



**OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF THE**

**STATES OF DELIBERATION**

**OF THE**

**ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

**HANSARD**

**Royal Court House, Guernsey, Thursday, 23rd May 2024**

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

**Volume 13, No. 10**

**ISSN 2049-8284**

*Published by the States' Greffier, The Royal Court House,  
St Peter Port, GY1 2NZ. © States of Guernsey, 2024*

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

**Representatives of the Island of Alderney**

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

**The Clerk to the States of Deliberation**

E. Gallienne (Deputy Greffier)

**Absent at the Evocation**

Deputy A. C. Dudley-Owen; Deputy P. T. R. Ferbrache (*absent de l'île*);  
Deputy N. R. Inder (*indisposé*); Deputy C. J. Le Tissier (*indisposé*);  
Deputy J. P. Le Tocq (*relevé à 9h 52*); Deputy C. P. Meerveld (*relevé à 9h 46*);  
Deputy V. S. Oliver (*indisposée*); Deputy P. J. Roffey (*indisposé*)

## Business transacted

Evocation .....	735
Convocation .....	735
<b>Billet d' État VII.....</b>	<b>735</b>
10. General Election 2025 – Second Policy Letter – Debate commenced.....	735
Procedural – Early lunch break .....	769
<i>The States adjourned at 12.20 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.17 p.m. ....</i>	<i>769</i>
General Election 2025 – Second Policy Letter – Debate continued.....	770
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 3.34 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 3.50 p.m. ....</i>	<i>787</i>
General Election 2025 – Second Policy Letter – Debate continued – Propositions carried .....	787
11. Schedule for Future States' Business – Proposition carried.....	801
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 4.40 p.m. ....</i>	<i>802</i>

*PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK*

# States of Deliberation

*The States met at 9.30 a.m.*

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

## **PRAYERS**

*The Deputy Greffier*

## **EVOCATION**

## **CONVOCATION**

# Billet d'État VII

## **STATES' ASSEMBLY & CONSTITUTIONAL COMMITTEE**

### **10. General Election 2025 – Second Policy Letter – Debate commenced**

*Article 10.*

*The States are asked to decide:*

*The States are asked to decide whether, after consideration of the policy letter entitled "General Election 2025 - Second Policy Letter" dated 5th April 2024, they are of the opinion:*

- 1. To agree that a General Election of People's Deputies be held on Wednesday 18th June 2025.*
- 2. To agree that the nomination period for candidates for the office of People's Deputy should open on Monday 12th May 2025 at 9:00am and close on Wednesday 14th May 2025 at 4:00pm.*
- 3. To agree to set the following candidate expenditure limits:*
  - i. Up to £7,500 in money or money's worth for candidates*
  - ii. Up to £15,000 in money or money's worth for political parties*
  - iii. Candidates supported or endorsed by political parties have the option of transferring up to half of their expenditure allowance to fund their political party, provided the total of all transferred expenditure does not exceed the party's expenditure limit prescribed in (ii).*
- 4. To agree that the £500 grant for candidates should be discontinued.*
- 5. To agree that the provisions for the holding of by-elections should be revised to require a minimum of three vacancies to occur in the office of Deputy before the first day of December next preceding the date of a General Election.*
- 6. To direct the preparation of such legislation as may be necessary to give effect to the above decisions.*

**The States' Greffier:** Article 10, States' Assembly & Constitution Committee – General Election 2025 – Second Policy Letter.

**The Bailiff:** Well, good morning, Members of the States. In the absence of the President of the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee, I will invite the Vice-President, Deputy St Pier, to open the debate.

**Deputy St Pier:** Thank you, sir. I was not entirely expecting that. I had been pre-warned that the President might be absent yesterday. So in the absence of Deputy Ferbrache who is, of course, re-treading the steps of Napoleon to Saint Helena, albeit obviously for different reasons, I have lost my biggest fan for my fandom readership of my column in *The Guernsey Press*. And in *The Guernsey Press* I referred to this policy letter as perhaps being an opportunity to give the President of the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee a bit of a kicking. So there you go, that is karma because I now stand in his place (*Laughter*) ready to be kicked.

So I do, indeed, have a speech here, sir. And it begins by saying I am pleased to be able to lay before the Assembly today – and indeed, I am pleased to be able to lay before the Assembly today – the second of our Committee's policy letters in respect of the preparation for the next general election, scheduled, as we all know, to take place in June 2025. Of course, hopefully on 18th June, subject to the Assembly's agreement here today.

As well as the proposed date of the election, the policy letter recommends other important dates in the election process and also, of course, looks at candidate and party expenditure and grants. And I notice the President has just entered the Assembly, sir. His timing is impeccable! (*Laughter*) The good news is he will be here to present, lead and defend the position of the Committee on the amendments. But nonetheless, I shall continue with presenting the policy letter.

So whilst not critical to the 2025 Election, the Committee has also taken the opportunity to recommend changing the trigger for a by-election. And I am sure that will trigger some debate in recognition of the fact that under an Island-wide voting system, a by-election is obviously a significantly and more costly undertaking than it once was.

The Committee has considered very carefully the proposed date for the next general election, taking into account all of the processes necessary to ensure that the election can, indeed, take place. The Reform Law was amended during the last term and now provides that general elections should take place in June. And the last States' Meeting of this current term is presently set to be on 30th April 2025. So the new political term starts on 1st July 2025. So there is, effectively, a nine-week window between the final meeting of the Assembly and the swearing in of the new Assembly. In practice, that time will be lessened slightly because it is unlikely that the final States' Meeting this term will be concluded in one day. And previous experience suggests that it almost certainly will not happen, indeed, could extend beyond the scheduled period.

Should States' business not be concluded on Friday 2nd May, Members might agree to continue debate on Tuesday 6th May, which is closely, of course, followed by Liberation Day. Therefore, the earliest feasible day for the opening of nominations is 12th May which is the date that the Committee is recommending in the policy letter. That leaves a period of roughly seven weeks to carry out all of the following tasks to receive and process candidate nominations, prepare ballot papers, prepare and distribute the candidate manifesto booklets, prepare to lay on the Meet the Candidates events, distribute postal packs, voting packs, to process those postal votes. Of course, run the count and potentially, sir, under your careful eye, a recount, possibly, to provide Deputies Elect with necessary IT equipment. And then, of course, for the swearing in.

So that is merely an outline of what *must* be undertaken in that relatively short time. But it is not, of course, a reflection of everything that will need to be done between the opening of nominations and the swearing in of the new Assembly. And the policy letter explains in more detail why the key dates have been proposed. And I hope that fellow Deputies will accept those dates.

Just as the predecessor Committee did prior to the 2020 General Election, SACC is recommending that the candidate grant be removed. As some of my colleagues may recall, the

55 £500 grant was agreed for in 2020, after a successful amendment. And we know that we have an  
amendment today in similar terms. The original intention was for it not to feature. That was the  
recommendation of the previous Committee on the basis that the States was funding a significant  
amount of publicity for election candidates in various forms, including, of course, the manifesto  
60 booklet, the candidate videos and the opportunity to receive and answer questions via the Election  
2020 website.

Given the significant investment envisaged in the candidate manifesto booklet which cost almost  
£135,000 in 2020, which voters did find to be the single most useful source of information about  
candidates in 2020. And that was evidenced by the work of the Scrutiny Management Committee.  
And combined with the cost of other initiatives to support candidates, such as the Meet the  
65 Candidates events, the Committee has concluded, as with its predecessor, that in the current  
financial climate, it cannot justify further financial support for candidates, particularly as it is not  
possible to quantify the total expenditure that this would entail. As this, of course, ~~both~~ depends  
on both the number of candidates and their level of claimable expenditure incurred.

It is also worth noting that other jurisdictions, including Jersey, do not offer a candidate grant.  
70 Indeed, of course, many instead have the reverse and insist on candidates providing a deposit which  
is only refunded if they achieve a certain level of votes in the election. Indeed, in the report on the  
2020 Election, the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA), referred to the £500 grant as  
'generous'. The Committee considers that the support given to all candidates for free means that  
all candidates have ample opportunity to engage with the electorate and that more than offsets the  
75 loss of the grant.

Furthermore, preparations for the 2025 General Election which have already started, include  
opportunities for candidates to learn a great deal about the realities of the demands that will be  
placed on them as elected representatives and also about how the States works. And consequently,  
what demands are likely to be placed upon them. Therefore, Government is putting considerable  
80 resource into supporting and preparing candidates for the election and the Committee's view is  
that this is a smarter use of scarce resources than giving grants to candidates to assist them to carry  
out activity that the States has already funded.

The Committee is proposing to increase expenditure limits for both individuals and political  
parties to £7,500 and £15,000, respectively. And I know, sir, there is also an amendment that has  
85 been lodged in respect of that. The candidate expenditure limit has been reflatd from 2020 levels,  
and then rounded up, giving a total of £7,500. And the party spending limit has been set at double  
the candidate expenditure limit, as the Committee considered that this simplifies the matter and  
provides us with a formulaic approach which it is recommending for future elections.

The other matter which is dealt with in the policy letter which, as I said at the outset, sir, is not  
90 related to the forthcoming election, but nonetheless is important in terms of wider election  
administration going forward. And that is to do with by-elections. At present, the Reform Law  
provides that:

A vacancy in the Office of Deputy occurring before 1st December in the year preceding a general election will trigger a  
by-election to fill the seat in question.

Should a vacancy arise later in the term, a by-election is not automatically triggered, but instead,  
sir, falls, as you will know, to the discretion of your Office as to whether the by-election is called.

95 The Committee believes it is important to note that under Island-wide voting and hence Island-  
wide representation, the loss of one Deputy does not result in the democratic deficit that would  
have arisen in the event of a parish or district representative vacating a seat in that district.  
Therefore, there is, we contend, sir, less of a driver to fill a vacant seat immediately.

In the past, the States have managed to function in the face of ongoing absences by Deputies,  
100 perhaps, because of illness or other personal circumstances. Therefore, it is difficult to argue that  
one vacancy should immediately trigger a by-election and the evidence, indeed, suggests otherwise.  
It is also relevant that under the previous system of district by-elections, by-elections were far more  
straightforward to run than they would be under the Island-wide system. Whereas, previously, the

105 district in question would have organised and resourced one or two polling stations followed by a count for, most likely, a small number of candidates. The responsibility for the logistics now on a much wider scale would, of course, fall to the States.

110 There is now a distinct possibility of considerably more candidates standing than would have been the case under a district by-election. And necessitating the establishment of several polling stations and a centralised count which will prove resource intensive in terms of time, money and people. Whilst, of course, that should not be the sole determining factor in decision-making, the combination of a lack of real democratic deficit, the fact that the States demonstrably can function in the face of Members' prolonged absences and the resource implications of by-elections under the Island-wide system, the Committee is proposing that we take this opportunity to amend the Reform Law so that a by-election should not be triggered until three vacancies arise.

115 Sir, in concluding, I should remind my colleagues that preparations for the 2025 Election are, of course, already underway. A great deal of work has already taken place behind the scenes and all of the proposals in this policy letter have been carefully worked up to support this important democratic process, which is, as we know, relatively infrequent. But is, of course, crucial to the functioning of Guernsey as a democratic jurisdiction, both locally and in a wider context. And so I hope that we can count on our colleagues in respect of the issues set out in the policy letter.

120 With that, sir, I should sit down and hand the baton on to the President of the Committee.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you very much indeed. Deputy Dudley-Owen, Deputy Meerveld, you have both arrived after the roll call. Is it your wish to be relevé?

125 **Deputy Dudley-Owen/Deputy Meerveld:** Yes, please, sir.

**The Bailiff:** I will mark you both as present. Because, of course, the baton could not have been passed back until Deputy Meerveld was relevé. It was almost tempting not to, but – *(Laughter)*

130 **Deputy Meerveld:** I rather feared that, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, two amendments to these Propositions have been submitted. I am simply going to take them in numerical order and invite Deputy Bury, who is substituting for Deputy Roffey, to move Amendment 1, if she so wishes.

135 Deputy Bury.

[Amendment 1](#)

*1. In proposition 3 to substitute the figures £6,000 and £12,000 for the figures £7,500 and £15,000 respectively.*

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

140 Sir, as with Deputy de Sausmarez's amendment yesterday, as you said originally, this was to be proposed by Deputy Roffey and seconded by myself. However, in Deputy Roffey's absence, I was very happy to step up to proposer and am grateful to Deputy Gabriel for seconding. I knew he would be happy to, having shown interest when there were first discussions of these amendments.

Like Deputy de Sausmarez did yesterday, I have tried to stay true to Deputy Roffey's thinking, but inevitably, being the seconder originally, I have my own thoughts to include also. So this speech is a bit of a merging of both of our thoughts.

145 So to be clear, this amendment applies to Proposition 3 of the policy letter and the expenditure limits allowed by both individual candidates and political parties. In putting forward this amendment, we were aware that how much candidates should be allowed to spend to promote themselves at election time is quite a subjective question. At an even more basic level, what constitutes 'a lot' or 'too much' is also subjective. Each person will have a different view, which will not doubt be based on their own financial situation and disposable income.



Informing his subjective opinion, Deputy Roffey believes that there are two competing key factors, both of which are similar to points raised at paragraph 5.4 of the policy letter. Firstly, it has to be high enough to allow candidates to effectively get their message out there. Secondly, it should be as low as possible while being consistent with the first requirement in order to try and level the playing field. And I agree with him. This second point, I believe, is particularly pertinent, as I think it would be really unfortunate if those candidates with deeper pockets were able to benefit from higher levels of promotional spending than others.

Now, I know SACC have suggested to us in the policy letter that this is not really a concern, because many of us won seats at the last election, despite spending a fraction of the maximum sum permitted. But that brought me to an entirely different conclusion than they reached. I read those stats the other way round. I read them as saying that the limit can clearly be set lower than where it was last time and still allow candidates to successfully engage with voters.

And to my mind, one of the most important effects of keeping the limit at a lower figure is not scaring those with a small budget off of entering the race. And while the stats do show the full spending is not necessary, how many people will actually know that. Some of this is about perception. Who wants to enter a fight that does not look like a fair one? You do not see lightweight boxers jumping in the ring with a heavyweight, do you? No. Because they know it would be a losing game.

Seven and a half thousand pounds is a lot of money to a lot of people. For most of us in here, it is two months' gross salary. And we are, pretty much, the average median salary of Guernsey, meaning that there are plenty of people in our community earning much, much less than we are. And we are in a cost-of-living crisis. People are struggling with ridiculously high rents, mortgage interest, food costs. We have increasing reliance on the Food Bank and third sector support. And here SACC are suggesting that more than two months of the average salary is a reasonable amount to be splashing out on flags and banners. Quite frankly, sir, I think it is a bit distasteful and looks very out of touch with what is going on in the real world.

Put simply, I am afraid that I just do not buy the argument that the individual limit needs to go up from £6,000 to £7,500. And SACC's own statistics support that. As I said earlier, barely any of the candidates spent that amount in 2020. And, more importantly, 70% of the successful candidates spent less than half that amount. So, arguably, the limit could be considerably less. But taking the point in the policy letter regarding the suggested extended regulation period, we thought it would be pushing it to try to reduce the limit in cash terms from where it was at the last election. So instead, the suggestion is to simply freeze the individual limit at £6,000, which, if taking the points together, that very few candidates spent that much and an inflation uplift is required, then the £6,000 essentially has the headroom for the inflation uplift already built into it.

The limit for spending by political parties will go up under this amendment, but by less than SACC suggests. What we have done is follow the SACC formula of saying up to 50% of four party members' limits can be transferred to their central campaign. But instead of four times £3,750, it is four times £3,000 to align with the suggested change to the individual limit.

I have tried to keep it relatively brief. I do not know if I have succeeded. But as I said, it is very subjective. So I will wrap up here. I look forward to listening to you and responding to debate.

Thank you, sir.

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

**Deputy Gabriel:** Yes, I do, sir.

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

Deputy Le Tocq, is it your wish to be relevéd?

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

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Aldwell.

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

I wanted to speak on this amendment and will stray into general debate, if you will allow me. I will only be three or four minutes and consequently I shall not speak in general debate.

I was flabbergasted that SACC had put forward an increase of candidates' expenditure limit of £7,500, and up to £15,000 for political parties, when I believe most candidates spent in the region of £1,500 which is still a great deal of money.

And I wondered what would the electorate think of a candidate who spent £7,500 to try and get elected? The message, what would it send out? It is certainly not frugal. I, like several other candidates, only spent £500, or just over; with manifesto leaflets and a photograph – I did not have the photograph portfolio which was commonplace in 2020; and sponsored Facebooks; a couple of banners and also contributed to two hustings of £100 each. Personally, I think even £6,000 sends out the wrong message and is too high. But it was agreed last term and so I shall be supporting this amendment for those who feel they need to splash the cash to succeed.

The policy letter removes the £500 grant and there is a call to reinstate the grant for candidates. And sir, I have thought long and hard about this, and I have come to this conclusion. Candidates wishing to stand need to understand this is a serious role. Standing should not be taken lightly. The role needs to be researched and it needs to be understood. We are given confidential, privileged information. We are asked to make difficult decisions. Candidates need to be organised. Time has to be allocated for Committee work, understanding mandates, possibly Subcommittee work, presentations. There will be mornings and evening events, replying to emails, researching speeches and reading Billets. Digesting hundreds of pages of legislation which go through this Assembly, this fills weekends and, on many occasions, family time. It is a fascinating role and what might not be understood is that it is normally the Presidents of Committee who have a higher profile as they speak in the media, on behalf of their Committee. Or those Deputies who continuously ask Rule 11 and Rule 14 questions. A new Deputy may not always be in the media, but candidates will need to understand, they will need to get comfortable with being uncomfortable.

And so I would hope if someone is serious and is going to give the time commitment needed to the role and have really thought it through, I should hope they can raise £500 to stand. Because as we know, the Government is already covering a manifesto booklet. The opportunity to put out a video, manifesto website plus Meet the Candidates events which is far more than when the election was parish or district based.

Five hundred pounds of taxpayers' money does not sound like much to help one candidate to put his face on or her face on posters all over the Island. But if 100 candidates stand and claim £500, that adds up to £50,000, the cost of a teacher or a nurse for a year. And with all Committees looking at budgets, I know where I would rather spend the funds.

Coming to a close, June 2025 will be upon us before we know it. Time marches on and I hope we have many new candidates thinking about putting their names forward. I hope they spend the time researching what each Committee mandate covers, and come along to the States' Meetings, and engage with different Deputies whose journeys and knowledge will be all be very different. With a week of celebrations for the 80th Liberation next year and the 9th falling on a Friday, candidates will have to be organised for Monday 12th. And when nominations open and close on Wednesday 14th. And of course, I hope we have more women standing. They bring a powerful contribution; they give another dimension in conversation around the table.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

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

I have quite a lot of common ground with what Deputy Aldwell said in a well thought through speech. Certainly, she is right. And I sometimes think SACC have underplayed this. That becoming

a Deputy is more onerous than many people imagine. You can meet people in the pub or the street who say, 'I could do the job better'. But the truth is there are a lot of downsides from being in the public eye all the time, to perhaps taking the blame for operational issues, someone could have been more overseeing, or whatever.

260 And there is, as Deputy Aldwell says, all of the misunderstandings, perhaps, that Committee meetings have an equal voice and role, or near equal role, in working hard on Committees, reading legislation and policy. And all of that is very true. It is also true, the good candidates, like Deputy Aldwell and others I could think of, could get in with very low expenditure or relatively low expenditure. But I am not going to talk about the expenditure for candidates now because we are  
265 focused on this amendment, specifically.

I must admit, though, I do take a different view. I am actually on the side of SACC here, which I happily sat on for four years. I might not be on some of the other Propositions. But on this, because we had an exceptionally high turnout at the last election; 80% of those on the electoral roll which contrasted with our friends in Jersey who got about 42%. And sometimes our turnouts have been  
270 more in the 40%, 50%, 60%, certainly in the more built-up parishes. And maybe the high turnout was partially due to the work SACC did in getting messages of candidates out there and the expenditure. But also the expenditure of the time in relation to candidates efforts.

I suppose, deep down, I would not want to have an expenditure limit at all, or at least quite a high one. I am in that sense, in a little bit of a libertarian camp, because I have looked across ... The  
275 UK have weird rules where if you live in a town, the amount is less than if you live in a larger country area, they have borough rates and district rates. But their rates are curious because although they are rigidly enforced, sometimes with threats to deselect MPs, like a Member for Newark a generation ago, the parties can spend what they like overall the country. And we are just about to see that again.

280 But what has always concerned me is the Guernsey and Jersey traditional Channel Island electoral conversation has been quite restricted. In Guernsey we are not allowed to put posters on roads unless it is on private land. In Jersey they are. And one looks at the situation that the media in Guernsey tend to take a view once an election is called all, or nearly all, publicity of potential candidates is banned. Now in the UK, when an election is called, you have got night and day  
285 coverage of all the parties. But because we have maybe 119 parties, or whatever, then nobody gets enrolled ...

So my point is, in order to maximise turnout which disappointingly used to be quite low in Guernsey, it is very low for Douzaine elections. I think election expenditure plays a role in animating people to know there is an election going on. And I think candidates and parties need resources  
290 relevant to today's inflation, so it should go up from what it was last time to meet the future.

I still believe that parties may be the future for Guernsey. We go on and on about our Machinery of Government which is tinkering with different ways Committees are elected or Committees are structured. But if you had real parties where people were elected accountably on a manifesto that was supported by Members and reflected real, I will not say ideological differences, but differences  
295 of approach to public expenditure, differences of approach to environmental policy, public health, who knows what, I think that would be helpful.

So I think we should not stifle the potential for parties or groups, even if I was not necessarily a part of any of them. And we have to, therefore, be realistic that we do need a degree of expenditure. Candidates, by the very nature of it, are a bit lastminute.com And I heard recently a commercial  
300 organisation, in terms of media placement of advertising, had a deal that they would work on an annual basis, say, rather than on a spot a la carte basis. But candidates often have to make very quick orders for manifestos, envelopes, advertisements, media adverts, blah, blah, blah. And they end up paying, usually, a bit of a non-commercial price. And so that is another factor.

Another point is, if you are looking at levelling up opportunities for candidates – and we will  
305 come to the other amendment later – but I think candidates might be sponsored. There might be, for the sake of argument, gender organisations or disability organisations or environmental

organisations who might want to sponsor candidates, not just necessarily those with deep pockets. And they should be given a chance because they may have raised funds.

I believe, to answer one of Deputy Aldwell's points – and Deputy Meerveld and Deputy St Pier can confirm this – that there will be a legal demand for all candidates after the election to publish their electoral expenditure, so that people will be able to see the more profligate candidates or whatever. I was probably one of the more profligate candidates. But I knew from anecdotal evidence that some of the more higher spending candidates did not make it in the election. And others who had spent very little, maybe within the £500, did. So it is not based on that.

But I would also argue, though, that some candidates start off with a stronger advantage than others. Let me just give a few examples. Arguably, incumbents do, because they are better known. Perhaps it is actually a disadvantage to be an incumbent, though, because people are fed up with those who are in politics. But I would also suggest that celebrity candidates who might be well-known for their excellence in charities or sports or arts or law or professions, have an obvious advantage because people instantly recognise the name and identify with that person. And therefore, they do not, and often do not, spend very much because the calibre of their candidature stands out for itself.

