



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 19th July 2024

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

Volume 13, No. 14

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

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

People's Deputies

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

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representative E. A. J. Snowdon

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

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

Absent at the Evocation

Deputy A. H. Brouard (*relevé à 9h 52*); Deputy T. L. Bury (*indisposée*);
Deputy J. P. Le Tocq (*relevé à 9h 52*); Deputy M. P. Leadbeater (*relevé à 10h 12*);
Deputy C. P. Meerveld (*relevé à 9h 52*); Deputy V. S. Oliver (*indisposée*);
Alderney Representative S. Roberts (*absent*)

Business transacted

Evocation	1055
Billet d'État XII	1055
Requête	1055
9. Commonwealth (Latimer House) Principles: The Role of the Parliamentary Assembly within the 'Three Branches of Government'– Debate continued – Propositions carried	1055
10. Schedule for Future States' Business – Proposition carried.....	1088
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.17 p.m.</i>	<i>1090</i>

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The States' Greffier

EVOCATION

Billet d'État XII

REQUÊTE

9. Commonwealth (Latimer House) Principles:

The Role of the Parliamentary Assembly within the 'Three Branches of Government'–

Debate continued –

Propositions carried

The States' Greffier: Billet d'État XII, Article 9, the continuation of the debate.

The Bailiff: Deputy Queripel.

5

Deputy Queripel: Sir, late yesterday afternoon, I invoked the guillotine motion. Only 11 colleagues supported it, even though we had heard more than enough arguments from both sides. So seeing as though that is the wish of the majority of my colleagues, even though I had no intention of speaking, here is my contribution to the debate, which I wrote last night at three o'clock. But who cares? As Deputy Parkinson said, when he spoke yesterday. I am really torn on this one. I can see both sides of the issue, and we have had excellent speeches from both sides.

10

Focusing on just a handful of those, Deputy Murray, Deputy Le Tissier and Deputy Parkinson all made excellent speeches against the Requête. Every single one of them nailed the 'navel gazing, we are fiddling whilst Rome burns' approach.

15

And in support of the Requête, Deputy Aldwell and Deputy Dudley-Owen made excellent speeches that nailed the whole issue from supporters' point of view. Deputy Aldwell quite rightly said, 'There will never be a right time to discuss this and it needs to be discussed, so let's just get on with it', or words to that effect, and I agree with her, wholeheartedly. Deputy Dudley-Owen quite rightly pointed out that if we are to have any hope whatsoever of attaining cohesive, joined up Government, or words to that effect, then we need to support the Requête, and I can see the value in that.

20

I want to focus on the facilities aspect for a moment. I can see the value in having a room where Members can meet to discuss issues, requêtes, amendments, etc., but if I were a Member of the next Assembly – which I will not be because I am not standing in the next election, but if I were a Member of the next Assembly – I would not meet up in a room one-to-one with a fellow Islander

25

to discuss a one-to-one case. Why wouldn't I meet up, just the two of us in one room? The answer to that is because they could kick off, any time. And if they do that, you are trapped. There is nowhere to go and there are no witnesses around to explain what they saw.

I have worked on 315 one-to-one cases in my 12 years as a Deputy. Apart from meeting a person in their house, the very first case I took on, which was a big mistake, every single meeting since then – except one occasion when Deputy Meerveld asked me to visit the house of a person he was working with – I have insisted on meeting in a public place. I have found many quiet public places over the years to meet. They are out there. That first time I was trapped I actually managed to escape with just a few cuts and bruises but the whole affair severely traumatised me, which is why I have insisted on meeting Islanders in public places if they want my help on a one-to-one case, and if they are not comfortable with that, then I just do not take the case on.

The only time I would agree to meet an Islander in a room somewhere is if there was a security guard present and that is not going to happen, even if this Requête succeeds because the public would not be willing to pay for that. In general, of course, they do not have a clue what Deputies actually do. The vast majority of the public think we meet up for a States' debate once a month, and that is it. Either that, or they think we meet up at Frossard House every day to discuss issues. I stand to be corrected, sir, but I think it was Deputy Gabriel that said that.

As Deputy Dudley-Owen said when she spoke, although we are all extremely busy every day with our Committee work or one-to-one cases, endless emails, endless phone calls, endless issues to address, some of us do not actually get to see one another from one States' debate to the next. So the vast majority of the public do not know what we do all day. In their defence, it is because we have been very poor at telling them what we do. A job description for a Deputy should have been published years ago. Having said that, I am only too aware that SACC were at one time working on a job description; whether they still are or not, I do not know.

I never contributed to their request for Deputies to relay their views and experiences because when I was a member of SACC, I told my colleagues that in an attempt to enlighten candidates in the next election, if I explained to them what they are letting themselves in for my submission would focus on the bad, as well as the good. In my case, there has been a lot of bad. I have been physically assaulted three times out in the community by people who are really upset by what I have said or the way I had voted on an issue. A former partner left me because she was in fear of her own safety. Two of my dearest friends have deserted me because of the way I voted on issues.

I have had my wing mirrors ripped off my car, my windscreen smashed and a note left on the seat but – I will not use the swear word – but it said, 'You better leave this neighbourhood because we do not want any "beep" Deputies around here.' So I had to leave the neighbourhood.

The list of bad stuff in my experience is endless but when I relayed all that to my colleagues on SACC, they pointed out they were trying to encourage candidates, not discourage candidates, which is why I did not submit my experiences. And I am reminded of a time when a former Deputy, who shall remain nameless, said 95% of his time as Deputy was an enjoyable experience and 5% of his time was like trying to walk through a field of treacle in oversized Wellington boots.

I said to this former Deputy, who should remain nameless, I said, 'Geoff' – *(Laughter)* I said, 'Geoff, it is the other way around for me, 5% of the time I have enjoyed it, 95% of the time it is like trying to walk through a field of treacle in oversized Wellington boots.'

I just want to touch on something Deputy Mahoney said when he spoke yesterday in his speech, he said that he had used the Members' room at Frossard House on several occasions and he had only ever seen Deputy de Sausmarez there.

It did not occur to me until I was writing this speech last night, when I went to the Members' Room once to do some work, Deputy Mahoney was in there and this is prior to the GST debate, knowing I was probably going to vote against GST, he did his utmost to convince me that I should vote in favour, but all to no avail, of course. *(Laughter)* But I mention it to highlight the fact –

Sorry, sir, I give way to Deputy Mahoney.

Deputy Mahoney: I thank Deputy Queripel for giving way.

I merely did not point that one out because that was just pure fun, sir, meeting him for that reason, not work. (*Laughter*)

80

Deputy Queripel: Sir, I do thank Deputy Mahoney for spending time going into considerable detail about what introducing GST would mean to the community because I learnt a lot from that discussion, even though I still voted against it. I used the room at Frossard House probably once a fortnight. I would use it a lot more if parking was not such a problem, sometimes I would go there and you just cannot park and I am not going to get the bus from L'Eree. I am not going to pushbike from L'Eree.

85

Very often you need to go to other meetings anyway after that. But where would Islanders park if they wanted to meet a Deputy at Frossard House? Where would they park if they wanted to meet a Deputy in a room here? Parking is a lottery. Where would a group of Deputies park if they wanted to discuss an issue here? So for me, the premises would have to be somewhere where parking is not an issue and I have every faith that that venue could be found.

90

Moving back briefly to what does a Deputy do, 101 issues we have to deal with; we have to be aware of even more than 101 issues. Every day, seven days a week. It is relentless. But again, as Deputy Parker said when he spoke, 'Who cares? If you cannot stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.' The Committee do not care if we do not have facilities. They just want us to get on with the job we have been elected to do and one of the reasons why I am standing down at the next election is because of the lack of facilities. Incredibly frustrating.

95

By the time of the next Election, I will have done thirteen and a quarter years of constant criticism, constant stress, constant scrutiny, constant frustration and a lack of facilities. But what do we really mean when we say we need more facilities? Well, it could be argued that we have done our jobs all this time without facilities, and some would say there has not been a problem, but I know some of my colleagues share my views. It is incredibly frustrating not having facilities.

100

So to stay on the issue of what do we mean about having more facilities? Well, I am starting to get arthritis in two of my fingers and typing is a real problem. And it is only going to get worse because we have to spend a lot of time at our computers responding to emails.

105

So I could really do with a secretary – I am not talking about a full-time secretary, I am talking about maybe two or three hours per day. So maybe we could all have access to a secretary, if and when we need them. That would certainly result in a much more efficient and effective outcome, as far as I am concerned. So premises, more support, more facilities certainly equals more effective and efficient Government, in my opinion. Although I agree with Deputy Roffey when he said, 'Just because you have got more facilities, does not mean to say you are going to have joined up Government,' because people who just do not get on and who cannot even say 'Hello' to each other, certainly will not want to work together and meet up in the same room, apart from this one.

110

On the issue of facilities, I did send an email quite early on in this term, and I understand if my colleagues have forgotten about this, because we have received tens of thousands of emails since then. That email informed them that there are lockers available in this building. If you need a locker, you can get one, I have had one for years. They are downstairs, opposite the records room. There are six. Two are gone, so there are four left. So you better be quick if you want a locker. Which in itself is a classic example of the pathetic lack of facilities for Deputies, seeing as there are 40 Members of this Assembly and only six lockers being made available, on a first come, first served basis. And I am sticking with this facilities issue because it is a major issue.

115

One of the two coat rails out in the lobby where we hang our coats occasionally collapses because the bolts are sheared off at the bottom. The pedal on the pedal bin in the toilet that we all use does not work, so we have to bend down and lift the lid if you want to put something in the bin. Pathetic. Absolutely pathetic. And they have been like that for years, so things are not looking good because if we cannot get a new coat rack and a new pedal bin, then where on earth is the money going to come from for all the other facilities we need?

125

But in the words of the famous song, one of the favourites of our Chief Minister, 'You have to look on the bright side of life' (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) because future Assemblies will need more

130 facilities, other than a laptop, a locker, a coat rail that collapses occasionally and a broken pedal bin. And I am just focusing on basic facilities here, sir; some of my colleagues might be thinking in far more elaborate terms.

I have listened very closely to the debate so far, I will carry on listening very closely to it. I will pay particular attention to what Deputy St Pier says when he responds. I still do not know which way to vote on this but I am not an immovable object. I am not a lost cause, and I am not a Luddite. I remember saying that in a speech years ago when Deputy Sr Pier laid an amendment. I cannot remember what it was on, but I remember saying it.

I think perhaps all I need to hear is that killer line, that fundamental point that absolutely nails the whole issue one way or the other, which I am not seeing at the moment. Especially about the parliamentary areas because I listened very closely to what Deputy McKenna said when he spoke yesterday and I hope my colleagues listened very closely to what Deputy McKenna said when he spoke yesterday.

Thank you, sir.

145 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard, Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Meerveld, you have now arrived. Would you wish all to be relevé?

Deputies Brouard/Le Tocq/Meerveld: Yes, please, sir.

150 **The Bailiff:** Does anyone wish to speak? Deputy Moakes.

Deputy Moakes: Thank you, sir.

At the moment, I am looking down, I am navel gazing. I am thinking about a nice office and about what type of Nespresso coffee I want in it, and all the other facilities that would be really great. And now I am looking outwards, I am looking beyond this Chamber. I am actually not against some of the principles in this Requête. However, over the last day or so, there has been a lot of debate about this Requête and points 1 and 2 have been mentioned but the main focus seems to have been on points 3 and 4. In other words, debate has focused more on facilities rather than the Latimer House Principles themselves.

160 What will the impact be on the administration of justice if courts are given up? (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) And why do we need more space when facilities that we already have access to are rarely used? I agree with what many people have said, they are not ideal. They could be better. Broken racks, bins that you cannot get to, but they are not used very much and they do for now. But more importantly, there is an entire world outside of this Chamber. We have been talking about ourselves for two days.

170 What must people be thinking? (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) At a time when Islanders are struggling to find homes, should we not be focusing on resolving the housing crisis, (**A Member:** Absolutely.) rather than securing a prestigious new home for ourselves? (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Sir, I encourage Members to vote against this Requête and concentrate on issues that affect Islanders today. This matter can wait.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

175 **Deputy Gollop:** Sir, and Members of the Assembly, having been, in a sense, the Father of the House, although two Members precede me in terms of understanding of the previous States. I have been here a long time – 27 years – and as has been pointed out, we have had periods when facilities have been enhanced, and we have also had the Harwood Commission and other reports on the Courts which have specified a way forward. I agree with the points Deputy Moakes and Deputy Queripel have made about some of the tedious elements of things that do not quite work near the Chamber.

I know we should not have plastic cups anymore but they seem to disappear for two days. I found a secret stash. (*Laughter*) But they are details. And there is a bus, two buses from L'Eree to Frossard House and my problem with Frossard House is I have to walk there, usually, and it is a mile away from here. So it is an odd scenario. But in response to the interesting points Deputy Moakes made, I want that coffee. I want the prestigious facilities. We need more and we need it now. (A Member: Hear, hear.) And we needed it. Actually, we needed it, in a way, 27 years ago but we did not get it.

