 If I could be allowed to express excitement, passion, about something that I feel is actually providing our community with a future to grab hold of really, I like Deputy Conder feel extremely privileged to be a Member of the body of people who put this together, because it was a team effort. The officers at the Education Department, all Board members, which includes non-States Member Denis Mulkerrin who has played an important part, have been almost at one on this. Yes, there have been disagreements on certain points and as you have been reminded this morning, as
1460 as the proposals are rolled out to you, there will be debate, there will be disagreement and maybe there will be compromise. But it is an exciting Proposition for someone like myself who has been involved in the Education service for such a long time.

In deference to those Members of the States that have already played an important part on the development of education in the Island, those previous Board members, I am very conscious that
1465 you have provided, if you like, the basis on which we can move forward. But I must say that in the 44 years' involvement in the service in one way or another, this is the first time I have actually seen a joined-up, coherent proposal put to the States, which actually considers education from birth for life.

1470 There have been lots of good proposals, lots of good changes over the last 40 years but this is the first time there has been a coherent programme offered to the States.

I echo Deputy Conder's comments with regard to our Minister's presentation of this Report, which was excellent, but there was one little omission Deputy Sillars, you forgot to mention early years intervention, which will actually handle the issues with regard to early years – really early years from birth – and that is where there is another exciting possibility of real joined-up planning
1475 in the Island.

I welcome Deputy Dorey's comments with regard to the position of the Institute of Health Studies but I know that the involvement of HSSD and SSD with regard to other aspects of our vision are terribly important, and it is that joined up aspect that I find so exciting.

1480 There are so many of you here in the Assembly today that will play a part, not just in debate when proposals are put to you, but in terms of the formulation of those ideas. That to me is extremely exciting. Yes, there will be challenges, there will be debates that will be uncomfortable for some, but we started off as a Board recognising that there should be no sacred cows with regard to our future debates. Everything is up for grabs. We need this opportunity to challenge what exists at the moment and hopefully out of it will come that great vision for the future.

1485 I believe that we at present have a system which sets limitations to expectations. Some of you will disagree with that, but that is my considered opinion after such a long, an extensive time in the profession. That needs to change for the reasons that have already been explained to you.

The Island has got to be competitive, its natural resources its people, the young people that I have spent most of my life working with, superb young people should have no limitations set on
1490 their expectations and it is up to us as an Assembly to make sure we provide the wherewithal for those expectations to be raised to the ceiling.

And so it gives me great pleasure to ask you as colleagues, as Members of this Assembly, to endorse the core values that we lay down and to endorse the proposed direction of travel for the next two years and beyond and I ask you to support this whole heartedly.

1495 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Next Deputy St Pier, then Deputy Le Lièvre and then Deputy Le Tocq.

1500 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, I am just wondering actually, with our financial and environmental targets, whether we really need the lights on, on such a beautiful day – just a small thought.

The Bailiff: The switches are behind you, if you wish to turn them off. *(Laughter)*

Deputy St Pier: There we go, thank you. *(Applause)* I think, sir, I did see a –

1505 **Deputy Trott:** The Minister has only done half a job – *(Interjections)*

A Member: But twice as much as the last Chief Minister, sir. *(Laughter)*

1510 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, I did fear touching the switches for fear of the accusation that it might be executive government, sir.

Sir, I was actually particularly pleased that the Minister for Education described his plans for the rebuilding of La Mare as being concrete, I thought that was a particularly good start. *(Interjection)* I did spot that.

1515 Sir, this is a vision document. It contains lots of warm words and I think, as both Deputies Gollop and Luxon described it as motherhood and apple pie – although I did rather favour the Chief Minister's description yesterday of apple and motherhood pie, which sounded much more interesting! *(Laughter)* The unanimity of the debate so far does leave me questioning whether we should be worried by the fact that this may all be common sense verging on dogma, which is something that we were warned against by Deputy Le Lièvre earlier in the week; and indeed
1520 whether this is another plan to add to our pile of plans, which as again Deputy Le Lièvre frequently reminds us, we have more plans than Baldrick.

However, I wholly endorse – *(Interjection)*

1525 **Deputy Le Lièvre:** Sorry, sir, I never mentioned Baldrick! *(Laughter)* Blackadder maybe, but not...

Deputy St Pier: I do stand corrected, but I certainly know Baldrick has been referred to by some Members.

1530 But I do wholly endorse this vision because it captures the Minister's, it captures his Department's *optimism*, I think was the word that Deputy Soulsby used, and passion and enthusiasm. That comes across so strongly in the document and, of course, by all the Members of the Department who have spoken so far. I am sure the Deputy Minister will get his own back in a moment. It captures that ambition and in particular the ambition is to improve outcomes, rather than just managing the existing service, and I think that is what is so important.

1535 In particular, the Minister and Deputy Sherbourne spoke passionately about pre-school education and indeed of course early years intervention.

I know that the Minister is as frustrated as I am that the development of States-wide project prioritisation including this initiative will be slowed as a result of the amendment on the Government Service Plan earlier in the week.

1540 The Minister also said that every penny counts and it will cost, and of course he is absolutely right, in order to deliver this vision. That for me emphasises two things: it emphasises the need for proper States-wide prioritisation, not just departmental prioritisation, to enable the delivery this, and it also emphasises the need for tight fiscal and financial discipline to release funds for the new service developments that the Minister and his team are looking for, whether that be pre-school
1545 education or early years intervention and so on.

Therefore it re-emphasises the need for us to deliver on the Financial Transformation Programme across the board, including the Strategic Asset Management Plan which we will come to later, and it emphasises our need to support Education in order for them to deliver the whole of this vision.

1550 We cannot just cherry pick for fear of political unpopularity. I know that that is going to be tested over coming months, as we need to support them in their initiatives in what they are doing and they have done an awful lot in the delivery of what has been asked of them by the States as a whole in relation to FTP. We must remember that. We must remember this debate as they look for that support in coming months.

1555 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Lièvre.

Deputy Le Lièvre: Thank you, sir.

1560 Right at the start of the week, Deputy St Pier said that his daughter had a nightmare. Well, he was lucky – my son *is* a nightmare, (*Laughter*) but I love him deeply and it is now recorded on *Hansard*, for which he will never forgive me!

Education as a Committee is fortunate in having three educationalists within its membership, because there is absolutely no doubt it makes life a great deal easier for those of us with non-
1565 educational backgrounds.

Likewise, the three educationalists are fortunate in having three normal folk alongside them, (*Interjection*) because we would act as the counterbalance in the event that we drifted towards some sort of educationalist heaven. (*Laughter*) (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Not that it has happened and of course it will not, because the Committee is united and fairly well balanced.

1570 I can assure you, however, that it does have its differences and these differences are fought out behind closed doors in the main, so what you see before you today has not been a result of cosy chats over tea and biscuits. Education biscuits are always soft in any event. (*Laughter*)

I would like to thank Deputy Stewart for his commitment to improving bandwidth so that we can actually achieve what Deputy Soulsby referred to with regard to our ICT. It is absolutely
1575 essential. I know, for instance, that some children or students come in and sign on and by the time that the lesson is finished, the business actually comes up on the communicator etc, so that is not good enough. You cannot have children coming in to be taught with an iPad or whatever, a tablet, and it not working until the end of the lesson, that just does not work.

I would like to thank also, not only everybody who has contributed to this debate, but also
1580 Deputy De Lisle for his reference to evolution not revolution. This is not revolution. We will evolve and I think, although the vision document might look like a revolutionary document, it in actual fact is composed of very sensible moves.

If I might turn to some of the things that have been mentioned. Pre-school education: now, when I was reviewing various Billets in relation to the Government Service Plan, I came across a
1585 report from Dr A T G Thomas, who was the father of a friend of mine when I was at school, and Dr Thomas, in his annual report as Medical Officer of Health, on the education aspects of health, made reference to the fact that there was significant evidence that if a child attends school at the age of three and half, then they have stolen a march on all those pupils who did not go to school until they were required to by law. This evidence was based on reports conducted during the First
1590 World War. So if we will achieve by the time Education comes back according to the schedule, we will have been where we were 100 years ago. So it has taken a time but we will get there.

With regard to the comments about the review of secondary education and indeed selection at 11, I noticed a few eyebrows and smiles as though Education has made its mind up. Well, in
1595 preparation of the vision, I threw a *complete* wobbly and threatened to go if there was any sign in this document that Education has made up its mind on which way to go.

There is no decision reached about selection at 11. We have not even discussed it and every member of Education would actually agree to that statement. We have not discussed it.

I think we are all of a mind that whatever happens, post that review, what recommendations will be made to this Assembly will be for the betterment of whatever exists – so that is absolutely
1600 sure. I will not sign up to anything that I believe is less than we have now.

With regard the rebuilding of La Mare, it will happen. For those people who are listening today and might think that some of the comments will mean that La Mare will be put back, I can assure you that it will not. The school needs to be rebuilt, the area needs it, particularly the area in which it is placed. The parents need it and most of all the pupils need it and it will happen. It is not reliant
1605 on the review of secondary education.

Deputy Bebb said to me, and it has been mentioned a couple of times already, that Education's vision was okay, but it was a bit of motherhood and apple pie. Well, I suppose it is in a way. It would be almost impossible to produce a policy letter that was not; after all we are dealing with the children and young men and women for whom we have an enormous duty of responsibility
1610 and duty of care.

However, let me assure this Assembly this Education Committee, as with every other Education Committee that has gone before it, is determined to maintain and improve the education of Guernsey's children and young men and women, and its no-so-young men and women as well. Education never stops and it is not the intention of this Committee to stop either.

1615 Our vision – and I admit I do not like that term, this is a job list, it might have easily have been referred to as a review of Guernsey's Education system, but whatever we call it, our vision – it makes the child, student or learner the focus of the education system and not *vice versa*. It recognises that every child is different and has different needs, and boy, oh boy are they different! They come from different backgrounds, they come from different financial backgrounds from different accommodation, etc. They are all different and they are all unique.
1620

It focuses on equality of education for all. It will encourage learners, because that is what we call them in Education, of any age to maximise their potential, and we will give the child, every child, the choice they so very much need to achieve success through whatever avenue they so desire, be it further education, on or off Island and/or employment.

1625 We will seek to ensure that in future, as far as is humanly possible, our children leave our education system fit for employment. We will encourage social inclusion and respect for the needs of others; we will encourage healthy living and responsible citizenship and most importantly and this is most importantly, we will make learning a happy and enjoyable process which need never end.

1630 And if this is motherhood and apple pie, then I am happy to eat a slice of it. In fact I will eat the whole pie – *(Interjection)* no change there then. *(Laughter)*

What you see before you today is a job list. Some jobs are going to be easy to sell to this Assembly and some are not. Some jobs are going to be happy events and some not so happy. It is the nature of things.

1635 It is not a job that we are going to be able to do by ourselves. We are going to need the help of HSSD of Housing and of Social Security and of every Member in this Assembly to think openly and honestly and to act accordingly.

1640 Before I sit down just let me give you one assurance – and this is particularly, if you like, aimed at Deputy Queripel – this Committee is not half hearted about its job list. It will not rock and roll just to ensure some form of limp wristed compromise. It might take sensible and logical amendment, but that is about as far as it will go. It has a job to do. It intends to carry that job out, despite a very ambitious time scale, and it does not intend to take much mucking about.

1645 Please approve the vision before you today and we will be back in October with our first task on the agenda. Furthermore, the Board's intention is to report back on an annual basis on progress so far, so we are not going to just wait and see what happens; we will report back on the progress we make.

Thank you, sir.

1650 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq and then Deputy Bebb.

Deputy Le Tocq: Sir, as a former Member of Education from 2000 for four years, and as a parent myself with three now grown-up girls, I welcome very wholeheartedly this Report and the vision for education, and particularly the way in which Education have sought to portray and to explain to us and the whole community of this Island the way in which they are going.

1655 I think it is important because my own experience has been that if we focus in too much on individual detail, then we have all got our own opinions on those sort of things, and we miss the greater picture, which is far more important.

1660 Education of course is far more than just to do with children. There is so much emphasis and there needs to be on lifelong learning and training now, and I am glad that that is put into perspective here.

Sir, our adopted poet and the French political reformer, Victor Hugo who himself, whilst in exile on the Island, did a lot to better the situation of many of the poor children of the town, is quoted as saying: '*Celui qui ouvre une porte d'école, ferme une prison.*' – 'He who opens the door of a school closes a prison'.

1665 I want to focus on just one aspect that that alludes to, and it touches on what Deputy Sherbourne was speaking to before, that early intervention is absolutely key if we want to see our community, as a whole in the long term, change the way in which it has traditionally handled those who perhaps come from families with complex needs, that early on we see, and sadly still often do see, children getting involved in crime and in unnecessary anti-social behaviour early on. I firmly believe that education is the solution to that, and early intervention.

Of course, education certainly starts as an extension to parenting and I do not believe that the States should replace parents in that role, but where there are breakdowns, where there are weaknesses, where there is clearly plenty of difficulties arise it is vital that as a community we have the means to engage early in providing appropriate responses and help.

1675 I know my Department would agree with me that working together and supporting education will benefit our law enforcement in general and particularly the prison, where fortunately we are seeing a reduction in prison population, but it would be fantastic to see some of those who seem to just duplicate what their forefathers have done, not actually coming into the criminal justice system at all because they have better options in life and because they have been given appropriate responses early on, so I absolutely fully support this.

1680

But as I said, it is not just to do with children. I was intrigued and encouraged in the run-up to the election last year, while I was out campaigning, to knock on the door of a 94-year-old, I think she was actually at the time. She came to the door after a little while, it took her a while, but she was skyping her great-grandson somewhere on the other side of the world and she had learned to do that through courses provided by the College of FE. She was thoroughly enjoying it, and not only that, but she showed me how she was able to make small pocket money by selling stuff on e-bay. Absolutely incredible, so there is hope for even Deputy Jones in this in the long term.

Sir, I will not speak any further. I am sure people generally know my views on this. I rise to primarily focus on that aspect which I think overlaps with our mandate in the Home Department, and I too ask the Assembly to completely support this Report.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Bebb.

Deputy Bebb: Thank you, *Monsieur le Bailli*.

Having had the accusation of calling this motherhood and apple pie from Deputy Le Lièvre, I was not actually going to refer to that in debate, but I think that it is fair to say that any document like this which actually looks to have an overarching feel, it is difficult for it not to have a slight feel of motherhood and apple pie. I fully recognise that from the work of the 2020 vision and to start work on such a large document by going into the details which will obviously be contentious would obviously scupper the Education Department's plans, and therefore I fully understand why they have actually brought this document. I do not disagree with motherhood and apple pie every single time.

However, I would also like to thank the Education Department by bringing this document they actually reminded me of a book which actually formed a lot of my political thinking and that was from Hayek. Many people will know and either love or hate him, because he seems to be a bit of a 'Marmite' character, but rather than *The Road to Serfdom*, which is the one that is usually discussed, it is *The Constitution of Liberty* and the last paragraph talks about education and research. If Members will bear with me one moment, I would like to quote from it:

'Knowledge is perhaps the chief good that can be had at a price but those who do not already possess it often cannot recognise its usefulness. More important still, access to the sources of knowledge necessary for the working of modern society presupposes the command of certain techniques, above all that of reading, which people must acquire before they can judge well for themselves what will be useful to them.'

It goes on further and Hayek's contention is frequently about states' intervention within schools. It is not surprising, given Hayek's background and having grown up in Austria during the Nazi time and the state intervention that happened in schools at that time. I realise that we are not in the same way at all today. However, state intervention in school: it is interesting that even today and from the Minister's comments in his opening speech that to make schools free it is obviously still some contention.

But it is interesting that Hayek's solution to this, of making schools free was the beginning and the genesis of the idea of the pupil premium. I know that some people find that contentious because of course it has taken on its own form in the UK. But taken in its simple sense, it means that you give to each child an amount of money to spend within education and that actually gives parents the choice over how their children are educated, because of course they would entrust the money to whichever school supplies that.

That model would then be far more beneficial for parents to choose the appropriate schooling for their children and I think that that model is interesting, given that today we probably do not have parity on funding of education within secondary schools as a result of the funding that goes rather disproportionately probably towards the colleges, and I think that that question as to setting schools free is actually interesting one. However, I think that it needs further exploration.

I would also like to go into the question of the pre-school education, a lot has been said already and Members will remember that I brought an amendment to the Social Security Children's Benefit last year, along with Deputy Sherbourne, but it is interesting that when we discussed the possibility of pre-school education with the current providers they stated that the biggest obstacle to providing pre-school education at this point in time is premises. Premises are very difficult to come by and when we do talk about the Strategic Asset Management Plan we note that it is completely silent on such premises, and yet we know that it is going to be central to delivering exactly what Deputy Le Tocq actually referred to in his speech.

I would like to go on to talk about secondary schooling. A lot that I wanted to say about IT within schooling has already been said and I will not repeat it. However, I would also ask the

1745 Education Department to bear one other thing in mind. Evidence was given in Paris as to a modern way of teaching that had been taken over by all schooling, but out in the *banlieues*, it was actually failing, because pupils were still proving to be reluctant to engage. And that in that school it was interesting that the best teachers had reverted to old fashioned methods of placing children behind desks, in lines, looking at a board, because sometimes the focus is what is missing within the home life and that is what is needed in their education.

1750 Therefore, I am not advocating that we revert to the old systems at all, but what I am saying is that they have a very good place, and therefore when the Education Department come back with their ideas I would actually urge them to be bold and not to be afraid of saying that on certain occasions it is time to revert to previous practices that seem to be a little against modern practices because if it is proven to work, I do not mind whether it is actually old fashioned or modern; I want something that is actually working.

1755 The other final question is in relation to tertiary colleges. It is interesting that we actually look, and I think Deputy Conder's speech actually made reference to what is happening. It is interesting that as a Government we make no judgement as to who can actually enter into tertiary education. The UK due to its size simply controls the amount of pupils that go into tertiary education by allowing more places or less places each year. That is their control and with such large amounts of people of course you can do that. Here in Guernsey such a solution is not possible.

1760 I would like to propose one solution that, bizarrely enough, came to me when I was in Greece: each local area decides and determines what skills they require in order to keep the skills within that area functioning. The example that was given to me is that one particular area realises they need one dentist every year and therefore only one child goes on to study for dentistry every year. 1765 It sounds harsh but the brightest and the most capable actually goes on to be a dentist. It does not preclude any others. However, they need to find their own funding.

What I would actually suggest is that form of moulding the skills that we need is exactly the difficult types of decision that we must undertake, if we are to also resolve the population issue that was burning last month.

1770 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Spruce and then Deputy Brehaut.

1775 **Deputy Spruce:** Thank you, sir.

Members, I, like everyone else, am supportive of the vision statement after all how could you not support a vision statement that makes so many grand statements. But the devil is in the detail and unfortunately that has yet to be unveiled.

1780 My main concern centres around section 5.8 to 5.11 which covers the review of selection and tertiary education. Section 5.8 to 5.10 suggests that the Board is in listening mode with regard to the review of selection, but when one looks at Appendix 2, there is a clear statement that the Department will bring a new structure for secondary education to the States in 2014.

1785 So obviously, although theoretically listening, I believe change in the current model is definitely in the offing. It sort of proposes that change is required rather than await the consultation.

I am surprised that no reference is made to the part played by Elizabeth College and Ladies' College to the provision of education in Guernsey and to where these colleges fit within the overall vision.

1790 I am also concerned that we will be asked to commit to the rebuild of La Mare de Carteret High School prior to the outcome of the review of selection in tertiary education, which could have a fundamental impact on the overall model.

1795 Anyway, whilst standing, I must offer my support to provision of pre-school education, it is long overdue and I hope the Assembly finds its way to support that. I am supportive of the general vision statement, subject of course to the concerns I have expressed. So please support the vision but recognise that considerable debate will follow whilst Appendix 2 of this report unfolds.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

1800 **Deputy Brehaut:** Thank you very much, Mr Bailiff.

I have made up my mind, I have a fairly fixed view on elements of education, and it was some 12 or 13 years ago that I was sat in that Public Gallery there, with Deputy Steer who went on to get re-elected and became Education Minister. We were both involved with an organisation that

we had started called Fair Start, and Fair Start had one explicit objective which was to ensure that the selection at the age of 11 should cease. That is still my position: I think it should.

1805 On that day, which is indelible on my memory, Members in the Assembly at that time were pretty much of the view that selection at the age of 11 was probably the wrong thing.

Then of course, we had the amendment. If ever an amendment was on the hoof, it was the Torode amendment that said, ‘Okay, some of you are feeling uncomfortable why do we not “invest” into the secondary system and give these kids some new schools.’

1810 The new schools were promised – not yet delivered, but the new schools were promised and then that was the sugar that sweetened an otherwise bitter pill and the Education’s new start or whatever the proposals were called at the time were to a degree shelved because they had to go down another route.

1815 Now I have since had children. My children are at primary school and when you go into primary schools at a certain time of the year, you will find predominantly mothers, I have to say, and maybe the occasional father in groups in huddles consoling one another. They are consoling one another because their child has not gone to the school or is not going to the school that they would have liked. Invariably, it is that their child has not passed and that their child will be going to another school.

1820 I cannot support that system and I was hoping, I know we have this problem on the environment, we want to talk road transport strategy and people say, well, paid parking. You want to talk education, I am afraid you just might have to talk about the 11-plus more explicitly at some stage.

1825 It was said yesterday that... Has somebody turned the lights off? I can just about read my speech here – (*Laughter*) Yes, if you want to go fast, go alone; if you want to go far, go together and I commend the five politicians on the Education Department for going there together, and I applaud them for their presentations.

1830 I have been to presentations where the politician will open the meeting and then hand over to staff. I do not think in my nine years in this Assembly I had ever been to a presentation where the report was introduced and each political Member then came to the lectern and gave their view, and they have to be commended for that, and if ever that is a lesson in politics, if you can get five politicians facing the same way on your Board, you can make real progress, and well done to them.

1835 What I would say is there is not, however, in my view, a lot of togetherness within the current system. Within the education system the provision of schools there is a hierarchy. Guernsey tends to like hierarchy and hierarchy is there in education.

I think, although I indulged in the Latin exchange yesterday, for some listening in, perhaps the Latin exchange between the room with former old Elizabethans may just have made their toes curl at some stages a little bit, (*Interjection*) and I take on board and support rather Deputy Gollop’s view of more inclusive education for those with learning difficulties. I understand they are on one campus, at Baubigny and that is fantastic. It would be great if over the years there was more real interaction between these two schools, but again I support the general direction.

1845 The question does have to be asked whether it is the parent or child, and it is usually both of them. Some children believe that they have got a gold medal, some believe they have got a silver medal and we have to ask why some children still believe that in Guernsey secondary school, you have won a bronze medal.

People will say that that is as much the responsibility of the parent and the expectations of the parent, but we do have a system that does seem to draw out, highlight, in fact almost celebrate, difference of a sort that makes me feel uncomfortable.

1850 But then of course, we still have what I would call the ‘Charlie and the Chocolate Factory’ approach to education, the hand of fate that intervenes with Charlie’s golden ticket and you may be lucky and get a scholarship. This random social mobility may intervene and make you more socially mobile through education and people believe that. If people believe that if this hand of fate can intervene and take you out of the States system and take you to another place and give you a better chance, a better life experience – please make a note, Deputy Perrot – then this is something that should concern us.

This is an enormous leap of faith, it is an incredible leap of faith this Report, the vision report.

1860 I have said before that sometimes reports are not too clear. They are a bit like an impressionist painting, you have to stand back to them. When I first read this document I found myself looking for the canvas, the paint and at times even the easel, because it is not a document that does jump out at you in the conventional way.

But I will go on to support a group of politically committed sincere politicians who believe they are doing the right thing.

1865 I also believe that in doing the right thing, we will have to close schools and I believe in doing the right thing we have to look at selection at 11 again, and I urge the Education Department to do the right thing.