And other candidates who are less well-known to the public, who might be new to the Island or are quite newish to the Island or have led a quiet life but need the opportunity in a campaign to give their message clarity. And one of the problems of the last campaign was with 118-119 candidates, you could easily get lost in the middle. And I think some good candidates did get lost in the fray. And without a parochial electorate, that is another factor. Why some, in the old days, a candidate who was really well-known on Douzaines or as a parish Constable, or with a long-term residence or commitment to a part of the Island, would have an advantage to get in a district. Island-wide, even a person in St Peter Port who polled 3,000 votes, which only happened once in 1970. They would not actually get anywhere near getting in because they need Island-wide support.

So I think, for a lot of reasons, we need to move with the times and come up with a fair compromise between unlimited expenditure and realistic expenditure, because media spend, new technology does not come cheap. So for those reasons, I will support the Propositions within the SACC policy letter because I think they actually look to the future rather than focusing on what has been the case, because as you know, we have all changed our electoral system anyway.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Falla.

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

In a sense, sir, we are all experts on this topic because we actually made our way here by one way or another. And we all have our own stories to tell in terms of what our budget was and the methodology we used to get elected. And the truth is, as we have heard, that actually only 30% of those of us who are here spent anywhere near up to the top level of budget that was applied last time.

I refer, sir, to Wanamaker's Dilemma, which is, 'Half the money I spend on advertising is wasted but the trouble is, I do not know which half.' And I think, for some, I heard anecdotally there was some of that. It is just like, throw money everywhere and hope some of it sticks and it assists with the election campaign.

Personally, sir, I would have supported a move to reduce the budget further, possibly to somewhere around £2,000. Because I think that it does raise an issue around the real drive for an individual to want to enter public service. Should it be through good motives and through demonstrating one's ability to serve the public in this very important role as a representative? Or should it be like a wealthy F1 driver who pays to play alongside others who have spent years honing their skills right up from sort of go-karting, from ordinary families and then getting sponsorship and beg, borrowing and stealing to make their way in the sport?

Canvassing, in reality, starts way before the nomination period opens, way before any marketing spend occurs. And really, I think that that is the truth of it. If somebody is intent on taking this

360 worthy position as a representative, they will be thinking about that for some years, possibly in advance of an election, not just having a big spend at the last-minute in what is effectively a high stakes gamble to obtain a seat in the Assembly.

So, sir, I will be supporting the amendment. I would have wished it would have taken the level of expenditure even lower. But as it is, I will vote for it.

Thank you.

365 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gabriel.

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

I will be relatively brief. But in my view, capping political election candidate's expenses is very 370 important for a number of reasons and I will build on those.

Number one, it creates a level playing field. It ensures the financial Davids can compete with the financial Goliaths, or against them, and that all candidates have got a fair chance, regardless of their resources available to them. And the danger is that wealthier candidates could, potentially, drown out the competition by outspending them on advertising, campaigning. Despite what we have 375 heard Deputy Gollop tell us, there is still an avenue available for advertising and campaigning rather than your face fitting.

And we have already heard – and section 5.6 covers it quite nicely in the policy letter – that no more than 50% of the candidates spent up to the £6,000 limit. And again, section 5.7 goes on that even 10 successful candidates with the lowest expenditure only spent between £285 and £1,034. So 380 again, pointing to Deputy Falla's point that £2,000 could be adequate. But we are talking about £6,000. And in my view, £6,000 is adequate.

We should still be having safeguards. And in my opinion, that safeguard should be a cap of £6,000 and following the ratio in the policy letter, £12,000 for parties. Because caps can help prevent corruption and undue influence from wealthy donors or special interest groups who might try to 385 buy influence by funding a candidate or even a party's campaign excessively.

So I touched on it earlier. We should be promoting democracy by limiting campaign spending, and the focus can shift more towards and should definitely shift towards candidates, policies, experience and the key message, rather than just, 'He who shouts loudest' and has the most money to spend on advertising. And again, capping expenses increases transparency and accountability in 390 the political process, fostering trust amongst the electorate, that elections are fair and not simply bought by the highest bidder.

So in my view, sir, overall expense caps are a crucial aspect of maintaining the integrity and fairness of political elections and they should be capped at a reasonable rate. And I believe that the reduction, down from £7,500 and £15,000 to £6,000 and £12,000 is reasonable and I ask Members 395 to support the amendment.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Helyar.

400 **Deputy Helyar:** Yes, sir.

I also support the amendment. But contrary to some of the comments made by non-States' Members on certain Committees, I was not one of the high spenders and neither was the party that I was a Member of at the time.

I would, like Deputy Falla, to support the numbers being reduced further. And I would certainly 405 have supported something that put it at around £2,000 or even lower. Perhaps a mechanism, thinking about this going forwards, would be to take the median spend of the previous election and add, perhaps, whatever the interest rates have been in the intervening period as the cap for the next election and then it will continue to be capped into the future.

But I commend the amendment and hope the Assembly supports it.

410 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Mahoney.

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

415 Likewise, I will be supporting the amendment and it sounds like we should have brought some amendment to bring it down, in fact, which I did not think would find favour – to actually reduce it. And I suspect others are thinking the same.

I think Deputy Bury spoke very well. I support everything she said. And I really like the analogy from Deputy Falla; the racing driver buying his seat in a team. It would be a real shame if Guernsey goes down the route that you can buy your seats on these benches just by spending whatever you need. I think it was Deputy Gollop, I may be speaking out of turn, that said, he might support unlimited payments. I will give way if he wants to correct that. You did say it. Thank you.

**Deputy Gollop:** I said do it [inaudible]

425 **Deputy Mahoney:** Yeah, okay. I would counter that by saying, surely that would actually put off some candidates saying, 'I cannot compete with that. If everyone is allowed to spend whatever they want, I cannot compete with that. In which case, I will not even bother putting my name on the paper in the first place.' So I think that would be a dreadful idea.

I am somewhat bemused that at section 5.7 in the policy letter SACC, themselves, in the last sentence and a half, say, 'It was not necessary to spend anything close to £6,000 in order to be successful'. And then recommended it goes up to £7,500. So that, perhaps when whoever is summing up, sums up, they could give the Assembly some sort of guide on where the logic in that was.

430 So I certainly wonder, going back to the, 'Can you buy yourself a seat?' I can see an argument that perhaps some who are here were just in when the votes were counted are only elected because they were able to spend up to the £6,000 limit. And those that came below 38, maybe one unsuccessful, because if they had been able to spend £6,000, perhaps they would have been able to have a few more ads, a few more billboards with their face splattered around. So I think that is a concern that we should all have.

440 Also perhaps some clarity from someone. Last term, it was £6,000 per individual with a £9,000 party limit. So a 50% uplift on the individual limit. And now, for some reason, that is 100% uplift on an increased spend as well. So if someone, there must have been a reason behind that. So if perhaps Deputy Meerveld or whoever is summing up can say why it was felt necessary to suddenly increase the party spend because that went really well, didn't it, for everybody. They really worked out well. 445 So if he could give some clarity on that, then I think that would be certainly useful for me and, I suspect, others in the Assembly.

So I will be supporting it and I commend Deputy Bury for bringing it.

Thank you, sir.

450 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

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

Despite being a Member of the Committee, I was not actually intending to speak, but I would just like to pick up on a few points that have been made.

455 Firstly, I do not support any increase in the spending limit. And clearly what is in the policy letter is not any increase in the spending limit in real terms, which is actually what matters. So I just think we need to not be framing this as an increase from last time. It is the *status quo*, allowing for the significant period of inflation in the intervening years.

There seems to be a wide extreme on this. I certainly do not support Deputy Gollop's position. I think that would be extremely damaging, but I do not think there is any likelihood of that ever becoming a reality, so we do not need to worry about it too much.

But I think the reason that I support keeping the limit where it was in real terms has got a lot to do with the work that the Scrutiny Management Committee did on the election and what we found, in particular, from the survey which was widely supported and responded to by the public. And for me, one of the most surprising findings of that survey was that members of the public said they did not feel they had enough information on candidates. And the source that they wanted to use as that source of information was the manifesto booklet. I think that was the top resource used by people, by a long shot. And you can understand that, or we can understand that, insofar as, visiting 119 individual candidate websites is probably not a task anybody but the most ardent political watcher even dreamed of undertaking. So, having a manifesto booklet on your kitchen table, flicking through it, putting 'yes', 'no', 'maybe', on each manifesto as you go through over a period of a week or two, maybe, was what most people chose to do.

Now, one of the recommendations of the Scrutiny Management Committee was to give candidates the option, not the compulsion, but the option of having up to four pages in that booklet instead of two. And on the surface of it, this was a really surprising finding for me because it was a big enough document. It was quite remarkable that in every single age group we sampled and adjusted for demographics and everything, people wanted more information in the manifesto booklet in the order of about 70% of respondents across all age groups. And I think that was because for a lot of people, that was the only source they used.

So we had this discussion at SACC as to whether we were going to increase this. And in the end, we had to agree not to, simply because the timescales that had already been established on this election, the firm advice we were getting from the people who had to deal with putting that information out was that they could not do it. And there were points that could have still been argued, but at the end of the day, SACC is not going to come to a decision saying that that must be made available only to find that it becomes a real stumbling block and members of the public do not receive their manifesto booklets. So that did not go forward.

The key about the election is people being able to make an informed decision, having sufficient information readily available to them that they are prepared to look at in order to choose the right candidates. And two pages in a large font, and it necessarily has to be a large font for accessibility in the manifesto booklet, with possibly half of that space, if not a little bit more in some cases, taken up with photographs, does not leave a great deal of space for you to tell people about yourself.

So in the absence of being able to provide what a majority of the public said they wanted, keeping the candidate limit where it is does give individual candidates, and I accept it is on an affordability basis, but it does give individual candidates the opportunity to contact each household on the Electoral Register, should they so wish, and get more information out about themselves. Now I realise not many people will want to take that up. Even people who could afford to do it would not either. But that, for me, is about having an information that cannot be classified as a low information election, where people can make more informed decisions and choose people who they think are right to lead this Island for the next four years. So that is the reason that I will be voting with the Committee and against this amendment to keep the limit the same as it was at the last election.

Just one final point before I sit down, which is a lot of people have made something of the fact that you only need to spend £385 or whatever it was to get elected, but what is being ignored is there are clearly people in our community, some who have been Deputies before and some who have not, who would be able to actually spend zero and possibly also go on holiday for the four weeks of the campaign period and still be elected. So I think just making some kind of sweeping statement about how much money you need to be elected ignores an awful lot of other factors, and is not really a sound argument in this case.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Leadbeater.

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

It is interesting that most of the speeches so far have been in support of the amendment, but would like it to go further and reduce, because that is the camp that I am in as well. And I am feeling now that I should have maybe spoken to a few other Members and brought an amendment to reduce it. I am the skinflint that spent 285 quid, by the way, (*Laughter*) in the last election!

Interesting, though, the reason I decided that I did not need to print manifestos etc., is because the goalposts had moved since the 2016 parish elections, where you physically had to have your own manifesto, you had to get it printed, you had to go out to the electorate and either post them to their houses, because you had no central booklet like we have now. And I think that is where the goalpost has shifted. And that is why we do not need to spend all of this money.

And the point that Deputy Burford just made, that everybody should have the ability to be able to spend a bit more to go out and give more information to people. But that is only if you have £7,500 or whatever it may take to be able to achieve that. There are some people that ... Certainly, I could not afford to spend £7,500 to go out on the campaign and I think there are many other people in the same situation as me.

So I think increasing it, I understand the point about inflation, etc. and the real terms, it has not really moved since last time, but I do not think that the optics are that good. I really do not. And I am going to support the amendment. I think it is going to fly through, I really do. And it is unfortunate that I did not pull my finger out previously and try to reduce it even more.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

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

I was intending to speak rather more fulsomely on this, but given the tenor of debate, I will keep my comments quite brief. I believe there is an amendment being drafted now to reduce the limit for those that are taken by that option.

But for the purposes of this amendment, which is really what we need to speak on, to pick up from, I think, Deputy Burford's points were of course very reasonable and valid. However, if the core issue that this expenditure limit is trying to address is that the electorate want more information about all the candidates, then I would put the emphasis on *all*. I totally understand SACC's reasons for not doing that, but I think the onus does lie on that being provided through an even playing field. I do not think it is right or acceptable to give some people a potentially very significant advantage over other candidates just because they have more means at their disposal.

Also it just sits really uncomfortably with me, we had in the region of 120 candidates last time and, had the majority of those candidates ... The idea behind the limit is, essentially, it is printing expenses because other things do not cost as much. If even the majority of candidates had chosen to go down that route, we would just be dealing with so much paper. I just think it would turn into complete spam.

So either you have got a majority of people accessing that and doing that, which I think has got problems all of its own, or you only have a few, which has different problems because it is an unfair advantage, which does, at the end of the day, boil down to people's means. And I just do not think anyone should be given an advantage over other candidates just because they have got more money at their disposal. I am really reticent to take a leaf out of American politics books where there is no expenditure limit and you can see where that one ends.

So yes, in brief, I will wholeheartedly support this amendment and probably the next one as well.

**Deputy Haskins:** Sir, in light of the amendment being drafted, can I call a Rule 26(1), please?

**The Bailiff:** Will those Members who wish to speak in debate on this Amendment 1, please stand in their places. There are some behind you, Deputy Haskins, as well but do you still wish me to put a motion pursuant to Rule 26(1)?



**Deputy Haskins:** Please, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Okay. The motion, Members of the States, is that debate on this amendment should be curtailed subject to hearing from the President and the proposer in reply. Those in favour; those  
570 against?

*Members voted Contre.*

**The Bailiff:** I will declare that lost.  
575 Deputy Brouard.

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

I am in two minds of how I am going to vote on this, but I think the points made by Deputy  
Burford, were very relevant. You either have to do the *quid pro quo*. You cannot have both. If we  
580 want to have candidates who can contact all the electorate, they must be able to be able to do so.

Now, not everybody wishes to be in the book and the book is not everybody's *panacea*, but I  
think we lose something where we make it unable for a candidate to post, print and deliver to all  
Island homes or all Island electorate, their manifesto. So you are then channelled into the booklet.  
Your position in that booklet will be probably determined by your name. And then you are restricted  
585 as to how you can format it. You are restricted as to the typeface from the point of view of size and  
you are also restricted from the point of view of two A4 sheets of paper, which is quite small. By the  
time you have got your photograph in which most people want a picture of the family dog.  
(*Laughter*) There is not very much left over, as Deputy Burford explained, to get your message  
across.

590 So I think if you are going to reduce the ability or, not reduce, prevent candidates from delivering  
a manifesto to every household, then you have got to do the other side of the argument and give  
at least four sides of A4 in the booklet. And I cannot see how that is going to be difficult to print  
four sheets as opposed to two sheets.

I will give way to Deputy Burford.

595 **Deputy Burford:** Thank you.

It is not actually the printing. We were advised, and I think some of this made it into a report in  
*The Bailywick Express*, as of course, our SACC meetings are open to the media. We were advised that  
the time was in the typesetting, because the States and the typesetter were very keen to have a  
600 professional-looking document. And some of the submissions they received, we were given to  
understand that they received 15 handwritten submissions which they then felt obliged – and the  
decision was made, and I am not sure I can go with the decision – that they had to typeset and typo  
check and everything and make as presentable as any other submission; which again, I think is  
problematic because it is preventing the electorate from seeing the candidate as they present  
605 themselves, having gone through an 'airbrushing process'.

So the time was involved very much in going back and forth up to eight or nine times per  
candidate with some of the candidates in order to get their submissions correct. And that was why  
they were proposing, I think, an increase from nine days to 16 days for that period. And as the  
timescales on this election are so tight I actually think we should have considered looking at  
610 changing the date of the last States' Meeting to give a little bit more slack in the system, but that  
had passed.

Those are the reasons. So hopefully that helps Deputy Brouard enough.

**Deputy Brouard:** No, thank you, that does.

615 But with today's modern technology, if someone puts a manifesto in and it is in a handwritten  
one, I can take a photocopy in a couple of seconds and it is printed. So that is what I would do. So  
there is no problem there. And if candidates do not get their act together in time then I have,

probably, little sympathy because you are probably going to know that you are going to be standing a year, six months, three months in advance. You can get your manifesto virtually ready well before the day. And some candidates, in fact, either did not choose not to put into the booklet or just missed it by their own thing.

So I think if you are going to restrict candidates from the ability to be able to send their own manifesto out to every household, then I think you then need to reflect in the booklet that you give them enough space to be able to get their message across. Because then the only people that can deliver an Island-wide mandate or a manifesto will be those who are in a party, because that is where you then can access the larger funding. So you are then almost forced into a party of two of you or three of you, just to be able to put your manifesto out.

So I think I am going to stick with the Committee's original position. I hear the idea of levelling up, that we want everybody to have exactly the same position, but I think if we do so we need to be a little bit fairer to candidates and widen the space to four sides. And I appreciate that SACC will be coming back with another policy letter on this topic before the ... which is, I think they are going to be coming back with regard to criminal convictions, etc. So I would urge them to just reconsider, for those candidates who want to, not for everybody, but just those who want to, to have at least four sheets in the paper. If you are going to start to reduce the ability for candidates to actually contact the electorate.

If the Chairman of SACC can give us some indication of what the cost is to deliver to all Island homes by post, print a manifesto, that would be helpful, because that gives some idea of the cost that you will need. So I would be reluctant to take that away from Islanders. You are literally then channelled into the corporation's book. I am happy to be in it myself, but I do not think we should be restricting everybody into that. Or if we do, please make sure that they have enough space so that they can send their message. But I appreciate the argument from Deputy Bury.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Matthews.

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

I will try and be brief because I think it is fairly apparent that an awful lot of the Assembly will support the amendment, as will I. And I thank Deputy Bury for bringing it in Deputy Roffey's absence.

As Deputy Falla mentioned and Deputy Helyar also supported. I would actually support a further reduction. I would be interested to know what the minimum level would be in order to basically just do a manifesto print. Because that is all I think that you could really justify, because six or seven ...

Sir, I will give way to Deputy Meerveld.

**Deputy Meerveld:** I thank Deputy Matthews for giving way.

As it has been raised by the last two speakers, I will just mention that the rough numbers were done when this was debated previously before the 2020 Election. And to print and post a manifesto to all the households on the electoral roll was about £4,000 then. So if you use inflation, that would be about £5,000 now.

Thank you.

**Deputy Matthews:** I thank Deputy Meerveld for that. And, of course, there are options for candidates to combine as well. But I think that the limit also allows for some quite extensive potential for people to spend money on things like advertising and things as well. And one of the things that I think is very important to try and protect about our democracy is not to let ourselves go down the line that some other jurisdictions have gone down. The USA, as Deputy de Sausmarez mentioned, is a very good example where spending is everything. And one of the issues with that is it means that the very wealthy have much more access to become candidates than ordinary people. But also that people become beholden to donors and sponsors. And that is one of the

670 things I think we ought to really be guarding against. And that is what the cap should really be there to try and do, is to try and make sure that we are not creating a situation where our democracy needs sponsorship from corporate interests or from wealthy interests in order to get elected.

So I will support this amendment, and I will be very interested in any subsequent amendments that would look at reducing it further.

675 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Moakes.

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

680 Given the issues that the Island faces today, I am actually quite surprised that anyone has spent time looking at and then justifying an increase in the expenditure allowance. I am not sure how much consultation the Committee has done, but it does not appear to have much support in this Chamber. Very few candidates spent the full allowance at the last election, so why raise it now? It should probably go down, as many people have already said. It sends out completely the wrong message to the electorate.

685 I will not be supporting increasing expenditure for candidates or parties. Remember, this is on top of the support that the States provides. I ask Members to support this amendment.

Thank you.

690 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

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

I appreciate Deputy Burford's contribution in terms of explaining the reasons the Committee have come up with the solution they have. And I take on board the explaining why it is really just an increase in real terms. But it is 25% at the end of the day. And I have to think, is it necessary, in the modern world that we live in at the moment, that it is to be able to pay for people to be able to put lots more paper, as Deputy de Sausmarez referenced, through people's letter boxes. I am quite happy with that real terms cut.

700 And I thought it was interesting. There is a bit of a conflict between what Deputy Burford was saying in terms of needing to be able to have that extra money for candidates, if they can afford it, of course, and then Deputy St Pier, in his opening speech, saying about, well we think that enough is provided that candidates can get their messages across through the candidate booklet. So it is either the candidate booklet ... Now that justified why they did not need to provide candidates with the £500, which I agree with, by the way. But I just think there is a conflict between the two, saying 705 on the one hand the booklets are enough and on the other hand, candidates should be able to post everything to every person through their letterbox.

And I just think it is not a level playing field. Deputy Burford did talk about if they can afford it, of course. But £6,000 is a hell of a lot to be spending in just over a month, let alone £7,500. Even when we know that there has not been in real terms the same increase in wages over the same period as cost. So I do have an issue on that.

710 But my final point in relation to that is in terms of political parties and something I might, I think, bring up in general debate. But this really is going to be of more advantage, I think, to political parties than anybody else. As we know, most people are not going to spend £6,000. Those who want to make a concerted effort and can afford it might spend that amount of money, but the vast majority will not go anywhere near that. But political parties will have the benefit of being able to pull resources and donations directly to political parties and that which under our current rules can collect outside of the general election period without any problem at all and without any controls at all. And so, I do have real issues from the political party point of view.

715 So I am going to question whether I am happy how far we cut it. If an amendment comes along, I think there has to be balance somewhere. But I certainly do support the amendment by Deputy Bury. And I really appreciate her opening speech as well. I thought it really got the message across.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

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

725 I was a member of the previous SACC that was responsible for the arrangements for the Election  
in 2020, despite the fact that I did not really want to be on it. And in fact, I voted against myself. But  
I was unsuccessful in that regard. I did not want to be on it, because I did not really want Island-  
wide voting to work. Unfortunately, we were very successful in making it work in terms of the  
turnout, and it is here to stay, so I accept that. I am a democrat. However, I do think that whilst I  
730 accept Deputy Burford's argument that all that has happened is that the figures have gone up in  
real terms, I do think the figures were too high to begin with, really. There was not a lot of science  
behind it. I know that. I was on the Committee.

And it was more than a finger in the air, but it was not a lot more than that. And therefore, I think  
spending a lot of time trying to work out what will be right for the next election is probably not a  
735 wise thing to do. So I do not think I will support anything, but I will support this amendment because  
it just keeps it the same actual level. And I think we should do that for at least another election, until  
we decide if there are any changes that need to happen more regularly, because it was a bit of an  
odd ... it was the first time that we had an Island-wide election. It was during a difficult time in terms  
of the pandemic and all of that. And so I prefer to keep things roughly the same at the moment.  
740 And then, in due course, the next SACC perhaps could look at it again.

**The Bailiff:** I am going to invite Deputy Meerveld as the President of the States' Assembly &  
Constitution Committee to speak to Amendment 1, please.

745 **Deputy Meerveld:** Thank you, sir.