Now I am aware that many past and former Members of the Chamber and many useful and knowledgeable members of the community will not be pleased at navel gazing and they actually not only support you, sir, as Presiding Officer and everything you do, but also support, dare I say it, the States of the 1980s and 1990s, maybe noughties, with great nostalgia for the personalities. And they would like to see that Chamber back again. Maybe not 57 Members – possibly the Douzaine representatives, the Conseillers. They thought that system worked better for us and it did bring us half a century of extraordinary progress on so many levels, making us the successful society we are today.

But over a discussion recently on the many merits of the former system – some of which I resisted at the time – the point was made that if we could magically go back to the constitution of the Assembly of 1991, say, we could not really fill it because times have changed. The days of the growers, farmers, business titans who owned their own shops and hoteliers, that has gone. We are more of a society of high value employees, digital entrepreneurs, and so on, in that era – and the era of part time politicians has probably gone, for the most part, again, people would say.

But that is where we are and we are also in the situation – and it is relevant here – we had several, as we still do, lawyers and members of the Guernsey Bar, at one point they had four advocates as States' Members. (A Member: Hear, hear.) But we used to meet at 10 o'clock rather than 9.30 a.m., for example, and we ended at 5 p.m. 'What is the relevance of this?' the Presiding Officer is probably thinking.

Well, the States of that era had a culture whereby men of business – and it was predominantly men, unfortunately – would actually work in their shops or offices and then come to the Assembly and the point is, in many cases, the more senior Members had functioning offices of their own because they were very successful in what they did outside politics. That is another difference. And so I do think we need to acknowledge that some degree of change is desirable and needed.

We had a States of Election meeting the other day; even that has changed. We have fewer directors than we used to, and we now have, I think, wisely – a former Bailiff decided we needed to increase from 12 to 16 jurats because of the increasing demands on the Royal Court – the Board of Administration and the States of two decades ago made the decision with hindsight, rightly, for the new Court building and the foyer, and we have now found – and I think there is good reason for this – that the Courts are being used even more than they were and the need for specialist judges, tribunals, family law has increased.

Now, Deputy Soulsby was a little bit petulant that I appeared to say one thing in the Committee meeting and another thing in the Chamber. It is not unusual, perhaps. But actually my thinking in the Committee – and two of the Members were absent so it was like a SACC, perhaps a rather uncertain majority – was that the letter of comment that was sent, and the points underlying it, are useful for Members to consider. To just highlight two issues there. We were very grateful to have a tour of some elements of the Royal Court, even though cases were about to begin yesterday.

The first element is I think there are genuine concerns from officials connected with the Royal Court, etc., that it would not be suitable for parts of this estate to be permanently assigned to the parliamentary system and it could make the working of the Courts more inefficient and tie up space and resources. On the other hand, we know there are a few nooks and crannies around but to my untutored eye, they did not look entirely suitable for the kind of parliamentary work that we needed to do long term. Maybe in the short term some of those sites which have sort of peeling ceilings and things, and old books that probably belong in the St Barnabas could be activated.

235 The second really important point is this is not prioritised – I know the Government Work Plan is not, strictly speaking, parliamentary, but in our system, resources come to the same thing and there are resource issues. Now again, I sometimes upset people even on P&R if I say that I do not care how much it costs, I do not care what resources it takes, I want it done. But that is not necessarily the most responsible view. But nevertheless, I think we do show that when we do have a job to do, whether it be the Royal visit, the royal acclamation or Moneyval, we get on and do it – Brexit was another example – and we really succeed. Maybe the Island-wide election was another example, that Deputy Ferbrache itemised yesterday.

240 And I think this has been left on the shelf for a long time and I have been on the fringe of the Machinery of Government work, first on SACC and latterly on P&R, and I regret that probably it will not make the impact in this term that it could have done. But I have to say I think it started from the wrong place. I am more interested in functions and departments and whether we have the right things, whether it is infrastructure, housing or transport in the right place and we did not really come to terms with, ‘Do we want the change that Deputy Roffey does not want to see to a more separation of Government and the parliament?’

245 But I think the fundamental question Deputy Queripel really identified, what is the role of the States’ Member? And we were very grateful to have – as we always do – wonderful speakers from the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association – and yes, that is an organisation that has evolved and will continue to evolve, and perhaps some Members would like to see further change there. I do not know. But it is an invaluable organisation that, as many Members have suggested, because it gives Members of the States an insight into not only other Crown Dependencies, but to British-type parliaments around the world.

255 Yes, some of the issues of Latimer House are not relevant to us, but to emphasise some of the points, I think we do want independence of parliamentarians. We do know that we want to support the Presiding Officer and the Deputy Presiding Officer in maintaining and strengthening the independence of the judiciary. We want merit to be the main dynamic of public office holders. We want ethical governance, we have since the Wales Audit Office report or even earlier. We want accountability mechanisms. And so a lot of it does apply to us and we have had some interesting contributions over the last few months and years from GPEG and other successful people and some of them come to the view that we are running the wrong sort of Government. It is an odd thing to have 38 or 40 people in an executive, and why should we not go down to 20 or 15? And we always seem to start from that basis.

260 Actually, if we are at the same time, the executive and the legislature, then that argument has a certain merit. But the reality is we cannot run an executive efficiently with 38 or 40 people, we need to be clear that there is a distinction between persons who perhaps have a more executive role in Government and the Assembly, as an Assembly. And I do not think an Assembly is just about legislation. It is about raising issues. It is about scrutiny. It is about questioning. It is about providing not necessarily an opposition, but alternative ideas. It is about representing constituents when people who have other roles have a lot to do.

265 And I am amazed and pleased that External Affairs, for example, is such a successful part of our Government but it is a bit divorced from this Assembly because it is not part of a Committee. So you can see in some areas of our Government – External Affairs being one of them – there is a difference between the level of work which is reportedly successful in that area, and our work here in amending policies and Propositions, and even changing the Budget and supporting the Budget.

275 I think if we start to think of ourselves more as Assembly Members and parliamentarians and less as exclusively policy makers on Committees, which are like five-headed Ministers, we will make progress and I find on some Committees – Social Security, to a degree, very helpful staff – Policy & Resources, you do have teams of staff who support Members who sit on those Committees very well, but other Members like perhaps Deputy Queripel in previous years or other Members, perhaps my colleague Deputy Le Tissier sitting next to me, they do not get that level of support.

280 I think we should not be overly focused on the rooms in this building. I agree there are security concerns and other issues, but we should be focused on the overall goal of resourcing the

parliamentarians and we are out of step with everyone else – even Jersey and the Isle of Man – and Deputy Queripel said he is not sure which way to vote and yet his speech was overwhelmingly in one direction, that he has suffered to a degree for 10 years without that degree of support and there are clearly gaps in what we are doing.

Now, do I have reservations about allocating space in this building permanently to an Assembly that meets maybe more than 30 days, but also for non-timetabled ...? I do, a bit, because not only do we have to realise, as Deputy McKenna bravely said, we are fundamentally in this room, we are a Royal Court. We are –

I will give way to Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: I thank Deputy Gollop for giving way.

I just wanted to point out that I do not think the intention is to *permanently* allocate room, other than possibly the Library, but certainly the court room downstairs, the Proposition is to work with the Courts to share that space. That court room is rarely used, because it does not have a judicial walk that enables the judiciary to get in and out without passing complainants or lawyers.

Thank you.

Deputy Gollop: Well, I am all for sharing but I do take seriously some of the arguments that have been made at P&R, perhaps by officials who know their job very well, and also by a distinguished Advocate like Gordon Dawes. But we can share the facilities. But I do agree with some of my colleagues to the left who suggested there would be additional costs (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) but I support the direction of travel of this. I think we can get on with this, and I do think we do have too much of a start-and-stop culture with elections.

I get the impression that most of the Members of the current Assembly are thinking about standing again. Whether they will be successful or not is another matter. But there could be a degree of continuity, which is helpful because if you start everything at the beginning of a new States, you delay significantly and bunch of the work.

I think one point, in response to Deputy Meerveld's interjection, is that not only did we hear from Deputy Roffey about things like the mail boxes – I used to get bills in there when people couldn't find me – I think, came and went. But there is a security issue here. It may not be widely known, but States' Members theoretically have 24/7 access to Sir Charles Frossard House to work late or early, and they have a basement and another smaller room that is used for them.

Well, I have seen it occasionally used for meetings with the media or Civil Service rooms and we are short of meeting rooms in Frossard House. But I do not think all of us Members would be able to have 24/7 access here, because you are on a different level of security with the Royal Court, and also you have further issues about ultra confidentiality. We were shown yesterday there are some areas where very sensitive records are kept. There are other areas where very sensitive cases take place.

And although I do think we should further look into how we can share space and use it in a way that gives equal support in part for both the parliamentary side of the States and the Royal Court, I suspect a longer-term conversation is using a building nearby, perhaps, but that is not part of this estate, because I think the mixture of the Court and the States is not ideal. And we have been to the Isle of Man, Tynwald is clearly separate from the Court there. You go to Jersey and in 1899 – not 1999 – they separated with a different building. And of course, Deputy Moakes' argument is that we should not be navel gazing or spending money when times are hard. Well, most of the time they have been hard. We went through Zero-10. We went through the credit crunch. We went through the great uncertainties of COVID. There will never be an ideal time. It is like always postponing repainting of the house.

I think there are times when you do need to say there is a change. There is a change in the UK. There is a change in the way we work; we are trying to be a more inclusive States. And perhaps I will finish on this, I know some Members, past and present, will say Members do not need all of this

because some very capable politicians were able to achieve a lot without all of these facilities. But some of them – many of them, possibly – were very successful, organised people.

But our goal now is to be more inclusive, to be representative of the whole of society and to represent some of us who are not IT literate, who could do with calendar help or secretarial help. Think about the weaker ones who need to represent the public. We should not be faulty-superpowered people. I do not know. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)** We really do need to be more of an Assembly, more of a parliament and get on with at least supporting this and see where we go with it.

The Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater, you were the first to arrive after the roll call but had to slip away because Deputy Queripel was speaking. *(Laughter)* Only because of where you sit. Is it your wish to be relevé?

Deputy Leadbeater: Yes, please, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you.
Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Thank you, sir.

I have enjoyed the three speeches this morning, they have all been different. But I am not starting with them, I am starting with Deputy Roffey's speech yesterday. Deputy Queripel said he spent part of late yesterday evening writing a speech; well I have not written a speech and that is always the most dangerous because you tend to ramble, but there we are.

Deputy Roffey, yesterday made a speech and he described the reference to the various Principles as risible. I thought it was a rumbustious speech, I thought it was a Dickensian speech. *(Laughter)* And I do not think he quite finished it because I think at the end he should have said, 'It is an outrage! They are making me have electricity, a mobile phone and even an inside toilet!' *(Laughter)* He did not say that but that was the impression and that was the thing that, 'All things are well, we should stick with what we have got.' Now, neither Deputy St Pier or I, as he said, we have spoken about this now quite a lot over the last six or seven months, are seeking a Palace of Versailles. We are not seeking that at all.

These are pretty modest proposals that are being prepared and – my own preference would be for a much more ... much more government by executive, far fewer States' Members. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)** A much more disciplined approach, but we are not going to have that. So what Deputy St Pier is saying – and I think this is an excellent piece of work, by the way, from Deputy St Pier, probably the only thing I really disagree with him – and it was the point highlighted almost in approbation by Deputy Gabriel, is that we could be having a cafe and sale of merchandise, etc.

I think I would rather leave that to some other establishments in Town *(Laughter)* than having a picture of a mug with Deputy Roffey, Meerveld or Ferbrache's face on it. *(Laughter)* I think that would be ... they might sell a lot, it would be interesting, but I am not sure what they would be used for.

But in relation to where we are, let me tell you this. I stood just to the left of where Deputy Parkinson is with my friend Steve Denslow, many years ago, we were sworn by the then-Bailiff, Sir John Loveridge, as advocates of the Royal Court, sworn in by the then-Senior Deputy Greffier Wilson Gideon because the Greffier was on holiday. And I thought I was the 20th and friend Steve Denslow was the 21st advocate.

My good friend and long-term – for over 30 years – legal partner, Garth Bainbridge said, I think, I was 22nd or 23rd. It does not matter. There were not very many of us and, as Deputy Vermeulen said yesterday, there are over 260. But I can say this, I have been a litigator all of my time in Guernsey, and I have covered a wide – and there are very many able litigators and there have been very many able litigators – but I have covered a wider spectrum of litigation than any other Guernsey advocate,

of that there is no doubt. So I think I can speak with a degree of authority. And I have mentioned Sir John Loveridge.

