



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 6th September 2024

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

Volume 13, No. 17

ISSN 2049-8284

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

Present:

Ms J. E. Roland, Deputy Bailiff and Deputy Presiding Officer

Law Officers

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

People's Deputies

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

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

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

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

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

Absent at the Evocation

Deputy H. L. de Sausmarez (*relevée à 9h 43*); Deputy S. P. Haskins (*indisposé*);
Deputy A. W. Taylor (*relevé à 9h 43*)

Business transacted

Evocation	1277
7. Candidate Expenditure Limits and Criminal Conviction Declaration – Debate continued – Propositions carried as amended	1277
Requête	1313
8. Establishment of the Committee <i>for</i> Housing – Motion sursised.....	1313
9. Schedule for Future States’ Business – Proposition carried	1320
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.27 pm.</i>	1322

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE DEPUTY BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The States' Greffier

EVOCATION

Billet d'État XIII

STATES' ASSEMBLY & CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE

7. Candidate Expenditure Limits and Criminal Conviction Declaration – Debate continued – Propositions carried as amended

The States' Greffier: Billet d'État XII, Article 7, States' Assembly & Constitution Committee –
Candidate Expenditure Limits and Criminal Conviction Declaration.

5

The Deputy Bailiff: Good morning, everybody. Could I just start by wishing the Father of the House a very happy birthday today! (**Members:** Happy Birthday!) Secondly, Deputy de Sausmarez, do you wish to be *relevéd*? (**Deputy de Sausmarez:** Yes, please.) And thirdly, His Majesty's Procureur is going to update us on the advice that was sought at the close of yesterday's Meeting.

10

Madam Procureur.

The Procureur: Thank you, madam.

15

Yesterday, during debate, the concept of benefits in kind came up and I think that is because it is referred to just once in the policy letter. But actually that is more of a taxation term so the reason, yesterday, I was alluding to the fact that there are quite complicated rules about elections is because the benefits in kind is more a taxation term.

20

Elections and electoral expenditure are dealt with separately and there will be an Electoral Expenditure Ordinance that comes back to the States before the election, as there was with the 2020 Election. And the reason that is important is to make all Members aware of that, in that if there is anything around the periphery of this debate that is not unclear in terms of expenditure, there will be an opportunity to come back for the Electoral Expenditure Ordinance, but also because that Ordinance is very likely to follow the predecessor Ordinances which were all made under the Reform Law 1948. And the concept around electoral expenditure is the concept of money and money's worth rather than benefits in kind.

25

There was a lot of guidance issued, both in the 2020 Election and in previous elections which you probably cannot now find online. Which is why, when I was looking last night, it is no longer

there. It has been taken down for the next election. But that guidance is absolutely crucial and will accompany the Electoral Expenditure Ordinance.

30 Now what I can do, because officers very kindly last night, between the close of business yesterday and this morning, have come back to me with the guidance that was issued in 2020 which is largely likely to be the same for the next election, subject to the States deciding to approve something different with the Ordinance. But largely, it might be worth me just reading a little bit of that out, madam, and if Members will bear with me, just for clarity.

35 So in short, in relation to, for example, the question about whether volunteers need to be declared as an election expense:

Time spent by a person providing services or otherwise working for a candidate or a party on an unpaid and voluntary basis, in respect of the election, has no value in money or money's worth.

So those are the terms that will be used in the expenditure Ordinance.

What is money's worth? Election expenses include money and money's worth; that is goods, services and facilities which have a market value, but which may be provided to the candidate or the party free of charge or at a discounted rate.

40 So, in essence, Members, goods and services which are received free or at a discounted value do need to be recorded as electoral expenditure or as a donation. And the value of the expenditure is the commercial rate for the goods and services. So that is what Members need to keep in mind. And in essence, those are reasons for transparency. I am advised that they do reflect UK practice as well around expenditure. So we are not out on a limb with the guidance that has been given. But,
45 as I mentioned earlier, that expenditure Ordinance will be coming back to the States separately. And the terminology that is used is whether something is money or money's worth.

So I hope that –

The Deputy Bailiff: That is extremely helpful. Thank you very much, Madam Procureur.
50 And can you pass on our thanks to the officers who assisted you with that information.
Deputy Falla.

Deputy Falla: Madam, may I just seek some clarification from (**The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes.) His Majesty's Procureur?

55 Do I understand correctly then that if a friend or volunteer assists with the distribution of manifestos, for example, that would not need to be paid at an hourly rate, at minimum wage or otherwise, that in fact that would not need to be declared as value?

The Procureur: Thank you, madam. Yes.
60 Time spent by a person as a volunteer does not have value in terms of money or money's worth, so it would not need to be accounted for as electoral expenditure. That is correct.

Deputy Falla: Thank you.

65 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you very much, Madam Procureur.
I think Deputy Trott has a –

Deputy Trott: Well, only that I did ask a specific question, but I think I know the answer from what His Majesty's Procureur has said. But I think that for good order, I would like to ask it specifically.
70

So if an existing Member of this Assembly has an election website that has been switched off but will be switched back on in the lead up to the election, that is not a declarable cost because the money has already been expended. And therefore, if that is the case, the point I was making about the incumbency factor being of an advantage is not only made but confirmed.

75 **The Procureur:** Thank you for reminding me of your specific question. Sorry I did not cover that earlier.

 You are absolutely right in the sense that, inevitably, there will be an inherited advantage, not just in terms of websites that Members may already have, but also in the experience that they have.

80 But yes, if there is no obvious and tangible commercial value to switching a website back on, and that is very much a matter for Members in terms of how they might edit it or the cost of any edits. Then on the face of it, at the very least, it is simply the fact that you will have that advantage and you will not be able to declare anything extra. If, of course, switching it back on entails more commercial expertise, you will need to declare that. But yes, on the face of it, I agree.

85 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you very much, Madam Procureur.

 Yes, Deputy Queripel, you have already spoken, so have you got a query?

Deputy Queripel: I am rising to ask clarification, madam, from **(The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes, certainly.) Madam Procureur.

90 It is on the issue of one having friends or family members helping to deliver manifestos. And that may have been clarified but I missed it. You are given the electoral roll in confidence. It is confidential information. So I am concerned that whoever asks friends or relations to help them deliver, it is breaking that regulation. So I would like clarification on that please.

95 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Madam Procureur, are you able to answer that question?

The Procureur: Well, if I have understood it correctly and it relates to the data on the electoral roll which will go to candidates, it does not have to go to unpaid volunteers. If you are asking someone to deliver in a road, they do not have to have access to the information that you have got. 100 You are simply asking them to deliver in the parish or in the road. So I cannot see immediately that there would necessarily be a breach. **(The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.) Unless, of course, you are proposing to give the candidates all that information which you should not be doing. But I hope that helps.

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

 Deputy Matthews, I think you also have a question of –

Deputy Matthews: Yes, and it was a question which I referred to yesterday. And it was really about things like the siting of posters which I understand has a specific planning exemption for 110 elections. But were that commercial advertising which, of course, would need planning consent under our system, it would have a material value. And so is that something that would be or should be declarable or not?

The Deputy Bailiff: Madam Procureur.

115 **The Procureur:** Well, as it will be set out in the Electoral Expenditure Ordinance, anything that has value in money or money's worth – so the guidance is clear and I am sure it will be clear next time – that if you have got something that has being provided to you free of charge or at a discounted rate, but that has a commercial value outside, you ought to be declaring that if you are 120 able to quantify what that is. And obviously, you might not be able to quantify it to the nearest pence, but insofar as you are able to quantify that, that needs to be declared. And it really goes back to that general principle of transparency, that people know what you have spent in terms of that electoral expenditure. Does it have money or money's worth?

125 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Sorry, I would just like to follow up on another question to His Majesty's Procureur. On the electoral roll issue, insofar as, obviously, not every house is on the electoral roll. In fact, it is just a small majority. So if you are asking a whole group of friends to deliver your manifestos by hand because there is no money to post them, then you will, by definition, need to give those friends and family some form of list of which houses to deliver to. Because you will not be printing 30,000 manifestos for all the houses in Guernsey, you will only be printing 18,000 for the number of houses which are actually on the electoral roll. Does that present a problem?

The Procureur: Well, again, I think this is the kind of detail that needs to be thrashed through when we get a little bit closer to the election. On the face of it, if you are giving your friends and family a pile of manifestos that you want delivered to people in the parish they can deliver those through the letterboxes. They do not necessarily need to have itemised detail of all the residents that are in that property. They are knowing that they are delivering to all the addresses in that street.