The Bailiff: Does anybody else wish to speak in this debate?

1870 Yes, Deputy Collins and then Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Collins: Thank you, sir.

I will be very brief but I thought it would be prudent to get up and speak. Deputy Fallaize and I were at school together and being the youngest Members or the last ones obviously to go through the education system.

1875 I also attended the presentation which was excellent. In fact, on the night it was a question of the education vision or buses and to be honest, we certainly had an education on buses but anyway.

1880 Pre-schools: this is a great idea. Personally I have got a lot of friends and I have seen the benefits of the children that go to pre-schools to the benefits that do not. I am not making any judgement of my friends but I have seen that with my own eyes.

1885 Now for something a bit more personal. I have heard a lot, Deputy Green, Deputy Le Lièvre, Deputy Brehaut talking about this selection, this 11-plus. I did not take my 11-plus sir, as my teachers recommended to my parents that I had troubles, and to be honest there are lots of labels you could give to me – (*Interjection*) Well yes, yes, but that has probably made me the driven person I am, sir, because I went on to school and I gained qualifications. In fact, I have got a few letters after my name – I am sure Members could think of some letters, anyway!

1890 I have gone on to have some very highly paid jobs in some very top companies in Guernsey. So the message I want to send to all the children in the Bailiwick is look, I was behind. I was behind in education, I will admit that, and to be honest, for a very long time I did not tell people because of the chip on my shoulder that I did not take my 11-plus because perhaps I fell down a gap, but actually it was me probably, maybe, I do not know. But I buckled down I worked hard and look where I have been. Okay, like I said, I have been driven not only in education but sport and I apologise for being away last month and winning the British Championships, (*Interjection*) but there we go.

1895 To the children in school, look what you can become, look you can even become a Deputy. The future is bright and as we have already heard, I do totally support this vision. It is excellent and for me it actually agrees that there is future in education, and I will certainly be engaged in the forthcoming debates, so thank you very much.

1900 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher and then Deputy Perrot.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Thank you, sir.

1905 Sir, I fully support the Propositions at the end of this Report. However, like Deputy Spruce, I can find no mention of where our colleges fit into this overall vision. They do play a significant role in the delivery of educational excellence for a large number of, as we now call them I am told, learners, but I do want to go one step further, I want to ask the question: why is this, why has there been no mention of the colleges in this vision?

It is as simple as that. Thank you, sir.

1910 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Perrot.

Deputy Perrot: Well, there I was, heroically trying not to fall asleep (*Laughter*) and all of a sudden Deputy Brehaut took a pop at me! (*Laughter*) It is unfair! I don't know why, I have not said a peep during this debate.

1915 The only thing that I can possibly be guilty of is that until a couple of weeks ago, I was Chairman of the Gibson Fleming Trust which sent boys to Elizabeth College, and I happen to be a patron of the Foundation of Elizabeth College, which – could I just report that it has raised, since 2007, something like £3.1 million. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

1920 I am not quite sure, as I say, why Deputy Brehaut should take one against me this morning because I am not against this vision. I would not dare be, we have all been bathing in these terribly warm feelings and perhaps a little bit of self-congratulation here, but so what, we all agree with the general tenets that we ought to have a good education system here and I support that.

But let me say and it is quite clear from what Deputy Brehaut has to say that his mind is already well fixed, so whatever may be said during any debate about selective education is not

1925 going to change that one vision which he has. (*Interjection*) So far as I am concerned and as
product of it and a person who has benefited from it, I had very much supported the old vision of
selective education, but can I say this and perhaps it is a bit odd coming from me, certainly Deputy
Brehaut will think that, but my mind is not completely closed to the possibility of there being
1930 changes in relation to selective education. It is entirely... The States of Guernsey have to accept
that there is a cost to educating children and that if children are not at the colleges, then they are
going to be within our States system. There will be a cost of educating them.

Now I cannot imagine that anybody but perhaps Deputy Brehaut (*Interjection*) would try to
bring down the edifices of the Ladies' College and Elizabeth College and so they will continue
into the future.

1935 But one could possibly see that one could change the system somewhat, whereby instead of
having a conventional 11-plus selection system, one might perhaps start swinging it around to
some form of bursary system, so I suppose the only reason for my standing up, apart from being
woken up by what Deputy Brehaut (*Laughter*) had to say, is to make a general point about that,
that I look forward to any debate about selective education.

1940 Let me just place on record – I suppose this is what Deputy Brehaut expects me to say – I think
that the colleges have punched way above their weight (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) for a very
long time. They are institutions not to be sneered at in the slightest degree, they are a great credit
to our Island and of course the Grammar School and those (*Interjection*) proceeding it were great
credits to our Island.

1945 Over very many years, our forms of secondary education have been extremely good,
everything can be changed a little bit, but I think it is unfair because you might happen to have one
fixed point of view that you assume that everybody else is going to have a completely fixed point
of view as well.

1950 **The Bailiff:** Does anybody else wish to speak. No?
Then, Deputy Sillars are you ready to reply?

Deputy Sillars: Yes, sir, I think so.

1955 **The Bailiff:** You are entitled to –

Deputy Sillars: Get it over and done with.

The Bailiff: – prepare your thoughts if you wish to do so. You are entitled to an adjournment if
1960 you wish to do so, as you may need to prepare your thoughts.

Deputy Gollop? [*Inaudible*] Can you put your microphone on, please?

Deputy Gollop: ... yesterday, but would it not be...? Perhaps we could rise now and
1965 reconvene at 2.00 p.m.

The Bailiff: I wonder, yes, that would give Deputy Sillars a chance to compose his thoughts.

I will put that to Members. The motion is that we rise now and return at 2.00 p.m. Those in
favour; those against.

1970 *Members voted Pour.*

The Bailiff: Then we will do exactly that, back at 2.00 p.m.

1975 *The Assembly adjourned at 12.17 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 2.00 p.m.*

1980

**‘Today’s Learners; Tomorrow’s World’
The Education Board’s Vision
Debate continued
Propositions carried *nem. con.***

1985

The Bailiff: Members of the States, it is for Deputy Sillars now to reply to the debate on the Education Department’s Report, ‘Today’s Learners; Tomorrow’s World’ – the Education Board’s Vision.

Deputy Sillars.

1990

Deputy Sillars: Thank you, sir, and thank you everyone for letting me have the time to put it together. I worked out it could take one hour and a half to reply, but it will be slightly shorter.

I wish to thank all Members for a constructive and encouraging debate and your supportive comments. I would also like to thank all the Education Board Members for their excellent speeches and I look forward to working as a team to deliver the challenge we have set ourselves.

1995

In the interests of brevity, I do not intend to deal with each speech separately, but will just comment on some of the common themes, and I trust that this will be acceptable and welcomed by Members.

2000

Firstly, the lack of detail: as explained, our vision provides a structure and framework which will guide us and show how the individual workstreams dovetail and fit together and will follow as set out in appendix 2, and we intend to provide evidence-based recommendations, through consultation with all interested parties. This is not simply all words: our actions and behaviours will demonstrate that we intend to live up to the expectations we have set out in our vision.

2005

If you do want to see this as ‘motherhood and apple pie’, well, think of it as the Education Board as being your mother and giving you the recipe, the ingredients and showing you how and when to eat it.

IT bandwidth: it is a concern and we are seeking to address this and we welcome the support from the States Members on this. This generation of young are the first truly digital natives who will live in a very different world that we find ourselves.

2010

Technology: the Education Department is working with telcos in partnership with rolling out Guernsey’s Integrated Learning Environment, also known as GILE2. None of this is going to be easy, but just because it is difficult does not mean that we do not try and address it – and, yes, cost is a huge issue.

2015

Inclusion, Les Voies: this will have a positive impact and I suggest Members watch this space for September. It is an exciting opportunity tailored to our young people’s needs, and I am pleased to hear the positive feedback so far. We have an excellent headteacher in post and have high expectations. I have met with the Disability Alliance to explain the rationale for this development and I believe they now have a better understanding of why we did what we did.

2020

Selection: this will be a debate for another day and, as Deputy Le Lièvre said, the Board has not discussed this and reached a view. It is in our workplan. In my speech, I confirmed that the new structure of secondary education will include a full review of selection at 11 with recommendations.

2025

The role of Colleges and Grammar: some Members commented on no reference to the colleges. Well, there is actually no mention of any particular school, other than La Mare High and the Primary; but we do say all education establishments, whether mainstream, special, grant-aided, further education or private, working collaboratively to ensure the equality of opportunity, breadth of experience, continuity and flexibility of provision and choice. It goes without saying that colleges are part of our fabric and our education system and we will work with them going forward.

2030

La Mare High and the Primary School: La Mare, regardless of the outcome of selection debate, we need this capacity. The design will allow some flexibility, dependent on the outcome of the debate on selection, so we have future proofing. Simply delaying is *not* an option and you will undoubtedly hear far more about this in September during our prioritisation debate.

2035

Post 16: at this stage, this is merely about the GTA and Education’s mandate. Whether or not the Sixth Form Centre is included depends on the selection debate. At the same time, the Department is also working on reforming the CFE, the College for Further Education’s Development Committee, to improve corporate governance.

The Coutanchez: it makes perfect sense for the CFE to move out of the Coutanchez and become more efficient and release property. This action is neutral and should happen regardless of what happens elsewhere.

2040 The Primary phase: the Board will be working on Primary as a matter of urgency and will be reporting back to the States as soon as is practicable.

The role of parents and community: regarding the comments about parents only getting involved when it impacts on their children, the challenge for all of us is to raise the profile of education and make the community recognise the importance of it. Looking further afield, why is
2045 Finland so successful? It is because the community is highly involved and supportive of the profession. The Education Board will welcome your help in raising the profile of education and getting the community working in partnership with the profession.

Working with key partners: we are all committed to working with our partners, be they public, private or third party organisations. For example, pre-school are looking forward to working with
2050 HSSD on developing these proposals – as their Minister says, the two Departments do work closely together well.

Now, just briefly responding to some comments made by Deputy Queripel, specifically, he has some concerns about terminology, regarding demoralised teachers, etc; the use of ‘we will’,
2055 implying we are not doing it already. I would like to highlight that point 4.1 states:

‘The Vision recognises that there are many examples of excellence throughout the education service in Guernsey. [We want] to enable these examples of excellence to be further developed and extended, sharing good practice across the whole service...’

2060 We are not complacent. We want to make excellence commonplace but, as I said, the Board believes we can do better.

We absolutely do appreciate all those who work across our education system, not just teachers but our supports staff, the caretakers, cleaners, employers, parents, PTAs, as highlighted by Deputy Lowe, helpers, volunteers. For example there are 250 volunteers who help with Every
2065 Child Our Future.

Retaining teachers on licences: we have a close working relationship with Housing and may apply to extend licences for excellent teachers. Where headteachers and heads of service are able to demonstrate the essentiality of continuity of staff, we have been successful in obtaining
2070 licences. So, thank you, Housing Department for your help and support.

Problems for the Department: Mr Mulkerrin highlighted ‘level of central control’ and we are addressing that through LMS – Local Management of Schools. As in the vision, we have committed to an independent review of the Departments and are developing terms of reference to give to Scrutiny, so that this in an independent review of the Department’s performance. Perhaps
2075 this is a model which should be extended to all States Departments.

Teachers not consulted: this is a bizarre claim. Headteachers, heads of service were involved in early drafts of the vision, which were then issued for consultation. All staff across the service were invited to one of two specific presentations with questions and answers. The vision was available
2080 online on our service-wide intranet and the web statistics show nearly a thousand individuals hit on the vision page on the intranet.

I am disappointed about his scepticism about our ability to deliver, I would simply respond by saying, watch this space. My Board, with the help of headteachers, teachers, teaching assistants, staff, parents, carers and the wider community working with all Departments and this Assembly, we can turn our vision into a reality. *Carpe diem* – seize the day. *(Interjections, laughter and*
2085 *applause)*

The Bailiff: Members of the Assembly, we vote on the Propositions, which are on – Deputy Green.

Deputy Green: Sir, before we go to the vote, can I just declare an interest that I should have declared before? **(The Bailiff: Yes.)** Just out of an abundance of caution, really, just to say that, the interest I want to declare is that my cohabiting partner is a teacher within the States’ sector in Guernsey.

The Bailiff: Thank you.
2095 Deputy Sherbourne.

Deputy Sillars: Sir, me also – my wife is a teacher at the Grammar School.

The Bailiff: Thank you.
2100

Deputy Sherbourne: And me too, sir. *(Laughter)* Mine is a temporary TA down at the Link Centre.

2105 **Deputy Ogier:** And me too, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ogier.

Deputy Ogier: My wife is a TA at a primary school.

2110 **The Bailiff:** Thank you. Anybody else wish to declare an interest? No?

Deputy Fallaize: Well, sort of, sir, because... *(Laughter)* It might be slightly tenuous, but my wife... Well I do not actually know entirely what she does, but *(Laughter)* it is something to do with IT support in schools – and she agrees with Deputy Stewart about broadband, by the way. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Fallaize. Any – ?

2120 **A Member:** Sir, I have met Deputy Matt Fallaize's wife, sir.

The Bailiff: Sorry?

A Member: Sir, I have met Deputy Matt Fallaize's wife, sir, I would like to declare an interest.

2125 **Another Member:** Oh, we'll have none of that!

The Bailiff: We come to the vote, then. There are two Propositions on page 1180, I have put both Propositions to you, together those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare them carried.

2135 **Deputy Sillars:** Can I just say, thank you –

The Bailiff: Deputy Sillars.

2140 **Deputy Sillars:** – to the Assembly for their unanimous support. This is a card I got sent by a pre-school, and I take it around with me to make sure that I carry on with Education, so thank you all very much. *(Applause)*

2145 **POLICY COUNCIL AND
TREASURY AND RESOURCES DEPARTMENT**

**Strategic Asset Management Plan
Debate commenced and adjourned**

2150

Article VII.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the Report dated 3rd and 4th June, 2013, of the Policy Council and the Treasury and Resources Department, they are of the opinion:

2155 *1. To adopt the principles underpinning the Strategic Asset Management Plan as described in Section 9 of that Report.*

2. To agree that, in consultation with the Departments, developing and implementing Phase 1 of the Strategic Asset Management Plan shall commence immediately.

2160 *3. To note that all capital projects to be undertaken by States' Departments in fulfilment of the Strategic Asset Management Plan, including those identified in Phase 1, shall be subject to capital prioritisation.*

4. To note that the Treasury and Resources Department shall be responsible for making decisions on all disposals of property in fulfilment of the Strategic Asset Management Plan, including all disposals associated with the provision of 'affordable housing'.

2165

The Bailiff: Greffier.

The Senior Deputy Greffier: Article VII. Policy Council and Treasury Resources Department: Strategic Asset Management Plan.

2170

The Bailiff: The Chief Minister will open the debate.

The Chief Minister (Deputy Harwood): Thank you, sir, Members.

2175

As this is a joint Report, with the leave of the Bailiff, I will open, but Deputy Gavin St Pier will close the debate.

Sir, if I may just, first of all, premise by referring to two comments that were made in the last debate. To Deputy Queripel, who is concerned that this could be a States that promises a lot but does not deliver, to him I would urge if he supports this plan, then this actually would be an opportunity for this States to be seen to deliver.

2180

To Deputy Sherbourne who used the expression 'no sacred cows', I would ask that we also, in viewing this particular plan as far as the property portfolio of the entire States is concerned, there should be no sacred cows.

Sir, amazingly the Strategic Asset Management Plan is a first for the States of Guernsey. It is the first time that the States has attempted to look across its entire estate and decide how best to use its land and property, to meet its policy and its service objectives. Now, just saying this seems astonishing, but in common with many other governments, so we are not alone, over the years property has been accumulated by the States for one purpose and then later used for another, simply because it has been easy to do so. This Report is therefore an attempt to avoid the current process that ensues when any property becomes vacant and to stop Department clinging onto their assets as if they were prized personal possessions, notwithstanding any demand that maybe exists elsewhere within the States.

2185

But this Report is much more: it is a catalyst for change; a prompt, should we need one, to reappraise what services we offer, where they can most appropriately be located and how best they can be delivered.

2195

This last point, sir, is crucial. For too long, our buildings have dictated not only where services are provided, but how they are provided. Requiring staff to arrive and leave at roughly the same time, to each have their own dedicated office or workstation and to record when they arrive and leave are just some of the established practices that persist across the States, but they are practices that do not necessarily belong in a 21st century world. In this century, public increasingly want to interact with us – I hate to say this – via the internet. Our staff would want to be provided with the technology to enable them to take services to where people live, rather than requiring them to clog up our roads coming to us, and our focus should be on how we can show we have made a difference to people's lives, rather than simply counting how many people have walked through our doors.

2200

Sir, this Report is an opportunity to rethink how we do business. It is about providing the political backing to start along a long road to review and change the way Government delivers its services.

2205

But many of you will no doubt be saying, is this Report not just yet another effort about generating monies for the FTP by selling of some of our assets? Yes, it could contribute to the FTP programme, and yes, we could result in selling off assets, but these are by-products of a vision for how we can, most effectively use our land and property, and they should not be regarded as the sole objectives.

2210

This plan should have a life of its own, irrespective of any immediate FTP benefits. There is absolutely no point in generating cash and saving money, if all we do is move people around without improving how we deliver services and, particularly, if we do not provide our hard-working staff with better workplaces. However, if we can do these things and generate FTP efficiencies and save money, is that a bad thing? No, it is not; it is a win-win.

2215

Many of you will, I am sure, want to drill down on the detail of this Report and you will have your own views about what has been suggested. I sense some of the Ministers may have their own view on individual suggestions as set out in the Report. This is understandable but in so doing, I ask you to focus on the underlying principles, in particular those described in paragraph 9.2, as

2220

further explained in paragraphs 9.3 through to 9.20. These principles are what the States is being asked to vote on.

2225 But, of course these principles, if approved, need to be applied, which is why the Report sets out a vision for the use of our land and property for the next 5 to 15 years, a vision which you not only have a chance to debate today, but also to comment on when we consider the capital prioritisation programme in September.

2230 However, it is an undeniable fact that there is a financial imperative – we must all recognise this – to save money, which is why the suggestions for phase 1 of the plan are outlined in the Report in more detail. I use the expression ‘outlined’ deliberately, because no decisions have yet been made because currently work is being done and needs to be done in consultation with each Department to test the feasibility of those suggestions, so that if they indeed prove workable, steps can then be taken to implement them as soon as possible. Such implantation should benefit us all. 2235 Whatever savings can be made from property means that there is less money to be found from other parts of departmental budgets.

Sir, so much for what the plan contains and seeks to do and what the plan is about. Perhaps, however, I can now address what the plan is *not* about and what it does *not* seek to do.

2240 It has been evident from various comments that I and other members of the Policy Council have received from States Members and, indeed, from things that have been said at recent meetings, that the Strategic Asset Measurement Plan is perceived by some as a cunningly built Trojan horse, containing a heavily-armed team of civil servants and Ministers intent on leaping out and seizing power in the form of executive government. *(Laughter)* Sir, this is not the case. It has never been the case and, indeed, had it been so, I would hardly be explaining this in the public gaze, as it would undermine the element of surprise. *(Laughter)*

2245 Can I also draw the attention of Members to the definitions of ‘strategic’ and ‘operational’, which is set out on page 1103. I will read those definitions because these have been misunderstood:

2250 ‘In this context, ‘strategic’ is defined as the ‘back-office’ work involved with the research of policy or the provision of general management or administrative services with very little, if any, contact with the public.’

And the definition:

2255 ‘In this context, ‘operational’ is defined as the customer-facing and front-line service delivery functions of a department.’

2260 I am conscious of the starting point for such suspicions may well be the reference made in the Report in briefing meetings for opportunities to co-locate Chief Officers and their strategic teams together with the Chief Executive within Frossard House. That may, somehow, have been interpreted as being a method by which people can be drawn into a spiral vortex at the centre.

2265 Regardless of what might have been applied from reading the Report or hearing a briefing, the Policy Council is adamant that such a plan is not the driving force behind this programme. There are indeed advantages, or possible advantages, in terms of daily interaction and face-to-face contact, if it was possible and sensible to house Chief Officers and their support teams together in one location. Similarly, there would be advantages if those within Departments responsible for developing strategy and policy were also together and this must surely pave the way for better working across the States.

2270 However, the Policy Council is equally aware that such advantages may well be outweighed by disadvantages rising from the breaking up of existing teams or physically removing a Chief Officer and his team from a location where interaction with operational leads will undoubtedly add to both a sense of togetherness within a Department and his understanding the real issues that face his front-line troops. In other words, this is not a ‘one size fits all’ and that must be recognised.

2275 There is no perfect answer. Of course, there will be Departments that are simply so large the Chief Officer and his team cannot be with all his team all the time. For example, unless you were to relocate the Airport alongside the Harbour, and add States Works and Guernsey Water in the same location, the Chief Officer and his team at PSD will never be together.

2280 So, while it may be a bonus if departmental back-office functions can be brought under one roof, can I emphasise that this is not the driving force behind these proposals. Indeed, it would be very sad if the principles set out in our Report are resisted simply because of fears on this score.

May I also say that it clearly must be recognised there is some benefit, surely, in bringing front-facing, in this sense of the word, operational groups together. A classic example: someone who is taking up employment in Guernsey for the first time has to go along first to sign on at the Social Security Department in one building, has to walk to the Income Tax Office in another building and then has to walk to yet a third office to the Home – (**A Member:** Housing.) to the

2285 Housing Department, to get his right to work document. Does that make sense? Surely in that context, those front-facing offices could be brought together under one roof, making life easier for all our customers – and remember that the States of Guernsey is providing a service; service implies customers.

2290 So, sir, if the principles set out in the Report are rejected, to do so would be doing our customers, the public, a gross disservice both in terms of a missed opportunity to improve what we deliver and to make more efficient use of property.

I therefore urge all States Members to support the Proposition set out in the Report.

2295 **The Bailiff:** Members, I understand there will now be just two amendments. They are the amendments that have been circulated: the first proposed by Deputy Fallaize, seconded by Deputy Soulsby; and the other proposed by Deputy Soulsby and seconded by Deputy Le Clerc.

I propose that we take Deputy Fallaize's amendment first. Deputy Fallaize.

2300 **Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.

There is now no amendment –

Deputy Brehaut: Excuse me, sir. Oh sorry, sir. We had an e-mail to say there would be an amendment –

2305 **The Bailiff:** I understand that is not going to be laid, for reasons that the Treasury and Resources Minister will explain in due course.

Deputy Fallaize.

2310 **Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.

The States has rationalised property in the past and since 2009, there has been in place a Corporate Property plan binding on all States Departments.

2315 I say that sir, really, only for the sake of balance because, once again, we have a policy letter sponsored or, on this occasion, co-sponsored by the Policy Council, where the Council is eager to impress upon the House how apparently disjointed and haphazard and unco-ordinated the States have always been. I do not think that presents an entirely accurate picture of the facts.

Nonetheless, only a fool would claim that the States could not use their property more efficiently and, clearly, there are opportunities for further rationalization. Some of those opportunities are outlined in this policy letter and I am sure that there are other which will emerge in the coming months and years.

2320 Generally, I have more sympathy for the objectives and the thrust of this policy letter and its underlying principles than I had in the case of the Government Service Plan policy letter which we debated earlier this week.

So, although I am laying this amendment, I commend the sponsoring Committees, Policy Council and T&R for, if you like, providing fresh impetus to this area of policy.

2325 Unfortunately, though, this policy letter is not in a fit state to be laid before the States. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) Or, perhaps to be more precise and slightly kinder, the policy letter is not in a condition which properly justifies the quite far-reaching Propositions which are attached to it at page 1130. That is my principal objection to it.