I want to start off by thanking my able Vice-President for introducing the policy letter and  
inviting him to carry on responding if he wishes. But going to the actual response, Deputy Bury will  
not remember – well, she was not a Member last term – when we had the debate over where to set  
the limits for Island-wide voting. It was a very long and tortuous debate where we went into all  
750 kinds of details. And Deputy Le Tocq is, too, correct in saying, to some extent, it was a guesstimate  
of where the maximum cost should be. And there was never ever any suggestion and I do not think  
there will ever be a suggestion of having no spending limits in Guernsey at all. So we are always  
going to be preventing the uber rich from buying a position in this Assembly through weight of  
funds.

755 The original limit was designed, and the discussion was around, whether or not this Assembly  
should actively preclude candidates from pursuing the campaign they wish to have. Deputy de  
Sausmarez and Deputy Soulsby have expressed their concerns about printed paper. But the fact is  
at the last election some people did invest in an Island wide maildrop. And it was their choice on  
how to spend that money. Now that was around a £4,000 cost. Just factoring inflation in, that would  
760 be now about £5,250. That would leave you with enough for, at the last election without inflation,  
one newspaper ad in *The Guernsey Press*. *The Guernsey Press* was, for a colour page run of paper,  
so a random page in the paper, £998 at the last election. A thousand pounds.

Some people will want to put in ads in the newspaper, as they did at the last election, at £1,000  
each. So when Deputy Matthews, I think it was, suggested £2,000 limit, you would have two ads and  
765 no printed materials, no posters, no nothing.

So whilst we say it is a lot of money, and agreed, for a lot of people in this Island it is a lot of  
money, for those who wish to approach the electorate through more traditional means of postage  
and printed adverts, there has to be a level of amount of money that enables them to afford that.  
And again, people have said it is ridiculous that SACC, or have criticised SACC, for increasing the  
770 allowance. We have not. We have simply adjusted for inflation. We have maintained, in real terms,  
the exact cost from the last election, brought forward, and simply rounded up.

So there is no effective increase. You are allowed to buy exactly what you were able to buy at  
the last election. And this Assembly has been very vocal in criticising some of our charges for things

like mooring fees, most recently, because they were not increased with inflation over time. And yet we are now turning around and saying, arbitrarily, we will ignore inflation going forwards.

Deputy Soulsby bemoans the size of the increase, but that has been the inflation during the time period. So what this Assembly would do if they support this amendment is effectively saying we are reducing the limit. Now, that is a decision we can, as an Assembly, make. But it will start precluding people's choices. You will start saying to people, you cannot use an Island wide maildrop because you simply cannot do it within the budget. And is that a precedent –

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

**Deputy Meerveld:** – you want to set?

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

**Deputy Mahoney:** I think it is somewhat disingenuous to say that there will be nothing through everybody's letterbox, when in fact, of course, the booklet that is prepared, that is every candidate having the opportunity to put something on every single person's doormat. So to say, we would preclude people from being able to mailshot, or whatever name you want to give to it, is simply not correct. The booklet does exactly that.

**The Bailiff:** I am not persuaded that that was a valid point of correction, bearing in mind what Deputy Meerveld was actually explaining in what he was saying. So Deputy Meerveld to continue, please.

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

I think as several Members have alluded to, one of the difficulties in an election, Island wide, certainly with the number of candidates we had last time, is how do you differentiate yourself? How does each individual raise their profile versus the rest of the candidates and attract the attention of the electorate? And as I say, some people will want to use the traditional means, and those are more expensive than social media. Some of our older candidates may not be on social media. As Deputy Burford pointed out, the agent who did the printing of the booklet said that 15 of our submissions for the booklet were handwritten.

Now, there is an argument that actually we are providing too good a service there, in that, there was a discussion at SACC's table whether we should just photocopy whatever we are sent and produce it in a booklet. But as the agent said, you would not need somebody to do a layout, but States of Guernsey name is on the front and it would not be an easy-to-use document. We would be having complaints from the electorate, that they could not easily interpret the information on the page. But that would be a true representation of the candidates. So there are a lot of discussions around the SACC table on how to make this work. But what we have come to on this cost – and again, SACC is not going to die in a ditch over this if the Assembly wants to reduce it, that is fine. But you will be restricting the choice of some candidates on how they present themselves.

Now to go through some of the points raised by others Deputy Bury made a big play of the increase, as Deputy Aldwell did as well. It is just an inflation adjustment over a previous number. Now, if Members believe that number is too high, I believe there is an amendment coming which I am not aware of that will propose reducing it.

Deputy Mahoney – party spending. Again, we fairly, arbitrarily, decided that a party which could have 40 Members could only spend the amount of money allocated to an individual candidate multiplied by two at the last election. Some people might say, well, actually, that is not really fair to parties and inhibiting the growth of parties in Guernsey, in that you might say, well, they can allocate 50% of their expenditure, which is the case now, but only up to a maximum of two or three candidates, four candidates, a quarter of their expenses. Anyway, they can allocate expenses to the party. But we have decided to cap the limit, which effectively is limiting parties in their ability to

grow and develop in this Island. And that is a conscious decision of the States as far as I am concerned. And again, SACC is not changing anything from the previous election. We are just bringing forward exactly the same principle.

I think Deputy Leadbeater made some very interesting points which, to some extent, speak to the next amendment we will be discussing. The goalposts have moved, and I made a note, 'and we do not need to spend as much as we did previously'. That is absolutely right. And this is one of the reasons why the previous SACC Committee did not recommend the £500 grant be included at the last election, it was inserted by amendment. The States of Guernsey spent £135,000, over £1,000 per candidate, producing and distributing a booklet that gave all the manifestos consolidated in one place. So the States of Guernsey is going above and beyond compared to other jurisdictions, in helping candidates reach out and present their information.

Is it then necessary or reasonable to give additional grants of capital to individuals? And certainly, the need to spend their own money has been reduced. When they stood at parish level, it was a case of, you had no choice; if you wanted to reach out to your parochial electorate, you had to print posters, you had to do your own manifesto. There was no support given by the States, no centralised support in the form of a manifesto, booklet or videos, etc.

But as I say, now we have gone Island-wide, what it does do is, if you want to follow that traditional route of posters and of a mail drop and a page in the paper all of that has significant costs associated to it. And do we, as an Assembly, want to tell people, actually, we are going to make it so that you cannot pursue that route as an individual. You can only do it by joining a party or you are restricted to simply using the vehicles that the States have subsidised. Or going on social media, etc., which you may not be familiar with.

I think that answers all the questions that have been raised. And I encourage the Assembly to reject this amendment and to just simply stick with what we had.

I will give way to Deputy Brouard.

**Deputy Brouard:** Would the President of SACC just give a few comments about whether or not four-pages would be a possibility, and why not? Or would they at least take it away and have a think about it before the election?

Thank you.

**Deputy Meerveld:** Yes, I thank Deputy Brouard for the interjection because it has been something that was raised and was actually discussed at the last SACC meeting. We had a presentation from officers and the company who compiled the booklet last term and will be doing it again this term. And they said, basically, it would add a number of days both to the typesetting and to the printing and would delay the production and delivery of the booklet by at least 12 days. And one of the things we are trying to do this election is make sure that booklet which, as Deputy Burford has pointed out, the Scrutiny Review highlighted as the most single desired vehicle for information and get it on people's desks earlier in the election process so they have time to review it before they go to hustings before they engage with Deputies directly.

So there is a technical issue, a physical issue, in trying to deliver four pages within the timeframe. The thing we would have to consider is, potentially, just doing what I said earlier, and photocopying or, effectively, reproducing an image of an individual's manifesto, regardless of what shape or form it was in, and just publishing that in a binding. That could be done in the time limit. But then you would have a document that possibly would not be as popular with the electorate as a reference work, because it would not have a standardised format. It would not have standardised information. It would simply be a disparate bound up copy of each individual's manifestos which may or may not be appreciated by the electorate as much as the existing booklet.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** I invite the proposer of Amendment 1, Deputy Bury, to reply to the debate, please.

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

880 I do rather feel like I am pushing on an open door, which is a nice place to be in, so I will try not to take too long. But as I really appreciate Members' contributions to debate, I do want to respond to some of them.

To Deputy Aldwell, who I will come back to later in my speech, thank you for the support. I think the word was 'flabbergasted' – and I think that is an apt term – and the message about not being frugal, which I will come back to you later. And I think it is a really important one.

885 I am going to try and keep to the points that I feel are very relevant to the amendment. Deputy Gollop mentioned candidates that perhaps got lost in the middle alongside his thoughts about having no spending at all. And again, in this subjective way, I think I see that the other way round. Potentially there are candidates getting really lost in the middle and more so will if people are allowed to spend limitless amounts. Really good candidates who do not have that income at their disposal will get lost.

890 Deputy Falla, thank you for his support. And I think he was one of the first people to mention a lower limit which I believe may be on its way. I think Deputy Gabriel raised a point that not many people did, and it is mentioned in the policy letter, but about prevention of corruption and wealthier groups influencing and supporting certain candidates. Again, I think that is a really valuable point to be taken into account.

895 I thank Deputy Helyar and Deputy Mahoney for their support. Deputy Burford mentioned that SACC see this as not an increase because it is just about inflation. I accept that point to an extent but as I said in my opening, as the £6,000, originally, was clearly way higher than most people needed, essentially that inflation was already built in to that amount. So we do not need to move any further.

900 I think a few people raised the point – Deputy Burford and possibly Deputy Brouard – around the space in the manifesto booklet. And this is where I feel that SACC have tied themselves in knots a little bit – and we will hear that in the next breath, and Deputy Soulsby raised this. The arguments are being put right now that if the limit is lowered or frozen then the manifesto booklet does not allow enough space or it does not leave a lot left. But in the next breath we will be told that people do not need £500 to promote themselves further. So which one is it?

905 I also think, and I know that what was taken from the Island-wide review, was more information. That was the wording in the Island-wide review, that people fed back that more information was wanted in the manifesto booklet. But I do not think *more* information necessarily means more pages. (**A Member:** Yes.) Better quality information, fewer photos, less rambling about potentially irrelevant things. Perhaps your use of the space is reflective of how you might use your time in speeches. So it is a good indicator to the electorate.

910 And phrases used like, 'If people wish'. Well, yes, if people wish, but if people can afford as well. It is not just about wishing. If it was, this job would be a lot easier, wouldn't it?

915 I thank Deputy Leadbeater for his support. Again, Deputy de Sausmarez mentioned, and I think a really important point, if people want more information on all candidates, then it should be more information on *all* candidates.

920 Again, Deputy Brouard mentioned about the space, I think that four pages is a lot for 100-odd candidates. Two pages was a lot. And I think in the business world, when people are applying for jobs, there are some really harsh recruitment processes around the length of CVs. If it is over a couple of pages, it does not even get looked at on the pile.

925 And I think one of the points that Deputy Brouard was making, and I think Deputy Meerveld made as well, was we will be preventing people, we will be precluding people from being able to send to every single household. That seems to be the point. And well, I think, welcome to using your budget wisely and not being able to do everything that you want to do. That is the first training for the job.

I think I will move through as quickly as possible. Deputy Moakes, Deputy Le Tocq, thank you for the support. As Deputy Le Tocq said, there is potentially not much science to it in the first place. So we are in a process now that we can take learnings from the previous election and we will be

930 able to do so going forward. This is potentially one of them. The amount was not needed, generally. And so we can refine that process as we go along.

So I think that is pretty much it. But I would like to just refer back to points that Deputy Mahoney and Deputy Aldwell both made. So the line in SACC's policy letter says:

Election success was possible with minimal expenditure and it was not necessary to spend anything close to the £6,000 limit in order to be successful.

935 And I agree with Deputy Aldwell about the message it sends to the public: if you believe that you need even more than that £6,000, £7,500, then the message that they are sending to the people of Guernsey is that they do not know how to do something for a reasonable amount of money! (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) And I do not think that that is a skill that we are looking for.

Thank you, sir.

940 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, it is now time to vote on Amendment 1 which is proposed by Deputy Bury, seconded by Deputy Gabriel and will affect Proposition 3. And I will invite the Greffier to open the voting, please.

*There was a recorded vote.*

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

945 **The Bailiff:** In respect of Amendment 1, proposed by Deputy Bury and seconded by Deputy Gabriel, there voted in favour, 24 Members; 9 Members voted against; 2 Members abstained; 5 Members did not participate in the vote. And therefore, I would declare Amendment 1 carried.

And we will now move on to Amendment 2, if Deputy Queripel wishes to lay that amendment now.

950

[Amendment 2:](#)

*To delete the wording of Proposition 4 and replace with the following:*

*'To agree that the grant for candidates be continued for the 2025 General Election, to assist candidates with campaign expenses, and that the grant will include the inflationary uplift as laid out in paragraph 5.21 of the policy letter.'*

955



**Deputy Queripel:** I do, sir. Thank you.

Candidates who can well afford to spend thousands of pounds on their campaign independently of the States have an enormous advantage over candidates with limited funds. So surely it is  
960 extremely unfair to remove the grant. And I have been speaking to some Islanders who have some really good ideas about where we can make and save money. And they tell me if the grant is discontinued, then they will not be able to afford to stand in the next election. So not only will they lose out if the grant is discontinued, but so will the whole community.

And someone said to me recently – and I will not say who it was, but what I will say, it was not a  
965 Member of this Assembly – this person, who shall remain anonymous, said, ‘If a person cannot come up with a few hundred pounds to stand in an election, then they cannot have much upstairs. And that is not the kind of person I want as a Deputy’. And I was really shocked to hear that, sir. So I explained to this person that I would not have been able to afford to fund my successful campaign back in 2012 if the grant had not have been in place. I had learnt lessons from an unsuccessful  
970 campaign in 2008. And I knew exactly what I needed to do in 2012, but it was going to take more money than I could afford to spend.

And the reason I was struggling for cash at the time was because even though I ran my own successful decorating business, I had cash flow problems because not one, but two of my regular customers had lost a lot of money on their investments and could not afford to pay their bills.  
975 Consequently, along with several other traders, I was owed a lot of money, so I really needed that grant. And I have been a Deputy for 12 years now, so I must be doing something right in the eyes of Islanders who keep voting me back in, despite the fact that you are of the opinion I could not have had much upstairs because I needed the grant to help fund my campaign.

And I felt the need, sir, to expand on the point I made about new Deputies having their own ideas. So I explained that, due to my expressing a concern that far too many States’ reports and documents were printed in full colour when printing them in black and white would be far cheaper, I saved the taxpayer £80,000 in an 18-month period. And those savings continue to this day. Deputy  
980 St Pier will remember that because he is the one that reported that figure to the Assembly.

But a lot more reports and States’ documents are now printed in black and white instead of in  
985 full colour, which a lot of them were printed in full colour with a gloss finish back in 2012 when I was first elected. And at that point, the person I was talking to said, ‘Well, now you have explained all that, I can see why you want to continue with the grant’.

So the choice is quite straightforward. The question being, do colleagues want to continue with the grant or don’t they? And I guess the majority of my colleagues will be focusing on two specific  
990 points; the cost angle and the morals and principles angle. My approach, along with that of Deputy Bury’s, my seconder, is that it is well worth spending in the region of £60,000 to uphold those morals and principles. And this is all about what a person can afford to gamble, because as we all know, standing as a candidate in an election is a gamble in more ways than one. Islanders standing as a candidate put themselves at the mercy of the electorate because they have a desire to serve the  
995 community as a Deputy. They know that, should they be elected, they will be asking a lot of their partners and their family members and friends and taking an enormous risk on them all being able to cope with the lifestyle changes that will need to be made, should they be elected.

Now, of course, I realise that every candidate is in the same boat. But Islanders who need the grant will not be able to get on the boat if the grant is discontinued. And surely, we will be shooting  
1000 ourselves in the foot if the grant is discontinued because, as I said earlier, the electorate will lose out on candidates who, should they be elected, have some really good ideas they want to pursue in an attempt to benefit the whole community.

So by saving in the region of £60,000 on the grant, we risked the whole community losing out in so many areas. I ask my colleagues to bear that in mind, sir, because the money a candidate  
1005 spends on their campaign is not necessarily going to buy them a seat in the Assembly. But it buys publicity independently of the States. So the more money a candidate can afford to spend, then the more publicity they can buy. And that is a crucial point.

Deputy Meerveld, when he spoke earlier, said – I think he said, I stand to be corrected – ‘It costs £1,000 for a full-page in *the Press*, in colour.’ It does not need a full-page in colour in *the Press* to get your message across. You could have a simple black and white four-by-four with an eye catching slogan that will be just as effective as a full colour page advert; and a small black and white four-by-four with a photograph and this slogan will probably cost you about £120 – I stand to be corrected on that. But you do not need a full colour page in *the Press* costing £1,000.

And to continue with the morals and principles theme, we are being asked to agree to a grant being discontinued that was available to candidates in previous elections. Even though a manifesto booklet was published in 2020, the grant was still in place. Every single Member of this Assembly who took the grant in 2020 benefited from it. So how can it be fair to take it away from candidates in the next election?

And on the point of our being asked to single out and penalise and exclude a certain section of our community in the next election, i.e. the poorer members of our community. Surely we need to be sincere about our being inclusive and not singling out any members of our community. Thereby, excluding them from opportunities which then only become available to people who can afford them. Surely, we need to walk the walk of an inclusive society and not the walk of an exclusive society.

How often have we heard it said, ‘We are all in this together’? Well, here is an opportunity for us all to put those fine words into action. What kind of message will removing the grant send out to Islanders? To state the obvious, sir, send out the message that even though previous Assemblies, along with this Assembly, were only too willing to have a grant in place and benefit from it, the majority of this Assembly do not want candidates of the future to benefit from a grant that we all benefited from. It will send out the message, even though the majority of previous Assemblies were only too willing to see candidates become Deputies, even though they could not afford to fund their own campaigns. It would send out the message that the majority of this Assembly do not want that to happen. ‘If you cannot afford to fund your campaign, we do not want you as a Deputy,’ that is the message it will send out. Well, it is not just me saying that, it is being said by people out in our community as well.

Surely opening the door even wider to candidates who can well afford to stand whilst closing it to those who cannot, can justifiably be considered to be penalising and excluding lower earners who need the grant. We have Islanders who have the enthusiasm, the drive, the knowledge, the desire and the ideas. All they need is the grant. And if the grant is removed, then we will be putting more focus on the process and less on the people, when first and foremost an election is supposed to be all about people.

Several members of our community have told me over the years they do not want an Assembly full of finance experts and businesspeople; they want a mix. They want a mix right across the board and, in particular, in that mix, they want grassroots politicians – politicians who are prepared to help them with their day-to-day problems, politicians who know what it is like to struggle, who know what it is like to struggle to keep a roof over your head and to struggle to even get a roof over your head in the first place. They do not want every politician focusing on high level strategies.

Now they tell me that obviously they realise we do need politicians who do that; what they are saying is they do not want every politician in the Assembly to be that kind of a politician. They see the need and the value in having a mix of politicians from all walks of life in order to attain comprehensive representation in this Assembly, which is why of course they are of the view that the grant should be continued.

And of course it is extremely important, vitally important, for unknowns to publicise themselves as much as they possibly can independently of the States. And as we have heard earlier, they will need to cover as many angles as possible. Whilst doing so, they will be competing against candidates who are already well-known – Deputy Gollop focused on this when he spoke earlier – who are already household names. Members of this Assembly will be standing, sir, and they are already household names, they are already well known. Everyone knows what they are capable of. High profile businesspeople will be standing; celebrities from the world of sport and the arts could

1060 well stand; well-known leaders of local charities could well stand; journalists and radio and television presenters could well stand. (*Interjections*) High profile household names from the world of finance and the legal profession will definitely be standing because they have already told me. All manner of well-known, high profile high household names will be standing.

1065 So the candidate whose name is never in the media will really need to pull out all the stops to get their name out there. They will need to cover all the angles. So the grant will help them pay for such things as publicising themselves in *The Guernsey Press*, having posters printed to put up in strategic places around the Island. They may well want to hire premises in which they can stage their own drop-ins for the electorate to call in and ask questions of the candidates present.

1070 Deputy Gollop and Deputy Fairclough will no doubt recall I hired numerous venues back in 2020, because they joined me as candidates at those drop-ins. And of course, I realise a lot can be done for free on social media. But I am talking about totally unknown candidates needing to cover *all* of the angles here, not just social media.

1075 Sir, in his opening speech, Deputy St Pier said he had mentioned in his *Press* column, some Members of the Assembly may consider this debate to be a good opportunity to give Deputy Meerveld a good kicking. (*Interjection*) Sir, I have no intention whatsoever of giving Deputy Meerveld a good kicking, (*Laughter*) or any other Member of SACC a good kicking. Why would anyone want to do that when they are just doing their job? Now, I have the utmost respect for every single one of them, and I get on really well with every single one of them. But in my opinion, in Deputy Bury's opinion, they are looking to make savings in an area which would be detrimental to our whole community, should their Proposition succeed. And surely we should not be looking to make savings in an area where certain Islanders will be singled out, penalised and excluded anyway. Surely SACC could have come up with ideas to save money in other areas.

1080 So moving towards a close. The total spend on the 2020 Election was £877,000. And as we all know, £50,454 worth of that £877,000 was spent on the grant. And spending just over £50,000 on the grant certainly had the desired effect because we had a pretty diverse range of candidates from all walks of life in the last election. As we all know, there will be a slight increase to £60,000 if the grant is continued for the 2025 Election. Deputy Bury and I think that spending that money is worth every penny to foster an inclusive and aspirational society. And to encourage as broad a range of candidates as possible from all walks of life, with the hopeful outcome being representation from all walks of life in the next Assembly. Because the grant will be an absolute lifeline for those who otherwise will not be able to afford to stand. And some of those people will have the ability and the ideas and the enthusiasm and the drive to go on to become great Deputies and have an enormous, beneficial influence on the whole of our community.

1095 So, sir, there are several questions my colleagues need to be asking themselves. And I will finish by listing them. Do they want us to go backwards when we should be going forwards? Do they want to focus exclusively on funding and put morals and principles to one side? Do they think it is fair to remove a grant that was available to us all in the previous election, even though a manifesto booklet was also published? Do they want to single out and penalise and exclude a section of our community, i.e. the poorer members, from standing as candidates in the next election? Do they think it is worth spending £60,000 of taxpayers' money to foster an inclusive and aspirational society? Do they or don't they want a broad mix of candidates from all walks of life, representing all walks of life in the next election?

1105 And finally – this is a very relevant point – do they think it is worth spending in the region of £60,000 of taxpayers' money to give taxpayers what many of them are asking for, which is that broad mix of candidates from all walks of life?

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Bury, do you formally second Amendment 2?

1110 **Deputy Bury:** Yes, I do, sir.

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

1115 **Deputy Burford:** Thank you. Just very briefly, sir.

I am aware the policy letter says 'grant' and that is obviously the word that is being used, but just a very small point of clarification. Of course, this is a reimbursement in actual terms. The money is only available to candidates if they have already spent it. So it is not as if it is £500 handed out to candidates with no need for them to spend the same amount. And I think, anecdotally, there are stories from last time that there were some people who stood because they actually believed they would be receiving £500. I do not know how true that is, but it certainly was doing the rounds at the time. So it is just that point of clarity.