390 So the Bailiffs that I have appeared before in various forums have been Sir John Loveridge, Sir Charles Frossard, Sir Graham Dorey, Sir de Vic Carey, Sir Geoff Rowland, Sir Richard Collas and Sir Richard McMahon. I have appeared before all of those and they all share the same qualities. They are people of integrity, people of ability who will do their absolute best for the Bailiwick of Guernsey. I have no hesitation about that at all. And Sir John Loveridge was also Guernsey's first ever Deputy Bailiff when he was appointed in 1969. My first senior partner was a lovely man called Advocate
395 Percy Ozanne. Advocate Percy Ozanne was the first advocate called to the Guernsey Bar after the Second World War.

He was called in his RAF uniform in September 1945 and he said, 'Peter, when we appointed John', because that is what he called him, he said, 'When we appointed John, we did not think he would have enough work to do.' (*Laughter*) And he also said that, 'You have been called now with
400 Mr Denslow, I think the Bar could grow to 30 people, and that is about its maximum level.' Well, lovely Percy, who retired at the end of 1983 – and had been an advocate since 1945 – obviously underestimated. We have got 260-odd and growing. I do not think it will be that long before it is 300 and these rooms are used a lot.

But I just looked today – and I do not pretend that this is anything other than a snapshot: of the
405 various court rooms, there are two of them that are not being used at all today and one that is only being used for half a day. But, of course, there are courtrooms. Now digressing a bit in relation to point 3, and Deputy Meerveld has made the point, this is an exclusive 350 days per year usage, or whatever. It is exclusivity for a bit of the time, in relation to what we are. Now, this used to be a criminal court, as I said yesterday – completely unsuitable now for a criminal court, it has not got
410 the security. You would not use this except *in extremis* as a criminal court. It is still used as a civil court and for other matters.

It was used by the Court of Appeal last week – and I think the Bailiff presided over a civil matter last week – it was used last week. It is a hopeless court for any kind of ... Look where you are supposed to put your files, look where you are supposed to put your kit. Civil cases now – I am
415 dealing with one at the moment where not that many weeks ago, I had to read 4,000 pages of documents – and anybody who knows me knows I would have read those 4,000 pages of documents. So to spread those out here, in any kind of form is ... This room is not fit for court purpose going forward. That is the practicality of it. We have other rooms that are better suited, but Devil's needs. When you have got nowhere else, you have got that. And I do not pretend to know
420 the day-to-day administration of justice anywhere as well as our able Bailiff or the court staff that have to fit court cases in and do things, in relation to what they are.

So I accept that premise but we have got a system that does not work and my good friends – and normal political allies – Deputy Moakes and Murray made the point that we should not be navel gazing, etc. We are not navel gazing. We have got a system that does not work. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) It does not work. We have achieved so little, in real terms, this States. We have done nothing
425 about housing. I bend my knee to nobody in this Assembly as to the need to progress housing.

I worked very well with two conscientious Deputies, Deputy de Sausmarez and Deputy Roffey, in relation to the Housing Action Group. We devoted lots of time, we persuaded the States to spend money. We bought money. Do you know how many social houses we are going to build in the four
430 years and eight months of this term? Less than 50. We built 91, I think it was, in total last year on the Island of Guernsey. It is not working. I was shocked, frankly, when I heard two able Presidents, Deputy Oliver and Deputy de Sausmarez, say yesterday over this form that people have got to fill in if they want to make representations to the IDP that neither of them had seen it, had any input into it, thought it was any good.

435 The tail is wagging the dog because we do not have an efficient system, we do not have a system that works. So if we carry on with the current consensus system – whereby at the moment nobody seems to want to make any difficult decisions – and I have got this mental image of us all holding

hands and going round the cherry tree, without making any difficult decisions at all – we have got to do something. We have got to make sure that we have a system of government.

440 Now all Deputy St Pier is saying – and I support him 100% – is if we look at the four Propositions, the first one is to agree that the Latimer House Principles are relevant. Not that they are binding, not that we should fit everything within them, but they are relevant. Are we honestly saying in the 21st Century that none of those Principles are relevant? That is all he is saying, so that we contain a strong and functioning – I emphasise the word functioning because we are not functioning at the
445 moment – (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) democratic system which underpins the ... I am not going to read the rest of it, it has too many words there.

And secondly, to direct SACC and report back by 2026 with recommendations ‘for the adoption of an *appropriate* version of the Model Law to establish a special purpose parliamentary body to oversee the institution of the States of Deliberation’ – and I emphasise these words because I do
450 not think everybody has read them yet – ‘as a parliament, having regard to our size, scale, and system of government,’ that is what we are talking about. Nobody is saying that this other document, we can fit it in and it is 100% appropriate. It is not. We have had the doctrine of separation of powers since the age of Montesquieu and Danton, and they have been dead a long time.

455 Deputy Roffey was saying, ‘Well, you know, we have got this consensus Government. We are all members of the executive, we are all members of the legislature.’ Well, it takes too long. It takes too long to do things. Democracy is a precious flower that needs to be nurtured and developed. We have had the office of Bailiff for hundreds of years. We have only had Deputies since 1900. We only had nine of them. Then we had some more before the Second World War. We had the first
460 female Deputy in 1924 – and she was a very able lady but she came from a certain social background – she could afford to be a Deputy. She was not a shop assistant from Creaseys. She was an able person and did the Island very well for 30 years or so.

The first time that we did not have the patrician, because that is what it was – system of government – of any kind was post the Second World War, as a result of the reforms brought in by
465 the Labour Government. When then the Bailiff’s rule had to recede, there was an interim period which lasted a long time where the Jurats sort of faded out, but they were still in the States, to a degree. We brought in a system of Conseillers because we wanted to see wise men – as it was in those days – and it should be wise people, and that lasted until 1991, when we then had the – no, wrong, that lasted until 1994, when we had the system where the Conseillers were elected by the
470 people of Alderney and Guernsey. Eric Walters topped the poll first time and a very humble Guernsey advocate topped the poll second time and then they abolished it.

But in relation to that, we have had evolution. We have now got a system of 38 Deputies and two Alderney reps, and it does not work. I see, I am interesting, Deputy Taylor. He can perhaps tell
475 us why we cannot vote at 16. Anyway, all that stuff. We will get there. The point in relation to where we are is that we must have reasonable facilities. I do not go as far as Deputy Dudley-Owen.

I am not concerned about that and I am more fortunate than most because I do have, because of my other commitments, a secretary who helps me and I pay for her personally. I have had that assistance for a long time, which most States’ Members do not have. They do not have that ability or facility. So I have got that help. If I need to have something typed overnight, I can get it typed
480 overnight, as an example. Also I have got legal matters.

I remember just this week at 2.40 p.m., I think it was, on Monday afternoon, I got a message from the Court of Appeal that they wanted a submission by noon the next day. I pointed out it was a bank holiday, and I was told, quite properly, by the English Judge of the Court of Appeal that it was not a bank holiday in England, so we managed by working overnight to get the submission into
485 the Court of Appeal within the due period of time. But I have the facilities, albeit legally, to do that and I also have the facilities privately for other matters which most Members do not have. That is not satisfactory. Deputy Gollop made a point: that is not satisfactory.

If we just want to continue with what we have got, it is not working. So those like Deputy Murray, who I 100% agree with – we should be looking at housing and all the other things, and who I respect

490 generally, and Deputy Moakes as well. We have got to change the system. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)
We are only going to change the system by looking at things like this. If we do not look at things
like this, we are going to get nothing done and the next Assembly is going to, again – instead of
just having perhaps 18 months of dancing around the mulberry bush, we are going to have five or
six years of dancing around the mulberry bush. Guernsey is going to be in trouble. These are
495 concentrated, reasonable proposals.

And just again, the point that Deputy Meerveld very ably made when he interjected a few
minutes ago, we are not saying this room – I am looking at Proposition 3 – should be exclusively
used. What it says is to designate these as part of the parliamentary estate (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)
to change the order of priority, such that in the first instance, it is designated as space for the use
500 of the States of Deliberation. Not exclusive, it is just it. And the other part about Court 6, Deputy
McKenna said yesterday, that it is used for court purposes; all Proposition 4 seeks, is to direct P&R
and SACC to consider the practicality.

When it considers it, it might find that it is impractical. But if you do not want to look at
something, you are being impractical and you are not taking this modern jurisdiction that we ...
505 [*Inaudible*] This is a fantastic place. But, as Deputy Gollop has said, it is not fixed in stone. It needs
to be developed. It will continue to be developed. Democracy is – as I said at the beginning or the
early part of this speech – a precious flower. That flower could die unless it is properly serviced.

Thank you, sir.

510 **The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez, to be followed by Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

I voted against the guillotine motion, which is something I always do, but I did so particularly
because I was very keen to hear the debate. I came into this debate very much undecided and I
515 really value the points that have been raised in debate, and I think it has been very useful.

The Latimer House Principles – I am sympathetic, obviously, to the need for separation between
the executive, the legislature and the judiciary. But I am not necessarily persuaded that in practical
terms, there is a particularly pressing problem that we need to deal with, at the moment.

However, I am more concerned by the separation of powers between the executive and the
520 legislature. Because of course, in our system of government, we are one and the same and this is
really underscored in the Model Law, which states that one of its primary aims is to provide for an
equity of powers between the executive and legislative branches. Well, we have already nailed that.
So, that is not something we need. But I am particularly concerned, having heard what Deputy
Ferbrache has just had to say, because it is quite clear that the motivation behind those Propositions,
525 certainly in his mind, is a move towards executive government and that is something that greatly
concerns me. I really do not think that executive government is the *panacea* that Deputy Ferbrache
has just presented it to be. If he looks at executive governments across the world, he will notice that
they, too, are struggling with many of the similar problems that we are.

And of course, the housing issues that he has referred to have got nothing to do with our system
530 of government and everything to do with the fact that the context has massively changed from the
previous Assembly, where we had a declining population and the States had been criticised for
aiming for too much housing and building too much affordable housing.

The construction sector took its foot off the pedal and decelerated. And then, we had this
complete about turn with the convergence of the pandemic, Brexit, and the Ukraine crisis, which
535 had an impact on energy prices and supply chains and everything else. So at exactly the moment
that our population very significantly swelled in a very short space of time, far higher than our
construction sector could ever have coped with, even if it was running at full speed, at that very
moment of time where we needed to be able to provide new homes – many more of them – we
were so particularly hobbled in doing so, as an Island, because of the cost of materials, the cost and
540 the availability of labour, because of the end of the era of cheap borrowing and the difficulty of
accessing finance and all of the other factors. So it was a very big tanker to turn. It is a slow tanker

to turn. The UK are actually grappling, with their executive system of government, with a very similar problem. And on the affordable housing front, of course, we have only got complex sites to develop.

545 So I just wanted to shoot that particular *canard* that I do not think that executive government has got anything to do with the problems that we are currently facing and dealing with, in relation to housing. And I am certainly very concerned – more so than I was at the start of this debate – that the Latimer House Principles, should they be agreed as relevant and appropriate, are indeed just a back door into executive government. So I will not be supporting Propositions 1 and 2 for that reason.

550 When it comes to facilities, I certainly agree that our current facilities are a bit subpar. I am one of the people that use the facilities at Frossard House very regularly. I have to say that in eight years or so, I have never actually once had a problem with parking, but that might be something to do with the way I arrive there. But I do use the facilities there very regularly, and I do see other Members, notably Deputy Haskins, Deputy Aldwell and Deputy Queripel and indeed Deputy Mahoney that
555 one time, Deputy Gollop, as well, and various others. So I use them a lot. And that is probably because actually my default working environment that I think we are supposed to do is a home with seven people living in it and a dog. I do not have an office. It is the kitchen table or some other corner. I have sat on the stairs before for meetings.

So I do really value the ability to have facilities. I quite like having Frossard House there. As
560 Deputy Gollop pointed out, it is 24/7 access, and I have indeed gone to print things off or whatever at weird times of day and night. I think it is quite convenient in terms of being able to access some of the officer resources, as well, when that is relevant.

In terms of the Court facilities, obviously people have commented on it a lot, just in the Court's defence, what I will say is that when I created something of an additional need in the previous
565 political term by having a baby and needing somewhere to potentially breastfeed or express milk, the Royal Court actually, with the support of SACC, was very good and did make those facilities available. They got a mini bar, not sadly for any sort of lunchtime G&Ts or anything, but for the storage of expressed milk.

And it does remind me of – this probably speaks to subpar facilities, but it was quite amusing –
570 there was one time where, for some reason I had to express milk in the Library next door rather than in the small room over there. I cannot remember why – and it was all very discreet – and I was absolutely comfortable with doing that. There was nothing to see that could make anyone blush, but there was a bit of a soundtrack, it was an electronic pump. Over the course of the lunch hour, several of my male colleagues wandered in and realised what was going on and wandered out
575 again.