2330 I suspect if this policy letter had been submitted by another Committee of the States, the Policy Council would have exercised its right to defer submission of it to the States and would have sent it back to the Committee and said, 'You are outlining some sound principles, we understand where you want to go. Now you need to go away and join up the dots and fill in the gaps and come back to us with more detail.' Or they might have said, 'Why don't you report to the States under Rule 12(4) with a Proposition to note, on the understanding that there will be more detailed Propositions laid before the States in due course?' – because this policy letter reads like a Green Paper.

Paragraph 1.6 states:

2340 'The plan represents one of the most far-reaching, transformational initiatives ever undertaken by the States with he implications for all States departments and committees, their staff and the public.'

2345 But despite its avid aspirations, this policy letter is patently incomplete and, in places, is quite muddled. Sir, perhaps I should not admit this public, and I do not know whether other members feel the same way, but I have read this policy letter seven or eight times now, and quite large sections of it remain completely unintelligible to me. I have no idea what it is trying to achieve and I have no idea what I am being asked to vote for.

The initial impression is created that the States are being asked for their endorsement for a set of principles; but, on a more detailed reading, it is quite evident that voting for Propositions 1 and 2 is to endorse quite significant parts of this plan, with little if any, understanding of the effects of so doing. *(Interjections)* That has not made any difference to the state of the policy letter either. *(Laughter)*

Deputy St Pier: At least I have established what I am responsible for. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Fallaize: This paradox, sir, in this policy letter is captured at paragraph 16.5, which starts:

‘The States are being asked only to agree the principles underpinning the plan’,

but which concludes:

‘It will fall to the Policy Council, working with T&R, to decide and give approval for whatever programme of works is required in phase 1 to implement the principles agreed by the States.’

Now, I understand that major capital expenditure which may arise from this plan will come back to the States through the capital prioritisation process, but any States Member who has participated in previous rounds of the process – and there have been two, under Deputy Trott in 2007, I think, or 2008 possibly, and under former Deputy Parkinson in 2009 – any States Member who has participated in that process must know that the capital prioritisation debate and report is not an appropriate place to consider the use of property right across the States portfolio. We just will not be able to do that in that debate.

So, sir, if the States aspire to making well-informed and reasoned resolutions, I really do not believe the States can have anything to do with Propositions 1 and 2 as drafted. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)**

Sir, my amendment qualifies Proposition 1, substitutes Proposition 2 and adds a new Proposition 2A, and I will take them in turn.

Proposition 1 as drafted in the policy letter is unclear in the extreme. It recommends to adopt the principles as described in section 9 of that Report, but 18 of the 20 paragraphs in section 9 are not restricted merely to principles at all. Section 9 includes separating departmental functions, working environments, document management, hot-desking – whatever that is *(Laughter)* – and a new strategy for the delivery of front-line services.

Sir, they are details, though they are presented speculatively, and yet they are in section 9 of this Report and the States are being asked, in Proposition 1 to adopt the principles as described in section 9 of that Report. Well clearly, if the States votes for Proposition 1, they are not restricting themselves to adopting merely principles.

In fact, one paragraph, I think it is 9.20, which the States is being asked to adopt, there is a line in there explaining something which says:

‘... the detail of how and when this is to occur and who will fund and organise it has yet to be determined.’

And yet, that is covered by or incorporated in Proposition 1 which the States are being asked to adopt. I do not see how we can possibly adopt something if it is in that condition, sir.

I am content to agree to the principles of this plan, because I agree with them. They are set out at paragraphs 9.1 and 9.2 of the policy letter, but I am not content to agree to the other parts of section 9 which have nothing to do with principles and for which, as yet, no case has been made. If amended, Proposition 1 would read, ‘to adopt the vision statement and the principles underpinning the plan as described in paragraphs 9.1 and 9.2 of that report’.

Sir, Proposition 2 is to agree to the immediate implementation of the plan or to agree that the commencement of implementation will begin immediately. Sir, I have never tried to nail jelly to a wall, *(Laughter)* but if I tried I think it would be rather like trying to establish what the scope of phase 1 of this policy Report is actually meant to be about, because there is absolutely no clarity in this policy letter, concerning where phase 1 of the plan starts and where phase 1 of the plan ends. Above all, that is what makes this plan completely unintelligible.

In section 10 of the policy letter, there are references to the ‘indicative’ Strategic Asset Management Plan and the ‘indicative’ plan for phase 1. Yet the States is being asked to agree at Proposition 2 to the immediate implementation of phase 1. Sir, there is no clarity, no certainty and therefore I am not persuaded to agree to the immediate implementation of phase 1, especially not when, so far as I can work out, the initial investment required before the end of next year is £11

million or £12 million. I would have to say to Members, do they have sufficient information before them? Is this policy letter adequate to agree to proposals of that scale?

2410 I could vote for Proposition 2 and agree to this indicative phase 1, but I will be voting for it without knowing what I was agreeing to, so I will not do that. Instead I would like to delete it and substitute the Proposition 2 in my amendment, which would ensure that the States were presented with detailed proposals for what is necessary to fulfil the principles of this plan and to explain properly how, in practice, this plan can be stitched together coherently.

2415 Sir, I would ask the States to give consideration to SAP. SAP, I am reliably informed, is a good system, but quite plainly, it has been very poorly implemented. That was because, in its planning phase, it was not given sufficient time, it was not given sufficient thought and I think there are many, many similarities between this policy letter and the way in which SAP was developed.

2420 Sir, certain elements of this plan do have political as well as operational consequences. Some of them are set out in the nine suggestions which are contained in section 10 of the policy letter – but again, I am completely unclear about which of those suggestions are part of phase 1 and which are not. Some of them clearly are. Some of them in section 10 of the policy letter are linked inextricably to phase 1, but with others it is left for the reader to make up his or her own mind.

2425 One that clearly is part of phase 1, I think, is the separation of strategic and operational functions across the States, which includes, but is obviously not limited to: centralising in one building all Chief Officers and their immediate support staff.

2430 Now, I think that as Propositions 1 and 2 stand, though certainly not in my amended versions, the States are being asked to agree to, or to adopt, that separation. I know what Deputy Harwood said when he opened debate, but if you read the Propositions and then cross-reference them to the sections of the Report they refer to, it is quite clear, because it says that Proposition 1 asked the States to adopt principles as described in section 9 of that Report, and Proposition 2 asked the States to agree to the immediate implementation of phase 1, it is quite clear from this policy letter that phase 1 includes the centralisation of all Chief Officers and their immediate support staff.

2435 In fact, sir, I think that somewhere in here... I cannot find it now, but somewhere in here, there are words which put it beyond doubt. It is at paragraph 10.9:

‘A key proposal of the indicative SAMP is thus to separate strategic and operational functions.’

2440 Now, the indicative SAMP is what is referred to throughout this policy letter as phase 1. So, it is quite clear to me that if the States... We have to consider the Propositions as they are written and if the States votes for the Propositions unamended, they are voting to adopt or to agree to the separation of strategic and operational functions across the States.

2445 Section 9, which Proposition 1 recommends be adopted, states that in respect of this separation of functions, quote:

‘It is considered that the advantages of the proposed approach outweigh the disadvantages.’

2450 And yet, in section 11, which is not subject to any of the Propositions, it states that nobody has determined that practicality and benefits of separating those functions. Well, how could it possibly be that in one section of this policy letter, we are told that the advantages of separation outweigh the disadvantages and a few paragraphs later, we are told that nobody has determined the practicality and benefits of separating the functions?

2455 Sir, I think it is premature, whether implicitly or otherwise, to agree to something of significance for which no case has been made – hence the new Proposition 2A which my amendment is seeking to insert, which notes that there has not been any determination about the separation yet and directs that, in advance of any such separation, the Policy Council and T&R shall lay before the States their considered opinion of the likely advantages and disadvantages of implementing such a separation.

2460 Sir, I know that some Committees’ functions are separated in that way today, and I know that there are other Committees who more or less have all their staff based in one building; but that is quite different to establishing the policy of a uniformed separation and centralisation of every Committee’s most senior staff, which is far-reaching.

2465 But, in any event, sir, that is only one of the many inadequacies and flaws which dominate this policy letter. I have to say, I was astounded by the amendment that was circulated this morning by two members of the sponsoring Committee of this Report – astounded, because it seemed to me that they believed that the only flaw in this policy letter was the proposal to separate Chief Officers and operational members of staff, and actually, the remarks which the Chief Minister has made in opening debate rather underline that. But the flaws in this policy letter go far, far deeper than that particular issue.

2470 I do not see an enormous conspiracy being organised by the authors of this policy letter to centralise Chief Officers. I believe in... well, I will not use the word, but Members will know what I mean – I believe in something rather than conspiracy, in respect of this matter, but that is just one element. The biggest problem with this policy letter is that as a States Member, and I know there are other Members who feel the same way, I cannot discern, from this policy letter, what I am
2475 being asked to agree to. That is a far, far deeper problem than this issue of the separation of strategic and operational functions.

Sir, this amendment does not seek to stop property rationalisation and much that is in this policy letter and is operational could proceed now under the present corporate property plan, if Departments and the Policy Council and T&R are agreed on vacating and refurbishing buildings and relocating staff, they can get on with doing that now. They do not need a grand plan to do that. They do not even need a States resolution to do that.

In any event, sir, we are not dealing here with a sudden crisis. There are times when the States needs to act with speed, above all other considerations. We debated a topic that fell into that category earlier in this meeting, with the purchase of aircraft and guaranteeing loan facilities to Aurigny. But there are times, and I think this is one of them, where the overwhelming need is not for a speedy decision but for the *right* decision, and from what I can see there has been insufficient thought to how the implementation of this plan will work in practice and what its risks are and what its effects are. The States been there before and invariably when the States acts with undue speed and agrees to things which are not properly thought through, there are problem which later
2490 ensue.

Sir, I am not asking the States to reject the principles of this plan, but I am asking the States not to be enticed by those principles into voting for Propositions which are plainly without proper justification and which, in any event, are ill defined and imprecise. I do not have sufficient information upon which to agree to the quite far-reaching Propositions as they stand, and I require the authors of this plan to give the effect of their ideas more consideration and more scrutiny. I require a proper case to build upon the principles enunciated in this policy letter and, in the meantime, I am not prepared to delegate to the Policy Council or to T&R, or to anybody else for that matter, responsibility for approving, quote, ‘whatever programme of works is necessary’ to fulfil what are promising but nonetheless general and imprecise principals. To do so, sir, would absolutely fly in the face of the States desire to make informed and reasoned decisions.

Sir, in their policy letter on access to information the Policy Council warned against adopting what they called a ‘big bang’ approach. Sir, they used the right words in the wrong policy letter. (Applause)

2505 *Amendment:*

1. In Proposition 1, to add the words “the vision statement and” immediately after the words “To adopt” and immediately before the words “the principles”; and to delete the words “Section 9” and substitute therefor the words “Paragraphs 9.1 and 9.2.”.

2510 *2. To delete Proposition 2 and substitute therefor:*

“2. To direct the Policy Council and the Treasury and Resources Department, after having undertaken in conjunction with departments the further feasibility studies referred to in paragraph 16.5 of that Report, jointly to lay before the States detailed proposals for any programme of works they consider necessary to contribute towards fulfilling, in part or in whole, the vision statement and principles outlined in paragraphs 9.1 and 9.2 of that Report.”

3. To insert a new Proposition 2A as follows:

“2A. To note that paragraph 11.3 of that Report acknowledges that no determination has yet been made about the extent of the practicality and benefits of separating strategic and operational functions and, as referred to in paragraph 10.12 of that Report, locating in one building all Chief Officers and their immediate strategy/support teams; and therefore to direct that in advance of any such separation, and after having undertaken in conjunction with departments further feasibility studies, the Policy Council and the Treasury and Resources Department shall lay before the States, either in the report referred to in Proposition 2 above or in another report, their considered opinion of the likely advantages and disadvantages of implementing such a separation.”

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby, do you formally second the amendment?

2530 **Deputy Soulsby:** I do and reserve my right to speak.

The Bailiff: Thank you.

I will call first Deputy Domaille, followed by Deputy O'Hara and then Deputy Spruce.

Deputy Domaille: Thank you, sir.

2535 I will be supporting this amendment for many of the reasons that Deputy Fallaize has already outlined.

Before setting out my reasons, and by way of information for those Members who may not be aware of my past employment history, I was actively involved in property matters for the States of Guernsey for many years – so long, in fact, that I have the somewhat unique achievement of being
2540 part of a team that built a building and later, as a member of another team, pulling it down. *(Laughter)* I do not quite know what that says about my abilities, but that is a fact!

I was Chief Property Manager for the Board of Administration and later the Strategic Property Adviser to the Advisory and Finance Committee. It follows that I have extensive knowledge of the States property portfolio and the pitfalls involved in a programme such as the one we are debating
2545 today.

Sir, I have a number of concerns regarding these proposals. In short, as it is phrased in paragraph 1.6, the SAMP, or Strategic Asset Management Plan represents:

2550 'one of the most far-reaching transformational initiatives ever to be undertaken by the States, with implications for all States' departments and committees, their staff, and the public at large.'

I do not consider this Assembly should give it a green light on the basis of this Report and the nine suggestions – suggestions; not firm, properly considered proposals – contained within the Report.

2555 The Report itself acknowledges that there are several major implications and issues that have to be considered and we should not sign off before the necessary work has been done. Before I expand on my concerns, I must stress I fully support the concept of strategic asset management and the States adopting a strategic asset management approach, as set out in section 6 of the Report.

2560 So, what are my concerns? Firstly, I am concerned the Report is hasty. I am not at all convinced that the costs are reliable, that sufficient thought has been given to the consequences or that options have been properly considered. The devil is definitely in the detail. It is very risky and most unwise to commence a project as important as this without proper forethought. We have only
2565 to look to the SAP project as an example of a project carried out in haste, with insufficient resources and recognition of the pitfalls. The magnitude of the issues facing SAP pales into insignificance when compared the Strategic Asset Management Plan.

Secondly, Deputy Fallaize has already alluded to this, the notion of separating Departments and Chief Officers from their staff is flawed. Staff are already feeling unwanted and not involved. They look to their Chief Officer for help and support and physical presence is important. I realise
2570 this is probably the same rationale that has been adopted to justify moving Chief Officers to be with other Chief Officers and the Chief Executive, but staff require daily help and support. Sir, if the mountain will not go to Mohammed, then Mohammed must go to the mountain. In this case, the mountain is the 1,700 or so civil servants.

2575 As an associate issue the proposals as drafted would also have the effect of distancing board members from departmental staff.

Thirdly, with regard to my Department, I understand the intention is to split Forward Planning from the Planning Section. The notion of splitting planning staff is counter to Shepley and can only be detrimental to provisions of planning services and cause difficulties in the management of staff. For Members' information, Chris Shepley carried out an independent review of the planning
2580 service in 2008 and it is his recommendations that have formed the bedrock of our Planning Service which, I am sure Members will agree, is functioning better than it has ever done before.

Shepley expressly stated the Planning Department must be kept together and policy and decision-making are inextricably linked, with one feeding the other, and there must be close contact and liaison between the two sections. In fairness, he also said that planning should not sit
2585 with the Environment Department – but he did not get everything right!

Sir, the proposals pay no heed to the fact that the majority of Environment staff – planners, building control officers, environmental services officers, etc – have to visit sites all over the Island, the majority on a daily basis. It follows personal transport is essential and so is the provision of car parking. Sir Charles Frossard House is the logical site for the Environment
2590 Department in its entirety, especially when the numbers of daily visitors are put into the equation as well.

While on the Environment Department, if my suggestion re Sir Charles Frossard House is followed, then Traffic could be considered for inclusion, freeing up Bulwer Avenue.

2595 I appreciate paragraph 11.3 makes it clear that, and I quote:

‘The degree to which this *principle* of separation is practical or beneficial will form part of the consultations with departments before any part of the intended [Strategic Asset Management Plan] is implemented.’

2600 And yet section 9, which we are asked to adopt, takes it as a given, as Deputy Fallaize has already said.

Fourthly, Sir Charles Frossard House is the largest building we have and is the most accessible and publicly known building. The vast majority of people rely on the car for transport, even though I am promoting the buses, and Sir Charles Frossard House is the only building with sufficient parking to accommodate public visitors.

2605 If we are serious about providing public services, then Sir Charles Frossard House is the best site to receive visitors. It follows that Sir Charles Frossard House is the best place to locate back-room public-facing staff, which are the largest proportion of staff, in the States’ largest building. They will be sited in one building, not split as under the current proposals, which, if adopted, would be confusing to the public.

2610 Strategic Policy staff could be located at Edward T Wheadon House or the Tourist Information Centre.

I would add, the argument about receptions does not stand up. There are many buildings in shared use, with different companies on different floors, each of which share a front desk and have their own receiving areas.

2615 In conclusion, sir, I support the principle of having a Strategic Asset Management Plan and the carrying out of further development of that plan, but only on the clear understanding that more considered proposals are submitted to this Assembly before works are commenced.

2620 Finally, sir, in asking Members to support this amendment, I ask Deputy Fallaize to clarify that the ongoing property management functions of the States can continue, pending the submission of more considered proposals to this Assembly.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy O’Hara.

2625 **Deputy O’Hara:** Well, thank you, sir.

Sir, Members will have noticed that I do not often get to my feet in the Assembly. I would like to think that, over my time in Government, I have been able to discuss Reports and amendments before they reach debate in the Assembly and establish the reasons behind the policies.

2630 However, in this instance, I feel I must object to parts of these proposals which are very far-reaching and what appear to me to be overoptimistic.

The principles within the Report are to be applauded. However from a practical and fiscal point of view, like Deputy Fallaize, I believe them to be flawed. The authors and supporters of the Report ask us to adopt or note the ideals that are suggested, but I find myself with difficulty to even agree to these at this stage because, put quite simply, I believe we have inadequate information to commit, even at these initial levels.

2635 In short, I would want far more information, together with a much more refined and rigorous schedule of advantages and disadvantages and any risk factors before making a decision.

2640 The Report makes a point that we must commit to the actions of these proposals, to assist and reach FTP targets. This is admirable, but as I have been saying for a considerable time, we must give great thought to how we tackle FTP and the effect those decisions have on our infrastructure and culture. It is so easy to make the wrong decision based on little information.

Now, I suspect, sir, that there will be other Members who will feel the same way as I do and will also bring to the attention of the Assembly some and more of the points I wish to raise.

2645 In essence, the crux of the Report is to relocate staff from present accommodation into new areas, thus releasing property to be sold, leased or reused for other purposes. Sweating our assets in this way is a good idea and I have, in principle, no objections to doing this, but not in such a hurried, express-train fashion which this Report proposes. The Report asks that we separate staff into separate areas of strategic and front-facing duties and the start of this very ambitious scheme is to adopt front-facing staff in phase 1 of the proposals. It sees alterations to Sir Charles Frossard House, Edward T Wheadon House, and the Old States Office which many people will know as the Tourist Information Centre.

The Report states that these buildings are not fit for purpose and moneys will need to be expended on them, but what are the definite costs to achieve these modifications? I cannot see a proper detailed breakdown in this Report and that gives me concern.

2655 We are also asked to consider a very noticeable movement and increase of staff into Sir Charles Frossard House – Law Officers, Commerce and Employment, Culture and Leisure and others will be asked to vacate their present premises to relocate into Frossard House. We all know that the building is already overcrowded and parking is almost impossible at times. Indeed, the
2660 Report acknowledges the car-parking problems and suggests it could be rectified by staggering the start and finishing times of the staff to compensate for this problem. Well, I cannot believe this is very practical and cannot see staff being satisfied with this arrangement at all.

As I have stated previously, the three buildings are to be used for front-facing duties, in order to allow the public to pay bills, meet with staff, etc. Well, I could not think of a more inconvenient
2665 plan for the public, who would have to find a place to park to visit these offices. Car parking within town is horrendous and the added visitors to these buildings will only create more difficulties in what are already very overcrowded car parks. Again, I feel this is not practical and, as I have stated, will only lead to more pressure on town parking.

We now come to the Old States Offices. Can I say immediately that this is not me, as Minister of Culture and Leisure, being protective of the Department's quarters – far from it. We would not
2670 object to being moved. Indeed, plans are being looked at to vacate various members of staff to other departments concerned with the Department. This is totally about the fact that this wonderful historic building is an important asset to our tourist industry. It is a proud civic building which reflects on the impression it gives to our visitors. It plays an important part in our visitor offer. I believe it is one of the important gateways into Guernsey's culture and heritage.

2675 To put this into perspective, the footfall into the centre is noticeable and may come as a surprise to some Members and general public. For your record, the footfalls over recent times are as follows: in 2010, there were 115,000 people; in 2011, it rose to 131,000; and in 2012, it rose to 135,000. To the end of June this year, the figure is already 141,000 and it is highly likely that the
2680 final figure will reach 175,000 by the end of 2013. This reflects the refurbishment work which has recently been carried out at the Information Centre, together with the hardworking staff which have to be congratulated.

For those who may have doubts, can I say that these footfall numbers are *purely* into the Information Centre only. They exclude visitors to the Bureau de Change and visitors to other floors.

2685 The building is light and airy and is capable of coping with the footfall that I have just quoted. It provides a very welcoming space to greet and help visitors. I believe it shouts out, 'We are Guernsey – come in and have a look around and talk to us'.

What I do not want to see is the Information Centre being reduced into a building that is unable to cope with the number of visitors. I do not want it to become an impersonal area which, sadly, I
2690 have seen in so many other parts of the world. It is an important area. It was for these very reasons that I took a very robust attitude to SAMP, when it was presented to the Policy Council.

Members, I have to tell you that when this Report was first brought to the Policy Council, the authors wanted to locate two new information centres, one at the Airport and one at the Harbour. With the greatest respect to the authors, this initial decision can only be described as foolish. Sir,
2695 what do visitors first do when they first arrive at their holiday destination? They grab their bags and head straight for their hotel. Will they visit the centres in those two spots? No. Will they go back to the Airport later or the Harbour later to look round? No.

When quizzed about this point, the authors stated that they had consulted on this matter and were told it was a good idea. Well, who did they consult with? It certainly was not my
2700 Department, who are the front face of tourism. There had been no consultation with my staff about the use or closure of the Information Centre or the alternative port centre.

Members should know that the first time my Department and I received the SAMP details was on the Thursday afternoon, when my Policy Council papers arrived for the following Monday's meetings. I *immediately* consulted my Chief Officer who, like myself, knew nothing about these
2705 proposals. This, I believe, is a clear indication of how little, if no, consultation or communication in connection with this Report happened. Well, this is simply not satisfactory and whilst I applaud the authors' hard work and efforts in producing a report to meet FTP targets, I have to say, we should have been better informed and provided with more information.

2710 Having got that off my chest, I have to say that my robust challenge at Policy Council was heeded and the Report in front of you now states that the Information Centre will be relocated to another town position – but where? Where would you be able to cope? Where would you put the

Information Centre to cope with an annual footfall of 150,000 people? What other building would you use to provide to give the visitor the same impressive facility that the present centre provides?

2715 I can remember Jersey moving their information centre from a superb historic building near their millennium... *(Interjection)* thank you, Liberation Square and that caused many problems. Tourists to this day struggle to find where the centre is. I do not want that. We do not need that. Wherever the centre is, it has got to be very accessible and it has got to say, 'This is Guernsey'.

The Culture and Leisure staff can be relocated from the centre, leaving areas to be leased. However, I believe, strongly that the Visitor Centre should remain where it is.

2720 Incidentally, and ironically, the Culture and Leisure Department was moved from Sir Charles Frossard House down to the Information Centre some while ago, because it was recognised that the vast majority of the staff were front-facing, dealing with tourists and associated events.

Okay, as Deputy Jones would say, I have had my rant. I am sure by now you know my feelings and that tourism is vitally important and the Visitor Centre should remain untouched.

