



**OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF THE**

**STATES OF DELIBERATION**

**OF THE**

**ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

**HANSARD**

**Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 24th November 2023**

*All published Official Reports can be found on the  
official States of Guernsey website [www.gov.gg](http://www.gov.gg)*

**Volume 12, No. 38**

**ISSN 2049-8284**

**Present:**

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

**Law Officers**

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

**People's Deputies**

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

**Representatives of the Island of Alderney**

Alderney Representatives S. Roberts and E. A. J. Snowdon

**The Clerk to the States of Deliberation**

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

**Absent at the Evocation**

Deputy A. H. Brouard (*relevé à 09h 51*)

## Business transacted

Evocation .....	3175
<b>Billet d'État XX.....</b>	<b>3175</b>
2. Motion of No Confidence in the Policy & Resources Committee – Debate commenced	3175
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 1.03 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.....</i>	<i>3213</i>
Motion of No Confidence in the Policy & Resources Committee – Debate continued .....	3213
10. Schedule for Future States' Business – Proposition carried.....	3252

*PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK*

# States of Deliberation

*The States met at 9.30 a.m.*

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

## PRAYERS

*The States' Greffier*

## EVOCATION

# Billet d'État XX

## 2. Motion of No Confidence in the Policy & Resources Committee – Debate commenced

### *Article 2*

*The States are asked:*

*Whether, after consideration of the motion of no confidence in the President and Members of the Policy & Resources Committee dated 1st November 2023, signed by Deputy C.N.K. Parkinson and six other Members of the States, they are of the opinion: -*

*1. To decide, in accordance with Rule 21 of the Rules of Procedure, that the States of Deliberation require the immediate resignation of the President and Members of the Policy & Resources Committee, they having no confidence in the said Committee.*

**The States' Greffier:** Billet d'État XX, Article 2 – Motion of No Confidence in the Policy & Resources Committee.

5

**The Bailiff:** Good morning, Members of the States.

Before I call Deputy Parkinson to open debate on the Motion of No Confidence I think it is appropriate that I inform you that I have received two letters this morning, both of which tender resignations from the Policy & Resources Committee.

10

The first is from Deputy Helyar and the second is from Deputy Mahoney. The consequences of those two letters being received I think will be that if the motion does not carry then Propositions will be submitted; a single Proposition for two Members of the Policy & Resources Committee will be submitted by me and therefore will be in play at the meeting commencing on 12th December this year.

15

However, if the Motion of No Confidence is successful then the terms of Rule 21 will apply and the President and all four Members will simply be deemed to have vacated their offices with immediate effect and therefore there will be a requirement to elect first a President and then four Members.

So the resignations, although both Deputy Helyar and Deputy Mahoney have tendered their resignations in accordance with Rule 37(5), are not effective until such time as the Proposition is dealt with, which would be on 12th December.

The other thing that I propose to say in relation to the Motion of No Confidence is that the case that the Committee is required to meet, and therefore the relevance of debate in respect thereof, is that set out in the grounds of the Motion of No Confidence from Deputy Parkinson and six other Members. It is a very short Motion of No Confidence in that the grounds specified are simply that the undersigned Members have no confidence in the ability of the Policy & Resources Committee to discharge its mandate.

Accordingly, for the purpose of the Rule relating to relevance of debate, Members will need to focus on how or how not in the view of each Member the Committee has discharged its mandate. This is not about anything other than discharging the mandate of the Committee. This is not about persons, this is about the mandate, and any Member who expresses a view outside of matters touching on discharging of the mandate of the Committee is likely to be asked to refrain from doing so. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)** It is, however, a broad mandate and people might need to remind themselves exactly what is on the face of the mandate.

Without further ado I will invite Deputy Parkinson to open the debate, please.

**Deputy Parkinson:** Thank you, sir, and to save time in the debate I will not be giving way.

Sir, so far, like our predecessor States, we have woefully failed to meet the concerns of the bedrock of our community. Those are not my words, sir, they were the words of Deputy Ferbrache making a statement on behalf of the Policy & Resources Committee on 30th March, 2022. And Deputy Ferbrache was right; his Committee, which was elected on slogans like: '*Action This Day*' have achieved very little. It has still achieved very little.

Not only has it not led and inspired political action but it has also frustrated other Committees that have sought to take any action. If it was not their idea, P&R were opposed to it. They seized control of the process but then introduced nothing but delay and procrastination into it. I will give a few examples.

The first concerns the Commercial Ports Project. STSB, on which I sit, spent a great deal of time and money on the first phase of the investigation. We produced a Policy Letter which suggested that further research into the practicality of a new port at Longue Hougue South was necessary. STSB met with P&R prior to the States' meeting and were assured of their full support. During the debate P&R withdrew their support without warning and told STSB that they could only vote in favour of the main proposals if the two Committees also proposed the setting up of an east coast development agency. STSB had no objection and worked on a compromise amendment with P&R in good faith. Once that amendment was passed P&R reneged on that agreement and voted in favour of the proposals to set up a development agency but against taking forward the work on the commercial port. The upshot is that, in last month's Finance & Investment Plan debate, the States agreed to spend a couple of million pounds on exactly the investigation work on a new commercial port which STSB proposed two and a half years ago: the very opposite of '*Action This Day*'.

A second, and related, example is the issue of inert waste. The last States agreed that Longue Hougue South was the preferred site for disposal of inert waste, subject to a planning inquiry. Two Members of the new P&R and, indeed, new Members of the States, strongly disagreed but, instead of trying to amend the decision of the previous States, on the floor of the Assembly they and their colleagues denied E&I the funds to conduct the necessary planning inquiry. The result is that many millions of pounds will now have to be squandered in double-handling inert waste and creating a 30 feet-high mound of it on the existing Long Hougue North site. This will sterilise the land for other purposes such as, for example, possibly a new power station, until the stockpile can be cleared.

Deputy Roffey may choose to describe the behaviour of those two Members of P&R towards senior public servants, ridiculing their estimates of the costs of making Les Vardes quarry a part of Guernsey's mortar storage and distribution network but I will leave that to him.

70 The third example within my own experience is the dairy project. The existing dairy is past its sell-by date and it sits on a valuable site, contiguous with the PEH; a site which would be ideal for nurses' accommodation or even for the Medical Specialist Group. Various projects on that site could be supported by an income stream.

Deputy Ferbrache, when President of the STSB, led the successful call to fund a new dairy. Then, as President of P&R, his team de-prioritised the project. He explained to Deputy Roffey that one difficulty was incredulity at the estimated cost of the dairy. A compromise was agreed that STSB would hold off for now but P&R and STSB would jointly prepare and propose an amendment to bring in an independent expert to check STSB's homework in the outline business plan. This was passed but, despite frequent reminders, P&R have never actioned the resolution.

80 Sir, that is just three examples of P&R frustrating the good work of other Committees, from my experience on STSB alone. No doubt other Members will have further examples from within their own experience on other Committees. Far from helping us to make progress P&R have been obstructive at every turn, have gone back on their word on several occasions and have sabotaged progress.

85 But the issue which was the catalyst for this Motion of No Confidence was, of course, the failure of P&R to get the central plank of their fiscal policy through the Assembly. In any normal western democracy a government which lost the key element of its fiscal policy would resign. Without the revenues that it deems essential to its spending plans the whole of its policy platform falls apart.

I do not intend to rehearse the arguments that we have so recently debated but suffice to say that I believe I presented a realistic and sensible proposal to enable the States to fund Portfolio (2), which included the schools project, to the Assembly and it was rejected. I emphasised that what we need is more economic growth because States' expenditure is growing at 1.5% per annum and the economy is growing at only 0.5% per annum. And I pointed out that there was nothing in the proposals from P&R which would stimulate economic growth. We do not need to dwell on the old ground but we do need to understand where the result of that debate now leaves us.

95 Essentially, the States has plans for capital investment which cannot be funded under existing fiscal policies and which are probably undeliverable in practice. And the budget debate earlier this month and in the earlier part of this week has only made matters worse.

When it became clear that ESC wanted to push ahead with the Transforming Education programme P&R decided to support them, even though there was no new revenue stream to support the necessary borrowing and, instead of saying, hang on, we need to work out how we can raise the necessary funds by way of borrowing or otherwise, Deputy Ferbrache effectively said the bulk of the funds will not be needed until 2028 or 2029 and the next States can figure out how to solve the problem – a complete abdication of responsibility. When the States needed leadership on a fiscal issue, which is entirely within the mandate of P&R, P&R went missing.

100 The result of these debates is that P&R has lost the confidence of the Island. I think even Deputy Ferbrache would concede that P&R failed to take the public opinion with them through the GST debates. And one reason for this is that their arguments kept shifting. Firstly, the public were told that we needed GST to fund the financial pressures of an ageing population. Then, in last month's Funding & Investment Plan debate, we were told that GST was needed to fund capital investment. We could not afford, we were told, to do both the PEH Phase 2 and the Transforming Education project without an additional revenue stream; indeed, it was arguable that we could not afford to do either project without the additional revenue that GST would bring in.

105 Then, in the budget debate which has just concluded, we were told we could just go out and borrow the money to add the TEP back into the capital programme and that the next States would have to figure out a way of repaying the capital. Some things are frankly more important than money, Deputy Ferbrache told us. Well, which version are the public to believe? Unsurprisingly they remain deeply sceptical, not least because several of the people trying to sell these arguments to them stood at the last election on a platform of cutting expenditure and not increasing taxes. Many members of the public no longer know who to believe.

This term, sir, has 18 months left to run and it is very clear that not much will be achieved in the remaining time if we retain the present leadership. The States needs a less divisive leadership which will tap into all of the talents in the Assembly. It needs a leadership with vision which will prioritise sustainable economic growth. It needs a leadership with the courage and integrity to meet our fiscal challenges and not run away from them. It needs a direction that all Members can buy into and leadership that enables and supports the efforts of other Committees instead of frustrating and obstructing them. That is what collaborative working is all about; acting in a collegiate manner does not mean everyone else doing P&R's bidding.

In terms of the capital investment programme I believe that the funding problems will start to be resolved when we introduce the Pillar Two tax changes from the beginning of 2025. The tax, which will in effect be a territorial corporate income tax applied to companies that are members of large groups will, I believe, bring in far more money than Treasury expect, and it will signpost the way to more sustainable public finances going forward.

But, sir, now is not the time to rehearse the arguments in favour of corporate tax reform. We need to be cognisant of the fact that Guernsey, along with Jersey and the Isle of Man, has already announced that is going to bring in the Pillar 2 charges by 1st January 2025, which is only just over a year away and there is a huge amount of work to be done to prepare that new tax system. The consequence of all this is that the Transforming Education programme may well become affordable in terms both of servicing the debt and repaying the principle without additional tax measures in the short term. But the present P&R is in no position to make that argument. They have voted solidly against corporate tax reform throughout the life of this Assembly and are on record as having said many negative things about it.

For all these reasons I believe that we need a new team to lead the States through the remainder of this term. We need a team that can command the respect of the public, which can rebuild consensus government and which can credibly plot a path forward based on the fiscal policies that the States have already announced. I do not think we need another debate on the fiscal policies of the States. We do not need another debate on capital prioritisation although, in my view, there needs to be some adjustment of the capital programme to reflect a re-prioritisation of economic growth.

We all agree, I think, that the Transforming Education programme should go forward in the States this term, although no doubt there will be fine-tuning of the scheme. And I tried to throw education a lifeline with Amendment 20 in the last debate for the new P&R, a P&R or current P&R, to come back to the States by March with workable plans to fund the Transforming Education programme. Deputy Murray dismissed those plans, or that proposal, on the grounds that it did not provide any certainty, and that is true. But what it did provide was hope and that hope has been in short supply these last three years.

In short, there is much that we can agree on but we need to restore consensus government to make better progress. We need to restore public confidence in the States of Guernsey and, frankly, for much of this last week I have simply been embarrassed by what a shambles I was witnessing. The present composition of P&R is not conducive to either restoring consensus government or to restoring public confidence in the States. The present P&R promotes only division, procrastination and inaction.

Sir, Guernsey deserves a brighter future and I urge Members to take this opportunity to start bringing that future closer to reality.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard, is it your wish to be relevéd?

**Deputy Brouard:** Yes please, sir. Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Queripel.

**Deputy Queripel:** I will start by saying I very much hope this is a civilised debate and does not sink to the depths we witnessed during the debate on the Privilege Panel's findings against Deputy St Pier. That debate was an all-time low (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and when a Committee does not resign due to the fact they are considered to have failed in their duty. So the question is have P&R failed in their duty and their responsibilities? Have they been disrespectful towards the members of our community? Have they been disrespectful to any Members of this Assembly? Have they deliberately hindered our making progress on any projects or initiatives? Are they guilty of hypocrisy and contradiction and changing their mind when it suits? Well, I guess we could all be accused of doing some of those.

At the moment I am undecided on this motion. So what I need, as we always say we need to enable us to make a decision, is evidence. I am not talking about hearsay, I am talking about evidence so I am looking for colleagues to provide me with that evidence, sir, because I need to hear it.

My initial reaction, when I first heard about this Motion of No Confidence was that I was not going to support it. I was not going to support it because it appeared to me based on a single issue; that issue being that P&R laid GST in front of the Assembly three times. Despite being given a resounding 'no' on the first two occasions they still brought it back a third time, for it to be rejected once again.

I am aware Deputy Parkinson in his opening speech has laid out some more examples of why he has brought this motion but, getting back to the GST issue, in my view P&R were just doing their job. We all have a duty to come up with ways to make money to pay for the services we need and P&R were convinced that GST was the way forward. I do not see a problem with laying an issue in front of the States on more than one occasion, as long as it is not exactly the same set of proposals each time and that is why I originally thought I was not going to support this motion.

Since I said that and since I thought that I have heard things from some of my colleagues about P&R that have really concerned me but I have not yet been provided with any evidence. Sir, if colleagues make accusations against P&R in their speeches and P&R deny those accusations in their speeches who do I believe? I will have no option but to abstain and I do not want to abstain but I need to be convinced on one side or the other. How can we possibly know who to believe once we enter that sort of pantomime-type dialogue where one person says: 'Yes, you did' and the other person says: 'Oh, no I didn't', which then just goes on and on and on? And how on earth is anyone who wasn't there at the time supposed to know who to believe? In my view we have to ignore hearsay and focus on evidence.

I have heard reports of P&R bullying some of my colleagues but I have never witnessed it and I have never been bullied by any Member of P&R. If they had tried to bully me I would have just told them to go away in no uncertain terms. Also how can evidence of P&R actually bullying Members of the Assembly be provided? Well, it can be provided here by telephone conversations recorded, via e-mail, in the minutes of a meeting or in a letter. Evidence can be provided in a number of ways. So, in my view, sir, unless evidence is provided there is no case of prosecution.

I say all of that after having said several times in my speeches in the States that I loathe and detest bullying. I have seen bullies at work like we all have. I was bullied at school as I am sure many of us were. I was bullied well into my teens until I finally had the courage to stand up to a bully and the bully backed down, which is often what bullies do.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Queripel, I am slightly concerned that you are not concentrating on whether or not there is the ability of this Committee to discharge its mandate.

**Deputy Queripel:** Sir, if they are guilty of bullying anyone then surely they have not complied with their mandate. My colleague, Deputy Taylor, is trying to alert me to something, sir. Oh, it will be (5): '... to act in accordance with Rules and Procedures of the States and their Committees ... required to be civil to all Members,' and I thank Deputy Taylor for that, sir.

225 **The Bailiff:** Well, that is from the Code of Conduct rather than a mandate.

**Deputy Queripel:** Sir, once again we are presented with a situation where we could be tempted to protect a friend regardless of whatever they have done, or bring down a colleague because we do not like them but that is not what this is about. Surely, and I am reminded once again of what  
230 former Vale Deputy the Late Graham Guille often said; it is not always about what it is supposed to be about.

So whatever have I got to go on here, has anyone got to go on? We all know P&R laid GST in front of the Assembly three times and does that justify supporting a Vote of No Confidence? I do not think that alone does and I can honestly say I am not defending a friend here and I am not  
235 trying to bring down a colleague. I am trying to look at this in a balanced way, a measured way, and I am trying desperately to get hold of some evidence. And if that evidence is forthcoming I will have no hesitation whatsoever in voting in favour of this motion. So I need to hear from colleagues who have lost confidence in P&R exactly why they have and I need them to provide me with the evidence.

I think it makes sense to also hear who they would prefer to see on P&R and why.

240 **The Bailiff:** No, no, that is not relevant, Deputy Queripel, to this motion.

**Deputy Queripel:** Well, I accept your warning, sir. I do not agree with it, but I will accept it.

So, hopefully, colleagues will be able to provide me with information on a professional basis and not personal and laden with jibes and insults exactly why they have lost confidence in P&R. Under  
245 our current Rules, even if P&R do fall victim to this motion, every single one of them can stand for re-election of course, and if they are supported they will once again become Members of P&R, which is a total farce to some members of the community I have spoken to.

I will dispense with three pages of my speech, sir, so I will move towards a close. I will listen very  
250 closely to debate to hear if any of my colleagues can provide me with the evidence I need to prove that P&R have failed in their duties and their responsibilities to our beloved community and, if some of that evidence is going to focus on bullying, the question that springs to my mind is if a Member of this Assembly, one of my colleagues, has been bullied by P&R why did they not submit a Code of Conduct complaint against those Members? Surely that would have been the way to go.

255 So, in closing, I am only too aware of the disruption it will cause if we put a new P&R in place at this stage of the game but, at the same time, I certainly cannot support what could be considered to be a continuity of incompetence. So I will sit down and wait to hear the evidence I have requested and I need to hear. If I do not hear it then I will have to vote against the motion. If I am not convinced by either side come the end of the debate then I will have to just abstain.

260 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Prow.

**Deputy Prow:** Thank you, sir.

265 I am very pleased that you have called me after the speech from Deputy Lester Queripel because I think his speech actually sets the tone of this debate very well, on two points, actually.

The first point he makes is a plea to keep this a civil debate and I applaud those words.

The second point he makes is a call for evidence, as he often does actually, sir, in debating, and he is right to do that. He asks, I think, sir, for evidence from both sides of the argument. I will  
270 certainly, hopefully sir, provide evidence that I do have heaps and heaps of confidence in the current Policy & Resources Committee and, sir, I believe I can evidence that.

In my position as President of Home Affairs I am in the thick of a lot that goes on with the Policy & Resources mandate. So dealing with Rule 21, and I thank you, sir, that you have given guidance, I looked at the grounds of the motion quite carefully in preparing for this debate and I find them in  
275 one sentence contained in a letter to you of 1st November, 2023:

The grounds of the Motion of No Confidence are that the undersigned Members have no confidence in the ability of Policy & Resources Committee to discharge its mandate.

That is it.

280 Sir, this motion to me typifies the state of our democracy and our government system in our beloved Bailiwick. Of course, I do completely acknowledge and support the ability of several Members to lay such a motion under Rule 21. I respect that right and respect that they have thought it appropriate to bring it but,, sir, such a motion should be mobilised with a huge portion of collective responsibility around what it seeks to achieve, and must demonstrate justification. I do not see that in that one sentence. Others will disagree but this is the test I have personally set to  
285 frame my contribution to this debate. The motion fails this test miserably on both.

Sir, Deputy St Pier, as already alluded to, regularly writes in *The Guernsey Press* and gives the reader and us the benefit of his personal assessment of the pending States' Meeting. He said, amongst a few other things, when referring to the items lodged, and I quote:

... all of which are pretty technical other than one highly political item of no confidence in P&R.

290 Sir, I think this observation is spot on and sets the scene.

Normally in this Assembly we have the benefit of detailed Policy Letters submitted by deadlines, often supported by prior presentations, assisted by subject matter experts. This, of course, includes everything that comes under the mandate of Policy & Resources; highly politically-motivated Motions such as this one, however, appear to dispense with this despite Rule 21 stating that the  
295 motion shall:

... set out the full details of the basis on which the petitioners propose the motion of no confidence.

I will not refer back to the one sentence in the motion but I see no full detail and I would suggest that Deputy Lester Queripel, who craves that detail, does not see that either.

300 So, sir, this motion again follows a continuing habit of making decisions on the hoof in this Assembly; in this case the ability of P&R to discharge its mandate. This phenomenon is caused by frequent amendments, some of which appear at short notice, lacking Rule 4 information or meaningful background data, encouraging long speeches.

Again, sir, this unsatisfactory position has been referenced in many speeches. I should observe these are not caused by Policy & Resources discharging their mandate or by the Committees. They  
305 emanate from the floor of this Assembly. Sir, they send us down rabbit holes. They veer away from the original Propositions. Sir, we turn off the motorway and planned route, and spend hours driving around culs-de-sac; we reverse out of one-way streets and agree nothing. Sir, this is not the fault of P&R; it is our fault exacerbated by a set of bad Rules which we ignore anyway and a lack of willingness to change them. This is the real issue to tackle. This is where we should point the finger.

310 So, again, with this motion, the petitioners will be relying on highly political speeches; political pots will inevitably be calling kettles black, with emotive language. Entrenched opinions will reign rather than factual evidence and, sadly, individual political ambitions and uncompromising political stances will form the underlying agendas. Sir, remember the sage words of the late former Deputy Guille, 'It is not always about what it is about.'

315 It is against this background I must ask what will this motion achieve? Let us put matters into wider context and consider we are living in very difficult times. All matters are within the mandate of P&R. In this term we have had to cope with COVID both on our wellbeing and paying huge amounts for all the litigations, the aftermath of the UK exiting from the EU, preparing for an international assessment of our finance sector, huge pressures on recruitment across all sectors and  
320 the Russian invasion of Ukraine causing rocketing inflation. This has affected us way beyond the normal pressures of running a very small jurisdiction without the resources of neighbour European states.

Globally, sir, there are many who look at us with envy and who are ready to kick us if we falter. These factors have also exacerbated our considerable challenges in formulating fiscal policy, which became apparent last term but were not fully addressed and, sir, a subject of Deputy Parkinson's opening. Our existing policy previously built on the so-called Zero-10 model, which has served both the Island and our main industry very well, is creaking badly and our vital infrastructure woefully behind the kerb. Sir, we need to move on but we cannot collectively sum up the courage.

I listened last meeting to a mini-debate which argued whether or not anybody else knew or cared about Guernsey and, sir, I now want to give Deputy Queripel some of the evidence that he craves. Sir, I know that we are very much on the radar of other international jurisdictions, from those who make up the Financial Action Task Force to those jurisdictions negotiating trade agreements, to those within the UK government with whom we have made binding agreements or with whom we need to demonstrate global equivalence or compliance. This is so, so important.

Sir, what I am absolutely certain of is our current Policy & Resources have done a sterling job, demonstrating leadership and meaningful engagement, and displayed the ability. I know every Member has played a part, including our Chief Minister, and I have full confidence in them all. When I have worked alongside or fronted on some of the issues I have seen the President of P&R and Members of the Committee in action, discharging these vital responsibilities under their mandate. Now, Guernsey needs to punch far above its weight; sir, they are more than capable. And it is crucial more than ever that this Bailiwick continues to need stability and certainty in government.

Sir, in my view, Deputy Parkinson's very narrow opening dwelt on his experience in the Committee that he sits on – not entirely but predominantly. I, sir, am the President of Home Affairs. It is a two-way street, sir. I have worked hard with Policy & Resources, I have engaged with them on Government Work Plans. I have engaged with them on the budget. I have listened to them and they have listened to me, and my working relationship with regard to that Committee has been, in my opinion, first class. So, for Deputy Queripel's benefit, the evidence I put is different, totally different to that of Deputy Parkinson.

We do not want to be displaying unmanageable, self-destructive traits and historically, despite our differences, we have avoided this. Deputy Parkinson majored on consensus government but we are, as an Assembly, unable to find consensus when we really need to. The facts are in a democratically-elected ... and the divisions apparent in the Assembly, when we formed a unique and very challenging Committee system, have not gone away, and neither have the challenges that this presents for 40 of us. A vote of no confidence will not change anything for the better or the way we will vote, except it will undermine the very bedrock of our success that we are still a stable, secure and excellent place to live and for others to do business with.

Deputy Parkinson has introduced a lack of agreeing a fiscal strategy in this House and it will come up again in this debate, sir. My late mother, who I often quote, used to say that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones. Taxation is a highly emotive topic and rightly open to huge public and political scrutiny. It is absolutely true that we as an Assembly are still struggling with the dilemmas of meeting public expectations on service provision and the provision of vital infrastructure and how to resource it.

Sir, I contend that our Committee system is an inhibitor and Policy & Resources' limited mandate means Guernsey has no executive, and we cannot progress anything except to come to terms with the reality that it is our responsibility in this Assembly to collectively rise to these challenges and find solutions when we independently cast our individual 40 votes with no whipped party line. In trying to promote their progressive tax proposals Policy & Resources, listening to the advice they received, put forward well-developed proposals, which our democratic process did not support. This is the outcome, a democratic outcome from a unique democratic process.

Yes sir, they failed to get those Propositions over the line but, importantly for this debate in particular, neither did any other proposals coming from those laying amendments find favour from a majority of the 40 of us in Assembly. Increasing income tax scored two out of 40; corporation tax reform is slightly better with 11. So this, ironically, includes the one from the Deputy who is leading this motion.

375 Sir, is the current Policy & Resources perfect? No, sir. Could they have done some things better? Very probably yes, sir. Have I given them challenge? Yes, I have, sir. But, sir, at the end of the day I have found them to be intelligent, very capable people who do listen to advice and are able to alter course and have discharged their many responsibilities under their mandate extremely well and competently and, as said, in perhaps the most difficult of times we have experienced in decades. I see absolutely no proper cause not to have confidence in them or their ability.

380 Sir, what I do not have confidence in is what an alternative Committee might turn out to be in discharging their mandate. Why on earth would it bridge the divide and not widen it? I also have failing confidence in our Committee system of government and our Rules, and a lack of appetite to reform and make them fit for purpose but, sir, that is for another day.

385 Sir, there is no basis to this motion and this explains why there were no details given as requested and laid out in Rule 21. Sir, I ask Members to throw out this motion; send it packing. It fails the collective responsibility and justification test I set out. It is not about the best interests of this community; it is about jostling for personal, political ascendancy. It is about the encouragement of promoting blame culture without offering viable solutions.

390 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fairclough.

**Deputy Fairclough:** Thank you, sir.

395 When a senior reporter for *The Guernsey Press* contacted me after the Funding & Investment Plan debate to ask me for my thoughts on whether there should be an early General Election in 2024 instead of 2025 and whether, in addition or alternatively, there should be a Motion of No Confidence in P&R and how would I vote on such a Proposition, I told him I am unlikely to support a Motion of No Confidence in P&R because I am not sure what it would achieve given the relatively limited time left this political term. I obviously respect any Member's right to bring such a motion and, as ever, would only ultimately decide how to vote having listened to any debate.

I went on:

My feeling is that all Members should now be working together to find a way forward with the challenges we face, including expediting the work on reshaping government.

405 My position has not changed much and I will build on those themes during my brief speech, sir. But I do wonder why P&R decided to call for an early General Election following the Funding & Investment Plan debate. That was clearly a misjudgement and I think that if the Committee had stood down at that time it could well have been reinstated and we might have been able to move on. SACC was consulted about the implications of calling an early General Election during the F&IP debate and the advice it gave was that the earliest we could practically hold an election was probably October 2024; whether that dissuaded P&R I do not know, and the reason I do not know was that that was the last I heard on the matter. No communication on whether or not that was being pursued. Was it just a diversionary tactic? I know not to this day, and it is that lack of communication that for me has been one of the weaknesses of this particular senior Committee.

415 I believe that, given one of the longest political terms for decades, there was an opportunity to address our fiscal deficit and the challenges and take the community with us. How many times have we heard that? A post-COVID scenario was the ideal time to show leadership and embrace the fiscal challenges of the future head-on, and I appreciate that P&R entered politics at a very difficult time post-COVID. I think I might even have been persuaded for GST if any Members of P&R had reached out but, despite to going to every presentation, the questions I asked never seemed to be answered and the siege mentality prevailed. And this echoes something said in this Assembly this week, yesterday I think. P&R seems to think it is their way or the highway.

420 I do not know if it is just the Committee that I sit on but my experience of dealings between that and P&R often seem adversarial, whether it is the question of sacked priorities or the undermining of E&I's mandate. I do not mind disagreements, robust debate and get that in politics we all fall out

425 from time to time; that is not my issue here. It is just the culture and for me that has to come from the top. P&R have wanted to get on with things; I get that, 'Action This Day' and all of that. But, as Deputy Ferbrache himself has said many times, we all just have one vote so it is imperative that Committees take other Members with them to engage, consult and compromise if necessary. And we have seen some great examples of that recently. Deputy Kazantseva-Miller working with Deputy  
430 Dudley-Owen to try to find a way forward for education. Deputy de Sausmarez working with Deputy Murray on the Electricity Strategy. It can be done.

We have heard more than the occasional reference to the fact that things would have been so much better under an executive form of government so why, oh why has there been so little progress on a previous priority of this Assembly – reshaping government? When I last asked P&R  
435 about this at a public scrutiny hearing I was told it would come back before this Assembly during the summer just gone. I personally think the importance of that work has been underestimated by P&R and the mood music, because that is all I am getting about the work of that sub-committee, sounds off-key. The fact is our system of election has been criticised, our system of government has been blamed and then, no, it is the 38 Members who populated that are the problem. Or P&R –  
440 why not blame them? Well, who is right? Answers on a postcard, please.

So I could and would have backed an early General Election because this week has once again demonstrated to me that we, as a collective Assembly of 40 Members, and I am part of that, seem unable to work cohesively within a consensus system to come to decisions that are in the best interests of our community. My thought on Wednesday night was that collectively we have all failed  
445 the young people of this Island and we should all be resigning. But when I woke up the next day I thought no – we have been elected to do a job, to serve the people, and must find a way forward and I still have hope for that; the hope that shone brightly in the young people of our Youth Parliament in these seats less than a week ago.