But then Deputy Roffey came in and said, 'Ah, just the person I have been looking for! I want to speak to you about something.' Pulled up a chair and realised what was going on. I said, 'Are you comfortable with this?' And he said, 'Of course, nothing I cannot handle. I have been President of the Dairy Board!' (*Laughter*)

580 But I do thank the Royal Court for pulling out the stops and trying to make adequate facilities available. That said, I do appreciate the comments that others have made and I do think that they are still subpar.

While I do not agree with the implication behind some of Deputy Murray's and Deputy Moakes' comments that the States can only possibly do any one thing at any one time, which I think is a
585 total misrepresentation, neither do I necessarily see the case for prioritising the issue of facilities. But I am very much open to persuasion, and I will be particularly keen to hear from the relevant parties about the resource implications of doing that, because that is one of my concerns over Propositions 3 and 4, which otherwise I am quite sympathetic to.

I certainly do not see the harm, bar any significant resource implications, in Proposition 3 or,
590 indeed, Proposition 4. I think people might be jumping at shadows a little bit with Proposition 4 because my reading of it – it does talk about identifying from within the States' estate additional space, which to me seems that we are not directing anyone to say, 'Go and build us a flashy new parliament with the espresso machines that would keep Deputy Gollop happy,' and probably not

Deputy Taylor. (*Laughter*) So I am sympathetic towards Proposition 3 and Proposition 4, and obviously Proposition 5, if relevant.

But I certainly am looking for a bit more clarity on the resource implications of that because I am not particularly persuaded that it is a sort of pressing priority over and above other issues that would require the same resource. I did vote yesterday in favour of the longer timeline. I think that vote was fairly immaterial because I think it is going to take as long as it takes, in reality. But anyway, I do look forward. I am genuinely waiting to hear more arguments from the relevant people before making up my mind how I vote on Propositions 3 to 5.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I will try and be as brief as I can. I think many have shared the sorts of things I was going to say. I just want to explain that I put my name to this Requête because I believed, perhaps a little naively, that it was a few very small steps forward in the right direction. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) In an evolutionary way, not a radical way. When it was first mooted – the sorts of things that were included – I was not for it at all. But this Assembly, sir, has been so difficult. It has been so difficult in this Assembly to find compromise where we have got extreme views on almost every single issue. This one is proving to be similar.

I hope it does not end that way but it is proving to be similar. People seeing conspiracy theories underneath all sorts of fairly harmless, I think, things. The Propositions state things like, 'To agree the Latimer House principles are relevant', and then 'To investigate the Model Law', which I accept, as Deputy Roffey referred, is not appropriate in its current form for Guernsey. Absolutely. And then the rest is to 'report back' and it is very typical language for the sort of incremental stuff that we should be able to agree on. But as I said, it is very difficult to find compromise when these extreme views are so strongly held.

I am one that tries to find a third way, a middle way. I had hoped that this provided that opportunity because having been latterly the Chairman of the Reshaping Government Group and finding exactly the same problems, people wanting some *radical* extreme sort of changes and some wanting no change whatsoever into the system, it is very difficult to find a middle ground that we can all buy into but we need to do that. We need to do that, sir, for the sake of our community. I certainly I think that the States of latter year were a little bit more radical.

I do not know how many people, I think it should be compulsory reading, Richard Hogarth's *An Island Assembly* is a great tome, not too heavy to read, to give a little bit of background. You can find out the evolution of the States' Member and find out how the States, as an Assembly, began to take over some of the roles that the Royal Court used to do. It certainly, in my mind, should be compulsory reading for every candidate.

But also, I did some research of my own, having been brought up in a home where my father was a Douzenier, I had cousins and uncles and things that were involved with the States and were Douzaine reps in the day. So I had an interest in that and I remember finding, I think it has been reported in the media, but although these prestigious buildings, the Royal Courts were built at the end of the 18th Century, at the end of the 19th Century, there was a proposal to actually develop this and put facilities in this complex that would be appropriate for parliamentary use, even including women's toilets! (*Laughter*) This was the late 1800s. I thought that was exceedingly ... Changing rooms, all sorts of things, were thought of over a hundred years ago.

And so we find it difficult in our day to say that this is over the top, to have a priority for the States of Deliberation. I think that is a great shame. There have been improvements made in this Court, which I accept is not ideal at all. It is not ideal for the Public Gallery either. There have been some improvements since I was first elected.

Certainly, there was only that little room on the side there that I sometimes used for MS Teams meetings, available as a Members' room. When I was first elected, there were 57 Members; you

could never get more than about 20 Members in there and even then, it was a Guinness Book of Records type of event. (*Laughter*) But when the new Courts were built, soon afterwards this facility was modernised, certainly. I used to sit in the Castel benches, which was down where Deputy Falla is at the moment, and certainly the knee room was not as good as it is today. It might not be very good today, but it certainly was much worse back in those days. Similarly the benches behind.

There have been some improvements, there were very few electrical sockets, that has been changed. But generally speaking, we have not entered into the modern era as the Courts have. We have been able to do that – we did it in 2004 – in that term. But we have not done that for ourselves.

Now, sir, if we were looking at something appropriate and money was not an object – and I will come on to that before I finish – I think the time we met during COVID in St James was probably the best in terms of providing facilities, space and even Public Gallery, although we did not really have members of the public there.

St James is better geared, and if we were going to do that, particularly because St James is not a good acoustic for modern music, it would be better to look to build a modern music facility – perhaps over the Sunken Gardens – and then use the complex there for a dedicated parliamentary building that could be linked to this building. But that is not what we are discussing today. I am not arguing for that, I know that would get nowhere because we have not got any money.

Now I will just pause there. We have not got any money but we are going to have to face our resourcing, not just financially, but in terms of people, because it is not right in this day and age – it might have been at one time – but it is not right that our parliamentarians, those who are perhaps backbenchers or only on one Committee or on parliamentary Committees, do not have that sort of support.

When I was first elected in 2000, it was not salaried in those days, but I was fortunate to have an office that I could work in. I had a study at home – which I have still got as well – and I had a part time PA. I had an email as well, I think I was one of only three that had emails in those days, personal emails. I had all of those sorts of things – and I was fortunate – and all I needed to do was to employ my PA for a few more hours to do some filing and to keep records for me. I was fine, on that basis. It was fine from that point of view. But I know that, first of all, not all of us can have those facilities, even though we are paid a salary today. Not all choose to use their salary in those sorts of ways, it would be very hard to do so.

But nevertheless, the other thing that has changed, sir, is that 20-odd years ago, the sorts of issues that we were dealing with and the legislation was far less than it is today. So at some point, we are going to have to grasp this nettle. That brings me back to the Propositions in front of us. In my mind, they should be read simply as an opportunity to begin that process and unless in the beginning of the next term, some resources are put in by this Assembly by the new P&R Committee to enable that to happen – and I hope, therefore, to make some recommendations as to possibly how us, as an Island Assembly might change to be more effective for the people that we represent, our community.

Unless that happens right at the beginning of the next Assembly, then this is going to get nowhere. And so I lay that down, because it is up to those who stand and get elected to make sure that this important matter gets properly resourced because that next Assembly is going to have to look at resourcing in general. And if we are going to keep a pace with the modern world, we have got to do something.

I was late, sir, this morning because at very short notice I had to make a Teams call with a newly appointed Member of the frontbench in the UK and not knowing whether there was any room available here, I decided to do that elsewhere. That is a regular feature, sir, now. A regular feature not just for me but for others, as well, and it is only going to increase.

It is not just for parliamentarians. I am very often doing it in the little room at the side there and obviously stopping Deputy Brouard and others from getting in there. But it is one of the issues which we are going to have to address. We have not got the facilities even at Sir Charles Frossard House. The facilities are minimal for us as parliamentarians and I think we need to address that. But

this particular set of Propositions in front of us only makes some baby steps in that direction. We should not be fearful of them.

700 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Thank you, sir.

 So I just want to make a few comments. I want to start by addressing some comments made by my friend Deputy Ferbrache. He accused this Assembly of not functioning. I think he got a little bit carried away. I think what he was trying to say is that this Assembly does not function as well as it might under different circumstances, and I would believe that to be a fair comment because we must not forget, it is a proper debating Chamber in terms of the debate that we have and we do set budgets, approve legislation, scrutinise policy, etc.

710 But, sir, you do not have a voice in this Assembly. So I have decided to draw out one or two paragraphs from your letter of comment to the Policy & Resources Committee, and I think they will be valuable in terms of allowing Deputy St Pier and others to address them if they wish. But you make the point, sir, that there are some inaccuracies in the petition. You state that in paragraph 13, to say that Court 6 is the least utilised Court is incorrect. It has a larger footprint than Court 6 and so it is used more regularly and further on.

715 Sir, you make the point that in respect of paragraph 9 of the petition, the judiciary does not accept that the States effectively sits at the pleasure and convenience of the Royal Court's availability. And you go into some detail explaining why that is. But you also, sir, make the point that the primary purpose of the building is as a Royal Courthouse, despite making it clear that the States of Deliberation has prioritised use for this building.

720 Now, sir, it is really to Deputy Moakes' point, we are discussing this Requête today because our parliamentary processes allow seven Members to bring a requête. It does not mean that matters pertaining to housing are on the back burner. In fact, nothing could be further from the truth. There are those that are mandated with those issues, spend matters thinking about this particular issue every single day and meet regularly in an attempt to accelerate the issues around the provision of improved levels of affordability in the housing stock. So I think we sometimes need to be a little bit careful with our language in this Assembly. We do not want to give the impression that this is stagnating, it is anything but.

730 Sir, in Deputy St Pier's opening remarks, he made reference to the Board of Administration's policy letter in February 2000. That, if my memory serves me correctly, was one of, if not the last matter that was debated by this Assembly in the lead up to the 2000 Election, which is the election that I came in at. I was appointed on to the Board of Administration and subsequently on to the working party that was responsible for building the new Royal Court building, which it did, incidentally, on time and on budget, which was a rarity in those days and we were awash with money in those days.

735 Deputy St Pier referred, sir, to comments that were made at that time about the inadequacy of the parliamentary estate, and that it was a matter that would need to be addressed. That was a quarter of a century ago and things have not changed. I do not think it is in the least bit self-indulgent to be talking about these things in the way in which we are because for a modern parliament to function properly, it needs the resources to enable it to do so.

740 It is often said that any system of government can be made to work, however inadequate it is, if it has the right resources and the right people. So I think that is a particularly relevant point – that as long ago, when we were spending millions of pounds on new Royal Court facilities, it was understood and appreciated back then that the facilities were not adequate and that something would need to be done about it in the future.

745 This is, as Deputy Le Tocq has referred, nothing more than baby steps, and I do, sir, intend to support all four Propositions in the Requête. I make that point because it is – no, it should not be a surprise but it should be noted – that there are four people in this Assembly who have held the most senior public office in elected office – Deputy St Pier, Deputy Ferbrache, Deputy Le Tocq and

750 myself – and now on two occasions, all four of us support this Requête. That should tell this Assembly and the people of Guernsey a great deal, with regard to just how inadequate the parliamentary provision is, and indeed the parliamentary estate. So I welcome this Requête and I thank those who have brought it for doing so.

755 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld, you will get the chance to speak immediately before the Vice-President. So, you do not need to stand up at all.
Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you, sir.

760 I had no idea that Deputy Trott was responsible for bolting on a Russian tractor factory to the west end of this building and I would like to congratulate him.

In Deputy Dudley-Owen's speech, she assured Members that her support for the Requête was determined largely inasmuch as this version of the prayer was different to the original, it did not directly reference the separation of parliament and judiciary. In short, the removal of the Bailiff as the Presiding Officer and the replacement with either independent Presiding Officer elected by future Assembly or indeed a plebiscite. However, Proposition 1 says:

765

To agree that the Latimer House principles are relevant to ensuring that Guernsey maintains a strong and functioning democratic system ...

According to the requérants, this does not directly refer to the original draft Proposition that some of us saw that asked the States to agree that the Presiding Officer should not be the Bailiff and including, I assume, the Deputy Bailiff. It is true, the Proposition does not say *adopt* the Latimer Principles but it does use the word 'relevant' and it also goes on to say 'maintain strong and functioning democratic system'. I think it was Deputy McKenna who said this was a Trojan horse and I suppose anything that drives a set of principles – and somewhat half-heartedly, to be honest with you – as this Requête does, sets the States on a path.

770

Adoption of these principles, will almost certainly set the States on a path, one which many of us in this Assembly will not be determining. Despite the protestations of the requérants, I would refer Members to the CPA, Appendix 2 and 3, entitled Parliament and Judiciary, Independence of the Judiciary and the annexe Parliamentary Supremacy and Judicial Independence. The adoption of Proposition 1, in my view, sets the future States to effectively full adoption and this part of the Requête is in my view, a chess move towards a separation of those powers. Now, do not worry, that is allowed. That is actually allowed. What I mildly object to is that speakers do not necessarily recognise the likely outcome ...