2725 Let me get back, very briefly, to some other sections of the Report. Section 17 states that we have already employed consultants to establish phase 1 proposals and further professional advice will be needed to firm up other requirements of the future works, including IT. I have to wonder why we need that advice. I am sure that we have the expertise in our staff to do this work. I do not want to be totally pessimistic, it is not in my character. I have always been an optimist and have a pro-active approach to life, but the lack of information and consultation within this Report is very concerning, to say the least.

I do like some aspects of the Report and can understand and semi-support the principles. However, I must draw Members' attention to clause 16.5 of the Report. The Report states that the Assembly will decide... The Report generally decides that the Assembly will decide on the various aspects of the projects as they progress. However section 16.5 makes it quite clear that phase 1 works will bypass States approval and place the final decisions in the hands of the Policy Council and T&R. I will read it out. I know that Deputy Fallaize has brought it to your attention but I want to read it out:

2740 'Finally, via this report, the States is being asked only to agree *the principles* underpinning the SAMP. Nonetheless, it must be understood that the imperative for its prompt implementation means that once further feasibility work has been undertaken in conjunction with departments, as part of its responsibility for the FTP, it will fall to the Policy Council, working ... with Treasury and Resources, to decide and give approval for whatever programme of works, etc, is required in Phase 1 to implement promptly the principles agreed by the States.'

2745 Well, I do not like that. I may be wrong, but I think that is what it says: it is up to T&R and Policy Council to do it and forget the States decision. But surely we, as a body of the States, must give approval for phase 1 and anything else that is far-reaching that this Report devours in its path. I know that some of my fellow Policy Council members disagree with me and they are happy to approve these proposals. However, I am sure you can understand, now, that I have made my feelings perfectly clear to them and I believe that this Report is being hurried through.

I could carry on being even more critical about this hurried Report, but I shall leave this to others. *(Interjections and laughter)* I am generally optimistic and proactive and want to improve all that Guernsey has, to benefit the Islanders. However, I find it difficult to agree to proposals which seem to be *rushing* through at breakneck speed without due consideration to the effect on the Island. I *know* that FTP is important but, sadly, in our efforts to meet these FT proposals we seem to have developed an approach which sees us making cuts irrespective of the effect that they have on our very culture of Guernsey. I sometimes think we are being whipped into FT submission, no matter what the consequences.

2760 I have real concern for the path we seem to be taking at the moment. Guernsey is changing every day for the worse and we need to be careful and cautious in what we are doing. We *must not* destroy all the hard work that previous generations have done in the past to make Guernsey the great place it is today. Decisions made now are difficult, if not impossible to change in the future.

2765 This Report needs more time. This report needs more consultation. This Report needs to mature to a better and more informed level. In short, it needs more thought.

The Fallaize-Soulsby amendment needs to be fully supported. It provides the time, I believe, that is needed to fulfil all I have said; and I will also be supporting the Soulsby-Le Clerc amendment as well.

2770 Thank you, sir. *(Applause)*

The Bailiff: Deputy Spruce and then Deputy Duquemin.

Deputy Spruce: Thank you, sir.

2775 Members, may I start by recording my 100% support for the rationalisation of the States property portfolio. After all, why would I not? Its primary aim is imminently sensible and long overdue.

2780 But sadly, even though the Report is jointly sponsored by the Policy Council and Treasury and Resources Departments and even though a delay in implementation may have an impact on our FTP targets, I find myself, as a T&R board member, unable to accept the Report in its current form.

I object to the lack of thought-through evidence, the lack of sensible, realistic analysis of the financial business case for the project. I object to the lack of any detailed consultation with departmental boards and some of the fundamental suggestions made in this Report.

2785 I object to personally being expected to rubberstamp this Report. I chair the T&R Property Services Sub-Committee and we, on that Committee, had no input whatsoever. *In fact*, the T&R board were not consulted until a couple of days before the Report went to print. (*Laughter*) That, in my view – I have made this point clear already – is not acceptable, especially as we are joint signatories to the Report and my name is on that Report.

2790 I object to the conclusions drawn by a very small team of senior officers about how the future should look. This project is far-reaching and represents a major step forward in how the States utilises its huge property portfolio. I personally feel that the Report has been produced in haste by a small group of civil servants who had to fit this in amongst their very busy day jobs.

2795 The significance of these proposals and the potential for improved efficiency and financial gain are huge, especially if this project is carefully thought through and managed correctly. Getting the project foundations correct first time and buy-in from all staff and States Members is vital. In my view, these proposals should be developed and managed by professionals tasked to do the job. I mean this as no criticism of anyone, but this is not a job for inexperienced senior officers, delegated to manage a huge change process as a bolt-on to their daily workload.

2800 Members, I ask you to support the Fallaize-Soulsby amendment and the principal aim of the States Asset Management Plan.

The Bailiff: Deputy Duquemin.

2805 **Deputy Duquemin:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I will speak on the amendment and in general debate. It is not every day that I disagree with my Minister at Culture and Leisure – most days, but not every day – but sir, today is one of those days. I am in total support of the principles of the Strategic Asset Management Plan Report and believe that, when implemented, the suggestions 1 to 9 will all make a difference to the effectiveness of the States of Guernsey. That is what I, as a Deputy, want to help bring about.

2810 Suggestion 1 focuses on the separation of strategic and operational functions – front and back office, by another name. This is a suggestion that I want to concentrate on during my contribution to this debate, but I support all of the other eight, too.

2815 For me, 9.13 is a key paragraph in this Report and it is one that I would like to highlight specifically. It says:

‘The co-location of similar activities should generate improved efficiencies in both the use of buildings but, most importantly, in ease of access for customers and service users.’

2820 That last phrase is key for me. It explains that the most important reason for co-locating services is not for the benefit of the States of Guernsey itself; it is for the benefit of its customers. It is all about making a difference and that is a much-needed move in the right direction.

Government should be as user-friendly as possible and, like any successful business, should look to focus on and serve the needs of its customers first, not its own needs.

2825 Paragraph 9.14 continues:

‘... utilising buildings in a way that enhances service delivery and cross-departmental working rather than being confined solely for a specific department’s use.’

2830 Paragraph 9.15 accepts that:

‘it is recognised that there are bound to be challenges in the separation of the strategic and delivery arms of some departments; but ... the advantages of the proposed approach outweigh the disadvantages.’

2835 It will be researched, to answer one of Deputy Matt Fallaize’s questions, but, in other words, it is admitting ‘no pain, no gain’.

Sir, all Departments need to extract themselves from any silo mentality that still exists and they need to ask themselves, how can they embrace SAMP and do their bit to the greater cause, even if, for them, there appears, at first glance, to be a little pain? And this is where, as an example, Culture and Leisure, a board that I sit on, must do its bit, even if it is perceived by some to be a bit of a pain. I focus on C&L, but a similar story will apply to almost all other Departments.

Sir, point 10.10 starts to put some flesh on the bones of suggestion 1, the separation of strategic and operational functions. It says it is planned to deliver:

‘customer-facing services from two, convenient, locations in St Peter Port – Edward T Wheadon House and the Old States Office (currently occupied by Culture and Leisure and used as the Tourist Information Centre)’.

Point 10.11 continues to explain how this change will:

‘enhance the customer experience, and provide opportunities for inter-departmental and inter-agency working’.

Mr Bailiff, Members of the States, how many times have we heard the cry for joined-up Government and delivery of services? Suggestion 1 of this Report is all about putting this joined-up philosophy into action, to make a difference. Let us stop talking about joined-up Government and let us start *doing* joined-up Government. (A Member: Hear, hear.) Let us start joining up Government.

Sir, let us return to the question of the Old States Office. It *is* a wonderful building, in a great location and with a tremendous history. There is a fascinating picture on the wall, just inside the door, that shows the whole of the Civil Service – about 20 people – standing outside the building in which they worked. It was, as its name suggests, the States Office. I see the proposed eclectic use of the Old States Office as a big idea, a back-to-the-future idea that I wholeheartedly support. Having a flagship building in the heart of St Peter Port – a light and airy one as described by Deputy O’Hara – where customers – I deliberately use the phrase ‘customers’ again, sir – where *customers* go for services provided by the Island’s Government and also, possibly, key agencies for the Island’s third sector is a big idea that I see as making a real difference to Islanders in the years to come. I support this big idea that will show Government as closer to Islanders, less remote.

The States of Guernsey provides some first-class service to our customers and we should not hide them away in a back street. We should shine a light on them in one of the highest profile buildings that we have in our portfolio. That building *is* the Old States Office where, I repeat, there is a wonderful back-to-the-future idea that we can and must exploit.

So to turn this idea into reality, Culture and Leisure must happily play its part in the brave new world where we are putting customers first. The Guernsey Information Centre Service that is provided by C&L at the Old States Office is a vital one, but, as it says on the footnote 13, on page 1103, beneath point 10.11, alternative premises, in a central St Peter Port location, for the Tourist Information Centre, would need to be sought and would be investigated with vigour if the suggestions in this Report were adopted. That is great, fine.

Initially, I admit, I had missed the footnote and thought that a great report was otherwise silent on a new home for the Guernsey Information Centre; but I am more than happy with the commitment to find alternative premises with vigour.

I have no doubt that one of the many empty shops in St Peter Port or perhaps a new building created as part of the Port’s Master Plan vision will serve as an even better home to the Guernsey Information Centre than its current home in the Old States Office – a win-win; perhaps more gain than pain for C&L in the long run.

Talking of win-win, if we can put customers first and save taxpayers’ money at the same time, even better. Property rationalisation makes sense and is the sort of workstream that the FTP is all about.

The organogram on page 1111 lists the variety of services that could be offered to customers from these two central locations. A quick glance at the list reveals that often these services will be hugely complementary. It makes sense for me, and it is a point that I have already made in this Assembly, sir, that the front-office-desk, customer-facing team of Social Security and Income Tax, particularly Contributions, are in one building. How many times have customers had to traipse between Edward T Wheadon House in Le Truchot to the Income Tax Offices in the Albany, simply to ask two similar, simple questions for making two separate payments to the States of Guernsey? It was a point that Deputy Hardwood did raise earlier.

Better our customers go to the new Old States Office to ask their two questions and make two payments at neighbouring desks – or better, at one desk with one payment. Let us start to put our customers first. (A Member: Hear, hear.)

2900 Sir, as previewed, I have concentrated on only one of the nine SAMP suggestions but I would stress that I could have spoken in equally effusive manner on all of the other eight. As Deputy Harwood stated in his opening speech, it is astonishing that this is the first time that a plan that looks at the whole of the States property portfolio has been created. As a Government with more plans than the aforementioned Baldrick, this is a plan that I feel very confident will make a real tangible difference.

2905 Mr Bailiff, this is a largely well conceived and hugely positive States Report that will make a difference. I want the States to adopt the principles that underpin SAMP, Proposition 1. I want to start work *now* (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and I want buy-in from all departments, including Culture and Leisure – Proposition 2.

2910 I accept the housekeeping in Propositions 3 and 4, including a restatement of T&R's role in the delivery of SAMP.

Sir, I understand some Members' concerns with point 16.5 and clearly, neither the Policy Council or Treasury and Resources were trying to hide anything because it is one of the few paragraphs, perhaps the only one, that is in all bold type. If the only way we can start – I repeat, *start* – to get on with a job when we leave here today is by voting it through with the amendments, 2915 I am happy to accept this expediency, but let us not let process get in the way of progress.

Sir, sometimes we must not think of ourselves as 10 different Departments and the Policy Council. Sometimes we must not think of ourselves as 45 different Deputies and two representatives from Alderney. Sometimes we must think of ourselves as *one Government*. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Our customers often refer to us as a single entity, 'the States', and the adoption of SAMP is one way that I believe we can work, as one, to put those customers first. 2920

I urge everybody to support all of the Propositions, whether or not they are amended.

Thank you, sir. (*Applause*)

2925 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby, then Deputy Wilkie, Deputy Stewart, Deputy Collins.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, I totally support the concept of the Strategic Asset Management Plan and, in theory, how can anyone object? I believe that the diagram on page 1098, which sets a vision, makes good, logical sense – at least in theory, and more on that in a minute.

2930 I would like to focus on three specific points to explain why I cannot support this plan, as it stands, and why I urge Members to support this amendment.

I will firstly focus on the strategic nature of the plan itself. Now, the Institute of Asset Management – yes, there is one – defines an asset management plan as a:

2935 'Document specifying activities and resources, responsibilities and timescales for implementing the asset management strategy and delivering the asset management objectives.'

An asset management strategy is defined as a:

2940 'Long-term optimized approach to management of the assets, derived from, and consistent with, the organizational strategic plan and the asset management policy ...
The asset management strategy converts the objectives of the organizational strategic plan and the asset management policy into a high-level, long-term action plan for the assets and/or asset system(s), the asset portfolios and/or the asset management system.'

2945 In other words, the organisational strategy comes at the beginning and the plan at the end of the process. However, we have been presented with a plan which is also setting organisational strategy. It quite openly sets out the need for the division between operational and strategic functions in the States of Guernsey. The first time we, as Members, should hear about this should not be in the Strategic Asset Management Plan. It is a bit like going to see a film that has been advertised as a western and the watching it and finding out it is a sci-fi movie. 2950

Let me be clear, this does not mean I am against change. There are clearly problems with the current structure. However, nowhere in the Strategic Asset Management Plan does it set out why this structure would work better than now. My own belief is that no new structure will work unless and until there is a cultural change and a more collaborative approach from the centre – something 2955 I mentioned in the debate on the Government Service Plan and so I will not go over all that again now.

I would now like Members to turn to page 1129, to appendix 2. It is two more than Deputy Laurie Queripel has now. This sets out the plan's compliance with the six principles of good governance, according to the authors of this Report. Some of the statements are tenuous at best and the case of Core Principle 4, totally misleading. 2960

Core Principle 4 states:

'Good governance means taking informed, transparent decisions and managing risk.'

2965 and the supporting principles for Core Principle 4 are being rigorous and transparent about how decisions are taken; having and using good quality information, advice and support; and making sure that an effective risk management system is in place.

2970 The previous Public Accounts Committee in its Report in 2011 on good governance used the example of the long-running saga of pay parking to fund the road transport strategy, to highlight the importance of compliance with Core Principle 4. They stated:

'The time and money spent on this issue demonstrates the difficulty experienced when attempting to implement decisions of the States of Deliberation which have been made on the basis of outline, in-principle decisions and/or amendments, but which lack detailed analysis and costs.'

2975 We have no idea from this Report whether there is a complete property register, whether any cost benefit analysis had been done including consideration of life cycle costs or that any proper risk analysis has been done. None of that is apparent in this Report. I do not see a section headed up 'risks' that explicitly states potential issues that will have to be managed, such as impact of another new project on what we are told is a Civil Service already overburdened with work; the impact of changes on different ways of working; the possibility that these proposals may conflict with other strategies that are currently in progress, such as 2020 and the Education Vision.

2980 I refer all Members to pages 1120 and 1121, and would like to ask you all, are you happy approving £12 million-worth of expenditure on the back of the information you see in this Report, and the fact there is clear non-compliance with Core Principle 4?

2985 And that leads me to my final point. Perhaps we would be happy giving Policy Council and Treasury and Resources the benefit of the doubt if there was proven recent track record of effective project implementation. *(Laughter)* Members will be aware that at the last States meeting, the Treasury and Resources Minister stated that the implementation period for SAP had been extended to the end of the year, due to the various problems that have been encountered and need to be resolved. This has the effect of delaying the post-implementation review which, I believe, will be crucial to establish whether lessons have been learned for any future major project, such as the Strategic Asset Management Plan.

2995 Let us not forget what was made clear in the Government Service Plan debate: this Report is being submitted at a time when staff have more than enough to do already. Surely we therefore cannot be happy to accept, as it points out in 16.5, that this Assembly just approves the principles and then we let Policy Council and Treasury and Resources just get on with it.

3000 Sir, in summary, given the speed that this has been brought in, the lack of detail, the lack of consultation and the overburdened staff and the fact this is not a Strategic Asset Management Plan at all, I think it is our duty to slow the train down, before it all goes off the rails. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)** More haste, less speed is in order here.

It is for all these reasons that I urge Members to support this well-crafted amendment by Deputy Fallaize and so ensure that we have a better chance of ending up with a Strategic Asset Management Plan that is worthy of the name.

3005 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Wilkie.

Deputy Wilkie: Thank you, sir.

I rise to speak against the amendment.

3010 In Proposition 1... Over the last four days – and I hate these words, I really do – we have heard a lot about these words 'motherhood and apple pie'. In effect, Proposition 1 in the amendment takes away the details and gives you 'motherhood and apple pie'. What we have heard over the last four days is everyone complaining that there are not enough details and too much of this 'motherhood and apple pie'. Well, this Proposition 1 is exactly what it does.

3015 In Proposition 2, I think the delays which are going to be caused are unacceptable. There is a need for a speedy decision and the longer we take, the less in savings we will probably realise and, unlike Deputy Fallaize would normally do, he has, in fact, not put a date on when the Policy Council and Treasury should report back to the States. So, really, Proposition 2 is open-ended. They could come back in 2020, if they so wished. There is nothing forcing them to come back any quicker.

3020 I do have some sympathy with Proposition 2A, but I feel, as a Department Member, that the assurances given by the Chief Minister are enough for me. I do not agree with his argument that this is SAP all over again. If the Members had known every detail of SAP software, it would not have made any difference to the implementation of SAP, because that is a task carried out by

3025 others. The SAP was the correct policy decision. However, the problems were with the implementation.

Now, Deputy Soulsby said, ‘Are you happy to part with £12 million of expenditure?’ Well, are you happy to part with £12 million of expenditure, knowing it could create a surplus of £6.2 million? I certainly am and I would ask Members to reject this amendment and support the Report.

3030 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Collins. Sorry, Deputy Stewart next – sorry Deputy Stewart, I cannot read my writing! Deputy Stewart.

3035 **Deputy Stewart:** Thank you, sir.
I speak to this amendment and also in general debate.

I will be supporting this Report and I will be voting against the amendment. The reason for that is I am sure in common with most of the Members present, we all joined politics to make a difference or to get things done and, although I understand the sentiment behind the amendment and I have listened to the speeches as well, it does, for me, just throw a huge handful of grit into the machine and slow the whole process down. So here we are again, wading through States of Guernsey syrup.

3040 I think we are getting very risk averse. This is about high level policy. This is about, ‘Let us make a decision and start getting on with it’. There are plenty enough checks and balances along the way, where will have input, where we can influence what is happening, but for goodness’ sake, please can we get started!

3045 I am also concerned that this process – and we are talking about money and Deputy Soulsby raised this point – this process, and if the amendment is successful, will result in us losing – and perhaps the Treasury Minister can confirm this – a £1-million cost-saving opportunity.

3050 And, just on the money side of it, I cannot see... and again, I would ask for the Treasury Minister to confirm, but I do not think we are approving a £12-million spend right now, but perhaps we can get some clarity on that. *(Laughter)* Well, okay, maybe I have not read it correctly but I will get some clarity on the finances.

3055 There are, as they say, and I am going to use a *cliché* unfortunately, some real no-brainers that we could get started on straight away. I think Dr Stephen Langford made the point very carefully, during the presentations we had, that what we have done for years and years and years is make do and mend. The longer we go on making do and mending, we are throwing good money after bad, in my view. And this process and starting this process, as recommended in the Report and without the amendment, means that we can get going now. We can stop throwing good money after bad and we can start looking strategically, in getting some of these ‘no-brainers’ going.

3060 I just want to refer to, just to give you a couple of practical examples, on 10.14, page 1104, it mentions that:

3065 ‘It is also intended to examine whether part of the legal services provided by St James Chambers could be accommodated in Frossard House. Currently, HM Procureur and his team of advocates, lawyers and paralegals are operating out of cramped and overcrowded accommodation...’

– I need my glasses now! – well, also I will add, so is my Financial Sector Development Unit. Now, my board members will remember that about six months, or maybe more ago, we wanted to beef up the team at the Financial Sector Development Unit. The one thing that held that back was there is absolutely no space at St James Chambers and there was absolutely no way... They are all practically sitting on each other’s laps down there.

3070 Also, if we look at Raymond Falla House: lovely on a nice sunny day – it is raining now, but lovely on a nice sunny day – walk round the garden and I can go and make a few phone calls; but the place is a rabbit warren! It is totally unsuitable for what we are using it for. The corridors, to navigate down there, I expect to bump into Dr Livingstone, who has already been there! *(Laughter)*

3080 One of the things that has been mentioned by Deputy O’Hara is that this front-facing customer, the Sir Charles Frossard House is obvious for that. Well, I remember Deputy O’Hara being late for a meeting because he was going round and round the car park, because so many members of the public had parked there he could not make it to the meeting, he was spinning round and round. I have never had a problem finding some sort of space at North Beach. Secondly, if we do attract more people into town, it will probably help with our retail strategy, thank you very much.

3085 But I think, what I did feel from Deputy O’Hara was we are already starting to get this departmental nimbyism creeping in: ‘The Information Centre is there, it is a lovely building, it cannot possibly go anywhere else.’ Well, maybe we ought to build a modern, fit-for-purpose

visitor centre, where people can actually sit down at tables and chairs, that they are not all crammed in, and we are buying teacloths, cups and ‘Can you tell me the way to Fermain tearooms or Icart bay?’, so... *(Laughter)*

3090 I would also turn to page 1124... Oh no, before that, I just want to make a point. Industry has recognised the value of modern floor plates. That is why we have got all Northern Trust, dare I say the GFSC and all Investec, and everyone else down there, are moving into modern floor plates. Why? I have been to several of these and I have asked them about their move. A lot of the offices in town are similar to what we have in the States: they are cramped, they are not fit for purpose, 3095 wireless network does not work properly in them because you cannot get through the granite walls. The efficiencies that industry has had by moving to these modern floor plates, which are flexible, have been reflected in their returns. It has saved them a fortune.

So, one thing I was very impressed at, when I went to see the Hub – and I guess that could be a bit of a model of how we would refurbish our own buildings – when you look at the lighting, when you look at the desking, when you look how much more pleasant that is than the rest of Charles 3100 Frossard House, it is also apparent to me that, whether you have this plan or not, we need to refurbish our existing buildings, just to improve the working conditions and get them up to modern standards for a lot of our staff.

So, what I will say is, please can we get on. I will be voting in favour of this Report, but for all the reasons I mentioned, I will be voting against this amendment.

3105 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy...

3110 **Deputy O’Hara:** Can I rise? Sorry, just a point of clarification.

Just to put it, I would not like the public to think that Culture and Leisure was not pulling its weight or was involved with any form of nimbyism. It is far from the truth. In fact, my speech made it quite clear that we are not unhappy to move. What I was trying to put through my speech is that the building, as a visitor centre, is historic and should remain. That is all I want to do. I think it is important for the tourist industry.

3115 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Collins and then Deputy Perrot.

3120 **Deputy Collins:** Thank you, sir.

I will speak generally and also on the debate.

Well, sir, where to start with this one? Is it really a good time to start selling off the crown jewels without detailed advice? Well, personally, sir, I am still recovering from SAP and, after reading the secret Simon Elliot SAP reports, I do not think the Civil Service could handle another 3125 joined-up Government project on this scale any time soon.

I must apologise to Deputy Bebb because I am sure he would love to see these. In fact, I would love to give him a copy, but I can imagine the almighty ELT... potentially, the words ‘code of conduct’, I am sure could possibly be in future sentences.

Personally, surely we have got to look at some of this after the review, the Machinery of Government findings because we could end up with seven, six, eight Departments, who knows? I 3130 do not like kicking cans, sir, but kick this one a little down the road. Let us get over SAP. Members, you have here all the arguments, I am not going to repeat them, please support the amendment and I urge you, urge you, as again talking about SAP, there is a lot of work to yet be done and to get over and, believe me, I wish I could share this Report with you.

3135 Thank you.

The Bailiff: I was going to call Deputy Perrot next and then Deputy Storey, then I will come to Deputies Le Tocq, Gollop and Brouard.