Something has got to change, Members, so unless we can change our personalities or our system something else has got to give and it is in a crisis that we look to our leaders. I do not envy  
450 the Members of the Policy & Resources Committee; not at all, and I have nothing against any one of them personally but we are currently lacking direction and leadership. I touched on it at the start of the tax debate; where are our priorities? The Government Work Plan reset has floundered; the order of critical debates has been skew-whiff, out of kilter, illogical. Where are we heading?

I could just hunker down and focus on my Committee work for the next 19 months; there is plenty going on there and that, despite all the naysayers, is where much of the work of Government gets done, not in the so-called big picture stuff because that is where I think we get it all wrong –  
455 at the strategic level. I like change, but not change for change's sake and that is why I think we have to look beyond what could simplistically be considered the wrong people in certain jobs. It is why I think we could benefit from mid-term elections, rolling elections, continuity and change.

And so, reaching a conclusion, sir, I believe the biggest failing of this P&R has been the inability to take a step back, draw breath, realise that things are not working this term, and attempting to do something about it with all of us instead of pressing on regardless. But I have seen little evidence of that and I was genuinely concerned when Deputy Soulsby felt the need to leave our senior  
465 Committee, especially given the reasons she cited. But what would be gain from a new senior committee? Someone to steady the ship? Is that the best we can ask for or expect? Can we realistically be more ambitious given the limited time left this term? For me, sir, there are more questions than answers so, as ever, I will listen to debate and vote in what I believe to be the Island's best interests.

470 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy de Lisle.

**Deputy de Lisle:** Thank you, sir.

475 I have taken this very seriously and thought carefully before signing the vote of No Confidence.

The public has expressed its distaste and discomfort with the direction that P&R have taken over this term and not taken over this term, and it has been reflected on all of us in this community. P&R have not taken heed of the Islanders' everyday battle with high inflation and rising prices; in fact, P&R itself has been a major contributor to inflation with year on year increases in taxation and charges. This has been a frustrating time for many of us in trying to force change in the public interest.

P&R have repeatedly threatened the public with GST, not once but twice, stressing out families and demeaning their concerns and their way of life. Furthermore, they called out for further borrowing against public resistance with no due attention to pleas from the elected representatives of the States. They were quite prepared to saddle future generations with borrowings of hundreds of millions of pounds for capital projects without a mechanism to service the debt.

P&R have budgeted marketing campaigns, spending more money to involve the public in wishful thinking with false hopes of spending cuts which never took place. P&R have overturned and ignored the prescribed government policy in relation to TRP rate increases far in excess of the States directive on residential and commercial buildings. This has led to a downward spiral in public trust in their governance, especially when overturning and ignoring Resolutions of the States for their own benefit –

**Deputy Mahoney:** Point of correction, sir.

**Deputy De Lisle:** P&R have not shown –

**The Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Mahoney.

**Deputy Mahoney:** Sir, Deputy de Lisle is saying that P&R did those things yesterday. The Assembly voted to do those things yesterday. P&R do not have the authority to do those things and yet it was voted through very much by the Assembly yesterday to do those things with TLP.

**The Bailiff:** Before inviting Deputy de Lisle to continue, in respect of what might be perceived to be misleading or inaccurate statements, focused in this debate as I said at the outset, is whether or not Members have confidence in the ability of the current Committee to discharge its mandate.

The proposals were brought forward by the current Committee. Deputy de Lisle is commenting at the moment about this. It is not going to aid this debate if we have Members seeking to make points of correction or points of order. Members want to speak and express their view in respect of the grounds on which this Motion of No Confidence is advanced and they should be able to do so. Deputy de Lisle, to continue but focusing on the mandate.

**Deputy de Lisle:** It all represents my frustration and that of the public, sir. P&R have not shown any cohesive or positive leadership over the term. They have broken their promises to the people of Guernsey and this is truly a sad state of affairs. We need a new term, sir, a new team, sir, to bolster and restore public confidence in the States and I call upon Members to support the Motion of No Confidence.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Gollop:** Thank you.

Deputy de Lisle made a Freudian slip just now when he said a new term rather than a new team because I agree with a lot of what Deputy Prow has said and to a degree a lot of the concerns of Deputy Fairclough, who I work with on two Committees. To me there have been some issues with this Policy & Resources Committee, perhaps with communication, getting on with some of the rank and file of some Members, but I do find the Chief Minister, the President, Deputy Ferbrache, always amiable and approachable.

But there have always been issues with the senior Committee. Like Deputy Ferbrache and Deputy Roffey I was around when we had Advisory & Finance, which had seven Members. We only switched to a joint, two-headed monster of a Policy Council of 11 and a Treasury & Resources of five, which Deputy St Pier, and others – Deputy Parkinson, of course, was Treasury Minister and now we are on a five-Member Committee. One of the issues I think Deputy Parkinson raised was perhaps the narrowness of the focus of the team at Policy & Resources and whether perhaps they represented the States as a whole. Now I would argue, in a way regrettably, that there has been a game-changer today with two resignations; that guarantees change and I believe that we should welcome that.

I also think, going back to the glory days, bearing in mind that Policy & Resources has responsibility for the machinery of government and changes to Committee mandates and so on, in practice Deputy Fairclough has raised his concern to the delay but there would of course a simple expedient. Policy & Resources within a month or so could bring a Policy Letter expanding the membership of Policy & Resources from five to seven, like the good old days of Advisory & Finance. That would guarantee not just two new Members but four new Members. I know we should not get into who could be a Member but I am sure that some of the lack of competence has been the sense that Policy & Resources have been a tight-knit team.

But, like Deputy Prow, I do not see the evidence for the failure, at least on the narrow grounds because it basically said that ... the seven Members who signed it are saying they do not have confidence in the Committee in the ability to discharge its mandate. Well, I would argue this Policy & Resources, unusually for a senior Committee, has had three new Members on it actually but they are very able Members, able in that they have backgrounds in property, surveying, trust management, law and many strands of business.

And if they have ... if sometimes discussions and presentations are being relatively robust it has been the view ... it has been because the Members whom I have confidence in, including Deputies Mahoney and Helyar, have enormous ability. Perhaps they could occasionally be more tolerant to some of us who like to chat a bit, or to reminisce or to go off on tangents, but the point is that they are very focused on success and will have seen breakthroughs in terms of property management negotiation, working with social security pretty well ... we have our differences on social issues but we have been pretty united in terms of housing action and achieving the sites. Perhaps not enough has been built but nevertheless I think it has been a constructive relationship, which is why I was surprised to see a recent headline indicating that there was discord among P&R because I know that P&R and ESS have worked together in achieving sites and plans for key worker housing and other initiatives, and that is important. The reasons why we have not moved forward are more to do perhaps with the construction economy.

I will bring another point in. Deputy Fairclough was frustrated about the lack of progress on the Machinery of Government, as I am too, although I do not necessarily want the slim-lining that some people might want but I do agree our system is perhaps flawed; thus for discussion today. I will contend that if people have issues about the competence of P&R to deliver its huge mandate at perhaps the most challenging time we have had for 15 years it is because of staff shortages, resource shortages and those shortages are to do with money, talent, occasionally illness, all sorts of factors, and they have been a restraining factor. Any new Policy & Resources team would have those same issues, although they would be minus one because some of them, perhaps all of them would be coming to it for the first time or the first time after a break. And so that would be a challenging disconnect.

I agree with Deputy Queripel to the extent that they have been criticised by the public and Members of the Assembly not because of their ability or lack of it but that they are putting forward, as Deputy Inder sometimes says to me when I say you are not listening to me – he will say I am listening to you but I just do not agree with you. And I think, of course, Policy & Resources have had a different view than many Members of this Assembly but that does not mean to say they are wrong. As Deputy Ferbrache once said at an IoD debate, I might be in a minority of one but I have a right to be in that minority of one especially if you are wrong and I am right.

Deep down I think most of us would acknowledge that unless we do the spending cuts that Deputy de Lisle would like to see or the economic development another Member, Deputy Parkinson – and I agree with him, we do need more focus politically across the board on economic development, not just from that Committee – but unless we do one or the other or both we are in an unsustainable situation financially. That is why I understand the reasons and to a degree support them and in fact did vote for the Goods and Services Tax package. I would have done a different package. I think it did change the package; it introduced a non-food element, for example, and a different range of options and a different emphasis here and there but they put forward that package, not because they wanted to be unpopular or lose support in the Chamber – they knew both were likely – but because they believed it was right for the Island based on their advice and their professional ability and their knowledge.

And yes, I supported Deputy Parkinson on his tax plans, and Deputy Trott and have different views. But for me the alternatives were second best to the extent that I have to accept the advice I get from Policy & Resources and other Members like Deputies Vermeulen and Moakes, that it is not wise to tinker with tax rates for high net worth individuals or higher-paid individuals of corporates with registration levies because it potentially undermines our economy and competitive position. I would do it rather than have cuts or restraint or to have disconnect but I do understand that the holistic thinking Policy & Resources brought –

Oh, I will give way to Deputy Taylor.

**Deputy Taylor:** Okay. I will take the opportunity, as Deputy Gollop has given way. I was actually going to rise to do a point of order under Rule 17(6). I understand that he likes to give his views about different tax proposals but I am not entirely sure how they were relevant to the mandate and Motion of No Confidence.

**Deputy Gollop:** Yes, I will not go any further on that; I think enough has been said. But I would point out that, as Deputy Parkinson did in his opening address, I am slightly shocked constitutionally as an old Member of this States that the Motion of No Confidence is so brief; that it contains very little in the way of evidence or examples. But if you take it as a general premise that they do not have the ability I think we have proved ... Deputy Prow has proved they have had the ability with Moneyval and representing the Island's interests at the highest level internationally and in the United Kingdom. I think they have proved that, individually, they have all had careers and reputations and I think we have proved that, although GST was a misfire in terms of the Assembly and some popular opinion, they did it for genuine reasons based upon a careful evaluation of all the upsides and downsides of the other issues.

I think one of the main reasons why we are here ... the main reason is the GST debate, because Deputy Parkinson initially wanted to do an early General Election I remember, which I have sympathies for but the early General Election idea, even if it is achievable, which it is not easy to do ... in a way I would prefer a Vote of No Confidence because I think all of us in this Assembly have failed and the mix of us means somehow we cannot find consensus on anything. Policy & Resources are defeated and nobody else succeeds either, so I cannot see the renewed Policy & Resources Committee would be luckier in achieving its goals and in fact it may lead to further division.

I also agree with Deputy Queripel that changing the cast at the moment would not help us necessarily with international relations and Moneyval, but would be disruptive. But there is actually a few people I like to see on Policy & Resources. We will get too many people essentially unless the other Members stand again ... anyway. But it will cause consequential changes; loss of Members of Committees, potential loss of Members of Presidencies. Mid-term elections I do support ... we are a bit past that now. But not in this way. We should have a structure to lead up to it, ideally in the spring. This is more from the seat of the pants.

I argue that everything Policy & Resources have done they have done with the belief that it is the best way of leading the Island, balancing the needs of the finance and corporate sector with the needs of the public sector, and I have been a bit surprised occasionally that they have shown relative

generosity in terms of spending, although they do not like particularly spending too much on the bus services, but they have realistically put up money for health and ... but they realised there is a social need, there is a need on the Island. I would like them to support more vigorously initiatives like green energy and so on but they can and they have been doing that. And I think if we have  
635 seen two resignations today we perhaps would benefit from Policy & Resources outlining, if they stay in office, and I wish them to do so, how they would perhaps move forward on a policy agenda.

But the reasons that they have faltered are not because they have been difficult as people; it is that the issues were difficult.

I will give way to Deputy Queripel –

640 **Deputy Queripel:** Sir, I thank Deputy Gollop for giving way. You reminded the Assembly that yes, I did say I was concerned about disruption that dispensing with this P&R Committee and putting a new one in place is going to cause but I also said I cannot possibly support the continuity of incompetence if I am provided with the evidence that they need to go.

645 Thank you, sir.

**Deputy Gollop:** Although there are lots of interesting political movements that I have heard for the last 27 years of my fascination in politics, I do not think there is evidence, and I have not heard it and I wish people had the courage to put it about this evidence of incompetence. I just ... I am  
650 not very knowledgeable on the ports but I supported, with a heavy heart actually, the rejection of the STSB on ports that Deputy Parkinson alluded to and it was simple because I did not necessarily think that Longue Hougue was the right solution at the right price. If there was pushback on that I think we have to be extremely careful, and Policy & Resources know this, on spending £346 million pounds on the infrastructure. I think they have been right to try to find a way without committing  
655 economic suicide in supporting the Transforming Education programme.

They also tried to get 'Action This Day' in many areas; there has been a lot of achievements of this Policy & Resources, tackling housing, a new approach to wage negotiation, a dynamic approach to property, restraining I think staff appointments where appropriate. In moving Leale's Yard forward, which did not happen for a long time, in actually, hopefully indirectly supporting our  
660 principal shipping firm we have also seen a reduction in the losses of Aurigny and we have seen Moneyval ... and we have seen confidence in the business community. We are seeing quite a lot of people across the board being very optimistic. We are not seeing demonstrations or pushback from the community.

So I think we should give Policy & Resources a mandate to continue and I would also say no  
665 confidence is a very serious measure. You have to prove today that we have no confidence in some very able people. That is different from saying we would like a change of membership or we would like a different mix of people or a different mix of politics. That is a different question and it is not fair to confuse the two.

670 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gabriel.

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

I am pretty sure that none of us really want to be here discussing this, sir, and as I said yesterday in debate we are in an embarrassing and depressing state. We, as a States, are in danger of  
675 imploding. We have failed to agree a tax strategy, a fiscal policy and the Blue Book, sir, states that P&R is the senior Committee of the States. It should concentrate on leadership and co-ordination of the work of the States, fiscal policy and economic affairs and representing the Island in external affairs.

For me, sir it has been about the leadership shown by our senior Committee. Some think  
680 leadership is a set of behaviours used to help people align direction to execute strategic plans and to continually renew an organisation. For me, leadership is something you do, not something you

are. It is characterised by actions that inspire trust, energy and focus and in my view, sir, P&R have not shown that leadership.

685 Some of the behaviours I have witnessed while deputising for Deputy St Pier in meetings have been nothing short of deplorable. I am at pains to discuss them publicly but we are where we are.

**Deputy St Pier:** Point of correction, sir. I do not think that Deputy Gabriel has ever deputised for me in any meeting. I have yet to serve on a Committee in this term. (*Laughter*)

690 **The Bailiff:** I think that was a slip of the tongue, Deputy Gabriel?

**Deputy Gabriel:** It certainly was. My apologies to you, Deputy St Pier. You were mentioned in my speech, which I have deleted.

695 So, while deputising for Deputy de Sausmarez some of those behaviours have been nothing short of deplorable, and the behaviours I have witnessed have no place in our society and certainly do not show the leadership that I was expecting; table-thumping aggression and machismo which all seemed to play right out of a late 1980s TV boardroom drama. And while I was shocked to see our leadership team behave in this way I was more shocked and, let's face it, saddened that it was permitted, even facilitated, by some of our senior leadership team and our Chief Minister; after all, it is his team we are talking about.

700 But what struck home to me and why I am speaking today were the comments from the Civil Service staff who, in my view, have no right of reply. They are the ones that deserve more and they were not surprised by the behaviours I witnessed and even said it got worse on occasions.

705 The harbours debate in June 2021 has always struck a chord with me. A stalemate seemed to be on the cards and every option was not likely to be approved until mid-debate compromise Amendment 9 was lodged, seemingly with the support of P&R and STSB by Deputy Roffey and Deputy Helyar and my heart was starting to fill with hope that we actually might get somewhere with strategic direction. And yes, the amendment passed, but only to be voted down in main debate by four of the five P&R Members in debate. And this was the beginning of the end for me, sir. I started to lose confidence in the leadership of P&R. There was and, in my opinion, still is no strategic direction by our senior Committee.

710 Sir, some of P&R's leadership traits have reminded me of a fable by Aesop, titled *The North Wind*, as, however hard the north wind blew the traveller only wrapped his cloak tighter to keep himself warm but when the sun shone the traveller was overcome with heat and soon took his cloak off. I will let you decide, Members, who I think P&R represents in the fable, and it certainly is not the weary traveller. That is certainly how I feel.

715 So, sir, this and many other reasons is why I will be supporting the Motion of No Confidence and, as I said earlier, leadership is something you do, not something you are. It is actions that inspire trust, energy and focus. In my opinion, sir, we cannot even govern ourselves, let alone our Island, responsibly and that makes me desperately sad for Guernsey and its people.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Falla.

725 **Deputy Falla:** Sir, there is no doubt in my mind that the lack of coalescence in this Assembly has hindered its ability to make progress on a number of fronts over the past three years.

Part of P&R's mandate is to advise the States and to develop and implement policies and programmes relating to leadership and co-ordination of the work of the States, and this is the area that I am going to concentrate on in my consideration of this motion, sir.

730 While it does not have full executive responsibility P&R is widely regarded and referred to as the senior Committee, and with that label comes some responsibility. How powerful it would have been for the Committee to have used its position to lead and encourage consensus among Members. Has it led by example? We have seen U-turns; we have seen mistrust in colleagues; we have seen an able Member of the Committee resign because they felt that their views were not recognised or

acknowledged around the Committee table. It has been, to some degree at least, a missed opportunity to exercise the required leadership and co-ordination to address the divide that has been a recurring and prominent feature of this political term rather than to contribute to it. In school report language, sir, they could have done better and of course we all could. Perhaps the reshuffle resulting from this morning's resignation announcements might be enough for something of a factory reset for P&R. It may not be too late to address some of these shortcomings and so I shall listen to the remainder of today's debate before deciding which way I shall vote on this motion.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

**Deputy Inder:** Sir, what I have not done, but that is probably fairly common for me, is to prepare much of a speech but I am going to respond to the opening speech by Deputy Parkinson because there are two sides to every single story and I do not think it unreasonable people should just have the microphone and speak not having an opportunity to respond. Some of this response is basically where I come on certain areas of STSB's policy.

Deputy Parkinson started his motion around his belief that P&R have particularly frustrated a number of STSB policies, and I am saying 'Good'. Now he could ... on the matter of the harbours he criticised the States on the ground of non-support for the third harbour. Well, Members, that had a £400 million note attached to it, and I am going to top these costs up as I go through this. Four hundred million pounds, and I will not support, and have never supported, that project. In fact, I have offered on a number of occasions viable solutions so, Members, let's do some maths. Remember that figure, four hundred million pounds.

He then went on to mention inert waste. He claims that E&I were denied to look at Longue Hougue South, I believe it was, and he mentioned that the Inert Waste Strategy looks ... sorry, the inert is going to be ... some kind of bund is going to go around the existing Longue Hougue built area and they have got nowhere to put it. Well, Members, I have said to you all before and I will repeat it again, there are real problems with procurement and our system of government and this has been touched on already, particularly by, I think, Deputy Prow. When the previous Assembly agreed Longue Hougue South it was £30 million in the Policy Letter. Thirty million pounds. Eight months later it became something like £47 million or £48 million and the last time it was debated, or at least mentioned I believe, was when I think it was Deputy Ferbrache was heading STSB and I have a memory of around £65 million. So this is three years later, from £65 million last vote. So that is quite obviously going to be £100 million. So there we are, Members, half a billion quid from STSB already without even thinking about it too hard.

In the future harbour development plan which Deputy Parkinson made mention of there was a note on maintenance. Thirty million pounds just on maintenance alone. Two years on and I read somewhere recently it is now £60 million. That is £500 –

**Deputy Roffey:** Just for clarification, sir, I am not sure it is central to this debate but the reference to the £30 million was the backlog maintenance that needed to be done. The reference to the £65 million involves what would have been routine works anyway over the next 10 years so it is £65 million –

Okay, just to clarify, the reference to £30 million back then was to go with the backlog of maintenance at St Peter Port harbour that needed to be done to catch up but of course there were always capital works to be done in the ports. The reference to £65 million includes that £30 million but also includes some work that would need to be done anyway over the next 10 years so there is no ... it is not out of kilter in any way.

**Deputy Inder:** Well, I think it is. Three years in the seat, Deputy Roffey, a backlog of £30 million-worth of maintenance and we have now got a note for 65 million pounds. So, Members, we are now up to £565 million if ...

**Deputy St Pier:** Point of order.

**The Bailiff:** Point of order, Deputy St Pier.

790 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, this 17(6) is really ... We are not having a debate about the harbours or the STSB. This is a debate about (**Deputy Inder:** I am responding ...) a Motion of No Confidence.

**The Bailiff:** I am going to accept that as a valid point. (**Deputy Inder:** Of course.) This is not a response to what STSB has done; it is a response on what Deputy Parkinson opened on how Policy & Resources reacted to those particular things. So you can comment on that but it is not a re-run of any decision relating to what has already been done where a different Committee has been involved.

Deputy Inder to continue, please.

800 **Deputy Inder:** Sir, Members, anyway, I was going to carry on. Basically I will take your direction. We are currently at £560 million and a poor marina that has not been delivered by Policy Letter, which actually would have grown the economy. It would have grown the economy.

I think, as Deputy Parkinson opened, it was entirely right for me to respond to that opening. I did not think this was like a press article where one person can say and no-one else can respond, but that is a decision of the Presiding Officer, so I will get to the meat of this.

805 To the grounds themselves of no confidence in the ability to discharge its mandate, and I will remember when I tie it up at £560 million, I disagree, and from my experience of President of Economic Development I see nothing but support from Members and I can give multiple examples, and unlike Deputy Parkinson our community has had an entirely different experience.

810 We will start with the Members in no particular order of preference; we may not get to the end. Deputy Mahoney has obviously been cast in some way that has been mentioned as some kind of devil. But if Members cast their mind back to the election period we may all forget how little we knew each other. I did not. I had worked with Deputy Ferbrache previously and this is where a lot of my information from STSB comes from in a previous Assembly, and also Deputy Le Tocq I knew. 815 Deputy Mahoney was a new name to me and the last time I had met Deputy Helyar was playing badminton at Le Rohais Hall circa 1980, when I think he actually beat me quite a few times. So since then, in the last 30 or 40 years, I had heard his name, did not know him from Adam, and we forget, Members, we are all a random set of people chosen from the public who are thrown into a room and we have to try and work with each other over the four-year period. We may know each other 820 now but you have to cast your minds back – we didn't know each other very well at all, or at least half of us did not know each other.

Deputy Mahoney's responsibility was property and I am going to talk about a couple of things where he actually helped our Committee. I was approached at the concept of using the Tourist Information Centre along with Deputy Moakes, I think it was. We cannily thought that the Tourist Information Centre was under-utilised. We believed that we could move the Visitor Centre, or at least the staff from the Visitor Centre, somewhere else, and only through Deputy David Mahoney's help ... unless I am hopefully going to assist the likes of Deputy Queripel, who wanted evidence ... it is only through Deputy Mahoney's help, working with STSB, have we now identified the Tourism Information Centre as a potential area as an event area for the Victor Hugo Centre. So that is, as 830 referenced by Deputy Parkinson, that looks like growth to me.

Elsewhere, working with Deputy Mahoney, and I have got to be a bit ... and I will try and ... I will take some comments. A number have been approached, or I have particularly, with him, on ... the best I can say without giving away too much is a sport idea, and I will leave it at that.

835 Now, I have worked ... again, I was called into the room as President of Economic Development ... all of this actually inspired by Deputy Mahoney and myself. He was entirely amicable. Actually he knew his brief very well indeed, he knew his subject area and he knew how to move things through the system and this is important, Members. It is very easy to not be in government for basically

three years and sit on the side-lines, go on holiday, not attend any presentations, hardly turn up to their own Committee and sit and carp from the side-lines. When you are actually in the centre of it this is a difficult job and you need a certain style about yourself, and sometimes it does have to be a bit brash, Chief amongst them. This is me standing up here. You have to have a certain style. Or you can choose. You can choose, as some Members have done in the past. You can get elected, have a name, go to the vin d'honneurs, get your picture in the press and mince around a bit, go on social –

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, point of order.

**The Bailiff:** Point of order, Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, 17(6) – this is not about the mandate of P&R.

**The Bailiff:** I think that is right, Deputy Inder; this is about the mandate. You were on more comfortable ground when you were discussing the relationship that you, as President of the Economic Development, have had with the Members of the Policy & Resources Committee.

**Deputy Inder:** Okay, sir, I will stick to how brilliant Deputy Mahoney is. I will not be long. *(Laughter)* I have worked with him a few times and my experience of working with Deputy Mahoney seems to be at the core of some of the style and management. I have worked with him and I am ... oh, I thought Deputy St Pier was getting up again; he just moved.

And let's move onto another area – the Vivier bunker. Now it is interesting that Deputy Vermeulen is actually a signatory to this. He is a Member of Economic Development as well and he knows full well that a man who always says, 'Go for growth, we need more activity,' who is actually very happy that the Vivier bunker has worked. This is working Deputy Mahoney. It is entirely down to Deputy Mahoney that got us the Vivier bunker because, well ... Deputy Vermeulen I am willing to give way for him if he wants to, because I was in it through you, sir, and it is entirely down to Deputy Mahoney's efforts through his role on property services that got us into the position where we can use a dilapidated building which sits on STSB's land, which is earning nothing, which will be earning something or contributing to the massive debt that STSB has got itself into at the moment.

And so, Members, this is a tough job. We do have choices and my choice, and I think Deputy Mahoney's choice, is to try and do what we can in the time we have got, and sometimes it is a bit brutal; it is as simple as that. This job is not for the thin-skinned. Now –

**Deputy St Pier:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Point of correction –

**Deputy Inder:** Maybe he thinks it is for the thin-skinned.

**Deputy St Pier:** I am prepared to be wrong, sir, but I think Deputy Inder has been misleading the Assembly in saying that he has secured, or suggesting there is a secured income stream from the Vivier bunker. To the best of my knowledge no lease has been signed on those premises. So discussions may be ongoing but it is not a secured income stream. So to suggest that is a win I think is misleading.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Inder to continue, please.

**Deputy Inder:** I will carry on but we have to accept that Deputy Taylor is a signatory to the MONC and he does not want to hear anything at the moment. But the facts are only through Deputy Mahoney's efforts have we got to a point where there is a lease ready to go on a dilapidated building

which had no income stream at all. It was not through Deputy Taylor or any of the signatories; I can tell you that for free.

Now let's move on to Deputy Helyar himself. Again, like I said, I met him probably 40 years ago, playing badminton. When we met we were approached by the ... effectively the CBD industry and there were real challenges in getting some of the growing licences through the system of government. I had a meeting with someone I did not know very well – Deputy Helyar. I remember where we met. We met with two of the guys and it was only through our having a very hard and robust conversation with officers that we got the growing licences issued. I can remember one e-mail I sent to officers and it read, 'As the President of Economic Development if I can't do it who the hell else can?'

That assistance alone, something that had not happened on the previous government, had been in place for two years, had not happened, whether it ended up being the right thing to do, it was basically through the efforts of Deputy Helyar, probably Deputy Ferbrache as well, a little bit of Deputy Prow in the corner there, did we then get the cannabis licences.

And then moving on to the MOU which came in some weeks later all of that again, work with officers ... and we forget, Members, and Members will know actually know, to be honest with you, that sometimes the public need to ... They believe that some of the officers live in their own boxes, only work for Policy & Resources, only work ... they do not. They are like *Mr Benn*; one minute they have one hat on, one minute they have the other hat on. Over that period where an industry wanted us to get licences produced, sorry, issued and an MOU completed, that was entirely done with working with Deputy Helyar and elements of Health and Home as well.

Now let us look at the Government Work Plan because, apparently, there is no growth at all. No growth at all and the signatories have got all the answers. This will be good. The Human Capital Development Plan again from the Committee's perspective no resistance whatsoever. Everything that we have done has been entirely funded by the Government Work Plan, which you may or may not go to and in that there is the human capital ... sorry, the HCD, which is led by Deputy Kazantseva-Miller. I remember yesterday she had some concerns about whether we would actually get to the Government Work Plan and it is right for her to say that. And also the implementation of the digital infrastructure. But there is no growth! P&R are all wrong! This Assembly has spent £12.5 billion putting fibre into every house in this Island. We forget ... I know it does not play well through the media. I know it does not look good in the opinion columns but this through Policy & Resources led by, I think it was at the time, Deputy Murray. Deputy Kazantseva-Miller is on our Committee. Deputy Murray was a Member because I think he had an interest in it he was co-opted onto that group, myself, Deputy Helyar. Again I cannot remember if Deputy Ferbrache was there but Deputy Murray was not. So that is within the first few months of this government that has done no action at all, none whatsoever according to Deputy Parkinson, who wants a £560 million bill for us all to pay. That was implemented by Policy & Resources, Members of our Committee, one Member of ESS and now, currently, Deputy Murray. So that was done, but there is no growth; none whatsoever.

Sorry, I beg your pardon, I will give way to Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** Thank you.

As Deputy Parkinson highlighted in his opening remarks our economy is currently growing under one measure at about 0.5% per annum; he actually referenced that. My question to my friend, Deputy Inder, sir, having given way, is, is he content as President of Economic Development at what can be described as sluggish growth at best; positive, admittedly, but sluggish nonetheless?

**Deputy Inder:** I entirely agree and I will get to the importance of housing, and how Policy & Resources have helped us, later in my speech.

Now, on the scoping for the pilot for the Guernsey Enterprise Investment Scheme, again I think Deputy Falla mentioned that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller was entirely focused on the ... on enterprise and innovative new business and growth and scaling. Again, in the Government Work Plan, £600,000

committed but, according to Deputy Parkinson no growth – we have not got a growth mindset; it is all P&R's fault. Utter nonsense and I am quite sure people are choosing what they want to read.

Now of course to Deputy Trott. Investing additional funding in promoting Guernsey as an offshore finance centre, and I will remind Deputy Trott, you may speak if you ... oh, he has, has he? I can't remember if he has spoken already, has he? He hasn't spoken already. I remember it was this Committee along with P&R who actually put in the initial uplift to ... for the marking and now wants to sustain it, so this is all done under this government, not the previous government. This was all done under this government; that is the growth mindset. It is not for Economic Development and Policy & Resources to build chip shops or houses. Our job is to create frameworks and our job is to actually allow business to do what it does best, and that is to market itself.