So I do not think, on the face of it, it should work. But if there are particular questions, I am happy to deal with those offline. And I know that the election assistants were dealing with similar queries on the last election. It is not all covered. The guidance really goes to the electoral expenditure, but the issues about the data protection and those issues can also be covered. But, generally, the information about members of the community, those details should only be going to the candidates and not freely released to members of the general public.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Burford, I know you want to follow up. This is not. We are not going to go down this rabbit hole any further, because this is not actually about the Amendment 1 that we are dealing with at the moment. I know it is something of interest and I think Madam Procureur has made quite clear that when this does come back, as it will come back, that will be all Members' opportunity to thoroughly grill Madam Procureur or His Majesty's Comptroller about the minutiae of how it works in terms of electoral rolls etc.

But unless anybody has got specific questions in relation to expenditure, I am going to propose that we carry on. Does anybody else wish to speak on the amendment? This is Amendment 1, remember. In relation, before I ask Deputy Meerveld and Deputy Falla to respond.

You do not need to put your hand up, Deputy Taylor. If you want to speak, you stand up. You have already spoken.

Deputy Taylor: No, I was just going to see if I could be relevéd, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Oh, sorry. I should take back that mild bit of sarcasm. I am terribly sorry. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Taylor, do you wish to be relevéd?

Deputy Taylor: Coming from the most sarcastic Member in the room, madam, it is entirely welcomed. And yes, I do wish to be relevéd.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Does anybody else wish to speak on this amendment? In which case, I will ask Deputy Meerveld to respond on behalf of SACC.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, madam.

We have had a very long debate on this already, so I am not going to necessarily go through every comment that has been made. But just to reiterate, I know that some Members believe that it is not necessary to produce your own manifesto or necessarily to use the post to deliver it, but the fact is that some people may choose to do that. And the basic principle that drove SACC in looking at what the expenditure level should be is two things really. Advice from international organisations, the Vienna Commission and the UK Elections Commission, that express opinions on

180 the international standards that we should be meeting which say that, basically, we should increase by inflation, the amounts previously awarded. Albeit, as this Assembly is discussing, as Deputy Roffey raised yesterday, we have the discretion to lower that if we think we have made a bad mistake. And that is maybe what this Assembly will do. But those international standards were very much in our mind when coming back and saying this needs a limit. And the basic concept that we, SACC, did not want to restrict people's choice of how they reached out to their public.

185 And there are some members of our community, probably the older members of our community who are not familiar with social media and the internet, who may want to reach out in the form of a written manifesto and have it delivered to every house. Again, a more elderly person possibly does not have the ability to deliver to 18,000 homes or necessarily the network of friends who will do it for them. And if you want to do that, that is going to cost you £6,500 just in printing and postage.

190 Again, a lot of people made a *big* thing out of the fact that you do not have to spend that amount of money to be elected. And that is quite true. The whole point of this is you spend what you can afford and what you believe you need to spend to raise your profile. And we are setting a limit that makes sure that nobody can spend *excessively* to buy an election. So we are not looking at numbers like America where they spend hundreds of millions, literally, or billions on campaigns. Or the UK where you have the Labour Party and the Conservative Party who have a massive war chest of capital they could throw at supporting a party manifesto nationwide, while having individual candidates in districts presenting themselves under that umbrella of spending.

195 No, we are simply saying that in our structure of election, as we have it now, the basic concept should be that if a more mature person, for instance, wants to send out a manifesto to every home, or if a party wishes to send out a manifesto to every home, they should be able to. This limit of £6,000 on parties would not enable a party to send out a manifesto, print and post a manifesto, to every member of the electorate.

200 So I think this Assembly should be very wary of the message it sends and the international comparisons that will be made if we decide to lower our spending limit from the previous amount allowed that enabled people to get into this Assembly today and goes against international standards.

205 On a personal note, I think there is a danger of, whilst this is a decision that has ostensibly been made to protect people on lower income and enable them to ... Well, actually, what it is doing is it is preventing people with higher incomes from competing with people on lower incomes in a disproportionate way. But I think there is also a danger that will be perceived by the public as Members in this Assembly, drawing up the drawbridge and setting and creating hurdles or difficulties for new candidates competing with them.

210 Now, I predict we will have, at this election, more sitting Deputies standing than ever before, (A Member: Hear, hear.) and my concern is that, in the course of the election, new candidates and members of the electorate will view a significantly lowered expenditure limit as having potentially been done to help secure the positions and reduce competition for the people who have already got the incumbency advantage that has been highlighted in this debate.

215 So I would strongly urge Members not to support this amendment.

220 Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Falla.

Deputy Falla: Thank you, madam.

225 I would like to thank everybody who has spoken in this debate. This matter did need to be talked out.

Deputy Brouard's hyperbole about Big Brother Falla and the Cabal – it sounds like a band! – was entertaining, but his approach is misguided. I bumped into him on the road while campaigning in 2020. I think it was somewhere near Pleinheume. And I know he places value on door-to-door

230 campaigning, and he mentioned this yesterday, but the limit proposed in the amendment would not stop him from doing that.

Also, it should not be forgotten that under the amendment, candidates would still have £3,000 to play with, with which to innovate, in Deputy Trott's words, or to use ingenuity in Deputy Taylor's. Deputy Burford said that people complained about the paucity of information in the booklet. Well, that was based on the 2020 booklet.

I give way to Deputy Brouard.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

240 **Deputy Brouard:** Thank you very much. Thanks for giving way.

I do not think in the time limit available, to go around all the households on the electoral roll, that you can have 18,000. You cannot physically do it. So therefore, the use of funds to be able to put a manifesto out becomes more and more important. That was the point I was making. You just physically cannot do it, unless we start the election campaign in January and we give everybody a sufficient chance to go around ... *[Inaudible]*

Deputy Falla: Thank you.

Deputy Burford said that people complained about the paucity of information in the booklet, but that was based on the 2020 booklet. Why can't SACC make the 2025 combined manifesto booklet better to overcome any perceived shortcomings? Surely that is a better solution than setting a perceived high cost of entry to the election race?

Deputy Burford was one of the first to mention incumbency advantage, and this was also raised by a few other speakers and has been a point to which the debate has returned on several occasions. But I do think that the jury is really out on whether that is a true advantage. As mentioned, there have been some very high-profile examples of where incumbency *did not* ensure that the candidate was returned to the Assembly – in some cases, after many years' service and high profile. Incumbency, I think is a double-edged sword and should not be used as a justification for SACC's approach.

Deputy Inder dubbed the amendment as cynical. No, it is not. It is a genuine attempt to make candidacy and campaigning as accessible as possible, no matter the candidate's level of wealth.

Deputy Ferbrache and others rightly spotted the irony of this debate following that on the minimum wage, recognising that even a £3,000 limit is out of reach for some. And repeating comments made to him about how unrealistic £7,500 is as an expenditure limit and that we should be setting an example of operating within realistic means. And that view has been reflected overnight in comments from the community on social media.

Deputy Moakes echoed that a £7,500 limit rules out many people in middle Guernsey. And Deputy Oliver reminded us about people living in today's real world. To suggest that candidates should borrow money to fund their election campaign really is remarkable.

Deputy Aldwell came tenth in the election and spent less than £500 on her campaign. Deputy Leadbeater spent £285. Two excellent cases of what can be done if candidates put their mind to it. Deputy Leadbeater pointed out that lowering the budget should increase the number of candidates, and surely that is the definition of fair.

Deputy Mahoney also made strong points about affordability and fairness. Deputy de Sausmarez explained that £3,000 will buy enough personal manifestos for every household on the electoral roll, if candidates choose to go down that route. Combined with a more pragmatic approach to distributing them without defaulting to *Guernsey Post*, who, let's remember, say they could not manage the workload of a manifesto delivery for every candidate anyway.

SACC is wedded to a model that is unworkable. And candidates can get unpaid volunteers to help with no value or money's worth according to the Electoral Expenditure Ordinance 2020. So all talk of paying the minimum wage for such assistance is completely incorrect. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Regarding confidentiality, volunteer manifesto posters could be given just the addresses of

those on the electoral roll. They do not need to know the names of the occupiers. Also, it is possible to build a website at almost no cost by even somebody like me with the most basic of IT skills.

What Deputy Trott described as cheap is not cheap to many, Deputy Aldwell reminded us. Deputy Bury raised a strong point about bias and emphasised that this should not be about what the candidates want, rather, a key part of democracy is to have a system that fits what the *electorate* wants.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller was one of the speakers to question the worth of the combined manifesto, asking whether it was really worth anything at all. Well, if it is not, we could save a great deal of money by scrapping it and instead reintroducing the grant. But remember, the Scrutiny Review showed that 87% of electors said they used the booklet when deciding how to vote.

Deputy Matthews said we do not know what campaigning is effective and what is not. Well, that is all the more reason not to spend £7,500 on a vanilla household drop, the basis on which SACC's figure has been devised, and to use more imaginative ways of getting candidates' views across.

The 2020 spending limit was, in any case, something of a finger in the air for a guinea pig Island-wide election, an unknown. And as Deputy Dudley-Owen said, we now have knowledge on which we can base a realistic limit. Remember, the vast majority of candidates spent less than one third of the £6,000 limit, much less than the amendment's proposed £3,000.