3140 **Deputy Perrot:** I am a member of the Treasury Board and I have to say that having heard the debate thus far, I do accept that this policy letter was not well put together, was not well crafted. Policy Council has not covered itself in glory nor has the Treasury and Resources Department. I accept that, but not every policy letter is actually put together perfectly. There are gaps in many policy letters which, nonetheless, do receive the approbation of the States and certainly the thrust of what is being put forward here is quite clear.

3145 I think one of the problems which I have noticed since I was elected – well, since I was elected to Treasury and Resources – is that, actually, everybody is frenetic, there is too much work going

on, too much work is being done too quickly by too few people and perhaps that does explain – does not necessarily excuse, but that, perhaps, explains – why...

Am I not...?

3150

The Bailiff: Your microphone is on, but I think...

A Member: It is not put forward.

3155

The Bailiff: Oh, it is not put forward. Can you...?

Deputy Perrot: Testing. (*Laughter and interjections*) I will bend down a little!

Deputy Fallaize, as is almost invariably the case, comes up with a very well-thought-out, beguiling speech, a sensible amendment and it would be very easy to say, 'Okay, I give up'. Well, I suppose, for the benefit of Deputy Trott, who is an expert on foreign languages, I ought to say, 'Mea culpa.' (*Laughter*) I am one of those who did accept that the policy letter should go forward. So there is a beguiling amendment and a very well-made speech, but the point is we have got to go ahead, as a Government, in dealing with our assets.

3160

3165

The only assurance, I think, which I could give to Deputy Fallaize is that things do not happen on their own. You do not go and see the civil servant or you do not get the Treasury Minister or you do not even get the Chief Minister saying, 'This will happen, therefore...' There has got to be debate and you do not switch senior officers around, you do not separate people unless you actually discuss things with the Departments concerned.

3170

So, I do not think... I know that I will not persuade him to change his mind, but I do not think that Deputy Fallaize ought to have these misgivings, that there will be proper debate, there will be consultation.

I suppose the reason why I am on my feet, apart from admitting to my guilt as a member of Treasury and Resources, is to say how unattractive I have found the conduct of something of a turf war between members of the Policy Council. I do not believe in executive government, as I have said quite recently, but I do not like the idea of there being some sort of micro-management, micro-administration, some sort of turf war going on between members of the Policy Council and I would expect the sort of comments which have been made – they are perfectly entitled to make them – but I would have expected the sorts of comments that have been made by Deputies Domaille and O'Hara, as it were, to be made behind closed doors, so that a rather more unified approach can be taken by the Policy Council.

3175

3180

Far be it from me, normally, to express any disagreement publicly with my friend Deputy Spruce, but I think that he got something slightly wrong about the timescale, in respect – he is shaking his head, I disagree with his shaking of his head – (*Laughter*) I disagree with him about the timescale as to how this went through Treasury and Resources. To the best of my knowledge, information, memory and belief, what happened was that a draft report came through, it was quite heavily criticised at that stage, and I got an idea that, at that stage, Deputy Spruce was away. He was not actually at that meeting, but was at the subsequent meeting when it came through in re-draft. Anyway, alright, perhaps we all have fallible memories, but my memory was, it was not a couple of days just before it went into print: I seem to remember this Report hanging around for several weeks before it was then given the *imprimatur*.

3185

3190

Sorry, may I continue?

The Bailiff: Yes, please do.

3195

Deputy Perrot: Thank you. Having said and admitted, that we did not put together a terribly good policy letter, its interest is clear, as I have said. The trouble is, you cannot win in this States. We all talk together about having some sort of more corporate government. We do not want centrism, but we do want to have a more joined-up system of working, where we do co-operate together. As soon as you put something in, such as this policy letter, which has the intention of sweating our corporate assets, everybody screams blue murder.

3200

Point scoring is easy when there has been, perhaps, not sufficient thought in putting forward a policy letter, but we do have to sweat our assets. I would suggest that the Policy Council needs to get to grips – its members have to grips with each other, not in an antagonistic way, but in a co-operative way to come to a corporate decision between themselves in respect to any disagreements as to how we are best going to deal with our assets. I think that this policy letter ought to go forward and although, as I as say, I admire the way in which it has been put by Deputy Fallaize, I will be opposing this amendment, I am afraid.

3205

The Bailiff: Deputy Domaille.

3210 **Deputy Domaille:** Just a point of perhaps either clarification or expansion, I would say, and I am sure the Chief Minister will confirm it later, that, actually, everything I have said today is what I have said in Policy Council and *[Inaudible]*

Secondly, actually if you look at page 1127 of the Report, you will see my name is not there, so I actually was not present at the meeting when the Report was signed off.
3215 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Storey next, then Deputy Le Tocq.

3220 **Deputy Storey:** Thank you, sir.

Sir, I must say that I feel it is common sense for us to be discussing rationalisation of our properties. That is quite obvious. Quite a lot of the properties that we operate from, or in, are obviously not fit for purpose and wearing my HSSD hat, I will mention Swissville and Lukis Houses – just two examples of completely inadequate properties. We are also completely without proper key worker housing which, in fact, mitigates against our ability to be able to recruit the people that we need to work on this Island.
3225

But sir, I would just like to speak now, just on the amendment, because I have other things that I would, perhaps, like to say in general debate later.

But, sir, I have to support this amendment for a variety of reasons. The first one is that phase 1, which we are asked to approve in principle, and to leave to T&R and the Policy Council to implement, includes the concentration of the Chief Officers and their support staff into a central location, separate from the rest of the Departments. That is really such an important step for us to take that I feel that should be subject to a separate debate. It is not part of how we use our properties; it is about how we run our business and they are two completely different things. We have not debated it and we have not made an agreement. If we have agreed that that is what we should do, and we should concentrate the Chief Officers together, then yes, that is fine, but we have not.
3230

The second one is, again, paragraph 16.5 is asking for authority to do lots of things. But I come back to the theme I raised... I cannot remember which day it was now, this week (*Laughter*) – limits of authority. If we, as a States, delegate authority to a Department or a person to do something, then there should be limits on it or we should know exactly what we are authorising them to do. Paragraph 16.5 does not specify, in detail, what we are expected to authorise them to do. So, I cannot support it on that basis – so I support the amendment on that basis.
3240

In addition to that, sir, pages 1120 and 1121 set out some numbers. Well, I am sorry, but I do not call that a business plan. If a department wants some money to spend on whatever project, we submit a business plan to T&R and they go through that business case with a fine-toothed comb and, if they do not find it satisfactory, they kick it out or they kick it back to us. Now, if what is on those two pages represents the sort of business plan that T&R are happy to approve, then great, we can get loads of projects through, because, to me, that is completely inadequate and would no way satisfy me, if I was responsible for inspecting a business plan before I authorised it.
3245

One thing I would agree with Deputy O'Hara in the Visitor Centre: I would not necessarily say that the Visitor Centre had to be in the current building, but what we do need is a high profile building in an easily visible location in the centre of town and not something that is hidden away in one of the back streets. We are not told what the alternative is, just that, 'Well, we might be able to find some alternative property in the centre of town.' Our visitor economy is much too important for this Island to tuck away a visitor centre in the wrong place and to have a poorly presented visitor centre, so I would agree with him on that.
3250

But sir, one of the biggest problems that I see with this programme and why I would support this amendment is that not enough thought has been given to the management of change. Now, management of change is a very, very difficult area of management and we have already seen, with the introduction of SAP, that our management of change, within the States, is not up to the mark. There are also dangers that have been outlined in this Report of splitting the Department teams. There are obviously some advantages in putting the Chief Officers and their planning support into one building, so that it increases the communication, at that planning level, but there are also dangers of moving the Chief Officers and their support staffs away from the operations of the Department.
3255

Now, I appreciate that some Departments have grown up that way and it would not cause them much of a problem; but in other instances, moving the senior management away from the operations could be quite a big problem and, once again, we come back to management of change
3260

3270 and there is nothing in this report about management of change or the risks involved in the changes that are being envisaged.

So, although I am fully supportive of having an investigation into how we better use our property, I do not think that, at the moment, I am prepared to support this document without the amendments that have been proposed. So I will be supporting these amendments and I hope other Members will do so as well.

3275 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Perrot.

3280 **Deputy Perrot:** I need to correct something, I am afraid sir, I have been reminded – certainly it is my brain which is infallible... which is fallible, I mean (*Laughter*) – that I said that Mr Spruce's recollection was, perhaps, incorrect. It was correct. Treasury and Resources were given an abridged presentation by PowerPoint a few weeks before the written Report was given to us for a Tuesday board meeting.

3285 So he is correct; I am wrong.

The Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Perrot.
Deputy Le Tocq and then Deputy Gollop.

3290 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Sir, I will pick up something on those comments of Deputy Perrot and the timeframe in a moment, perhaps, but I want to pick up something the Deputy Storey said just now and agree with him. He was talking about our management of change and I would agree that there need to be a change in our management of change.

3295 We are clearly, as a corporate body, not very good at doing that in certain sections – not in all sections, but in certain sections and when people, I think, talk about 'more joined up', being more joined up as a Government, I think part of that means we do need to be better at change management and certainly there are recent examples of where that has not been the case and we need to improve.

3300 However, I do *not* believe – and I want to speak just on the amendment at the moment – I do not that this amendment actually will help us, in that respect. That is something that, in my mind, is a given and we need to do that.

3305 Secondly, I do not believe we need to get all our ducks in a row before we start attempting anything big because we are fearful of what might happen. We need to find a methodology together to be able to go forward as a consensus and, as a result of that, I cannot support any delaying tactics. I feel that particularly, because I know there will be different reasons for supporting this amendment and I am sympathetic with a lot of the arguments there, but I do not believe that any of them justify delaying further what, in my mind, is something that began way back when I found myself as a member of the T&R board under Deputy Trott's chairmanship.

3310 At that time, the Strategic Property Group, I think it was that became the States Property Services, came under T&R and there began – and I see this as an example of that process that began right back then, some might like to trace it even before that – but there began an audit of all the property that the States owned and for what purposes it was currently being used. We had huge surprises: I think everybody did. I see the Environment Minister nodding. We discovered some things that we did not know we owned and some things that, actually, we thought we owned and we did not and some stuff that was actually being dealt with in completely inappropriate ways – money was being spent for no apparent reason – just because it had always been done that way.

3315 Now, some improvements have been made and Members, in their speeches, have pointed to that and we also had a more co-ordinated approach. In my mind, this is just the natural progression from there to say, well, since we have done that, we have begun that process we have a more controlled and managed property portfolio than we had before, now we need to do this next stage, which is to better provide for and better dispose of, for the benefit of the taxpayer and for Guernsey as a whole, the properties we have, so that we have some that are fit for purpose and others that we can say that, at the moment, it would be bad use of money, given the current economic climate particularly, that we continue to throw money at them, to repair them, or to try and make them fit for a purpose that is not appropriate and is not cost effective.

3325 Sir, when I entered the States in the year 2000, I made myself this resolution that I would never abstain, I would never say the words '*Je ne vote pas*'; but I have, sir, and the first time that I did that – I had to do a heart searching – was in the debate on what colour to paint St James. I could not believe at the time, sir, I still cannot, that this... (*Interjection*) It certainly was not a black and white issue; it was a grey and white issue, or a brown and white issue! Sir, I could not believe that

3330 such a long debate should have happened, or should have even come to this Assembly. It perfectly demonstrated to me how some of us like to, and I think the phrase is 'go native' when we get elected, and suddenly we take an interest in ridiculous amounts of detail.

Now, there is not detail in this particular Report and some people have asked for it. I do not think anyone is asking for detail of what colour to paint buildings, but there is this demand for
3335 greater detail and, at some point, if we are going to be more joined up, we are going to have to trust those who work with us and for us, accepting that change management is necessary, to deal with some of those details and we are going to have to put our pet likes aside.

Of course I had an opinion on what colour St James should be painted and, fortunately, the States chose to paint it in the right colour in the end. But, the point is, I did not see it was the job and role of this Assembly to make that decision. Now, that is a political argument we could decide. I am making my point here, and I think some of the momentum behind this amendment is because we want much detail before we are willing to take the risk. That word is being used and I am going to use it, because I believe we are foolish if we think that by slowing things up and adding more hoops to jump through, that we will somehow alleviate the risks. We may alleviate
3340 some, but we will create a whole load of others, because we will miss opportunities that are there before us.

I believe it was the right thing when the change in the machinery of Government happened to give T&R largely the responsibility for property and built resources in that way. I trust that team to deliver in an appropriate way and to work with Departments and to consult and, in my experience, they have done very well indeed in doing that.
3350

This is a high level vision. It is not about detail. If there is detail in there that may, to some degree, indicate to some Members that certain things are written in stone – should I use that phrase? I am not sure, but... then I would say that that is an unfortunate event, because I, like Deputy Perrot, am conscious of the fact it is not a perfect Report. In retrospect, it could have been better written. In retrospect, there could have been more information given. I think some of the responses today come from people who have been recently elected to the States and feel that they have been out of this process, which, again I would reiterate, that has happened, I think, for some time. Much of what is in here is not a shock or surprise to me. I was out of the States for four years, but maybe because I was on T&R, maybe because some of the things were thought of and imagined then, and that is going back eight years, I find that this is not something which is rushed at all but, actually, is something that has taken far too long to do.
3360

Now, that may not be your experience and I accept that, but I think we have to, also, accept, in our political system, that there are going to be times when we have to trust those who have gone before us. I know that there was a delay, particularly in bringing things to the States right now because of the election last year, but it is incumbent upon all of us to recognise that there are only certain things that we can do and there are risks both sides.
3365

So I do encourage Members not to support this amendment, but to trust that the thrust and the vision behind what the Strategic Asset Management Plan is seeking to do is worthy of support as is, and we can take it forward, trusting the Treasury Minister and his team and those in the Policy Council to work with Departments, where necessary, in order to facilitate the vision that is in that plan. So, as a result, please do not vote for this amendment.
3370

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop, then Deputy Brouard.

3375 **Deputy Gollop:** Thank you, sir.

I was interested to hear Deputy Stewart's earlier speech, in which he seemed to passively support the ending of the Burnt Lane era, perhaps in the future, and I was tempted to think that he might see me skulking in the corridor and I would say, 'Deputy Stewart, I presume'. (*Laughter*)

But actually Deputy Le Tocq has led us onto wider territory here, which I think goes beyond the scope of this debate into our system of government; but I would say that some of us, in a way, have always wanted to micro-manage the issues and focus on the colour of St James. That is a concern because, in a way, the public still expects States Members to be involved with that and that is an argument for another day about our system of government and how many States Members we therefore need, because if we exclusively focus on high level strategy, we could do it, really, with a dozen people. But that is another debate for another day.
3380

I have to say that I am on the horns of a dilemma with this particular Report, because, like Deputy Le Tocq and many others, I entirely support the principles of strategic asset management, of releasing capital assets so as to raise money for more worthy projects and of a consolidation in the interests of both the staff and, more importantly, the public and the end users.
3385

3390 But this Report is a work in process: it is not quite there yet. I have listened to Deputy Fallaize's amendment and I will support it, not necessarily because it is perfectly constructed, but it is the best way, I think, of accepting this Report rather than rejecting it. Because the alternative is the amendment does not make it, I am afraid, is I will, reluctantly, vote against it, in the hope that a better Report would come back to use within the next year.

3395 This Report confuses, as I think Deputy Storey and others have identified, operational issues with strategic issues and ways of working issues, and expects us to endorse not only principles, but also all kinds of workstreams. As a member of the Social Security board, I am not convinced that it would be necessarily in the interests of the Department – I need to think about it carefully after evidence – for the Administrator/Chief Officer to be located at Sir Charles Frossard House. What impact would that have on the way in which the Department is run? I am not sure. The same goes for Health and Social Services.

3400 When I heard Deputy Domaille making his points, I was quite interested because, in a way, he was suggesting, and I did not disagree with everything he said, that it would be bad for the civil servants to work in the town centre because they need the car parking, but for Sir Charles Frossard House to be used as a public interface was great. But we all know that, despite the improvements to route 11, that is not an area well served by buses at the moment – only one on the eight or nine routes goes to that point. So there are all kinds of issues about connectivity and, again, it is a micro-issue perhaps, but I was horrified to hear the way in which the Tourist Information Centre was being used as a political football in this process.

3410 I do indeed share concerns that Departments, at either political or even operational level, were not given much headwind as to what was coming. Indeed, when I attended the presentation – it was a very good presentation, it was thoughtful and full of ideas – what came across to me was how few politicians in the room, even those in key positions, had any inkling on what was going to be said. So, in a sense, this is another example of a well meaning and capable executive putting forward a *kind of* executive governance, without much political engagement.

3415 So, I would not actually necessarily agree with the point Deputy Fallaize made, that it is not a conspiracy. I am not suggesting there is any smoke-filled rooms or, these days, smokeless rooms; (*Laughter*) but nevertheless there is a sense in which the politicians, in some cases, are not kept fully in the picture. It is interesting that we no longer seem to get newsletters from the Policy Council that we did in Assemblies gone by.

3420 So, I have reservations about the speed of change, the philosophy of the change of management being implemented, the lack of consultation and the many open strands. Is the water reservoir really the best place for a new police station? The road network turned from St Andrew's is poor, when you think of Le Variouf and the Bailiff's Cross road – just one idea floated in this.

3425 And do I particularly want all 1700 States social housing going to one housing association? In what context? With what standards? With what provision for special cases? I do not know and I think we have to be very careful about a blanket endorsement.

I recall being caught like this before in a previous Assembly, I think I voted for the Capita FTP report, Tribal Helm, on the grounds that, although I fundamentally disagreed with some of the points, I agreed with most of it and the spirit in which it was going. Later on, we were told we were signed up to it, every single word.

3430 So be cautious, States Members, and go for the Fallaize amendment.

3435 **Several Members:** Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Members, for your information, the list of members waiting to speak at the moment is Deputy Brouard, Alderney Representative Arditti, Deputy Dorey, Deputy Adam, Deputy Le Lièvre and Deputy Hadley.

3440 Next, Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

I think part of the problem with this Report is it is not what we were expecting to get. I was expecting to get the 10, 20, 30, 40 year out strategic needs of the States with regard to land – which buildings we might need, which ones we might dispense with. I rather like the Policy Council, where odd ones occasionally stick their head out of the door, as opposed to their colleagues. I have not put a cabal up there as Policy Council; I have put individual Ministers and I want them to represent their Departments and I want them to be individuals and I want them to be honest. If they do agree with somebody on Policy Council or agree with the rest of the group, then please, for goodness' sake, say it! (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) *That* is what I want and that is what I want to see.

3450

I appreciate the honesty of Deputy Perrot. If you cannot cope, if there is too much coming through... I want it well read and thorough. This is property for the next 30 or 40 years: it makes no difference whether we approve it this month or next month – unless... unless... And then, of course, the light hit me: unless, of course, you wanted to fulfil an FTP objective and get some money into the pot really quickly, to save someone's face, and then the whole thing all starts to fall into place.

So, instead of having a strategic look at the property, we end up with a quick dirty fix that is rushed through to try and get some money in the pot, so that we can obtain this objective and I just think that is absolutely a foolhardy way to conduct business. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

The similarity with SAP goes further, as Deputy Fallaize mentioned, because the acronym only adds an 'M' and I do not know whether that in an 'M' for management or muddle. (*Laughter*)

Now, if you just think – as a Guernseyman, I try to think sometimes a bit basically – if you were thinking of what would you do with our portfolio that we have got now? What would you...? The logical thought, and I do not think I am alone, would be actually we have got a fairly purpose-built building in Frossard House; there is a fairly modern building next door, it is mentioned in the Report here, Mill House. Possibly you would look at buying Mill House, possibly you would think at putting a couple of extra car parking levels at Frossard House, and building a wing or two wings. That is how most people would consolidate it. But we are doing this weird thing where we are moving Income Tax here, looking at the States building – it is a *mess*. I was expecting a well-thought-out, rational and costed way of looking at our portfolio 30, 40, 50 years out, not for an FTP saving that needs to be in next week.

So, we are looking at another jumble of compromises not much better than the last lot and the level of thought that has been put into it – I do not think you could make it up – is on 17.5, and Deputy O'Hara touched on it: better use of the car park can be made by staggering the start times and finish times of staff. Now, if you say that quickly, that sounds great!

But assuming that each of them has their own car, I have worked it out this way: so the first person is in at four o'clock in the morning to do their eight hour day to finish at 12 o'clock. Now, the next person cannot start at 12 o'clock, because the car park will still be full with the 12 o'clock person, so the next person comes in to start their shift at 12.30 to work for eight hours, finishing at 8.30. Now, that is great, I can understand that that works... except, of course, you need more staff on at the lunch time, because that is when we are going to serve the customers that Deputy Duquemin talks about.

So, really then you either have to move the four o'clock shift a little bit later in the day, to make sure they are there to cover the lunch time, or you start the one that finishes at 8.30 in the evening a bit earlier at 11.30.

If that is the level of thought that has gone into this, forget it! Please, States Members, go along with the amendment from Deputy Fallaize and let us come back to the States with a proper strategic plan and not some FTP bandage.

Thank you, sir.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Arditti.

Alderney Representative Arditti: Thank you, sir.

Unfortunately, this is another example, and it is not the first time this week, of a poorly prepared report. Thus far I agree with Deputy Perrot. Indeed, very few Members, it seems today, want to defend the quality of this Report and that is, to my mind, what really lies at the heart of how I will vote on this amendment. It is a poorly drafted report. For me, it is not about subtle attempts at executive government or any of these other issues; it is a poorly drafted report and the resolutions are poorly drafted – and it is those resolutions which we are being asked to vote on.

For me, it is a pity because I have no difficulty with the principles. But Deputy Fallaize is right, in my view. I am not a great supporter of amendments but, on this occasion, it is right of him to invite me to look at the Propositions and the underlying Report, *as they are written*, as they are presented to us – not as the Chief Minister has presented it in his opening or as I think I can define that their meaning might be.

And it *does* matter. This is not one of those occasions, in my view, where we are talking about process for process sake. It does matter. When we vote on a Proposition, we must be confident what we are voting for. It is not about micro-management, in my view. A badly drafted report is a badly drafted report.

I certainly cannot accept the argument that if you present a poorly drafted report, you can then accuse those who say, 'Come back when you have improved it' of throwing grit in the works! Bringing a poorly drafted report, you have to be ready, in my submission, to accept the consequence.

3515 And the delay is regrettable, but delay cannot be, in my submission, the justification for voting for badly drafted Propositions.

I would hope that, by burning the midnight oil, perhaps this could be brought back in September or probably October – I imagine September is going to be rather a full Billet already! – but I can only stand here saying I hope that these principles are brought back to us quickly, with a report and, more specifically, with Propositions that we can vote for with confidence.

3520 I will listen carefully to what the Chief Minister says in closing but, at this point, regrettably I personally feel I have no alternative but to support Deputy Fallaize's amendment.

3525 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Thank you, sir.

I will support the Deputy Fallaize amendment and, as a member of Policy Council, I apologise, I think, and accept, that this Report could have been better drafted.

3530 I did attend a discussion of the plan when we discussed it at Policy Council and I did have my say and I did suggest... and there were amendments made to it, and there were quite a number of amendments made by Policy Council members. I did leave before the end of the discussion because I had to leave for HSSD business, but I accept responsibility as a member of Policy Council.

3535 The Report was there, I think it was rushed but it was rushed for very good reasons, because we have an FTP programme. Significant savings can be made from property and we wanted to be able to make those savings. I also think it was crucial that this Report was debated before the capital prioritisation debate in September, because I think without that Policy Council would have been justly criticised.

3540 I think that I accept the questions about drafting the Report and I think the other criticism, of course, is in the actual Propositions and, again, I accept responsibility for those.