So there is a lot of public money invested with the grace of Policy & Resources with no resistance whatsoever, supported by the Chair of Guernsey Finance, and we are told there is no growth; we do not have a growth mindset. More nonsense. Investing in our root developments, Government Work Plan, we are in discussions ... I say we are in discussions, we are past discussions now ... March next year Guernsey will have a new international link and we will fly to Charles de Gaulle with Aurigny, which comes under STSB's mandate and there is a note attached to it. I am absolutely confident it will work. No resistance from Policy & Resources whatsoever. They, in fact ... I think they may have done it under delegated authority as part of the air policy framework ... we as a Committee for Economic Development have been asked to highlight a European hub. Within three years we have done it. We are working with Policy & Resources and that is called growth. It is not a £560 million bill that Deputy Parkinson wants to send everyone.

Now all the more interesting stuff: low-value debt relief, lending credit and finance Law, all of this slightly social stuff that Economic Development does not normally ... socially responsible stuff that, sorry, a bit of a correction there ... but we do not usually do apart from the fact that we have problems getting it through the legal system. But this again was also supported by our officers along with P&R.

And on external affairs, Deputy Le Tocq – well, we have not done anything. It is all P&R's fault. External relations are wrong. No confidence in external relations because this Motion of No Confidence is actually about the whole of the Committee. Deputy Le Tocq has done nothing; nothing at all. Nothing. And they may be right but I do not think they are. In February 2022, following extensive discussions with the EU and France the Bailiwick of Guernsey was able to implement in full the UK Fisheries access arrangements for the Bailiwick waters under the UK/EU Trade & Co-operation Agreement.

Now I sat in those meetings and I can tell you there was a difference between Guernsey and Jersey, and it was only because ... I do not think it was my boyish good look, charm and jaunty way I wore my hat that got us through the line. It is more likely that Deputy Le Tocq's ... I suppose the sort of corporate knowledge that he had, having worked with Mr Moran and there was a distinct difference between the Guernsey and Jersey approach. Guernsey knew what the end result ... well, it is a bit like having a divorce ... you can argue that you do not want 50% but the wife is going to get 50% ... so we went in knowing what the likely outcome was. So that was delivered by external relations; entirely delivered by external relations and we will know that through other works, certainly with Deputy Moakes, Deputy Le Tocq is doing a fine job working on various trade agreements. But according to Deputy Parkinson we are doing nothing. Policy & Resources are evil weevils because they do not smile enough. And it is true, they do not smile enough.

So that is the real work this Committee is conducting. Now, sir, Deputy Trott – he may have to get up slightly earlier than that – spoke about growth and he spoke about the sluggish nature of our Committee. He will know as well as I do that all the effort being made by our Committee, supported by Policy & Resources, him as the Chair of Guernsey Finance, we are trying to address that. There is a natural churn of business in the Island. We cannot live on our own past roles; you always have to spend money marketing your position so that answers in part his question.

But I will get on to the other important bits. Housing, and I am not going to repeat everything that Deputy Moakes said because I tend to bore myself on that matter, but he is absolutely right

even though he is bored with me. The fact that we had a Housing Action Group and a Housing Action Plan is something that this government, along with Policy & Resources ... I think it took too long; I was actually quite disappointed that it took 18 months to come up with the States' Housing Action Group ... but on top of that Policy & Resources, we have got to a position where we take housing sensibly and I do not know where it is at the moment .... It is maybe something Deputy Ferbrache ... the Leale's Yard issue needs to be resolved this term and I genuinely do not know where it is. But Policy & Resources have entirely backed that as I understand but I do not know entirely what the position is on that.

So, there we go. There are all the things that we have not done. We have not put any digital in the ground, we have done no work on external relations; there is nothing on housing, there is nothing on the TCA so they have all got to go. Three years of hard work has not been seen because no-one wants to see it. That is entirely what ... and I will make mention of Moneyval. Now this is something, Members, that I think, hopefully, and I thank Deputy McKenna actually for when I posted an e-mail sent to all Members on the amendment previously he said I am a straight-shooter. I am a straight-shooter and Deputy McKenna knows that. If I do not know about something I will tell you I do not know about something. I will never blag my way through anything. *(Laughter)* Simple reason ... apart from the last three years ... I do not believe ... I take the job seriously. I know my limitations and as soon as I start lying it means I have to remember things. And as soon as I have to start remembering things, I am stuffed. *(Laughter)* So I play with an entirely straight bat.

Now I am just going to briefly talk about Moneyval. Everything is the single most important issue. We had a debate, I think over the last ... it feels like three years, probably three days, probably six days; housing is the most important thing, unless it is a Human Capital Development Plan, unless it is Moneyval. We have a number of crises that are entirely workable through but one of them will be Moneyval. Moneyval is apparent. The evaluators are coming very shortly and Deputy Prow, this chap here, is probably the one President who actually knows his job. What I mean by that is that ... from a technical ... well, I will qualify that: actually knows his job from a technical point of view, having been a lifer ... having a life-long ... being a life-long civil servant he understands immigration, he understands he can speak to civil servants –

**Deputy St Pier:** Point of order, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Point of order, Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** Rule 17(6), Deputy Prow is very talented but this is nothing to do with the mandate for Home.

**Deputy Inder:** The thing was –

**The Bailiff:** Just a minute, Deputy Inder. It is bringing back each time to the discharge of the mandate, so it is the mandate of Policy & Resources not the mandate of the Committee for Home Affairs that is an issue here. So if you can relate it to that, that is fine.

**Deputy Inder:** I am not entirely sure if Deputy St Pier was entirely listening; it will not be the first time. But I started thematically talking about Moneyval –

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Inder, I am just going to stop you for a moment. That is a really unnecessary comment, isn't it?

**Deputy Inder:** Well, I do not think so.

**The Bailiff:** Well, I am telling you, Deputy Inder, that is a really unnecessary comment because this is not a debate to start attacking other Members for what they might have done in the past.

1045 This is a debate focusing on whether or not the current Policy & Resources Committee has the ability to discharge its mandate, so please can we refrain, and that goes for all other Members who are yet to speak, from identifying a particular person and making what might be a throw-away comment in respect of them. Please concentrate on the matter in hand.

1050 **Deputy Inder:** Right, Members, and that part ... I was getting to the end of my speech, was about Moneyval. I made the comment and importance of the role that Home has got. I was then, had I been allowed and not interrupted, going to move onto the role of Policy & Resources and whether they are able or not.

1055 Having had three years of watch ... and what I actually said sir, if anyone I was knocking was actually myself because I know my limitations and if anyone ... now Deputy Parkinson ... I am really going to be looking forward to his summing up because if you have not been at the centre of this process for three years there are going to be risks. P&R will be spoken to over the next maybe eight or nine weeks. The evaluators will – (*Interjection*) Pardon? Sorry, I beg your pardon, within April next year and the evaluators will be knocking on the door. The only people ... and this is about risk and this is more for Deputy Fairclough as well ... Moneyval is actually the singularly most important thing that we have got, which is not that interesting for the general public but is very important for our finance industry.

1060 Now P&R as it is is ensconced in it, but apparently they are not despatching their mandate. Now, be careful what you wish for. What I have described is actually the action that for Deputy Parkinson does not exist. What I have tried to describe today is the level of the detailed work that Deputy Parkinson does not see and some of the Members who are signatories on the Motion of No Confidence simply do not see the amount of detailed work that goes in on a daily basis.

1065 Members, it will be your choice but I think I have described evidence of how this Committee has ably worked with Economic Development, how it has found support. We have not whinged about the £560 million that Deputy Parkinson's Committee ... the sub-text is what is the bill he wants to spend ... send to Guernsey out of which ... the majority of which I will never support.

1075 What I have described today is how a Committee can work with a Committee under difficult circumstances: Brexit, end of COVID, TCA work, external relations, housing crisis, issue with revenue and they are still wrong. But Members, I do have ... I do not always like P&R ... I mean, Deputy Ferbrache always gets up and has a bit of a pop at me. I am used to it; I usually tell him to get in the queue and take a ticket. (*Laughter*) I can find it quite annoying as well but I have confidence in Deputy Ferbrache. I have definitely got confidence Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Murray himself; I mean if anyone has changed, not changed, shown a different side to themselves over the last few months it is entirely Deputy Murray himself. When he presented the Government Work Plan he did a fantastic job, his summing up was fantastic and I am pleased that no-one shakes their head here because the majority of people saw what I saw. They saw a man who had basically come of age, got down into the technical detail of a policy decision and presented it well and summed up well, and I will congratulate Deputy Murray for that.

1080 But I will also thank Deputy Helyar for all their service under very difficult circumstances as imperfect as we all are, and I will also thank Deputy Mahoney for their service.

I will be supporting Policy & Resources for all the reasons I have mentioned and I look forward to Deputy Parkinson's summing up because, as Deputy Prow says, it is not really what this is about, is it, Deputy Parkinson?

1090 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Matthews.

**Deputy Matthews:** Thank you, sir.

1095 It is with a heavy heart and some considerable sadness that I find myself here today making this speech on the matter of confidence in the Policy & Resources Committee. I will try my very best to keep my speech concise and relevant to the debate.

I would like to make a polite request, Members, to ask if they could refrain from calling 17(6) as I may briefly touch on some events that perhaps more directly relevant to the Committees for HSC and ESC but I do sincerely believe it has direct relevance to the motion before us. So if I could be given a degree of forbearance for a few minutes or seconds to allow me to tie things back to the motion I would be grateful.

Sir, I believe we find ourselves here because, as Deputy Ferbrache informed us after the Funding & Investment Plan debate, we have reached an impasse. This impasse, it is clear to me, involves most specifically the inability of P&R to fulfil the funding requirement for the policy proposals adopted by HSC and ESC almost exclusively, although I know there are other funding proposals.

Now HSC has largely achieved its main objectives but Members of both P&R and ESC have, over the course of the last couple of debates, given me the impression that this impasse means effectively they are unable to deliver their mandates. This appears to fall directly within the area of responsibility of the Policy & Resources Committee, given that it is responsible for leadership and co-ordination of the work of the States, including developing and promoting the States' overall policy objectives and leading the policy planning process.

I suppose I view the Committee's responsibilities in an old-fashioned way as twofold, in that I think of the Committee in two halves, being an amalgam of the previous Policy Council and the previous Treasury & Resources Department that have been put together. I suppose in many ways that seems an appropriate, simplified mental model as, in order to deliver a set of policy objectives on the one hand, funding and resources need to be provided on the other. And I feel an incredible level of sympathy for P&R in that the specific issue of the funding shortfall we currently have is not of their making. Under our system we do not agree the funding and the policy at the same time. Policy direction is agreed by the Assembly with outline high-level cost estimates and the detail is then worked up until a specific funding request can be made with known costs and a full business case, and it can still go up even from there. In our case we have been caught out by changes in the economy driven by outside forces. COVID and war in Ukraine have driven up inflation and costs, especially construction costs, much higher than could have been predicted.

Now, it is true, and some will say that the resulting deficit would have come about anyway and was known about and predicted for some time, even before the Election in 2020. Ordinarily, without the very sharp cost increases that the economy has delivered, the split approach with policy and funding agreed separately would not matter as much but, unfortunately, with the inflation we find ourselves with an agreed policy portfolio and insufficient funds to match. That is the crisis that we find ourselves with. But we cannot blame the economy and hold it accountable; that is just completely outside our control.

Now P&R would and Deputy Ferbrache and Members of P&R have argued that the Committee has done everything it can to resolve the crisis within the limitation of the various levers and using the toolbox that they have available to them. The Committee's attempted Resolution was to propose a new revenue source, GST, which would permit borrowing that would be sufficient to fund the portfolio, essentially when it boils down to both the school and the hospital. I know there are other items in the portfolio but those are the two big-ticket items; that is what we are really talking about. But the Assembly did not support it. So there is a perfectly valid position that it is the Assembly's fault and that we should hold an election to resolve the issue. I do not agree with that position; we are all elected as individual Members for a fixed term to find a democratic way through disagreements. That is our role and I take it seriously. I do not play personality politics. I am an independent, I am not a party member. I am not a member of any faction or grouping. I do not support or oppose issues based on who is proposing them. I take each issue on its merits and I vote according to my principles and beliefs in the way that I assess the ... just over 8,000 people who voted for me or the 63,000 people I represent would expect me to.

I did not support GST because I do not think it has popular support and I do not agree with it either at this point in time, with a cost of living crisis and a housing crisis. And I understand the mitigations in the package; I just do not support it for the reasons I have given in debate and I do not intend to re-hash.

1150 But the relevant fact is that Guernsey does not do snap elections. Our electoral mechanics do not support an early election so we have to find a solution ourselves. There has to be democratic accountability. So if we cannot blame the economy, and it does not matter if we blame ourselves or not ... I mean, we almost certainly the worst States ever; we have earned that title – until the next one, then the accountability, the next stop lies with P&R and many people would say that is where it should be anyway. That is the old-fashioned way of looking at things.

1155 I am reminded of a speech by the late Senator John McCain in 2008, when he talked about General Dwight Eisenhower on the eve of the invasion of Normandy. He went to his quarters the night before the invasion and he wrote out two letters. One of them was a letter of congratulation to the brave Americans and allies who landed at Normandy and made the most successful invasion and they brought about the beginning of the end of World War II. The other letter he wrote was a resignation from the United States Army, taking full responsibility for the failure of that invasion, 1160 McCain said. He was lamenting what he saw as the missing accountability in modern politics and he has a point. I recall that Eisenhower would have sailed directly past what were then the occupied Channel Islands en route to Normandy with the largest naval and air and land operation in history and we can be thankful that, due to its success and our eventual liberation, the type of issues we face today are as nothing compared to the horrors the past generations endured.

1165 But it is a political crisis and we must find a way to resolve it. The question we face is will simply swapping the people on the top bench get us any further forward. I will say at this point I do not hold any Member of P&R accountable as individuals for any failings. I do not have any issues with Members of P&R as people. Deputy Ferbrache I have enormous respect for as one of the Island's foremost litigators. I have been recommended to his services many times. Fortunately I have never 1170 had the occasion to sue anyone. I did have a planning dispute some years ago and my dad recommended Advocate Ferbrache as someone to go and see about it, although I did manage to work around it but not completely resolve it. I saved myself some money though.

I also respect enormously the role that Deputy Ferbrache has as Chief Minister in a very difficult States, and I have no issues with Deputy Ferbrache individually. I think we have never had a cross 1175 word, although once over the ending of COVID lockdown we did disagree quite sharply, but I am not somebody who would hold a grudge or let any minor disagreement become an ongoing issue. And Deputy Helyar, Mahoney, Le Tocq, Murray – I like to think I get on with them as individuals and, though we may disagree on policy issues from time to time, or most of the time in some cases, I have no issues with them as people and that is who I am. I am certainly not politicking or looking 1180 for payback for any past slights or anything like that. The vote is for P&R collectively as a Committee, not the individuals who make up the Committee.

I could go through all the examples of failings and missteps that I think P&R has made but I am trying to keep my speech relatively brief so I won't itemise each occasion where I disagree or where I would have done things differently. And, actually, things started out so well. P&R –

1185 Sir, I will give way to Deputy Queripel –

**Deputy Queripel:** Sir, I am grateful that Deputy Matthews has given way.

I would ask him please to itemise all those failings. I have asked for evidence. Everyone else needs evidence to enable them to make a decision. This debate takes as long as it takes. We need 1190 evidence so, sir, please relay the failings that you said you would rather not relay. There is a lack of time. Time is not the issue. This is a debating Chamber. If people do not want to be here for the required amount of time, they should resign.

**Deputy Matthews:** I thank Deputy Queripel, and what I really mean by that is we are bound to 1195 have disagreements. We are all different politicians with different views. It is not the case that I am going to agree with every single policy approach that P&R takes and there are things that I would do differently. I do not think it would be appropriate to list them all; I have not written them down. I wanted really to focus on one or two main items which I think are more illustrative.

P&R membership was put together as an attempt to draw different parts of the Assembly together; two Members of the Partnership of Independence, as it was then, and one from the Guernsey Party and Deputy Mahoney representing new Members and independents who were not in a party I think was the idea. And we had a very genuine attempt to canvass opinion for the Government Work Plan. Members may remember filling in spreadsheets with priority ratings against a large list of items. I think that process was flawed but it was a very solid attempt to gain an idea where the whole Assembly stood on a range of priorities and reflect that in Government Work Plan priorities. Perhaps I was naïve; I felt the whole approach was very positive and an attempt to reach out to all Members. But something changed and the approach switched from broad consensus-building to simply what was needed to gain a narrow majority.

Now that is reasonable, I suppose, in many cases but it does carry a risk. Alongside this I feel that the ESC approach also changed and I think that is linked. From what had seemed like an attempt to be as inclusive as possible, to review all the options, to instead dropping a review entirely and going ahead with an option that could just scrape a majority. It was a 22-17, not a strong endorsement at a cost of £43.5 million, and the problem this poses for P&R is obvious. Not all the Members voted *Pour* but the ESC proposals subsequently went on to vote in favour of the funding options that P&R put forward when the costs had more than doubled. And it is my observation that since the Tax Green Paper P&R has been in a state of denial about the prospect of getting GST through.

It was quite obvious that one of the two big-ticket projects could go through, just about, without GST, with difficulty, and it was obvious that it would be the hospital modernisation not TEP that would get the support of the Assembly if there was a choice between the two. But P&R seemed to be in a state of denial about that too. The support was for TEP ahead of hospital modernisation and this is just a complete mismatch. The States has now clearly prioritised the hospital ahead of the school and if TEP is to go ahead it needs additional funding. That is the co-ordination role between policy on the one hand and funding on the other that P&R has to do. That is, in my view, its proper role and function.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller attempted to do just that with an amendment to the annual Budget. It failed, but perhaps with some work on the consultation, the funding side might work as part of an overall solution. Deputy Trott suggested it might involve a rise in income tax and I tend to agree. But even if funding can be resolved I do not think that is enough. There is the other side, the policy hand, the policy side and I do strongly feel that to resolve this mismatch the policy from ESC needs to be altered too, and that is a role for P&R, the senior Committee, to co-ordinate. In our consensus system it is simply unreasonable to ask from such a narrow pool of supporters to be the same Members who will back a funding Proposition. As we know, it is bound to be a controversial funding package; there are no popular taxes. To get the two to line up a policy needs to build a broader consensus and that does mean looking at the type of change actually that I proposed in the Funding & Investment Plan debate.

Now, some will say that is not P&R's role; that is ESC's mandate, that is the Assembly, but I think it is a perfectly legitimate role for the senior Committee when trying to match up funding and policy to exert influence over what is, at times, an intransigent, recalcitrant and sometimes dysfunctional Committee and say simply if this policy is to gain funding it needs changing; it needs to have more support. I would like to think that P&R would do that. It has shown no willingness to do so to date. But regardless of the outcome of this motion it is the direction that I think needs to be taken by P&R.

As I wrap up, I return to another wartime analogy because I know Deputy Ferbrache is an admirer of Winston Churchill. I had lunch with Deputy Ferbrache yesterday along with former Deputy Low and Deputy Gollop, the mother and father of the house I might say, and I asked Deputy Ferbrache if this motion is successful would he consider standing for a place on P&R because I would support that. I would vote for Deputy Ferbrache and perhaps for one or two other Members of P&R. And he said no, and I understand that.

1250 As Deputy Bury said yesterday, when you have burned the Christmas turkey you are not going to feel terribly happy and you are not going to want to take part. With all due respect, I disagree, sir. To me that is not public service. If you are a people's Deputy you serve in whatever capacity you are able to make yourself useful. Even if you do not like it much you have to pick yourself up and that is what everyone has to do. Everyone who works – not everybody likes their boss or gets on with their colleagues but you have to work together. That is how you get things done; that is how you pay your rent or your mortgage; that is how you pay your taxes, which we then spend for you. That is just what you have got to do.

1255 So, getting back to my wartime analogy eventually – Deputy Ferbrache will know better than me – Churchill was not elected as a Conservative Prime Minister until 1955. He had lost the election in 1945, straight after the war. In 19 –

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Ferbrache.

1265 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Churchill was first elected Conservative Prime Minister in October 1951 after the second election because Labour won in 1945 and won again with a reduced majority in 1950. Then there was a further election in 1951 which Churchill won.

1270 **Deputy Matthews:** I knew he would do that!

In 1940 he became Prime Minister with Labour support. It was a government of national unity. His War Ministry contained Clement Attlee, Arthur Greenwood, Ernest Bevan and Neville Chamberlain, his predecessor and rival, and it is the sort of thing you have to do in a crisis. You cannot win a war if politicians are arguing with each other. You cannot win anything if all you are doing is fighting with each other. You need unity; you need people to work together. Even if they do not like each other very much that is how you get things done.

1275 So that is my wish. I would like to see a new P&R that can bring together factions and that the whole Assembly can unite behind. I recognise sometimes that you may wish for peace but it may ??? (11:53:37) to get there and that is why, with regret, I support this motion. I learned this morning of course about the resignations and I have not had any more detail than that but my position is that I support this motion.

1280 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

1285 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you, sir.

This has been, as others have said really ... this is a debate that I, too, was hoping upon hope could be avoided and a speech I was very keen not to have to make; however, as until 9.30 this morning all Members of P&R have not stood down I owe it to them, to the Assembly and to the electorate to explain why I intend to vote in favour of this Motion of No Confidence.

1290 I will start by explaining some of the factors that do not come into my reasoning. This for me has very little to do with P&R's proposed tax package. In my view they made a few avoidable missteps in the process but beyond that I think they have developed and argued for what they believed to be the best course of action in the best interests of the Island. I disagreed with that belief but I do not disrespect them for it. Neither do I hold any personal animosity towards them. I have seen first-hand what an excellent job Deputy Le Tocq is doing as the community's external relations lead and one-on-one I find Deputy Ferbrache to be reasonable, fair and easy to work with.

1295 Members will, I am sure, remember the Electricity Strategy debate, when Deputy Murray and I were able to talk through our differences on that issue and bring forward an amendment that bridged them.

There have been plenty of times across the full gamut of States business, including this week, when I have agreed with P&R's stance or agreed with them variously as individuals and argued in their favour, and vice versa. Sometimes we agree on policy and sometimes we disagree, and that is a healthy aspect of democracy. No policy disagreements factor whatsoever in my reasoning for supporting this Motion of No Confidence.

The reasons I will be supporting the motion relate to two interconnected areas: governance and the effect on the States as an organisation. I have become increasingly concerned about the effect that this Committee has had on both, and they relate to the Committee's mandate in a couple of important ways. The third item listed under P&R's duties and powers is as follows:

Promoting and facilitating cross-Committee policy development, ...

– and these aspects also relate to two of the Committee's responsibilities; namely;

... to contribute to fulfilling the States' objectives and policy plans, including by supporting and participating in cross-Committee work ...

– and –

... to ensure that public funds and other resources are used to best advantage, including through co-operative and flexible working practices.

Now I do not think the responsibility for this sits equally with all Members of P&R but for the purposes ... sorry, the responsibility for the negative impacts that I perceive sits equally with all Members of P&R but for the purposes of this debate we do need to consider them as a collective.

Meetings where there is no Presiding Officer or Public Gallery or live audio broadcast can be quite different to meetings that we have in this Chamber. In my experience, what marks this P&R apart from their predecessors and the other Committees that I have been involved with is their tone and manner, which can be viscerally aggressive, sometimes to the point of abusiveness, and are often characterised by incivility. As Deputy Fairclough and Deputy Gabriel alluded to it does feel as though E&I have had a particularly high hill to climb every time we have had to ask for resources or P&R's support, in striking contrast it seems to the experience of some other Committees. In one meeting recently I had to remind P&R that they were under States' direction to work with us on the issue that we were there to discuss and that they could not just make the unilateral decision they told us they had already made and did not intend to reconsider despite our evidenced and reasoned explanations as to why we thought that decision was problematic.

Sir, you know that I am no shrinking violet. I can and do hold my own in political discussions. My rugby-playing career in my younger days helped me feel at home in scrums, rucks and mauls and in taking up the Presidency of E&I I grew a rhino-thick skin. I am well able to handle the heat of the political kitchen. However, what I am talking about is not robust disagreements on issues of policy; it is about the way people have treated and the hostile atmosphere that has been allowed to develop. It is unprofessional, it is unproductive and it is unnecessary.

Now I have been raising the issue of overtly aggressive and abusive behaviour through every appropriate channel I could have thought of since early in this term. I am by no means the only person subjected to it and I know that others, including officers, over the years have also raised it as an issue with the President of P&R, especially in his Committee's regular meetings with Presidents of senior Committees. But it was brought home to me a couple of months ago just how normalised it has become, when Deputy Leadbeater, who does not normally attend these meetings, commented to me afterwards that he was shocked by the aggression directed my way. I explained that it was par for the course, so much so that actually at that particular meeting I had not even mentally registered it towards myself but I had been concerned for a colleague who I thought was given an unfairly rough ride.

Now Deputy Queripel asked for evidence. I was not planning to include any of what follows in my speech but because he has asked for it I have done a quick search of my e-mails and will read

out a couple of relevant messages, one of which refers to the fact that there are plenty of others. I will start with an e-mail that I wrote to Deputy Ferbrache on 25th June 2021, titled: '*In Confidence*' and I quote:

1350

Hi Peter

I didn't want to e-mail you with this before today's important briefing (this was the COVID era), which I thought was very helpful – well done.

I am getting in touch to raise a concern that I hope you will treat with seriousness but sensitivity.

The President-to-Presidents meetings are a great concept and should be a really useful forum but their usefulness is undermined in my experience by the way (a colleague whose name I have redacted) often behaves in them. That degree of rudeness and aggression and the attacks on other people's integrity would not be acceptable in any other forum and, to be completely open with you, I have too much on my plate to willingly devote time to the meetings if it continues. Today's was not an isolated incident. It is part of a clear pattern of targeted hostility towards certain individuals and it needs to stop. Disagreeing with someone's political views is no reason to abandon basic standards of respect and civility. If that happened in a board room it wouldn't be tolerated and in my view politics should be no different.

Can I please ask you, in your capacity as Chair of those meetings, to address this issue.

As I said at the outset, I think President-to-Presidents meetings could and should be a really useful forum but this one aspect discourages genuine engagement and constructive dialogue.

Thanks very much and have a good weekend.

Lindsay

I am not sure of the GDPR implications of me including Deputy Ferbrache's response but I hope you won't mind if I do read it out – it is very short. Deputy Ferbrache replied to me as follows:

Thank you, Lindsay.

I agree. I think (said person) overstepped the mark and I will have a word.

You have a good weekend too.

Peter

1355

Another piece of evidence is something which I submitted to Deputy Queripel's own Committee, SACC, to help substantiate my request that a code of behaviour be introduced and in that I hope this also answers his question about why I do not think that the Code of Conduct is an appropriate tool to address it. I will now quote from an e-mail which I sent to SACC's principal officer in February 2022, so I am quoting here:

1360

I am talking about the kind of behaviour which, if taken to the Code of Conduct panel in the form of a complaint, would probably seem low-level and therefore petty, and any individual incident would likely be dismissed as not a significant enough breach in and of itself.

I know it could be possible to prove a pattern of behaviour (I have plenty of written evidence to do so, in fact, but I am not prepared to take it to the Code of Conduct panel). But the Code of Conduct panel is the wrong tool for the job as it would be perceived as disproportionate plus, in my personal opinion, Member on Member complaints are distasteful and an inappropriate use of the panel in the first instance, as it really should be for members of the public to hold us to account.

I then go on to describe the bullying and harassment of colleagues and officers in meetings other than States meetings, and I am not going to quote directly because I think people would be too easily identifiable. I then go on to continue:

It's the kind of behaviour that would not be tolerated in any other workplace and it covers many of the behaviours listed here.

1365

and I provide a link to the Employment Relations Service on gov.gg.

It is intended to intimidate and belittle the target or targets and it creates a hostile environment. It is unprofessional and totally unacceptable. I and other have submitted written and verbal complaints to Chairs of such meetings and nothing can be done. The abuse was once so bad that I had to leave that meeting in tears. I was really shaken and, as you know, that is not like me.

I am particularly concerned about officers who are poorly treated as, in reality, they have even less recourse to solutions than we do.

There are other Deputies who I have been the victim of this behaviour. I have also witnessed officers being bullied or harassed and there are plenty of officers who have witnessed this behaviour in, I imagine, multiple settings, at least one of whom I know has also complained about the treatment meted out to me rather than to them. But again, nothing can be done, it seems.

I did go on but that is the most substantive bit; it was quite a long e-mail.

It is one thing to treat fellow politicians with disrespect but what I consider completely unacceptable is the way in which I perceive officers to be treated. Our civil servants provide professional, impartial advice and support and in my experience they work hard in the best interests of the Island. They are essential facilitators for the policy development and delivery of public services that we are responsible for and, contrary to popular belief, there are not very many of them. They are discreet to a 'T' but those who have worked with the civil service for longer than this political term have probably noticed how much morale has plummeted over the last three years. It is at rock bottom. The States has become, in this political term, a less attractive place to work and, anecdotally, that seems to be reflected in some of the recruitment and retention challenges that we have.

Now, this tone has been set from the top. I have been dismayed with the disrespectful way I have seen officers treated in meetings with P&R. Sometimes I have sought them out afterwards to apologise for the way in which they were spoken to and once, when I wondered out loud how they could put up with that kind of behaviour, in a rare unguarded moment, an officer assured me that, 'It's not always that bad but sometimes it's worse.'

More than one officer has mentioned that Deputy Le Tocq is a moderating influence, so meetings when he is present tend to be more civil, but when he is not there I have witnessed first-hand what a degrading and demoralising experience it can be. So this is relevant to the way in which some decisions appear to be made at P&R, which leads me into my next area of concern; governance.

On more than one occasion I and my fellow Committee Members at E&I have been surprised and perplexed by some P&R decisions pertaining to our mandate and, on closer enquiry, it has become clear that the relevant officers were not even invited to be present or provide advice even when, as in one case, they were sitting outside the room waiting to be called in.