Madam, we needed to have this debate. And I maintain that basing the limit on a household drop of individualised manifestos is over the top and duplicates the resources that the States is already paying for, let alone inflicting a snowfall of potentially 8.5 million sides of A4 paper on the electorate.

Deputy St Pier, in his column, said that this amendment was *Vicar of Dibley*. Well, madam, Deputy Aldwell and I say 'No, no, no, no, no, no, no, no', to SACC's Proposition and yes to ours. And we would encourage Members to do likewise.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Falla.

Members, you can see the amendment before you. I am going to ask, very shortly, the States' Greffier to open the voting. And whilst we are voting, I am going to ask His Majesty's Sheriff to distribute the fourth amendment.

States' Greffier, would you open the voting, please?

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 19, Contre 18, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 0, Absent 1

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

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to the amendment, there voted *Pour* 19; *Contre* 18; there were 2 abstentions. I, therefore, declare that the amendment has been passed.

320 With that in mind, Deputy Roffey, I do not think you wish to lay Amendment 2, do you? Amendment 3, then. Do you wish the States' Greffier to read out the amendment, Deputy de Sausmarez?

[Amendment 3](#)

To delete parts (ii) and (iii) of Proposition 1 and replace them with: "ii. Candidates supported or endorsed by political parties have the option of transferring up to half of their expenditure allowance to fund their political party, provided that the total of all transferred expenditure does not exceed the limit set for individual candidates prescribed in (i)." OR, ONLY IF THIS AMENDMENT'S PROPOSITION 1 ABOVE IS NOT CARRIED: 2. To delete parts (ii) and (iii) of Proposition 1 and replace them with: "ii. Candidates supported or endorsed by political parties have the option of transferring up to half of their expenditure allowance to fund their political party, provided that the total of all transferred expenditure does not exceed 1.5 times the limit set for individual candidates prescribed in (i)."

325 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** I am actually not sure if that would help. I think it might just confuse people. Would you like me to open?

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, please.

330 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Is my microphone working this morning? No. Okay, right. This one is. I am going to project in this direction. I hope we find the right speech. Sorry, just bear with me a second. Right. Thank you.

So, Amendment 3. I was caught off-guard trying to figure out what was coming in Amendment 4, but I am back on the right page now. What Amendment 3 boils down to is the following question:
335 To what extent do we think political parties should be advantaged in our electoral system over independent candidates? We commit in law the ability of groups of people to form political parties. So clearly, we do need to give parties the ability to spend something during an election campaign. The question is how much relative to independent candidates?

340 The original proposals for the Island's inaugural Island-wide Election in 2020 were that the individual spending limit and the political party spending limit should be equal. In the relevant policy letter, in 2019, each of those limits was addressed through a separate Proposition.

Now, what follows is something of a *mia culpa*. I brought a successful amendment to introduce a range of options through a cascade on the individual spending limit, but that amendment did not affect the spending limit for parties. Another amendment, which, reading back through *Hansard* the
345 other day, I was reminded I also, belatedly, had a hand in, did engage the political party spending limit. But because we would not know, at that time, where the individual limit would be set until voting on that substantive Proposition had taken place, it was much more difficult to gauge where the party's spending limit should be set. So the decision-making was really muddled, as is made very clear in the *Hansard* transcript of that part of the debate.

350 More to the point, the original spending limit for both individuals and parties, was proposed as £9,000. That was based on a certain logic, flawed in my view. But at the end of the day, as was very much acknowledged during that debate, the eventual limit was based on nothing more than a feeling or a finger in the air. There was nothing more scientific to it than that. And there was certainly no science behind the differential between the individual spending limit and the party limit.

355 Now, as Deputy Falla pointed out when he opened on Amendment 1, parties still need to reach the same number of electors as individual candidates. And inherently, they have more people to help deliver manifestos, if that is what they choose as their preferred method.

It is interesting to note, as I think it was Deputy Helyar referred to yesterday, that all parties spent less than the £9,000 limit in the previous general election. And, in fact, on average, party expenditure was around £6,330. So just over the individual limit which at that time was £6,000.

So back to the original point of this amendment. I am really pleased that SACC have carried forward the condition from the previous election, whereby candidates can allocate up to 50% only of their personal allowance for use as party spending. That is a really sensible provision in my view. However, there is clearly a potential advantage to a candidate in terms of bang for their buck from collective spending through a party. And the more members of a party there are, the more cost-efficient that spending can be for them, even when that collective expenditure is capped.

So how much should parties be able to spend, relative to individual candidates or independent candidates? SACC has told us that it has decided to change the underlying formula for party expenditure for the party expenditure limit to two times the individual limit. But the policy letter does not explain the thinking behind this increase. Why have they decided to increase the advantage of parties relative to independent candidates? In my opinion, I do not think we should be giving parties a significant structural advantage over independent candidates.

There is a theory that Island wide voting would work better under a party system, and I can certainly see the logic in that. But in my opinion, there is some considerable lack of enthusiasm for a party system within the electorate. This does seem to be supported by the evidence put forward in the Scrutiny Management Committee's report on Island wide voting which said, and I quote, the survey, which was the survey that informed the report:

The survey asked about people's views on political parties. A third of respondents, 34%, said that they were very unsupportive of parties, contrasting with just 8% who said they were very supportive. One quarter of people were neutral.

And indeed, as someone in yesterday's debate mentioned, parties have been something of a damp squib in the experience of this term. There are now, I think, just two Members of the Assembly who are in one (*Interjection by Deputy Vermeulen*) Deputy Vermeulen, off-mic, is pointing out – (*Laughter*) Yes, I am not going to repeat it because it will be corrected by someone.

I, therefore, do not think we should be stacking the deck very consciously in favour of parties when experience and, I believe, public sentiment is not crying out for more of them. Obviously, that does not mean that we should disadvantage parties in relation to independence either. If people want to form parties, they absolutely should be able to do so, and they should be able to promote themselves as such.

So where do we draw the balancing line? Deputy Burford, in her speech yesterday, made an impassioned case for limits being consistent with the previous election which in respect of party limits would be one and a half times the individual allowance. This amendment enables that option, along with the option of equalising the individual and the party limits, as per the original suggestion back in 2019.

The amendment might look a little complex, but that is just because it has been designed in such a way to be agnostic to, and accommodating of, whatever the individual limit the Assembly agreed. The amendment's effect is, in fact, very straightforward. What it does is it replaces the proposal to set the party limit at twice the individual limit with one of two options. The first option is making the party limit the same as the individual limit, and the second option is making the party limit one and a half times the individual limit.

If Members prefer either of those two lower limits, they should support this amendment, which would put them into the substantive Propositions in a mini cascade. They can then make the case for their preference in general debate and vote accordingly.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey, do you second this amendment?

Deputy Roffey: I do.

The Deputy Bailiff: Who wishes to speak on this amendment?

Deputy Gollop.

410 **Deputy Gollop:** Although, I think the last decision we made is curious, I think, though, we should allow at least the possibility of parties to have more of, not necessarily an advantage, but a future in our system.

The truth is, the parties at the last election were not really, in my view, proper parties, in that they were a collection of individuals who got in, perhaps based on values or personalities, but not
415 how parties should operate. A party, to work, needs to be a mass membership body which attracts people from across the community who may or may not fund, who vote and direct their delegates or candidates to adopt certain views. And there is, potentially, much greater accountability and clarity, and the parties should do a lot of research and think tanking and offer alternatives to Civil Service thinking, dare I say. But that has not happened. That does not mean to say it might not in
420 the future.

And I think now that we, apparently, although I will ask a question in the next debate of Deputy Meerveld, and actually, it is relevant to this as well and potentially His Majesty's Comptroller too, that if we choose to vote against the SACC Propositions today, whether we go down to zero electoral expenses or the expenses of the last election. That in itself is intriguing.

425 But on this specific point, yet again, this is a way in which I think the possibilities of candidates to be innovative, to captivate the electorate, or to offer the electorate a different perspective will be reduced, unfortunately, by this amendment. And it makes us realise that maybe we need to think out the whole principle of Island wide elections and the way in which they are structured.

430 **Deputy Burford:** Thank you, madam.

Deputy de Sausmarez is right. I did make an impassioned plea for us to be consistent with the limits set in the previous election. And as such, I will be very pleased to support the second option in her amendment, setting the factor at 1.5 between the personal spending limit and the party
435 spending limit. And I hope when it comes to the substantive vote, Deputy de Sausmarez will be keen to take that consistency to its full extent and vote against the recently amended Proposition which will have the result of leaving the limit at £6,000 for individual spending, as that is the existing position before this debate.

Thank you.

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

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Thank you madam.