775
780

Oh, Deputy Brouard is just standing up. Now, I asked Deputy Ferbrache whether he was going to speak and in the lobby he told me it was going to be really long and he had not written it yet. *(Laughter)* It was a very interesting speech – I will give him that – I love the history and I encourage him to write fewer speeches. *(Laughter)* Now, I am going to speak to them.

785 I am going to give Deputy Ferbrache possibly a chance because we have got different views on this. In a previous presidency, when Deputy St Pier as the then-Chief Minister, wrote to us at SACC asking us to review the States of Election and that was Deputy Ferbrache's role on the Committee, I believe. Given that our Committee was working flat out to deliver the Island-wide voting, I do not remember us getting around to complete that piece of work, I think that is correct.

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

Deputy Ferbrache: I think it is a point of correction, if not ... I did produce a paper, as did another colleague on SACC, but we never actually made a decision.

795

Deputy Inder: All right, okay. Well, I accept that and I like I said, I didn't believe ... Okay. We did produce a paper but I do not think anything came of it and from memory over the past two or three years, I do not think that has become part of SACC's output either. But I genuinely cannot remember what the end of it was.

And I just want to refer to this – the States of Election which has not been mentioned. Most of us who sit on the States of Election – that ancient place – in my view, is the one thing that really needs something that looks like reform, *really* needs reform. And again, in my view, and it may not be shared with others, unelected priests should not be part of the voting body.

And I never thought I would quote Tony Benn in this or any other States (*Laughter*) but to use his phrase:

What power have you got? Where did you get it from? In whose interests do you exercise it? ... And how do we get rid of you

And that has been missed from this conversation and I will go further than that – and if anyone is troubled about the separation of judiciary and parliament, the focus should be on the States of Election, absolutely.

A number of our Jurats have been proposed, seconded and likely voted for by Members of the Assembly, whose secondary role is advocates of the Royal Court. Proposed by an advocate on a Wednesday, in front of them on the following Monday. That should concern people. That is where the separation of powers should really start, in my view, I have been internally uncomfortable ... Not like that! A different 'uncomfortability'. Advocates and priests proposing and assisting in the appointment of Jurats. Really? In this day and age?

So the question is how am I likely to vote? If it helps, I am likely to support the Requête. I am just not too sure which part yet. But I do take practical and business approach to the vote and I do like things in order. My view generally is that this should have been wrapped up with the review of Government. It really should have been. We do things out of sync. They are always out of whack. Well, there is some mumbling, which I am I am keen on. But that is, as I have expressed, my view which has taken three years to get us absolutely nowhere. So I have probably argued myself out of my position immediately on that and there is every indication that P&R are likely to bump that review into next term and another one of those special purpose bodies.

So the requérants have tried, they are in difficult positions – inasmuch as, and I think, we are one Government – and I do not like the word backbenchers and I really do not like it – but those who are not at the heart of the Committees, who have a responsibility to deliver something, are entirely entitled to bring requêtes and work quite hard on those requêtes to test this in the Assembly.

Having been on the back end of requêtes early on in my political career, I know how difficult it is. Could I be my usual petulant self and disagree with Proposition 1 because I do not think it is in the right order? Yes, I could, but I am not going to be. I am going to vote for Proposition 1. And, Proposition 2, well, we have discussed and I do not entirely disagree with what Deputy Soulsby said, but that will be down to the leadership of the next SACC presidency. I have got every confidence that if you have got the right person in the right place, you can do anything. But whatever happens after 18th June this year, it is the States of Election that is a real problem. Priests and advocates should not be voting for Jurats.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

Well, I was not going to speak but just a few points. I will get to my feet partly because some of the points that Deputy de Sausmarez raised. When this Requête landed, I was very sympathetic to it. I attended the presentation that we had at Beau Séjour, but what started to throw me off balance on it a little bit was the letter of comment from P&R, which went into great detail about possible different systems we could have, talking of bicameral and tricameral systems and what is going on

in the Isle of Man. I just felt that was not what I was necessarily reading in the Requête, and I wondered whether I was missing something and I am still wondering whether I am missing something. Although that was covered a little bit by Deputy Ferbrache's speech where he also went into detail on the system of government, so I am now really rather concerned.

850 I certainly support the idea of having a better parliamentary estate. I think we should, to whatever extent we can, like everybody else. As much as a parliament building would be ideal, it is certainly not something that is going to be on the radar. It just would not be appropriate to spend that kind of money at this particular juncture.

855 I was encouraged by some of the comments from Deputy Dudley-Owen, particularly on facilities for States' Members and I do think that is important. People are quite surprised when they say, 'Oh, can I meet you at your office?' You go, 'Well, I do not have an office.' So we meet in cafes. I am not sure that is ideal but we have just become very used to it. So for me, the jury is still slightly out. I would like to hear some more, particularly from Deputy St Pier, when he sums up, on how far this affects machinery of government issues, rather than parliamentary estate issues.

860 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir.

865 I will be as brief as I possibly can be. I want to start off by actually thanking all the requérants, the ones that have spoken, for bringing this Requête. Because, for me, this is not self-indulgence, this is a very important debate. Basically, accusing the Assembly of navel gazing around these sorts of issues, I think, is unfair. For a start, we have an Assembly and Constitutional Committee, which does a very important function around democracy. It arranges the election and it looks after the
870 Rules of how we can conduct ourselves. And one of the problems for me with the way the Assembly works is that we all divide up into Committees and we have got this very unique Committee government system and it is not cohesive, it is not collective government.

I think it does need discussion and I do think it does need some sort of debate. I am curious around the suggestion that we have a consensus government system. When it is things of major
875 importance, we very rarely agree on anything of import. Now, the Island is facing huge challenges: housing and lots of other, issues; fiscal policy, we have not managed to have any fiscal policy for the last two terms. And I think the debate has fallen into two sort of camps – if it ain't broke, don't fix it. But I think there are some other quotes we should think about. If we keep on doing what we have always done, you will keep on getting what you have always got and the definition of madness
880 is doing the same thing over and over again, expecting a different outcome.

Now, the reform of Government is in the Government Work Plan, and again, that is something that we have not had a debate on. I think it is absolutely what we should be debating. I think one of the problems with the Requête is that we are concentrating on the Latimer Principles rather than the fundamentals around our inability to grapple with the problems in a global world and
885 collectively have a responsibility to sort these things out. I think that is where we get so much public criticism.

I think the standout speeches for me were Deputy Gollop and Deputy Le Tocq; I think they absolutely nailed it. Deputy Dyke, quite early in this debate, did pick out that in listening to all the arguments being put forward, you could kind of agree with them all. But I think he was asking the
890 question, 'Well, where does this all get us?' Well, I think the Propositions, as they are very carefully worded, start, I think, a process of us as democratically elected Members of this Assembly to start thinking about how we can deliver. Is our system of government fit for purpose? I am in the camp that absolutely questions whether it is. So I will be supporting the Propositions in the Requête.

895 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

900 This does not always happen, but I am aligning myself this morning with what Deputy Queripel said. I think he made a very good speech; he made some very good points. I think that also goes along with what Deputy Le Tocq was saying. Things have changed. Many years ago, when I first came to this Assembly, people would write to you on Basildon Bond paper and stick something called stamps on them (*Laughter*) and they would be quite happy to have a reply within a month. Now people are unhappy if they do not get a reply by dawn the next day. It has completely changed.
905 We have gone from very much a basic world of paper to digital.

One of the reasons why, picking up the point this morning that I was late – I had a phone call with the MSG. But I could not risk coming here and trying to do it in a corridor somewhere or finding a room. I did it in my home, where there is a bit more privacy. So again, that is why I think we do need to have some really basic facilities just brought to us, here in the building and I think, by just
910 changing the priority of our parliament, as it were, just in this building for the times when we are sitting here, will start to change that mindset. If there is a judge's room that is not being used and there is not a judge there, why can't we use it? Why wouldn't that be? Why isn't it possible that I can lay a laptop down when I am trying to do a phone call to someone?

Taking Deputy Moakes' point on two counts, it is not necessarily expensive to do that because
915 we have already got the facilities there. It is just allowing us as parliamentarians to tap into that. Of course, those phone calls and those issues may well be about our mandates. It may well be about housing. It may well be something that our constituents are struggling with, who need to get in touch with us sooner rather than later, because we have moved well away from waiting three weeks for a reply by post.

920 The Latimer Principles are not only about the separation of powers. I think it is an assumption in the Latimer Principles that we actually have facilities to be able to do our jobs, because if you read one of the parts here of the Act, it says on law making process,

5. Adequate resources to government and non-government backbenchers should be provided to improve parliamentary input ...

– and should be improved with the secretarial, research facilities, etc. They are assuming already that we have got a phone call connection and we have got a private office to work with in the
925 Latimer Principles. We have not even got to the first base yet. So it is about changing the mindset. I think that this building is our building when we are here and we can use it as our home.

Deputy Queripel will be pleased to know I did report the broken coat rack to the facilities people at the building yesterday, so that is already hopefully in hand and probably will be fixed later next year! (*Laughter*)

930 While talking about space to have meetings with people, I will just recount a very quick story. Saturday afternoon, no appointments booked. Someone knocks on my door, they come to my back door of my house. They do not use the front door because it is Guernsey and they come in, carrying a bundle of newspaper to have a discussion with me about housing.

At which point I say, 'What is the bundle of newspaper?' And the person says, 'It is my lunch, it is fish and chips and would you please be so kind to put it in your oven at 50 degrees while we have
935 this conversation?' (*Laughter*) Yes, so if there is some meeting space, can we make sure there are oven facilities available there as well? (*Laughter*)

I think it is really about the change of priority for this building and I think that is what Deputy Trott was saying. We are the Cinderella in this building, even when we are here sitting as a
940 parliament and if we can just turn the dial a slight bit, so we can get some modern facilities – I am not asking for a new carpet or anything like that – just some private spaces, where we can actually deal with some of the work.

It is not going to get any quieter, as we go forward for the next 20 years. It is going to become busier. How could we have a Teams meeting in the Library, for instance, with everybody else there?
945 That is not possible. If we have got one tiny little room which is next to the toilet – and of course, I should not say this, but I am going to do it anyway – if you speak loudly in that room and you are

in the toilet, you are in the room as well, okay? You have got the same conversation, both ways round. (**A Member:** Yes.) Not acceptable. Except, of course, when I want to find out what is going on. (*Laughter*)

950 Being serious, it is just a small step. I am very supportive of the Requête. It starts to move the dial that we actually need to have a few basic facilities to help all of us, to be able to function, to do all the things that we want, whether it is more housing or better hospitalisation, etc.
 Thank you very much indeed, sir.

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

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Sir, I am proud to be part of the place or team where this Requête originated because it was at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference that I had the privilege to attend with Deputy St Pier, Deputy Dudley-Owen and our parliamentary Greffier.

960 To me, as a young parliamentarian, being part of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association has been an extremely enriching and valuable experience. I stress that it is the Commonwealth *Parliamentary* Association because it is not until you join those events and understand what the organisation is about, that you understand that it is all about the parliaments. It is about the capacity of parliaments in all the different jurisdictions and branches around the world, and the role of
 965 parliaments versus the executive and the government that is placed.

 And to me, I know some Deputies are completely against our involvement and do not see the need, but actually the involvement with the CPA – in particular the session we had about Latimer Principles that was organised by the CPA was extremely enlightening and useful, to really help understand the differences with what the parliamentary role and function should and could be, and
 970 the value of having strong parliamentary functions with the right resourcing facilities around it, versus what an executive could be.

 I know Deputy Queripel has been holding for the killer line and it has been mentioned a number of times – to me, it is absolutely about the core of the strength of our democratic institutions and us being effective government and parliament, to make sure we meet the needs of our community
 975 in the best manner possible. So, to me, this is essential for us to be able to better address all the challenges, the operational challenges; whether it is housing, health – whatever it is, to deliver for our community. This is why I am a signatory to this Requête because there is probably nothing more important for us to try to be as effective as possible to lead for our community.

 I think some of the Deputies said, 'Well, we have nailed this because we are the legislature and the executive.' Well, to me that creates a huge muddle. It absolutely creates a huge muddle and the fact we that call ourselves – all of us here, all 40, with Alderney Representatives – as executive, I also feel it is a complete muddle because actually, when Deputy St Pier has been on the back-benches, I do not think he has been in Government, he has been a backbench parliamentarian.

 And there are other functions of parliaments which we currently muddle up with the executive and with the States of Guernsey. For example, the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee is a
 985 Committee of Government and how many times have we heard about resource constraints and that P&R has not provided the resources needed for us as an Assembly to execute on the changes we want as the parliament, as this Assembly, to deliver better for the community. That has been an ongoing struggle for resourcing SACC this political term.