Perhaps the most extraordinary example of P&R's attitude towards governance is an episode that I have been in an ethical quandary over whether or not to recount publicly because it shows Guernsey in a less than flattering light. A couple of years ago it was brought to my attention that a meeting had taken place with E&I's counterparts in Jersey, the former Minister and Assistant Minister for Environment, both of whom have since stepped down from political life. The meeting was to discuss the subject of offshore wind. It was, I was told, instigated by a Member of P&R and the meeting was attended by two Members of P&R along with a number of other Deputies. Although E&I have the mandate for renewable energy and were in the early stages of developing the Electricity Strategy, we as a Committee were not informed of this meeting, which went ahead without any officers present on the Guernsey side. By contrast the Jersey Ministers did treat it as a formal meeting complete with civil service support, and later they told me of their embarrassment when they realised they had not been talking with an official mandated delegation of Guernsey representatives. They felt, I think, like they had been unwittingly complicit in undermining me and my Committee, with whom they had always had a good relationship.

Some time later a group led by Deputy Meerveld produced their reports on their views of the local potential for three types of renewable energy, one of which was offshore wind. Deputy Meerveld brought those reports to E&I for discussion just before they were made public and told us of his intention to discuss them next with P&R. Three of his Members, incidentally, were credited with involvement in those reports. As this was so clearly an issue in our mandate, which includes energy policy including renewable energy, the Electricity Strategy, infrastructure, the marine environment and climate change among other relevant aspects, we fully expected to be invited to discuss those reports with P&R. However, not only were we not invited but neither was the relevant officer, our head of energy and climate change, who is the States' foremost subject matter expert and who has been deeply involved in all the work around renewable energy in Guernsey for well

over a decade. Now, and he is sitting right beside me, I am not uncritical – he knows this – of the way in which those reports were put together but, in fairness to Deputy Meerveld, with respect to how the work on offshore wind should be taken forward, his recommendations in black and white very much involved E&I in recognition of how intrinsic to our mandate that work is.

Anyway, not only did P&R decline to involve E&I or even the relevant officer in their decision-making to advise, P&R also decided not to involve E&I at all; in fact, we were never even officially informed about the existence of this sub-committee that they decided to set up in spite of Deputy Meerveld's explicit recommendation to involve us. Until last week the only information we received about this sub-committee was that which was made public, and our request to see the sub-committee's remit only bore fruit as recently as last week.

Under Rule .. I think it is 454, it might be 455 ... anyway it is one of those, a Committee can set up a sub-committee relating to any area of its mandate, but its mandate only. Now P&R's mandate in respect of offshore wind is actually relatively limited. It includes the process around sea bed leasing, how that process should work rather than which areas of the sea bed should be leased and they also have a role to play alongside E&I and STSB in respect of a route to market for any wind farm at export scale. And they also have, in fairness, a role alongside E&I and Economic Development in the establishment of a renewable energy commission; however, let us be clear, the significant majority of work around offshore wind sits squarely in the mandate of E&I. So for us to be excluded entirely from this work is an extraordinary step from our senior Committee, whose mandate, includes, as I mentioned earlier, promoting and facilitating cross-Committee policy development.

Being left in the dark as to what was going on through that sub-Committee put us, and by us I mean Guernsey, in a number of embarrassing situations commercially and politically because it was clear to those engaging with us that the left hand did not know what the right hand was doing. I am not going to exacerbate that embarrassment by going into any details but I can say categorically that the poor governance around this, arrangements established and endorsed by P&R, has caused us actual reputational damage.

I have focused only on a small handful of examples to illustrate what I feel are the core issues; other examples are legion. I was sorting through some paperwork the other day when I found a note that I had passed to an external expert who had been presenting to a group of Deputies. In this note I had apologised to the presenter for the behaviour of some of our senior Committee and one or two others, and advised them not to take the rudeness personally as, sadly, it was common. That is how endemic this is. We can and must do better, and we know that we are capable of it because, actually, there have been plenty of examples of cross-Committee collaborative working, where meetings have remained civil and constructive despite the same range of personalities and views. The Electricity Strategy was one and the Population and Immigration Review was another; they are two good examples, and there are plenty more that I could cite. But the difference is in the tone that is set at the top and what behaviours are tacitly endorsed.

So the manner in which P&R have chosen their mandate thus far has, in my view, been corroding the bonds of trust and respect and effectiveness in the States as a government and as an organisation. We need a re-set, a refresh and because this motion requires us to consider P&R as a collective I will vote in favour of this Motion of No Confidence.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** I think it is a point of order – you can tell me if it is not, and that is of my intention to move a guillotine motion on this matter at 4 p.m. this afternoon should that be necessary. Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** In just giving advance notice, Deputy Trott, of that intention I am treating that as you simply giving Members advance notice of your intention.

Well, as nobody else wishes to speak ... Deputy Cameron, you are one of the –

**Deputy Cameron:** With many other topics being covered I will keep this brief.

As a person with a reasonable amount of expertise in this area I want to primarily focus on the States' IT and digital transformation as a barometer of how this Policy & Resources Committee is delivering its mandate.

'This website is unavailable'; this is the first impression of Guernsey for many attempting to view our Government website. Nurses and teachers looking for employment unable to access vacancies; entrepreneurs looking into relocating unable to access the information they require; Members unable to access meeting papers; Islanders unable to complete their tax returns. The down time of our Government website this month so far is 10 hours 45 minutes; 19 outages. Some months it is approaching 30 hours. No explanation to users, no apology, no recognition that the outage event even occurred. This is a longstanding issue that remains unresolved despite £70,000 on a review to highlight the performance and complete neglect of our digital government infrastructure. Very few improvements have been achieved, and frequent and persistent outages are still being experienced.

There are currently 260 IT projects now in the pipeline, many of which are cost-saving or even revenue-raising and also offer improved service to the public. These projects need to proceed in order to realise the benefits that they are intended to deliver.

The complete mess that the mismanagement of PTON and ATON provides a poor impression of our government organisation, one of which is traffic and highway services. They were forced to move the Driver & Vehicle Licensing Section of staff from Bulwer Avenue to Edward T Wheadon House under the assurance that the MyGov customer hub would be in place to support reducing the staff numbers and deliver a far greater customer experience. The customer hub has not been delivered and has pushed DVLC staff to limit, resulting in a 100% turnover of staff. Four million pounds were wasted on the MyGov portal so far with nothing to show for it.

P&R have also been responsible for cutting the funding to the Sports Commission without even the lid on the consequences felt by our secondary school students, which they have endured this term with little or no sports enrichment. P&R reducing the funding to just 16% of that originally requested; a huge cut in funding with absolutely no clue of the negative impact on our young people.

Signing this Motion of No Confidence was not a decision I took lightly but I was –

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Dudley-Owen.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** The funding was based on a figure that was put through by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Cameron to continue.

**Deputy Oliver:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Oliver.

**Deputy Oliver:** The person that was responsible for the moving the PTON or the OTON, I think it was, whatever it was, was actually Deputy Heidi Soulsby.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Cameron to continue.

**Deputy Cameron:** Thank you sir.

Signing the Motion of No Confidence was not a decision I took lightly but I was in complete disbelief that our senior Committee would rather turn on their colleagues in calling a general election just because their tax proposals were not supported by the majority of the Assembly.

Absolutely no consideration to the three years of hard work that Members and officers are putting into hundreds of workstreams being developed within Committees. No consideration given to the consequences and expenses of halting work on all of these workstreams; just the nuclear option of a General Election.

I ask Members to allow fresh eyes on the issue we face and support the Motion of No Confidence.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dyke.

**Deputy Dyke:** Thank you, sir. I will take the pre-lunch slot if no-one else will. *(Laughter)*

I have been listening to the debate. I think what we all need to bear in mind is life is a series of choices which is a terrible thing really because you do not have to make them. We are now faced with two prospects, although the choices have now changed because two Members of P&R have now resigned. I think we probably all need to digest that fact. So the circumstances are slightly different because there will be elections to two places on the Committee.

Anyway, yes, we have a choice between removing the current Committee or dismissing them unceremoniously and electing a new one. There are various issues that derive from there. We have 18 months to go before the next election so one question we should ask ourselves is, is it a good idea to change everything around with only 18 months to go? There will be knock-on effects no doubt on other Committees, and it always takes a while to get a grip on what one is supposed to be doing, so I question whether taking this action and voting for this motion is in the interests of good governance and the best execution of the people's business, which we have to continue to do.

Underlying that choice and that decision is whether we believe the current Committee is competent to carry on for the remainder of the term undertaking its business or whether it is not competent, and I think that is quite a high bar to achieve in terms of proving incompetence. I have disagreed with P&R on a number of things, obviously most notably GST, where we came from completely different angles. But so be it. I do not regard them as incompetent; they believed what they were doing on the GST debate was right. The proposals put together if you are going to do GST were actually quite good and well thought through; I happen to disagree with them.

There has been a lot of talk about rudeness and that sort of thing. I guess a few of the Members can be a bit sharp but I have always found them perfectly reasonable to deal with. Deputy Ferbrache is positively quite friendly usually unless he is telling me off for singing *Sweet Caroline*. *(Laughter)* But I certainly have not been bullied despite having quite a few disagreements over various things. I do question whether a vote of No Confidence is appropriate now or whether it would be a very good idea at all to vote for it. Bear in mind, out there our people are looking in with a sense of concern, I think, as to what we are doing and whether all of us know what we are doing.

The debate yesterday I found terribly disappointing in terms of where we have left education and I think that is resounding out there. There have been concerns about expenditure and our tax proposals, which everyone worries about a lot. Do we need to add to that by presenting a sort of crisis to everyone in terms of suddenly axing our main Committee? Are the circumstances such that that risk and those results are worthwhile? I actually do not think they are and, to answer a specific point that Deputy Cameron raised about our IT problems, our IT problems are enormous. They stem from the contractual arrangements that we entered into in the last States which were distinctly sub-optimal. We are looking at them on Scrutiny at the moment but we were left effectively having left ourselves with no competent IT staff to deal with a very aggressive IT company and that has led to all these different problems that every Committee has had in the States. I do not think that can be laid at the door of P&R and, in fact, I think P&R have been taking some steps to remediate at least the cash drain that that contract has been causing us. That is something I would not wish to interfere with.

So, on balance, it seems to me that it would be inadvisable to vote for this proposal.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

1575 **Deputy Brouard:** Thank you, sir.

They are not perfect but they are not cuddly and they are certainly not even pretty, sir, *(Laughter)* but they are our P&R. They did not create the problems we have; they are here and they are tasked with finding solutions. I think the main straw, or the bundle of straw, or the hay bale that I think Deputy Parkinson is bringing forward is really the GST tax debate as being the catalyst for this.

1580 But in their defence, sir, I would say their Members, who had very different initial thoughts when they came to this Chamber on tax – they were going to cut taxes, make savings – and the reality and the health check after three years acknowledged that we actually need more funds and they showed real courage when they changed their mind and came up with a cunning way to introduce a GST with a lower burden and lower taxes for those with narrow shoulders and the weight put on  
1585 those with the broader shoulders.

We collectively, I think, let P&R down. We did not follow their lead and, in my view, I have changed my position on GST and I think we had every squeal from 'It's the wrong time, it's the wrong rate' and 'there are unicorns that will pay tax in the future'. But I do not think P&R were wrong; they put their political lives on the line. They did not leave the ship, they did not look to the  
1590 next election; they went against their own original beliefs to do what they thought was right for Guernsey.

We do not make our funding position, if that is the real reason for this move, any better by changing the crew. We are not here to be popular; we have to do what is right for Guernsey.

On HSC, as I mentioned yesterday, we have had on balance very good support from P&R, not  
1595 on everything but the main thing is they do understand our problem and that is half the battle to a solution, and I do thank them for that. They have been moving heaven and earth with us to get one of the key enablers that we have, which is key worker housing, and that is especially through Deputy Mahoney. But it was this House again that frustrated our progress with a requête to prevent the building of John Henry II and the like. So I think, with many other things, we also need to look at  
1600 ourselves as well as to other Committees. On balance I will be supporting them and I will not be voting for this motion.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** I am looking around the room on the basis that, as I indicated yesterday, I am minded  
1605 to invite you to continue for a bit longer rather than breaking at this point, especially in light of the indication given that there might be a guillotine motion. Are there other Members who wish to speak in debate on this Motion of No Confidence?

On that basis would one of them like to continue standing up and I will call them.

Deputy Vermeulen.

1610

**Deputy Vermeulen:** Thank you, sir.

I do not know how long you are going to extend debate, but –

**The Bailiff:** It is beforehand so we do not have to worry about extending while you speak.

1615

**Deputy Vermeulen:** Okay, thank you.

So, sir, I was the seventh man, or person, to sign the vote of No Confidence and I did so because of where I felt we were. My experience is basically in negotiations with the public and business and my colleagues in the Assembly.

1620 Sir, I have got the utmost regard for all my colleagues in this Assembly, and P&R is our top Committee and the buck has, unfortunately, got to stop somewhere.

What has happened, it is quite plain to me, is that they have lost the room; they have lost the public of Guernsey, the confidence of the people of Guernsey in the direction, in incessantly bringing back GST so many times that people even refer to it as the GST Committee now. I have  
1625 seen first-hand the fear that even the thought of bringing GST back again instils in businesses and individuals who really, really are struggling at the moment – struggling to keep their heads above the water and they just feel Guernsey is far too small with 63,000 people ... you know, they just do not want that tax imposed on them.

My frustration in all of this is that I voted for everyone on P&R; some of the Members that have  
1630 resigned – I have very high regard for Deputy Soulsby, and in hindsight her resignation was a serious loss to that Committee. She has got my regard because she is a performer, she has got a qualification. She, in the previous Assembly, was in charge of the hospital and health budget and she finished within her budget, and anybody that can do that gets my respect. So I think they are none the richer without her and maybe this is where problems came to a head. There were obviously  
1635 some arguments within, perhaps on financial positions and directions and an accountant or another Member was not listened to. We have seen several other examples and I was very upset to hear Deputy de Sausmarez read out in granular detail some of her experiences.

Now, I am a big bloke, sir, and I am quite a robust fellow but I do expect people to behave in a certain way with decency, honesty and integrity, sir, and I hope that all Members, and Members that  
1640 come into the States in the future, treat people with that. And I have learned, sir, that people have got a different opinion ... you know, you have to listen to those opinions and understand why they think it, you have to understand how they are thinking and then hopefully try to weave your ideas into that, and you do not do it by being brash, being rude. And we have witnessed civil servants being spoken to in unprofessional ways and other Members in this institute leaving in not a good  
1645 way.

I think it boils down to communication, sir. The way you treat people is the way you are treated; it is how you talk to people, how you listen, how you communicate with people, and there is no harm in doing it – in being polite I am quite a direct and forthright person. I will tell Deputy  
1650 Ferbrache exactly how I am thinking and if he said something that might upset me I will say: 'Hang on a minute', you know, and we clear things up. So, yes, I have got high regard for him and I know he has given 70-hour weeks and applied himself to it but we are at the end of the day where we are – in a very uncomfortable position. GST has not been successful and I am fearful that it would be brought back several times over the next 18 months and I do not think we can run our Island, our government, in that way, so it is probably time to use some of the other talent that could enrich  
1655 that table around this House, if I am honest.

We have got to find, as I said yesterday, for Education ... we have got to find a different way and find it we must.

Now we talked about growth and, sir, I am paid to do this job. I am a people's Deputy and I am paid to make decisions. One of the strangest things for me, and I hate anybody abstaining – it is a  
1660 yes or it is a no – but I am paid to make those decisions; I am not paid to abstain. And the most unusual voting patterns from P&R just yesterday ... with abstentions ... I have seen abstentions when I was trying to bring a runway extension and that was put to me as though I had been supported, even though it was unsuccessful, by Members of P&R abstaining. That goes against the grain. It is either a yes or a no, unless you are conflicted in some way. I can understand that somebody might  
1665 be in an impossible position and have to abstain but there is far too much abstaining going on and I feel it is ducking the issues.

The fact that we spent five days on the budget tells another story. I have spoken to two Members who were in the headlines recently this week and I said I had no idea what was going on. This was the people being investigated and I wonder how the dynamics of the Committee work when your  
1670 colleagues are dubbing you in and getting an investigation into what you are doing. So there are problems in the current P&R.

I was pleased to receive Deputy Helyar's e-mail explaining his official position after the news article but nonetheless that position is untenable with things like that going on, it really is. And we have some financial challenges that have to be met.

1675 We do have a Moneyval inspection and there are people in this Assembly that could quite easily slot into those positions and take us through a Moneyval inspection in their role on P&R. It is the finance industry and, I suppose, that is going to be measured there.

Behaviour is, I have mentioned this ... I do cringe, sir, and there are people I have had to ring up and just check on after incidents have happened and you pulled a Member of P&R up just in the  
1680 last meeting for accusing ... disrespect, basically. But it matters to me; that matters a lot. It is very important to me that people are treated with respect and I do not like to see people disrespected or bullied even. So other Departments I have had to phone up on a completely different political dimension to mine and they have said; 'Well, I am bowled over that you have rung me and you are the last person in the Assembly that I expected to be calling.'

1685 But those things happen and that is what I do, so I have got to kind of look after their welfare as well. Sometimes the other side of the House come to me and say: 'Do you know, Simon, the effort you put into that, you really deserve to succeed, and the result you got, the score you obtained did not reflect the effort that you put into that.' So that is nice as well. That is the two-way street that I am talking of.

1690 There have been some really good points made by both opinions from the Assembly but I was really looking forward, after GST failed last time, and an early election was put forward by the Chief Minister, I was happy to really get behind that and welcome an early election because I thought that was the right way to deal with it. And then, I think it is true to say, my hopes were dashed when there was no sign of that early election happening.

1695 So, really, a Vote of No Confidence does two things, and it can do two things regarding the outcome. It can give us the opportunity to freshen it up, get some fresh eyes in there and reach some other decisions. It can also give the existing P&R the opportunity to say: Hang on a minute, you know, we are right, we have done nothing wrong here at all and, you know, they can reassert themselves. So that really is the only tool, failing an early election, that is left to me. But we can do  
1700 so much better, sir. We really can. I am amazed at how many barriers are put in the way of somebody that genuinely wants growth and I think we have forgotten, as an Island, as a States, I think we have forgotten totally why we are here, what Guernsey is all about and why we have these low rates of taxation, and why souls like Deputy Vermeulen vehemently oppose GST. It basically would be bringing in 5% to 6% on but the low interest was to stimulate growth in the first place and that is  
1705 what we have forgotten about.

So I will not be changing my ways and I am going to be supporting, with a heavy heart, a Vote of No Confidence, sir.

Thank you.

1710 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, let me just test whether you want to continue until, say, one o'clock, or whether you want to come back early. So I will start with the continuing to one o'clock. I am going to put a motion to you that we continue this debate until as close to one o'clock as possible. Those in favour; those against?

1715 *Members voted Pour.*

**The Bailiff:** I will declare that carried.  
Deputy Roffey.

1720 **Deputy Roffey:** Thank you, sir.

We are being asked a simple question today; whether we retain confidence in the Policy & Resources Committee, and that question has been posed after yet another failure by P&R and myself to persuade the States to support the central plank of its fiscal policy – one which we, they,

have repeatedly told the Assembly and the Island is absolutely essential for the future of our community.

I think we are also being asked that question in the light of P&R's reaction to that, which was to call for an early General Election, despite our fixed term system of government and citing a reason for that call, I quote, '... that this Assembly refuses to be led.' Now these were all very tricky questions from my point of view and maybe made more so by the news today of the double resignation but I will hopefully, in a calm and measured way, unpack my reaction to all of those strands.

Obviously, I have not lost confidence with them on the basis that I think their proposed funding package was flawed. Indeed, I supported it strongly and had a hand in its creation, and I put on record that I admire the way they stuck to their guns, of which more shortly.

But also that second defeat of P&R's flagship policy was the catalyst for this debate of No Confidence. It is obviously not the only matter which Members need to take into account, so I do have to ask myself the wider question of whether I generally retain confidence in this P&R.

Now, frankly, I am afraid to say that my general confidence in P&R drained away long ago, in fact in the early months of this Assembly. I think the States has been very poorly led and an example from the top has created a very poisonous atmosphere in this Assembly. I am certainly not saying that they are solely responsible for that toxicity but their approach to politics as a body has certainly done more to fuel it than to remove it.

I have seen behaviours the likes of which I have never encountered in local politics before and I hope I never will again. I have seen a desire to control imposed, synchronised, and ignore Committee mandates and overstep numerous red lines, all of which doomed this States to under-achievement. And I have seen a senior Committee which, in my view, never really tried to make a consensus Committee system of government work, only to turn around and complain bitterly that the system itself is broken. So, I am sorry, I am sorry. It is quite impossible for me to have confidence in P&R as currently constituted.

As I say, I am very far from saying that P&R are solely responsible for the obvious shortcomings of this Assembly and it does have shortcomings. If any of us thinks this is a States which has over-performed then I really worry about their sense of perspective, although I do take the point it is an Assembly that has come in at a really difficult time, not just because of COVID and the lingering effects of Brexit but, actually, when the demographic time-bomb, known about for decades, is finally exploding which puts unique challenges in front of us both of service provision and finances. So I take all of that but nevertheless I think we could have handled a bad set of cards better.

I think we all need to take some responsibility for those shortcomings, some more than most and not just P&R, but I have no doubt that the rot started from the top. P&R started this political term with, I think, a clear inbuilt majority in this Assembly and has slowly but surely gone about losing it. How? To my mind by a combination of trying to centralise power in their own hands, too often ignoring Committee mandates and a degree of arrogance and inflation of their own role.

Our system of government involves, or should involve, policy co-ordination by P&R. They should be servant leaders, working with Committees to build consensuses and agreed aims. It is about persuasion, not dictation. Instead, I am afraid this P&R has too often tried to act like it was a Cabinet and then whined over its lack of powers to do just that. Sadly, I think its chemistry is just all wrong, as is perhaps its lack of political experience. Now I accept the chemistry is changing as a result of resignations and I will ponder that over lunchtime.

Whenever that has been posed the academic question do I have confidence in P&R my answer at any stage over the past two and a half years would have been I am afraid not. But on the other hand I take Deputy Queripel's point about the effect that change has, and this Assembly would be pretty chaotic if I suggest that we change every States Committee that did not impress me.

So what about last month's Funding & Investment Plan debate as a trigger point? To me, sir, that is problematic. On one hand I think P&R's defence of what they knew to be required to meet the future revenue requirements of our government in order to deliver for the people of Guernsey the services and the facilities that they need has been this Committee's absolute high point. They have shown resolution, they have shown courage and determination. They fought for what they

knew to be right despite knowing that it was doing them personal, political damage, and I salute them for it. I wish we saw more of that sort of approach in this Assembly. And frankly, if we all went home yesterday feeling wretched I think the rot started when we did not face up to the funding decisions that P&R had the courage to stand behind.

1780 On the other hand the need for change at the top does not always relate to those in leadership positions having actually done anything wrong. The reality is that, sadly, they did fail to convince a majority to support their flagship fiscal policy, and not for the first time. And so did I, so I have to stand alongside them. It is not a criticism, it is just the way things turned out. And, for a Committee containing the Treasury function, that would normally demand at least a refresh at the top and I  
1785 know we are going to see that. That is good because it is very hard to just continue as if nothing has happened, nothing to see there, because that way would lead to zombie government.

Then there was that call for an early election and not just the call itself, I think we are all quite tempted to embrace it in some ways, but the reasons given for it; basically, P&R said we need to go to the polls because this Assembly will not be led by us. Frankly, if they really believed what they were saying on that occasion, then something has to change, and that is true whether the situation is the fault of P&R or the fault of the rest of us. If the Committee designed to lead is telling us that this Assembly will not be led by them, then just ploughing on with business as usual is not really an option.

I was quite frank with Deputy Ferbrache over that some weeks ago really now. I told him that I  
1795 thought at the very least P&R needed a refresh and that the best thing in my mind was for the Committee to step down and seek a fresh mandate, seeking a Vote of Confidence rather than fighting a Vote of No Confidence. If that had happened at least some of them would have survived and we would have had the right balance between continuity and fresh blood which was needed to acknowledge that P&R have hit the buffers over their crucial flagship policy. Instead, at the time  
1800 anyway, they decided on the musketeers approach, all for one and one for all, and therefore I had to consider it in that light.

Now, what to do? Deputy Queripel is basically asking for evidence. I do not like trial by anecdote; I am not comfortable with it but there are certain episodes I cannot ignore. Very early on in this term, during the second lockdown, I attended a tripartite meeting over the future use of Les Vardes  
1805 quarry. What I heard in that meeting, which was on Teams by the way, shocked me rigid. Never in all my political experience have I heard anything like the aggressive, rude, hectoring abuse of well-respected public servants as I heard from two Members of P&R at that meeting. In retrospect I very much regret not intervening more forcefully and I now apologise for not doing so. I am afraid a combination of the meeting being on Teams, where I was not particularly ... I am not particularly  
1810 adept at and being taken completely back by what was being said left me rather flat-footed, and I should have responded more rapidly.

Alas, sir, that has not proved to be an isolated incident; far from it. And as Deputy Parkinson said in his opening, down that bridge of trust and promise breaking over the joint commercial ports amendment between P&R and STSB it was shocking. Now, Deputy Inder tried to re-open the ports  
1815 debate. I would not mind at all if P&R to a man had opposed tooth and nail everything we are trying to put forward. That is their right, that is a political disagreement. I have no problem with that. It has nothing to do with that. It is the fact that shortly before the States, P&R in a joint meeting assured us of their full support of the Policy Letter. Of course they have the right to change their minds, although such indecisiveness would hardly inspire confidence, but on the day of the debate  
1820 P&R made clear to us that their continued support depended on us in turn supporting in principle the setting up of a development agency.

Now we did not have a particular issue with that. We went to that little room next to the gents' out there and we talked it through and we came forward ... it was the one next to the gents' actually  
1825 (*Laughter*) and we came up with what was generally called a compromise amendment. And the clear understanding between both bodies was that if we put forward an amendment that involved P&R coming back with proposals for a development agency then we would have continued support for our proposals. And then most of the Members of P&R voted for the agency but against the main

proposals. That is not the way politics have been done in my experience. People may have been watching *The West Wing* or whatever it is and thinking that that ... you know, particularly if they were new to politics, this is the way it is done. I do not think it is the way it has been done in Guernsey and I do not think it should be.

And I think Deputy Vermeulen ... I made quite an angry speech when that happened. Deputy Vermeulen looked at me aghast and sort of said the wind was blowing through his hair and said it was definitely him. I was quite angry. I hope now he realises quite why I was so angry. I felt there had been a very significant breach of trust.

And then Deputy Vermeulen has brought up this issue in the *Press* and Deputy Helyar's clarification last night was quite right. There was, in the end, no investigation into Deputy Ferbrache and I. That was what was requested. The Civil Service made quite clear that they had no ability or mandate to do that so instead by proxy there was an investigation set up. Officers that were under the direction of Deputy Ferbrache and I to try to discover exactly the same thing. Well, I mean even the CEO of the then GHA I think was called into the P&R and really given the third degree. So I am a big boy, I can live with such complete nonsense even though it is quite distracting and far from good government. What I cannot excuse is that those shenanigans brought us perilously close to losing that deal over Braye Lodge and the crucial key worker housing that will come with it.

And I have to say likewise with the request for affordable housing, sir. Deputy Gollop has said that P&R have stood beside us. And I have to say yes, they have, but it has been like walking on eggshells because it depended on who was around the table on the day, because at least 40% of the Committee seemed to have no sympathy with the affordable housing programme. So it really was like walking on eggshells.

And, early on in this Assembly, we lost two absolutely ideal sites for key worker housing which would have been up. We wrote and we wrote repeatedly to P&R and they got sold off instead but they would have been up and running now and available to the staff at HSC, although I have to say I must pay .... This is not covering my backside in case he survives and wants to carry on but I must pay tribute here to Deputy Ferbrache, who both in HAG and outside HAG, inside our joint working, has been an absolute brick in support of the affordable housing programme. Nobody could possibly have been more supportive. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)**

So, sir, taken in the round, I am afraid ... ask the academic question, do I have confidence in P&R and I am afraid I do not but not because of the tax debate; rather because of these incidents and scores like them.

Perhaps more to the point is the best way to react to such unacceptable behaviours and I am afraid, and I said it was not just P&R to blame, I am afraid that this Assembly starting to become a philosophy of tit-for-tat; to regard politics as a competitive contact sport, and I am not talking about Deputy de Sausmarez' former rugby playing days which I knew nothing about, where the purpose seems to be more to defeat the opposite team than to actually move things forward on behalf of Guernsey. I do not see it that way. I think we are all here to serve the people of Guernsey and of course sometimes we will vigorously disagree over how best to do that but falling out over one political issue should not poison one's ability to work together.

So when certain Members of the States who are perhaps quite ... not particularly supportive of P&R asked me why I was being so supportive of P&R over the tax strategy when they apparently had repeatedly shafted me on other matters, my reply was quite simple –

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey, I spoke to you *(Laughter)* the other day about the use of that language being unparliamentary.

**Deputy Roffey:** I totally recall withdraw that word that I mentioned there ... undermined me, sir, maybe, is that acceptable? ... on other matters? Sorry, I was into the common vernacular and I certainly did not mean it in any literal sense. Anyway, let us move on, I think.

Why am I so supportive of them over tax? I said the two are unrelated. On each matter each of us have to do what we think is best for Guernsey. We are not elected or paid to indulge in tribalism.

1880 It is not me taking the moral high ground ... well, actually, it probably is, but if it is it is only because I know from experience that that is how Guernsey politics should work. Before the last two Assemblies it stuck. The rot started in the last Assembly and it has got worse in this one.

I think we desperately need to get back to that approach to government where we embrace, as Deputy Vermeulen says, all of our talents even if we may be at odds personally at times. And I have to be honest, I cannot see that happening without some change at the top.

1885 This brings me to my last point, and one which risks me alienating all of my friends from all quarters of this Assembly, and which may be viewed as personality politics but, frankly, it is exactly the opposite. After seven years and five years of political toxicity I think the way we get a fresh start and the best way to achieve that would be a P&R Committee which contained neither the current nor immediate past P&R Presidents. That is not an attack on either of them. I do not dislike either of them; in fact I quite like both of them. But I am fed up to the back teeth of the wars between the Ferbrache and St Pier tribes. Local politics is much, much bigger than either of them. We need to draw a line under this civil war, during which I never wanted to serve in either army. We need to move on and have a fresh start, and that means we need to refresh the top and probably, despite the resignations, although I am going to mull this over at lunchtime, I think probably the only way we really can move on is to vote *Pour* to this motion.