I think it is absolutely clear, and Deputy de Sausmarez has said the same in this speech, that this is purely designed to prevent political parties in Guernsey. So here we are, although some of us
445 campaigned in political parties, including Deputy de Sausmarez, we are making an executive decision that parties should no longer be allowed. And I will give you the reason why that is the case. Because if you look at the maths of how this Proposition will actually translate into practice, it will work in the following way.

The more people you have got in the party, the less advantageous it is to have the party
450 campaigning during the election, because, effectively, you will reduce the amounts that you can transfer to your party for those campaigning reasons.

So the whole purpose of being in parties and having a significant amount of people and parties, which will make them more powerful, is that you can campaign together. But this Proposition will completely reverse the advantage of what parties could have.

455 So I will give you an example. At the moment, the limit has been set by Deputy Falla's amendment at £3,000 which would mean the parties could only spend £3,000. That means if you have got 10 members in the party, they can only transfer up to £300 to the party and will have to spend, themselves, £2,700.

I give way to Deputy Oliver.

460

Deputy Oliver: Thank you.

Sorry, the parties will have £6,000.

465

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: No, the amendments by Deputy de Sausmarez says that the parties, in the first Proposition, they would only have £3,000. If that is not approved, in the second Proposition, they would have £4,500.

470

So just to continue with my maths. Even though the advantage of being in the party is that you could share some of the expenses, you could campaign together, you could develop those materials together, whatever it could be, the more people you have got in the party, the less advantageous it is during the election process. Because, as I said, you will only be able if, obviously, everyone shared equally – assume all of those 10 members share the party expenditure equally – you will only be able to transfer £300 and you will have to bear the cost for your individual campaigning of £2,700. But if you only had two members in your party, Deputy Vermeulen and Deputy Dyke, they could transfer £1,500 to the party and have a wider party campaigning budget. So the fewer members

475

you have got in the party, the more advantageous it is, to some extent, to campaign.

So again, the effect of this amendment is to block political campaigning at –

I give way to Deputy Dudley-Owen.

480

Deputy Dudley-Owen: I am very grateful to Deputy Kazantseva-Miller for giving way.

The agility of my arithmetical side of my brain is not as good as Deputy Kazantseva-Miller's. So I would ask, if you could please once more go through the maths side of things of where you have got to the £1,500. And then how we get to the increased number of people in a party we then go to £300.

485

I understand that the limits of £3,000 and £4,500, depending on which bit of the amendment you would like to support. However, what I do not then understand is how the multiplier effect works, reducing the amount that you can then transfer in.

Thank you.

490

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Thank you.

I am very happy to explain my arithmetic. And given that Deputy de Sausmarez did not stand to correct me, I believe I was on the right track to explain them. So I will start again and if Deputy de Sausmarez thinks I am not on the right track, I am very happy to be corrected again.

495

So the amendment suggests that the candidates supported or endorsed by political parties have the option of transferring up to half of the expenditure allowance to fund the political party. So under the £3,000 limit, they could, in principle, transfer up to £1,500. That is the maximum they could transfer under any circumstance.

500

However, the party, itself, can only have the one-to-one ratio. So the party, itself, can only in total get £3,000. So that means, to get to £3,000, it would take two members of a political party to transfer £1,500, but if you have got 10 members in a party, that means they only need could transfer £300. So that is where the scale is coming from.

I hope I have explained it correctly. And Deputy de Sausmarez is not jumping to her feet, so I hope that has been clarified.

Effectively, there is this inverse –

I give way to Deputy Taylor.

505

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Taylor.

Deputy Taylor: Thank you.

I am very grateful to Deputy Kazantseva-Miller giving way there.

510 I am just wondering what she thinks about the remainder of these candidates' balances. Because if you are in a potential party of 10 and you can only transfer £300 into your party, you still have £2,700 remaining in your budget to post out pictures, presumably, where you would have a logo of the party you are a member of, and you, presumably, put your party's pledges in that manifesto that you are putting out individually as well.

515 It is not such a big deal. If £3,000 is enough to spend for an individual, a website with 10 candidates does not necessarily cost more than a website with one candidate. A manifesto with 10 names on it does not cost more than one. So I think this is a bit of a red herring.

Thank you, Deputy Aldwell.

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

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: I give way to Deputy Murray. Obviously, everyone has a time to speak themselves, but I give way.

525 **Deputy Murray:** I just want, I think, to probably correct actually what Deputy Taylor has just suggested, because my recollection from when, and I was a member of a party originally, was that you could not transfer or you could not represent the party utilising the same expenditure. So you cannot, therefore, put a logo on your own material, necessarily, without that being factored into what you have then spent with the party. That is the way it works.

530 So whilst I understand the direction of travel that Deputy Taylor is coming from, I believe the reality was, and I think that is certainly how we approached it within the party, was that if you put anything out personally that was left from what you donated to the party, it could not represent the party. It cannot show the party. So I think that rather reduces the argument that Deputy Taylor is putting forward, that actually you have still got £2,700, therefore, you can put a logo on and you are still going to be representing the party. I do not think you are allowed to do that, but I stand to be corrected on that.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

540 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Thank you.

I appreciate Deputy Murray's intervention, because I think they are going to be the nuances again, which might come through the Ordinance. But I think the whole point of party campaigning is that you do the campaigning of what it entails to be a party, whatever it entails, whether it is logos, manifestos, whatever it is. If you are then following up in your personal budget campaigning with exactly the same material, well, then you are also conducting party campaigning. So I think it is a real nuance that absolutely has to be explored. But I think my arithmetic really continues to stand, that this amendment is designed to prevent parties. And that is the benefit you, I guess, do get by during election, potentially, you get or maybe you do not get, who knows because a lot of people in the parties were not elected. So again, this is back to the electorate to decide who they want to elect. But this amendment is absolutely set to prevent that freedom of campaigning. And really shut, in my view, party campaigning on its head.

550 I have publicly come out to say that I do not think it is a good idea to join a party and that is my personal view and my personal choice, but others may feel differently. And again, I think we need to allow for people to have the freedom to campaign and to set up political structures because they may feel they may work better.

555 So I will not be supporting this amendment. I think we should allow, given especially the reductions in what we have had, the two times proportion is reasonable in my opinion.

I do not think I will be supporting this amendment.

560 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller said two things about this amendment. She said that it was intended to block parties and she said that it was intended to reduce the advantage that parties get under the system. She was wrong in one respect and right in the other. There is absolutely nothing in this amendment that would seek to block parties. But unashamedly, I think it looks to reduce the inherent advantage in the spending rules that being a member of a party enjoys.

I have no objection to parties. Well, I object to some of them, but (*Laughter*) I have no objection to the concept of parties. And if the Island wants to embrace them, that is absolutely fine. But I do think there are some Members of this Assembly that almost want to force party politics down people's throats.

I absolutely respect the result of the Referendum and the type of election system we have got, but certain Members of this Assembly, including indeed the President of SACC, were unashamedly, before we brought that in, saying one of the advantages of Island-wide voting, was it would make sure that we had a party system because that was the only system that would work. Well, the electorate had their say on that. They had Island wide voting and they have said, no, we do not necessarily want to have parties (**Deputy Meerveld:** Point of correction.) in that respect.

The Deputy Bailiff: What is your point of correction, Deputy Meerveld?

Deputy Meerveld: I think during that campaign, I admitted that parties would have an advantage under an Island wide voting system where it lends itself to parties. But I never, ever said that it would specifically have to have the introduction of parties as part of its requirement to deliver.

Deputy Roffey: It is a battle of memories here, but I distinctly remember, on more than one occasion, Deputy Meerveld saying one of the advantages of Island wide voting was that it would mean that the Island would have to move to a party system. He failed to do it in that respect. So now what we are doing is we are skewing, increasing the multiples from what was previously approved to give a bigger advantage to parties in their spend than was true at the last elections. You cannot skin a cat one way, but it looks like we are trying to skin it another way. And, eventually, this Island will have party politics because some people want to have it. And I do not think that is right.

And I do not really understand the logic of Deputy Kazantseva-Miller's mathematics. She is quite right, of course: the bigger the party, the smaller the percentage that they can transfer. That is true, whatever party limit you put. If we have £6,000 which is what is proposed before this amendment comes along, a party of 10 members can only transfer £600, a party of 20 members would only be able to transfer £300. Well, it does not have to be £300 each. I think some of them could transfer more and some could transfer less, but they are left the money to spend afterwards. I was happy to second this amendment before the Falla amendment was successful, but I think it is even more important now. I actually think the Falla amendment went too far in restricting, even though I understand the motivation and I sympathise with it, but it went through. So now a party with £6,000 available really will be able to, I think, get their message out incredibly well. Particularly, they have got the membership for back up. They will certainly be able to get a substantive manifesto out to all households without any problem, whatsoever, above and beyond what is circulated by the States, whereas individuals, I think, will now really struggle to do that.

So we have, for very good reasons, I am sure, and very good motivation, actually amplified the advantages that parties have here. And as Deputy de Sausmarez says, there is no logic or explanation in the policy letter about why the multiple being proposed now of two is higher than it was at the last election.