990 To me, fundamentally, if we do go into the direction which we ... in those baby steps, to create a parliamentary body, a Committee such as SACC would probably naturally sit within that parliamentary body and ensure that they have also the right resources and facilities to support Deputies, to support the Rules of Procedure, change-making process or other legislative changes to support us, as the Assembly, to deliver most effectively for the community.

995 The other part of parliamentary functions, which is again hidden in another Committee is legislative scrutiny. So, although technically all legislation eventually comes to us, let's be realistic, how much legislative scrutiny does this Assembly actually undertake? Really? I would say close to none.

1000 The only serious debate on legislation that we actually had was around the Discrimination Ordinance. That was really, from memory, the only significant piece of legislative scrutiny that we as an Assembly have undertaken in the past four years. I do think we are probably missing drafting stronger, better legislation. I will not give way to Deputy Le Tissier. The other part is also appreciating the role and tools as parliamentarians that we could have in progressing – whether it is new laws, new projects or initiating new initiatives to drive progress for our community.

1005 Deputy Aldwell referred back to the book written by the new Chancellor, Rachel Reeves, called *Women in Westminster*, which has been a really fantastic book to really understand, not only about the progress of women parliamentarians in Westminster, in the UK, but also the role that parliamentarians have played in progressing legislative agenda, whether it would be for women's rights, women's participation, protection of children, domestic abuse. It is often not been just the
1010 Government's agenda, but also the agenda of the parliamentarians through the tools they have in parliament, such as the requêtes that we have got – Private Member's Bills – whatever it is, to progress important work that will make a difference to our community.

This is why actually as parliamentarians, we have had the tools through the Requête to bring initiatives like this forward, which are outside of the Government's agenda and that is fine because
1015 this is a matter for parliament. I really connected to what Deputy Trott said in terms of that, the most senior politicians that we have in the Assembly are all supportive of this Requête because they have been there and they feel that there is room for improvement – that things are changing, that we need to move on with the times.

I was also really taken by the comments of Deputy Trott, where he absolutely, correctly I think,
1020 has identified that these are baby steps but we have already have tanks on the lawns from some Deputies saying, 'No change because this is a Trojan horse to executive government.' Where is the consensus? Where is the ability to make those steps, to do something different so that we can find better ways of governing ourselves and governing for our Island? So I really urge Deputies to see this – as Deputy Le Tocq says – as baby steps in the right direction so we can start talking about
1025 these essential items; the right resourcing, the right structures, the right facilities, to enable for us to be the stronger, better, more effective democratic institutions for our community.

The Bailiff: Deputy Taylor.

1030 **Deputy Taylor:** Thank you, sir.

I will keep it brief because a lot of this has been done to death. Proposition 1, the Principles are clearly relevant and support would help. Yes, I will support that. Proposition 2. At first I was fairly indifferent but I would have supported it, but hearing the comments made by different Members – I think it was Deputy Roffey that really tuned my ears in first, with his concerns about executive
1035 government and I would share his concerns; and I think Deputy Ferbrache pushed me slightly further in that direction when he seemed to be indicating that it would be a move closer to executive government, although it is not expressly written in there.

That is not something I would like to see. But on the flip side, Deputy Dudley-Owen mentioned this should not be about the role of the Presiding Officer, which is what Deputy McKenna had
1040 introduced. Personally, if it did involve switching to a Speaker of the Assembly instead of the Presiding Officer we currently have, I would have supported that, but that is not what we are here to discuss.

Propositions 3 and 4 is where I get a little bit more interest. So Proposition 3, just touched on in one of the amendments yesterday, does not really make a massive amount of difference, in a way;
1045 it is changing the name over the door. But I did take a bit of issue with the response from you, sir, from the Royal Court.

Firstly, if I touch on the Library, according to the letter of comment, 'In respect of the Royal Court Library outside of States' meetings days, we understand that it is used quite frequently.' Not all the time, just quite frequently. 'There is a booking system in place.' We did not get any detail of how
1050 often it is booked. 'There is a booking system'. I would like to have seen, 'It is used for however

many days a year.' That would have been quite useful information for those of us that have been accused of potentially getting in the way of justice by using the Library.

But it would not affect justice anyway, 'because those who make use of the room for meetings (which does not often involve the judiciary) would need to find some other place to meet, in the event that the Royal Court Library became permanently allocated for use by States' Members.' Alternatively, States' Members just use the booking system that is already in place and we might be able to get priority on it, that we could book further ahead. I do not know. But I do not really see any issue, then, with us using the library or taking more preference on it.

And then this particular room, Court 3. This is where I think you, sir, have really overegged the pudding and it comes down – apologies to have to be direct, this is my view. It is the final paragraph:

Whilst we appreciate that Proposition 3 seeks to create a parliamentary estate without prescribing the level of use by parliamentarians, and that Proposition 3(c) will require some agreement to be reached for the level of access to be afforded to court three for judicial business, we would struggle to deliver the administration of justice in a timely fashion.

That really sealed it for me – that was just going too far – and we absolutely can use this, and it will not have an impact, in my view, on the administration of justice. What grounds do I have to really say that? Well, scroll back a couple of lines, when we talk about the current setup:

So in respect of paragraph 9 of the petition, the judiciary does not accept that the States effectively sits at the pleasure and convenience of the Royal Court's availability. The dates of States' meetings are known in advance under the Rules.

So it explains the current setup and we all know that; the dates are put in a long time in advance and then all the Court bookings, the judicial uses of this room are clearly booked in around that. But it tells us, 'However, if a Member were to propose a different day to meet, pursuant to Rule 6(4), it is possible that the Presiding Officer might already have judicial work.' You are not a building, you are a body and you obviously do go in different Courts. 'But that is why there are three acting Presiding Officers appointed, for this purpose. As such, any adjournment to a date not previously identified would always be capable of being accommodated.

So if it can already be accommodated under the current Rules, what difference does it make if we just switch around that preference? It makes none. So if Proposition 3 is accepted, I do not accept it will have any impact on the judiciary and I just want to put that on the record. So yes, I will be supporting Proposition 3.

Proposition 4, I think as Deputy Ferbrache quite rightly pointed out, it is simply to consider the practicality. But again, we are not given much information at this stage, on which to consider the practicalities. I did originally have that I would be willing to place a £10 bet that Court 6 would be empty today. But as Deputy Ferbrache has already pointed out, as there is not much booked into the room, that is probably an unfair bet and I am not sure anyone would take it. It might be inappropriate.

But what we are told is that the whole of the Courthouse operates on a 77% occupancy rate. Deputy Vermeulen might be the one to talk about occupancy rates, but I just quickly put it into a spreadsheet to see what could that mean? What could I make from that single piece of data about the efficient use of this building? So, if there are six Courts and in 2024, there are 262 working days – that is Monday to Friday – which gives us a total Court days of 1,572 and a 77% occupancy rate. That gives us 1,210 days in use but that occupancy rate includes the sitting of the States, which equates to 39 days.

So Court days account for 1,171 of the potential 1,572, which gives us *spare* Court days of 400. Given there are only 262 days of the year that the States might possibly sit – assuming we do not sit on a Saturday or Sunday, I have not even taken bank holidays into account – there is clearly some movement in the rooms within this building. I will give a caveat. I am well aware that if two Court rooms sit vacant for a day that would skew the figures, or three could sit empty for one day and we cannot sit in three rooms, we would only need one. But there is absolutely capacity to consider the practicality of us parliamentarians using slightly more space than we currently do.

1095 So I hope Members will support definitely Propositions 1, 3 and 4. There is nothing to be afraid of. It is just Proposition 2; I am probably going to *je ne vote pas* it because I do not disagree but I do not really know where it will go and it is a long way off. I do not think it will make any difference. But before I sit down, I just want to pose a rhetorical question because Members have touched on it, and I think it has been responded to about this 'navel gazing, twiddling our thumbs while
1100 someone's fiddling, while Rome burns'.

If Deputy St Pier and his fellow requérants had not submitted this Requête, we would have gone home yesterday and I would like to just ask anyone in this Assembly, had they intended to go and labour on some building sites, were they going to actually actively go out and build some houses? And if the answer is no, then I think we are perfectly entitled to have debated this and I thank the
1105 requérants for bringing it forward.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Blin.

1110 **Deputy Blin:** Thank you, sir.

I would like to, first of all, commend Deputy St Pier and the requérants for this. I think it is a brilliant piece of work. I am sort of astounded, though, that given the fact of the nature of each of the Propositions here, and they are all very much, 'Let's go out and explore, let's go out and see,' I am just amazed that we have all started going into minutiae detail on how this would affect us, etc.,
1115 when all we want to do is just go forward to see.

But the things I would like to say are that this morning I had a nice little swim at the bathing pools; I opened up my phone screen to look at the newspaper and there I see across the headlines, it was the 'Trojan horse' in the headlines and then I hear Deputy de Sausmarez saying, 'This could be a back door to executive government.' I felt a little bit saddened because I think this debate has
1120 been remarkable. Everyone has expressed strong views, but actually all of this, in my opinion, I feel is heading in the right direction. I would like to just make a few points because everything has been said.

For me, as I mentioned briefly yesterday as well, as a Deputy, I struggle, the fact that we do not have joint spaces where we work and get involved with other people – and I know, and everyone else who works in businesses knows, that when you have your meeting rooms and you talk with
1125 your colleagues all the time, you do not even have to actually plan to go and have a meeting with a specific colleague, you just see that colleague. You bump into them and there will be a topic and interest exchange, and then you will end up getting stronger bonds and links.

So I think the dedicated space for Deputies will definitely enhance the efficiency and productivity
1130 of the work we do. It will give us reliable access to resources so we can carry out our duties more effectively. Also, it will foster a more collaborative and conducive working environment and will engage in meetings, discussions and research. Everything will be much stronger.

For those who say, 'Well, we have been dealing with this for a long time,' I know immediately that this will be really conducive and for the public who may be concerned about the cost of this or
1135 something, well, actually, if they are fully aware that this is a very pragmatic and thoughtful process, will therefore ... I think the public will engage and realise that this is a very effective way.

Therefore, it will also be investing in the future for us, for the future and it reflects our commitment. And I think there have been various expressions made in the last days. So the one that comes to my mind is the one about, 'When is the best time to plant a forest?' And they say, 'It
1140 is 20 years ago. When is the second-best time? Now.' This is that seed that we are going to do ... And I believe it was mentioned that we hope that the next elected Deputies will immediately embrace this and take this forward if it gets through.

The final part really is on the Latimer Principles. I think sometimes we have to look beyond our shores for some guiding principles. But remember, it has been clearly stated, we are going to adapt
1145 this to Guernsey. So actually this is probably one of the best requêtes I have seen and I really hope

that we all support it. I am very much look forward to the summing up of Deputy St Pier and I will be supporting all of the Propositions.

Thank you, sir.

1150 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Matthews.

Deputy Matthews: Thank you, sir.

1155 I do not intend to take up an awful lot of time. I think most things have been said and it is a sunny Friday day, sir. I do not think we should be spending much more time in one dingy room, talking about what other dingy rooms we might make available to ourselves in the future. But I did want to respond a little bit to those who have said that we are spending an awful lot of time being self-reflective and on navel gazing when we should be spending our money and time on more important issues, like trying to solve the housing crisis and all the other pressing issues that we have got up against us.

1160 Because what we do here is not all about us and it is too easy to lose sight of what an enormous privilege it is to be able to speak up for the people who elect us and who we represent. We are People's Deputies, and it is our job to represent people's views and to actually drive solutions to those issues that people care about, like the housing crisis and all the other transport woes and other issues that are clearly facing our Island. But many mentioned the paucity of the level of facilities that we have available to us here and I actually wonder how many people realise, as parliamentarians, how little we have available to us. We do not have an office, a secretary or any administrative support. We have very little in the way of meeting rooms to be able to do that role.

1170 I think actually that says something about the status that the States' Assembly and States' Assembly Members are held in, sometimes, by the rest of Government. We should not be surprised sometimes when politicians complain that the show seems to be run by senior civil servants or other members of the public administration when we treat ourselves with this sort of sackcloth and ashes approach and run everything on a shoestring budget. Good governance is an important thing. Representing the views of the public is important, and I think that we should try and provide the facilities to do that.

1175 I am sure when the new Court building was built, the intention was that there would be such a surplus of space that we would have great facilities to be able to expand into and that just has not really happened over the years, partly because the Courts have increased the level of business that they do. This is something that I think now is the right time to be looking at, addressing and seeing what sort of facilities we ought to be able to provide and reserve for the parliamentary estate, which is so important for us to be able to do our role. So for that reason, I support all of the Propositions in the Requête. I hope it passes and I commend it to others to support also.

Thank you, sir.