**The Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, in accordance with the Rules we now have adjournment until 2.30 p.m. but I will just test whether or not you are minded to reduce the lunch break by a further 30 minutes and resume at 2 p.m., so that is the motion I am going to put to you that we adjourn now only till 2 p.m. Those in favour; those against?

*Members voted Contre.*

1905 **The Bailiff:** I will declare that lost and therefore we will resume at 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 1.03 p.m.  
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

### **Motion of No Confidence in the Policy & Resources Committee – Debate continued**

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dudley-Owen.

1910 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you, sir.

They are not good enough, is not good enough. It is not good enough for us in this Chamber just to make a judgement on the Policy & Resources Committee that they are not good enough. For a litany of disagreements, perceived failures and difficult decisions having been made is not good enough for us to base our judgement on in this matter.

1915 I have been really very, very keen to know exactly very clearly and very minutely what the criteria against which the movers of this motion have measured the performance of this Policy & Resources Committee and so far I do not really know I am not clear. I know that Deputy Parkinson has for quite some time now, I would say nearly a year, has been threatening to move a vote of no confidence against this Policy & Resources Committee on the basis of the success or otherwise of their fiscal policy. So on the basis that the tax policy is not pushed through, their preferred one, he would move a vote of no confidence.

1920 For me, that is not enough and whether or not it is done in other jurisdictions is quite frankly irrelevant because that is not how we do things here in Guernsey. If Members want us to do things

like that in Guernsey we need to change our rules but at present our rules do not account for policy failures meaning that a particular Committee has to move out of their seats.

And, indeed, was it a failure of policy or a failure to persuade? And even then that is not enough to cast a judgement on whether the Committee has been able to discharge the mandate. And really, Members, that means have they been able to carry out the task that they were asked to do.

The other thing I have not heard from the movers from this motion and albeit we have not heard from all of them and I do expect to hear from every last one of them, we have still got a couple of speakers to go, is what the level of expectation of performance actually is because unless we know what the level of expectation of performance is and we can put that together with the criteria against which this group of individuals, this Policy & Resources Committee, we cannot understand whether any future Policy & Resources Committee, whether it is this group or actually it will be a slightly different group of people because two have tendered their resignation this morning or any future new Members, whether they have achieved the bar of expectation.

So, it is really incumbent on the movers of this motion to enable us to understand whether or not a future Policy & Resources Committee has been more successful, less successful or as successful as this one because the uncertainty, the movement and instability that removing the central Committee causes to this Government to this States to this Assembly must be worth it and at this stage it is really unclear as to whether it is worth it. The case, in my view, is still waiting and needing to be made.

So I will speak to my experience of dealing with the current Policy & Resources Committee because I think that as a Committee President responsible for some of the most important policy areas in the States and one of the largest budgets, I think it is important that Members understand my experience and the evidence that shows that P&R have, in my view, discharged the mandate of their Committee.

So a policy area that has been essential to the success and future proofing and the efficient working and effective working of the education part of the mandate is our digital roadmap. Now this was something that had its genesis in the previous term, right at the beginning of the term under Le Pelley Committee and was bought forward in this term and this had to come to the Policy & Resources Committee in order for them to allow us to draw down the funding.

Now I found the group when I walked into the meeting with supporting officers the group of individuals as the Policy & Resources Committee interested, informed and most importantly challenging. They were challenging of us, they asked some really pointed difficult questions and I was very pleased that I was accompanied by technical officers who were able to respond accordingly to the challenges.

Now we came away with some success and success for me is that we were able to draw down the funding but not whole success because they did not approve all of the funding. They went back and they asked us to check our figures and this seems to have been a theme that has arisen from this particular Policy & Resources Committee that they are asking all Committees that are asking for the drawn down to go away and check your figures and if it needs independent verification buy it in, buy in that verification because we have done our homework and we think that it could be done for cheaper. And in the instance where a Committee has gone back and said it cannot they have challenged again.

I must say actually going back to the digital roadmap that now has resulted in the rolling out of infrastructure improvement and training. We get to get the final piece of the jigsaw, we have got action. So, there has been no barrier there has been challenge and we still have action and improvement from that.

The next area I would like to mention is COVID-19 funding, the bounce back funding as I would like to call it, because our young children they really suffered from the lockdown. The absence from education as a result of the enforced lockdowns and periodic absences from schools that we as a Government enforced on our school children had a significant effect on their ability to socialise, their ability to learn and meant gaps in their learning.

1975        So, we knew it was really important, we gathered evidence together from senior leaders and staff about what those gaps were and how they needed to be filled. We had a package of funding it came to the States here, that was approved in whole but we still had to go through the other gateway that P&R provided and we had to go and present our case in order to get it drawn down.

1980        They understood the issues, they challenged and I am very pleased to say that by majority it was passed and the most wonderful thing about that is that we know that the impact from that added funding has already been evidenced as very positive for those little people. Hundreds of our young children benefitting from that COVID money that is action, that is not a barrier.

1985        Another area that I think evidences P&R's discharge of their mandate was that the reorganisation of secondary and post-16 education as we all know, we will not go back to that but it has been a thorny issue, and at the very start of the term we were all keenly aware that there were two main areas on which the Education, Sport & Culture Committee had to focus its efforts and that was that particular policy area as well as the Education Law, both of which have been done, obviously not approved just yet.

1990        So, what we did was we wanted to work together with P&R because we wanted to have the critical friendship of people outside of the Committee but who were influential, who were able to help us, who were able to bring together that cross Committee and collegiate working environment so we invited Deputy Heidi Soulsby and Deputy Dave Mahoney as Members of P&R to attend regularly our internal meetings and discussions and that was really helpful. It allowed us to get the benefit of senior Members' wisdom, certainly one Member, Deputy Soulsby, having been a President herself having pushed through difficult policy through the States very, very helpful.

1995        Deputy Mahoney bringing a different expertise and a fresh pair of eyes from outside of the States into the room, to inject a different view, this is what we want on our Committees. So that really gave the project some assistance right in the early days and it carried on actually and certainly was very helpful on the guiding principles which everyone in this room had a part to play in designing.

2000        Now, this has been mentioned by quite a few speakers and this is in regards to the F&I Plan in regard to the Hospital Modernisation and the Transforming Education Programme and I think Deputy Matthews, and I know you will correct me if I am wrong on this because he was speaking to words on a page so, I think he said that the Policy & Resources Committee failed to deliver funding proposals for the two projects and if that is correct I would disagree with that entirely because they did, two scenarios were presented within the proposals that enabled both projects to go forward, two, not just one but two. So, there was a third one that did not allow either to go forward.

I will give way to Deputy Matthews.

2010        **Deputy Matthews:** I thank Deputy Dudley-Owen.

When I spoke in my speech I was really referring to the current state of affairs which is that as we stand at the moment there is no funding for the TEP project to continue.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Yes, thank you, Deputy Matthews.

2015        And as others are saying that was a States' decision that was not a failure on behalf of the Policy & Resources Committee to present proposals that could get us through that that was our body politic failure to be able to coalesce by sufficient numbers to agree the proposals that came forward within that plan. That is our collective failure not the failure of one particular Committee.

2020        So, actually one thing that they probably did have a failure to do is to persuade but again whose fault is that and does it need finger pointing and blame laying? Deputy Fairclough, who I know is extremely measured and thoughtful and considerate in his cogitations, said that he was not reached out to by the Committee but why did he not reach out to them?

2025        These questions go around, I mentioned in the debate this week we, I personally, have made considerable efforts to reach out to individuals I am but one person there are, minus my Committee, there are 30-odd other people in this Committee and I have to sleep in between and I have got

family commitments in between. The job of the President for the Committee for Education Sports & Culture is full on, it is Monday to Friday, Saturdays and Sundays too sometimes, and it is full on.

Members will note that I send emails quite late at night sometimes because I need to fit in family time and some time just to be able to gather my thoughts. So, it is really incumbent if there are still misgivings on Members that they should go back to the Committee. Yes, they may get a reach out but it is actually their responsibility (*Interjection*) because we were elected here to be as fully informed as possible to make our decisions.

So, I wonder whether, I cannot remember who said it, it might have been Deputy Prow, no it was Deputy Gollop, a conflation of confidence in the Committees ability. Actually it is the Committees ability that we are talking about and confidence in the Committee is actually more about people's desire for different individuals to be on that Committee than it is about asking whether that Committee are capable of doing their job because that is what the question is today. Are the Committee capable of doing their job?

In my view, it has not always been easy the relationship with P&R it has not always been plain sailing because it never is because they are there to challenge but they are there to bring us together they are there to facilitate. It should not be comfortable bed fellows; it is not our job to have cosy relationships. Sometimes we need to have pointed sharp conversations (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and sometimes it does feel that possibly an approach that has been mentioned could be too robust in terms and I cannot comment on that, however, I would like to say that it is unhelpful to be, no, I will not continue going down that line but suffice to say that I think there has been behaviours in this term and in last term that have been pretty poor from a lot of Members are we are not dragging that out on the floor of this Assembly because I think there are two sides to every story. But, I have witnessed some extraordinary behaviour in my seven years and actually most of it was last term.

I think that Deputy Gabriel, again, this is not just about the evidence, the need to substantiate the claims is also about submitting complaints and I would have hoped that Deputy Gabriel might have submitted a complaint for his experience like Deputy de Sausmarez did because I think that is really, really important and I would say that as the President of Policy & Resources Deputy Ferbrache cannot control the behaviour of people within the room any more than the previous President of Policy & Resources last term, Deputy St Pier, could control the behaviour of Members which is a job that I think that both individuals have found very difficult to do.

They do not have an Executive Lead they can only appeal to people's good nature to check their own behaviour and it is incumbent on all of us to check our own behaviour. We all get ratty sometimes and I do apologise for having been ratty over the last couple of days. (*Laughter*) I did want to bring up actually that Deputy Meerveld in his true combat metaphor style has said of the previous Policy & Resources last term that they fed their friends and starved their enemies. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I think that that was always a very interesting statement because it depended on what side you landed on. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I think and as probably for terms and terms it has been the same (*Interjection*) that if the Policy & Resources of the day are more challenging with certain Committees then it may be a perception that they are not as friendly to those Committees as otherwise.

So it is extremely difficult in that instance to provide evidence of policy disagreement as being the barrier to running the Committee well. So, we have evidence today of Committees that have had challenge but have had approvals but Committees that have had challenge and they have had disagreement and no approval. It is difficult to see where that lies and how that actually speaks to the fact that the Committee has not been able to discharge its mandate. I would suggest that the rounded picture that is being presented by all the principle Presidents here, because we have all got different experiences, would be an indication that actually the Policy & Resources Committee are doing the job that it was asked to do.

Sir, my final comment really would be that I am still none the wiser as to why this particular vote of no confidence has been bought. I think it is extremely unhelpful and I would suggest that here are two places now on Policy & Resources and if any the movers of the motion had ambitions or if others had ambitions to be on Policy & Resources this is the time now to be able to put this to bed

vote against it and for those people to do onto add a new fresh look at Policy & Resources in the last remaining 18 months rather than go through the upheaval of an entire election for a new group of people who will take time to get their feet under the table.

They will not be able to do anything quickly that is an absolute practical fact and we really do need to consider that. Even if they have sat in those seats before they will still have to pick up the reigns from the previous Policy & Resources and that will take time. But one thing that I will say, because I need to trust that if this particular group of people who I have a high regard for each individual on that Committee I have a high regard for, if any Members want to replace this group if they fail and the vote of no confidence is successful, if Members want a seat on that particular Policy & Resources I have to be convinced of their good intentions.

**A Member:** Hear, hear.

**Deputy Taylor:** Point of order, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Point of order, Deputy Taylor.

**Deputy Taylor:** Well just for consistency with 17(6), Deputy Queripel did seek to introduce the future of what might happen after a successful motion (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and it was ruled that that was not appropriate and I feel Deputy Dudley-Owen is straying towards that.

**The Bailiff:** I think, Deputy Dudley-Owen, that we do not want to think too far ahead, we are concentrating at the moment on whether or not motion should succeed.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** I was just drawing to a close before I was interrupted and my last comment would be that I will not vote for anyone who has voted for this Committee to go because I cannot be assured of pure intentions.

**Deputy Gabriel:** Sir, could I crave your indulgence for a point of order?

**The Bailiff:** Point of order, Deputy Gabriel.

**Deputy Gabriel:** If possible I was wondering if you would provide some advice or ruling if a Motion of No Confidence does not pass this evening or whenever we sit to is it possible that the resignations from Deputy Helyar and Deputy Mahoney could be withdrawn or rescinded or have they been officially accepted (*Interjection*) as Deputy Taylor did when he resigned from the Vice Presidency of DPA?

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** I do not think that is, strictly speaking, a point of order because there is no suggestion that anyone has broken any Rules and it would only be Deputy Dudley-Owen who could have done so. Consistently with what has happened before if a Member who has tendered a resignation from a Committee then seeks to withdraw that resignation it is permissible to do so and that would not create a vacancy on the Committee. So that is the answer to that, Deputy Gabriel.

I am going to call Deputy Mahoney.

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

If it is any comfort to anyone I will not be seeking to un-resign ... (*Laughter*) but who knows! (*Laughter*) I am joking I will not be seeking to un-resign. Sir, I will go first from the trenches. So I am going to start with a joke and end with a quote because Lord knows something needs to lighten up the mood today. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

2130 The Bjorn and Sven are hunting in the back woods and they shoot a deer, they begin dragging the deer back to their truck by its tail but they keep slipping and losing grip. A farmer sees them and asks what are you doing? Dragging this deer back to our truck they reply. So the farmer tells them you are not supposed to drag a deer by the skinny little tail but rather by the big sturdy antlers. So the Bjorn and Sven thank the farmer and start pulling the deer by the antlers. Well after five minutes Bjorn says to Sven that farmer was right this is much, much easier and Sven replies yes but we are just getting further away from the truck. (*Laughter*)

2135 Sir, the comparison here, and I am glad we added some hilarity anyway, is that many people in life are just pulling the easy way but getting away from the goal. The easy way for Members is to keep making the safe non contentious decisions. Something which this P&R have not done but it does get us further away from our goals as an Assembly.

2140 So I think I am not going to be long but as with a lot of votes this term I think most people have already made up their minds on this but I do have to just address a few of the points that have been made. We had, as I would expect, a convenient version of history from Deputy Parkinson P&R should go because our funding plans were defeated was one of the arguments, which they certainly were. When he and others and someone else made the point earlier have come up with nothing either so presumably will not be standing if, when P&R lose or if the motion is carried rather.

2145 Deputy de Sausmarez made various comments and statements, I think mostly to play to the point made by Deputy Queripel that he wanted evidence, evidence of bullying, evidence of wrong doing but none was provided. Those are stories we are told but no evidence was provided.

2150 **Deputy Queripel:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Queripel.

2155 **Deputy Queripel:** Sir, Deputy de Sausmarez cited emails that is evidence (**A Member:** Okay.) that can be seen by anyone should she decide to send them to us. That is evidence.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Mahoney was simply giving his interpretation of what was said so it is not a valid point of correction, please try and let people continue their speeches.

2160 **Deputy Mahoney:** Thank you, sir.

I was in the library listening at the time but I think I heard it right that two years ago she said that there was a meeting with the Jersey E&I Minister who is no longer in office, I think she said that. She is shaking her head I think. No, but there was a meeting with an E&I officer from Jersey by two Members of P&R well it was not me and I have checked with the other Members of P&R and they say it was not them so I am really not even sure what that meeting was about when she said her toes were being, or the Committees toes I beg your pardon, were being trodden on by P&R riding rough shod over her mandate. None of us can recall meeting. I have never met a Jersey Minister.

2170 I will give way if she wants to stand. I give way.

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** I thank Deputy Mahoney for giving way, it was a virtual meeting and I was informed by the then Minister who is not a Minister for Environment & Infrastructure obviously because that is our title, but the then Minister and Assistant Minister, I was given a list of names of attendees because of course they had Civil Service records and Deputy Mahoney and Deputy Helyar's names were on that list.

2180 **Deputy Mahoney:** Well I have never met physically or virtually any Jersey Minister so I have got absolutely no idea what she is talking about there. Now she made great play of a previous President's meeting in I think she said 2021 but I may have got that wrong, where she quite rightly redacted a name in an email that she had sent in exchange between herself and Deputy Ferbrache.

Now, whether intentionally or unintentionally of course she then quite rightly did not say who that redacted name was but certainly the inference was that it was a Member of P&R that she had been fighting with and it was not a Member of P&R so I am not really sure what the point was. The evidence provided was that someone had been mean, there had been a nasty incident and that she had made a complaint of sorts, whatever you want to call it, to Deputy Ferbrache who said that he would investigate it or deal with it or whatever the phrase was, sorry I cannot remember.

But it was not someone from P&R. So it may have happened it was probably wrong I accept that but it was not one of us. Now I am big enough and ugly enough to face, I was expecting a 'hear, hear' from Deputy Trott there (*Laughter*) any challenge and disagreements without crying for bullying. Now some clearly are not and that is where we are all made differently but we have clear, very clear, rules around behaviour for us as States' Members and the way in which we interact with the public sector and its workers and no one, to my knowledge or I understand the knowledge of the rest of P&R, no one has made a complaint against a Member of P&R.

We have the Rules and no one has made a complaint. All of these people complaining but nobody, apparently, to the people that are supposed to be the subjects of those complaints. A statement I said just a second ago, a statement from Deputy de Sausmarez that someone said to her they were bullied is no evidence, it is no evidence at all. I can stand here right now and pick a name out of the people who stood in front of me and say I had a really serious complaint against Deputy X that said they were bullied. I have no evidence for it whatsoever other than saying I got an email from a person that said they were bullied. That simply is not evidence.

Others have talked about the collective failure being laid at the door of P&R but that is just the old adage, everyone wants to be a lion until it is time to be a lion (**A Member:** Yes.) Everyone wants responsibility until it is time to take responsibility and that I am afraid has been the flavour so far of this Assembly.

I wanted to just note a few of the points, sorry there was one other sorry. It was referenced by both Deputy Roffey and Deputy Parkinson this ill tempered meeting at STSB regarding Le Vardes quarry. Just for the record so that, I am not giving way, just for the record that was Deputy Helyar and I, neither of us are ashamed to say it was us it was not any of the other three and I will tell you what happened at that meeting just to put some meat on the bones. Because we were talking about Le Vardes and its future use.

I have made no secret of the fact that I think it should be used for inert waste (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and SDSB have made no secret of the fact that it should be used for water retention (*Interjection*) that is fine that is just a difference of opinion, we have them. But when a very senior Civil Servant, the one that we were talking about, said to Deputy Helyar and I under direct question how much would it cost to actually bring that on line as a water reservoir bearing in mind it is miles from the nearest pumping station the answer that came back was £500,000.

Miles and miles of serious double pipes, digging up roads, digging up fields for half a million pounds. So when Deputy Helyar and I both exclaimed, I think we laughed out loud at the number, that that was just a joke figure it was defended by the senior civil servant but clearly is absolute nonsense.

By raising it here I just wanted it to be on *Hansard* so that at some point in the future in 40 years time when the States can get round to doing it others can look back and say why did that cost £15 million when we were told it would cost £500,000. It is just not going to happen for that price and it is worth just putting some actual facts behind that again so people can see the nature of that dispute.

Sir, having said all I am pretty sure it has not been that bad actually in terms of the behaviours or whatever you want to call it today. It must have been cathartic for many who have spoken today some of them have got no roles in Government save picking up a cheque (*Laughter*), nice privilege, but I hope the therapy received today from getting the stuff of their chests has made them happy and I hope when they look at themselves in the mirror tonight they are happy with their days work.

But, sir, I will finish with a quote from Teddy Roosevelt which I hope applies to me and the effort that I put in and I hope others can buy into. So President Roosevelt once said:

It is not the critic who counts; not the man who points out how the strong man stumbles, or where the doer of deeds could have done them better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who errs, who comes short again and again, because there is no effort without error and shortcoming; but who does actually strive to do the deeds; who knows great enthusiasms, the great devotions; who spends himself in a worthy cause; who at the best knows in the end the triumph of high achievement, and who at the worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who neither know victory nor defeat.

2235

Sir, that is what this Assembly should be aspiring to, that is what every single one of us should be doing. Get me in the arena, get me dirty and sweaty and I can roll up my sleeves and get on with it. Doers and triers not blockers and naysayers. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) If the issue is with Deputy Helyar and myself then we have fixed that. We have fixed that now and then on the 12th December or whenever thing comes round depending on what happens today we will no longer be on P&R. If the issue is E&I then that matter has been fixed and I highly recommend that the remaining three Members of P&R remain three Members of P&R.

2240

Sir, finally just to thank those who have offered kind words of support from within this Assembly and I have to add externally that have emailed me this morning to express their regret. As I said the three remaining Members of P&R are all highly capable and experienced and I urge Members to reject this motion.

2245

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

2250

**Deputy St Pier:** Thank you, sir.

I think it was helpful for Deputy Mahoney to confirm that he will not at any stage withdraw his resignation because I think Deputy Roffey and Deputy Falla had raised the question of whether that does change the dynamic of this debate and I think, indeed, Deputy Mahoney has raised that himself.

2255

So, I will give way.

**Deputy Helyar:** Just pre-empting what I suspect Deputy St Pier was about to say, I am happy to confirm exactly the same thing there is no question of my resignation being withdrawn.

2260

**Deputy St Pier:** Indeed, Deputy Helyar, you read my mind as is often the way so I am grateful for that. Sir, Deputy Roffey spoke about two tribes and I am sure at this point Deputy Queripel will be thinking of Frankie Goes to Hollywood (**Deputy Queripel:** Yes.) (*Interjection & Laughter*) a tune that I am sure we can all remember but in my case, sir, and I had a word with Deputy Ferbrache about this before lunch, certainly in my case if I have a tribe I have lost it (*Laughter*) and I would like to think it is probably one of the 10 lost tribes and I think Deputy Le Tocq is probably best placed in this Assembly to speak more and tell us more about who and what the 10 lost tribes were and where they ended up.

2265

I actually hoped that we would avoid this debate and the further division that it produces that it induces. As has been said I think if P&R had offered their resignations after the Funding & Investment Plan debate I think they probably would have been re-elected and I think there was a further opportunity this morning for the remaining three Members to do so following the resignations of Deputy Helyar and Deputy Mahoney and that would have avoided a divisive debate and a vote which, in itself, is not going to help heal the divisions and bring the States back together whichever way the vote goes and I think that is a further demonstration of poor judgement and leadership.

2275

Now this is not personal for me and I have worked very closely and successfully for eight years with Deputy Le Tocq and I have said many times and I would hope that Deputy Ferbrache would agree that there is no and never has been any personal animosity between he and I, irrespective of any perceptions to the contrary. Before this States I had never actually met Deputy Mahoney or Deputy Murray and I still really do not know either of them and I knew of but had only met Deputy Helyar a couple of times before the election.

In short my only perspective of Deputy Helyar, Deputy Mahoney and Deputy Murray is through their public conduct as trustees. Now in that context I was surprised this week to learn that Deputy Helyar and Deputy Mahoney had concerns about Deputy Ferbrache in relation to the Braye Lodge transaction and I think even if they felt unable to raise those with him, which I would understand if issues were brought to their attention, what I do not understand is why they did not raise them with other Members of the Committee at the time, Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Soulsby.

Now it has been suggested that they did not do so because they had some kind of direct or indirect or putative interest in the competing deal. Now no doubt they will take the opportunity to scotch that allegation. But in any event there

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Someone is cheering Deputy St Pier's speech. *(Laughter)*

**Deputy St Pier:** But in any event their failure to involve their colleagues was, again in my opinion, indicative not actually indicative of the traditions and behaviours of our system of government.

Now leadership is hard at the very best of times. It actually may be quite a lot easier if you are Vladimir Putin and it might even be a little bit easier if you have got some of the levers like the patronage of hire and fire that the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom has, but it is really, really hard in our Committee consensus system and I know because I have had that responsibility and Deputy Dudley-Owen has referred to that and the key word is consensus.

To build consensus requires time, emotional intelligence and leadership and, as Deputy Vermeulen has said, it requires good communication. Now, as Deputy Queripel has said looking for evidence into some of the reasons for the need to support the Motion of No Confidence I think, for me, what has become apparent about this particular Policy & Resources Committee is a level of inflexibility and rigidity which is not consistent with that need to build consensus.

Now basic law of physics which actually I was not very good at school, sir, but I knew enough to know that if you apply enough force to a rigid object eventually it does break and I think that was captured by Deputy Fairclough's phrase referring to a siege mentality.

I want to just give three very simple and short examples where I think I can evidence that inflexibility and rigidity. The first one is a very minor one it came up earlier in the Budget debate related to the issue of His Excellency's tax exemption. It would have been very, very easy for P&R to bury that issue by just saying to me 'yes, we will look at it' which is all I asked them to do.

The second level of inflexibility and Deputy Dudley-Owen and I have spoken about this again during the lunch recess was P&R's approach in relation to Education and the third that I think I can evidence is in relation to the GST proposals because as Deputy Queripel said they came back with exactly the same set of proposals the second time round as the first time round. There was a little narrative as has been mentioned as to why they were needed but it was the same set of proposals.

I can give further evidence of the inflexibility. When Deputy Soulsby and I went to go and see Policy & Resources in January, and it was the only time I have been in a meeting with the Committee and it was a very interesting dynamic to observe and others have noted it, what was very clear is there was not any wish to really find and seek an acceptable compromise and the conversations which Deputy Soulsby and I had had actually with Deputy Murray and Deputy Ferbrache before that meeting were far more positive than at that meeting and the result was an inflexible opposition to the amendment which came forward.

So those are my three pieces of evidence to demonstrate inflexibility. Now Deputy Prow has also talked about evidence and I want to give some evidence from outside the Island because I was in Jersey last week and I had quite a number of people say to me, too many people say to me, what

on earth is going on in Guernsey, what has gone wrong, why is it falling apart? And that really saddened me, I think it was a phrase that Deputy Gabriel used, but it really did sadden me because I think when you live in the political bubble as we all do you actually hope that perhaps it is not really being observed outside and that actually the damage that is being done is not being noted. But to have that played back, in Jersey of all places, was particularly painful and saddening.

Now the mandate of this, as Deputy Falla has said, of this Committee is about leadership of the States as the Senior Committee. Now I was not going to reference the Privileges Panel debate but Deputy Queripel has specifically asked that I should and I have got no desire to feed the narrative of a Deputy St Pier, Deputy Ferbrache psychodrama and this being another round of that psychodrama because I do not actually believe that exists and I just think that is a narrative and quite a convenient narrative because actually we have always had a one to one, we have always had a cordial personal relationship of engagement and I think as Deputy Gollop said Deputy Ferbrache in that environment is an amiable individual.

But in that debate all Members of the Committee piled in following the lead of Deputy Ferbrache and that pile on was personal and I think it was unbefitting of the leadership of the States. It did not work in bullying me because I responded with evidence of course. Now, I might remind Deputy Queripel of another public act of bullying by, dare I say it, Deputy Ferbrache because in this Assembly he threatened legal action against members of the public who had bought Codes of Conduct against him and as Deputy Queripel will know as a current Member of the States' Assembly Constitution Committee that is a highly in appropriate response for any Member of this Assembly to a Code Complaint. All the more less so from its senior leadership –

I will give way, sir.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Two points if I may raise, sir. Firstly I was accused of dishonesty and I do not take with my background, it is nothing to do with being a lawyer but where I come from, accusations of dishonesty. I was accused by two members of the public of being dishonest and the second is on 29th September of this year I received an email at just before 10 a.m. from Deputy Meerveld saying can you please help me; I have just received at 7.32 a.m. that morning, or whatever the time was, and he copied it to me and email from Deputy St Pier threatening legal action against him and I have got copies of these if Deputy Meerveld or Deputy St Pier have forgotten them.

So that was eight weeks ago, when Deputy St Pier wrote an email to Deputy Meerveld saying my lawyers are watching if you do such and such I will issue proceedings against you. Deputy Meerveld asked for my assistance as a friend, as a politician and a lawyer asking tongue in cheek but to act *pro bona* well I have done *pro bona* several times, but would I act *pro bona*. I helped him through that morning with several responses.

So the person who last threatened legal action in relation to such matters on 29th September 7.32 a.m. from Deputy St Pier to Deputy Meerveld. Nothing at all to do with Deputy Ferbrache, Deputy Meerveld eight weeks ago was asking Deputy Ferbrache for his assistance as a friend, as a politician and as a lawyer all of which was given.

**Deputy St Pier:** I have got to say, sir, I think threatening litigation against Members of the public who have submitted Codes of Conduct complaint is unbefitting of the leadership of the States and Deputy Queripel also witnessed verbal assaults by Deputy Ferbrache on Deputy Taylor in this Assembly quite recently and, of course, also and I think one of the most egregious examples of that is the expression of not having trust in Deputy Roffey and the Committee for Employment & Social Security and I think that is unprecedented and again not befitting of the senior Committee of the States.

But I want to finish by referencing a number of areas of policy where I think policy leadership consistent with the mandate where I think the Committee have failed because financially fiscally this is the most incontinent period of the management of the States' public finances in decades and there are a number of examples of that.

2380 The decisions around the inert waste as we know are going to cost, I think, £8 million for no real gain what so ever. I think at the beginning of this term in the first budget the decision was made to freeze the TRP Escalator Policy and I think it was simply because it was a populist and was consistent with a policy of no tax rises and we have now of course swung very considerably the other way and all the more painful because we have not eased the passage of that policy.

2385 I think the failure to borrow earlier in this term is going to cost the States' and the public exchequer millions in the decades to come and fourthly the absence of any, any attempt to contain public expenditure. There may have been challenge in the preparation of budgets by Committees I know that that has gone on, but I think there has been zero real leadership of what was required.