3545 Proposition 1, I think, was badly worded and I think, Deputy Fallaize's amendment does improve that one by clarifying what part of section 9 this applies to. I think the biggest problem is between Proposition 2 and 3. But actually, I think the most important Proposition is Proposition 3, which, you are only asked to note, that:

'all capital projects to be undertaken by States' Departments in fulfilment of the Strategic Asset Management Plan, including those identified in Phase 1, shall be subject to capital prioritisation.'

3550 So, effectively, they are going to come back to this Assembly as part of capital prioritisation and, just as capital prioritisation and projects, there will be further debates on those, in order... because the capital prioritisation debate, in itself, does not give you the go ahead; it sets out the plan.

3555 Effectively, they will have to come back but Deputy Fallaize is asking for a detailed report and I accept that.

I think there was an attempt to, again perhaps could be worded better, but if members turn to page 1117 and it has got 'phase 1, making savings now', I think those are pretty clear, where it sets out what is going to happen. It is in bullet-point form, the major projects, but it is, perhaps, lacking in some detail, although there is detail in other places within the Report.

3560 I just think if the Report had been probably better drafted, it would have been not subject to the same criticism that Members have made, but I think you go back to... I read out Proposition 3 and Proposition 2 does not seem to be consistent with that, because it says, 'should commence immediately'; and, yet Proposition 3 says it has got to come back as part of the capital prioritization.

3565 It is important the Members go back, and there are three members of T&R from the 2004-08 term, where, in fact, if you were in that term, very significant changes in responsibility for property were made and approved by the State. I am reading from the February 2006 Report, it says that:

3570 'The Treasury and Resources Department shall be empowered to approve sales of land and property to be made on behalf of the States without prior reference to the States except for any property of historic importance.'

So, there were very significant delegation of responsibilities to T&R in that debate and, effectively, on the back of that, properties can be sold now by T&R without reference to this Assembly.

3575 So, I will complete my speech now and, again, just apologise for the drafting of the Report and I think Members will have plenty of other opportunities to debate these issues when they come back in capital prioritisation, and subsequent to that when the details come back in reports.

Thank you.

3580 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Adam.

Deputy Adam: Thank you, sir.

I will start off the same as Deputy Perrot started off by saying I am the newest member on the T&R Department and, like him, I have to admit that the board accepted this Report and, certainly, they have allowed it to go forward.

3585 However, on reflection, I have to accept many of the criticisms by, I would say, the majority of the Deputies who have spoken so far concerning the Report. The problem is, like Deputy Le Tocq, if you have been in the States and around the States for the last 12 years, you have heard a lot of these suggestions being mooted in the past, but you have never seen them actually being progressed.

3590 If I look at the list of properties in phase 1: Beauville House, well, that is part of what one might call a dual carriage site, which is actually earmarked for possible key worker housing – and it is still there and it has still not progressed.

3595 The Duchess of Kent, moving patients out: again, that has been so thought about because the long-term care part of Duchess of Kent is not up to standard.

Hayward House: that is the house that was going to be redeveloped for respite care, but even redeveloping, it would not have been suitable for adult respite care and I think it has got one flat occupied.

3600 Lukis House and Swissville: again, they have been discussed, over the past five or six years, as being totally unsuitable office accommodation. What *is* suitable office accommodation? If some of you find your way up to level 6 in sir Charles Frossard House, you can see what an improvement the development is as far as the usage of that space. That space has got more people in it than it used to have, yet it feels nice and airy and spacious.

3605 Therefore, I may have been wrong to accept this Report but, as I say, so much of it, you might say, ‘Oh, I’ve read before that before sometime; I’ve read that before at sometime.’ So, I accept the criticism but, as I say, the important thing to me, the vitally important thing, is that we accept the principle. It is so important. We must start progressing things instead of sitting on our hands all the time and saying, ‘Oh, we will think about that’ or not progressing because it is too difficult or someone else should do it.

3610 One good thing, and I think we should all acknowledge, is that the States Property Services actually have collated, and it has taken a good long time to collate, all the properties, fields, leases, rentals, etc that the States of Guernsey have in place at the present time. It has taken them a long time. But I feel they have achieved it and now they are coming forward with, ‘What do we really need to use?’ and putting forward suggestions.

3615 Now, Deputy Fallaize, actually, stated in his speech, much of it could proceed now. Therefore, is he inferring that if this amendment is passed, it will not make any difference to the progress of this States Report? I would like him to confirm that, since that is how I take it, because he said specifically he could go ahead and refurbish these properties. Obviously, Deputy Dorey has just said, T&R could go ahead and sell these properties. Therefore, it would be interesting to know if 3620 Deputy Fallaize feels it is going to slow things down or if, as he states, Policy Council and T&R can bring forward areas where things can be progressed.

Micro-managed issues: I am not too sure that it is micro-managing, but it is getting pretty close to it. You want all the t’s crossed and i’s dotted, and I am a bit wary about that.

3625 The other aspect is Best’s quarry, I think Deputy Gollop mentioned the centralisation of the emergency services. Well, that has been talked about since 2002 or 2003. That is when I was Commander of the voluntary side of St John. So, again, this has not been progressed, we have been talked about centralised emergency calls going into it for the Police, Ambulance and Fire Brigade. In fact, there is a new centre built at the power station, when I was on the Home Department, which was eight years ago, and it has got three stations – three telephone points and 3630 computer points just for the Fire Service.

Again, it is time that we accepted, we have to work in a corporate manner and if something is cross-departmental, it works as cross-departmental and we do not end up with having things being stuck on shelves, not being progressed.

3635 This is not an ideal Report, I accept that; but at least it is trying to bring a whole lot of threads together in to one place so you will all have a much better idea. But it is complex. It is not going to be simple. It is complex to get the information. How many properties does HSSD have? Deputy Dorey will be able to tell you, it is round about 28 or 30, and that is properties looking after people in the community, not hospitals, I am talking about.

3640 So, it takes time to get all the information. How many leases does HSSD have? I think it is five or six leases, for nursing staff, etc. How many flats does the Education Department have? They have got several flats for their staff. All this, we have to collate the information, have to sort the problems and then progress forward so we use our assets to their best effect.

3645 I like that aspect, since people are using it: you sweat your assets. Well, we would all be sweating quite happily in this Chamber, but it is lovely and cool now, with the rain falling, but I hope that you will accept the Report for what it is, bringing forward the principles of what should be happening, to start sorting out the problems in relation to asset management.

Thank you, sir.

3650 **The Bailiff:** Thank you. So, Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Just in relation to the Duchess of Kent House, I would just like to make it clear, the Department does provide good quality care at a building that was designed for residential care and was built not that long ago in terms of the history of buildings. It is now used for people with dementia and the reasons why we want... is that that is not where we want to be providing that service in the long term.

As ever, if you have a newer building, you can always improve your standards.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Lièvre.

3660 **Deputy Le Lièvre:** Thank you, sir.

Mr Bailiff, Members of the Assembly, before I start I should, possibly, for the edification of Deputy Duquemin, point out that those visitors to E T Wheadon House do not usually go to pay money in – (*Laughter*) not by my experience, anyhow.

3665 I will be blunt, Members of the Policy Council, this policy letter takes a serious subject worthy of very careful, almost forensic, examination and systematically turns it into an Ealing comedy or a Greek tragedy, depending on your point of view. Without doubt, this is one of the most disjointed, difficult to read, difficult to get to grips with and therefore difficult to understand policy letters I have ever had the misfortune to read.

3670 I had to make several concerted attempts to read it before I managed to reach its conclusions. Understanding it to a level that I knew exactly where it was taking me: well, I do not think I made it that far. This policy letter should be used as a classic example of how not to write a States Report – in fact, any report.

3675 I accept that, by its very nature, the subject has to be broad, but by trying to cover matters from health visitors in Lukis House to selling off a £¼ billion of social housing and putting the CAB into E T Wheadon House to building 1,000 properties in the next 10 years, the Report has overstretched itself. I cannot understand how a document of such questionable focus made it through the eagle eyes of our senior Members. However, having heard from Deputy Spruce that T&R had a mere 48 hours to consider it, I am not surprised. It is a bit like Bernard Montgomery going to Winston Churchill on the 4th June 1944 and saying, ‘Winston, I’ve got a plan.’ (*Laughter and applause*)

3680 If reading it was difficult, then writing a speech presented a whole new range of issues, the predominant one being which part of the Report do I focus on? And therein lies the problem: this is not one policy letter; it is, in my calculation, at least three policy letters, possibly more, all melded together into something that is held together by constant references to the four letter acronym, ‘SAMP’. In some areas, it is the only clue that you are still reading the same policy letter. If it was not for this SAMP ‘glue’, then there is a distinct possibility that Members could think that some pages had fallen out of their Billets and they were reading a different policy letter. (*Laughter*)

3690 There are three distinct policy letters. There is one about the general States properties and I agree, it is sensible to co-ordinate the use of those and to rationalise them – it is eminently

sensible. Just, I think somebody said that Lukis House had been under consideration for six or seven years: actually, no, it is nearly 50. It was considered in the 1960s.

3695 Then the Old States Office: it was not old when I worked there, it was just the States Office, but never mind... (*Laughter*) It was only... no, it was not that old, and it has been used for any number of different reasons and it was not just 20 members in the Civil Service when it was built; there were about four times as many as that who worked for the Public Assistance Authority, but that is another matter.

3700 Then there is the staffing and service delivery, Chief Officers, policy staff, service delivery and outward-facing staff: very sensible but it should have been the subject of another separate report – with links, I accept, with links, but it should not have been all mish-mashed into this one document.

3705 And, finally, we have what is, if you like, all the long-term housing issues, and it reads like a mini-Corporate Housing Programme about affordable housing properties, GHA, States housing, key workers, etc and, of course, it is in there, because the Corporate Housing Programme stands to be one of the beneficiaries of this Report. It had to be in there, but I was confused when I reached that part of the Report, because there is no mention of it in the executive summary. When you read an executive summary, you expect to give the reader a taster of what he or she might find buried in the document. But it does not. It makes no mention of the Corporate Housing Programme at all and you have to be 25 pages into the document, on paragraph 12.7, that the potentially major beneficiary of this policy letter is actually mentioned. One would have thought that this might have been referred to, even obliquely, but no, the reader, as I said, has to read through two thirds of the document before this becomes evident.

3710 There are only vague references to the massive potential of change within the Civil Service; no reference to a potential £¼ billion transfer to a housing association – paragraph 10.40; no mention of the potential staffing and other costs of the project; and no details of the use of the sale proceeds. That is what is missing out of the executive summary. If that had been in there, it would have been a clue as to what I was going to find, as I worked my way through. So it is not surprising that, when I got to the end, I was just wholly and completely confused. I am not quite as old as Deputy Perrot, but I am getting there.

3720 What is, perhaps, more worrying is the total value of the transactions talked about in this Report in an almost inconsequential manner. I have already mentioned the potential £¼ billion transfer to a housing association. That may include cash but has not up to now, but the policy letter does not mention what it is going to be.

3725 It talks about building 1,000 homes over the next 10 years and if you take it as £200,000 per unit that is £200 million, at today's prices. It talks about spending £7.2 million on refurbishments from either £18.2 million or £15.4 million, the sales of assets, including one hospital, one old people's home, one college and one office complex previously used as a school.

3730 However, that is not the end of the matter. There is mention of £2.8 million difference between being the discounted cost associated with land that might be subject to planning covenants, and a massive £4½ million management programme costs that would be taken from the sale proceeds.

3735 Then, in paragraph 12.8, it just casually mentions that the Corporate Housing Fund, which currently stands at £60 million might become exhausted, will become exhausted and that it will have to dip into the Capital Reserve that is used by the rest of the States. It does not, of course, mention that the Corporate Housing Programme has been subject to £6 million to £8 million grant from T&R annually for the last four, five, six, seven years. (**Deputy David Jones:** Rent rebates.) It is not, it is a capital grant for the Corporate Housing Programme, I accept that, but it is a guaranteed one every year. (**Deputy David Jones:** Of course.)

3740 It makes no mention of the continuous capital funding from T&R in respect of rents forgone to the tune of £6 million to £8 million per annum (*Interjection*) and when... and what this sum... No, please, Deputy Jones, it is £10 million in real terms, but the actual grant is discounted to £8 million and, I think in relation to 2013, £6 million, but generally, it is a grant and it is in relation to rent rebates, but it is, nevertheless, a grant which no other States Committee receives.

3745 The most startling aspect of this policy letter is that it proposes that the States should adopt the principles underlining this potential £½ billion turnover strategy with the most minimum of detail – in fact, with virtually no financial detail at all.

3750 If the States agrees it today, then phase 1 should commence immediately, when what comprises phase 1 is not exactly clear, when the costs are not clear; and where the money is going to come from is nebulous to say the least. It proposes that all capital projects undertaken by States Departments, including those identified in phase 1, should be subject to capital prioritisation but Deputy Dorey has already raised that fact that they do not need a massive program to make some

of the moves that we could do without any of this strategy whatsoever. It can happen at any stage without any further interference.

As I have already said, above everything else, it is the funding of this strategy which is the least clear.

3755 The policy letter acknowledges, on several occasions, that much of the detail of this strategy remains to be completed and that funding arrangements are not finalised and yet it still asks the States to sign off this policy letter today with huge aspects of the strategy remaining unspecified and loose ends wherever one chances to look.

3760 As I am speaking on the whole policy letter, not just the amendment, I hate to say this, but the Corporate Housing Programme has been a force for good, but this policy letter makes it look as though the matters within the Corporate Housing Programme could well now take a rethink.

It is clear that what happened to the GSP must also happen to SAMP. As a policy letter it is hopelessly incomplete, and way outside the parameters that would allow this Assembly to approve it today in an unamended form. For the Assembly to do so would be neglectful of its duty of care to the community.

3765 I think the Policy Council, when it comes back to the Assembly, as it surely must, should go further than simply providing more detail. It should, in my opinion, consider whether the time has come to consider collapsing the Corporate Housing Programme and bringing back housing into the corporate fold, so that all of its priorities and services are ranked against the priorities of other States Committees, it now seems, given the adoption of the principles of the GSP although not the detail as yet, *incongruous* that a single Committee should remain within its own significant funding stream whilst, at the same time, dipping in and out of funds from the sale of the family silver and the family savings.

3770 Furthermore, the suggestions that housing needs to build a further 1,000 properties over the course of the next 10 years needs to be at least stress tested. It is a pity this document was not stress tested because, if it had been, it would have failed at the first fence. The States have not been given the slightest indication who these 1,000 properties are for and whether or not the cost of subsidising each accommodation is sustainable.

3780 Would it be cheaper, for instance, to assist with rents in the private rental sector and encourage the private rental sector to provide affordable accommodation, possibly subsidised by the taxpayer with rent control? Who knows? We must not ignore the fact that, at the time the Corporate Housing Programme was set up, we had 2,243 properties, give or take five or six, I cannot remember the exact figure. It was certainly over 2,200; and now we have 2,200 or so – better quality maybe and better suited to the needs of the Island, but still the same number of properties.

3785 *(Interjection)*
Just on a point of detail, between 1945 and 1966, the Housing Department either funded directly through the Homes for Workers Loan Fund or through their own Social Housing Build Programme over 960 properties and all of those properties, give or take one or two, are still standing today. They are not the properties that were knocked down later on.

3790 So the Corporate Housing Programme, yes it has been a success, but if we are talking about 1,000 properties over the next 10 years, and many of those properties would be rent-rebate related, we have to start thinking ‘sustainable or what?’

3795 To take a page out of history, I think the time has now arrived for the setting up of a committee of States Members to examine the long-term housing requirements of the Island, together with various options of delivering that need. The options placed before is today by the SAMP document represent too great a risk to our somewhat delicate funding mechanisms at this time. I truly apologise for being so negative, but I do not believe I am to blame. This Report cannot be allowed to go further without significantly more detail. To do so would carry too great a risk to the current assets of the States, to its Chief Officer senior management structure and, ultimately, the stability of the States and this Island.

3800 Please vote for the amendment. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Next, Deputy Hadley, then Deputies Langlois and David Jones.

3805 **Deputy Hadley:** Mr Bailiff, this morning the Education Department’s vision statement was overwhelmingly endorsed by this Assembly, despite the fact that a significant number of its members are opposed to the abolition of the 11-plus and a number of us are opposed to the suggestion that one or more of the primary schools are closed down. Yet we endorsed the policy because we have got to move forward, the Education Department has got to move forward and, to a large extent, it was a vision statement.

Now, in my innocence, I took this paper in the same vein. There are a lot of very sensible suggestions as to the rationalisation of the property of the States and we were given the steer that this would save a lot of money, in terms of capital receipts we would get, and also in terms of the revenue consequences. To vote for this amendment kicks the whole thing into the long grass and we cannot afford to do that, given the finances of the States.

So I urge Members to reject this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Langlois.

Deputy Langlois: Sorry, sir, taken by surprise there. *(Laughter)* Yes... *(Laughter)* 'Stand up' – no, I am standing up! *(Laughter)*

Sir, I think it is extremely important that we take a deep breath here. It has been a long few days and the weather has been a bit balmy on occasions and it is a bit cooler now and all the rest of it. I think we really should take the cool-end look at this.

The Deputy Chief Minister's comments which were made earlier regarding the level of detail, trust and the history of this particular topic in the States, were very wise. They covered all sorts of ground which, through no nobody's fault at all, a number of us in this place will not be familiar with, but this has been the real original old chestnut, in terms of the States and being able to move things on and not move things on and so on.

I will return to the level of detail question. I do hope that, once again – which seems to happen on alternate days in a States meeting like this – tonight I do not go home thoroughly depressed, because the lack of trust which is being displayed, in terms of not allowing a Committee to move a programme forward from here, to me is just appalling; but that is my reaction to it.

If we then move on to the election – the last election; I am not talking about the next one – the last election, I remember a lot of euphoria, in the early days, to do with change, being elected on a ticket of change and so on. This Report, in its present form and the imaginative presentation of it, exactly the right level of detail *at this stage*, actually does reflect the spirit of change which I think was in the Assembly then. Then suddenly today, I see a pattern that is, for those of use who have been in for more than one term, so, so depressingly familiar.

Just when we think we might move somewhere, just when we think we might move forward, we see, 'No, we cannot do it because of this, we cannot do it because of that, we have got this vested interest, we have got that vested interest, we have got a bit of caution here, we have got not enough detail', and so on. That is worrying to me.

There is another reality here. When I was on Treasury and Resources in the last term, I was fortunate enough not to be on the Property Sub-Committee – sorry, Deputy Domaille! *(Laughter)* I was fortunate enough not to be on the Property Sub-Committee and I say that advisedly, because, actually, during that term, the period from 2004 to 2008 that Deputy Dorey described, a lot of work was done to actually shift a lot of the responsibility properly into the right place, and then in the 2008-12 term, I know that three of my colleagues spent many – I was going to say, 'happy hours' – many hour, thrashing through some of the detail of the backlog of what needed moving on.

The reality in that area, as far as I can recall, from what they then brought back to the Committee, is a very complex one, to do with the commercial nature of dealing with property. Property is not an easy business to be in. You talk to any property speculator or property person and it is a highly complex thing. It is an area in which you have to be quite fleet of foot.

This Assembly can be accused of many, many things, but I have never heard it being accused of being fleet of foot. What we have got to do is we have got to devise a system where, in this case, the Treasury and Resources Department, where the principle has been established way back now – way back in 2004 – that they take a lead on this, can be fleet of foot, especial in a relatively small property market that can be affected by rumours and moves quite quickly.

Then we move on to some of the comments. I think Deputy Hadley has made some very sensible comments today. That is not meant to imply any form of contrast from other occasions. Let us leave it that we do not always agree, but then I hear, from Deputy Gollop, 'Well, I think we should be cautious here.'

Just for the newcomers here, 'Be cautious' is States speak for, 'Let's not do anything.' *(Laughter)* 'Let's do something else, let's do it later.' There is a sort of *mañana* aspect about it, if it is said in a particular tone. *(Laughter)*

I thank Deputy Le Lièvre for his supplying the appropriate analogy and we like his jokes, we like his jokes about... Sorry, not the whole speech, sir; the little jokes, the one-liners and we like his jokes about Churchill and Montgomery and so on, and he is quite right, if that had happened it would be a very strange thing to have happened.

3875 But I paint another picture, if on that same 4th June, Montgomery had gone along and said, 'By the way, Winston, there are 10 files outside, there are about 80,000 pages of plans and by the way, you did not know, but I have had 50,000 people working on this for the last two years, and we are ready to go in two days' time. If you want to read them by then, please have a look, but it is all in place, everybody knows what they are doing,' that would be equally implausible, right? That is the parallel that some people appear, to me, to be asking for.

3880 Let us leave... let us move to the positives of this and, to me, the two really big positives in here are in one of the subtitles, phase 1, 'Making Savings Now'. I very rarely fall back on saying, 'I believe the public expect', and the people out there, who I speak to – do I want them to say to me, when I am doing my shopping tomorrow morning, 'Well done, you've made a decision, there is a set of plans in place, we're going to see the States do something'; or do I want them to say, 'Yet again, it has all been put off. What looked like a perfectly reasonable plan to us is going to be kicked into touch'? And I think the answer... That is a totally rhetorical question. 'Making Savings Now', is the title of phase 1: we should do it.

3890 The other thing was picked up by Deputy Duquemin, and that is, for the first time in a really consistent manner, the word 'customer' and 'customer focus' is used. There is a whole area of services to our electorate, to people of the Island, all of the people of the Island, where we should treat them like customers. That is a very major theme in here and I applaud it.

So, sir, let us not mess about with the amendment and putting things off. Let us stick with this plan. Let us accept that there is a lot more detail, but let us, for goodness' sake, get on with it!

Several Members: Hear, hear.

3895 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dave Jones.

Deputy David Jones: Thank you, Mr Bailiff, Members of the States.

3900 Where to start, really? I suppose, if some of the Members in this Chamber had been here when the Corporate Housing Programme was suggested, they would have thrown it out, because it was pioneering staff and it did not cross all the i's... sorry, dot all the i's and cross all the t's (*Laughter*) The same we saw with Deputy Le Lièvre and a small band over extra care housing, if we had followed their route, we would have still been talking about it round the table, instead of seeing the new buildings coming out the ground to address the real demographic problems that this Island faces.

3905 This is not new. The attacks on the Corporate Housing Programme, housing in general from Deputy Le Lièvre get more vicious and more sustained every time, but we are used to it and we have got on. I think sometimes they just get tired of Departments that have actually done something that has been of benefit for the people of Guernsey.

3910 Of course, Deputy Le Lièvre, we get a grant back from Treasury every year to Housing. No other Department pays rebates on the scale that we do. Our rebates we pay are £10 million. The alternative is that we will just charge them full rents, and you can sort it out with somebody else, how they are supposed to live. So, Housing cannot absorb a £10 million shortfall in its rental income every year, without some of that shortfall being made up – and you worked for Housing long enough to know that that is the case. So it is extremely disingenuous of you to stand up here... Sorry, through the Chair, it is extremely disingenuous of Deputy Le Lièvre to stand up in here and try and polish this particular onion to make it smell of something else. (*Laughter*)

Deputy Brehaut: Are you mixing metaphors or vegetables?

3920 **Deputy David Jones:** Sorry! Yes but the thing that really astonished me about Deputy Le Lièvre's outburst is that, somehow, the Corporate Housing Programme will be a beneficiary of this property rationalisation. Well, I hope it is!

3925 One of the things I am always being told is: 'what are you doing to find more housing? What are you doing to increase the amount of social housing?' Well, I can tell you all, we built on every vergée of land that you have given us as a States and now we do not have any more. We need to do something else.

3930 Deputy Spruce wants us, instead of going to the HTAs, to wait two years while Environment do a review of the planning laws, of the... sorry of the Island, what is it called? (*Interjection*) Yes, Urban Area Plans. Two years' waiting puts everything back five years, and the same with this. We have to get moving and we have to do it now.