1120 On this particular amendment, I will support the Committee position. I am rather ambivalent about it and I do take note of what Deputy Bury highlighted in terms of the juxtaposition with the previous amendment.

1125 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

1130 **Deputy Gollop:** Yes, it shows what a difference individuals can make in the Chamber, because Deputy Queripel and me did not always agree on SACC. But I think we would have been united on this and it just needed one more person maybe to take it over the line and have it as our policy. Because I am actually supportive of the Deputy Queripel and Deputy Bury amendment. In a way, for similar reasons, perhaps it was taken slightly out of context when I said I favoured unlimited expenditure. I just think that probably would be my philosophical position, really.

1135 But I also favour, I think, the principle point: I do not want to see any part of our community disadvantaged. Certain people have already said, 'We should be more business-like and try to live in a budget and look at the length of CVs and things'. Well, actually, if we were running it commercially, you would allow people to spend what they spend and the best would do ... But if we are looking for business skills, then it is actually about ingenuity. But the problem with taking the grant away is we take away from a section of society that opportunity to stand.

1140 Deputy Aldwell, in her interesting speech, said that she had spent probably a good average, about £1,500. Actually, that was less than what we could spend in ...

1145 **Deputy Aldwell:** Point of correction. I spent £500.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Aldwell.

**Deputy Aldwell:** I spent just over £500.

1150 **Deputy Gollop:** Oh I did not realise. Apologies for that.

But I remember when we had the districts, candidates could spend £1,800, but there was a grant as well. It does appear to me that we are denying candidates the opportunity to spend if they have no resources at all. And indeed, we heard other Deputies say, 'Maybe £2,000 is a good upper limit for expenditure'. But the person who has not got £2,000 is at a disadvantage.

1155 Deputy Queripel made the point well, that well-known candidates, celebrities and professional or other fields have an advantage. Deputy Burford made the point, even more pithily perhaps, by saying that some well-known figures, and I can think of one or two from the past certainly, could actually have a month's holiday and put their name down and do nothing and they would be successful. But that is not true of younger candidates. I think older candidates have an advantage here actually, because they have been around longer and have more connections. And I think perhaps female candidates are put at a disadvantage with no additional funds because of household budgets and so on.

1165       Somebody said, 'We cannot justify spending £60,000 because of the financial situation of the Island'. Well, goodness me, it is not ... We have got money in our reserves – although some on P&R would say we need more. But if we are struggling as a Government that has had a long strategy, think of the public out there who will really struggle to be candidates in many cases, who will be worse off, who have had pay freezes, who have had issues since 2020. So that is a concern of mine.

1170       Another concern of mine is about incumbents. Because I think our presence in the Chamber and our presence in the media, some of us have over the years even had newspaper columns or whatever, it can be an advantage for some. And certainly, there has been a pattern in recent elections that half of the incumbents who stand get re-elected. And the incumbents are getting a degree of publicity up to the lead up of the election period.

1175       But there is another point here, and not everyone will accept my argument. But it has been put to me by some individuals, including candidates who stood at the last election who were not successful. And sadly, Deputy Queripel did have wonderful hustings, but most were not successful, who attended. But they said that on the assumption most States' business ends prior to the election, such as the States' Meetings, but not necessarily all Committee meetings. But not all of us are on Committees. States' Members are paid their salary until the end of their term which for the sake of argument might be 30th June. Whereas candidates who are in work or not in work or are self-employed have no funding. So it has been argued to me that candidates are receiving a salary and are able in that halcyon period, in some cases, to go knocking on doors, campaigning, doing social media, all sorts of other nice things.

1185       But candidates who have not had the privilege of being in office or being paid or struggling to fit in part-time jobs or whatever, they have no money at all. So you could argue, maybe to be really subtle, you could just pay candidates who are not incumbents this money. But we really do, as a democracy, need to encourage candidates.

1190       SACC has been working very hard and I am delighted many States' Members engaged in this, in meeting the candidates last month. I think there has been an unparalleled level of preparation for this election. But there were issues that I struggled with on SACC. I wanted the four pages. I wanted to be verbose in the manifesto booklet, but for technical and other reasons that was opposed. I believe the videos have been cut down as well, so I or anyone else cannot go on for minutes and minutes.

1195       So the candidates may all be on a level playing field if they get their material in on time. This is technically challenging for some, and some people are last-minute candidates. I think Deputy Meerveld was not somebody who planned to stand until comparatively late in the process back in the day. But all of that means that candidates should have the liberty to spend a budget in their own way, outside of all being 119 together. And I do not think a book that contains everybody in the same format is necessarily the best way of allowing candidates from diverse backgrounds and ages and types to put their case across. They need the freedom to do it themselves as well as what the States provides.

1200       So to that end, it is one of the reasons why I am relatively libertarian on electoral expenditure, but it is also a reason why I have always believed. In fact, I thought it should be higher, if I am honest. That we should be giving £500, or in this case, an RPI uplift to what candidates are given by the States. Yes, it is £60,000, potentially, if there are 119 candidates. There may be less. The way we are going, we will have a lot fewer candidates which will be a disruptive, I think, to our diversity and to democracy. But I want as many candidates as possible, good quality candidates. I want all of them to have a chance. And if we have, in society, some people who can easily afford £1,500 or £2,000, let alone £6,000, to spend on the campaign and others who do not, on their own initiatives, 1210 I mean like *the Press* adverts, like the meeting rooms, like banners or whatever, like even painting a sign on a van, I do not know what, we should allow everyone that opportunity. And so, we should keep the grant in place.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Matthews.

1215

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

Once again, I will not be very long because I do not know really what the Assembly's feeling is on this. I am certainly going to be supporting this, because I think we just ought not to discourage candidates from disadvantaged backgrounds from being able to stand. I do not think that is a very good look. And we need more candidates from ordinary walks of life to be able to make their way to the Assembly and not put up barriers in their way.

I think the more diversity that we can encourage, the better. I think if we can get to ... What the public think of this Assembly is probably a bunch of ... Well, it is probably not very parliamentary, most of the descriptions that we were able to use. And I think that the greater representation that we can get, the better. That is the point of democracy. But democracy is expensive. I understand that SACC would like to save money and there is a potential to save money by reducing the grant. But democracy is something that I think is worth fighting for.

Lots of people have struggled for democracy. People have fought and died for democracy. And I think we ought to try and encourage as broad as possible access for people to become candidates and to represent their community in this Assembly.

So, I will support this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

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

A couple of brief observations. The first is I have never heard anyone refer to Deputy Queripel as having 'nothing up top'. And I certainly would not want the nickname 'Deputy Lester Bungalow Queripel' (*Laughter*) to gather any momentum. So let's hope that is the last we hear of that, sir.

But there is a more valid point to make. And it is an example given earlier by my friend Deputy Leadbeater. Am I right in saying that one could spend £285 on a campaign, receive a £500 grant at the end of the process ...?

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

**Deputy Trott:** I am not right. That is why I am asking the question. I will gladly give way to Deputy Bury.

**Deputy Bury:** As Deputy Burford said, it is a reimbursement for expenses on production of invoices and receipts. So, if you had spent £285, that is what you would be able to reclaim.

**Deputy Trott:** Splendid. And that would be very reassuring to many who are listening. But the point is that it is paid at the end of the process. It is a reimbursement which means that the candidate would have needed to have found the £500 before he or she stood.

Now let's assume the candidate was successful. The candidate would immediately receive an income that was greater than median earnings which would enable the *successful* candidate to have the ability to reimburse themselves, or whoever had lent them the money, in short order. However, if the candidate was *not* successful, then the taxpayer is then in a position where they are rewarding a candidate, or reimbursing a candidate who they did not wish to be a Member of this Assembly.

So it seems to me that on this occasion, SACC have got it spot on and that it is inappropriate to have a grant, particularly at a time – and I remind Members – that this Assembly is running a deficit, and whilst £50,000 or £60,000 on its own is not a huge sum of money, it *all* matters. It all counts. And wherever savings can be made, this Assembly should grasp that nettle as robustly as possible.

So I shall be voting *with* SACC on this and against the amendment.

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

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

1270 And I am pleased to follow Deputy Trott, because my sentiments lie in the same area. And the narrative that we have heard this morning in relation to this amendment, which I thank Deputy Queripel and Deputy Bury for bringing to give us an opportunity to air our different views around this, has talked to inclusion, diversity of or cognitive diversity, I would hope, being in this Chamber.

1275 But my views, I think we should be broader thinking than just about who we are getting in the Chamber. It has got to be about the thought process that goes into standing, the planning that goes into standing and also the characteristics of individuals who Islanders want to see in this Chamber. Characteristics of people who have got financial management, who themselves, no matter what background they are from, are prudent with their cash, because obviously that is a characteristic that they want to see exercised in this Chamber.

1280 And certainly at the moment, I think some of the narrative is running away about the type of people and their propensity to be able to manage their funds, and that all of those type of people that are from lower income backgrounds may not have the wherewithal or management skills to be able to afford the £500. I think that Deputy Trott has brought up a very valid point there about the electorate not wanting certain people in the Assembly. And then those people, too, will be reimbursed for their expenses.

1285 And it brings me to a point that actually what I found quite surprising in the last election, was that there were some candidates who stood who actually were very much the type of people that people would not have wanted in the Assembly. Because those people were found to be wanting for behaviour that led them into the Court space very soon after they actually had stood for election. That they were being investigated by the GFSC for wrongdoing in a financial sector.

1290 And so, yet, we are being very generous. We are told by Deputy St Pier, in his opening speech, that this is noted as being extremely generous, to give £500 reimbursement or offer the limit of £500 reimbursement for expenses. But that also the Government-funded support in terms of the candidate booklet has been *the* most effective of tools for the electorate to make their decisions. So why is it that we are thinking that an *additional* £500 on top of that, which is extremely valuable –  
1295 *extremely valuable* – those resources that Government have offered. Why do we feel that we have to add additional taxpayer burden onto that when some of the candidates will not be successful and others will be found wanting in their character, as we found in the previous election, which, as I say, was a complete surprise to me that people would be so lacking in integrity to even put themselves forward, knowing that they were under investigation.

1300 To my mind, just some general points. Candidates need to be *really* prepared to stand for this job. It is exceedingly arduous, and people do not understand that. Last-minute decisions to stand for election, I think people have been lucky in the past to get in. But actually, again, characteristics that people want to see in this Assembly are people who are prepared, who are considered. We have to show good judgement and being well-informed and that that takes advance thinking and  
1305 consideration.

If we are making these decisions now, it gives candidates a year in which to prepare their budgets and to note that they may not be reimbursed, if that is the way the decision goes today, which I hope it is. Because we are having to take really good care of our purse strings. And that message goes out to candidates. They also need to be aware that this is an investment. The return on that  
1310 investment might be that you are chosen to represent the community in this extraordinary place. And it is a privileged place to be, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) but my goodness, it takes a lot of work, a lot of effort to be here and to consistently do the job and to exceed and to meet the high expectations that are rightly set upon us.

But, sir, I cannot support this amendment today.

1315 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Bury.

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

1320 Members disagree on many things in this Chamber, but I am pretty confident that not many  
would argue that the job of a Deputy is to represent the people of Guernsey. And that is a simple  
description of the role itself, at an individual level. However, if the Assembly, as a whole, aims to  
adequately represent *all* people in Guernsey, which it really should, then we need Deputies to be  
from all walks of life. And this is something that, in my opinion, we do not achieve well. A cursory  
1325 look around the Chamber at how few women we have is testament to that. Just over 50% of the  
population, yet only 20% of Government. Age is another one. Our younger generations are woefully  
underrepresented. And while some decent life experience is probably desirable for the role, our  
young people are the key to the future of our Island. But we do not hear their voice in this Chamber.

I could go on with various examples, but I think the real doozy in this area of representation, sir,  
1330 is wealth, or perhaps lack of it. The cumulative wealth in this Assembly is quite astonishing. Some  
of us, myself probably leading the charge, are really pulling our weight and bringing the average  
down. But generally, the socioeconomic status of everyone in the Chamber appears to be very  
comfortable, and for others, that is an understatement. And there is nothing wrong with that, of  
course. But it is really important to bear in mind that while our skillsets are important to our role  
1335 and our decision-making, another major factor that affects our decision-making is our lived  
experience. Put simply, sir, it is very difficult to put yourself in someone else's shoes if you have not  
walked in them.

So bringing it on to the grant, if we are supposed to represent all of the people of Guernsey, and  
yet we have little to no one from recent poverty or lower socioeconomic backgrounds – I put 'recent'  
1340 there because I knew I was teeing up an outside toilet chat, but we seem to have dodged that bullet,  
(*Laughter*) so we do not have anyone from recent poverty or lower socioeconomic backgrounds –  
then we are not representative. We do need to ensure that the voices of those people are heard  
and their situations considered in our decision-making and the only way to do that, in any really  
authentic way, is to actually have the voice in here and in Committees, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and  
1345 in order to achieve that, we need to attract people from those backgrounds to stand for election.  
And to do that, we need to do all that we can to reduce the barriers to standing. And the candidate  
grant is one way that we can do that.

Admittedly, as Deputy Trott mentioned, it still is a bit of a sticky wicket for those who cannot  
stump up the cash up front. However, it has certainly got to make it a lot easier than not having any  
1350 offering of expenses being covered at all. It really could be the difference between a candidate  
having some or absolutely none of their own individual materials or events.

And I think to Deputy Dudley-Owen's point, talking about budget management and, potentially  
planning now, savings. I am talking at the bottom end of the scale. It is not about planning, it is not  
about saving. It is not about fund management. It is about not having it. Full stop. And those are  
1355 the people that we would be preventing potentially.

Of course, SACC could have, essentially, told us that the States-supported elements of the  
election campaign will suffice; the manifesto booklet, the candidate events, etc. However, two things  
concern me about this. One is that we do not actually have any formal confirmation of these things  
yet. They are mentioned, they were done before, but the policy letter is scant on actual firm details  
1360 of any of these things happening. And secondly, as I mentioned in my previous speech, it is  
contradictory, because in their last breath, they were telling us that some people needed £7,500 to  
engage with the electorate, but in this breath it is absolutely fine that some might just have the  
States' offering.

I believe the main argument from SACC is that this is a saving, which is of course to be applauded  
1365 as all Committees should be looking for savings wherever possible. But whenever looking at savings  
that can be made, I believe the interlinked question should always be, 'But at what cost?' If the  
outcome of not having a grant or reimbursement is that potential candidates with the sort of life  
experience that we rarely hear in here end up not standing or not being able to reach the electorate  
in a meaningful way, then in my opinion, that is a cost, not a saving.

1370 And on another note, it is quite difficult to quantify the saving, in the broader context. The figure  
is suggested to be approximately £60,000. And £60,000 is £60,000, whatever the context. It is not



to be sniffed at. But we are not given any sort of indication of what the overall budget for the election is and, therefore, what percentage this is of that.

1375 Looking back at the 2020 Election budget, the overall expenditure came in considerably under the predicted budget, to the tune of approximately £88,000. The candidate grants were around 5.5% of that, marginally over what was predicted. Clearly, as it was the first Island-wide election, and with COVID elements still at play, it was quite unpredictable. And so one would think that this time around the budget would be easier to predict. However, here we are pretty much at next time and we do not have a budget to assess this saving against. We are being asked to make a decision  
1380 rather in the dark. A saving that in the grand scheme of the overall budget might be quite minimal, but with a potential heavy cost in terms of accessible, open and fair democracy.

In researching this matter, I did refer back to the Island-wide voting review done by Scrutiny, and I could not find anything in it with reference to the grant, which is understandable as I understand it was more about the opinions of the electorate than candidates. But I did note a couple  
1385 of things in it that are relevant to this issue. It has been mentioned previously that in the survey, voters were asked about their experience assessing candidates from online and printed material, and they were asked which sources of information they used and how useful each of those sources were. The manifesto booklet and information on the States' website do both come out in the top two in terms of used and usefulness. However, fourth on that list, above social media and above  
1390 other news outlets and many other items, is candidates' own leaflets and flyers. And that was over website etc. So flyers and leaflets cost money. So if candidates want to be using one of the evidenced most useful resources, they do need to have some funds to do so.

Another interesting point of relevance I noted, was in the section regarding a potential monetary deposit by candidates, which they would forfeit if they did not secure a certain percentage of the  
1395 vote. And while that, in itself, is not particularly relevant, I do think the summary response is the report notes:

Only one third of respondents supported this idea, perhaps indicating that people are generally not supportive of anything that represents an additional financial barrier to someone putting themselves forward for election.

And so I think that speaks for itself in the context of removing a small monetary support.

The other argument I have heard, that Deputy Burford has already mentioned, was that some candidates did not realise that the grant actually meant recovering expenses, not just standing and  
1400 getting £500 for the fun of it. But I think that is fairly easily addressed. I think I would suggest changing it to a reimbursement would be a wise change. And also, it is obviously something that Deputy Burford is aware of, and she is on SACC, so she can make sure it is much clearer this time around.

I will wrap up shortly, sir. And I will apologise to Members for longer speeches, today, than I  
1405 usually like to deliver. However, my colleagues may have gleaned from the last debate we had on election matters, and today, this is a subject I feel exceptionally strongly about and that is because elections, while only four-yearly events, and they disappear into people's memories, they affect everything – absolutely everything! How the election is run affects who we attract to stand, who we attract to stand affects who gets elected and who gets elected affects everything else after that.

1410 Making standing for election as accessible as possible to candidates from all walks of life is one of the only ways to give the Government of this Island a really decent shot at representing our *whole* community, effectively. And the grant is a key way that we can facilitate that to happen.

So, sir, I would really encourage Members to support this amendment.

Thank you.

1415

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Mahoney.

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

I was very clear on the last amendments what my feelings were, but this one not so much. So I  
1420 am still a bit undecided. I am undecided whether to support the amendment. Deputy Queripel

broadly argues, forgive me but, that tradesmen and women will be disadvantaged in this. And I am not sure, somehow there seemed to be an undertone from some that have spoken that somehow the bankers have become the villain of the piece again and there are too many of us, sorry, in the Assembly. Money men, or whatever you want to call them.

1425 And the phrase was used, 'Ordinary people from ordinary walks of life is what we need'. I am not really sure what that phrase means. I am an ordinary bloke from an ordinary walk of life. I just happened to work in the finance industry, that is all. So I do not really get what that means or what this obsession is with making sure we have, just for want of a better phrase, others have used 'white van man' or whatever, it does not matter, we want rounded people here.

1430 I accept fully the arguments made by Deputy Queripel, that there are people that cannot put their hand in their pocket today and pull out 500 quid to pay for these things. I accept that entirely, but we are 12 months from the election – 12 months in terms of that is 12 months to having the funds available that you need. And we already know that Deputy Leadbeater has said £285 is actually his amount. So although we keep throwing £500 around, you do not need £500 to be successful. So it is quite a long running 12 months to raise, let's use it again, £500 to be able to fund your campaign. And as others have noted, immediately refundable to you up to that amount of money.

1440 And as for profile, I think Deputy Queripel raised that matter. 'The famous', I think, the phrase was – anyway, that was the hint of it – it is much easier for them to get in. But again, that is down to every individual. You have 12 months now to raise your profile. That is 12 months to go and to nip into the Citizens Advice Bureau or any charity on Island and decide, 'I would like to volunteer for you, please. Put me to good use.' Now, you can do that amongst a number of other charities, football clubs, cricket clubs, rugby clubs. Whatever it is you choose to do, you have got 12 months from now before the election period starts, even, to get yourself out there and get known.

1445 There are lots of people here that are more *famous*, to use Deputy Queripel terms, than others that stood at the last election and that is fine; you have an advantage, call it what you will. But this is not something, the UK, where we sprung a snap election in six weeks' time: 'Good luck and get on with it.' You have got 12 months ahead of you now. So anyone that wants to raise their profile, you have got a full 365 days to get out there and raise that profile. It is up to you to do that. It is not up to us to raise the profile of anyone that is looking to stand. Get off your backside and do it yourself, if that is what you think will actually help you get elected. It may, it may not, who knows?

1450 So I am undecided. I have not been convinced either way yet. So if anyone else is going to speak, there is a vote up for grabs. And I am really not sure, but that is it.

Thank you, sir.

1455

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fairclough.

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

1460 I agree with Deputy Bury that we need more diversity in this and future Assemblies, and that the Assembly needs to be more representative of our society, but the fact is we had the grant at the last election and we have the Assembly that we have before us today! (*Laughter*)

There are clearly other things we need to do and I think we will. And I can assure Members that SACC is taking this issue seriously and will be doing a lot more in the lead up to this election than was done last time round.

1465 Other comments that have not been made – many points have and I will not be speaking for long – but no other comparable jurisdiction provides support of this nature. It has already been pointed out the CPA described Guernsey's grant as 'generous' in its post-election report.

1470 Some jurisdictions require candidates to raise a deposit to be able to stand which is a much bigger barrier to potential candidates of modest means. Guernsey does not take this approach and it provides significant benefits *in kind* to candidates, meaning that standing for election in Guernsey is very accessible in financial terms. And I think that that was reflected by the number of candidates that stood last time.

In terms of the budget for this election, the simple fact is that that will largely be driven by the number of candidates that stand. And that is why there is no accurate assessment of what the budget is. But in my view, the public purse should not have to fund both the benefits in kind and a grant, so I will not be supporting this amendment. But of course, as ever, will respect the will of the Assembly.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Taylor.

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

I am wholeheartedly behind this amendment. I think is a brilliant, well – Keeping the *status quo*, having this grant, however you describe it, is a good thing.

I do not think I have a huge amount to add to debate, but I just want to pick up on some of the points that Deputy Mahoney has made. I think he is absolutely right on the money, calling out this reference to 'ordinary people' because we are ordinary people. It is a bit like his reference to 'Middle Guernsey'. I always hate that reference to Middle Guernsey. It does not really mean much. So I think it is a fair point there.

But I do take a bit of exception to his suggestion that people should go out and do a bit of charity work, raise your profile, because I think, I probably do not have the data to back it up, but I think it is disproportionately more difficult to do charitable work when you do not have the financial security yourself to be able to go out and give your time when your time has already been given to working evenings and whatnot. So it is not as easy as just going out and raising your profile, even if you do have a year.

And I do also take exception to this suggestion, just save £500 in the next year. You have got 12 months. It is only £500. That is easy. And I think that is easy for any Member of this Assembly to say, 'Just save £500 in the next 12 months'. That is not difficult. You could do that in a month. Easy. But for some members of our community, that is not an easy task to do and even if they do save that £500, they have then got to commit it to basically a job application where there are not really fair rules, it is not like an ordinary job application where there are processes and it has to all be done fairly. It could be £500 where you do not stand a chance. But to commit that £500 that you spent a year saving, that is gone. If you are then not elected, you do not ... and I take the point that Deputy Trott made that, yes, if you are elected, you have that median salary coming in and you could easily pay back your expenses. I think that is a slightly different argument and I would probably support something that if you were successful, that you were not entitled to receive the grant. But if you were unsuccessful in getting elected, that £500, for some people, is a large amount of money. So yes, I think this is something we should all be sticking with.