1185 **The Bailiff:** If no other Member wishes to speak, we will go into the final stages on this Requête and I will call the President of the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee to reply to the debate.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

1190 Unlike Deputy de Sausmarez, who – as a matter of principle – never votes for guillotine motions, (*Laughter*) I did vote for the guillotine motion yesterday, on the basis that I often think that everybody's positions are fixed and everything has been said. I sometimes get frustrated when we have people preaching to the choir, when the anticipated vote which materialises is a unanimous support for a Proposition. But I am glad that yesterday's guillotine motion failed because we have had excellent speeches today that really have, I think, brought on the conversation from yesterday.

1195 Starting with Deputy Queripel, he was looking for a killer argument that would sway his vote. Unfortunately, as on many occasions, there is no killer argument. If there was a killer argument, we probably would have had a lot shorter debate. We have to make decisions on many subjects where

we have to look at all the pros and cons, and come out on a balance of probabilities of what solution or what decision is likely to be better.

1200 Deputy Moakes today and Deputy Murray yesterday accused this Assembly of navel gazing: 'We should get on with housing, housing, housing and other issues facing our Island.' (A Member: Hear, hear.) But they overlooked the other issue that is on the tip of the tongue of the public – that this is yet again the worst States ever. (*Laughter*) And part of that accusation is our failure to address a housing crisis, which, in my opinion, is of our own making.

1205 Our own Island development plan, GP11, helped hinder property development. All our own policies, our immigration policies now are changes where we are taking people out of Open Market hotels and put them into the Local Market, are exacerbating our problems. There are many issues that the States have created, which have helped create the housing crisis that we now struggle to address.

1210 So when I look at that idea of navel gazing, I look at how this Government itself has changed dramatically in the last 20 or 30 years: gone from 57 Members, from effectively a two-tier system, with some elected and perceived to be above others, down to a very flat system; how the number of Committees have changed, the mandates of Committees have changed, and how we keep on rejigging Government, trying to get to something that is more effective at delivering what the public need and want, whether that be a housing crisis and cost of living today, or an education system as
1215 the major debate at the last election. We constantly need to be striving to do that, as I said in my opening, governments need to evolve to meet the changing society and the changing needs.

As Deputy Brouard said, it was not that long ago you got sent a letter by post and you were expected to respond within three weeks or a month and now we get a post on social median' or an SMS across your phone, and you get a message five minutes later saying, 'Why haven't you responded yet?' The world has changed and we need to move on. To reassure Deputy Burford and
1220 Deputy de Sausmarez, I do not see this as a Trojan horse to executive government. When I first came into the States, as somebody coming from a business background I favoured the idea of executive government. I no longer favour that.

1225 Having seen the way the States operates and the complexities and difficulties of running a government, and how different it is to any business in this world, and the demands from the public of Government are so much broader than the demands of shareholders to a corporate entity, I do not favour executive government in our structure now. I want to find ways to make consensus government work better. And whilst some people may think that targeting the Model Law and the Latimer House Principles is a back door to bringing in executive government, I do not believe that.

1230 I would like and hope that the next SAC Committee – because this Committee will not have time and resources to do this in the remainder of this term, as we prepare for an election – I would hope that they would take this as a broader review. They would not just look at Latimer House and Model Law, but they would look at a broader view of how our Assembly functions, and it would be one of those elements. We have had people bemoan the fact that the Machinery of Government findings
1235 came too late in the term to be effective this term. Well, again, we hope the next States – I hope the next States – picks that work stream up and works on it earlier in the term when it can be effective.

What I would say is that if this is passed, all four Propositions which I support – and I would have been quite happy to be a signatory to this Requête – if it goes through, I think SACC will work with P&R to look at trying to work with the stakeholders, with the judiciary and with the Court to see
1240 what space can be available. So hopefully our next intake of Deputies will have a facility to work from. People have bemoaned ... Deputy Moakes admitted, that our facilities in Frossard House are substandard. I think that is understating it somewhat. I have used those facilities on occasion, but I can tell you now, if we have the facility in this building, I will use it far more often in future. I would welcome the idea of being able to invite constituents to come and visit me in a facility like this,
1245 which I would never do in Frossard House.

Again, we have to look at this in a broader context, as well. I think Deputy Moakes referred to 'palaces' developing. We are not looking at developing a palace for us. We are not looking to spend

a lot of money in building a facility, although many other parliaments have. We are simply saying that there is underutilised space in this building that we could utilise very effectively for ourselves.

1250 Why is it we are the only parliament in the world that I am aware of that does not have a parliamentary space? Is every other parliament putting in facilities they do not use or do they utilise it, and does it help contribute to them doing their job and their role as parliamentarians? People will say, 'We have never had it before. Why now?' Well, that is not a good reason. We are regularly accused of being the worst States ever. Is this a contributing factor? I agree with Deputy Roffey's
1255 comments yesterday, this is not a *panacea*. Us having facilities will not change the nature of this Assembly overnight, but I think it could be a contributing factor to improving the way that we function, and the next Assembly functions. It will not help this Assembly, but the next one. I think having that available and approaching things in a slightly different way is one of the incremental steps. As I said in my opening, I said there are elements.

1260 The Machinery of Government looks at the structure of Committees and our relationship with the Civil Service and how we function there. The Rules of Procedure, SACC will bring back a policy letter, we are working on proposals now that hopefully will address some of the poor governance around late amendments and things like that, as proposals for the States to consider. This is the other element; this is the element that has been overlooked for way too long, in my opinion, which
1265 is looking at how we knit together and function as a parliamentary body. So I am very strongly supporting these Propositions and hope that other Members will do, as well.

I think I will finish off by just quoting Deputy Ferbrache, who made an excellent speech, one of the things he said was, 'Are all things well and we should stick with them?' Well, the fact is, I think we can all agree that all things are not well and there is need for a review. And he said that the
1270 system does not work, this form of government is to some extent dysfunctional. As I said, you have got the Machinery of Government, you have got the Rules of Procedure and you have got how the parliament is structured.

I am hoping that all Members will support all four Propositions, and that Model Law and Latimer House will be expanded to a broader review, because I think it inevitably leads to that – because
1275 there is not a perfect fit but it will start a conversation that will hopefully improve those elements and contribute to making this a better parliament, making a system that works better than it does now. As Deputy Le Tocq said, 'It is evolutionary change in government.' Revolutionary change you might do in a business and you take the risk. In Government, we are responsible to everybody. We cannot implement revolutionary change, even if we believe the outcome will be dramatically better.

1280 It has to be an evolutionary process because the risk in revolution is too great. We have too many dependencies and too many potential unintended consequences. I see this as an incremental evolutionary process and remember, these Propositions do not fix anything in stone. Any proposals for changes in the structure of government come back to this Assembly for a debate in the future. That is when we can have the arguments about whether we think those changes are appropriate
1285 and potentially amend them, but at least, Members, give the future SACC and this Assembly a chance to discuss and review them.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: I will turn next to the Vice-President of the Policy & Resources Committee, Deputy
1290 Soulsby, please.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, sir.

Members have heard the views of all other members of Policy & Resources Committee, so I will reserve my points for my views on where we go. I think it has been an interesting debate. I have
1295 been surprised, though, that given the talk about separation of powers, it really has not been referenced a lot. We have not really had a great detail on the separation of powers and what that means from a philosophical point of view. I thought that is a bit of a shame really, because it is something that interests me the most. I have always been interested in it since I read Aristotle's

Politics, where the concept was first brought up. Needless to say, it was not the first edition, although it was a long time ago that I read it.

I would just like to make a point about Deputy Roffey, talking about how the Latimer Principles were irrelevant to Guernsey. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) That is absolutely not the case. They are absolutely, totally irrelevant. I think it has been a shame because we have not explored that in this debate. I do not think members of the public tuning in now would actually know what is meant by the Latimer Principles. It does look at: the role of the three branches, executive, legislature and judiciary; but it also compares parliament and judiciary in that role; the independence of parliamentarians; the independence of the judiciary; public office holders, what their role should be; ethical governance – I would have thought ethical governance is relevant to any system of government that we have

Accountability mechanisms: looking to the accountability to parliament, in terms of what we do; we have ministerial, presidential statements and we have questions; as well as judicial accountability. How do we remove judges? Where are the disciplinary procedures for judges, if necessary? As well as judicial review? It looks at the law-making process; the oversight of government – the role of scrutiny, in other words.

As well as – and I think this is one thing that we have not debated, we have done a lot of looking at ourselves and how our system of government is rubbish and how we need an executive or consensus system of government – but actually, it talks about the role of civil society. For me, that is a really forgotten area, where we struggle with it all the time. Our role in how we consider civil society is, 'Oh, let's send out a consultation.' We could do far more. I have really believed and I have tried to bring in the concept of citizens' assemblies.

The one thing I do agree with Deputy Inder, though – yes, you might be surprised but I agree with him very strongly – is in the States of Election, and this informs the role of the States of Election. How we appoint our Jurats very much falls within things to discuss as the Latimer Principles.

I share the concerns about how we do elect our Jurats. I have stood up and made a number of speeches on behalf of people wanting to be candidates as recently as this week. But I do share his concerns about how we do it. In the modern age, I think we should be doing far more. So I do hope that is something that is taken forward now. In terms of facilities, the Requête is not asking a lot. It is not asking for a new building or new staff to run it.

I do not subscribe to the view that some have put forward, that better facilities lead to better decisions. I do not think there is any evidence for that. I think we can look over the water to our closest cousin to see that. The Isle of Man has got the most wonderful building that we went to see. But I am not quite sure that means that their decisions have been so much better than ours, certainly in recent years. Points are made about, 'Oh, we need the building so we can see each other more.' The alternative comment for that would be that absence makes the heart grow fonder! (*Laughter*) So, I am not so sure about that. It will, hopefully, make us do our job more easily and I think that is the point.

Deputy Le Tocq talked has spoken about the small room outside here. I just think it looks like a dumping ground for old books and lost broken bits of furniture. The only thing it was good for was when after my appendicitis, I could lie down on a soft sofa, rather than this hard seat, while I was recuperating. But apart from that, it is not ideal. We cannot use it when we are not in session, our tags only work when we are here. I think that that just says it all, really.

Let's talk about the facilities at Sir Charles Frossard House. When I was in Frossard House and the media wanted to do an interview with me over the ether, all of the rooms of Frossard House were being utilised, the only room available that was empty was the Members' Room. So I went down to the Members' Room to do this Zoom online, something to be broadcast by one of the outlets, and I started speaking and the lights went off. Every couple of minutes, I had to wave a hand while I was in this interview to make sure that the lights would stay on. So, yes, not necessarily ideal. I do subscribe to the view that it does look like we are in the bowels of the building with hardly any light, it is not ideal.

I think we are talking about facilities a lot but I think there are other factors that have not been referenced here that we should be considering. We do not have those protections. As parliamentarians doing our constituency work we do not have the protections of those working in Committees.

I know last term at least a couple of States' Members were going through a really stressful time, they were being accused of various things and had to seek their own independent legal advice because it was completely separate from Government. And at the same time, they did not have other protections in terms of the data protection law because we are our own data controllers. So we have all the risk but we do not have any of those protections. I think that is an area that we should be looking at as part of this. At the same time, conversely, DBS checks. We should have DBS checks, I believe that some of us can go into particular areas that members of the public would not be anywhere allowed, where there are vulnerable people who need protection. Just because we have been elected Deputy does not make us all necessarily people that should be in those spaces. That is something I have tried to bring forward for a long time. But those are two things not discussed here; we focused on facilities but I do think in our role as parliamentarians they should be considered.

Deputy Moakes – and I think others like Deputy Taylor – made a very good point on this and Deputy Trott responded to Deputy Moakes' comment about the housing crisis, and that we should all be talking about that. Well, to be honest, it is the delivery that is more important than us debating in this room. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) What we need are the resources to make the delivery happen, rather than just pontificating about what we all think is the best way of doing it. But I guess that would be something we might be debating in September. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Finally, I will just talk about the work on the Model Law. If agreed by the States, it will have to fit around the other work and considered in relation to other priorities, of which, yes, housing is obviously the highest. I think we would all agree that anything that moves that forward faster and if it involves us –

I will not give way, I am on the last run here.

But, yes, this will have to fit around other priorities. But of course, that is for the report that comes back. It will not be the legislation. Again, that legislation will have to fit within priorities of legislation and we know a lot of work has had to be prioritised for Moneyval this term.

Who is to know the other stuff that will come up in the meantime? Deputy Burford referenced the letter of comment talking about unicameral and bicameral and seemed to go down a bit of a rabbit hole. Well, that was put in there by the Director of External Relations. After Tuesday, he might be looking for a career on the stage, but it was the Director of External Relations who thought it was relevant to put that in. Because that is about the different roles of different parts of the parliament, in terms of bicameral parliaments and where we might pass policy letters, but you have another Assembly that deals with legislation. So that is why he put it in there, it is actually relevant to those separations of powers.