So, if you really are serious about social housing, Deputy Le Lièvre and others, then we need to be looking at ways now of how we can find more land to build more social housing. You are not

happy with the Bouet, you told me the other day – you do not like the design, you do not like the massing and you do not want a bus garage down there, you are not really pleased about any of it; but at least, we have improved social housing beyond recognition in this Island and we have not made huge amounts of gains, because we have had to decamp over 250 tenants to rebuild the slums that have been left up for 20 or 30 years beyond their sell-by date. Where is the recognition for that?

The very same people who were complaining about those slums at the time I was and when they needed to be pulled down, go and have a look: we have done that. We have not made significant gains, I will grant you, but because we now have no land to build more.

Right, getting back to this particular policy letter... *(Laughter)* Well, I just want to take Deputy Brouard to task, because Deputy Brouard made such an extraordinary speech, that this was some sort of clandestine, stealthy FTP project. Well, Deputy Brouard, I would ask you, personally, to look at 9.11 on page 1100 – in fact, I am going to read it to you:

The development of the SAMP has been initiated as a FTP project, and ultimately has an objective of securing significant financial savings as soon as possible. The SAMP has, therefore, been designed with this in mind. These savings may take the form of ongoing annual efficiency savings in managing and running fewer buildings, in the non-renewal of leases, and in one-off capital receipts from property disposals. There are also anticipated to be some consequential staff savings as explained in more detail [in further paragraphs]...'

So, the idea that this is some clandestine FTP, when it is written large in the Billet that you criticise so much, is extraordinary. You clearly have not read it.

My other rant is about, in the opening in parts of this Billet, it talks about the numbers of vergées... sorry, it talks about the number of acres and 1691 acres. What astonishes me is that some civil servant had to convert that from the original vergées to call it acres, when all they ever had to do was to say there are 4,034.4 vergées! Anyway... *(Laughter)*

In the years of plenty, we acquired properties because we simply had the money to do so and we used those properties for whatever at that time we thought we might do. The result is that we have millions of pounds, now, of assets tied up, many of these properties are underused and several are clearly surplus to requirement. Also, we have now the golden opportunity to centralise our emergency service in a purpose-built compound with shared administration on several levels.

These are the real benefits that we get if we move forward with this today. I accept there is a considerable amount of concern about the centralisation of civil servants and Chief Officers at Frossard House but, for goodness' sake, that is something that can be sorted. If you are really and truly unhappy about that, then clearly, given the music coming from the States today, the Policy Council cannot ignore that. It will have to go back and look at that.

But the actual rationalisation of the property part of this Report, which is the majority of it, should be forged ahead with so that we can start to make the real savings that we will make if we do so.

I hope you do find the courage to do what you told the electorate you were going to do just a few months ago and actually try to make some real changes in the way this Island is governed, to act more corporately and to move forward. We are trying to look at the properties that we have got, get rid of the ones that we no longer need, reuse ones for other purposes that we can keep but, actually, deliver to the public many of the promises that I read in many of your manifestos not too long ago.

Thank you. *(Applause)*

The Bailiff: Deputy Gillson, then Deputy Trott.

Deputy Gillson: Sir, I think that, as others have said, everybody agrees the need to use properties in the most effective way. I think that is generally a given but, as other people have said, this is a poor report. It suggests that the Assembly is making a decision in principle when we are not being asked to make a decision in principle. Making a decision in principle would be expecting the Policy Council to go away, find something else out, and come back; but they are not. We are being asked to be able to allow them to implement phase 1 completely and, like others, I have read the Report a few times and I actually find it difficult to know what phase 1 is, where the limits of phase 1 are.

It is often said, and it is often said by Ministers, that we must make evidence-based decisions but this Report has little in the way of evidence. The amendment, on the other hand, calls for the Policy Council to revert to the Assembly with the evidence that we need.

3995 So, on the basis of a report with little evidence, it makes sense to have an amendment which says, 'Hold on, go back, get the evidence, get the justification for what you want to do and bring it to us.' The devil is in the detail, we need to know the detail before we can make decisions.

In order to fully appreciate the benefits of the amendment, I think we need to consider what is missing in the Report. Section 6.6 is a really important starting point. It says that the first stage has to be to determine a vision on how services will be delivered. That is correct.

4000 We are not being presented with details of a vision; we are being presented with a rough outline, being asked to let the Policy Council go away and sort out the details of it.

Section 9.20 is quite a revealing section. The suggestion is that the Report assumes the staff and services are reallocated, but then it admits that details of how, who, who would fund it, who would organise it are yet to be determined. It is a 'suck it and see' section.

4005 Section 10.12 is the now infamous section, about all Chief Officers moving into Sir Frossard House, away from their Departments. Now, as Deputy Le Lièvre said, this is a big issue from the way Departments operate, to the way boards operate and it is worthy of a report in itself. In fact, what we have got is six lines, and the last two of those say that operational details are unknown and will need to be sorted out. A whole restructuring of the top end of the Civil Service based on six lines.

4010 If we move on to consider section 11, yet again, a section which is interesting but draws selective and inappropriate conclusions, the Chief Minister referred to this section, it uses PSD as an example of a Department where the Chief Officer is separate from all the operating sections and it works really well. It does work well with PSD: that is because PSD is unique in that it is not a Department; it is a conglomeration of business units, all of which are individual and really work autonomously. The relationship between the Chief Officer and each of those separate, different business units is quite different. The Chief Officer of PSD does not run Guernsey Water in the way that the Chief Officer of Social Security is responsible for all aspects of social security. That example is a really bad example, because it is so selective and it is not representative of the Civil Service.

4020 The Report just does not provide any justification for moving all the Chief Officers together and yet we are being asked to agree to it.

I find section 1.7 concerning. This is a section which is about timing and it seems the timing of this is being driven by the FTP. Well, surely the timing should be driven by what we need, not just 'we have got to grab these savings and put them in our pocket by the end of 2014', which is what that section says.

4025 Now, I am really quite surprised that there is an expectation that capital proceeds are going to be applied to the FTP. That seems completely wrong. Sale of capital assets is not savings. I would be interested to know, for clarification, as to why capital proceeds are being applied to the FTP target. Maybe it is just because that is the only way we are going to get the target.

4030 Section 9.6 speaks of service-wide delivery, but to have States service-wide delivery is dependent upon agreeing the delivery vision, something which section 6.6 early on confirms does not exist. So, again, this Report just does not hang together, we have got another unknown.

4035 There are sections 9.12 and 9.13 which refer to desire to move common services to common locations, suggesting it will benefit the public, so you have public facing areas together. I dispute the logic. The only benefit of a one-stop shop is if you have a number of people who often use more than one service at the same time. That can be the only rationale.

4040 It may sound logical, but how many times does somebody want to pay their income tax, collect social security, pay a parking ticket and see a planning officer? You do not! (*Laughter*) We have got such a wide array of services, that chances of this co-location really benefiting the public, just I do not believe them.

Actually what we should be doing, in a way, is something towards the opposite. What we should be doing is making use of the 10 Douzaine rooms to be able pay bills, pay parking tickets... (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) That would really add convenience to the public.

4045 We look at page 1111 and we see a really nice diagram, but a closer look on that shows something which is quite interesting, because it is not mentioned in the report at all. It shows that, under the additional services to be moved to Sir Charles Frossard House is a finance function. Now, as I said the Report does not mention it. Given that payment of invoices and that sort of thing are already in Frossard House as the Hub, what finance function is going to be moved to Sir Charles House? Is this the strategic financial management department? I would like the Treasury Minister, when he replies, to explain exactly what finance function is going to be moved to Sir Charles Frossard House that is not there already and, more importantly, why the Report is totally silent on explaining it, why that is just slipped into a diagram in some incredibly small print.

Remember that despite the Report saying or implying in bold text somewhere that we are voting in principle, we are not. We are voting on Propositions and those Propositions depend on giving authority to the Policy Council. Now, they may have to come back with funding, but anything which does not involved funding, they will not have to come back to. So anything in there which does not involve capital funding, they will be able to do without reference to us.

Section 14.14 comments that other alternatives have been considered and it lists some. It is very noticeable that the alternative of keeping Chief Officers where they are is not listed. Perhaps that is because it actually makes sense for them to stay where they are!

Now, Deputies Perrot and Le Tocq and, I think other Deputies – maybe Deputy Langlois – have admitted it is a poor report. Quite frankly, just standing up and saying, ‘Oh, sorry, it is a poor report’ does not justify us to actually support it, and actually when you have people who are on Policy Council or on T&R holding their hands up saying, ‘it is a poor report’, frankly alarm bells should be ringing! We should be definitely not supporting. If the people who signed off a report admit it is wrong, it is poor and lacking, the last thing we should do is support it unamended. We must go through this amendment, we must approve this amendment.

Finally, sir, I agree with Deputy Duquemin that we should act as one Government, but acting as a good government means making decisions on the basis of being given sufficient information, not being kept in the dark as to details and being given examples in reports which do not stand up to true analysis.

I think this amendment is essential to correct what is failing in a poor report. Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Perrot.

Deputy Perrot: Sir, just a point of order.

I did not simply... I did not actually say it was a poor report; I said it was badly drafted and I went on to give reasons to say why it should be supported.

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Thank you, sir.

Sir, before I speak, is it your intention to propose an extension today?

The Bailiff: I was going to wait and see how...

Deputy Trott: Well, then I shall too, sir, for strategic reasons.

The Bailiff: Well, there is nobody else waiting to speak at the moment –

Deputy Trott: Oh well, okay.

The Bailiff: – so it is possible we might have finished this amendment by 5.30, I do not know. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Trott: Okay, in regards...

The Bailiff: If not, I really do not know where we are going to go.

Deputy Trott: Okay, well that makes sense, sir.
Sir...

The Bailiff: Oh, there is now Deputy Bebb waiting to speak.

Deputy Trott: Despite my proclivity for languages, I have to say that I found much of this Report Double-Dutch, and that is not a language that I profess to have any proficiency in. *(Laughter and interjections)* Yes, it is. *(Laughter)* Although the more I listen to my good friend Deputy and Advocate Perrot, the more likely I am to pick up some tips *(Laughter)*

Sir, I certainly agree with those, including the mover of this amendment, that section 9 is a struggle to understand at best, and if we look a page 1095, sir, right at the very top of that page, section 7 is drawing up a States Strategic Asset Management Plan and I quote, very sensibly, from the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, with regard to public sector asset management, who say:

4115 'To prepare a good asset strategy it requires the buy-in of the whole organisation to that vision.'

Now, this is a vision document, sir, and I can be certain of that because it is so short on detail, but what is quite clear to anyone, either in this debate or listening, is that there is anything but a buy-in of the whole organisation to that vision.

4120 Sir, on page 1119, under section 14.1, we are told that, at this stage, no attempt has been made to cost the financial implications of implementing the entire SAMP, pending States approval of the broad vision set out in this Report. Now, I challenge those members of the Policy Council who are used to sitting on corporate boards, whether they would feel comfortable approving a document of this type, with a statement of that nature included in their board pack.

4125 I am the first to admit and understand, sir, that the Government is not the same as running a company, but the point is when we are accountable outside of this Assembly, we need to explain to those who interrogate us why we were happy to support something – and that is an example of why Members feel so uneasy.

4130 Sir, on page 1129 we are reminded, and I think it may have been Deputy Soulsby who touched upon these earlier, the core principles of good governance. Core Principle 4 says that:

'Good governance means taking informed, transparent decisions...'

The Policy Council's justification for their adherence with that Core Principle is:

4135 'The report identifies the approach that has been taken in drawing up the SAMP and highlights various risks that will need to be managed if it is adopted.'

4140 And there are various risks that need to be adopted, quite considerable ones arguably, but what it does not do is it does not allow me to make an informed transparent decision, because it is so light on detail.

4145 Now, sir, on page 1091, we are reminded of the genesis of the Strategic Asset Management Plan. I am grateful to my friend, Deputy Dorey, who advised us earlier that there are three members of the T&R Department, T&R political board between 2004 and 2008: they are of course, the Deputy Chief Minister, the Minister for the Health and Social Services Department and me, sir. We did a lot of work on this matter and yet, when you read this States Report, it is almost like Korea: it is almost as if the world started on the 1st May 2012 (*Laughter*) – although I accept, sir, in Korea, it was actually several decades earlier, but you take my point.

4150 I have noticed this trend in Policy Council reports, which I hope will end soon, and it is almost a failure to accept that lots and lots of good ideas did actually come before this Assembly and many of them have helped inform the States Reports that we deal with today.

But, as everybody knows, sir, I am a positive sort of fellow, so I am going to end on a positive. On page 1122, we are advised under the section that responds briefly to some of the concerns that were raised when this Report was in its evolution stage, under the third bullet point:

4155 'Providing a purpose-built office building either in St Peter Port or another location would cost more than refurbishing all the existing buildings for the purpose. It is also questionable whether, in the current financial climate, such a project would be prioritised above the building of a new school or health care facility, while finding a suitable site – particularly in St Peter Port – would be problematic.'

4160 Well, sir, here is a little bit of thinking outside the box, although I am the first to admit that this was first suggested to me some 10 years ago by a member of the then Advisory and Finance Committee, and that is that we use some of the Superannuation Fund – the Superannuation Fund now invests in property; in fact, a fairly significant proportion of the Superannuation Fund is now invested in property – to either purchase a suitable building or, more appropriately, build a purpose-built building, because, not only would that allow the right specifications to be drawn up, it would almost certainly provide the best possible whole-life costing solution and would be one of those win-win situations, where the Superannuation Fund gets a nice secure income from arguably the best tenant in the Island – the States of Guernsey – and, at the same time, the States of Guernsey gets precisely what it needs to deal with this particular problem.

4170 Now, sir, I mentioned earlier the difference between a board and this Assembly. If I was on a corporate board, I would accept Deputy Fallaize's amendment; but I am not going to. I am going to reject it, because, at the end of the day, I understand what the big picture is with this States Report.

4175 But I would hope that the Policy Council go away and accept, this really is a shocker, guys – an absolute shocker and you really must do better.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Bebb.

4180 **Deputy Bebb:** Thank you, *Monsieur le Bailli*.

Briefly, given that so many people have spoken already, I was actually quite shocked at a few comments made in debate, in relation to the fact that we were elected in order to *do* something. Well, the idea that you do something because then you are seen to do something is good, is one of the worst ideas I have heard. We should only do something if it is the right thing to do and, at this
4185 point in time, the assertion that £12 million could be spent in this way, with no details, no information, I cannot personally say that this is the right thing to do. Therefore, I would suggest that the best thing to do is simply support the amendment, so that we get the details that are actually required.

The other thing that surprised me from this is that, as Deputy Le Lièvre actually asserted, this is a whole host of ideas thrown together at the last minute. Various people have suggested that this is a poor report. It *is* a poor report because of the whole plethora of ideas that have not actually
4190 been fully explored.

Some of the things that also... about the idea that we should continue and complete this by the end of 2015 is flights of fancy. Take a look at the projects that are actually being talked about here – and I will be the first to say, I would be happy to see HSSD vacated from Lukis House, from
4195 Swissville and the Castel. The Castel is already underway. Lukis House is a disgrace: if anybody has actually been there, you will notice that it is *not* the right kind of accommodation for people to work in. And if you want to talk about the worst, I think that Swissville is the one that has shocked me to the core, because Swissville, we have people who, literally... loft areas are being used as
4200 office areas, with far too many people crammed in. Then you throw into the factor that people are visiting their children in the Children's Services, Social Services there, in rooms where one of them does not even have central heating.

So, for me to stand here and say, 'No, I do not want to continue' really did take some doing because, at the same time, I know that HSSD have in the past drawn up plans in order to remove
4205 themselves from Swissville, Lukis House, the King Edward and the Duchess of Kent. But let us take a look at the whole idea of moving out of all four of those buildings and into a new building somewhere that has not been specified, by the end of 2015: I can say that that sounds like folly to me.

The idea, as well, that we would need to have speed on this issue: let us consider two of those buildings, the Duchess of Kent contains some of the most frail people we have in our community, in relation to their mental health. I do not assert that a fast moving plan is necessarily the best idea, given that that has to be very carefully thought out; and the King Edward contains some of our
4210 most physically frail members of our society. Swift, unconsidered and dangerous action can result in people suffering greatly and therefore the idea that we just simply pop people out of their beds and into a bed somewhere else, as seems to be the idea, by the end of 2015, is quite simply
4215 dangerous.

Therefore, Members, the idea that we simply have to do something to show that we are doing something, that is one of the worst explanations that I have heard. I sincerely hope...

And the idea that we could do nothing without this plan is also galling, because I know that
4220 Departments are far progressed in a number of these plans, and Treasury and Resources have the authority to do a lot of these already. But no, we need to actually shove it all together, have a top-down approach and then what do we have? Yet another example of SAP – a disaster that is actually still playing out today, to a disgraceful, absolutely appalling degree.

Members, if you want to have another SAP but on a far more dangerous level, given that we are actually talking about *very* vulnerable people, then please, ignore the amendment happily. Personally, I would rather have a little more caution, I would rather have the information and I
4225 would rather have it done measured and therefore I ask you all to support the amendment.

Thank you.

4230 **The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak? Chief Minister, do you wish to speak? Oh, Deputy Burford is rising, sorry.

Deputy Burford: Sir, just to pick up on Deputy Hadley's point, first of all, he did compare this vision with the Education vision. I think the fundamental difference, to me, is that I believe
4235 Education planned to come back to this Assembly with all the various things, such as the secondary school, school closures and other matters; whereas this vision is just giving almost what seems like *carte blanche* to me for very large amounts of money.

4240 Everyone is agreed that sensible use of property assets is a good idea. We do not even need a report for us to be agreed on that idea. However, the SAMP goes much, much further and we should not be hoodwinked into buying into it, just so that we can rationalise property. Indeed, it is mentioned already, certain actions are possible under the existing Corporate Property Plan.

4245 Now, despite the assurances of the Chief Minister, I really am concerned that much of this is driven by a desperate need to meet the FTP targets. The FTP deadline is the wrong driver for such fundamental change: it is the tail wagging the dog.

This Report is putting the cart before the horse. We need to have much more flesh on the bones of modern ways of working, in section 9.20 first, before considering these major changes.

The Report also admits the need for the buy-in of staff. From the staff I have spoken to, I think this is going to be a really big ask and the fallout could be very significant.

4250 Section 9.8, which is about States-wide service delivery, rather than departmental service delivery, has more than a touch of rose-tinted spectacles about it. In section 9.8, it says :

‘This should be of benefit to both service users and employees; better methods of working will be achieved, which, in turn, will result in higher standards of service delivery; and, importantly this will result in considerable efficiency savings.’

4255

How can we be sure that the upshot of section 9.8, in five or ten years’ time, will not actually be a report telling us everything that is wrong with the then service delivery system and proposing another expensive way of putting it right? Support this plan in haste and repent at leisure. I will be supporting the amendment.

4260

Thank you.

The Bailiff: I see no one else rising. It is now getting very close to 5.30, so we do need a decision as to whether we are going to continue beyond 5.30.

4265

The only speeches left on this amendment will be Deputy St Pier, who I understand is going to reply on behalf of the Policy Council, and Deputy Fallaize who will reply to the debate. There is then another amendment, which I understand is not going to be opposed. Can I just have an indication of how many people would wish to speak on Deputy Soulsby’s amendment, on the basis that it is not opposed?

4270

Perhaps, Chief Minister, you could confirm that it is not opposed?

The Chief Minister (Deputy Harwood): That is correct, sir.

4275 **The Bailiff:** Yes, on the basis that it is not opposed, how many people would wish to speak on that amendment? No, so we might be able to deal with that very quickly.

And how many more people would wish to speak in general debate, who have not already spoken generally? Four, five... Well, I do not think we would finish the whole matter before 6.30 then.

4280 So what I am going to propose is that we just complete the present amendment, but we continue to sit for as long as we need to do to finish this amendment, and then we will have to take a decision as to when we are going to come back to complete this Billet.

But I do not believe, with five people still to speak in general debate, the average length of speeches has been such – and then, of course, Deputy St Pier has to reply to the general debate – I do not believe we would finish by 6.30.

4285 So, what I am going to propose is that we continue to sit just to complete the present amendment. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

4290

The Bailiff: Right, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, thank you. Thank you, Members, for contribution to the amendment debate.

4295 Sir, before I go any further, I must just respond to some comments which Deputy Collins made. I need to advise Members that there are no secret reports on SAP. As Deputy Collins will be aware from his time as a member of the Treasury and Resources Board and as a political member on the SAP project team since the election, and for much of the implementation, there have, as Members would expect, been a number of normal project reports on SAP prepared as part of the project management for the project board, to assist them in managing the delivery and as a part of the normal gateway review process, sir.

4300 **Deputy Collins:** Sir, could I, with your indulgence, read the lines of the distribution of this Report?

The Bailiff: Well, only if it is a proper interruption under rule 12(6). Are you saying Deputy St Pier is misleading the States?

4305 **Deputy Collins:** Well, the Minister has just informed the Assembly that it is not secret. Perhaps the wording of the distribution of this Report would indicate other. But I will concede the point, sir. It is pointless.

4310 **The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Clearly, as I say, there are normal internal reports prepared as part of the project management. I would not classify those as being secret reports and my point, sir, I think is it unhelpful for Members in this Assembly to use inflammatory and provocative language.

4315 With that said, sir, I will move on to the amendment. Deputy Fallaize expressed surprise that Deputy Le Tocq and I had only focused on Proposition 2 in the proposed Proposition 2A in our draft amendment which was not tabled. What I would say to Deputy Fallaize is, the reason for that is, as Deputy Luxon correctly makes the point, is that we are listening and what Deputy Le Tocq and I heard was some comments about, concern about this being a move by the centre and civil servants and we felt that that was addressing that.

4320 However before the amendment was to be laid we heard that, actually, there were wider issues which, clearly he addressed in his comments and have been addressed by others. So I would suggest that we were listening carefully in the decision not to present the amendment and also having recognition of the time and where we are in the week.

4325 I think I would describe myself and probably Deputy Le Tocq as having a reasonably high level of emotional intelligence and we have clearly heard what has been said here this afternoon and, therefore, recognise that there is perhaps an uphill task, that there is broader opposition.

4330 Having said that, I think what I have clearly heard is there is not broader opposition to the principle of the Strategic Asset Management Plan, but opposition to this Report and, in particular, the comments that it had perhaps been brought forward too quickly. In fact, at one point, given that all the speeches have been against and none have been for, I was even contemplating denying my own right to speak by bringing a guillotine, but there you go... In jest, I was not really.

4335 Given the time, sir, I am not going to address everybody's comments but I obviously, clearly, would like to acknowledge those that have spoken against the amendment, Deputies Duquemin, Wilkie, Langlois – and I *think* I would like to thank Deputy Trott for his useful comments! And also, of course, Deputies from my own Department, Perrot and Adam.

4340 I think it is also fair to acknowledge the comments of Deputies O'Hara, Spruce and Domaille, to confirm that, in the meetings I was present at, they did fully and frankly express their concerns and that is the joy in the system of government that we have, and there is nothing further to be said in relation to that.

4345 Deputy Stewart, I think, was perhaps unfairly heckled. I clearly interpret his question as being a rhetorical question to prompt me to address the point, which was that clearly it is not intended to be an approval to spend £12 million. There will be at least two other opportunities to approve spending required under this Report. The Capital Prioritisation Report, in September, which is exactly why it was felt important to have the debate in July, and then, again, when the further business cases are brought forward for approval.

4350 Deputies Le Tocq and Hadley quite correctly identified this as being a high level vision and that was precisely the intention of those drafting and of the Treasury and Resources and Policy Council in deciding to bring this Report in its current form, and suffered the criticism as a result. But it was felt appropriate to seek to get backing to the principles of the strategic asset management before directing resources, time and money to taking the project further forward.