And I just want to pick up before I sit down – it was another point Deputy Trott made; sorry, I am not picking on him; I know he has got thick skin – on this comment that we have got to look after ... it is just not £50,000. We are in a deficit. That is a huge amount of money. But about two years ago, I raised in this Assembly my dissatisfaction that we were, as part of a capital project, budgeting £50,000 to replace chairs and I was almost laughed at in the Assembly. 'Oh, Taylor. God, he is so nit-picky, he is so pedantic. Here we are, we have got bigger things to worry about and he is picking up on £50,000 on chairs'. But here we are, £50,000 to support the most needy in our community, having an opportunity to engage in politics and we are going to scuffle it.

So I think Members should support this amendment and I thank the proposer and seconder for bringing it.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** As I do not see any other Member rising to speak on Amendment 2, I will turn to the President of the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee, Deputy Meerveld, to speak on Amendment 2, please.

1525 **Deputy Meerveld:** Thank you, sir.

Deputy Queripel, during his opening speech, said we are singling out, penalising and excluding people from the election, potentially, by not providing a grant. I do take exception to that, in the sense I think we have one of the most open and well-supported electoral systems that I am aware of. The fact is no other comparable jurisdiction offers the kind of support that we do in providing a booklet which costs over £1,000 per candidate to produce, by offering to produce videos and the editing services that go along with those videos and that booklet. No other comparable jurisdiction offers a £500 grant either. This is unique to Guernsey, as far as I can see. And as Deputy Fairclough and others have mentioned, some jurisdictions actually require people to put a deposit, and if they wasted the electorate's time, effectively, by receiving so few votes that they do not reach a hurdle, then they lose that deposit. So there is actually a financial cost to failing to attract votes.

In Guernsey, we offer an electoral system where we are providing incredible facilities to enable anybody in our community to stand. And as Deputy Trott pointed out, this is not actually a grant, it is a reimbursement of expenses spent specifically targeted on marketing materials. At the last election, we are reliably informed by officers that some people stood because they thought they were getting £500 for nothing. And of course, the chance of a job to earn the median wage.

We also had at least some people submit expense claims under the £500 for things that were rejected. Now, I do not have the details of all of them, but one of the ones I was told was nail art. Decorations on your fingernails, was one of the things submitted as an expense under the £500.

So we have an issue with how the £500 is used. The fact that the £500 is not granted in advance so, in other words, people still have to raise the £500. People are applying to a position here to represent the community with incredible responsibility, but also a reasonable level of remuneration. Somebody would not go to a job interview without buying a suitable outfit to go in; a suit if it is an office environment or overalls if it is in a manual work environment.

We are not asking a lot of our citizens here, we are not creating hurdles. And you have got to look back at the history of this grant: back in the days when we had 57 Members and, arguably, a very diverse Assembly, there was no grant available to anybody and we still had people from all backgrounds elected.

But the grant was originally intended to defray the cost of postage for election candidates wishing to distribute manifestos or other campaign materials by post to the electorate. And in 2008, it was based on 50% of the lowest local postal rate applicable for one maildrop at a parish level. It was proposed by the previous SACC Committee in 2019, instead of a grant to candidates, to provide a number of ways that all candidates can be equally promoted via information disseminated by the States, as was done in Jersey. A combined manifesto booklet, election website, candidate videos.

The principle of the States providing benefits in kind instead of a grant was seen to be closer to the defraying of postage costs that was provided before 2008. It was felt that benefits in kind were a more effective way of ensuring a level playing field and a fair election than grants or subsidies. And given the value of work commissioned by the States on behalf of candidates, this should replace the grant. The States instead approved an amendment directing that 'the £500 grant should be made available to all candidates' – so that was at the last election – 'for the production and distribution of campaign material, thereby doubling up insofar as the grant and the benefits in kind were made available.' So that was a decision of this Assembly via an amendment, not the recommendation of the previous Committee.

As I have said, no other comparable jurisdictions provide support of this nature. There is an argument that should the public purse not fund both, effectively, subsidising candidates in cash and providing other services. So if Members say, 'Well, we want to provide cash to people to stand, we effectively want to pay for their campaign or subsidise their campaign,' then should we as an Assembly, continue producing the booklet, website and other vehicles at our expense? And at what point do we say what is the discretion of the candidate, what they want to spend money on, how they want to promote themselves? And at what point do we start regulating again?

Again, Deputy Bury mentioned the fact that the Assembly does not represent all the people in Guernsey, we do not have the correct proportion of women, and we do not have younger voices in

the Assembly. But that is what the electorate put here. They had those choices in the candidates. That was what they chose. And if you take this to its logical conclusion of saying everything must be equal, then maybe we should say there should be zero election expenditure allowed. Everybody  
1580 should have to conform with the States' booklet and website and everything else. That is a level playing field.

We have levelled it down to absolutely no difference at all between candidates. And we could actually have seats allocated in the Assembly based on an allocation basis, with positive discrimination to have a set percentage of people who are female, a set percentage of certain age  
1585 group demographics; that would achieve that. I do not think that represents any democracy I am aware of, or one I want to support.

Having said which, the grant, if the States want to go ahead with it, SACC is not going to die in a ditch in it, but we do not think it is appropriate. We went through this and looked at it every which way. We considered it at length and the Committee unanimously said, 'No, it is not appropriate for  
1590 us to be giving money to subsidise campaigns when other jurisdictions actually require deposits. And we are going above and beyond other jurisdictions in the value-added services and benefit in kind that other jurisdictions are providing. Therefore, we are levelling that playing field. We are opening this up to everybody.'

So I encourage Members not to support this amendment.

1595 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Finally, I will turn to the proposal of Amendment 2, Deputy Queripel, to reply to the debate, please.

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

So general themes run throughout the debate, but I will respond to certain things that were said. Working in reverse, Deputy Meerveld, well, he is opposed to the amendment and there is nothing I can say to help him change his mind.

Deputy Mahoney seemed to think I just said tradespeople were suffering. I did include  
1605 tradespeople, but what I referred to was anyone who cannot afford to stand. So that was included in that. A year to save money – well, as Deputy Taylor said, there are people who cannot afford to do that and I have spoken to some of them and they have got really good ideas; and we will be shooting ourselves in the foot if we remove the grant because the whole community will be deprived of those ideas.

1610 Oh, and the other thing. I do not remember saying 'ordinary people'. Deputy Mahoney said I had said ordinary people but I do not remember saying that. But I am quite willing to read out a section of my speech which relates to that.

Oh, I give way to Deputy Mahoney, sir.

1615 **Deputy Mahoney:** I thank Deputy Queripel for giving way.

Just for clarity, so that he does not have to really speak again (*Laughter*) I did not say he had said 'ordinary people'. I did not identify him. But since he has put his hand up, it was Deputy Matthews who said it. And he is nodding his head, sir. It was not Deputy Queripel, I am happy to confirm. Just to clarify that.

1620 **Deputy Queripel:** I thank Deputy Mahoney for clarifying that. I was only going to read out a page, (*Laughter*) but there is no need now. Okay.

Deputy Trott said we need to make savings and he referred to £500 upfront. But as I said in my speech, it is not just about 'making savings', it is about upholding morals and principles. So it  
1625 depends where you are coming from on that. And I suspect there is nothing I am going to be able to say to encourage him to change his mind.

Deputy Dudley-Owen said something along the lines of, 'There are those out in our community who really do not want certain people standing as candidates'. But isn't that championing exclusion? Isn't that championing and advocating exclusion when it suits?

1630 I give way to Deputy Dudley-Owen, sir.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you to Deputy Queripel for giving way.

1635 The point that I was making was around some of the bad behaviours that some of those people had demonstrated in the previous election. That they still then, knowing that they were under investigation, knowing that there were criminal proceedings that might come against them – and actually, one of them, I think, was quite a serious incident afterwards – that those people are not wanted by the electorate in this Chamber. Not at all. So I stand by that.

1640 And I also stand by the fact that, yes, there are some times where exclusion is necessary within the community, and that would be one of them: where people who are lacking integrity and good intent were excluded from making serious and significant decisions for the benefit of the Island.

**Deputy Queripel:** I take all that on board, sir.

1645 But if Islanders do not want certain people as Deputies then they will not vote for them (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Surely, sir, they should at least be allowed to stand as candidates. Deputy Matthews supports the amendment and does not want to disadvantage the poorer members of our community and he wants to uphold morals and principles of democracy, and all credit to him for having that approach.

1650 Deputy Gollop says he supports the amendment; he does not want to see any members of our society disadvantaged either. So we are on the same page with that one. We have had our disagreements in the past, but it is good to know we are on the same page. But not just good to know that we are on the same page for our benefit, but for the benefit of the community – those who will need the grant to help fund their campaigns.

1655 Just grappling through my notes. I do not think there is any more I can say, sir. I am not going to change people's minds if they are going to oppose the amendment. But I would like to end by thanking Deputy Bury most sincerely for standing alongside me all the way on this. Her support is very much appreciated, indeed. She understands, completely, when a grant needs to continue. She made an excellent speech. I hope Members took note of things she said. We can only hope so that the majority of our colleagues feel the same way as we do.

1660 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, it is now time to vote on Amendment 2, proposed by Deputy Queripel, seconded by Deputy Bury, to substitute Proposition 4. And I will invite the Greffier to open the voting, please.

1665 *There was a recorded vote.*

#### *Amendment 2*

*Not carried – Pour 12, Contre 19, Ne vote pas 3, Did not vote 1, Absent 4*

#### **Pour**

Brouard, Al  
Bury, Tina  
Cameron, Andy  
De Sausmarez, Lindsay  
Falla, Steve  
Gabriel, Adrian  
Gollop, John  
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha  
Matthews, Aidan  
Parkinson, Charles

#### **Contre**

Aldwell, Sue  
Blin, Chris  
Burford, Yvonne  
De Lisle, David  
Dudley-Owen, Andrea  
Dyke, John  
Fairclough, Simon  
Haskins, Sam  
Helyar, Mark  
Mahoney, David

#### **Ne vote pas**

Leadbeater, Marc  
Roberts, Steve  
Snowdon, Alexander

#### **Did not vote**

Le Tocq, Jonathan

#### **Absent**

Ferbrache, Peter  
Inder, Neil  
Le Tissier, Chris  
Oliver, Victoria  
Roffey, Peter

Queripel, Lester  
Taylor, Andrew

McKenna, Liam  
Meerveld, Carl  
Moakes, Nick  
Murray, Bob  
Prow, Robert  
Soulsby, Heidi  
St Pier, Gavin  
Trott, Lyndon  
Vermeulen, Simon

1670 **The Bailiff:** So on Amendment 2, proposed by Deputy Queripel and seconded by Deputy Bury, there voted in favour 12 Members; there voted against 19 Members; 3 Members abstained; 6 Members did not participate in the vote. And therefore I declare Amendment 2 lost.

Before we turn to general debate, Amendment 3, which has been touched on by some, has been submitted, and I would ask that the paper copies of that be distributed now, please. It will take me back to Woolworths; it is like Pic 'n' Mix.

**Procedural –  
Early lunch break**

1675 **Deputy Gabriel:** Sir, while they are being distributed, can I test your appetite or the Assembly's appetite for sitting later until business has finished and then finishing for the rest of the day?

1680 **The Bailiff:** Not at this stage, no, Deputy Gabriel. We will wait and see how long this amendment takes.

**Deputy Meerveld:** Sir, if I may suggest we adjourn early for lunch, because SACC Committee would like an opportunity to have conversation with the Deputies facing this amendment to discuss the best way forward.

1685 **The Bailiff:** Well, I am just going to wait until the amendment has been received by every Member.

Does every Member now have a copy of Amendment 3, to be proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez and seconded by Deputy Mahoney? Deputy Meerveld, you have suggested that I put a motion to Members that we break for lunch early. At what time are you suggesting the States might resume?

1690 **Deputy Meerveld:** Two fifteen, sir. I think the two-hour lunch hour is sufficient, it is just that we are going to have a discussion with the individual laying the amendment which may help to avoid the amendment being laid.

Thank you, sir.

1695 **The Bailiff:** Alright. Well, Members of the States, the motion is that we break for lunch 10 minutes early, but that you resume debate at 2.15 p.m. to deal with Amendment 3, if it is to be laid and general debate and the other item of business. Those in favour; those against?

1700 *Members voted Pour.*

**The Bailiff:** We will now adjourn until 2.15.

*The States adjourned at 12.20 p.m.  
and resumed its sitting at 2.17 p.m.*

**General Election 2025 – Second Policy Letter –  
Debate continued**

**The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez, do you wish to lay Amendment 3?

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** No, sir! *(Laughter)*

But if I can perhaps, sir, explain. Thanks to the Assembly's agreeing to adjourn in order to allow a conversation between SACC and myself and Deputy Mahoney who was seconding Amendment 3, we have reached a compromise position where we intend to not lay Amendment 3 but we are drafting as – well, I would be drafting it if I was not standing up speaking – a new amendment which is going to protect the lower level that we have already agreed, but to direct SACC to go away and come back, having fully explored the implications of lower limits in the spirit of what Amendment 3 was trying to achieve.

So SACC have indicated that they will be able to come back with that by September, by the start of September, I think. And so that is I am presuming will become Amendment 4. So with that in mind, we are not proposing to lay Amendment 3.

Thank you.

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

In that case, we move into general debate.  
Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Gollop:** Well, I think that Deputy de Sausmarez has shown an admirable collegiate attitude with SACC there. Perhaps I should have taken a leaf out of her book because, it would have been interesting to have seen a sudden death playoff on this and my guess is that probably the £3,000 would have won and the six ... the part two of it.

But I think we do need more careful thought on many aspects of this policy letter (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and the implications of equity. And it did occur to me, too, bearing in mind the UK are having a general election, that we had very good input last time from a group of Commonwealth parliamentarians, MPs who gave a report; they actually gave us their view, that we were perhaps being too harsh on criminal convictions, which of course this States did not like the look of in January. But we do need their feedback at least and I think that they might be concerned if we were either overly libertarian, like my suggestion of having no limits, but also if we had too tight a limit and there was a feeling perhaps that you could not run an independent campaign beyond the States' book. Because all of us candidates are equal in the manifesto book. Some are perhaps more equal than others though because, as we have said before, some of us have a higher profile than others or whatever.

But I do, in general, support the policy letter. I will vote slightly reluctantly for the amended Proposition relating to expenditure and perhaps against a loss of the grant to candidates. But who knows, that might mutate back in a different form if there is a reconsideration going on.

But I stand particularly to object on another Proposition. And indeed, I have drafted an amendment that has just gone through the system, sir. I do not know if you have picked it up. It went in the lunch hour, and I came back with a draft which was very fast work, which I commend the parliamentary staff and the Law Officers for. And my Proposition will be seconded by Deputy ... But people have not had notice of this. Deputy Gabriel. I was just saying, I do not know if Members need a paper copy. You –

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop, you cannot address an amendment that has not been formally submitted and circulated.

**Deputy Gollop:** Right.



**The Bailiff:** So you can give notice of the fact that you have an amendment that is likely to be submitted.

1755

**Deputy Gollop:** Yes.

**The Bailiff:** And if we were to reach the stage that the debate was going to end before that had been circulated, you could always ask that the States stand adjourned to allow that to come into play. But at the moment, it is not something that you can refer to.

1760

**Deputy Gollop:** Right. I do not ... So the circulation would ... So I will wait for it to be circulated if it is possible to be circulated. I have submitted it to Propositions.

But I will speak generally now; I will not speak to the amendment but you will see the relevance. My principal objection to the policy letter is the loss of the ability to hold by-elections without free casual vacancies coming into being. It seems to me, unusual for a parliament or assembly to deliberately leave seats empty because of the randomness of by-elections. That is not the practice in the United Kingdom; it is not the practice in the United States; it is not the practice in Jersey.

1765

Perhaps because we all, with the exception of our colleagues from Alderney, are representing the same constituency, the argument might be that because no particular part of the Island is disadvantaged, that we can accept that. But if we believe perhaps there are too many Members of this Assembly, that is a debate of a different kind. And it does seem to me to leave up to certainly one or two seats empty. The third would trigger, presumably, by-elections ... is careless and unfortunate. Because I believe by-elections are not only important to keep the constituted constitutional size of the Assembly going, but they invariably have a useful impact in not only bringing in a new person to fulfil Committee roles or constituency roles or other roles, but they also are a useful gauge of public opinion at the time that they are held. And therefore, it does seem to me unfortunate that we are losing that.

1770

1775

Now, I remember the Committee led by Deputy Inder suggested that we should wait for two, and that was clearly rejected by the last Assembly. But this Committee has gone further and gone for three with not much substantiating material. There is a reference to cost, but not being the primary factor. I have done some research and found that the cost of a Jersey senatorial by-election, shortly before they abolished the office, was around £30,000, not £300,000. And of course, Jersey is a bigger Island with many more meetings. And so I do not think cost in itself is a purpose.

1780

And I feel that, from a democratic point of view, to leave seats empty is not the way to go. Other places would actually fill them, maybe by nominating somebody who was a close runner up or people on a list system. But there is not even that proposed here. And I think that we should not actually change the Reform Law in that respect and we should facilitate democracy and allow by-elections to occur that we have seen for many, many years in many walks of life, including States' Committees. We also, of course, had an Island wide by-election in 1998. That, I think, was quite economical to organise and I am sure by-elections could be organised more economically. For example, that by-election utilised a *Press* handout, rather than a separately posted manifesto book.

1785

1790

So, although I support much of this policy letter, I do not support the loss of the grants. But, particularly, I am uncomfortable with the high bar to having by-elections. And hope – I will not talk to the amendment now, but the amendment would put a compromise forward, if we get to that.

1795

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

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

1800

I am just a little bit concerned about the equity that we are putting forward to candidates. We are very fortunate here as 38 Members, we have got fairly high profiles now and I am sure we are going to have even higher profiles in the next 12 months, but I am also concerned about the candidates coming through.

You are going to be, and I think the thrust is to reduce candidates' ability to spend. Well, that is fine if you have got a really good profile now but for someone coming up through the ranks, that may not be the case and they may well need a little bit of cash assistance to get their messages through. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

I would think that you almost need, and I am going to be a bit like a broken record again today, to balance one against the other. If you are starting to reduce the candidates' expenditure, then you are going to start to curtail what they can do. You are going to start to squash what they can do and you are going to limit their ability to get their message out.

The *quid pro quo*, or *quo* of that, would be that you need to make sure that the States' manifesto that is published gives them enough space to do it. And I am not convinced by the argument that it is going to take too long to format it. I think if we are able to, we need to offer at least four pages to candidates who want to use it, because not all candidates will. But I think that that offering should be made, especially if we are going to be reducing candidates' expenditure at the other side.

So if they have got no other way of getting their message out which is what we are trying to say, or I believe some of you are trying to say, then I think we should also give the candidates the ability and the States' manifesto to be able to do it.

So I will ask SACC if they are coming back, as I understand, in September, to have a really good reason as to ... or in fact, I hope they will come back saying they will propose that there is an ability for those candidates who want to, to have four pages. And I think that could be done with a little bit of guidance before the election, that candidates will be encouraged to write their manifestos early, get them formatted early, and that there are some really rigid cut off dates, that if they do not make it by then, they are not going to have four pages. They can only have two. If they do not do it by the third Tuesday, unfortunately, they are not in the manifesto book at all, as we had last term.

So that is my thing. I just think we need to balance. If you are going to reduce candidates' ability to get their message out, we need to make space for them to get their message into the manifesto book.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Queripel.

**Deputy Queripel:** Sir, I rise merely to seek clarification from H.M. Comptroller.

Proposition 4. Logically, thinking logically, to my mind, if something is not discontinued, it automatically continues. So Proposition 4, 'to agree that the £500 grant for candidates should be discontinued.' Voting against that, if that Proposition were to fail, does that mean the grant automatically continues? I have had the conversation with H.M. Comptroller, so I know the answer, but I think it is to be prudent and wise to everyone else to hear what he has to say. And also, he can put it far more eloquently than I would, sir. So I would like clarification on that, please.

That is all from me, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Well, Mr Comptroller, were you aware that that was coming?

**The Comptroller:** I was not, sir. No, but ...

**The Bailiff:** Would you like a little bit of time to think about it?

**The Comptroller:** I have to try and remember what I said, actually, (*Laughter*) to Deputy Queripel, more than anything, if I might.

So, yes, if I could just have a little bit of time, I will look back at our exchange.

**The Bailiff:** Right, I will come back to you in due course.  
Deputy Matthews.

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

I rather feel as though I am filling in a little bit while the Comptroller works out whether 'discontinuing' implies that something is continuing. And actually it is a point that I think that I would agree with Deputy Queripel on, and I would like to vote against Proposition 4, if we could be arrange for that to be voted for separately. Because I think we did have the debate about the grant or the reimbursement. And I voted to keep that. But I think that is a useful thing to try and keep in. And I know that throughout the course of this debate where we have been talking about the financing, in general, of elections, there has been a lot of talk about, well, if you compare us to other jurisdictions, we seem to be incredibly generous in that we have this grant, we have these quite low limits on spending compared to other jurisdictions who spend tens of millions sometimes on campaigns. And why don't we copy what they do? Or why aren't we more like them?

Well, other jurisdictions have enormous issues with campaign financing and how to resolve the issues where it seems like special interests are involved in politics. And in Guernsey, we are a small community, and we have a lot of wealth in that community. We have to be very careful to make sure that our democracy is genuinely representing the interests of the people of Guernsey and that it is not bought by interest. And so that is why I think it is important to try and maintain those types of controls wherever we possibly can.

So I will wait for SACC to bring back what I expect will be some options on lower limits, perhaps maybe with some sort of cascade on where they could be. And in the meantime, I will support the policy letter with the exception, I think, of Proposition 4, sir, which I would like to vote against.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Mahoney.

**Deputy Mahoney:** Just one question, please, sir. When Deputy Ferbrache, some while ago, noted that perhaps we should have a general election, SACC were very quick on their feet to say, 'Ridiculous, it will take us a year to put the electoral roll together'. And yet, I note that if someone ... I think it is 30th November, I think it is noted in there, to force a by-election with only six months before the due election. How long does it take to actually reconstitute the electoral roll? Because that would presumably need to be done pretty quick.

I will not give away because he can speak, but just an answer to that, please would be great. So how long does it take to actually reconstitute the electoral roll?

**The Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, before calling anyone else to speak in general debate, the amendment that Deputy Gollop was referring to is now available. And I am going to ask His Majesty's Sheriff to distribute copies of it to you. Those of you who have whizzy machines will know what is coming.

Does every Member have a printed copy of Amendment 4?

Well, Deputy Gollop, this is your opportunity to lay Amendment 4, if you wish to do so.

**Deputy Gollop:** Yes, I will do.

**The Bailiff:** Do you want to have it –?

#### [Amendment 4:](#)

*In Proposition 5 substitute the word "two" for the word "three".*

*Rule 4(1) Information*

*a) The proposition neither supports nor detracts from the States Strategic objectives.*

*b) In preparing the proposition, no formal consultation has taken place.*

*c) The proposition has been submitted to His Majesty's Procureur for advice on any legal or constitutional implications.*

d) *The financial implications to the States would be similar to the status quo.*

1900

**Deputy Gollop:** It might be a short debate, but ...

As I say, I sat on the previous, well, the earlier version of Deputy Meerveld's SACC Committee and we did discuss, of course, arrangements for the election. But this has mutated a little bit, because the original Committee that created the Island-wide elections, which is the Committee that Deputy Inder led that included, amongst others, Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Ferbrache, decided to submit to the then Assembly, which clearly had a rather different perspective on these events, that they would prefer to wait for *two* casual vacancies to occur rather than one.