I do think the current situation we find ourselves in is far from ideal, I have felt that a long time. I do think, also, we want to encourage more good candidates to stand. Hearing today what we are currently putting up with, there is a danger that might put some people off; but I think we do need to move more into the 21st Century, feel less like second class citizens and on a par with the other powers of this Island. I do think it is time for change, albeit, as I think Deputy Le Tocq said, through baby steps. For that reason, I am happy to support this Requête.

The Bailiff: Now I will turn to the lead requérant, Deputy St Pier, to reply to the debate, please.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir, and thank you to everyone who has contributed in the debate.

Deputy Prow's speech summed up the issues well and I thank him for it. Deputy Meerveld is right, too, it is not a *panacea*, and in fact, no requérant has claimed that it is. Deputy Aldwell said that this is evolution, not revolution and that was a point that was driven home to me very clearly, sir, by Deputy Aldwell, and indeed Deputy Dudley-Owen during the construction of this Requête.

Paragraph A and Appendix 1 of the Requête set out our historical evolution and the Propositions are just another tiny set of steps in that process, exactly as Deputy Le Tocq has described. This is the third way, compromise, as Deputy Le Tocq said. And again, I am sure both Deputy Dudley-Owen and Deputy Aldwell will attest to that, too, in the construction of the Requête.

I can reassure Deputy Burford that this is not about bicameral or tricameral systems of government. I appreciate Deputy Soulsby's explanation as to how those comments appeared in the letter of comment in that regard. But to be frank, I think they were a distraction, and I think they are a symptom of a system that can produce longer letters of comment, providing 15 reasons not to do things than a policy letter or a requête moving three or four ideas forward.

Deputy Inder made a good point that this matter could perhaps have been considered by the Review of Government. I think he makes a good point, but it has not been and the fact it has not is not a good reason not to progress the matter now. I know that is not actually what Deputy Inder was saying, but indeed, of course, for anyone to vote against the Propositions on those grounds, I think would be perverse.

Deputy Murray repeated a point that I made when I opened the debate: 'With housing, cost of living and climate crises, it would be trite,' I said, 'and easy to dismiss the Requête as institutional navel gazing,' a phrase that was used by others, 'and irrelevant to our community's key challenges at the moment.' Deputy Murray likened it to 'fiddling while Rome burned'.

Now, the failure of this States to deliver during this term – if it lies anywhere – is not with the requérants but arguably with P&R. So in using that phrase, he seemed to have forgotten that he is, as a Member of P&R, Nero. (*Laughter*) I would also note that if it is navel gazing, pretty much everybody in this Assembly has contributed to the debate. Deputy Le Tissier said, 'If it ain't broke, don't fix it'. Well, as Deputy Ferbrache said, 'It is broken.' It is demonstrably broken and as Deputy Ferbrache made clear, we fail as an effective Government and parliamentarians, in part, because our parliament is weak.

Deputy Brouard used the phrase that we are the 'Cinderella' and Deputy Matthews called out, I would say, that the Emperor has no clothes. He said that our culture is – and I would say it is our culture in both our community, but also amongst ourselves – that the States of Deliberation is a second-class citizen to both the judicial branch, the Royal Court, and indeed the executive branch. We have no resources we can command or direct of our own. So we are, of course, ignored and deadlines are missed, as others determine our priorities. I am sure Deputy Ferbrache recognises that, from his experience.

Deputy Parkinson's speech was a counsel of despair, 'Do nothing in this area because it will shine a spotlight on our failures to do nothing on anything else!' (*Laughter*) No, let's act. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Let's act on this because we can. 'It can wait,' said Deputy Moakes. Well, until when? As Deputy Trott pointed out, we have already waited 24 years! As Deputy Aldwell said, there will never be a right time.

Deputy Le Tocq also drew attention to the fact that there *were* plans for a parliament at the time of the Diamond Jubilee, but that is to say, Victoria's not Elizabeth II. So, as Deputy Blin said, 'Now is the time to act, if we have not planted the forest 20 years ago or 24 years ago'.

Deputy Roffey says the Latimer House Principles have no relevance. This is nonsense, as Deputy Soulsby spelt out in detail. Actually, I thank her for doing so and she was the only one to draw attention to all of those other Principles which so clearly do have application. Now, we may have a fused executive and legislature but the independence of our judiciary rests on those Principles. I have heard our judiciary well before this Requête make reference to them in defending their independence, quite rightly. As paragraph 14 of the Requête says:

The practical application of the Model Law may be more limited in Guernsey.

Deputy Ferbrache drew attention to that. Let's be clear exactly what the Propositions say. All Proposition 1 says is:

1. To agree that the Latimer House Principles are relevant to ensuring that Guernsey maintains a strong and functioning democratic system which underpins the components of a state ... and that this requires recognition in order to increase the capacity of the States of Deliberation by ensuring that its Members have appropriate space and support to undertake their role as elected representatives.

1450 And the second Proposition:

2. To direct that the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee should consider and report back by June 2026 to the States of Deliberation with any recommendations for the adoption of an appropriate version of the Model Law to establish a special purpose parliamentary body to oversee the institution of the States of Deliberation as a parliament, having regard to our size, scale, and system of government.

It is not a back door to executive government, as Deputy de Sausmarez suggested. It is about proper resourcing of parliament and its parliamentarians. Deputy Soulsby also made the excellent point that Deputies have no protection for acting in their constituency role. I thought it was an excellent point that was worthy of drawing attention to. In terms of resources, there are no net financial resource implications as set out in paragraphs 18 and 19. Paragraph 18 says:

1455

The propositions do not require additional resources. On the contrary, they will result in the higher utilisation of what is currently the Royal Court estate by formally designating its dual use, when appropriate.

Deputy Taylor spoke to that point. P&R have not demurred from that analysis in the letter of comment. Of course, Rule 4(1) requires that detail be provided and P&R have not challenged that. So Deputy Dyke is right, that if the dialogue envisaged in Proposition 3(C) produces any solutions that require any additional resources, then they will be subject to the normal approval processes and prioritisation. The States is not approving those here today.

1460

Deputy Trott identified that the four holders of the most senior political office in this Assembly all supported this Requête. Now all four of us, I am quite sure, in holding that office at times will have been immensely frustrated by the decisions of this Assembly over time.

But we have all come to realise from our experience that our ability to deliver in that office, in our roles, was hampered and is hampered, in part, by inadequately resourcing this Assembly, which in consequence makes us all less effective than we could and should be.

1465

Although Deputy Trott referred, sir, to your comments in a letter to P&R, that the judiciary does not accept that the States effectively sits at the pleasure and convenience of the Royal Court's availability because dates are set aside for the Court's use by the States of Deliberation, that much is, of course, true, sir. However, Deputy Trott will know from his extensive time in this Assembly that there have been occasions when the States has not completed its business during its allocated days and Members have been advised that space is unavailable on certain alternate days that the States might wish to consider extended sitting. That is what paragraph 9 was referring to.

1470

Let's be very clear, Courts are not being given up. As Deputy Meerveld and Deputy Ferbrache have made clear, this room will remain accessible for the administration of justice, as it is now. Paragraph 11 of the Requête says:

1475

Given the States of Deliberation's sittings are limited to a few days a month, there is no reason why, when not in parliamentary use, the designated space should not continue to be used for other purposes, including by the States of Election, the courts, and for ceremonial purposes.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller identified the challenges that exist within our fused executive legislative model that deserved more attention. Deputy Gollop hit the nail on the head that this Requête is more about resources for parliament and parliamentarians, and I think he made the case for Deputy Queripel to support this Requête. As Deputies Gollop and Le Tocq said, this is about direction of travel and we should get on with it. For Deputy Queripel's, and perhaps Deputy Burford's benefit too, the essence of this Requête is less about the physical space and is best captured in paragraph G of the Requête, which says:

1480

1485

The legislative branch of Government is a key tenet of democratic government. Parliaments and assemblies play a vital role in promoting parliamentary engagement with other parliaments, media and, most importantly, the communities they serve. This Requête can help promote better civic participation in politics and lead to better outcomes from the democratic process.

Actually Deputy Soulsby touched on that in her closing comments. However, the paragraph goes on:

... to do so, requires that the States of Deliberation and its Members have independence with appropriate resources, status, and support to enable them to discharge their role as an equal branch of government with the executive and the judiciary.

And then paragraph 5 goes on to say:

... it is recognised that, as a small jurisdiction, the resources made available to Members of the States of Deliberation must be both proportionate and affordable. However, within these constraints, it is possible to take steps to underpin and support the independence of our parliamentarians.

1490 It moves the dial, as Deputy Brouard said, and for that reason, sir, I urge all Members to support all four Propositions.
Thank you.

1495 **The Bailiff:** Well, there are five Propositions! (*Laughter and interjection*) I propose to take each of them as separate votes because the impression I have got is that some people might want to vote differently, even between Proposition 1 and Proposition 2, and Proposition 3 and Proposition 4. So there will be five distinct votes, please, Greffier. I will invite the Greffier to open voting on Proposition 1 first, please.

1500 *There was a recorded vote.*

Proposition 1

Carried – Pour 21, Contre 13, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 1, Absent 4

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

1505 **The Bailiff:** So in respect of Proposition 1, there voted in favour 21 Members, 13 Members voted against, 1 Member abstained; there are 5 Members not participating in the vote. So I will declare Proposition 1 duly carried. I will invite the Greffier to open voting on Proposition 2, next, please.

There was a recorded vote.

1510 **Proposition 2**
Carried – Pour 20, Contre 14, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 1, Absent 4

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

1515 **The Bailiff:** In respect of Proposition 2, there voted in favour 20 Members, 14 Members voted against, 1 Member abstained, and the same 5 Members not participating. So I will declare Proposition 2 also duly carried. We now turn to Proposition 3, please. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 3.

There was a recorded vote.

1520 **Proposition 3**
Carried – Pour 25, Contre 10, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 4

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	De Lisle, David	None	Leadbeater, Marc	Bury, Tina
Blin, Chris	Haskins, Sam			Oliver, Victoria
Brouard, Al	Helyar, Mark			Roberts, Steve
Burford, Yvonne	Le Tissier, Chris			Snowdon, Alexander
Cameron, Andy	Mahoney, David			
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	McKenna, Liam			
Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Moakes, Nick			
Dyke, John	Murray, Bob			
Fairclough, Simon	Roffey, Peter			
Falla, Steve	Vermeulen, Simon			
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Inder, Neil				

Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
 Le Tocq, Jonathan
 Matthews, Aidan
 Meerveld, Carl
 Parkinson, Charles
 Prow, Robert
 Queripel, Lester
 Soulsby, Heidi
 St Pier, Gavin
 Taylor, Andrew
 Trott, Lyndon

1525 **The Bailiff:** So in respect of Proposition 3, there voted in favour 25 Members, 10 Members voted against, no Member abstained and 5 Members did not participate. So I will declare Proposition 3 also duly carried. Proposition 4, please. I now invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 4.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 4

1530 *Carried – Pour 24, Contre 11, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 4*

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

1535 **The Bailiff:** In respect of Proposition 4, there voted in favour 24 Members, 11 Members voted against, no Member abstained, the same 5 Members not participating. So I will declare Proposition 4 also duly carried. Finally, Proposition 5, I will invite the Greffier to open the voting, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 5

1540 *Carried – Pour 24, Contre 11, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 4*

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

The Bailiff: In respect of Proposition 5, there voted in favour 25 Members, 8 Members voted against, 2 Members abstained, the same 5 Members not participating. So I will declare Proposition 5 also carried, which means that all five Propositions have been approved.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

**10. Schedule for Future States' Business –
Proposition carried**

Article 10.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the attached Schedule for Future States' Business, which sets out items for consideration at the Ordinary States Meeting on 4th September, they are of the opinion to approve the Schedule.

1545

The States' Greffier: Article 10, the Policy & Resources Committee – the Schedule for Future States' Business.

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott, is there anything you wish to say?

1550

Deputy Trott: No, sir. I have nothing to add.
Thank you.

1555 **The Bailiff:** No amendments have been lodged to the Schedule, therefore I doubt there is any debate on it, in which case I can simply put it to the vote. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on the Schedule, please.

There was a recorded vote.

1560 *Carried – Pour 35, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 4*

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

The Bailiff: There voted in favour 35 Members, no Member voted against, no Member abstained, the same five Members not participating in this vote. Therefore, I will declare the Schedule duly carried.

1565 That concludes the business for this Meeting, Members of the States. Can I wish you all a relaxing and enjoyable summer recess next month for no States' Meeting during the course of August and see you back in the Chamber in September. We are closed.

Deputy Gollop: Point of order, sir.

1570 Can I, as kind of Father of the House, wish you, sir, and all your family and friends, and indeed everybody connected with the Royal Court, a great summer as well, although you have much other business to do.

The Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Gollop. We will now close the Meeting then, please, Greffier.

The Assembly adjourned at 12.17 p.m.