2390 Now the explanation has been well we have not got the control, it is the States' budget not our budget and all we can do is compile it. Actually the Policy & Resources Committee could have presented a budget which simply cut Committees cash limits. That has been done in the past, we did it in the past and it met resistance and it met amendments and Committees bought forward revised Propositions and this Assembly made the decision but the Committee provided the leadership to say we do not think we should be doing this, we think there should be restraint and 2395 it is now for you, the States, to make the decision. They did not give up before even getting to the floor of this Assembly.

2400 So those are the four pieces of evidence I wish to cite in relation to policy matters but overall as you will see I do not have confidence in Policy & Resources and I do wish that it was not being forced to a vote that will be divisive in itself and will not help the States come back together but that is the direction in which we are travelling and we should proceed that way.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tissier.

**Deputy Le Tissier:** Thank you, sir.

2405 Now, I think of myself as a natural P&R supporter, well I was when this term started but then GST came along and that is where we started to diverge. So what I am going to say really gives me no pleasure what so ever. In fact I did email, speak to Deputy Ferbrache a couple of weeks ago and said it is a pity we cannot vote for individual Members. He said well you cannot do that, I know that, but you could abstain. So, I could but I think I am going to vote Pour or Contre.

2410 Now this motion was not entirely unexpected since P&R lost their flagship policy for the second time or the third if you count the green paper and then after they lost it they expected all of us to effectively resign so they could have another throw of the dice by having a general election. I said at the time and I am saying again now, if P&R want that then feel free to resign from the States and we will have a bi-election just for five new Members. It is considerably cheaper and considerably 2415 quicker than a general election. Now the answer is in their hands but it has all gone very quiet on that front.

2420 Now I just need to cut the next bit because Deputy Gabriel has got in first and thank you for the confirmation from Deputy Mahoney and Deputy Helyar. Now we have no money but we have money for the things they want to do, the ferry for example. Now, okay, that may become clear soon why we needed to buy the ferry but we have had no information for us Deputies. P&R just want to tough it out and in my mind that is the worst option.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Point of correction, sir.

2425 **The Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Ferbrache.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** It was not P&R that bought the ferry, the CCA made a decision that the ferry be bought.

2430 **Deputy Le Tissier:** Thank you, Deputy Ferbrache.

So, there is a lot of bitterness coming out in this debate and they could have avoided that by resigning before the debate but to use a footballing term and I am not really a supporter of any team, P&R have lost the dressing room.

Now there is one thing I do want to say and I am going to address it to the point that Deputy Queripel made about evidence. Previous evidence of contempt of Members if not verging on bullying and that involves the comments made by a certain P&R Member to belittle my own views in the debate three weeks ago. Now this is not hearsay or emails Deputy Queripel was in the room. I was told I was crassly stupid but that strays into Code of Conduct matters and it is not for this debate. So, I just want to say something like do not count your chickens Deputy Mahoney.

Now P&R often make the statement we are listening. Okay, I cannot dispute that they do listen but then they go on their own sweet way, their way or the highway. So it is not really surprising, in my mind, that P&R failed to take the public and Deputies with them over GST. Savings first, GST last.

How on earth could they have posed GST for the second or third time whilst working on tax and savings, tin ear maybe, I do not know? So is this a slip of the mask, would they have quietly dropped these Committees once GST was passed, but we will never know and I am grateful for that.

Then there is the wind farm proposal and I thank Deputy de Sausmarez for her speech it was very enlightening. We were a year ahead of Jersey on wind farms and now we are year behind, why? P&R seem dead set against it, was it because it was bought by someone else and not invented here syndrome? I do not know but I suggest P&R should have put aside the politics and the personalities and put Guernsey first so in that particular specific instance I have no confidence in their handling of the wind farm.

Then we get P&R agreeing to have another £110 million borrowing for Education to make it £200 million. Now that is something that was sensibly thrown out but in their own words it was previously unaffordable in the longer term but now it was worthy of support. Complete about face. Now I never got a reply when it was first muted on how we are going to repay it but in subsequent events this came out, it was just a hefty kick down the road. No plan, it was just the height of recklessness, there was no way of repaying it, leave it until the next Assembly and so to me that is an example of an erratic policy position at P&R. Now it remains my belief that P&R were hoping to tie the hands of a future Assembly into GST by the back door.

Then we have a number of other policies vamping, for example. I see it was in the budget yesterday and it is still going on, how long do we have to wait? But given all these points for me the main issue is GST. They have lost the flagship policy twice and so therefore the position is untenable. I would say step aside and let a new team try a different approach.

Now I always try to finish with a quote, I was trying to find out who said this, now Google tells me it was Oliver Cromwell but more recently David Davis said in the Houses of Parliament:

You have sat too long here for any good you have been doing [lately]. In the name of God, go.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Alderney Representative Roberts.

**Alderney Representative Roberts:** Thank you, sir.

Look at this situation from every angle and let him without sin cast the first stone in this Assembly. This has turned into a blame game and we are all to blame and really the public have every right of a Vote of No Confidence in the whole Assembly, all of us, not just three because three is all that is left.

I am very disappointed by the method that is used to degrade and destroy P&R and I am disappointed at the venom-like strikes. Parliamentary privilege used to by-pass data protection, accusations of bullying, is that all the evidence you can stack up? If I was on jury duty today I would see no evidence at all I would see just hear say.

People losing their temper at a meeting, whoever they are, well if I had a tenner for every time I have seen this in Alderney of losing the temper I would have been able to stomp up the money and the cash for our runway long ago! *(Laughter)* This happens in the UK Parliament I can guarantee every day it is not a crime, is that evidence?

In politics passions do run high and display care for the job. Education was picked on last term and once again this term, it seems the nature of the beast here. Home Affairs was picked on before that if I remember correctly, somebody may correct me. Play down politics is totally, totally unprofessional in my view. To point a finger when a small number of Deputies have been disruptive for the sake of it yet not only put up Guernsey first as they should have being driven by social media in a quest to be popular, you know that is true and you know who. They have held the Bailiwick back.

I am in the position of having many friends in the Assembly but today it is my saddest day without a doubt in my political career, sir. A new Committee will inherit the same problems, it will inherit the same pitfalls and disagreements, it will inherit the same problems because role reversal will change, it will open new wounds that last time will fester inhibiting agreement or solution in the short time that we have left.

Nothing but nothing will be gained because we have the same Assembly, same views and perhaps only election would have stopped this indirection or part of policy. We know each other personally and have been friends, we have laughed together, and we have cried together I remember. I regard most of you as mates and perhaps I am the only one that thinks this, but I do. Just because we spent a long time making a mistake does not mean we need to keep making it.

Nothing will change because we are the same players with the same fears and the same problems and just because you get elected as a new Chief Minister does not mean your Committee will retain the support within this Assembly. Wheeling out ex-Chief Ministers like cavalry from the museum will be like using old hoovers. *(Laughter)* It is the whole Assembly to shoulder the blame for refusing to accept consensus that should have stabilised our economy and helped the poorer members of our society. Every single alternative was voted down and all of us are to blame. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)**

So when we move into uncertainty we move into delay, we move into more huge costs, we move into division how will this look like and effect Moneyval which his on its way? Not good, we shoot ourselves in the foot once more, turn again Dick Whittington. Two Members have resigned so please consider if the motion fails two more fresh Members would create a new P&R anyway. Please remember that when you vote, two new Members will create a new P&R.

If we cannot, then save time and force us to have an election if that is what you want and let the public decide. If it is a GST election so be it, we owe the public the right to the majority view.

I beg your pardon sir.

**Deputy Queripel:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Queripel. Stop when I call another Member for a point of correction please.

**Alderney Representative Roberts:** Sorry, sir. Deputy Queripel.

**Deputy Queripel:** Sir, my friend, Mr Roberts from Alderney, said two new Members make a new P&R, they do not, five new Members make a new P&R.

**The Bailiff:** Not really but Alderney Representative Roberts to continue.

**Alderney Representative Roberts:** I stand corrected, a partial new P&R if I can rephrase that. Morally wrong and unfair in what is a shamed quest for power jostling and promising already. I hold

utter confidence in the leadership who had more and more constraints imposed on them tying their hands by this Assembly's amendments in a constant, constant trip up fashion.

2535 Politics really is a dirty business. Without stability a boat capsizes in my view, the good Bailiwick public really deserves better from all of us. Alderney has enjoyed great relations with Guernsey over the last few years, never better, and working closer together and I would require promises for this to continue for any future support that I may have to give whatever the outcome.

2540 Please, whatever happens, do remain our friends and we again thank the whole Assembly for what you have all done for Alderney. There are no negatives in life only challenges to overcome and that will make you stronger in the long run in my view. The black hole was evident in the last Assembly but it was failed to be addressed, it was simply left for the next parliamentary line up to pick up the pieces. Nothing to do with this P&R Committee they had to try and find a way to fund it, what they had been left from before and inherited with an Assembly that refuses to be led much because of old wounds and I fully understand that, I fully understand the old wounds.

2545 I will be looking for promises of support for Alderney should there be a new line up of perspective first Ministers to vote for, I can assure you of that. As my first priority and responsibility is Alderney. I also passionately work and love for our whole Bailiwick but I still hold confidence, sir, in P&R.

2550 Remember the challenges of the financial crisis, inflation and war and just what was thrown at them. They have coped admirably and should be commended. Some in the Committee have worked against terrible personal attacks not about policy but about power grab and that is very sad. The Assembly has been hampered by wounds from the last election and one member of the public spoke to me on my way back to this Assembly this very afternoon and stopped me and said that very thing.

2555 Today, my friends, I stand here worrying for Alderney and worrying for Guernsey for the whole Bailiwick I worry. I worry how we really look with the rest of the UK watching, with the Islands watching. But you always have to believe in yourself when no one else does, you have to do that. I would just like to take this opportunity, sir, if you will permit me to thank Deputy Helyar and Deputy Mahoney for all the work undertaken and I hope you will all join me in this. Deputy Helyar has worked very hard on community issues in Alderney and indeed Sark too and we should not forget that untiring commitment and will be a great loss to our Islands.

Thank you, sir.

2565 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

**Deputy Burford:** Thank you, sir.

I take no pleasure in making this speech but as I intend to support this motion I will set out my reasons for so doing. After losing the tax debate last month the President of Policy & Resources Committee called for an early general election telling the media this States' cannot be led.

2570 Sir, whilst I have no particular views about an early election *per se* Deputy Ferbrache was absolutely right to bring up the matter of leadership. Leadership or rather the lack of it is the over arching reason behind my decision to support this motion. In his call for an early election the President firmly placed the blame for his Committees successive failures in their flagship tax policy elsewhere, namely on this Assembly.

2575 But the corollary to his statement that the Assembly cannot be led is of course this Policy & Resources Committee cannot lead. Deputy Ferbrache will recall a meeting I had with him around about 18 months ago about leadership as a result of concerns I had had for some time. I felt strongly at that time and alas nothing has changed since that leadership was lacking and that lack was further entrenching divisions in this Assembly.

2580 Sir, Deputy Ferbrache has had a stellar career as a leading and sort after Advocate and whilst this room may be a court room this Assembly is not a court. Although mastery of an adversarial system of law and deftness in discrediting witnesses may be key skills for a defence advocate an entirely different skill set is needed to lead a consensus government.

2585 In strongly criticising the senior Committee collectively I fully accept that not all behaviours emanating from the back benches have been exemplary but the responsibility to rise above those and to set an example rests firmly and indisputably with those who have been elected to lead, in my view that responsibility has not been met.

2590 Sir, some have said that it does not matter who is on P&R and changing the senior Committee will not change the States as there are 40 Members in this Assembly and it will be the same people voting on issues just sitting in different seats. But of course it matters who makes up the senior Committee, it matters what experience and skills the Members of that Committee have and vitally it matters what the tone and the style of the leadership is like.

2595 It needs to be a leadership that is not partisan about individuals or Committees, one that seeks to bring people together, one that does not attempt to score points and one that understands that political experience has a value for without it costly and time wasting errors occur and on that last point Deputy Mahoney in his maiden speech delivered for the budget debate three years ago made no particular comment on the budget itself other than to say that he would be supporting it. Instead he used his speech to roundly and robustly decry the value of political experience.

2600 Well let me just now make a bold sweeping statement, he said, the public do not care jot about political experience they care about getting things done. He then issued a warning to the 20 Members of this Assembly with previous political experience 'marginalise us at your peril'. A combative tone from the outset that has alas come to define the senior Committee.

2605 I hope and believe that since most Members have come to appreciate the value that political experience can have in addition to the other undoubted skills that each individual Members brings with them and also that getting things done requires a degree of experience in order to understand the pitfalls, the possibilities, the lessons of history and the best and most collegial way to move forward for the good of the Island.

2610 Of course we are three years in and everyone here now has a level of experience but that does not resolve, for me, the over arching matter of a failure of broad leadership by this Committee. With a full year and a half to go I believe we should take the opportunity to try and do much better.

2615 We need a senior Committee who not only have the skills for the office but who will be able to at least start to heal the rifts in this Assembly and work to a higher standard where behaviours are concerned which have been lacking so far. I believe that task cannot be done by the existing Committee because if it were possible we would certainly have seen more evidence of it by now.

Now we cannot vote for or against individual Members in a Motion of No Confidence. Deputies may consider that certain Members of P&R should stay and others should go but I believe that all should be removed and the Assembly should be given the opportunity of re-electing any of them should they so wish.

2620 The resignation of two Members this morning may be colouring people's views but we need to be in a situation where every person on our senior Committee going forward has either a new mandate or a renewed mandate because this will inspire a renewed confidence which is needed, not just inside this Assembly but outside of it as well. If Members want to see any or all of the Members of P&R retained they have the option to reconfirm them by voting them back into office.

2625 Sir, we are also seeing the system of government blamed for where we are but blaming the system is truly the last refuge. It is convenient, it is easy, it moves the blame on and most crucially it is wrong. Yes, of course indisputably, some systems might be better than others but whatever the system it is made up of people. Ultimately if you have the wrong people leading no system will work. Whatever the rights and wrongs of the system this Committee was elected to work within it, if they cannot do that then it is yet another reason why they need to stand down.

2630 Deputy Fairclough, as always, made a very considered speech. In particular he described how he found the senior Committee had frustrated the work of E&I which he sits on. This contrasts with Deputy Prow who has nothing but praise for them. So who is right? Well, sir, they both are and I suggest the experiences of each stems from how those Committees are each viewed by P&R. No one, whatever side they sit on, can be blind to the fact that P&R, or at least some of its Members,

treat different Committees differently and that is yet another issue that creates division and desperately needs to be remedied.

The speech by Deputy de Sausmarez alone on behaviour side-lining and disregard of Committee mandates should be reason to dismiss this Committee. Other Members and Presidents saying they have not experienced the behaviour that has been directed at her are spectacularly missing the point. Are those Members truly saying we all have to experience such behaviour for it to be deemed unacceptable?

Sir, moving on I had already decided to support this motion before the budget debate but had I not then the spectacular *volte face* performed by four of the Committee on unfunded borrowing in voting for Amendment 12 would have given me cause to do so. I cannot begin to.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Dudley-Owen.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** The Members of P&R voted for the Scenario 2 in the original debate so there was no *volte face* in that regard.

**Deputy Burford:** I thank Deputy Dudley-Owen for that point in that case, yes, she is absolutely correct it was not just Amendment 12 the *volte face* had been at Scenario 2 because prior to Scenario 2 being debated P&R had made it quite clear as I go on to say that the Committee in charge of fiscal matters on which the success of this entire Island hinges, the same Committee who have been drumming it into this Assembly over three attempts at revenue raising that we have a significant structural revenue deficit that they could have possibly voted to put this Island deeper into debt with Scenario 2 followed by Amendment 12, you are quite correct, which we cannot currently repay from revenue income and blithely pass on that mess on to the next States, it is beyond irresponsible as Members of the Committee itself had acknowledged only weeks before.

So, to be clear, particularly in view of Deputy Dudley-Owen's comments in her speech for me this is not about failure to get the tax strategy through, she also asked if P&R are capable of doing this job and reluctantly I have to say collectively the answer, for me, is no. Bizarrely Deputy Dudley-Owen cites behaviour last term, I mean that is pure 'what aboutery', it is simply not the matter under discussion.

Finally on that point the behaviours Deputy de Sausmarez has clearly outlined cannot be diminished as 'being ratty' and it is very dismissive to suggest that. I will be voting to support this motion it would inevitably free up vacancies elsewhere where the skills of the Members on the senior Committee can be utilised, after all we are not casting the five Members of this Committee into the wilderness in voting for this motion.

I do not believe it will be disruptive in the way Deputy Queripel fears that it might and perhaps that wider refresh will have positive benefits too. I do not know who would make up a new P&R Committee but whoever they might be I will hold them to the same standards as I am holding the present Committee.

Sir, in calling for an early election the President of Policy & Resources clearly understood that we cannot go on as we are. I agree it is clear there will not be an early election and therefore the only remaining alternative is a change of leadership. There is time to make significant progress with a different Committee. I would urge those Members who may be undecided about how to vote to join with me in supporting the motion so that at the very least we have an opportunity to rebuild the reputation of this Assembly in its 19 remaining months.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Thank you, sir.

I am speaking now because Deputy Trott gave good notice that at 4 p.m. or thereabouts, maybe a little after 4 p.m. when I have finished my speech, he is going to raise his guillotine motion. Now I do not know what the result of that is going to be but I think it would be crassly irresponsible for the President of Policy & Resources to perhaps be caught out, I do not mean any criticism of Deputy Trott by that, by the States voting for the guillotine motion and I would not have the opportunity to say what I think I should say.

So let me just say in relation to that this may be this may well be my last speech as President of Policy & Resources or as I am known when I am outside of the Island on Island business or Bailiwick business as Chief Minister or colloquially known as Chief Minister, if that is the case that is the case.

I know my good friend Deputy Queripel often is interested in the length of my speeches so I am going to just mis-quote Captain Oates when he went out into the snowy wilderness in 1912 or thereabouts; I may be sometime. I do hope I return from the wilderness but we will see. Also I would like to quote from Jerry and the Pacemakers, the Liverpool Anthem as I call it which is when you walk through a storm hold your head up high. I hold my head up high for the work I have done over the last three years, I hold Deputy Le Tocq's work over the last three years, Deputy Mahoney, Deputy Helyar and for the last 12 months or so Deputy Murray.

I was very grateful for the able efforts for two years or so of Deputy Soulsby but she is not today facing a Motion of No Confidence. Now I am sure it complies with Rule 21(4)(a) of the Rules of Procedure which says that a Motion of No Confidence shall set out the full details of the basis on which the petitioners propose the Motion of No Confidence.

So the full particulars and the only particulars are, the grounds are that and then the petitioner, the people who brought the motion, have no confidence of the ability of the P&R Committee to discharge its mandate. Now if that were a legal pleading I would be asking for further and better particulars but as Deputy Burford has made the point this is not a court room this is a States' Assembly, a political Assembly. But that gives me the right to speak on very many issues because it says that this Committee does not have the ability to continue for the next 18 or 19 months. So to look forward you have got to look at the present and you have got to look backwards over the last three years and I will be doing that.

Now it has been said many, many times during the course of this debate today that we have lost the room, lost the dressing room whatever metaphor was used, the public do not follow us. I can only say, I can only speak from my own experience over the last several weeks, I cannot remember exactly when, since this motion has become more apparently so since it was obvious it would be taken.

Now I am not prone to exaggerate, I do not speak with superlatives, I do not speak with hyperbole, I have been stopped by dozens and dozens of people in different places, people I do not know who have tapped me on the shoulder and said you are doing an excellent job, do not let those people bring you down, do not walk away from the challenges, we want you and your team, but they were generally speaking to me personally, we want you to continue.

From the 92 year old that said he did not like GST he thought that was a terrible policy but he knew my dad, he would have been 95 I think if he was still alive, but he knew him, he knew how direct my father was and he thought perhaps I was a little more emollient than my father. But he said you are the type of person that Guernsey and the Bailiwick of Guernsey needs to lead us forward. We need people who are willing to stand up and be counted. We need people who are willing to understand Guernsey, You are a Guernsman and we want Guernsey people, it does not matter whether it is a man or a woman, we want people who understand the Island, who understand the Bailiwick to lead us forward.

Another example, I was at a restaurant with some friends and a lady came over with her husband and another couple I assume and tapped me on the shoulder, I thought oh my goodness what have I done, it is going to be GST and I am going to get a lecture on a Saturday night. Just the opposite, thank you for what you are doing, please carry on doing what you are doing, do not listen to them stand above them. Her words, not mine, you are better than them.

Now that is going to anger some people here and it is not aggrandisement on my part. Deputy St Pier says oh well look at Jersey, Jersey have said this is terrible it is a really bad state. Let me read a message I have received today from Dublin because that is where I would otherwise be if I was not here, 'We wish you well today, we are thinking of you. We hope that you get through this, we hope that you continue with the good work of Guernsey.'

I have had said to me by several senior politicians in Jersey over the last three years, but particularly in the last several months, that this is the best relationship they have had (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) with the Guernsey Government going forward. We have heard Alderney Representative Roberts just a few minutes ago saying that the relationship that Alderney has had over the last three years has been better than it has been for a long, long time and I see Deputy Snowdon nodding accordingly.

I get angry, angry when I am told that we are not approachable. My door has been open, Deputy Fairclough knows this, every Member of this Assembly knows this my door has been open both figuratively and literally all the time over the last three years. I have said to people if you want to approach me on any topic at any time you can do so, I will speak to you I will discuss it with you and we will talk civilly to each other and people have taken up that invitation, others have not.

Deputy St Pier, I was not going to raise it because I do not think that it does any good but I am not going to stand here and have my face slapped when I think it is unfair because as I say this may be the last time that I speak to this Assembly and to the people as Policy & Resources, he said oh well you know I went along and we had a fruitful meeting with Deputies, I do not use that word but it is the essence of what he said, fruitful meeting with Deputy Murray and Deputy Ferbrache and then we came into P&R and it was a different tone. That is what he said just a few minutes ago.

What I did, and the comment came back to me from civil servants I am not going to name them because that is a breach of etiquette in this Assembly in August knowing that we were going to have the debate in September or October time for the FIP, I asked Deputy St Pier and Deputy Soulsby to come and see me at Frossard House, which they did. They came and I explained what we were intending to do, asked for their co-operation, asked for a discussion. The civil servants once they left said 'weren't they grumpy, weren't they uncommunicative, weren't they unresponsive, weren't they unhelpful', those were the words of the civil servants that were in the room, I am not naming them, those were the words of the civil servants.

I said 'well did I do anything to offend anybody?' because in my role as an advocate I am known for being a little bit aggressive on occasions. They said no, you could not have been more civil, you could not have been more balanced, you could not have been more reasonable. So that is the other side of that equation.

Now as to bullying I have been President in my 13 years, it will be 15 years by the time I go, 13 years six months and 24 days I am grateful because Deputy St Pier was telling us he is 11 years, I have added a day now because we are a day further on. I have been President of four States' Committees; Board of Industry from 1997 to 2000 I was also a Member of A&F during that time, Member of Economic Development for about 18 to 19 months from 2016, President of STSB and now for the last three years President of Policy & Resources.

So different civil servants at different times, people may not like hearing this and it may offend peoples' egos, I have been told by every single senior civil servant that I have dealt with in those presidencies that I am the most approachable, I am the best President they have had to listen to them to take on board their views and to respect them. Four different groups over, I had a gap of 16 years, but over a long period of time. If that is not evidence of somebody who is not alive to listen to people, etc.

Now we have heard that civil servants have been bullied, we have been told that. Can I just say that is the first I have heard of it at all. I would have expected if civil servants that I am responsible for had had any concern at all that the previous Chief Executive of the States or when he left the States' employment the Head of Public Service would have tapped me on the should and said 'Peter so and so is being bullied by such and such' or whatever the details may be or that 'you are bullying them'. I am here hand on heart and I am seeing on one of the most precious people in the world

tomorrow my six-year-old granddaughter, on her being nobody has said that to me, nobody has said that to me. No civil servant has said that, I do not conduct myself like that.

Deputy St Pier said well look at the comment you made about not trusting E&I. Now that was a silly comment, I have since apologised to Deputy Roffey about that comment. You say things in the heat of the moment, what I should have said was I did not think they had got it right on that particular occasion. I have never attacked the integrity of Deputy St Pier or any other States' Member but let us put that right, let us put that to bed because I do not think there is any individual in this room or any individual in the Island of Guernsey or Jersey or the Bailiwick anyway that occasionally has not misspoke, that occasionally has not said things that they regret and wish they could bring their tongue back. Occasionally you say heated words to people, that does not make you a bad person, it does not make you a bully, it does not make you unfit for office.

Now the exchange of emails which I had completely forgotten about until Deputy de Sausmarez mentioned them and I do not mean any disrespect because it is a pretty full on job is being President of P&R. I think she has confirmed I responded properly, civilly and said I would take action and I did take action and the person whose name was blocked out was not a Member of P&R.

So it was not people like, oh, it is Deputy Mahoney or Deputy Helyar, they can bit aggressive, it was not either of those gentleman or was not even –

I give way, sorry.

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** I thank Deputy Ferbrache for giving way and I am glad he has confirmed that and actually because I rewrote my speech because of Deputy Queripel's request for evidence and I did actually have a paragraph that made it a little bit clearer and I realised that because there was a lot of repetition that was one of the things that got lost but I am happy to take this opportunity, if it was not clear, that what I was talking about because my original draft did contain something which said the culture that I was talking about were meetings including meetings which were chaired and facilitated by P&R.

Now Deputy Ferbrache is quite right that particular email, and there has been more than one I am not expecting him to be able to remember them and there were verbal conversations as well and I know it was also raised with officers, he is quite right to point out that that particular email exchange was about a Member who was not a Member of P&R, however, the culture that I described with the aggression and the hostility very much also did include Members of P&R and some of the behaviours that I witnessed in relation to officers did take place in all kinds of meetings involving P&R including meetings just involving P&R and whatever capacity I was in the room for.

There is a point and I tried to ask Deputy Mahoney to give way as well on this point, I am not sure how Members think that officers should be able to raise these concerns that was the exact point of why I raised it with SACC, why I thought there should be a code of behaviour because realistically officers who feel as though they have not been treated appropriately really do not have realistically a course of complaints.

Now I have done that on their behalf and I can confirm that I have taken it to the senior leadership team more than once, including the Chief Executive, there was no other avenue for me to do that but I am happy to say I have done that and my understanding is that I am not the only one that has taken that course of action.

So I hope that has been able to clarify it and I would also just like to put on the record that I am not suggesting for a moment and in fact I can confirm that to my recollection I cannot ever remember Deputy Ferbrache himself personally acting in a way that I felt was inappropriate or anything like that, I have to commend him for that. My criticism was that this culture was effectively enabled or facilitated however accidentally and that was really my point. But I hope that does provide a little bit more clarity.

Thank you.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Thank you, I am grateful for that and I am grateful for giving the opportunity because it shows that everything that could be aired is aired. The point I make and I repeat is that I

have encouraged the door has always been open, not only to just e.g. Deputy Fairclough or whoever it might be, to civil servants of whatever seniority to come and speak to me if they have got any concerns at all, by anybody at any time and I would have expected and I repeat that and I have confidence in the last Chief Executive, confidence in the Head of Public Services to, if they had had a concern, to come and raise it with me and I have already told this Assembly, truthfully, that they have never done so in relation to where we are today.

I talk about lack of ability, now two of my colleagues have tendered their resignation today and they confirmed both of them, verbally to this Assembly this afternoon that they have no intention of withdrawing their resignation in relation to that. Let me pay credit to them because we talk about ability now those two gentlemen are premier league players when it comes to ability, again using a metaphor, they might even get in the Tottenham Hotspur team (*Laughter*) that is how good they are in relation to where we are.

Now as regards Deputy Helyar a first rate lawyer but with tremendous corporate experience. Now he dealt with the budget, it is as though it is all P&R's fault that it took five days over the budget and there were 23 amendments, not all of those were tabled but I think 19 or 20 were tabled, something like that I cannot remember the exact number. We cannot stop people putting in amendments, okay, P&R put one or two in but most were put in by other people. The democratic process is those then have to be debated, that took five days, far too long.

But Deputy Helyar who sits there and writes notes I cannot read and cannot understand, he collates all of that and he responds in a measured, ordered, professional way. He never gets angry he makes witticisms he responds constructively to every debate and he has dealt with three or four budgets now and he has dealt with the FIP and all the other matters, he has dealt with them in a most professional way.

We have serious, serious issues that we cannot discuss in public at the moment. The expertise that Deputy Helyar and the knowledge that he has bought to one particular topic, he bought it to lots of topics but I am thinking in my head as I speak to Members of the Assembly, to one particular topic is beyond compare. There is nobody, and my colleagues round P&R know what I am talking about, there is nobody who would have that degree of knowledge, experience and ability. We are going to lose that either today if the vote of no confidence is passed or on 12th December if the vote is not passed and his resignation is then accepted by the States.

Deputy Mahoney is a person of strong views (*Interjection*) if I were in the diplomatic core I do not think I would have Deputy Mahoney as my Minister for certain places (*Laughter*) as much as I very much like and respect Deputy Brouard he would not be my diplomatic Minister or representative in Jersey (*Laughter*) or my good friend Deputy Trott in Alderney. No disrespect to any of them (*Laughter*) but (*Interjection*) and I mean that they know it is meant in good spirit.

When we came into the States it was felt as though when I sit here and listen and I hear things it is as though the world was perfect until 17th October 2020 when I became President of Policy & Resources. Everything was wonderful, the sun shining there was money piling up we had no problems what so ever, the world was on its way and we have messed it up over the last three years. Oh I wish that was true, I do not wish we had messed it up because we have not we have done our best, but oh when I look at what we were left with.

We were left with a property portfolio that was a shambles (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) an absolute shambles. The man who figuratively rolled up his sleeves and dealt with that, and he broke eggs because you cannot make an omelette without breaking eggs, was Deputy Mahoney. Now I do not pretend it is perfect now because you cannot go from the desultory diabolical condition of our property portfolio three years ago and in very difficult circumstances magic perfection over three years.

The strives that that Deputy has bought us along are not respected or known or appreciated by this Assembly. So if occasionally, and I am not saying he has, but if occasionally Deputy Mahoney has had a little outburst and offended somebody well I am sorry that he has done that but he has done far, far more good work than otherwise.