1905

So the process of putting into place the mechanics of a by-election, which I appreciate does cost, an unquantifiable cost in some respects, a certain amount of staff time, legal time and administrative time, which is, of course, a bit more onerous than the former district by-elections. But they decided *two* was the appropriate number. But the States overturned it and it became one.

1910

Fortunately, we have not had a by-election in this term, and we are reaching the point whereby it would no longer be practicable to have one, because the Presiding Officer would decide it was too late in the day.

1915

But when I sat on the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee until January of this year, the thinking as I recall, I stand to be corrected, was to wait *two* by-elections, which I am not particularly in favour of really, because I would prefer one. But in this policy letter we have before us today, the number has gone up from two to three. Now three, which is –

1920

**Deputy Haskins:** I am grateful for Deputy Gollop giving way.

I am just seeking clarification on the wording of this amendment. Perhaps, I could be wrong here, but I do not see in Proposition 5 the word 'two', I see the word 'three'. So I think it might be the wrong way around.

Thanks.

1925

**The Bailiff:** Can I just explain the answer to that, Deputy Gollop.

The wording in Proposition 5 is a minimum of three vacancies and the idea is to substitute the word 'two' in place of the word 'three'.

1930

**Deputy Gollop:** Yes, that is correct.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop to continue. (*Interjections*)

**Deputy Gollop:** I think it is correct. (*Interjections*)

1935

Yes, the clarity is to move from three to two.

Now my position, as I have said, is ideally to have it for one. But it would appear that if Members want to strike a middle course between what was previously agreed by the SACC Committee I sat on and the previous SACC Committee to be two, that two is more democratic than three.

1940

There is a theoretical larger cost than for three, but a smaller cost than for one. And this Proposition, effectively, gives us a new option.

Now, one Member has already suggested to me, Deputy Mathews said he would vote against Proposition 4. Well, I hope he might consider voting against Proposition 5, maybe, because Proposition 5, if we vote against Proposition 5 when we come to the final vote, we stay with the *status quo* as I understand it. Unless I am wrong in the Rules, there is no reform of the Reform Law and we would stay with the current *status quo*, because the change would have been rejected. And if we get to the final vote unamended, I will vote against Proposition 5.

1945

But in the spirit of compromise, I am suggesting that it is fairer to the public, more democratic and more accountable to allow by-elections. And rather than the very high bar of three by-elections. And I would struggle to think of any Assembly I have sat in that has had as many as three by-elections in a four-year term, that we would reduce it to the lower bar of two. Because I suspect, in

1950

the real world, in a future Assembly, if there was a vacancy, let alone two, let alone three, I think there would be pressure from the public and from the Members of the day to fill those seats.

And so I think this is a sensible amendment. And it is clear the intention, that instead of us voting for a Proposition with three in it, it is for two.

1955

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gabriel, do you formally second Amendment 4?

**Deputy Gabriel:** I do, sir, and I would like to speak now. I was –

1960

**The Bailiff:** Just a minute.

**Deputy Gabriel:** Unless there are any procedural motions.

1965 **The Bailiff:** Just a minute. I always have to pause just in case there is a procedural motion. (*Interjection*) But there is not. So Deputy Gabriel to speak as well.

**Deputy Gabriel:** Okay, so Deputy Gollop to clarify, the Greffier did not read it, but for those listening on *Hansard* or for the benefit of *Hansard*, I will read the amendment.

1970 So it is very short. 'In Proposition 5 substitute the word "two" for the word "three". And Proposition 5 is all about the triggering a by-election.

And again, for those that may be listening, we have got Proposition 5 is, 'To agree that the provisions for holding of by-elections should be revised to require a minimum of three vacancies'. And so we are substituting 'two' for that.

1975 And the policy letter already states that there is an accepted norm of people being absent in section six point something. I am scrolling as we speak, sir. But that accepted deficit through sickness or States' benefit is already a loss of voting Members, (**A Member:** Yes) and that is already accepted.

1980 So if we were to have another two or even three Members missing, then in my view, that would be a democratic deficit. And so the decrease from three Members triggering the by-election to two is, again, a compromise and a better version, which is why I seconded it.

So I would like Members to support it.

Thank you.

1985 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Mahoney.

**Deputy Mahoney:** I will try Rule 26(1), please, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Can I invite those Members who wish to speak in debate on Amendment 4 to stand in their places?

1990 Deputy Mahoney, is it still your wish that a motion under Rule 26(1) be put?

**Deputy Mahoney:** Yes, it is, sir.

1995 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, the motion is that no further debate be had on this amendment, subject to hearing from the President of the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee and the proposer of the amendment. Those in favour; all those against.

*Some Members voted Pour; others voted Contre.*

2000 **Deputy Mahoney:** Let's have a recorded on that, please, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Well, we will have a procedural motion up, please. I was going to declare that lost, by the way. *(Interjection and laughter)*

I will invite the Greffier to open the voting, please, on the procedural motion proposed by Deputy Mahoney.

2005

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Not carried – Pour 16, Contre 16, Ne vote pas 3, Did not vote 0, Absent 5*

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

2010

**The Bailiff:** So on the procedural motion proposed by Deputy Mahoney under Rule 26(1), there voted in favour 16 Members; there voted against 16 Members; *(Laughter)* 3 Members abstained; and five Members did not participate in the vote. And therefore, on the equality of votes, I will declare it lost.

Deputy Matthews.

2015

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

I am very grateful to speak. I was going to make a very short speech, so I think it is possibly less time than it might have taken to go through the procedural motion.

2020

I was really only just going to say I was invited by Deputy Gollop to vote against Proposition 5 which this amendment seeks to amend, which I think I might well take up that invitation. Because I think even with the amendment, and I will vote for the amendment, I think that it seems a little excessive to be potentially carrying vacancies within the Assembly for any period of time. And if we look at this Assembly, there have not been any situations where there would have been a vacancy like this. And I can appreciate the intent that you might not want to call a by-election and then immediately afterwards, six months later, call another one. And so if there was some time limit on this, like you did this once a year or something to prevent those sort of serial by-elections, then that might be useful.

2025

But as it is, you could go the entire life of the Assembly without having called a by-election until you reach the next general election which to me would seem excessive really.

2030

So I will vote for the amendment, and I think I may well, even with the amendment, then still vote against Proposition 5.

Thank you.

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

2035

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

There are so many variables when it comes to these types of debates. They are *really* frustrating because everyone can envisage a situation where, as Deputy Matthews has just stated, if we carried

a vacancy for over that period of time, then we could go for the whole term, entire term with one or two vacancies before we hit the criteria for a by-election. But it is all guesswork into the future and possibly a scenario that will not come to fruition.

So I am pretty ambivalent about these types of matters, to be honest. But I am not ambivalent about the lack of governance accompanying these particular types of amendment. And to love Deputy Gollop as I do, I am sure we all do, and Deputy Gabriel, I have got a great regard for him, but where it says for Rule 4(1) information, 'In preparing the Proposition, no formal consultation has taken place'. Well, great. We have ticked the box on that Rule because we have stated, 'No consultation has taken place'. Well, what is the point in having the Rule? The whole aim of it was *for* consultation to take place with the sponsoring Committee, but neither of the movers of this motion did so, despite having a lunch time to do so, albeit a short amount of time. (*Interjection by Deputy Gollop*)

Okay, Deputy Gollop is telling me that he did email. But Deputy de Sausmarez and Deputy Mahoney, I give some latitude there because I am not a real stickler in the face of all of these things, because there are positions where the Assembly, by a lot of people standing up and saying, actually, I would support something a little bit more than that so at least there was something to go on. And they have had the conversation with the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee.

But I just find these types of amendments ... And again, Deputy Haskins had to stand up and ask for extra clarification because you can read the amendment in a couple of different ways. It just says to me that the sufficient thought and consideration was not put into moving this motion that should have been. And actually, as I say, I can see why the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee came to the conclusion that they did. I am happy to support that. I think that we start to have our arguments and dance on the head of a pin in these circumstances, and quite frankly, we are just wasting time. And I am just wondering how many more amendments are being drafted in the meantime to put forward in a not particularly considerate or well-governed way.

I, for one, am not going to be supporting this amendment. And I suppose, in part, that would be as my protest vote. Please can we do these in a more considered way and stick to the Rules.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Bury.

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

Just briefly. And I do agree with much of what Deputy Dudley-Owen has just said, and also what she said in terms of that sometimes what happens on the day does also sweep you along to an amendment.

But I find myself in a similar position to a few other Members that have spoken. It is not what I am going to die in a ditch about, but I do not particularly agree with the original Proposition, so my intention was just to vote against it. I will vote for the amendment because I think it is a slight improvement, because I do not want to carry the democratic deficit. And just in terms of history and predictability about what may or may not happen, by-elections crop up once in a blue moon, really, and obviously very unpredictable. The last time there was two was in 2003. So it is a very unlikely thing to happen. That is 21 years that there has been two. So I think what we would be agreeing to is that if one space becomes vacant, you will carry that for the term, most likely.

To Deputy Mahoney's point about how long does it take, the last by-election in 2016 took four months from the space becoming available to the election. Obviously, that was on a parish basis so it might slightly differ on an Island-wide basis, but I just thought that was a note of interest.

I said I would be quick so that is it from me.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

**Deputy Soulsby:** I will be very brief.

2090 Just to correct Deputy Dudley-Owen, the Rules do not state that you should consult. They are there to inform Members whether a Member, in putting forward their amendment, has actually consulted, and then on that basis, consider whether it is worth supporting the amendment or not.

2095 So there is a slight difference. I agree, thought needs to go into it, but the actual Rules do not say that you have to consult. It is just to provide information to Members to whether you have or not.

I will not give away because I think we have gone through this long enough, to be honest. I was not going to stand and I thought I would on the back of that.

2100 I find this a bit of a Lady Bracknell amendment saying, to lose one Deputy could be considered unfortunate, to lose both looks like carelessness. And I think, well, two, and then we have got three in the policy letter, although, it is not very clear why it ended up being three. I think it mentions one or two in there. So I do not understand why it is three.

2105 But I am more inclined to supporting three. But we need to remember remaining Members are all democratically elected. So I struggle with this democratic deficit, particularly when we have got 38 Members. It is not a scientific number. It has changed over the years. Members of the public think we have got too many, if anything, like the survey that was conducted tells us. And there are other circumstances where we might have three Members or more that might be suspended and cannot sit here.

So I find it a bit difficult to see the problem with that. So I am more inclined to support what the SACC have put forward. So I think that is where I am going to go on this.

2110 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Prow.

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

2115 What I am going to say leads on very nicely from what Deputy Soulsby just said. The amendment is specific to around a by-election, but around the democratic deficit. I have said in this Assembly before, the House of Keys in the Isle of Man relies on 24 Members of Parliament. Twenty-four. So, I think, as Deputy Soulsby just said, the figure of 38-plus two very able Representatives from Alderney, of 40, should put this into context.

Thank you, sir.

2120 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Taylor.

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

2125 If this amendment had not been made, I would have been voting against the Proposition as it is originally drafted. But I am doing that without much information to really base that decision. There is very little in the policy letter to substantiate why we should be making this change other than point 6.5 which refers to the significant resources and funds required to hold a by-election. But there is no detail on that. There is no detail on the overall cost. So I am not really sure what potential risks we have got what costs are we looking to the Government would have in the case that there was one or two or three vacancies that needed filling.

2130 And again, I am not entirely sure, so I pose the question to the President of SACC or any Member. My understanding is it is not a requirement if there is a by-election to do it the whole hog with full manifesto booklets. It could be done slightly cheaper. Things could be changed. So I would just like to know, is there a route that an election could be held on a cheaper basis if we do not think there are going to be a full 100 candidates standing for that one position?

2135 So, sir, I will be supporting this amendment. I see it as a meeting in the middle, I suppose. There are some Members who think it should go to three. I think it should just stay at one. But I can see two being reasonable. I think that, basically, I see that we could carry one vacancy, but I do not think we should carry two vacancies. That is what I put it down to.

2140 So if Deputy Meerveld could answer my question with some indication of financially what the impact of this amendment would be and some indication of what, I am not saying what corners



could be cut if we were to hold another a by-election, but if he has got the information, exactly what it would cost to hold a by-election, because that must have been discussed at some point.

Thank you.

2145

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Moakes.

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

I just want to wrap a couple of things up that a couple of people have said. There are many people in the general public who think there are too many Deputies already. There are many members of the general public who think that Deputies are paid too much. I do not think, despite what many people have said, there will be a great outcry if there were one or two missing Deputies for a period of time. It would save money and there would be a few less Deputies around.

So I will not be voting for this amendment and I hope the rest of you do not either.

2155

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, very briefly.

But I think, very occasionally one comes up with a thought that just might sway some Members and I think this is an example of one. I would like Members to consider the scenario after Deputy Dave Jones passed and the by-election that was held in the Vale. Under either a two-vacancy or three-vacancy Rule, Deputy Inder would not have been elected (*Laughter*) in that by-election. And I would just like you to think that through.

2165

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, I joined the Committee after much of the work had been done on this, and in particular, in relation to this issue. And I think my inclination probably would have been more towards Deputy Gollop's position. But I share Deputy Dudley-Owen's view in relation to such an amendment being brought, really, so late. There is absolutely no reason why this could not have been brought weeks ago with the appropriate opportunity for Committee consideration. And, indeed, for the Committee to be able to advise the States with its considered position on the amendment which, obviously, we are not in a position to do because we have not had the chance to discuss it. So it is unfortunate but there is absolutely no reason why it has come so late.

2175

Deputy Taylor seemed to suggest that there may be an opportunity for a cut-price discount by-election in some way. I can understand the attraction of seeking to, he did say, 'cut corners', but he did not mean cut corners in the approach. It is clearly attractive at one level.

2180

But we have to remember these are about the fundamentals of our democratic process by which our elected representatives are chosen. And we have to accept and the community has to accept that does come at a cost. Some of those costs are completely unavoidable and need to be accepted as the price for democracy. And that, of course, is the balance which the Committee has considered in reaching the policy position that they have done in the policy letter. As I said, had I participated in that much earlier, I might have shaped its outcome, but it is a considered position. And if Members had wanted another position, as Deputy Dudley-Owen has said, they really should have moved that a lot earlier than in the dying embers of this debate.

2185

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

2190

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

Following on from my colleague on SACC, I agree with what Deputy St Pier has said. I, in fact, joined the Committee after all the work on this had been done. But I think my view is that either

2195 two or three is suitable. Despite that, I do actually, to counter some of the views that have been expressed, although, not going into it in great detail, think we actually have too few Deputies for reasons which I would be happy to expound to people at a later date. It is not a debate today on that subject.

2200 But one of the reasons that I think that at least two is perhaps useful in this situation, is that I think there are occasions when someone is elected, or at some point during the term, where they perhaps feel this is not where they want to be. This is not the job they want to be doing. And perhaps they have made a mistake, or circumstances have changed as such. And to know that if you were to step down, you would be incurring a cost to the taxpayer of a £250,000 is a very strong incentive just to stick with it. But I do question whether if someone really does not want to be here, whether they should be here.

2205 So I think having this limit of two, it may actually be used more than perhaps by-elections in the past, because there has always been a cost to stepping down in terms of triggering an election, whether it is parish or Island-wide. But I think that it would be interesting to see how that plays out.

I am sympathetic to the figure of two, but I concur with what others have said in terms of the late nature of the amendment and I will be supporting the Committee.

2210 Thank you.

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

2215 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Sir, Deputy Gollop has been criticised for bringing the amendment late which I understand and accept. But also, I think the Committee brought the amendment to trigger the by-election at three, but I believe they have not provided any new evidence to indicate why that should be the case. This was extensively debated in the previous term. Amendments were brought forward whether it should be two or not, and defeated. And the fact remains that there is, right now, no new information on which we can justifiably re-debate this issue. Luckily, we have not had a by-election. We have not gone through the process, so we cannot speak to the pains and the costs of it. There has been no cost information provided as to what the cost of a by-election would be. So I feel that the policy paper and the Resolution from SACC is not really based on any new evidence whatsoever that justifies a change.

2220 And if we have gone down into the Island-wide change, we should be ... I think, the justification has been around the democratic deficit, but everyone has still has one vote. So one vote down in an Island-wide voting or one vote down in a parish system, it is still one vote out of 40 in this Chamber. It is still the same democratic deficit.

2225 So I do not really accept the rationale from SACC that, suddenly, we have, under the parish system, it would have been a bigger democratic deficit. It is still one vote. So in a nutshell, I would hate to see the SACC Proposition going through, the three vacancies triggering a by-election. I think that, as Deputy Bury gave us some good evidence in terms of the likelihood of that happening, it is unlikely to happen, so the amendment actually improves on the Resolution.

2230 I would be tempted to support the amendment, but actually I am very tempted to stick with what we have today which is just one vacancy. And until we know that this is a problem, until we as an Assembly, under Island-wide voting go through this process to understand, is this actually a problem we need to solve, I do not think we should be changing anything.

Thank you.

2240 **The Bailiff:** On the basis of no other Member is standing to speak on Amendment 4, I will turn to Deputy Meerveld as the President of the Committee to offer his contribution.

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

I share Deputy Dudley-Owen and Deputy St Pier's concerns about late amendments in general and it would have been great to have more time to talk about this as a Committee, and therefore, I

2245 cannot give a Committee a position on this, having not had an opportunity to discuss it with Members.

People have talked about a democratic deficit. Again, Island-wide voting has changed the nature of our democracy. When we see by-elections in the UK, we see it for constituencies where they have a single representative who, for one reason or another, cannot continue serving. And if they are not  
2250 replaced, that constituency does not have representation.

But now we are all elected Island-wide. Again, in the parochial system you had a limited number of Deputies representing your parish and there would have been a democratic deficit; that parish would have had one less vote in the Assembly. But now we are all representing the Island, the whole Island, a whole community, there is not the same specific imperative of a democratic person elected  
2255 to a specific function, either a position in the States or representing a subset of our community that creates the same kind of deficit argument. And, of course, we have had many Members in this Assembly, members of the public, crying that we should reduce our number of Deputies.

So again, looking at the fact that we might function as an Assembly with one or two Members missing, we have had, during this term, for a couple of reasons, a couple of Deputies out for  
2260 extended periods when they were not participating for personal reasons. So the States does continue to function. So I think the argument that there is a democratic deficit is somewhat weak.

So why did SACC look at increasing the numbers? Well, I did not correct Deputy Bury when she made her statement about recent by-elections, but in the 2012 term, there was a by-election when Deputy Martin Storey died in 2016. As Deputy Trott pointed out, in the 2016 term, there was a by-  
2265 election when Deputy Dave Jones died which resulted in Deputy Neil Inder being elected. And of course, Deputy Kuttelwascher also died in January 2020, but because of its proximity to the then scheduled election, there was discretion not to hold – that the Bailiff had – a by-election so close to a general election. But otherwise, in the last term, we would have had two by-elections.

And of course, not only is the demographic makeup changed with Island-wide voting, but also  
2270 the costs and the logistics. The fact is, I think, whilst a by-election would not run the full cost of the £877,000 of a general election, it would run into the hundreds of thousands.

And if we do not have the democratic deficit, do we want to be holding by-elections if, as Deputy Burford said, somebody feels that the role of the Deputy is not for them having taken it up, or they have personal reasons or medical reasons that drive them to wish to stand down? Do we want to  
2275 place that onus on a ... reflecting on them that they have to hold the position because of the cost they incur to the electorate, or if we have deaths in the Assembly, regrettable, people pass away or have medical issues and cannot perform their duties, do we want to incur that cost?

But it is not just cost, it is also the election fatigue. Do we want to be calling for the entire Island to go to an Island-wide election on a potentially relatively frequent basis? At SACC we have  
2280 discussed three-year terms or rolling terms was one of the things we discussed. And one of the discussions around the idea of having a section of the Assembly elected every two years, say, a six-year term, with elections of one-third of the Assembly every two years. Well, one of the concerns is election fatigue. Are you asking the electorate to come out too often? Are you imposing the obligation on them to vote too often?

So there are a lot of different factors we looked at in coming to the number of three vacancies that left room for somebody, for whatever reason, who does not wish to continue – they are poorly and want to step down, for there to be people leaving on medical grounds or dying, whatever  
2285 reason, to mean that we were not pushed to run an election during that period unless it was absolutely necessary, unless we lost enough Members to justify it.

And also, just to answer a question from Deputy Mahoney earlier about the electoral roll, by-  
2290 elections are generally run on the electoral roll, or are always run, in the past, on the electoral roll available at the previous election. So you could be running an election on an electoral roll that is three-plus years out of date. Therefore, there will be quite a number of people who would be eligible to vote who would not be on the electoral roll. Or people who are on the electoral roll, who may no  
2295 longer be able to vote or may not be around anymore.

So going back to, that is part of the answer to that question from Deputy Mahoney, why can you hold a by-election in six months and not 12? Well, we do not do a new electoral roll. When at some stage in the future we have a rolling electronic census and electoral roll, then it will be possible to do things more promptly. But at the present moment, there are a lot of logistics and a lot of cost involved in by-elections. SACC came out with a number of three. I personally I am not that bothered if it goes down to two. I definitely would not want to see it remaining at one for all the reasons I have given.

But obviously, SACC has not discussed this. Members are free to vote whichever way they want on this. And yes, I leave it to the Assembly to decide. Two or three.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** And I will turn finally to the proposer of Amendment 4, Deputy Gollop, to reply to the debate, please.

**Deputy Gollop:** Well, thank you.

I have to give apologies to you, sir, and everyone else, that it was very much of a late result. But I will give my thinking there first.

The point is, that I had actually suggested to the Law Officers that I was toying with an amendment over a week ago. But of course, my fundamental philosophical position, like other Members, really, is I would stick at one by-election rather than the two. But it is obvious that from the attitude today that Members in some areas were looking for change and compromise. And we had just before lunch, from probably Deputies who do not always like late amendments, Deputy de Sausmarez and, particularly, Deputy Mahoney, a key amendment about electoral expenses that had game-changing implications for candidates. And that has now been withdrawn for the reasons Deputy de Sausmarez outlined, that it will be reconsidered in a more measured way.

But I suppose, I thought if Members who did not place amendments on reducing electoral expenses, were suddenly saying on the day of the debate itself, 'We do not like the amendment or the Proposition', then I thought it was my duty, in a way, to give another option. And I thank Deputy Gabriel and other Members for realising that because the criticisms levelled at me could equally be levelled, to a certain extent, at those who put the amendment on the expenses.

Now, I will start with, do a thematic ... Deputy Meerveld said that he would have liked more time for me to develop this with SACC. Well, I could go on for an hour, but I had better not. I think people want to get on with the vote on this, to say the least.