I think I am actually going to go for it being the same, because I think there should be an equality. The individual candidate should be able to have the same ability to get their message out as the party is able to do. But I would understand if people go for 1.5 on the basis of consistency with the last election, but exaggerating even more the advantage of parties. If the Island wants to embrace

it, great. But I do not think they should be spoon-fed it to the extent that we increase and increase the advantage that party membership has over standing as an individual.

615 So I urge Members, whether they want to go for 1.5 or whether they want to go for equality, unless they want to increase, ratchet up the advantage that party membership has as far as distributing material and raising profile that they actually support this amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Mahoney.

620

Deputy Mahoney: Thank you, madam.

I am glad Deputy Roffey said what he said because I was going to say some of the same points. I picked up, as well, that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller noted that this would lose the advantage of being in a party. So I thought that was a brilliant thing to do. I do not see why you should be advantageous to be in a party. And also Deputy Taylor raised the point, that the party has still got the same amount of money, whether there are 50 people in it or two people in it. I do not see the wrong with then having lots more money if there are 50 people in the party.

625 And also, I am not sure if someone, maybe H.M. Comptroller could clarify at some point during this, the point made by Deputy Murray, that you could not then, in your own stuff, advertise your party in some way. But, surely, the manifesto booklet that was sent out by the States had member of Guernsey Party or Party of Independence or whatever the name of it was and then the other one put in. But that, in itself, had – Sorry, I genuinely do not remember it. (*Interjection*) The Alliance Party, thank you. That had your branding of your party in it. The States are sponsoring that, so I do not see why an individual that is a member of a party cannot put their logo on top as well. But if someone during the debate could clarify that or change it if we need to.

630 And I, like Deputy Roffey clearly, thought that it was odd, anyway, that suddenly it had gone from 150% of the individual's allowance to 200% of the individual's allowance. I did not understand that. Really, part two of this just puts it back to the 150%. Or if we want to be a bit more honest about it, go back to just the 3,800% of it.

640 So I do support the amendment. I think it is a good amendment. And I am a bit confused about some of the points that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller made, that this would disadvantage you, take away your advantage of being in a party. I think that is a good thing to take away the advantage of being in a party.

645 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: Thank you, madam.

I tend to agree with Deputy Kazantseva-Miller on this. The point of the election is that individuals should either be able to stand as individuals or group together as a party, as they deem fit. It is unfortunate there is only one small party left in here at the moment, but the principles apply.

650 Generally, if you have 10 people standing and they have got an allowance of whatever £1,000 it is, surely, they should have more flexibility in terms of how they apply those allowances, whether they want to apply all of it to themselves or whether they want to apply some of it to the party, so it is combined. They should have a reasonable discretion on that. In theory and logically, not that logic ever applies, but, logically, they should be able to apply all of their allowance to the party, if that is what they choose to do. And then they would have no separate allowance for themselves.

655 So that is logically where you should be. That is not where we are going. There are going to be some limits, but to my mind, those limits should be rather more flexible rather than less flexible, because that is a freedom to apply your own money in your own election as you deem fit, subject to the overall spending limit.

660 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Taylor.

665 **Deputy Taylor:** Thank you, madam.

I just want to pick up on one of the other points that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller made which I do not think any other Member has. Slightly paraphrased, because I could not write it down exactly. But the thrust of it was, the point of a party is campaign advantage. I found that quite eye-opening. I did not think that was a point of a party. I thought the idea of a party was to demonstrate how you and a collective group might think and work together once you are inside the Assembly, not, 'We are all joined together to be able to use a collective additional pot of money,' which it is not really any additional money, but 'a way of sharing our election expenses and working together.'

670 So based on that alone ... I was going to support this anyway, but based on that bombshell –

675 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Point of correction, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: I was talking about the advantage during the election period that this would also present you in campaigning for the manifesto and what the party stands for which is, obviously, what the party would want to make happen after the election if they were successful. So I think Deputy Taylor is seeking to mislead the Assembly by misinterpreting my words.

680

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, misleading is a very strong word, as you know, in the Assembly. The fact that we have all sat here and heard what Deputy Taylor has said and then you do not agree with what was said, that is a perfectly viable point of correction. But I think saying that it is an attempt to mislead is a step too far.

685 Deputy Taylor.

690 **Deputy Taylor:** Thank you, madam.

I suppose, by extension, my interpretation of what Deputy Kazantseva-Miller is as I have explained to the Assembly. And if people find that misleading, I am sorry for my interpretation.

So on that alone, I will be supporting this amendment. It is sensible. As Deputy Mahoney has pointed out, it is not really changing anything. So yes, I hope other Members will get behind it and then we can move on to more important things.

695 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.
Deputy Falla.

700

Deputy Falla: Thank you, madam.

The successful amendment doubled the amount for parties to maintain the ratio that was there in the original SACC policy letter. Maybe that was right, maybe that was wrong. But it is what it is. However, as I said in the previous debate, in my view, a party is just a single entity. It still has the same number of people, electors to reach, as an individual candidate. And, therefore, there is not a huge amount of logic in it having a lot more money to spend, because it has only got the same job to do in a campaign. Same number of electors to reach.

705

And furthermore, if all party members are signed up to the party values and are echoing the party values in their own manifestos and in their own campaigns, then that brings a great advantage to the party anyway. And in the light of all of that, I am minded to support this amendment.

710

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.
Deputy Vermeulen.

715 **Deputy Vermeulen:** Thank you, madam.

It is official. In the Guernsey Party, we have become rather fond of Deputy Sasha Kazantseva-Miller over the period of time, and we were grateful to hear what she had to say.

I have stood with my colleague in the Guernsey Party and with others as newbies. In actual fact, all of our members in the Guernsey Party, originally, were newbies and had not been elected, had not gone through the voting process which we actually went through. So it was quite helpful to be with a bunch of people who had like-minded ideas and to go through it together and put our collective minds together to assist us through that difficult period.

Now, I am beginning to detect a bias in this Assembly which strongly favours the current incumbents. It is a bit like asking turkeys to vote for Christmas. And I think that is wrong. I think that is wrong. I think we should bear in mind and try to encourage new blood into this Assembly. So I do not think they should be disaffected. And there is no doubt now. And I do not like the fact that I have a website and I have got my posters, I have got my banners, I have got everything I did last time. It is all set up and I will be paid during the election campaign, whereas the newbies will not.

And I do think, on all of this, we have got some very intelligent men and women on the SACC Committee, and they have looked at this; they have got independent expert advice on these matters and here we are, we are trying to design a camel on the floor of the Chambers. We have got a fourth amendment turned up.

I think I am going to vote against this. And I think I am holding out that the whole thing will be overturned at the end of it and we will get back to where we originally started, accepting the recommendation from SACC. But I think it is wrong to do things just to help ourselves and to disadvantage others that may want to come into the Assembly. I think that is totally wrong. And I am afraid, the deeper this Meeting goes on, I am seeing just that. So I am very disappointed to see that. And I would wholeheartedly agree with the points made from Deputy Sasha Kazantseva-Miller.

Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you.

I really was not going to speak on this and I know it is a bit of a cliché, but Deputy Vermeulen brought me to my feet, because it does seem that no one is at a disadvantage being in a party. If this amendment does not go through, being in a party, you are at an advantage. So why should somebody be at an advantage just by being in a party because you have got everything with that party –?

I will give way.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Vermeulen.

Deputy Vermeulen: I am happy to answer that question.

Perhaps I did not make the point clearly enough. So as sitting Members, we have advantages. But if there is another party full of newbies, like the Guernsey Party certainly was, they do not have those benefits of the websites designed and everything and being paid during the purdah session. Those advantages just are not there. They have got to worry about taking time off work and missing out on their pay. They might get in, they might not.

So in that respect, against the party of newbies, it would level it up somewhat.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Oliver

Deputy Oliver: I am really sorry, I did not think that applied to individuals as well. I am *really* sorry. That logic does not work at all – through you, madam! (*Laughter*) If you have got to take time off work and everything because you are in a party, but for individuals, you do not. I am sorry, I am not there at all.

I think you have made my point stronger, that you need to support this amendment because why should the parties be beneficial to individuals? It should be a level playing field for everybody.

770 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.

Does anybody else wish to speak on this amendment? No, in that case, I will turn to you, Deputy Meerveld, to reply on behalf of the Committee and then back to Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, madam.

775 I do not think there is much to say on this. I think Members have pretty much made up their minds. Although, again, Guernsey is going against any other jurisdiction I know of. I do not know of any other jurisdiction that restricts the expenditure of a party down to the expenditure of a single member. It does seem to me to be a restriction that is designed to hinder or discourage the formation of parties. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I think people should be able to allocate part of their
780 contributions to the party. For instance, the party may want to set out a separate manifesto, stating the aggregate views of the party members and we are setting limits here that are below the ability for them to be able to do so.