2895 I am going to mention the others because I think that this is a collective, you cannot say I am  
going to have him, him and him we all go, the three of us that are still left will go and it may well  
be that we are all going to go and if we do I thank Deputy Le Tocq, I really thank Deputy Le Tocq.  
He is the most experienced politician of us all, he had a full head of hair I think when he came to  
the States, (*Laughter*) I am not saying that, but Deputy Le Tocq has held lots of positions he has  
2900 been a Chief Minister, but he has been the External Relations Minister for years and years. He is  
beyond compare; he is beyond compare holding that role.

I have seen him in action I have seen him dealing with English Ministers, senior English civil  
servants I have seen him dealing with the French people, because he is bi-lingual, they respect him  
so much. When he had his heart attack a few years ago, when Brexit was coming into a thing, I had  
to step in because sadly Deputy Le Tocq was ill and I remember we had that meeting between  
2905 Christmas and the New Year when we came and we approved the Brexit Bill, if I can call it that, that  
is not the correct title.

The person who should have had the credit for that is the person I am pointing at now, Deputy  
Le Tocq (*Interjection*) and Brexit I know we have not a good, we have not got a very good, and we  
have got an absolutely excellent external relations team of civil servants. We have got a fraction of  
2910 the number of people that Jersey has got.

When I go somewhere and I went with Deputy Moakes to the Labour Party Conference a few  
weeks ago, the only downside of that was we travelled from Manchester to Liverpool on the train,  
it was 22 stops and can I say none of those are going to be on my bucket list (*Laughter*), but in  
relation to that Deputy Moakes would confirm it the quality of advice we got the quality of support  
2915 it was exemplary, absolutely exemplary.

When I had shaken hands with 22 people over an hour and a half I just wanted to go. No, just  
go and speak to this one, just go and speak to that one you know it is another conversation, another  
card, another introduction all for the good of the Bailiwick from our team; so, well led by Deputy Le  
Tocq.

2920 Now when Brexit was coming about and when it was finalised and then we had this meeting, as  
I say, between Christmas and New Year till almost the last minute changes were being made. The  
British Government were doing this, the British Government were doing that our Civil Service team  
ably led by Deputy Le Tocq were on top of it. We could not have had, if we had had the Foreign  
Office, they were a lot better than the Foreign Office, we could not have had better people doing a  
2925 better job at that time and that has continued because if we think that the British Government,  
whichever political hue we are experiencing whether it is the Tories now or whether next year it is  
Labour we will wait and see, whoever it might be, they change.

It is not just the politicians that change and perhaps we have had a bit more change than with  
Labour we have had so many Chancellors and Housing Ministers and the like and Prime Minister's  
2930 recently but it is the civil servants that change, they change, they are at a Department, not all of  
them but some of them, and they move on and they have got to be re-educated, we have got to  
back over that.

Deputy Le Tocq and the civil servants, our excellent civil servants, do that all the time. Now you  
do not see that, sir, Members of the Assembly do not see that, the public do not see that because  
2935 that is work that is done almost behind the scenes. I say as a proud Guernsey politician, as a proud  
Guernsey man that the quality of those people is exemplary, we are so lucky.

And the last, but not least, but he has only been with us a year so he is a newish boy, Deputy  
Murray. It has already been referred to, the Government Work Plan, so well led for the first couple  
of years or so by Deputy Soulsby but Deputy Murray had to pick up the cudgels in relation to that  
2940 and his performance in that debate and his knowledge and the effort he put in was fantastic. He  
has been like that whenever you give him a task, he thinks about it, he sits, he talks perhaps talks a  
bit too much, (*Laughter*) he talks, he thinks it through you can see his brain turning and eventually,  
after a time, and he perhaps says a few more words that I do but it eventually comes out and it is  
good common sense and constructive.

2945 So these are the team of people that this Motion of No Confidence that says we do not have ability they have no confidence in the ability of P&R to discharge its wide mandate it talking nonsense. Now whether you vote for it, people have already nailed their colours to the mask and perhaps there is going to be a majority and if that is the case well they will go home tonight and think yabba dabba doo, there will be at least one who will think I have not only done it for GST I have got rid of them, my friend who helped me eight weeks ago, I have got rid of them.

2950 Now in relation to all of that the people that will have suffered will be Guernsey because forget Peter Ferbrache, I am just a humble Guernsey advocate doing my best, think of Deputy Le Tocq think of Deputy Murray think of the two Deputies who you have now lost Deputy Helyar and Deputy Mahoney, you have lost their skills you have lost their ability. And I say not you, sir; the Assembly has lost them because they threw themselves on their sword this morning because they thought it might mean that some of the heat would be taken out of this debate today. Obviously that has not worked, it was not done as a tactic it was done because they are two honourable decent people and what they did was personal sacrifice for the good of this Island as they believed it.

2960 So, that is where we are. Now also we have heard GST, GST, GST do you think I like GST, do you think I like standing up and having people abuse me? Deputy Queripel will remember in January or February time when we walked into this Assembly with the people waving their flags, I was sworn at. It is an actual thing, when we came in October Deputy Queripel I think was brave enough not to be with me, I do not mean that he knows I just mean it as a joke, but it is true I was booed.

2965 You think you are doing your best for Guernsey some brave individual, because I leave my cars out I have got rather a big garage but I leave my cars out, some brave individual decided several months ago to put dog poo all over the windscreen of my car. I regularly get abused I am a crook I am doing it for my own purposes I have been called a Freemason, which I am not and there is no disparity because there might be some Freemason's in here, but in relation to that all kinds of, any kinds of accusation that could be made about my conduct is being made. I rise above that because I come from Guernsey and I come from a place whereby as a Guernseyman I value where I come from. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)**

2970 Now there is a non-States' Member on Deputy Roffey's Committee who goes on Facebook, one of his Committees ESS, goes on Facebook and is constantly critical. 'Peter Ferbrache does not understand Guernsey, what does he know about the working man, he is a rich man how can he understand it?' He has not got a clue what he is talking about, he does not know Peter Ferbrache at all, he does not know what my family have come from and I know it interests Deputy Taylor again so I am not going to go into the outside toilet, it is locked down now they cannot put a blue plaque on it, in relation to where we are.

2980 Other than my Aunt Pam, my mother's sister, and Uncle Mickey, her husband, the person who has known me the longest in my life, because my parents are dead, etc., is a friend of mine Ray Bullock a Guernseyman, three years and four months older than me. He used to look after me at Amherst when boys used to come along and threaten to hit me, I would say I have got my friend Ray here and they would run away.

2985 Now I see Ray regularly I am in touch with people like Ray, Ray is a good Guernseyman I know a good Guernseyman, I know ordinary people. The fact that I live in a nice house and I might have five or six shillings in the bank is irrelevant I still know the ordinary Guernsey people, I have got the ability to listen to what they have got to say. I have got the ability to understand what those good people think. I have got that ability whether you want to listen to Deputy Parkinson who is far more educated than me, a posh English public school, Cambridge University *(Interjection)* lots of qualifications I am just a humble Guernsey advocate. I may have passed the bar the day after my 21st birthday, I may never have been to France before, I may have been told by those when I studied the Guernsey Bar I took my Bar exam it was the highest standard they had ever seen, but I am just a Guernsey advocate of modest ability.

2995 But I have got the ability to do this job for the next 18 or 19 months and frankly I do not think after today I will have that opportunity so this is my chance to say what I have got to say. Now we have looked at the proposals, GST proposals as they have been called were a much wider and more

balanced packaged. Now one of the people who is going to vote against P&R because he said so and I do have considerable respect for him, is Deputy Roffey.

3000 Deputy Roffey could not have been a more committed supporter of that package. Now when he started out on that journey with another States' Member from his ESS Committee with Deputy Mahoney and Deputy Helyar I bet none of them thought they were going to end up where they ended up and we took, we at P&R, took the best advice from world class experts as to what we should be looking at for our tax situation and they came up with a package effectively that was put forward.

3005 Because what we were hoping, it is a bit like we have heard the comment several times over the past few days, we all want tax to be paid but not by me, by him or her or them, not by me and I was hoping that really and Deputy Trott would know and I am just being a little facetious when I say it is 2007 and 2008 a lot of tax was paid by people outside of the Island. That changed in 2007 and 2008 and that is why Zero-10 was bought in by Deputy Trott and ably bought in by Deputy Trott and his colleagues.

3010 We had no option we could not have done anything anyway, you might have been able to kick the can down the road a bit but that would have been the end of it we would have had things in post to pass, so what do we have? So, that package failed. Now, overwhelmingly and I think with very limited exceptions this Assembly has accepted that we do not have a sustainable tax package going forward. We have got a demographics that is nothing to do with from 17th October 2020, we do not suddenly have lots more older people over the last three years, we have got some more, but our population has been aging for a very, very long time.

3015 It is happening everywhere and that means we need more hospitals, we need more social workers, we need more residential homes, we need more nursing homes and that is blinking difficult because other people need more hospitals, need more residential homes, other people need more care workers, places perhaps where the cost of living is not as high as it is here. So we have got those challenges.

3020 Now when I become President of P&R in the middle of October 2020 we forget we were still going through a pandemic. Deputy St Pier and his team had led that, what a terrible thing that has happened we did not have one of those before anyway not in living memory. Deputy St Pier and his team had led that splendidly for the eight months or so.

3025 I was President, or Chair I think it is called, of the Civil Contingency Authority for 16 months, twice as long as him. I was ably assisted by Deputy de Sausmarez, by Deputy Brouard, by Deputy Prow and by my very able colleagues from Alderney and Sark they were a wonderful team. But they were massive challenges we did not know about vaccinations, the vaccinations were still a thing in the offing and we thought we were coming out of it by January 2021 and I got a phone call about quarter past nine one Friday night from he is now the Head of Public Service he had a different role then and he said Peter we have got real problems.

3030 We have four different outbreaks, it does not sound a lot now does it, four different outbreaks of COVID that could not be traced because if they can trace them they are alright, they could say we know it is there we can do such and such. We had four different, there was a children's dance festival and Beau Séjour at the time so Saturday, this was a Friday night, it is going to be absolutely packed hundreds of kids lots of parents going we are going to go to a dance festival, it was a wonderful thing.

3040 We had to take an instant decision which we took within hours to close the Bailiwick down. Now if anybody thinks that is easy, because people had already been, they were tired they were fiscally at the end of their tether, they were mentally at the end of their tether because they had been through eight months of hell. When is the end going to come?

3045 And we were having to tell them, well I was not telling anyone, sorry, I had only been there three months – arithmetic I know is not my strong point, as Deputy Trott has pointed out previously. But they had been through hell and we were telling them again you are going to have this other period of uncertainty, we did not know how long it was going to be, thankfully it was eight or nine weeks.

But then we had the long progression out of COVID and the graph did not always go up in the sense that it got easier, it went bubbly, bubbly, down up and bit down a bit.

3050 There were times and I was ably assisted by Deputy Soulsby who we kept on as an adviser because continuity and her knowledge as previous President of Health, etc., and she will recall, Deputy Brouard will recall, that we used to meet in the then Chief Executive's Office at Frossard House with the Medical Officer of Health every single day for weeks and weeks and we often did not know what was coming to hit us. We were having to make instant decisions which were then, 3055 thankfully after consultation ratified by our other colleagues on Civil Contingency and then brought to this Assembly and regulations were made, etc.

We dealt with that for 16 months, I think because if you are looking at our ability to discharge our mandate we dealt with that it was not just Civil Contingency it was P&R because P&R had to put in all the levers to make sure that things were there. Deputy Helyar, our Chancellor as I will call 3060 him, had to make sure there was the money there to pay the bills. That companies could have money to keep employing people, that businesses could be kept open, he was absolutely adroit at the task that he performed.

So if he did shout at somebody, I do not believe he did, if he was a little abrupt with somebody or off hand with somebody I think he has got much more credit in the tank than the occasional 3065 blemish because as a friend of mine has said, I was named after a saint I know my behaviour sometimes shows that, but saints are in heaven they are not on earth, we are human beings we have failings.

But in relation to that we had that and then we had Brexit. Now I can remember when I was President of Economic Development from External Relations getting a pack saying this is what is 3070 going to happen if Brexit is passed. I said why am I going to read this it is never going to happen and I woke up at 5 a.m. of the vote and Labour were coming from Devon or somewhere and it was clear that Brexit was a pass.

We then had to wrestle with that, this tiny community had to wrestle with that and that took years and years. I have already repeated the efforts of Deputy Le Tocq and his team, we are still 3075 dealing with that because we are having to deal with treaties, negotiations, foreign countries things we did not have to bother about because we had Protocol 3 and that really helped us along and it made our life a lot easier. That disappeared as soon as Brexit came to an end if I can use that phrase.

Then what did we have, all of a sudden February of 2022 I am away actually staying at a cousins house, I was abroad, get up in the morning and he said guess what that mad Russian has done? 3080 Could not believe it, the tanks had come across into Ukraine. Since then we have had thousands of poor people killed, dislocated and a trench war is still going on in relation to that.

Now, thankfully, Deputy Inder's mother-in-law had to come from Odessa we have had Ukraine people come here but the main point of it is that in relation to where we are we have had the financial impact of that, the financial aftershock of that like everybody else. Interest rates have gone 3085 through the roof they are far higher than they have been for years thankfully, hopefully they will in the next year or two come down.

We, this P&R, this States' has had to deal with that. I deal; everyday is an exaggeration but not much of an exaggeration, with things that come out of the clear blue sky that I have got to deal with as President of P&R. Significant problems that I cannot bring to the Assembly, I cannot discuss 3090 it in public but they are real issues that I have to make, sometimes I make the decisions myself, wherever possible I consult with my colleagues because I am, a phrase used by, and he is right, a phrase used of me yesterday by my good friend Deputy Queripel I am a delegator because I think that is the right thing to do because you cannot do everything, if you try and do everything you will just burn out, so I am quite happy to share decisions I am quite happy to share things to be done.

3095 So what alternatives do we have to see if these are better because if we have not got the ability and if the Bailiff stops me well he will stop me but if we have not got the ability which is what the motion says there is no confidence in the ability of this P&R to discharge its mandate over the next 18 or 19 months, what is going to happen? What proposals were put forward?

3100 We had the proposals, the leader of this motion Deputy Parkinson a very clever chap I have known him a long time –

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache, I am going to stop you.

3105 **Deputy Ferbrache:** All right, sir, I will move on then, sir.

**The Bailiff:** It is not relevant to consider who might replace the Committee.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** I did not say he would replace it, I was looking at the proposals.

3110 **The Bailiff:** Well, you can refer to Deputy Parkinson on the basis that he has spoken to the motion.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Yes, sir. All I was going to say is I was looking at the proposals. We had a proposal for territorial tax which got 11 votes, we had a proposal put in a very proper context and I have said that before to Deputy Trott for Income Tax which got 10 votes. He raised that again a couple of days ago in a different context.

3115 Deputy Gollop also ably put a variant on that before. We also had other proposals none of those were going to close this chasmatic gap that we have got. Deputy Aldwell said during the course of this week that we are an Assembly that does not want to make difficult decisions and we do not want to make difficult decisions. And they say you can blame the system of Government, I have one vote out of 40, my colleagues altogether we have got five votes out of 40. We can lead, you can lead metaphorically the horse to water you cannot force that horse to drink that water even though it is in its best interest. But I have not got the ability to lead that team; these people have not got the ability to be that team, so I wonder how they will deal with the challenges.

3125 I believe we have got a good relationship, I have dealt with every single Committee, every single Committee of the States whatever other people may say today with respect. I have listened to what they have said, I do not always agree with them and sometimes you have said well you do not listen to us so therefore you are inflexible but we have changed our view on very many issues over very many times, I know that because I have been party to it.

3130 But, Health came to us and I respect the Members of the Health Committee, and said we need another £10.5 million next year. We did not give it to them I think they ended up with £4 million but I would not be at all surprised and I am not encouraging them to do it whoever is here then, but they may be finding that difficult to live within their means. I hope they do, I very much hope they do but I do not think they would have asked for £10 million if they thought they would only get £4 million.

3135 So we have got that challenge, but we have not got the ability to manage it. We have got the challenge of Deputy, and if I have got these figures wrong I do not mind if Deputy Brouard wants to jump up and tell me I am wrong, it is going to cost well over £100 million for the Hospital Project, I fully support the Hospital Project. What it is going to be when it is built is that the revenue costs per annum will increase by £9.5 million or thereabouts, I see him nodding, about that figure and I think it is another 180 people. I may have got that wrong but it is certainly a heck of a lot of people and they have got to be housed, they have got to be looked after, they have got all that. That is a challenge.

3145 We have also been told by Deputy Roffey recently that the bill for St Peter Port Harbour for general maintenance and he has explained it today is £60 million to £65 million (*Interjection*) so it is a heck of a lot of money and through no fault of his because I have had his job and it is a job I very much like doing, our trading entities are struggling by and large, by and large there are examples I believe they are all efficient but they are struggling because business is difficult.

3150 I mentioned it in a speech yesterday I have every confidence in our finance sector as Deputy Trott has said they are one of the best, if not the best, in the world. They are international class, they

are Harry Kane's they are in relation to that they are the best but the world out there is competitive. We have got Moneyval in five months. We are very fortunate again; just like we have got a consulate able politician for External Relations we have got the equivalent in Deputy Prow Home Affairs.

3155 He and I have worked hand in glove over the past 12 to 18 months, (**Deputy Prow:** Yes.) we regularly attend meetings together we have regular discussions we are up to speed on that particular topic. Now if I go he will still be around thankfully and somebody will be able to replace me because nobody is irreplaceable.

3160 Now if we think when those people come over in April they are coming over with bonhomie and they are coming over with an open mind and they are coming to say how wonderful a place like Guernsey is then – and I am sorry apparently I said something about Father Christmas yesterday and people listening on the radio and Deputy Gabriel told me that mothers were concerned because I said I did not believe, I do believe in Father Christmas if that is going to be the case (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) so in relation to that it is going to be exceedingly difficult.

3165 We are facing those challenges all the time and at the SFS meeting I referred to yesterday chaired as it always is well by Deputy Moakes we heard two things, well we heard two real things; we heard the considerable efforts of Guernsey Finance, money very well spent which P&R very much supported the increase of those funds. This P&R was 100% behind that, 100% and secondly we heard from the able representative of one of the bodies that Guernsey is going to have to run very hard just to stand still despite all the efforts of people like Guernsey Finance. The world out there is  
3170 envious of our position, is jealous of our position but we have not got the ability to do that other people, we do not know who they are, will come in and do it.

Now I have been very fortunate in my life, very fortunate when I was born, where I was born, etc. Very fortunate indeed. I am a Guernseyman and I was born six years after the occupation so I have got experience of people who lived through the occupation and I have been able to stand on the  
3175 shoulders of giants in my life and I am not just talking about, I live in a house that was built somewhere between 1580 and 1600 Les Granges de Beauvoir Manor very humble place but it was built by a former Bailiff.

Now that family has died out but the point I am making is we have had great families in Guernsey; de Sausmarez, Brocks, etc., who all contributed. I am the first, first from my branch of the  
3180 Guernsey family, the Ferbrache family because there are various groups of Ferbrache family that has been a senior lawyer and a senior politician.

**Deputy Gabriel:** Point of order, sir.

3185 **The Bailiff:** Point of order.

**Deputy Gabriel:** At the risk of interrupting Deputy Ferbrache's very long speech 17(6). I am not entirely sure his heritage or where he lives is relevant to debate.

3190 **The Bailiff:** I am going to permit Deputy Ferbrache to continue saying what he is saying on the basis that this is a Motion of No Confidence in his Committee and he is effectively speaking for the other members of the Committee at the moment. So, please continue Deputy Ferbrache.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Thank you, sir.

3195 So, the point I am making in relation to that is that I, Deputy Le Tocq, Deputy Helyar, Deputy Mahoney, Deputy Murray we do not all come from Guernsey, some of us come from Guernsey, but we understand Guernsey and I stand on the shoulders of people like my grandfather because I have got to show that we have got the ability because it says that we have not got the ability to be able to do that.

3200 Ability is founded on experience, intelligence, empathy and action and in relation to that I believe I have got all of that in buckets and I believe the Committee have got all of that in buckets. It is a shame that two of them have had to go and I have already spoken about what I think is a great loss

for those two people to this Assembly. But I look at my grandfather born in 1872 who worked until he was 80, he never owned his own house, never owned a motor car he was a stone mason who worked really hard all his life.

I stood on his shoulders, I stood on the shoulders of my uncle Dan and my uncle Fred when my father was involved in a serious industrial accident, helped my mother who was then 25 or 26 years old with three kids. I stand on the shoulders of my uncle George who fought in the Second World War and then worked in green houses all his life. I stand on the shoulders of my maternal grandfather who was a policeman after the war and also was a service man before the war. I stand on their shoulders and just like many other families Deputy Le Tocq stands on the shoulders of his parents who were wonderful people, doctors as a child he must be proud of them, I am sure they were proud of him.

We stand on the shoulders of those people in the past and the present. I look at the present and we have got so many challenges. I have referred to some of them, working collaboratively and I thank Deputy Roffey for his kind words and Deputy de Sausmarez for her 'hear, hear', we have worked collaboratively on affordable housing over the last 18 months to two years.

As a unit we have supported each other we have had very little disagreement and I think we have done good work. But I am the representative of P&R and also the representative of P&R the SLAWS group with Deputy Roffey and Deputy Brouard (*Interjection*) another good Guernsey boy, (*Laughter*) I knew he was doing that for effect Deputy Brouard.

But in relation to that we are in a position whereby we know that that is going to cost lots of money. Proposals will become public relatively shortly there will be public discussion but it is going to cost lots of money, that money has got to be found. We are going to have a hospital, we have got a hospital now, we are going to have a fully fledged hospital in another four, five or six years however long it takes, seven years, we do not know how long it is going to take but we are going to have a fully fledged hospital.

The schools are a disaster. Now I make no apology, Deputy Burford said look well they voted for this there is no funding but what I said was and I am sure it can be quoted back at me again, is that there are some things that are more important than money. It is important that our children, young people, have a future, they have a future they have an education system that is fit for purpose. They would have got one if we follow the proposals put forward by the Education Committee. We have not decided to fund that so that is a challenge, who is going to do that better than us, who is going to do that better than this Committee, where is the magic going to come from? Because there is no magic there.

There were two young women, 16- or 17-year-olds, Guernsey ladies, who I saw one on the telly a few weeks ago. She is a potential candidate for Oxford or Cambridge and she was saying that we have got to sort the education system out it has not been the same since we got rid of selection without (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) having any idea of what we were going to do. A 16-year-old speaking with more wisdom than I have got to say than I have ever heard in this Assembly on occasions.

Then a friend of my younger daughter came to see me recently about something, a minor legal matter, came to see me about that and I am talking to her and her husband and from their marriage they have got one child who is probably going to go to Oxford or Cambridge next September. Now I know when Queen Victoria was still on the throne and I went off to law school every single penny, my parents could not pay a penny, every single penny was paid by the Guernsey tax man.

My tube fares, my hall of residence, my sustenance all paid for by the Guernsey taxpayer, these decent people because we are in the financial position we are in now, next year next September or October when their daughter goes off to University they are going to have to find £30,000 per annum to pay for their daughter's education. That is a heck of a lot of money for an ordinary family, two good hard working people a couple working hard they are going to have to do that because what they do not want their daughter to do when she leaves university in four years' time, whatever it may be, is to have a massive debt that she will owe, a student loan type debt. So they have got to do that. So we are worse off in connection with that than we were.

3255 So we have got to address these for the present and the future we have got to tell people there are no easy issues to address. There is no, and I know Deputy St Pier has said I have captured this phrase, there is no money tree out that window or indeed any window in Guernsey. We have got to tell them all these costs we have got coming and look at how difficult that is going to be.

3260 Who is going to be resolute? Because one of the qualities I have got and my colleagues on P&R have got is we are resolute. Who is going to be resolute to tell the people of Guernsey the truth? Most people in this Assembly have not been so far, if I may respectfully say so, in connection with where we are. To tell them that sometimes we might have to cut back on buses, I hope we do not by the way I do not want Deputy de Sausmarez to get tribulations in connection with that, or we are going to have to do this or going to have to do that or we are going to have to increase or bring in health charges. We are going to have to charge more for such and such a tax or whatever it may be.

3270 But that is what we are going to have to tell them that there will have to be difficult choices, but every time we get a difficult choice and it is not just this Assembly it is the previous Assembly and the previous Assembly and the previous Assembly, we back off. This is too difficult we have got an election in 12 to 18 months we do not want to lose our seat we want to carry forward. We do not want to make these difficult decisions instead of thinking what is in the best interests of the people of the Bailiwick.

3275 I could carry on and on I have got much more I have prepared a long speech look as you can see I have not looked at any of it yet (*Laughter*) do you want me to look at 21 pages which will probably take another hour to speak, I think you probably do not. I think I have made my point. I have worked closely with all committees, I have absolute confidence in the people that still serve with me. I have absolute confidence in the people that I have lost.

3280 Have we made mistakes? Yes, we have. Have we always done things that we should have done on a timely basis? No, we have not. One of the things I hear from every single Committee is the shortage of available resources and often it is human resources to do things. Now what we also should be telling the people, it is a point Deputy Leadbeater made, I do not know if it was with our without the benefit of his £6.49 or £6.99 app I am not sure, but it is a point he has made about we do not maintain our properties in relation to that.

3285 Well I remember Deputy Aldwell, not all that long ago, sent me a clip from I think 1993 or 1994 from the then Director of Mr Stevenson showing that we were neglecting our schools then and they were poorly maintained. I remember walking round those schools with the late Conseiller Eric Waters, a good friend of mine, in the mid nineties and we were looking round the schools in the Castel, not just the Castel school, but all of them and they were all poorly maintained.

3290 What we have never done because it would cost too much money and we have not got the courage to put it forward because it might not get us votes is to say our estate is worth X million pounds we have got to spend Y million pounds every year on maintenance because that would be a big, big budgetary provision it would run into many millions of pounds per annum.

3295 We do not want to do that because that is a difficult decision so what do we do? We close our eyes and say we hope that it will last forever. Well, nothing lasts forever even a granite farmhouse needs maintenance from time to time. I am not going to go through the three individual cases that Deputy –

I give way sorry to Deputy Trott. I am nearly finished by the way.

3300 **Deputy Trott:** Sir, I am very grateful to my friend for giving way and he says that nothing lasts forever, I would like to remind him with the maximum amount of courtesy that he is approaching one hour on his feet and it has all been very interesting but I thought he might like to know that that milestone was about to be breached.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** I think that is a very fair point, I do not want to break my record! (*Laughter*)

**Deputy Gabriel:** Go on. (*Laughter*)

**Deputy Ferbrache:** You will regret that Deputy Gabriel. *(Laughter)* I can address all the three points which I was given no prior notice off in relation to the STSB, I can address all of those and that will take me another 20 minutes and probably another hour. I am not going to do that, what I am saying is that if you think we are not the right people, fine, vote us out, if you do then I am still going to be with my colleagues Deputy Le Tocq, Deputy Murray and my still colleagues and will always be my friends Deputy Mahoney and Deputy Helyar, we are going to walk tall.

Thank you very much.

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, I would like to move Rule 26(1) please.

**The Bailiff:** Can I start then by inviting those Members who wish to speak in debate in this Motion of No Confidence to stand in their places please. Is it still your wish, Deputy Trott, that I put a motion that debate be stopped at this point?

**Deputy Trott:** It is not, sir, but I would like to give further notice that I will try again at 5.30 p.m. with your permission.

**The Bailiff:** The motion that I am going to put to Members is that subject to hearing Deputy Parkinson reply to the debate that the debate on this Motion of No Confidence be stopped at this point.

*Members voted Contre.*

**The Bailiff:** Well, I am going to declare that lost.

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, for the record I did not move that motion, I said I would ask your permission to move it again at 5.30 p.m. so I give further notice that that is my intention, sir.

**The Bailiff:** But, Deputy Trott, with the greatest of respect I will draw this meeting to a close before 5.30 p.m. the reason being that under the Rules, and at that point, there can be a debate on what happens at that point. Under the Rules we have to deal with the Schedule for Future States' Business before we conclude this Meeting but there could be some debate as to what happens.

In relation to timing you can all have as long as you need realistically today, you can come back on another day but if you do not we have got to close the meeting and we have got to deal with the schedule and that will simply mean that this Motion of No Confidence is deferred to the next meeting. So I want to just explain that to people before I call anyone else to speak. I am going to call Deputy Leadbeater on the basis that Deputy Le Tocq has just taken somebody from Policy & Resources President, so Deputy Leadbeater.

**Deputy Leadbeater:** Thank you, sir.

On January 17th this year a letter was sent by P&R signed by Deputy Murray as GWP Lead and Deputy Ferbrache to all Principal Committees. The letter was entitled Government Work Plan Mid Term Reset, I think we all remember that letter. After a brief preamble the letter read as follows:

At its meeting today the Policy & Resources Committee has committed to using the Government Work Plan process to ensure that the States focuses on these three areas and in order to do that we need to rethink the role of Government urgently.

Then there were three bullet points with instructions for all Committees to follow. The first was:

We must ensure effective commissioning and the development of public private partnerships where such steps can improve outcomes and reduce the financial burden to the taxpayer. We have to move away from the model where the States do everything, the public sector grows in order to do that and we make the taxpayer foot the bill.

3355 Then without even a blink towards the hypocrisy of it all P&R announced that they support cutting the funding to one of the most effective Commissions that we have, the Sports Commission, an organisation that has been improving outcomes and reducing the financial burden to the taxpayer for years. Exactly what P&R seek in their instructive letter.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Point of correction, sir.

3360 **The Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Dudley-Owen.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** This is the second time this assertion has been made in the Assembly today P&R did not make a decision to cut the funding.

3365 **The Bailiff:** The way of dealing with this, Deputy Leadbeater, is to talk about the proposals. Deputy Leadbeater to continue.