But first of all, I will talk about Deputy Moakes who mentioned what is a fairly common position, that many people in the community consider that maybe there are too many Deputies and they are rewarded too handsomely. Well, of course, that has been around for a long time. But I will remind people, especially the more longer serving Members like Deputy Trott and Deputy Le Tocq, that we started this life with 57 Members. And it is a bit like the old joke, 'How many Deputies does it take to change a light bulb? Well, none because they do not want to change'. (*Laughter*) But my other joke would be, 'How many Deputies do you need to fill a States?' Well, the public clearly say, many less of them. But then if you actually ask the public how many there are currently, they would not necessarily know. And they are even less aware of how many States' Members there used to be. So it is a bigger question than that.

And in fact, some Members gave a view to the fact that maybe there were too many Members and perhaps we would be better off with 35 rather than 38, for the sake of argument, but that is not the point of this. The point is, we are leaving seats empty. And I wonder if they had been even more radical and suggested five instead of three, how that would have gone.

Now Deputy Prow wandered off into the Machinery of Government arena a little bit and he mentioned our friends on the Isle of Man. Now, that is an interesting insight, because they do have a larger population than us and they have strengths and weaknesses as a society and they are a competitor. But I would mention two points there. I have been there several times and have good relationships with the House of Keys, I think. But they have 24 Members, including an elected

political speaker. And the Tynwald has an elected speaker who is not exactly a politician, but is a political representative. But they also have a Legislative Council which consists of 11 people. Two of them are ex-officio, like the Law Officers, but the other eight plus the President are selected by the Assembly, like we used to select Conseillers – not quite a parallel, but it is that sort of thing. And so, actually, they have 32 politicians of whom 24 are directly elected and a bit like our old Conseiller system, 10 are indirectly elected. So they are not a lot smaller than us.

But I think the most pertinent point to make here is the minimum salary for a backbench Member of the House of Keys is £75,000 a year in an Island where property is a lot cheaper. So that raises a different issue, perhaps. But it makes a point.

The democratic deficit is an interesting argument that came across from several speakers – Deputy Gabriel and others. It is true, there is a stronger argument that when we had parochial districts, if you, for the sake of argument, had three empty seats in the west, that or any other district, that would not be acceptable. An Island-wide can muddy the waters a bit. One off-the-cuff suggestion I have received is that it could have been filled, the seat, by somebody from the parochial system who lived in the parish. Well, that actually would be rather odd. But initially, in the last Island-wide election, they had each candidate identify with a parish, but that was quickly stopped.

I entirely endorse what Deputy Trott said, that if we had followed these Rules in the past, and there was a case when I first observed the States in the Public Gallery, an unfortunate and highly respected candidate died a week after the election. But in more recent times, we all mourn the loss of those States' Members. Deputy Parkinson returned in a by-election, I remember, in 2015, and we were grateful for him to come back. But in the case of the late, great Deputy Jones, when he passed away, there was a big gap because it was in the summer. But four months later, Deputy Inder appeared. Now you have got to vote for this because we would be missing someone like Deputy Inder coming in (*Laughter*) with all guns firing. And instead, we would just have an empty seat and we would have been very much the worse off, I would argue, in the last term in that respect (*Interjection*) Well, anyway.

The democratic deficit is important in another respect, a more subtle reason. Given our current size and number of Committees, I could go on at length about how we actually have more Committee seats to fill, believe it or not, for 38 Members than we had in the days when we had Ministers. Not in Scrutiny, but in actual functional Committees.

I found that it is difficult to fill places. When I was President of the DPA, I struggled – perhaps it was me, my own personality – to get candidates to fill one of the empty seats. I eventually solved the problem by the very good admission of the Alderney Representative. But we do find, generally speaking, if vacancies occur for some of our Committees, that we cannot fill them easily. So if we were in the unfortunate position of three permanently empty seats, or two empty seats, a year into the life of the Assembly, I think that would not help us.

And I kind of agree with Deputy Burford, that there is an argument for more Members. Not necessarily more Members of the Government, but a diversity of approach, because some people who arrive in the Assembly do find it onerous. They are, perhaps, not able to compete across the spectrum and we need flexibility and I believe keeping up the number of Members.

Deputy Meerveld's point about electoral apathy is fair enough, and by-elections usually have lower turnouts than general elections. Although, in the past, when we had eight candidates, I took part in a by-election for nine Members once, did not get in and there was another one for eight, but the turnout was unusually high.

His point of electoral fatigue is really something for SACC to confront. I do not see why a by-election would not encourage candidates to stand and the public to vote. And in fact, you cannot have it both ways, because one of the arguments in the report is that after an election, there would be loads of candidates who just missed out in the first few months.

And one of my worries is Deputy Burford suggested it could cost £250,000. Interestingly enough, the newer Members of SACC, Deputy Burford and Deputy St Pier, have sympathies from my perspective, and I was puzzled why we moved from two to three. But Deputy Burford hinted it might cost a £250,000. Deputy Meerveld explained the whole cost of the election was £600,000-plus. I am

2400 a bit horrified by that because I know from a Freedom of Information request in the States of Jersey, under their senatorial system, a by-election, excluding staff costs, to be fair, and one or two others, was only £30,000. And we all know there was an Island-wide election when we had Island-wide Conseillers that, believe it or not, Tony Webber won. But there were 4,000 voters and it was at minimal cost.

2405 I just won a by-election for the Douzaine because of the sad death of Douzenier Garrett from St Peter Port. And I cannot imagine the cost of that was very extensive. I got in easily because I was the only candidate, (*Laughter*) but we will not go into that. So I do not see why these costs are so high. If they are that high, shouldn't we be working on a system that is more frugal, that would enable Island-wide in a lighter way?

2410 Yes, Deputy Dudley-Owen and other Members criticised me, but the truth is, these issues were explored by SACC and they are not difficult to take a judgement call on. And if you are trying to balance the principles of constitutional representative democracy and cost and overload, then surely, looking at two is a good compromise to make.

2415 And Deputy Soulsby is right, that one tried to go through the procedure. And yes, in some ways it is hard to quantify the cost, for example, but I think the Committee were aware, beforehand, of some of these arguments, if not, the specifics of the amendment. So I moved the amendment and I think if it does not succeed on this occasion, it will be a lost opportunity, because it may well come back in legislation or very quickly before a future Assembly.

2420 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, it is time now to vote on Amendment 4, proposed by Deputy Gollop, seconded by Deputy Gabriel. And I will invite the Greffier to open the voting, please.

*There was a recorded vote.*

2425 *Not carried – Pour 12, Contre 21, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 2, Absent 5*

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

**The Bailiff:** So in respect of Amendment 4, proposed by Deputy Gollop and seconded by Deputy Gabriel, there voted in favour 12 Members; 21 Members voted against; no Member abstained; 7 Members did not participate. And therefore, I will declare Amendment 4 lost.

2430 We now resume general debate. Mr Comptroller, you have had some thinking time. I have a question that was posed what seems a lifetime ago by Deputy Queripel.

**The Comptroller:** Indeed, sir. Yes, thank you for the thinking time.

2435 Yes, I think my point is that, looking back at the Resolutions from 2019, the way I interpreted things is that the grant related to the 2020 Election. It was not an ongoing grant that was given with every election. So, in fact, I think it is arguable that if Amendment 4 was defeated, there would not be a grant anyway, if you see what I mean. Or perhaps not.

2440 Sir, the point I am making is, in the context of the Propositions which were put and the grant was introduced by way of an amendment, I think. The way I read that Proposition was that it applied in respect of the 2020 Election. And therefore, if there was to be a grant for this election, it would need to be a positive Resolution to provide for a grant of a particular amount. And arguably, I do not think it actually needs to be discontinued. So that if Amendment 4 was not there at all, and somebody were to ask me, I would say, well, there is no grant, if that helps.

2445 **The Bailiff:** Okay.

Is there any other Member wishing to speak? (*Interjection*) This is general debate at the moment, now. Yes.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

2450 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Sir, can I just clarify whether we are still expecting an amendment from SACC or not, before I speak?

**The Bailiff:** It is possible that there is an amendment in development.

2455 **Deputy Meerveld:** Yes, sir. There is an amendment going through the process now being proposed by myself and seconded by Deputy de Sausmarez.

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** You have called me though, right? So I could not sit down?

2460 **The Bailiff:** I did call you. Yes.

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** You can call me back later, maybe? Or ...?

2465 **The Bailiff:** No, I do not think so. It is not a ring back option! (*Laughter*) Speak now.

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Okay. I will speak. I will speak now. Okay. That is fine, I will speak. I will also speak to this future potential amendment that might be laid or not laid so I will not speak on that.

2470 **The Bailiff:** You will have the opportunity to speak on the amendment, if it is moved.

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** That is fine.

2475 I think we have all been here longer than I think we all expected (*Interjections*) thanks to the last-minute amendments that we have been laying. I think we have had a balanced debate on the expenditure limits which is now a substantive Proposition. And I think, to me, we have only gone through one Island-wide election cycle, we have some evidence about how much money was spent, but we have not seen that the election expenditure has been a problem. Right. It has not been identified as a problem. The £6,000 limits that was set up has not been identified as a problem, either in its policy letter or in the review of the Island-wide voting that Scrutiny has undertaken. So  
2480 I am quite concerned that there is potentially still further work to be done by a Committee that desperately does not have the resources, as we have always known, that they have to do any further work on this subject.

2485 So I would really strongly advise and hope that this Assembly can focus on just getting ahead with just what we have got and focusing on solving problems that we know our Island has. And not trying to come up with problems that we do not have right now and spending resources that we

do not have on projects and further research that we do not need to do. So I really hope we can get ahead with voting for the expensive Propositions as we are, and not waste any further time on finding problems that do not exist.

2490 With this in mind and given that the last amendment did not succeed, I will be voting against SACC's Proposition to hold by-elections with only three vacancies. And I hope the Assembly can support the *status quo* as well.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Taylor.

2495

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

I have not really got a huge amount to add, but I am just going to repeat my question that was posed to the President of SACC about the cost for holding a by-election. It feels like the Committee or SACC knew this. They must have known the cost when they discussed the cost of by-elections. 2500 Apologies if I missed it when he spoke to the amendment that was just defeated, but I am intending to vote against Proposition 5. But unless you can give me a decent figure, we have heard the figure of £250,000 from Deputy Burford, if Deputy Meerveld can confirm that is an accurate figure or if you can give some information, that might sway my mind, but ...

I give way to Deputy Meerveld.

2505

**Deputy Meerveld:** I thank Deputy Taylor for giving way. It gives me an opportunity to answer the question straight off the hoof. The number we have been given by officers is a starting price of around £250,000, bearing in mind that our full election was £877,000.

2510

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gabriel.

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

I rise, really, for clarification. Members have said that they may be voting against Proposition 5 and I am just wondering what the *status quo* returns back to. We can see in Article 6 2515 of the Proposition letter, that is Article 29.2 of the Reform Law, states about the casual vacancy. So maybe either yourself as Presiding Officer or either H.M. Comptroller could confirm what the *status quo* will be or what the trigger for a by-election would be if Proposition 5 fails.

Thank you.

2520

**The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** I am mainly filling a little bit of time until this amendment can come forward. But yes, I too would just like to put on record my reasoning for my intent to vote against Proposition 5.

2525 Yes, it is one of the unfortunate things and it is similar to a lot of the issues that have arisen as a result of, or around, the candidate expenditure allowances. It is just a function of our very unique system of Island-wide voting that it is very different from the from the district or parish voting days because it requires the full kit and caboodle to be gone through again.

2530 So yes, I am comfortable with the idea of a democratic deficit to that extent. Given that by-elections for reasons other than death are unusual and, hopefully, we would be very unfortunate to experience more than one death in any political term. But I still do not think a democratic deficit of one is particularly palatable. And so I intend to vote against Proposition 5.

2535 And maybe slightly pre-empting, but in response to Deputy Kazantseva-Miller's comments, I do think that the issue of candidate expenditure allowances requires further examination. The reason being that the limits were set in relation to the previous limits. And the previous limits were set as a complete finger in the air. And I can say that with some confidence, because they were set as a result of an amendment that I brought in or I proposed which provided a cascade of options. And



it was literally a menu of different limits and we kept cascading through the options until we hit a majority. So it really was a finger in the air subjective field, because nobody had any idea of what would be required in an Island-wide election. And I do think the data that we have had produced since then shows that there is significant scope for a lower level, which then irons out the possibility of some people having a very significant advantage over others.

I am looking to His Majesty's Comptroller for any indication that he might be happy with the wording of the amendment that has been submitted by Deputy Meerveld.

**The Comptroller:** Sir, if I can respond. I have sent an email to Deputy de Sausmarez with what I think is the final wording, or ought to be the final wording. There was a typo in the draft that I got. I think my wording corrects it. But if Deputy de Sausmarez has confirmed, I think we are there.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** In the circumstances. Have you finished speaking, Deputy de Sausmarez?

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** I think so, sir. I was really just killing time.

**The Bailiff:** Can I say, it did not show! *(Laughter)*

Members of the States, there are effectively two options at the moment, unless there is any other Member who wishes to speak in general debate at this stage. But we have got a clear indication that there is an intention to submit an amendment. So rather than having other people pop to their feet to try and fill the time, I think it is called 'filibustering' in some places, that we could just simply adjourn the sitting until the amendment has been submitted and paper copies are on your desk. And therefore, you can come back, read the amendment, and then we can deal with the amendment and then we get to the conclusion of the debate moderately quickly. The alternative is that because the amendment has not been submitted, I call the President to conclude the debate.

So I am going to propose to you that the States stand adjourned until such time as the amendment has been lodged, submitted, circulated, printed and is placed on your desk. And hopefully, that will be done as quickly as possible. Those in favour; those against?

*Members voted Pour.*

**The Bailiff:** I will declare that carried. We will stand adjourned until that happens.

*The Assembly adjourned at 3.34 p.m.  
and resumed its sitting at 3.50 p.m.*

**General Election 2025 – Second Policy Letter –  
Debate continued –  
Propositions carried**

**The Bailiff:** Members of the States, I hope you have got a copy of Amendment 5. If so, I will invite the proposer of it, Deputy Meerveld, to move Amendment 5.

[Amendment 5:](#)

*To insert the following proposition following Proposition 3, as follows (and renumber accordingly):*

*"To direct the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee to explore lower candidate expenditure limits and to submit a policy letter detailing its findings in time for consideration by the States by the end of September 2024 at the latest."*

*Rule 4(1) Information*

- a) The amendment neither supports nor detracts from the States strategic objectives.*
- b) Consultation with the States' Assembly Constitution Committee has taken place.*
- c) The proposition has been submitted to His Majesty's Comptroller for advice on any legal or constitutional implications.*
- d) There are no financial consequences to this amendment.*

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

First, I would like to thank Deputy de Sausmarez and Deputy Mahoney for meeting with the Committee over lunch time and discussing the amendment that they had laid. Looking to reduce the expenditure limit for individuals and parties.

The SACC Committee Members had raised concerns about both, making an evidence-based decision where we can come back with actual numbers for updated costs for different channels that members of the electorate may use in promoting themselves to the electorate. And also check with the Venice Commission requirements or recommendations to make sure that anything, any changes we made were not restrictive or contradictory with those or the CPA group and their recommendations.

So what this amendment does is basically inserts an additional Proposition. It does not override the £12,000 and £6,000 limits that have been approved by amendment today. It simply says that SACC makes a commitment to come back to the Assembly with a policy letter to be debated in September that will detail, give the information and options for Members to decide on the expenditure limit for individuals and for groups. And I will, the Committee will also take the opportunity to look at the election manifesto book, as Deputy Brouard requested, and see if there is any way to change the format of that going forward. So we will look at those and other things that are related to it. So in other words, the package or the way that the candidates present themselves with the assistance of the States and come back with some recommendations and information so that we can have a more informed debate on what is a very important issue, as it literally affects our democracy and how it functions.

So with that, sir, I commend this amendment to the Assembly and look forward to debate.

**The Bailiff:** And Deputy de Sausmarez, do you formally second the amendment?

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** Yes, please.

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

**Deputy Falla:** Sir, it might be that the debate fatigue has got to me a bit, but I just wanted to clarify a point, please. If, for any reason, SACC does not return in September or at any point, as directed here, because we are inserting rather than replacing, does that mean their existing Proposition would stand?  
Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Mahoney.

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

Obviously, I was in that meeting, and I just want to have the President of SACC confirm to everybody, as he did to Deputy de Sausmarez and I, that he will be bringing this. There are no excuses for not bringing this back to the Assembly. Aside from the fact that we always hearing there

are no staff to do this, it has been cast iron-guaranteed that by September we will see something to this effect.

There was talk of, he will bring a vote of no confidence etc. against us, if we do not. I would just like him to confirm that we had that conversation. And then of course, requêtes are thrown around as well. So purely to actually get the President of SACC to confirm that those were part of the conversations we had in room number one during lunch time.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

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

I welcome the conversation that took place over the lunch hour with SACC Committee and Deputy Mahoney. And just wanted to assure Members – and also, I am sure it will be confirmed by Deputy Meerveld when he replies to debate – that this amendment, which of course, has been laid in lieu of what would have been what was Amendment 3, will respect the spirit of Amendment 3 which was to provide options for significantly lower expenditure limits for candidates.

And really, I think it does. I do not think this is the time to debate the issue in any great detail. But it does really seem to come down to a few distinct areas. For example, printed materials. So the printing and posting of, for example, manifestos and paid-for advertising.

The conversation was quite interesting. And it is clear that there are some more creative ideas that could be explored in this, in order to look at those issues in the round. And so I am hoping that is the kind of work and the breadth of work, admittedly, very quickly, that the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee seeks to carry out. I believe they have indicated that they will be able to do this. So they have resources sufficient to do that work in that timeline. Although, I have asked for it to be brought within the parameters of the work, it is obviously one specific issue and so I think it should be relatively straightforward to do that work. A lot of the groundwork has already been covered and other material. So I think it should be fairly straightforward to make sure the issue is examined in some detail and bring a very narrowly focused policy letter on that particular one.

But I think it does capture what I feel was a mood in the Assembly to go lower than had been proposed even by Deputy Bury's Amendment 1. So I am very grateful to SACC for working with us on this compromise, and I hope it does the trick.

Thank you.

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

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Sir, first of all, I want to draw a Members' attention to point (a) under Rule 4(1), which says, 'the amendment neither supports nor detracts from the States' strategic objectives'.

So my first question is, why are we even looking into this because, as the President of SACC, as the proposer of this amendment, clearly says that it, 'neither support nor detracts from the States' strategic objectives'.

The second point is that, 'the Proposition, as it stands, wants this to be debated in September of this year at the latest'. We have two meetings in September, at the beginning and at the end. In order to hit the deadlines for those debates to be taken place, the policy letter has to be either submitted at the beginning of July for the early September Meeting, which leaves you about a month and a week, about five weeks, and 16th August to submit a policy letter for the end of the September debate.

So again, what has to give way for this work to suddenly become a priority for the Committee of SACC which has a major general election and all sorts of other outstanding items on their agenda. We have always heard about resource constraints. And suddenly, within five weeks or a bit longer, over the summer recess, which inevitably there will be holidays and stuff affected, suddenly we are

2670 asking them to drop everything else because to do something that neither supports nor detracts from States' strategic objectives.

But further building on that point, as I mentioned in my previous speech in general debate, there has been no evidence to indicate that setting a limit of £6,000 has created any kind of issue for the election. There is no evidence and I really doubt what further work he will be able to do to suddenly  
2675 discover some magic number that is going to solve all of our problems in the States of Guernsey and the election cycle.

I really think this is a complete and total waste of time of the Assembly, of throwing resources that we do not have, to do something that neither supports nor detracts from the States' strategic objective, to do something that we really do not need to do right now, to solve a problem that we  
2680 have not even identified.

But I do want to draw to the direction of travel that Deputy de Sausmarez wanted us to go under and I think the objective of this amendment is that extreme direction is encompassed in the research. So the proposals of the amendment that were not laid, which I assume would be in scope for this amendment, so hence my reference, was for the expenditure to be limited to £2,000. Well,  
2685 if we accept that we have had inflation in this political term, so in real terms the £6,000 limit is actually £7,500, reducing the limit to £2,000, so by £5,500, represents a 73% real time reduction in expenditure limits. So this is the type of direction that Deputy de Sausmarez feels would be appropriate to do.

Well to do that, and I think Deputy Brouard illustrated that very well, this creates a huge advantage for incumbents in this Assembly. And by the way our political system is designed, it creates also advantages for Presidents who seem to appear on the face of their Committees and appear in media more frequently than the others.  
2690

So what Deputy de Sausmarez will be creating is an extremely preferential position for those incumbents that also –

2695

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

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

2700 **Deputy Haskins:** Sir, I get that there has been a lot said in previous debates, but this one particular amendment does not say, does not refer to what Deputy de Sausmarez was saying before. So I think this is not relevant to this particular debate.

**The Bailiff:** Well, I am going to allow Deputy Kazantseva-Miller to continue developing the theme that she is developing at the moment which is basically to say, 'vote against this amendment'.  
2705

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

It is exactly the point I am making, because the implications of lowering expenditure, especially to the limits that Deputy de Sausmarez is clearly advocating, has extremely serious repercussions. It is totally undemocratic. It prevents people from standing and being able to run the campaigns they may need. It potentially leads to very significant centralisation of actually campaigning into the hands of the States of Guernsey, because they will determine what campaign materials are developed. Is it the manifesto with two pages, four pages? Is it videos, is it not? So it is going to be, and ultimately, the States of Guernsey are the Deputies here who determine how elections are going  
2710 to be run.

2715 So this is a really dangerous direction. The key is that we do not have any evidence to say that the limit had any issues at the last election. And really, given the severe resource constraints and how much we and the Committee – I am not giving away, Deputy de Sausmarez – have still on their plate to do.

2720 Please, let's get on with real business and solving real issues for our Islanders and not waste any more time trying to force the Committee and re-debating this issue in September or wherever. Please throw out this amendment.

**Two Members:** Hear, hear!

2725

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

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

2730 I have been rather enjoying the experience of watching Deputy Mahoney throw off the shackles and burdens of responsibility in office and emerging from an ugly chrysalis into a beautiful butterfly of a backbencher! *(Laughter)* And in that process, his previous messages to this Assembly, on many occasions, that we should not have late amendments seems to have gone with the wind. And these are transitions which I recognise! *(Laughter)* So I welcome him to the butterfly club! *(Laughter)*

2735 But more seriously, I am pleased that Deputy Mahoney and Deputy de Sausmarez have agreed to not lay the previous amendment and to bring this amendment. And really, I rise to respond to Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, because really the case which she has made is precisely why the Committee felt that this work needed to be done. Because there was a very real risk that if the amendment had gone forward as was, the previous amendment that has not now been laid, that this Assembly could have made a decision to arbitrarily further lower the spending limits, engaging  
2740 all the risks that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller has spoken about. And certainly, for me, sir, when there was talk of an amendment in the offing, before it appeared, that the initial research I did in relation to the Venice Commission and, indeed, the CPA, I have not had a chance to look at the UK Electoral Commission, but there are very real concerns expressed by the Venice Commission. They talk about the freedom of expression, the code of good practice in electoral matters.