Thank you, madam.

785 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.

Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I thank Members for the mercifully concise debate actually on that one.

Deputy Gollop made some interesting points about the potential for parties in the Guernsey
790 system, and I do not disagree with him. But his vision of parties being mass participation movements etc. I really cannot see that coming to fruition in the next 10 months. That is not the system that we currently have, that is not the electoral system that we are designing around. And, therefore, I do not think that point is particularly relevant.

I totally agree that things may evolve in future in that direction and if it does then I think the
795 electoral system can adapt accordingly. But that is not the situation we have at the moment and I would be absolutely amazed if anything like that springs up in the next 10 months. I thank Deputy Burford for her comments. Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, I am sure her maths was correct, but I think there were a couple of points of the logic that were not necessarily as accurate, in my view.

Certainly, the first point to make clear is that this is not designed to prevent parties at all, it is
800 just designed to reduce their advantage relative to independent candidates. I think that point has been brought out more clearly through debate.

In terms of the amount that members of a party can transfer, it would always be the case that any member of a political party could transfer up to 50% of their personal spending allowance, as long as the party spending overall does not exceed the party limit. And that is really what this comes
805 down to. So I think the focus on how many members of a party there are is a little bit of a red herring, as Deputy Taylor described it, because it does not reduce the *advantage* of the party. The party has the same advantage by being able to spend that money. It is just that that advantage becomes more cost-efficient the more members of a party that you have.

So I do not think it does ... In fact, if anything, I think it increases the advantage the more
810 members of a party that you have, because it does enable, assuming that there is an equal split, it does enable members to spend more on their own campaigns as well.

Deputy Roffey just reiterated some of those points. This amendment really is just seeking to reduce the advantage of parties over independent candidates. A point well brought out by Deputy Oliver most recently, as well.

815 And Deputy Roffey made the point, and I think this is worth bearing in mind, that the current proposals brought by SACC do give parties a bigger advantage over individual candidates. So what has changed between the 2020 Election and the election next year is that what is being proposed is that parties have a bigger advantage over independent candidates than was the case in 2020.

Deputy Mahoney made the point that the party still has the same amount of money to spend; and I agree with him, that is the point.

Deputy Dyke was the first of two members of a party who stood up to surprise us with the news that he is in favour of parties being allowed to spend more. And yes, again, I would make the point that it would always be within the discretion of a candidate to transfer up to 50% of their allowance, irrespective of how many Members of the party there are, as long as the party expenditure does not exceed that limit.

Deputy Dyke thinks the proportion should be 100% of an individual allowance. Well, I am tempting fate here, because I do not want this debate to extend any longer, but that would have to be a separate amendment because that was the condition in the 2020 Election and that has been carried through by SACC in their current proposals. So if Deputy Dyke has got a problem with the proportion of spending limit being restricted to 50%, then that would have to be brought as another amendment. This amendment has no bearing on that aspect whatsoever.

I thank Deputy Taylor and Deputy Falla for their comments. Again, Deputy Vermeulen, yes. Again, unsurprising that this member of an incumbent party, what I presume might be an incumbent party going into the election, is in favour of having a bigger electoral spending advantage.

I give way to Deputy Taylor.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Taylor.

Deputy Taylor: Thank you, madam.

I am very grateful to Deputy de Sausmarez giving way. It was really an interjection to see if it would be possible, from His Majesty's Comptroller to get some clarification on the points that I had made, and Deputy Mahoney, also, on how the distribution of individual manifestos containing confirmation of membership of a party might be considered. Or perhaps it would be that this particular point might be covered by guidance at a later date due to the position. If that could be explained, or maybe at the end of debate.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez, would you wish, given that you are mid-speech, for this to be dealt with at the end, or – ?

Deputy de Sausmarez: I am very nearly at the end of my speech, but I think it is important that we do hear from the Comptroller, so I am happy to give way.

The Deputy Bailiff: Mr Comptroller, are you able to opine about this issue on an individual's pamphlet being endorsed by their party membership and that element of party being clear on an individual's documentation?

The Comptroller: Madam, I will proffer some advice. But I will just say in advance, or preface that with saying that I think this sort of detail may well be covered by guidance. I do not know that, but I suspect it will be. But it seems to me it depends on who has incurred the expenditure. Has the party incurred the expenditure? Has the candidate incurred the expenditure?

Deputy de Sausmarez: I appreciate that we have not yet – Oh, I am so sorry. Am I allowed –?
(*Interjection by the Deputy Bailiff*)

I appreciate that we have not yet got the relevant Ordinance, because that will be something that SACC will be working on bringing forward. But I have looked up the Ordinance from the 2020 election and I think that may shed a little bit of light on it, because it does talk about the party expenditure being for spending on, 'the promotion of the party and its policies'. And so I think that does relate to what the Comptroller was saying, about that is what the party expenditure is about. I do not think it has any bearing the other way on restricting what your personal allowance can be spent on.

So Deputy Oliver, I thought, actually put the core arguments into quite a neat nutshell and I would thank her for it. It really is about the fundamental question of why a candidate who is in a party should have an advantage over another candidate who is not in a party. And I think that is what this amendment does boil down to. She thinks it should be a level playing field, or at least a more level playing field, as do I.

And Deputy Meerveld talked about Guernsey not aligning with international protocol. Well, I think that is true of Island wide voting, generally. I do not think there is any other electoral system in the world that is like Island wide voting. And so I think we are in uncharted territory in that respect and we really do need to make the rules that we deem to be most appropriate in that rather unusual context.

So I would urge Members to support this amendment and thank everyone for their contributions to debate.

The Deputy Bailiff: Members, you have on your screens before you the amendment which is Amendment 3 which is a cascade amendment. I will ask the Greffier to open the voting now, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 23, Contre 12, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 2, Absent 1

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

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to Amendment 3, there voted *Pour* 23; 12 voted *Contre*; there were 2 abstentions and 2 Members were not in the Chamber at the time of voting. I, therefore, declare that the amendment has been passed.

Members, you should now have before you a paper copy of Amendment 4. Deputy Queripel, you are proposing this amendment, and the first part of that amendment is to suspend the Rules of Procedure to allow this to be considered in the first place. Is that correct?

Deputy Queripel: Yes, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: So I will put the motion to the Chamber. Those who support a suspension – Sorry, Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Queripel: Madam, do not I get an opportunity to explain why I would like to –?

905 **The Deputy Bailiff:** No, I think it is just a straight vote, I am afraid, Deputy Queripel. You do not get to pre-empt it with a debate on it.

Members, you will see there is, before you, Amendment 4 which needs to start with a suspension of the Rules of Procedure so that it can be considered in the first place. That is an aux voix motion, unless anybody is going to call that it should be done by SEV. I will, therefore, put that motion to
910 the Assembly.

Do you wish to suspend the Rules of Procedure to discuss Amendment 4? Those who support the suspension say *Pour*, those against.

Members voted Contre.

915 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I consider that a victory for those who do not wish to suspend the Rules. And, therefore, the Amendment 4 will not be discussed.

Deputy Queripel: A recorded vote, madam, please.

920 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes. Thank you, Deputy Queripel.

Greffier, are you able to put that motion up? Members, you should have before you on your screen, the procedural motion. The motion is to suspend the Rules. So if you support the suspension of the Rules, you should vote for the motion. States' Greffier, would you open the voting now,
925 please?

There was a recorded vote.

Suspension of Rules of Procedure

930 *Carried – Pour 15, Contre 21, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 1, Absent 1*

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

The Deputy Bailiff: There voted in relation to the motion to suspend the Rules, *Pour* 15; 21
935 *Contre*; there were 2 abstentions and 1 Member was not in the Chamber at the time of voting. I, therefore, declare that the motion has not been passed. And, therefore, we will not be debating Amendment 4.

I therefore turn back to general debate on the amended Proposition. Those who wish to speak in general debate.

Deputy Gollop.

940

Deputy Gollop: These SACC debates can sometimes go a bit in an unusual direction. We have seen three or four of that in the past year which is a pity. And as I say, I am not entirely clear – hopefully, Deputy Meerveld can explain this to me in his summing up – we have had now a selection of votes; collectively, we supported Deputy de Sausmarez’s amendment and Deputy Falla’s amendment which is a new Proposition now; if we vote against those Propositions, are we effectively allowing no candidate expenditure at the next election, or are we reverting to the status quo which would be the £6,000 –?

945

I will give way to Deputy Meerveld.

950

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: I thank Deputy Gollop for giving way.

The extant Resolution in the States after the last debate and a successful amendment is that the limits are £6,000 for individual and £12,000 for parties and that would stand if the entire policy letter were voted out.

955

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you very much for that clarification.

960

Deputy Gollop: Thank you.