**Deputy Leadbeater:** Thank you, sir.

3370 I just want to, for the benefit of Deputy Dudley-Owen I will read this bit again because I said P&R announced that they support the cutting of the funding, I did not say that they proposed the cutting of the funding, somebody else did previously and I made sure that I got the wording right so I hope that satisfies Deputy Dudley-Owen.

I thought there was no sense in this decision at all which thankfully has eventually been recognised by ESC and reflected in their amendment to the GWP. The next bullet point was:

3375 We must return to financial ...

**Deputy Haskins:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Haskins.

3380 **Deputy Haskins:** Sir, the amendment to the GWP is not by the Education Committee it is by Deputy Dudley-Owen and Deputy Cameron.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Leadbeater.

3385 **Deputy Leadbeater:** Okay. The next bullet point was:

We must return to financial prudence. The downgrading of Guernsey's credit rating by Standard & Poor is a stark warning. We must focus our financial plans on what we need to do. Investment in critical services, in infrastructure and resilience and not in political vanity projects nor in gold plating to unnecessarily emulate bigger jurisdictions.

3390 At this point, sir, I will talk about when HSC were invited to attend a meeting with P&R to discuss the Capital Portfolio. At that meeting along with officers were our Committee, HSC, and Deputy Ferbrache and Deputy Murray representing P&R. Deputy Ferbrache remained calm the whole time but Deputy Murray who led the discussion, in my opinion, was all over the place. He effectively told us that our Phase 2 plans for the Hospital were not needed and not supported by P&R and that Education's plans were far more important and therefore supported by P&R.

3395 It is fair to say at this meeting.

**Deputy Murray:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Murray.

**Deputy Murray:** I think that is a depiction about the meeting that actually has been grossly exaggerated. It may be, I mean obviously any Member of HSC can actually support what Deputy Leadbeater is saying, I think by my recollection of that particular meeting was a reflection of the officers view which project should move forward first and I think that is what we actually convened the meeting to collectively discuss. I did not in any shape or form say that the Hospital project was not required. Sorry, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Murray, the difficulty is that Deputy Leadbeater carefully prefaced his remarks by saying in his opinion and the point of correction was really a speech that could be made later in the debate. Deputy Leadbeater to continue.

**Deputy Leadbeater:** Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Will you stop interrupting him there is no need for other people to comment on what he is saying. Deputy Leadbeater.

**Deputy Leadbeater:** I will continue, sir, it is late in the day. It is fair to say that meeting turned out to be as constructive as the one we finished yesterday. When I questioned Deputy Murray at that meeting on why P&R were, in my opinion, so absolute in support of pressing ahead with the TEP plans for Les Ozouets and seemingly, in my opinion, so hell bent on stopping the progress of the OHM project at the Hospital the first thing he said was 'well we have planning permission for Les Ozouets and you do not for Phase 2'.

At that point we reminded him that we did indeed have planning permission for Phase 2 of the Hospital Modernisation Project. This was news to Deputy Murray not long of the DPA and now driving the GWP but once the penny had dropped that both the TEP and OHM plans both had planning permission in place Deputy Murray, looking for another reason to support the TEP and not Phase 2, changed tack and started telling us that HSC need to get on top of spiralling costs instead of continuing to press on with Phase 2.

He told us that before we even think about our plans for Phase 2 we need to get on top of the costs of health care and instead of seeking to increase capacity at the PEH we should be looking at sending out patients off Island for operations. The message was to get on top of costs before thinking about Phase 2. When we explained that Phase 2 of the Hospital Modernisation Project was central to the transformation of HSC and that the efficiencies were, we collectively wanted to deliver, were all driven by the extra capacity and efficiencies created by that project. It just fell on deaf ears, sir.

So when P&R tell us that we must invest in critical services, in infrastructure and resilience but not in political vanity projects nor gold plating to unnecessarily emulate bigger jurisdictions it appears that they do not really mean it because seeking to send members of our community off Island for operations certainly does not provide the resilience that they say they want us to provide and just where does he think we will be able to send all these people is totally beyond me. The NHS is already massively overstretched trying to deal with its own backlog of waiting lists and has no capacity to be able to provide this type of service to us at all.

At the start of that bullet point we were told we must return to financial prudence the downgrading of Guernsey's credit rating by Standard & Poor is a stark warning. Then this week Deputy Murray lays budget Amendment 18 a motion seeking to borrow in excess of £100 million to fund the TEP with only a potential income stream that only may be able to contribute towards the repayments but more importantly flies in the face of his instruction to all Committees to return to financial prudence in an effort to restore the confidence of Standard & Poor in how we manage our finances. The third bullet point tells us:

We must stop behaving like a G20 country. We are an Island of less than 65,000 people with limited resources. Our focus on international standards must be on those that enable us to maintain our position as a mainstream finance centre and enable access to markets through trade agreements, and we need to move from nice to have to need to have.

So again, sir, we are told off for our behaviour and reminded that we are an Island of less than 65,000 with limited resources and instructed to move from nice to have to need to have. I am not going to say that the TEP is a nice to have although I know that many in this Assembly, and also our community, do feel that way. What I am saying is that by supporting the TEP over the OHM projects Deputy Murray and P&R have effectively told us that, in their opinion, Phase 2 of the Hospital Modernisation and the extra capacity and all of the efficiencies it would deliver is a nice to have while the TEP is a need to have.

I wonder, sir, if Deputy Murray had been a Member of HSC before he joined P&R instead of a Member of ESC and if he had heavily involved in the Hospital project and not heavily involved in the TEP as he had been, if P&R would have favoured the projects in the order that they did. This to me smacks of favouritism and a failure to look at the Capital Portfolio objectively.

Deputy Fairclough spoke of the adversarial nature of P&R during dealing with his Committee and I agree and feel the same. I will give one example with a meeting between HSC and P&R regarding the Capital Portfolio. Their adversarial nature, in my opinion, has been apparent the whole term to date.

Deputy Inder, who is not in the Chamber at the moment, spoke of the great work between him and Deputy Helyar in helping to speed up the process of issues CBD Growing Licences to local businesses and I cannot believe he would point towards Government support for this massive industry, or total lack of support as the industry sees it, as a positive and something to herald as some sort of success.

There were 14 licensees operating in the industry before the signing of the MoU that was a resounding success according to Deputy Inder. There were 14 licenses operating in the industry before the signing of the MoU which was done in the absence of any input from or consultation with the industry. The industry association, the CICIA, all licensees and businesses operating in the industry asked to be involved but were told that they could not have any input in the development of the MoU. But not to worry, because the signing of it will deliver, amongst other things, the ability to easily take the materials grown and the products made to market.

The MoU did nothing of the sort it actually did pretty much the opposite making wading through the treacle of Government process even more difficult. This is why we no longer have a CBD industry, sir. Instead of still having those 14 licensees growing bio-mass and rejuvenating tens of acres of horticultural sites we now have none. The once burgeoning CBD growing industry is now all gone. So I would advise Deputy Inder that using Government support for the CBD industry as a measure of success is unwise unless, that is, he is trying to persuade Members to support this motion.

Sir, just like Deputy Vermeulen when he spoke I have the utmost respect for all my colleagues and putting my name to the Motion of No Confidence was not something that I took lightly but the last straw for me was the call for a general election by P&R when they again failed to get their tax proposals through the Assembly. This demonstrated to me that in their minds it is their way or no way and they were prepared to upset all of the ongoing Committee work streams across Government and compromise all of the progress those Committees have made to date.

Trying to end light hearted now, sir, I see P&R a bit like Tottenham Hotspur. (*Laughter*) At the start of the season they had a new manager and it looked like they had made some really good signings then right at the beginning of the season their star striker, Harry Kane, left the team or Deputy Soulsby in this instance. (*Laughter*)

Spurs came out of the traps well and looked like a decent outfit and also looked like they would not miss their former star player. Then came that game against Chelsea, or tax review two in this context (*Laughter*) where Tottenham were on the wrong end of a four one jobbing by their City rivals (**A Member:** Rubbish!) and they ended the game with only nine men and a handful of suspensions.

Since that game, sir, Spurs have capitulated and slipped down the league and any confidence their fans may have had about winning the Premier League have simply faded away. (*Interjection*) The confidence of success their fans had at the start of the season has withered away with a poor performance of a team that promised so much.

Thank you.

3505       **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

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

3510       The former leader of the Liberal Democrats Tim Farron is a friend of mine and he recently invited me to be interviewed on a London radio programme that he hosts and his podcast and the programme is actually called 'It is a Mucky Business'. It is about politics. This is certainly a mucky business and perhaps today is one of the muckiest for us.

3515       I was not looking forward to this and I am not enjoying it because we have all got a job to do and so I am not going to try and defend myself I think having heard him if I need a defence I will ask Deputy Ferbrache to do it pro bono. But seriously I think Deputy Parkinson said right at the start that the public, I think he said, certainly the community in Guernsey has lost faith in the Government.

3520       Well, we are the Government it is not Policy & Resources and I think we need to recognise that that we all have culpability and so I will speak about my culpability here. We have a responsibility to not only the current voters but the next generation to not just think about today but to think about tomorrow and what it will look like and I know that my colleagues and I particularly, but not exclusively, when dealing with our structural deficit and our recent debate that we have had on the Funding & Investment Plan took that very seriously, that we needed to look further ahead than just now. If we were just looking at the now we could put sticking plasters over the issues that we have got and to a certain degree that is what we decided in the Assembly to do although I think they are pretty poor sticking plasters if you ask me.

3525       I think this is one of the bravest senior Committees that I have seen and by saying that I have worked in quite a number, some of which I had led. So, I am not saying that I support every view or every methodology. Some of my colleagues are more confrontational than I would be. I prefer a more negotiating stance.

3530       Having said that we do need people who are willing to confront and perhaps for too long we have had a tendency just to accept what is put before us and my colleagues, certainly those who are new to politics, have been willing to confront some of the evidence that has been put in front of us and yet they have also, as others have mentioned, been willing to change their mind on things. That does take courage.

3535       Sir, as I said I am not going to try and defend my position. I am just trying to do the job to the best of my ability and I will seek to do that for as long as I am in this role. There is much to do and I feel, sir, that we are not doing our community a service and the proper service that we should in terms of duty by having this debate and prolonging what we are doing.

3540       I feel particularly, sir, perhaps because it is the end of a tiring week where we have had the budget to consider that we all need to reflect very seriously on how we are spending our time and consider again with the news today that two of our colleagues have resigned what that means and what that could mean for us in terms of the senior Committee, which at the end of the day whichever system of government, and I know Deputy Fairclough mentioned the Machinery of Government Review the Reshaping Government Review I chair that there is, in fact, a final draft policy letter out and I am actually waiting, I am sure he will not mind me saying, but for Members of my sub-Committee including Deputy Meerveld to get back to me with their comments on that and I asked him recently if he had time to do that and he said not yet.

3550       So, we are all in team together and that is why I think we all need to take a step back and reflect on what we are seeking to do here and take a deep breath and try and work better for our community, (*Interjection*) try and work together better, which means confrontation and negotiation. I think, for example I will just use this one example, I think my colleague Deputy Mahoney has done a much better job than I did for a number of years in terms of the public sector pay negotiations and I commend him for that, and I will mention Deputy Helyar as well. I commend Deputy Helyar for the way that he has responded sometimes to some quite, well, very difficult situations and requiring a calm and focused response and he has done so.

3555 Now, we are living in an age, sir, where the culture is such that people do lose their temper very quickly, similarly on the other side, people seem to me to get offended at the drop of a hat (*Interjection*) and I do not like either of those but that is why sometimes I would seek to try and be a mediator or a peace maker and we need all of those if we are going to listen to everyone because this Assembly reflects our society and there are people in society who are very cross with us at the way that we spend our time and what we should be spending our time on according to their views.

3560 There are others that are offended by some of the things that we do not do as well as some of the things that we do and so it is probably not surprising that we have some of those behaviours within this Assembly. I think they can be moderated if we are willing to compromise, I mentioned that during the budget debate. It requires all of us to give a little and if we can refocus on that and reflect on our behaviours I think we could move forward because there is much to do. There is a lot happening behind the scenes and if we continue to behave in this way we will not be working our duty in a proper manner.

Thank you, sir.

3570 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Moakes.

**Deputy Moakes:** Thank you, sir.

I believe that this vote of no confidence has more to do with politics than it has to do with anything that P&R has done because P&R has actually achieved rather a lot in collaboration with other Committees as we have already heard. I think this is more to do with who is sat at the top table, who is pulling the levers, who has the power.

3575 The problems we face today will not go away if we get rid of the current P&R Members and replace them with new Members. The funding gap will not disappear overnight, the pressure notes from the credit agencies will not disappear overnight and Moneyval will still be coming to visit us next year.

3580 Let us be clear P&R were caught between a rock and a hard place to find ways to save money and / or raise revenues to pay for the services that people need and the much needed investment in the Island's infrastructure which has been neglected for years. And what did P&R do? Well they presented a range of proposals to the States' not just GST as some would like you to think the last time around.

3585 All of the substantial proposals were defeated and yet no-one was able to come up with a viable alternative and I use the viable word very carefully there. A sticking plaster here a sticking plaster there and the result of not raising additional revenues is now beginning to hit home, not just here in the Assembly but also with the general public. It is not all down to P&R we all have a responsibility, every single one of us, to find viable solutions to the problems that we face.

3590 Sir, in response to some of the examples given for lacking confidence in P&R let me say this just because a Member disagrees with P&R does not warrant a vote of no confidence. (*Interjection*) This is a democracy, we all have differing opinions and blaming P&R when a Member's idea is dismissed by the majority of States' Members is not a P&R problem either. Take a step back and ask why the majority of Members voted against your idea rather than blaming P&R.

3595 So what happens if this motion is successful? A number of people have already thrown their hats into the ring for the top table jobs and there will be others. Will the shuffling of chairs and a change of management suddenly make the issues that we are facing go away? I think not. Sir, a new P&R will review the same data that the current P&R reviewed, consult with the same people that the current P&R consulted with and then almost certainly come up with the same conclusions. So the question is, why?

3600 Sir, I do not believe that this vote of no confidence is in the best interests of the Island, it is politically motivated. This Island needs stability and certainty given the scrutiny that it is under at this time. A political coup is the last thing that we need right now. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Shuffling the chairs will not change the facts, shuffling the chairs will not resolve the challenges that we face.

In addition take a step back and consider the implications of what happened this morning. Two Members of P&R have resigned already that means that there is now an opportunity to reject the vote of no confidence and vote in two new P&R Members and this at least would result in us being able to retain the experience and the knowledge that the three remaining Members of P&R have.

3610 Think about it very carefully, fix it, do not blow it up. I will not be supporting the vote of no confidence.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

3615 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Thank you, sir.

Confidence is ultimately a very personal feeling and experience so I will share it from a very personal perspective. I came with no political baggage to this Assembly but I stood as part of the Partnership of Independence. We know how that ended and I felt that for nothing to do with myself or my abilities I ended up being in opposition and I was being judged by my former alliance to the party and where I was sitting in the Assembly rather than my skills and abilities.

3620

I truly believe the creation of parties was one of the biggest disasters of this Island by voting and what happened. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) Probably the second biggest disaster was for this Assembly not to elect Deputy St Pier to STSB and give him a job to do and although I think I always voted completely independently I seem to be judged and to be in association of actions of others in the former party and I quote Deputy Roffey who called it a civil war between the warring Ferbrache and St Pier camps.

3625

Maybe I hold my hands up, maybe, and I have no doubt I played my role in that too. But in sum I did not have a great time in the States especially in the first two years. I felt often that it did not matter what I said or I tried to do I would always be voted down but I preserved because I knew that 9,000 people of Guernsey wanted me to continue to be here.

3630

So I continued the work diligently and hard executing against the mandate of my two Committees and trying to be available for the work of others, trying to build relationships across the Assembly and I have no doubt that many of you since have found me to be honest, with strong values, high integrity, maybe strongly opinionated and sometimes heavy handed.

3635

So I engaged with Deputy Murray on the economic strategy work I offered to be on the Savings sub-Committee that Deputy Mahoney was leading and most recently I have been working closely with Deputy Dudley-Owen in trying to rescue the situation in Education and through this work, this work has allowed me to see the Members whom I did not really know well as real human beings and really trying to do their best for our Island.

3640

I could see that once we put the politics aside and treat each other with respect we could get on with working together (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and I can see the beauty and the brilliance, perhaps the quirkiness, but ultimately the potential of all Deputies here and I feel some kind of regret perhaps that I did not try better or earlier to engage and go beyond the dynamics laid by those parties because I have really enjoyed working with all of them and I think they all have something to offer.

3645

So, I have been listening to this debate with great pain because I can really see both sides of the story. But in the end there is a very clear message to all of us there is a call for change, call for change from our community. They do not have the trust in us as Government and by that I mean all of us, not just P&R, to do the right thing for our community and as we should all know and as especially following our trip to Ghana, Deputy St Pier, Deputy Dudley-Owen, we have a consensus Government that means we are all in Government, we do not have a Cabinet that is responsible for decision making. We are all in Government.

3650

So, to me we are ultimately responsible for how low we have been descending and we ultimately, all of us, have to deliver this change. To me, like Deputy Roffey said, this is not about the tax debate because P&R is the only group of Deputies that has so far delivered tax proposals that will address our long term deficit and as the only tax proposals that have received the most support they are

3655

now being hammered for doing what may in the end very much be the only viable solution in the long term. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

3660 But to me and what Deputy de Sausmarez has said it is also about the culture. The behaviours how we relate to each other and it cannot just come from five people, it comes from all of us (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and I felt very sorry that Deputy de Sausmarez felt that she had no choice but to share how she felt and saw the things her way today and I share with her that at times I perhaps felt quite similar.

3665 I have shared these concerns with colleagues and what did I receive? I did not really receive much support. There is a rising star in Guernsey, a young lady called Poppy Murray, she launched the BE LADS campaign and it focused around reducing violence and sexual harassment against young women by showing that the men around us have the responsibility to stand up to the behaviours they see. Her campaign has become a national campaign not only in Guernsey but in the UK as well.

3670 We are all complicit in the behaviours because if you have witnessed bad behaviours and you did not stand up to it you are complicit in those behaviours. So we are all complicit in how low the States have descended this political term. The key now is how do we deliver on this change? I always say that it takes two to tango and there are many ways through which this change could be delivered and absolutely a change in the way our senior Committee has to function and behave is part of this puzzle.

3675 We obviously have the change that is going to come through the resignation of the two Members we could be supporting the wider change of the motion today and possibly because we are at such an impasse and I spoke about it during the Education debate that maybe we have no choice but really to change but we need leadership and change from all of us to work across the Committees which Deputy Le Tocq just also said.

3680 So to me it was beyond extremely upsetting today that I received an off the cuff remark from a senior and a very experienced Deputy a signatory to the motion that I was now seen as somehow aligning myself with a sinking ship that somehow I have crossed the line, the division line, and this was being frowned upon.

3685 I was devastated to think that my genuine efforts to work with Deputy Dudley-Owen in the last few weeks to help Education were being perceived in this kind of way. This kind of work and behaviour and my speaking truth to perhaps other Members in this Assembly is seen by the leaders of the motion and potentially future leaders in this Assembly as something wrong then we may have very low expectations of what a possible reshuffle of the senior Committee could deliver.

3690 So I am still listening and I am listening to how this change could be delivered and the reasons for this change that could be coming from some of the speeches that might yet come from some of our more senior leaders because as history shows it is very easy to go from a swing to a swing. We have had the swing of Deputy St Pier's Government to the swing of Deputy Ferbrache's Government and now yet another swing and history will continue repeating itself without solving the fundamental problems that ultimately we are just people trying to do the best (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and this will be what makes or breaks us.

**A Member:** Hear, hear. (*Applause*)

3700 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, I think it is time to take stock as to what you want to do and ultimately it is your decision, no one else's. As I say under the rules at 5.30 p.m. today we have to deal with the Schedule for Future States' Business in order to be able to convene the meeting that is starting on 12th December.

3705 I cannot turn to that unless we are going to close this meeting. Now in relation to closing it it would mean that this Motion of No Confidence would be added to the deferred business but it is open to you, if you so choose, to continue debating this Motion of No Confidence until such time as everyone who wants to speak has spoken or a guillotine motion pursuant to Rule 26(1) is successful and Deputy Parkinson has the chance to reply to that debate. So what I am simply going

to do at this stage is I am going to invite any Member who would be in difficulty sitting late today, whatever time that might be to, to stand in their places.

Thank you.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Would it be possible to specify how late or do people simply mean after 5.30 p.m. because somebody may have commitments later on?

**The Bailiff:** Well, how many people still want to speak in debate on the motion? (*Interjection*) I mean realistically that is an hour and a half to two hours allowing for the reply. How many people will not be able to remain in the States if the States were to continue to 8 p.m.? That is helpful, thank you. Then what I am tempted to do at this point is to curtail debate on this matter now. It would be adjourned to add to the business for 12th December and invite the President to move the Schedule for Future States' Business but if there are any other suggestions from brighter minds than mine (*Laughter*) then please do make them.

**Deputy Taylor:** Sir, can I try 26(1)?

**The Bailiff:** You wait to be called, Deputy Taylor.

**Deputy Taylor:** Very sorry, you do not normally have to wait on a 26(1).

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

**Deputy Burford:** Sir, could we try a guillotine?  
Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** You cannot, which is what I was just checking.

**Deputy Trott:** I can. (*Laughter*)

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, is Deputy Trott going to be guaranteed I mean.

**Deputy Trott:** I would like to move Rule 26(1) please, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Now I have to go through the process once again of inviting those Members to stand in their places who wish to speak in debate on this motion. Is it still your wish, Deputy Trott, that I put the motion?

**Deputy Trott:** It is, sir.  
Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you very much.

**Deputy Trott:** Can I get a recorded vote please, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Well in that case as there is a request for a recorded vote on the motion pursuant to Rule 26(1) I will not even put it to you orally and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting at this point please.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Not carried – Pour 13, Contre 25, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 0, Absent 0*

<b>Pour</b>	<b>Contre</b>	<b>Ne vote pas</b>	<b>Did not vote</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Burford, Yvonne	Aldwell, Sue	De Sausmarez, Lindsay	None	None
Bury, Tina	Blin, Chris	Queripel, Lester		
De Lisle, David	Brouard, Al			
Dyke, John	Cameron, Andy			
Le Tissier, Chris	Dudley-Owen, Andrea			
Leadbeater, Marc	Fairclough, Simon			
Meerveld, Carl	Falla, Steve			
Parkinson, Charles	Ferbrache, Peter			
Soulsby, Heidi	Gabriel, Adrian			
St Pier, Gavin	Gollop, John			
Taylor, Andrew	Haskins, Sam			
Trott, Lyndon	Helyar, Mark			
Vermeulen, Simon	Inder, Neil			
	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha			
	Le Tocq, Jonathan			
	Mahoney, David			
	Matthews, Aidan			
	McKenna, Liam			
	Moakes, Nick			
	Murray, Bob			
	Oliver, Victoria			
	Prow, Robert			
	Roberts, Steve			
	Roffey, Peter			
	Snowdon, Alexander			

**The Bailiff:** So on the motion pursuant to Rule 26(1) there voted in favour 13 Members, against 25 Members, 2 Members abstained and therefore I will declare it lost so debate will continue but potentially not today. (*Laughter*) Forgive me I obviously cannot count, the next meeting is being convened on 13th December not 12th December. I have got my dates slightly mixed up.

### **Procedural – Remaining business**

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld.

**Deputy Meerveld:** Can I put a motion from the floor, sir, to adjourn this Meeting until 13th December, so just simply close for future business but adjourn this meeting so this is the first item dealt with at the next Meeting?

**The Bailiff:** As I, and I know you forewarned me that that is what you wanted to do, under the terms of the Rules, the Rules are always important here, the motion would be added to the items that have been deferred to the Meeting starting on the 13th December. If we adjourn this Meeting, similarly to the way that the Special Meeting was adjourned, the business for the Meeting that started on Wednesday of this week could have already been dealt with by dealing with the Schedule for Future States' Business.

So, if we adjourn the Meeting as opposed to closing the Meeting it means that we will not have dealt with the Schedule for Future States' Business and therefore I will not be able to convene the meeting for 13th December. So that is the difficulty in relation to that. But when you come back on 13th December, and it is always possible when I announce an adjournment you can say well actually let us try and do another day at some other point, it is in your gift to continue the debate on this as the first item of business that day just as you chose once we started this meeting to bring forward

the matter. But if that is not approved by a majority of Members it would mean that the business would run in accordance with the order in Rule 9.

Deputy de Sausmarez, have you got a bright idea?

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** Sir, I just wondered before you invite Members to vote on that which you have so clearly explained whether we might be able to test the Assembly's appetite to extend this meeting a little later tonight say, for example, to 6.30 p.m. or 7 p.m.? (*Interjection*)

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Oliver, have you got a bright suggestion as well that might be another one?

**Deputy Oliver:** Sir, we have got so much business stacking up I wondered if we could test people's appetite to come in on the 12th December, so the Tuesday, rather than the 13th?

**The Bailiff:** Well let me start (*Laughter*) with the suggestion that we might get a few more speeches in today before adjourning tonight (*Laughter*) but we would have to deal with the Schedule for Future States' Business. So I am going to put a Proposition to you that this meeting continues until 6.30 p.m. and no later than 6.30 p.m. but we will have to have time to do the Schedule for Future States' Business.

*Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.*

**The Bailiff:** I think we might have to have a vote on that, Greffier, if you can put that up quickly. It is always difficult to tell quite how many people when it sounds about the same. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting please on that motion to sit until 6.30 p.m. today.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Not carried – Pour 16, Contre 24, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 0, Absent 0,*

<b>Pour</b>	<b>Contre</b>	<b>Ne vote pas</b>	<b>Did not vote</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Burford, Yvonne	Aldwell, Sue	None	None	None
Bury, Tina	Blin, Chris			
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	Brouard, Al			
Dyke, John	Cameron, Andy			
Fairclough, Simon	De Lisle, David			
Falla, Steve	Dudley-Owen, Andrea			
Gabriel, Adrian	Ferbrache, Peter			
Meerveld, Carl	Gollop, John			
Queripel, Lester	Haskins, Sam			
Roberts, Steve	Helyar, Mark			
Roffey, Peter	Inder, Neil			
Soulsby, Heidi	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha			
St Pier, Gavin	Le Tissier, Chris			
Taylor, Andrew	Le Tocq, Jonathan			
Trott, Lyndon	Leadbeater, Marc			
Vermeulen, Simon	Mahoney, David			
	Matthews, Aidan			
	McKenna, Liam			
	Moakes, Nick			
	Murray, Bob			
	Oliver, Victoria			
	Parkinson, Charles			
	Prow, Robert			
	Snowdon, Alexander			

**The Bailiff:** Well on that procedural motion there voted in favour 16 Members, against 24 Members and therefore I will declare it lost. I think that that means we are drawing stops today

3815 unless, Deputy Meerveld, if you wanted to suggest that we adjourn this meeting to some other day, including the 13th December but as I have explained the problem with that is that you would not actually deal with the Schedule.

**Deputy Meerveld:** Can we actually deal with the Schedule and then adjourn, is that acceptable?

3820 **The Bailiff:** No, because we would not interpose the Schedule at this point, I simply would not do that. We are mid way through a debate.

**Deputy Meerveld:** [inaudible]

3825 **Deputy Trott:** Sir, it is not a bright idea but, because I know you are a lot smarter than I am, I am just asking you if you have a suggestion that can enable us to come back on the 13th and deal with this matter as a continuation. Is there a mechanism that achieves that, because I suspect that is what the majority of the Assembly would wish to achieve? *(Interjection)*

3830 **The Bailiff:** I thought I had explained that! *(Laughter & Interjection)*  
In other words on the 13th what will happen when we deal with the Schedule we will simply put all the deferred items because there are already deferred items this motion and the business of this Meeting which started late yesterday will simply be added to that list.

3835 So the Statements will be added when the Order Paper is circulated and under Rule 9 it would mean that you would deal with all these other bits and pieces before eventually probably not even getting back to the motion in the three days *(Interjection)* that are set aside for the meeting then. But when the States convene then anyone can put a motion to say let us continue the path preferred as we would say in another context Motion of No Confidence and that can be the Members' decision on that occasion.

3840 Logically it will make sense I cannot imagine any Member would want to interpose other business before doing that so that is the way to achieve it. So we will conclude the debate today, stopping after having heard 26 speeches after the opening by Deputy Parkinson so the maximum number of other people still to speak is only 13 and we will now ask the Greffier to call the Schedule for Future States' Business.

## POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

### 10. Schedule for Future States' Business – Proposition carried

#### *Article 10*

*The States are asked to decide:*

*Whether, after consideration of the attached Schedule for Future States' Business, which sets out items for consideration at the Ordinary States Meeting on 13th December 2023, they are of the opinion to approve the Schedule.*

3845 **The Greffier:** Article 10, Policy & Resources Committee – the Schedule for Future States' Business.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache, is there anything you want to say on this?

3850 **Deputy Ferbrache:** No, sir.

**The Bailiff:** There have been no amendments received, we will simply get the Proposition up and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting.

3855

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 38, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 0,*

<b>Pour</b>	<b>Contre</b>	<b>Ne vote pas</b>	<b>Did not vote</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Aldwell, Sue	Trott, Lyndon	None	McKenna, Liam	None
Blin, Chris				
Brouard, Al				
Burford, Yvonne				
Bury, Tina				
Cameron, Andy				
De Lisle, David				
De Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Haskins, Sam				
Helyar, Mark				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Le Tocq, Jonathan				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Mahoney, David				
Matthews, Aidan				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				
Oliver, Victoria				
Parkinson, Charles				
Prow, Robert				
Queripel, Lester				
Roberts, Steve				
Roffey, Peter				
Snowdon, Alexander				
Soulsby, Heidi				
St Pier, Gavin				
Taylor, Andrew				
Vermeulen, Simon				

3860

**The Bailiff:** Now in respect of the Schedule there voted in favour 38 Members, 1 Member voted against, 1 Member did not participate in the vote and therefore for that reason I will declare the Schedule duly carried which means that we can convene the meeting for the 13th December. I thank everyone for their patience this week and ask the Greffier to close the Meeting.

3865

*The Assembly adjourned at 5.38 p.m.*