2745 The Venice Commission underscores the importance of freedom of expression and access to diverse media:

Limiting candidates to only States-sponsored media could be seen as restrictive and potentially stifling political debate and diversity of opinion.

And fair competition under the CPA principles, benchmarks of democratic legislatures. These benchmarks stress that, 'All candidates should have fair opportunities to campaign whilst States  
2750 resources should be accessible, restricting candidates to only States-sponsored routes could undermine' – I am not giving away. You will have an opportunity to respond to the debate – 'could undermine fair competition'.

And now, clearly, there is a legitimate debate to be had as to whether having a lower limit or whether it is £2,000, £3,000, £4,000, whatever it is, is driving candidates to only, effectively, use  
2755 States-sponsored routes. And that is precisely the work which the Committee now need to undertake and to present that information to the States. So the States can make an informed decision on where they think that line ought to be drawn.

As Deputy de Sausmarez said earlier, it had effectively emerged, as you said earlier, sir, it was a it was a selection from a Pic 'n' Mix back in 20-*whenever*. It was to be reflatd. It has now been deflated back to £6,000. And then we were going to go through another Pic 'n' Mix, as you  
2760 suggested, sir, to pick another number.

We need to do this in a more sophisticated ... This is our democratic process. We need to be much more rigorous about this. That, sir, to Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, is precisely why we need a bit of time to do that. And seeking to make a decision on the hoof that Deputy Mahoney had suddenly acquired a new love for was precisely the wrong move to make.

2765 And so I am pleased the amendment has come forward and there will be a time for the States to consider these issues properly.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

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

2770 Yes, I leapt up at the same time as Deputy St Pier before. I think he has covered some of the points I was going to say.

Really, in response to Deputy Kazantseva-Miller. I agree with pretty much everything the Deputy said, although possibly with the exception that being a President stands you in better stead for an election. I speak from bitter experience that that is not always true. But that aside, I agree SACC does not want to do extra work if it does not need to. But the fact that we had the meeting with the proposer and seconder of the amendment that was going to be laid and we have agreed that as a compromise, and it is a compromise, quite often the solution that nobody really wanted, it shows how strongly we feel about the risks that were associated with the amendment to possibly lower the figure to £2,000. And the mood in this Assembly, this morning, when the previous one was being debated, was definitely heading in that direction. It could well be that if we had just gone ahead and debated that amendment, it would have lost. But I rather think that what would have happened is that the £3,000 option would have prevailed, being then the new middle option. And the States certainly has form on that in the past.

2785 So it is a tight timescale, but I am sure the SACC Committee will pull together in every way we possibly can. I would like to think that we will aim for 1st July deadline, so that we have something in reserve. And we can come back to this Assembly with an evidence-based report which also takes into account some of the other points that were discussed this morning, including over manifestos, etc.

Thank you.

2790

**The Bailiff:** Deputy de Lisle.

**Deputy de Lisle:** Sir, in all due respect to Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, I do not see this amendment as a waste of time. I must say that when Deputy Roffey circulated his intention to bring in an amendment for his six and 12, basically, £6,000 and £12,000, replacing the £7,500 to £15,000, I had suggested at that time, my position being five and 10 – in other words, £5,000 and £10,000. I thought that was a better stance for an amendment.

2800 So I would like for the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee to consider that £5,000 and £10,000 in their deliberations that they are to have with respect to this amendment, if it passes. And I fully endorse and support this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fairclough.

2805 **Deputy Fairclough:** Thank you, sir.

It will, I hope, come as no surprise to my colleagues on SACC or Deputy de Sausmarez and Deputy Mahoney, that I will not be supporting this amendment. I am all for making evidence-based decisions, but that is what has brought us to the policy letter before you today. I am not sure what else we can explore and I think we will probably find ourselves back here in September having exactly the same debate all over again.

2810 Yes, there will be resource implications, not only for SACC, but also for the election team staff employed by the Home Affairs Committee. This will also fly in the face of good practice, in that all legislation pertaining to elections should be in place at least a year before an election. And if this amendment is successful, that now is not going to happen.

2815 Many of the points regarding the principles have already been made and I will not be going over those. SACC and the election team have come up with the proposals we have and it is every Member's right to try and amend these, of course. But I think there is a certain irony in this Assembly being elected with an election spending limit of £6,000 and then deciding we should slash it once we are in. It is a bit like, I do not know, States' Members setting their own pay! *(Laughter)*

2820 What is sometimes forgotten, and it has been alluded to by other Members, is that sometimes we find ourselves in a political bubble or echo chamber, whether we like it or not. And that has been alluded to by Deputy Queripel and Deputy Gollop earlier in the debate. And there is an inherent intangible advantage to sitting Members going into an election over new candidates, despite the fact that we are somewhat, inevitably, the worst States ever.

2825 In short, sir, I would rather have had the debate on Amendment 3. I will make no secret of that. I would have voted against it. And I am quite happy to explain why, but now I believe is not the time or place to do that.

Thank you.

2830 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Taylor.

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

I suppose there is a bit of a point just to raise. I think we spent more time debating the election than we did affordable housing in our last States' Meeting. But I do not think that was a priority, affordable housing!

2835 I probably want to say that I share some of the concerns that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller has raised. Albeit, I have to say I am slightly less concerned than her. But I do have a slight concern that we are just going to be wasting more and more time. I get that an election is an important part of democracy, but how many policy letters do we need to have from SACC on this topic?

2840 My understanding, from pretty simple political observations, is that towards the end of the term, you get more and more policy letters and more and more stuff coming through. And do we need more on this one topic?

So, sir, I am drawn to paragraph 1.6 of the original policy letter which tells us that:

A further policy letter will come from the Committee later this year which will cover candidate criminal conviction declarations.

2845 That came about of the amendments of the last time we debated the election. So, it was, I think, an amendment from Deputy Roffey and Deputy Meerveld and from Deputy Bury and Deputy Oliver.

So, we have got all this stuff coming back. Can we now just make a decision and move on from this? I do not ... It is death by a thousand cuts, sir. That is how I see it. So, I am not too fussed, I just hope Members will vote this out.

2850 And I think, if I had to sum up the way I feel about this, I would say I sit similar to Deputy Mahoney. Although, he has not spoken, it has been referenced that he has gone with the wind. And I think I have gone with the wind too, sir, because frankly, I don't ... I will not give you the whole quote. But, 'Frankly, I don't give a ...!' (*Laughter*)

Thank you.

2855 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Gollop:** Yes.

I enjoyed being a member of SACC, to say the least. In fact, I had been on the House Committee before. But I did find one, perhaps, minor downside of the role. Our meetings were only, generally, 2860 monthly with some exceptions, and we had to be out of there in three hours, later two, and I wanted to go on and on and on. But I think, to a degree, we should have met more frequently to debate these things. And I also think that we were, before the new Members, Deputy St Pier and Deputy Burford joined, a little bit of an echo chamber, even though we had our disagreements.

2865 And I think we have seen three times in the last year, the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee come before us with some well thought out, some policies in the pack, and we have seen, amazingly, not in some cases, amendments done a week or two ahead, but a whole range of late considerations. We saw that in January, and we saw that in the latter part to do with the Code of Conduct as well.

And my thinking there is, we might benefit more from SACC having workshops and/or email consulting with Members on some of these questions to draw where the levels of gravity are within the framework that Deputy St Pier ... Because I agree with him that we have to be extremely careful in terms of being seen to be fair, in terms of parliamentary candidates, without just using state resources.

But I think consultation with the Members would help and actually those dreaded presentations, because presentations held a week or two before, if Members turn up, at least flesh out issues and enable some feedback to occur before they come. So that is perhaps a little prayer of mine.

I personally am happy with the amendment Deputy Bury won earlier and do not particularly want to support this amendment. But if it becomes a Proposition, I will support it at Proposition stage. I think that it does create a situation of uncertainty. And it risks undermining a bit of the good work that we have already done, because SACC have already been engaging with potential candidates. And those candidates had every reason to think, maybe, that the expenses would be similar to last time. And now we are not only changed the goalpost on grants to candidates, but also on allowable personal expenses from their own resources, potentially, quite radically. As Deputy Kazantseva-Miller said, by a margin of 73%, maybe.

So I think there are issues with this way of thinking. And again, I wonder, given the fact that SACC do not have unlimited staff resources, whether it will be possible for them to bring it in this time, even though their intention is clearly that.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Queripel.

**Deputy Queripel:** Sir, regarding the term, 'to explore', can Deputy Meerveld please tell us what that means? What exactly will SACC be doing to explore candidate expenditure limits? Surely that exploration is going to have to be pretty comprehensive to enable them to come to a conclusion and draw up recommendations. And bearing in mind what Deputy Kazantseva-Miller said about timing, I am in need of an assurance that SACC will be able to carry out that comprehensive exploration in such a short space of time.

Just picking up on what Deputy Taylor said, can we have some clarification about whether or not this will be a separate policy letter to the other policy letter that is mentioned in paragraph 1.6? So would we end up with at least four policy letters debating one issue?

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** I will invite the proposer of Amendment 5, Deputy Meerveld, to reply to the debate, please.

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

Where do I start? I would like to thank Deputy Kazantseva-Miller for her support of the Committee and her consideration towards the workload we do have and the lack of resources that we also have. And I understand her frustration at wanting the States to focus on other matters. But I also agree with other Deputies who talked about democracy. At the end of the day, we have to safeguard democracy and make sure that we are enabling people to stand in our community under a set of rules that are not just fair to them, but that are also internationally recognised and acknowledged to be fair.

And the Committee were concerned that if we had gone into the debate by majority. If we had gone into the debate on the proposed Amendment 3 that we would not have had a time to even make a cursory examination of whether it may bring us in jeopardy of either undermining the rights of candidates and members of the electorate to stand, or be perceived to be in contravention of the Venice Commission or various other bodies' expectations of our election. So, we welcomed Deputy Mahoney and Deputy de Sausmarez agreeing to withdraw their amendment and give us more time to work up a more considered position for Members to then be able to debate.



2920 Yes, it is more work for SACC. Yes, we have made a commitment. We definitely will delay debate in September, barring some *force majeure* that might undermine the ability to do so. And I can confirm that Deputy Mahoney did threaten an MONC, but then again, that has been threatened for a while and not necessarily relating to reasons of the performance of the SACC Committee.

2925 **Deputy Mahoney:** Point of correction.

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

2930 **Deputy Mahoney:** I did not threaten it. Deputy Meerveld said, 'And if we do not, then you should bring a motion of no confidence', which I gladly agreed with.  
Thank you. (*Laughter*)

**Deputy Meerveld:** We have slightly different recollections. But yes, a motion of no confidence was mentioned and I know it keeps on coming up for different reasons.

2935 Deputy Kazantseva-Miller is very right about the delivery timelines or the publication dates in early July or 16th August to meet those debate dates. The amount of work we can do: Deputy Lester Queripel referred to extensive exploration; it will be as much as we can do within the time constraints and the resource constraints that we have. But what we do need to do is to be able to make sure that it is an informed debate by first checking whether or not conventions do apply or that we  
2940 should be mindful of. The practicalities of people standing in our election system and whether lowering the limit precludes people from choosing some channels to approach the electorate which typically they have enjoyed in the past. And just to confirm to Deputy Queripel, it will be a separate policy letter, we will do specifically one on this. Again, not to conflate it with other debates, we will be bringing something specifically to address this issue.

2945 On that note, I thank Members for their consideration and leave it up to Members to decide.  
Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, it is time to vote on Amendment 5, proposed by Deputy Meerveld, seconded by Deputy de Sausmarez. And I will invite the Greffier to open the voting,  
2950 please.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 19, Contre 11, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 3, Absent 5*

<b>Pour</b>	<b>Contre</b>	<b>Ne vote pas</b>	<b>Did not vote</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Aldwell, Sue	Dyke, John	Brouard, Al	Parkinson, Charles	Ferbrache, Peter
Blin, Chris	Fairclough, Simon	Bury, Tina	Roberts, Steve	Inder, Neil
Burford, Yvonne	Gabriel, Adrian		Snowdon, Alexander	Le Tissier, Chris
Cameron, Andy	Gollop, John			Oliver, Victoria
De Lisle, David	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha			Roffey, Peter
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	Le Tocq, Jonathan			
Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Murray, Bob			
Falla, Steve	Soulsby, Heidi			
Haskins, Sam	Taylor, Andrew			
Helyar, Mark	Trott, Lyndon			
Leadbeater, Marc	Vermeulen, Simon			
Mahoney, David				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Prow, Robert				
Queripel, Lester				
St Pier, Gavin				

2955 **The Bailiff:** So, in respect of Amendment 5, proposed by Deputy Meerveld, seconded by Deputy de Sausmarez, there voted in favour 19 Members; there voted against 11 Members; 2 Members abstained; 8 Members did not participate in the vote. And therefore, I will declare Amendment 5 duly carried which means we now have seven Propositions.

2960 And we return to general debate, at least, until the time the next amendment arrives! (*Laughter*)  
But as I do not see anyone – Oh.

**Deputy Gabriel:** I know I have already spoken in general debate, sir, but I asked a question of yourself or H.M. Comptroller and I just wondered if that answer could be verbalised in the Assembly. Thank you. (**The Bailiff:** Mm.) Would you like me to repeat the question, sir?

2965 **The Bailiff:** No, I can remember it, but the Comptroller might not because he might have been doing something else at the time.

The wording in paragraph 6.1 of the policy letter sets out the terms of paragraph 2 of Article 29 of the Reform Law and that is the default position as of today, in relation to triggering a by-election. As soon as there is one vacancy, there will be a by-election, unless that vacancy only arises late in the term, in which case it falls to the Presiding Officer to decide whether or not there will be an election to fill that vacancy at that time.

2970 In relation to Proposition 6, as it now is, what is being proposed is that provision be amended so that there would have to be three vacancies before any by-election would be triggered.

2975 Does that answer the question that you raised, Deputy Gabriel?

**Deputy Gabriel:** And if that fails, sir, it falls back to the *status quo* as described in Proposition 6.1?

2980 **The Bailiff:** So if Proposition 6, as it is now numbered, old Proposition 5, were not to be carried, and I think there will be quite a lot of discreet votes on this suite of Propositions, then Article 29.2 remains unchanged.

Mr Comptroller, I hope you agree with that. (**The Comptroller:** I do, sir.)

2985 Well, as no other Member wishes to speak, I will – Oh.

**Deputy Soulsby:** I was just going to ask for clarification on Proposition 3 of expenditure limits, that if that were to be voted down, does that mean there are no expenditure limits at all?

**The Bailiff:** Mr Comptroller? (*Laughter*)

2990 I think I know what I would say but I will ask you instead.

The Proposition 3, as amended, if that were not to carry, what would the position be about expenditure limits for candidates and political parties?

**The Comptroller:** I do not think there is a default, sir.

2995 **The Bailiff:** I do not think there is a default. I think that there needs to be something. But you have now got Proposition 4 which means that the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee would be directed to come back with something, anyway, and it would be done by way of an ordinance.

3000 **The Comptroller:** It is an ordinance, sir, that is required to set the limit.

**The Bailiff:** Yes. So it will be an ordinance that would be needed.

3005 If Proposition 3 were to be carried and Proposition 7 were also to be carried then, answering Deputy Falla's question from the last amendment, it is unlikely that the legislation would be enacted for those Proposition 3 limits until such time as there had been the debate on Proposition 4.

Is that a fair summary?

**The Comptroller:** Sir, I see it that way as well, yes, I agree.

3010

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Taylor. You are looking very critical.

**Deputy Taylor:** Sorry, sir.

3015 Just following on from Deputy Burford's question, can I just get clarification? The Electoral Expenditure Ordinance 2020 includes the £6,000 figure for candidate expenditure?

**The Bailiff:** The Comptroller, was that specific for the election?

**Deputy Taylor:** Is it only to 2020? So, that still would not stand, sir.

3020

**The Comptroller:** So yes that is correct. My understanding is that there was a prescribed period set out in the ordinance, (**The Bailiff:** Yes.) and that period has expired.

**The Bailiff:** Yes.

3025

So there will be a new prescribed period which will be a longer period because that is on the face of the policy letter. Because the time at which expenditure will be incurred runs from an earlier date going forwards. But that ordinance has not yet been put before you in draft for you, the States, to approve.

3030 Can I now invite the President of the States Assembly & Constitution Committee, Deputy Meerveld, to reply to the debate?

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

I am trying to look through my notes to see which ones I made to a general debate versus various amendments.

3035

I think, sir, at this stage, we have discussed this to death. I am going to sit down and let the Assembly vote.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, I just want to clarify who wants to vote separately on which Propositions. I think I can potentially take Propositions 1 and 2 together. I think Proposition 3, as amended by Amendment 1, needs to be taken on its own. And I think Proposition 4, as it now is, inserted by Amendment 5, potentially, also needs to be taken on its own rather than combining those two.

3040

3045 Proposition 5, which is the £500 grant for candidates which is now unamended, needs to be taken on its own. Proposition 6, about the modification of the number of vacancies triggering a by-election, also needs to be taken on its own. And I am going to have to take Proposition 7, which is directing the preparation of legislation discreetly, because Article 3, paragraph 4, is engaged in relation to that.

3050

**The Bailiff:** So Proposition 1 and Proposition 2, on their own, together first. And I will invite the Greffier to open the voting, please.

*There was a recorded vote.*

3055 *Propositions 1 and 2.*

*Carried – Pour 32, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 3, Absent 5*

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

**The Bailiff:** So in respect of Propositions 1 and 2, there voted in favour 32 Members; no Member voted against; no Member abstained; 8 Members did not participate in the vote. And therefore, I would declare both of those Propositions duly carried.

And we move now on to Proposition 3, as amended by Amendment 1. So this is about candidature expenditure limits. And I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 3, please.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Proposition 3.*

*Carried – Pour 26, Contre 4, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 3, Absent 5*

<b>Pour</b>	<b>Contre</b>	<b>Ne vote pas</b>	<b>Did not vote</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Aldwell, Sue	Burford, Yvonne	Brouard, Al	Le Tocq, Jonathan	Ferbrache, Peter
Blin, Chris	Cameron, Andy	Matthews, Aidan	Roberts, Steve	Inder, Neil
Bury, Tina	Falla, Steve		Snowdon, Alexander	Le Tissier, Chris
De Lisle, David	Leadbeater, Marc			Oliver, Victoria
De Sausmarez, Lindsay				Roffey, Peter
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Haskins, Sam				
Helyar, Mark				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Mahoney, David				

McKenna, Liam  
 Meerveld, Carl  
 Moakes, Nick  
 Murray, Bob  
 Parkinson, Charles  
 Prow, Robert  
 Queripel, Lester  
 Soulsby, Heidi  
 St Pier, Gavin  
 Taylor, Andrew  
 Trott, Lyndon  
 Vermeulen, Simon

**The Bailiff:** In respect of Proposition 3, there voted in favour 26 Members; 4 Members voted against; 2 Members abstained; 8 Members not participating. And therefore, I would declare that Proposition also duly carried.

We will now take Proposition 4 on its own and that is the one that comes from Amendment 5. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 4, please.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Proposition 4.*

*Carried – Pour 20, Contre 9, Ne vote pas 3, Did not vote 3, Absent 5*

<b>Pour</b>	<b>Contre</b>	<b>Ne vote pas</b>	<b>Did not vote</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Aldwell, Sue	Dyke, John	Brouard, Al	Le Tocq, Jonathan	Ferbrache, Peter
Blin, Chris	Fairclough, Simon	Bury, Tina	Roberts, Steve	Inder, Neil
Burford, Yvonne	Gabriel, Adrian	Gollop, John	Snowdon, Alexander	Le Tissier, Chris
Cameron, Andy	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha			Oliver, Victoria
De Lisle, David	Murray, Bob			Roffey, Peter
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	Soulsby, Heidi			
Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Taylor, Andrew			
Falla, Steve	Trott, Lyndon			
Haskins, Sam	Vermeulen, Simon			
Helyar, Mark				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Mahoney, David				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Parkinson, Charles				
Prow, Robert				
Queripel, Lester				
St Pier, Gavin				

**The Bailiff:** And in respect of Proposition 4, there voted in favour, 20 Members; 9 Members voted against; 3 Members abstained; 8 Members did not participate. So I will also declare Proposition 4 duly carried.

Now Proposition 5, former Proposition 4, which is about discontinuing the grant for candidates. And I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 5.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Proposition 5.*

*Carried – Pour 19, Contre 12, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 3, Absent 5*

<b>Pour</b>	<b>Contre</b>	<b>Ne vote pas</b>	<b>Did not vote</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Aldwell, Sue	Brouard, Al	De Sausmarez, Lindsay	Le Tocq, Jonathan	Ferbrache, Peter
Blin, Chris	Bury, Tina		Roberts, Steve	Inder, Neil
Burford, Yvonne	Cameron, Andy		Snowdon, Alexander	Le Tissier, Chris
De Lisle, David	Falla, Steve			Oliver, Victoria
Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Gabriel, Adrian			Roffey, Peter
Dyke, John	Gollop, John			
Fairclough, Simon	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha			
Haskins, Sam	Leadbeater, Marc			
Helyar, Mark	Matthews, Aidan			
Mahoney, David	Parkinson, Charles			
McKenna, Liam	Queripel, Lester			
Meerveld, Carl	Taylor, Andrew			
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				
Prow, Robert				
Soulsby, Heidi				
St Pier, Gavin				
Trott, Lyndon				
Vermeulen, Simon				

**The Bailiff:** On that Proposition 5, there voted in favour 19 Members; 12 Members voted against; 1 Member abstained; 8 Members did not participate. So I will declare Proposition 5 duly carried.

Now it is Proposition 6 which is the triggering of by-elections at a minimum of three vacancies, on its own. And I invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 6, please.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Proposition 6.*

*Carried – Pour 20, Contre 12, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 3, Absent 5*

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

**The Bailiff:** In respected Proposition 6, there voted in favour 20 Members; 12 Members voted against; no Member abstained; 8 Members did not participate in that vote. So I would declare Proposition 6 also duly carried.

Now we get to Proposition 7, directing the preparation of legislation. And I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 7.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Proposition 7.*

*Carried – Pour 31, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 3, Absent 5*

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

3105 **The Bailiff:** There voted in favour, 31 Members; 1 Member voted against; no Member abstained; 8 Members did not participate. And therefore, I would declare Proposition 7 carried which means that all seven Propositions are duly carried.

## 11. Schedule for Future States' Business – Proposition carried

*Article 11.*

*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 19th June 2024, they are of the opinion to approve the Schedule.*

3110 **The Deputy Greffier:** Article 11, Policy & Resources Committee – Schedule for Future States' Business.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott, is there anything you wish to say in relation to the Schedule for the next Meeting?

3115 **Deputy Trott:** No, sir. Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** No amendments have been received. And therefore, I will ask the Greffier to open the voting as to whether you are minded to approve the next schedule.

3120 *There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 32, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 3, Absent 5*

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

3125 **The Bailiff:** The voting on the Schedule was 32 Members voted in favour; no Member voted against; no Member abstained; 8 Members not participating. And therefore, I will declare the Schedule duly carried. So we know what we are doing next time.

That is the end of the business for this Meeting and I will invite the Greffier to close the Meeting, please.

*The Assembly adjourned at 4.40 p.m.*