At the risk of some Members, perhaps, voting for no expenditure which is the logic of some Members’ positions about unfair advantages from diverse groups or individuals –

I will give way to Deputy Roffey.

965

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: It is a fascinating question about what happens if we do vote things out. So if I understand what Deputy Meerveld said correctly, and I would like to ask Deputy Gollop whether he agrees with this, if then we are able to vote against Proposition 1, that would revert to the £6,000, but we could still support the Propositions that are being inserted by the de Sausmarez amendment. Is that his understanding as well?

970

Deputy Gollop: I would have to curate it. I would think, yes.

975

The Deputy Bailiff: I have already been asked about having them as separate Propositions. So it does appear that is to be a general will. So that is what we will do in terms ... which is a bit of a notification to the States’ Greffier that we will have them as separate votes, which is needed anyway because one of them is a cascade.

So sorry, do carry on, Deputy Gollop.

980

Deputy Gollop: Because I think we have got to holistically think through all the consequences, and we may well perhaps be discussing a requête about number of seats in the future. There are all sorts of things. And, I think, in that context, one has to think carefully about radically changing the logistics of the election.

985

Deputy de Sausmarez is right. We have been in uncharted territory with this election. Experts like Professor Lee thought that there potentially would be a disastrous misfire. I think he was actually pleasantly surprised by the efficiency of the process and the effectiveness of the outcome. But it is a very strange system and may, of course, be reformed in the future.

And in that respect I think that, like perhaps Deputy Roffey, the change has been too significant. I wish, perhaps, SACC had listened to the groundswell of opinion and come back with Propositions that were in between where they wanted and where Deputy Falla wanted, but that is hindsight now.

One point I did not make very clearly, yesterday, but meant to, when Deputy Leadbeater and others were talking about how to run a campaign efficiently on a low budget, is that is extremely commendable. But, of course, candidates who have spent money in the media or social media or with print or the post, they do actually contribute to the local economy. And I enjoyed Deputy Trott's story of how he pioneered colour manifestos which was a game changer. But I remember at the time there was a degree of debate that, I think another candidate had an issue whereby they could actually get manifestos printed cheaper off-Island than on-Island. And that actually is an intriguing element in the equation. It is for the manifesto book, as well.

But I think there is a gain to the local economy. And His Majesty's Procureur ably went through elements of electoral procedure and money's worth. But, for example, in that, I remember years and years ago, in the grapevine of Guernsey gossip, there was a story that a successful candidate had had a team of their employees going out distributing manifestos. And whether those people were volunteers or doing it as part of their job, we will not know. So there are nuances and there are grey areas.

And another point I meant to make yesterday, is if you ... I went to a Green Party conference last year. I always enjoy the seminars which are really about doing things rather than just talking and there were examples of people who were getting Green candidates elected in Conservative and Labour areas. And they said, although, it went against the grain of environmentalism which is about reducing paper and helping the poor trees, they did know from experience, that mailshots, whether hand-delivered or posted, did have an impact.

And what I think UK parties do is although they are restricted by the somewhat draconian borough and county constituencies, in between elections, the four and a half years in between, sometimes, they are going out there all the time. There is actually no expenditure on national parties on billboards. There is no limit. This just applies to candidates in an area. But the parties, when they are doing their overall campaigns, from television to social media, they can spend what they like, rightly or wrongly.

And in between elections, candidates will go around posting things. And somebody said, even yesterday, 'Oh, they wanted ...' I will come on to DBS. I will come on to that in a minute. But when it came to, for example, having a basic DBS check, somebody wrote saying, 'That would be an electoral expense'. Well, it would be if it was done during the time of the election, but it might not be if it was done a year earlier or a year afterwards, like Deputy Trott's website. So there are areas of uncertainty.

And I think that we have further muddied the waters, because I am sure some candidates would already have been under the impression that the expenditure limits for parties and individuals would be similar to last time. And now, of course, they are going to be radically different, potentially. Unless, of course, Members decide to vote against the amendment in order to give some continuity. So I am, perhaps, perturbed that we have made decisions a bit on the hoof with that and with potentially unforeseen consequences.

On the other issue of the policy letter, the complicated matter of criminal record checks, I understand SACC's thinking. I think it is a very complicated area and does involve us in looking at procedure elsewhere in the UK. I think more work could be done on, at least, basic DBS checks. I appreciate committees can do their own thing and in some cases do. And I think there are, perhaps, halfway houses we can go and update our own records as we do already.

But I do agree, on balance, that rushing through what is potentially very complicated ideas because we are office holders rather than conventional volunteers or employees, is the right way to go. But I, perhaps, would have liked a less one-sided approach in the report.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, madam.

I just want to pick up on a couple of points, but one was mentioned, I think, yesterday by Deputy Bury about skin in the game. I have no skin in this game for next for next term. So I am doing this, purely, because this is what I feel, I think, we should allow candidates coming through to be able to do so.

So, since the Cabal have decided we cannot have our own individual campaign, and the Cabal handbook is, realistically, the only effective way that we can promote one's candidature in the next election, can I ask the President of SACC to at least ensure that the Cabal handbook has ability of having four to six pages for each candidate? Can it be unformatted, with an ability to display as one wishes? Can there be no restrictions on pets? (*Laughter*) No common font, no spell checking? And if a candidate only produces a few handwritten lines, sobeit, that is photocopied and put in? (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) Because, yes, I just want to have as much advantage for anybody to use the Cabal handbook and have the ability to express themselves as well as they can in, basically, an A4 telephone directory.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, madam.

I missed the first iteration of this debate in May, because of my first ever encounter with COVID. So I was not here. But I have to say, I put on record, how disappointed I am that the Assembly decided to get rid of the candidates' grant that was there (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) the time before. I really thought that was a great leveller and allowed people of modest means to have a shot at things.

I could not vote to suspend the Rules. There was no rationale for that. The Rules are there for a reason. I would have loved to have voted for the amendment, but the Rules are there for a reason. And if you are going to have an impact on general revenue, you should be able to put in, give Members five working days' warning of that impact. And there was absolutely no reason why this amendment could not have been prepared any time over the last few weeks. So I could not, logically ... We either have Rules, they are there for a reason, or we do not. But I still very much regret that that is gone.

I decided not to lay my own amendment when Deputy Falla's succeeded, because I just thought how long can this navel gazing go on and the Assembly has made their decision. But despite not deciding to put it, I find out now from Deputy Meerveld in response to Deputy Gollop, that actually my preferred option of £6,000 limit is still on the table, whether I want to or not. Because if I vote against Proposition 1(i) which you are kindly going to put separately, that will be the limit that is decided.

And it is a bit odd, because it was the limit that was decided by 24 votes to nine just a couple of months ago. And if I had not had COVID, it would have been 25 votes to nine. But this Assembly is great at making a decision and sticking to it, isn't it? (*Laughter*)

I am going to ask Members, or at least one Member amongst the majority that went for Deputy Falla's amendment, to consider even worse flip-flop of doing it inside a couple of hours –

I give way to Deputy Mahoney.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Mahoney

Deputy Mahoney: I thank Deputy Roffey for giving way.

He is absolutely right. It was 24-6, the vote, although perhaps I had not realised he was not here. But there was an amendment on the table from Deputy de Sausmarez and I which would have reduced it. And it was only because the SACC Committee said please, please, please do not lay it. Let us go away and find something a bit better and a bit lower. And then, of course, they came back with exactly the same thing. So that is the reason it was not done back in May.

Deputy Roffey: I thank Deputy Mahoney for the explanation. I was too feverish to follow what you were up to on that day, I am afraid.

1095 But I still believe that £6,000 is the best compromise which is what we will get if we vote against Proposition 1(i). Because there are these two extremes and £6,000 does not satisfy either of them. SACC will say that it does not allow people to really campaign in exactly the way that they want to. Well, so be it. We are trying to satisfy two different extremes here. But be honest, if for £6,000, you cannot have an effective campaign in Guernsey, then I do not think there is much about you. I think
1100 you should be able to do that. I really do. On the other hand, it is clearly too high to try and level the playing field and let people of modest means not be disadvantaged against wealthier people.

But unfortunately, I think the electoral system we have got means that that is impossible to rectify, because you would have to take it right down to £1,000 or £2,000. And to be honest, in an Island wide voting system, that does not allow for effective campaigning if you want to do so outside
1105 the government system.

So I am not going to reopen the whole of the debate. What I am going to do is point out that the option for the compromise solution which I think would be safer as far as international attention is concerned. After all, £3,000, I think, will be taking it down to, in real terms, almost exactly the same level as a district permitted eight years ago.

1110 I just question whether that is not just too extreme a change of approach to say that from what a district allowed eight years ago is what we are going to allow candidates to spend as expenses to campaign in the whole Island. From the point of equality, I like it. I would like to even go further and have less. I really do not want to give wealthy people an advantage. That goes against my own DNA. But we do have to allow some effective campaigning and I think that what has been inserted
1115 is too extreme. And I really I worry that it will bring us into disrepute.