4355 There was vigorous debate, actually, in Policy Council and at the Treasury and Resources Department as to exactly how much information, how much detail in relation to what have been presented as suggestions should go in. It was recognised that to say nothing and just talk about 'we need a Strategic Asset Management Plan' would suffer criticism for too little and that to put in details of suggestions would, themselves, become hostage to fortune, and I fear that is what has happened, sir.

4360 But, as I say, it is very encouraging that, I think, I have not heard anyone speak against the need for the Strategic Asset Management Plan, although I appreciate we have not had the full general debate.

It is fair to say that this is not a cost-free amendment. As Alderney Representative Arditti noted, the adoption of this amendment will mean that some delay is inevitable and the principal impact of this will be that the anticipated early wins that would have contributed FTP savings over the next 18 months very likely would be unable to be released by the 31st December, and that was about £1 million or so.

For those that – Deputy Brouard and others – who are concerned that this was a driver, of course, it was always recognised that the Strategic Asset Management Plan *is* an FTP project, albeit one that will outlive the FTP programme for many years.

It does need to be remembered that the Treasury and Resources Department and Policy Council's enthusiasm for these quick wins, which has, of course, driven the production of the Report in a way which has now been criticised as being too quickly, was because of, as I said earlier, the need to have some debate before the Capital Prioritisation Report. That, of course, is also a recognition of our own, and this Assembly's, overarching commitment to the Financial Transformation Programme, for good reasons that we debated earlier in the year, sir. I may stand corrected, but I think it was Deputy Brehaut who made the point, in that debate, that we would need to remember that debate, because we would be tested with decisions further down the line, in relation to delivery of programmes and, perhaps, this is the first substantive test of that.

If we are to stick to the FTP's targets of £31 million and the delivery of those by the end of 2014, and we know that there are some pressures on that in any event, then, if this amendment is successful, we need to consider how we go about squaring that particular circle, whether FTP targets are... how they are changed elsewhere or how we manage the cash position in 2014, neither of those, of which, are attractive.

Sir, this, clearly, this Report clearly is not a showroom-fit, well-polished Bentley; it feels to me, perhaps, a little bit more like a slightly buffed-up, underpowered Ford Transit, (*Laughter*) trying to drag a weight up hill. This amendment will add more weight to that load. If the Propositions are accepted with the amendment, then it means we will get to the destination, but we will get there more slowly, with the consequences that that entails.

Sorry I have failed to address one question, which was Deputy Gillson's, in relation to the finance function. Of course, there are many finance functions spread around the place. The reference here, again, is not that... Again, given that this is high level principles, it was not in relation to specific functions, but merely consideration of raising the question of whether it is appropriate to look at whether there were any efficiencies that could be brought by bringing some or more of those together. That, I think, is the only reason for the reference, sir.

In relation to Proposition 2A, it appeared to be founded on the sentiment that the plan is, in some way, a conspiracy to strengthen the Civil Service or take further step towards executive government and I am encouraged that, in his opening comments, Deputy Fallaize confirmed that that was not his concern, because I know he had expressed some concern to members of the States Review Committee that, in some way, this could pre-judge the outcome of that work. So I am encouraged that he recognises that, because it is certainly not part of a narrative which I recognise and which Deputy Luxon and others have as well

Sir, for the reasons which I have said, I am unable to support this amendment and, for the reasons cited by a number of Deputies, I would encourage others to do the same.

Thank you, sir.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you sir.

Deputy Domaille was the first to speak after I had opened on the amendment and he asked whether existing property management could continue, including property rationalisation, in the event that this amendment was successful. Of course, it could and I think Deputy Dorey, in his speech, explained how, and that a great deal of what does need to be done to further property rationalisation can be perused under the Corporate Property Plan and, if this debate does anything to provide impetus to implementation of the Corporate Property Plan, then I think that that alone will have made this debate worthwhile.

Deputy O'Hara said that he thought the proposals were overoptimistic and I think that was a point that Deputy Bebb made as well and, I have to agree, if one looks at page 1117, my understanding is that all of the projects from paragraph 13.4 to 13.6 are earmarked to take place before the end of next year: refurbishing Frossard House, Wheadon House, the Old States Office and vacating a whole load of buildings, including Duchess of Kent House, La Couperderie, Lukis House, Raymond Falla House and I think that is hopelessly optimistic.

He spoke about the authors of the Report and, actually, the way he spoke and the way subsequent members of the sponsoring Committee spoke did make me wonder who has done the policy development here, because it seems to me that while there may have been some oversight

by members of the sponsoring Committees, the impetus for this has been driven at a staff level. Maybe that is incorrect, but that is certainly the impression that I have picked up from reading this Report and from the debate.

4425 Deputy Spruce... In fact, all of the first three speakers were members of the sponsoring Committees and all three of them spoke against the Propositions as drafted. I thought Deputy Spruce's revelation was extraordinary that Treasury and Resources, despite co-sponsoring this report, which we are told is proposing one of the most far-reaching transformational initiatives the States has ever undertaken, members of the Committee co-sponsoring the Report saw it for 48 hours! That cannot possibly mean that there is proper political ownership of this Report - particularly given that T&R's mandate is to advise the States on matters relating to the allocation and administration of all States resources and to provide corporate property services and advice to Departments and Committees. The members of that Committee saw this overarching property plan for 48 hours before submitting it.

4435 Deputy Duquemin is attracted to the principles and the objectives but, actually, as Deputy St Pier just said, I do not think there is any disagreement with the principles and the objectives. So I think the rest of the States is with him in that, but I do think it is complacent to overlook the flaws and the deficiencies, of which there are many in this policy letter, blindly to pursue principles and objectives which may be sound. I think that is bad decision making.

4440 He said that he agreed with the suggestions in section 10 and, leaving aside the first suggestion about the separation of functions, the eight other sections are covered by 31 paragraphs. I do not see how it is possible to agree to the construction of a bus depot in the location proposed on the basis of two paragraphs, or to want to see Duchess of Kent House vacated on the basis of five paragraphs. This is a grand plan, but politicians and grand plans that are not thought through very well do not have a particularly good history. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

4445 Deputy Wilkie criticised my amendment – the new Proposition 1 I am trying to insert – for only wanting to adopt the principles. But, actually, the Policy Council's Propositions themselves are to adopt the principles, so that rather implies that was all the Policy Council was after, but the problem is they then linked the adoption of principles to all of the narrative in section 9 of that Report which goes way beyond principles.

4450 Deputy Stewart bemoaned the laying of this amendment and Deputy Le Tocq spoke disparagingly of delaying tactics. It is not my fault that this amendment is necessary. It is not the States' fault that this amendment is necessary. This amendment is caused by one thing and one thing only, which is the Policy Council and T&R laying before the States an inadequate policy letter (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and then putting a gun to the heads of the States and saying, 'Well, actually, if you want to make progress, if you want positive change, you have to vote for it.' That is not my fault.

This amendment originated when the Policy Council and the Treasury and Resources Department submitted an inadequate policy letter. From that moment on, it was inevitable.

4460 Deputy Perrot accepted that the policy letter was not well crafted. He believes in the thrust of the policy letter and so do I. I do too, I believe in its principles and in its objectives.

He raised the issue of a corporate approach, which he also raised when we debated the Government Service Plan, and I do not think the problem here is with a corporate approach. The last States voted for something called a Corporate Property Plan, which was binding on all States Committees and was actually quite far-reaching in itself. The problem is not with the corporate approach; the problem is that there is not adequate information in the policy letter to justify the Propositions which are attached to the policy letter.

4465 Deputy Le Tocq, extraordinarily I thought, appealed for States Members to reject the amendment, so that the Policy Council could go forward in consensus. (*Laughter*) Well, sir, if this debate has proved anything, it has proved that the Policy Council cannot establish consensus for the Propositions as drafted. The consensus, as Deputy St Pier has rather suggested in his speech, is for the principles but not for the detailed Propositions which are set out.

4470 Deputy Le Tocq bemoaned the request for further detail, but Alderney Representative Arditti said, quite correctly, it is no good the Policy Council complaining when the States asks for additional information, when the Policy Council lays before the States an inadequate policy letter.

4475 Deputy Le Tocq said this was a high level vision and Deputy Hadley said the same thing and, as Deputy Burford has correctly suggested, this is not a high level vision because the Propositions turn it into something else. My Propositions in my amendment maintain it as a high level vision, because they ask the States to agree to the principles and direct the sponsoring Committees to come back with a further report.

4480 In the Education Department's vision, the Propositions were to agree to the Education Department's strategic direction and then to direct Education to report back to the States on further

details. So, that was a high level vision with appropriate Propositions. This may be a high level vision, but it does not have appropriate Propositions and I think my amendment makes the Propositions appropriate.

Deputy Le Tocq also spoke, and I thought this was a bit patronising, about newly elected Members and more established Members, as if newly elected Members could not possibly know what the States had done prior to 2012 and they were all a little bit naïve and that is, perhaps, why they have concern – although, bizarrely, when he spoke, he said that some of the disquiet was coming from newly elected Members who did not appreciate earlier work that had been done. But, at the time he spoke, I made a note that every Member of the States who was elected in 2012 had spoken in favour of the Report and against the amendment, and every Member of the previous States has spoken in favour of the amendment. So, that was a very, very odd point (*Laughter*) that Deputy Le Tocq made – but fortunately he is not here to defend himself anyway! (*Laughter*).

Deputy Gollop regretted that there had been ‘not much consultation with other Departments’ but Deputy Spruce demonstrated that there has not been much consultation with the people who were supposed to have submitted the Report! (*Laughter*)

Deputy Dorey, correctly, said that if the Report had been better drafted, it would have avoided much of its criticism. I have seen this before where the Policy Council is split on major policy letters. I remember the Financial Transformation Programme debated by the States in 2009, and I laid an amendment about the way in which the Financial Transformation Programme would be delivered and the Policy Council was split, I think, 6-5. They managed to get it through, I think, by two votes – and it was a disaster. Minister after Minister got up in that debate and said, ‘Look, it cannot be delivered in this way, because there is not enough detail in the policy letter’; but the States did agree to it on that occasion and, for two years, the Financial Transformation Programme really did not achieve what it was meant to achieve. Then, eventually, the Policy Council accepted that it had been approached in the wrong way, that it was all too centralised and there was a feeling as if it was being done *to* Departments rather than *with* Departments.

I have rather got the same sense today. I think a lot of this Report is promoted on the basis of helping three Departments... well, apart from Housing; four Departments in fairness – the other three Departments: HSSD’s 2020 Vision, the Education Department’s vision and Environment Department in respect of the bus depot, and yet all those three Ministers of those Departments are going to vote for my amendment.

So I think the fact that there is this disquiet and disagreement on the Policy Council is quite significant and it would be risky for us to vote for the Propositions as drafted, given that that is the case.

Deputy Adam said that it was vitally important that the States agree to the principles. I agree and they are maintained in my new Proposition 1. He asked a question about what could proceed anyway. What I am saying is that there are already quite significant powers held by T&R and the Policy Council in respect of corporate policy and property management, and I think that those powers should be used and any initiative pursuant to them should be implemented. They do not need further resolutions.

But what the amendment definitely does not do is commit the States to all of section 9 and phase 1 of the Report because it is absolutely unclear, from the policy letter, where phase 1 starts and where phase 1 ends.

Alderney Representative Arditti, I thought, was spot on when he focused on the Propositions, because we are not voting, today, on the thrust of the policy letter; we are being asked to vote on the actual Propositions and when you link the two, there is an enormous disconnect. The policy letter does not remotely justify the scope of the Propositions before the States.

We cannot vote for the Propositions, saying, ‘Well, we know what we think the Policy Council mean.’ We have to vote on the Propositions as they are actually drafted.

Deputy Langlois made an appeal for Members who are in favour of change to vote for the original Propositions. I thought that was probably, the poorest argument of the debate, actually. I could sit up here and say, ‘Look, I am proposing a Requête to abolish the 11-plus and if you are in favour of change and if you are in favour of making progress, you should vote for my Requête.’ Deputy Langlois would not! Deputy Langlois would say, ‘Well, I don’t like your form of change’ – and that is what I am saying here.

There is a difference between change and progress. This policy letter might represent change but there is not justification in it that it represents progress.

I do not think any member who spoke, not even Deputy Langlois, really genuinely spoke in favour of the Propositions. They spoke in favour of the Report, they spoke in favour of the general principles, the general thrust of the thing, the objectives. But, in respect of the principles and the general policies, the Policy Council is chasing the ball into the back of the net.

4545 The concern I have and the concern that many other Members have is not with the principles; it is with the Propositions and the Propositions have not been defended by members of the sponsoring Committees at all.

I have to thank Deputy Trott because I thought he made one of the best speeches in favour of the amendment. *(Laughter)* He did, bizarrely, finish with the conclusion that he would not vote for the amendment, but he said that the policy letter did not allow the States to take a transparent and informed decision in respect of voting for the original Proposition, and therefore if he is going to vote against the amendment as well, my only conclusion is that he is going to chuck the whole lot out, because that is the... If you do not think the original Propositions allow you to make an informed and transparent decision and you do not vote for the amendment, then the only alternative is to throw out the whole thing, it seems to me.

4555 Sir, I think, probably, that covers all the points that were made in debate which I feel the need to respond to. I would draw Members' attention, again, to this paragraph which says that the plan represents one of the most far-reaching transformational initiative ever undertaken by the States, and I wonder whether Members believe there is sufficient information in the policy letter to vote for Propositions that are of that sort of order; and it does say to the States that it will fall to the Policy Council working in conjunction with T&R to give approval for whatever programme of works is required to implement phase 1. Well, clearly, there is enormous disquiet in the States about that. I really do not feel that IT is appropriate to delegate that level of authority, when there is absolutely no clarity and no certainty about where phase 1 starts and where phase 1 ends.

4565 And no members of the Policy Council took up my challenge to explain to the States where phase 1 starts and where phase 1 ends, so I still do not know what I would be voting for if I was to agree to the implementation of phase 1 in Proposition 2 as it stands.

4570 Sir, I want the States to agree to the principles; I want further work to carry on; I want the States to rationalise property; but I want the States to do it in a way that allows the States to move forward in an informed way and I think that the Propositions laid out in my amendment are justified by the policy letter. I do not think the Policy Council's Propositions are justified by their own policy letter and I think my amendment improves the Propositions and then, if the amendment is successful, I look forward to the sponsoring Committees carrying out further work as quickly as possible and returning to the States with the next stage.

4575 Thank you, sir.
Sir, can we have a recorded vote, please?

The Bailiff: Members, we are being asked for a recorded vote on the amendment proposed by Deputy Fallaize, seconded by Deputy Soulsby.

4580 *There was a recorded vote.*

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby?

4585 **Deputy Soulsby:** I was just wondering, sir, given that Policy Council are not opposing my amendment and nobody wishes to speak, whether it is possible to lay my amendment and have a vote?

The Bailiff: Are you proposing not to speak on it?

4590 **Deputy Soulsby:** Yes, no –

The Bailiff: Well, maybe...

4595 **Deputy Soulsby:** Yes. *(Laughter)*

Amendment:

1. To add Proposition 5 as follows –

4600 *“To direct Policy Council and Treasury and Resources Department to work in conjunction with the States Assembly and Constitution Committee to ensure that the Strategic Asset Management Plan is consistent with Resolution (z) of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee, Scrutiny Committee and States Assembly and Constitution Committee report on Improving Governance in the States of Guernsey dated January 2012 (Article XVI Billet d'État No. V dated 8th March 2012).”*

4605 **The Bailiff:** Does anybody else wish to speak on the amendment? No? Well, in that case it seems sensible, perhaps, to get that out of the way.

So, Deputy Soulsby, you formally lay the amendment. Deputy Le Clerc, are you formally seconding it?

4610 **Deputy Le Clerc:** I do, sir.

The Bailiff: And then, if nobody wishes to speak on it, we will go straight to the vote. Those in favour; those against.

4615 *All Members voted Pour.*

The Bailiff: The amendment is carried.

Let us just wait for the vote and then we will decide when we are going to resume.

4620 *Amendment by Deputies Fallaize and Soulsby:*

Carried – Pour 28, Contre 14, Abstained 0, Not Present 5

POUR	CONTRE	ABSTAINED	NOT PRESENT
Alderney Rep. Jean	Deputy Harwood	None	Deputy Le Pelley
Alderney Rep. Arditti	Deputy Kuttelwascher		Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Brehaut	Deputy Langlois		Deputy Paint
Deputy Domaille	Deputy St Pier		Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Robert Jones	Deputy Stewart		Deputy O'Hara
Deputy Le Clerc	Deputy Trott		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy David Jones		
Deputy Sherbourne	Deputy Duquemin		
Deputy Conder	Deputy Adam		
Deputy Storey	Deputy Perrot		
Deputy Bebb	Deputy Wilkie		
Deputy Lester Queripel	Deputy Luxon		
Deputy Gillson	Deputy Quin		
Deputy Ogier	Deputy Hadley		
Deputy Fallaize			
Deputy Lowe			
Deputy Le Lièvre			
Deputy Spruce			
Deputy Collins			
Deputy Green			
Deputy Dorey			
Deputy James			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy De Lisle			
Deputy Burford			
Deputy Inglis			
Deputy Soulsby			
Deputy Sillars			

4625 **The Bailiff:** Members, the votes cast on Deputy Fallaize and Deputy Soulsby's amendment were 28 in favour, 14 against. I declare the amendment carried.

Procedural

Business adjourned until 24th September 2013

4630

The Bailiff: The question now is, when do we resume? There is a suggestion perhaps we come back tomorrow, to do some business tomorrow. Just looking at the Billet, we have got something like five speeches still to be heard in general debate and then, obviously, Deputy St Pier to reply in general debate on the present Article, and I would think that could be 45 minutes or an hour. We have got, perhaps, three Reports that would be quite quick and then we have got four which may attract more debate: there is the Environment Department's Report on coastal defence flood studies; there is the States Assembly and Constitution Committee's amendments to the Rules of Procedure; and the two Requêtees. I imagine that each one of those may take up a certain amount of time.

4640 One proposal could be to come back, say, tomorrow morning just to finish this present debate and, perhaps, to deal with the three things, or whatever it is, that we can deal with quite quickly, get those out of the way and then, I think, the Chief Minister is going to propose that we come

back at the end of September, in the light of the fact that the September Billet is not a particularly heavy one, and complete the rest of the business there.

4645 **Chief Minister:** do you just want to talk about the September Billet?

4650 **Deputy Harwood:** Yes, sir, there are two items on the September Billet which I believe will require some debate. One is the Capital Prioritisation Report and the other one is a Constitutional Report, really led by Deputy Perrot. Those are the only two items that I think will entail any significant debate. I believe, therefore, sir that we can, as discussed previously, start the meeting in September with the unfinished business on this Billet, and then move on to the matters on the September Billet.

4655 **The Bailiff:** I suppose the only question might be whether it would be a wise precaution to allow four days and start on the Tuesday in September, because if we do not finish in September, I understand the October Billet is going to be a very heavy one.

Deputy Harwood: Sir, there will be an October reserve date – a date reserved in October.

4660 **The Bailiff:** Well, there would be; and the default date, obviously Members realise, is that we come back on the second Wednesday in August, unless we agree something else.
 But you are talking about September to come back in October. Deputy Lowe?

4665 **Deputy Lowe:** Are you still proposing that we come back tomorrow, sir, to finish this debate, which I would agree with?

The Bailiff: I will put first that we come back tomorrow for, say, the maximum of the morning –

4670 **Deputy Lowe:** Finish this and get on with something...

The Bailiff: I will put that. I think there are quite a few people indicated they are not happy with that. Deputy Fallaize?

4675 **Deputy Fallaize:** Well, sir, as an alternative, can we not just carry on tonight? Even if it is until seven o'clock and then... because otherwise, if we come back in the morning, then that sort of ruins another day. *(Laughter)*

4680 **The Bailiff:** Well, the Rules say that only in exceptional circumstances do we go beyond 6.30. I do not believe, with five people still to speak, given the length of speeches that we have heard in this debate and given the fact that Deputy St Pier has to reply to the debate, I do not think we will finish by 6.30.

4685 **Deputy Fallaize:** But, sir, we can suspend the Rules, can't we?

The Bailiff: Well, we can, but the Rules are there because there have been instances where decisions taken after a very long meeting are later regretted by the States. Deputy Dorey?

4690 **Deputy Dorey:** I believe that we should leave these items to September.

The Bailiff: Well, let us not have a debate –

4695 **Deputy Dorey:** That is what the Rules say. I think we have had a long week, we have had four days, we have had a long day and I think many of us have got families and I do not want to come back tomorrow morning. I think we should... it is now into August, these items can wait to September.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

4700 **The Bailiff:** I will put first the idea that we come back tomorrow. We will take a vote on that. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Contre.

4705 **The Bailiff:** We will not come back tomorrow. *(Laughter)*
I can only recommend that we continue this evening if I am satisfied we can finish by 6.30, and I am not satisfied we can finish by 6.30. It has been a long day, it has been a long week. I am not going to recommend that we continue indefinitely this evening. I do not think that is good government.

4710 So what I am going to put to you is that we come back in September, *(Interjection)* on the Tuesday? Yes, come back on the Tuesday in September. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

4715 **The Bailiff:** Right, in that case we will resume this debate and deal with the other outstanding items on Tuesday the whatever it is – the last Tuesday in September – *(Interjection)* 24th, thank you.

We will finish for today. That is it, thank you very much.

Deputy Fallaize.

4720 **Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, may I just ask something in respect of one of the items that is going to be deferred, because Deputy Bebb's Requête – and I speak not as a signatory and not as a supporter of the Requête either – but it does contain a Proposition – Proposition 4... and it has been lodged for debate at this meeting and I just wonder whether the Chief Minister might be able to give a commitment that between now and the time when it is actually debated, nothing would be done which would make Proposition 4, in effect, redundant by the time it is debated in September.

4725 It seems to me that the normal convention is that if a motion is lodged for debate, then action which is contrary to that motion is not taken in advance of the matter being considered by the States. So, I just wonder whether the Chief Minister –

4730 **The Bailiff:** Well, I do not see how he can do that without consulting with Policy Council. He would have to convene a meeting of Policy Council to do that.

Unless, the Chief Minister wants to convene a meeting of Policy Council now to do that? Do you wish to?

4735 **The Chief Minister:** A number of members of Policy Council have now left the Chamber.
I do not think I can give an undertaking, because the Assembly will be aware that there is currently at least one vacancy which we are seeking to fill. I do not believe that would constitute a change in the overall structure, but I cannot... without considering the actual definition used in the Requête, it would be difficult to give that assurance at this stage.

4740 **Deputy Lowe:** Sir, as there are eight Ministers out of the ten still here, would it be worthwhile actually adjourning for five minutes?

4745 **The Bailiff:** Well, the Chief Minister has indicated he does not wish to. It has been a long week. I think I have already indicated the dangers of decisions being taken when people are tired after a long week. If the Chief Minister is not prepared to convene, then...

4750 **Deputy Bebb:** Sir, I have to register, I recognise the decision but I think that it is worth registering my disquiet at the very least as to the fact that no confirmation can be given that further progress will not be made that would actually, in result, actually render the Requête to be not worth debating due to the fact that Policy Council have already moved too far.

4755 I have to say that there is a report that was due to be debated this month and, therefore, for the Policy Council to pursue an action that is clearly in contravention of the Requête before it is resolved would be inappropriate.

The Bailiff: Well, I cannot require the Chief Minister to give an undertaking. He has indicated that he is not willing to convene a meeting of Policy Council now. I suggest we close this meeting.

4760 **The Chief Minister:** Can I just record that certainly Policy Council will take note of paragraph 4 of your Requête.

The Bailiff: Thank you. Let us close the meeting.

The Assembly adjourned at 6.08 p.m.