And I, therefore, urge those who voted in favour of it just to consider maybe voting against Proposition 1(i) and, therefore, getting with the compromise that they agreed by a large majority – although, admittedly, other amendments were at work just two months ago, in May – and stick with the £6,000 limit.

1120 **A Member:** Hear, hear.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

1125 **Deputy Soulsby:** Thank you, madam.

I do have some sympathy with Deputy Roffey, although I did vote for the Deputy Falla amendment. I do think SACC made a mistake here actually. I think they should, given that the Assembly voted to reduce to £6,000 and £12,000, to then come back with a higher number when we had actually asked them to look at a lower number, really did not help. I think if they had come
1130 back with a £6,000 and £12,000, it might be more likely to have passed.

But I thought we needed a change of direction here. I just thought we had been spending a day and a half talking about how much money we can spend if we can afford it, and talk about the other elements of the policy letter which is around criminal convictions and DBS checks. This is something that has been a great interest to me over the years. And last term, I did write to SACC at the time
1135 to say, what can we do about it? But I was actually more focused on what we do with Deputies and people once they have been elected.

And I totally understand why they are saying it is impractical from a candidate's point of view but I think once somebody has been elected it is really important. We, as Deputies, have access to areas that other members of the public might not. We might not have the right to, but we can
1140 often ... It is very difficult for people in certain positions to say 'No, you cannot come here.' And I do have concerns that we could be electing people to certain committees – Health and Education are the ones, primarily, that we can think of – where they have access to areas where there are very vulnerable adults and children. And I do still think that there is an opportunity to consider the use of DBS checks.

1145 I think it is wrong to say because we are not employed by the States it cannot be done. Non-exec directors are not employees of a company but I know, depending on the company, they will require an enhanced DBS check, depending on what they do. And I know, personally, that to be the case.

1150 So I think there is an opportunity there. Deputies, once they are elected, can do them for themselves and send the results of those to the States. But I think it is one area that does concern me. We do not know – because we have agreed, or it is as SACC says, we do not have candidates have DBS checks – what we have ended up with. And I think that is the opportunity to make sure that we are covered, because the last thing we want is for something to go wrong.

1155 So I do request SACC to look at that again, particularly for those who have been elected and whether that should be a requirement. Even if it is not the whole of the States, at least, for those that sit on specific committees.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Dyke.

1160

Deputy Dyke: Thank you, madam.

Firstly, I would like to say how disappointed I am that Deputy Brouard has no skin in the game for the upcoming election. That is a disappointment to us all! (*Interjection and laughter*)

1165 The other point I would make, in terms of the financial limits, as always, I agree with Deputy Roffey on this subject and I believe his compromise is a sensible one, given where we are. And for the same reasons that he has proposed it.

So that is all I have to say.

Thank you.

1170 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Madam, I just want to follow up on the subject Deputy Soulsby has raised in relation to the DBS checks. I thank also Deputy Bury who originally, in the first debate, raised the questions about what enhanced protections we can provide during the election stage.

1175 So obviously SACC has explored these issues and has not come up with any additional levels that we should be undergoing. But we have had emails from the Chair of Safety Net, Poppy Murray, suggesting, and in consultation with Committees, and also engaging with Deputy Aldwell ... It has been suggested to ensure that especially certain Members, if you are elected to certain Committees which have potential access to vulnerable Islanders, recommends that Members of those
1180 Committees should be subject, post-election, to DBS checks.

Actually she picked up on the fact that the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture are already routinely, as part of their own committee procedures, undertake that. So I thought that was quite an interesting interim suggestion and solution. I would certainly wish that, whether it is a SACC issue or individual committees could just do that themselves. But I think having some guidance from the
1185 States' Assembly & Constitution Committee would actually be helpful.

So just to outline the committees that were proposed to be subject to DBS checks were ESC, as currently stands; Home Affairs as these Members are likely to be invited to events with victims, survivors and vulnerable people; HSC as these are Members also likely to be invited to events with vulnerable people; P&R to ensure that no Member has been convicted of financial crimes and any
1190 other Committee where Members are likely to work with vulnerable people.

So I would like to seek assurance perhaps that SACC, at some point, should consider this suggestion.

Thank you.

1195 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, madam.

And I just rise, really, in response to comments that have been made on the DBS check. Coming in as President to the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, I am cognisant that safety is priority within the Education part of our mandate. I felt that it was incongruent that Members sitting on the Committee were not required to have a DBS check. It just seemed to be illogical and actually irresponsible, to be honest.

So right from the get go, I have been pushing to try and get us DBS-checked. And in our role as interim governors, as the Assembly knows, we have been sitting in a governance role above each of our settings. It is really important that when we are going into schools, that actually those school leaders have the confidence that the politicians who are coming in their role as governors are actually DBS-checked as well, as they would expect any other people coming in to the organisation in that type of capacity.

So I think it is just a responsible move. And I would go further than Safety Net have suggested. I think that every single Member should be DBS-checked because I think it is an expected protocol these days. And also, who knows, the parishioner query could be a vulnerable young person. And I personally would not, these days, endorse you meeting privately. Certainly, in someone's home as a politician. You put yourself at a level of risk that you just do not need to.

But say, for example, you were meeting with a vulnerable person or a young person and it was out of sight of others, on a park bench or something, you would want to have that reassurance that you yourself had put yourself to an extra level of check – I give way to Deputy Blin.

Deputy Blin: I thank Deputy Dudley-Owen.

If she could clarify when she is talking about this, especially with certain meetings, whether she is referring to the enhanced DBS or the standard, if she is talking to all levels. Just to ...

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you.

What I am happy to do, I think, which will be helpful in this instance is because Deputy Blin is going to take us down to a route of quite some technical detail, certainly, insofar as how we had to apply for our DBS checks and whether they were the enhanced one or not, I have actually put a question to one of our Committee's secretariat to get the response to that question.

And I think that in conjunction with SACC, what we will do is we will provide the information of how we did it in our Committee to SACC and that can be shared with other Committees. And they may seek to do it before the end of term for their Members. But other Members might seek to also make the applications themselves off their own back. But certainly, for the new term, that this becomes part of the accepted protocol. You are a Deputy, therefore, you are going to be putting yourselves in a position of responsibility and this is something that is expected of you.

But just to say I was very keen on what Deputy Bury introduced into the Assembly as an idea in the last debate that we had. And also just to the extent that I have been trying to press for that for the last four years and we have only just finally managed to really get it recently in Education. But suffice to say, I think that it has allowed senior leaders within our Education establishments to breathe a little bit easier that Members of the political board have got this check now, which I am very pleased about.

Thank you.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you.

I am going to start on the point of DBS checks, but actually I am not going to say very much because I know that Deputy Aldwell is likely to speak in more detail and she has been kind enough to share some of her findings on this issue.

I would say I am fully supportive, always have been, even when I was a Member of SACC, on the principles behind States' Members being DBS-checked. But I also understand, having been a Member of SACC, previously, that in practical terms it is incredibly difficult to do.

I really like the suggestion that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller made about making sure that Committee members are DBS-checked. Of course, that is right and of course, many are. But my understanding of the timings of DBS checks is that there would not be enough time between an election and electing people onto those Committees to do the checks first. So it would have to be retrospective to electing Members of those Committees.

However, I think, as we may find out from Deputy Aldwell, actually the declaration already covers some of the areas that people may be concerned with. But I think we need to look at the most appropriate means of making sure those safeguards are in place. They are really important. The problem is just the practicalities of what you can put in place and how quickly you can get them done.

Of course, enhanced DBS checks, my understanding is, or my recollection is, you cannot just request them for yourself. It has to be through an organisation. I take Deputy Soulsby's point that it does not need to be technically your employer, but you cannot just request one for yourself, I don't think. Can you? (**Deputy Soulsby:** You can.) Okay. In that case, there is nothing ... Yes, a basic one, but not an enhanced one. And so, I think candidates would be well-advised, if they can self-request a DBS check, and certainly you can for the basic but not the enhanced, I think candidates would be well advised to do that. When it comes to the enhanced it is more difficult. My understanding is you cannot request your own enhanced DBS check. There is a mix of views on that point.

But, ultimately, whoever receives the enhanced DBS check, there is a great degree of subjectivity, depending on what it throws out. So it would not necessarily be appropriate for someone requesting their own enhanced DBS check to say, 'Yes, I have done that, I am completely satisfied with what came back. Thanks very much.' So there are complications.

I give to Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: I thank Deputy de Sausmarez for giving way.

It can all be done online now and you can also send the details online and give people access to your records online. So it is not that difficult nowadays.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I have not researched ahead of this debate, but I do remember researching it ahead of the previous debate, that I think Deputy Roffey mentioned was in May. And my recollection then was that you could not request your own enhanced DBS check. However, if people can, that is great. And I would heartedly encourage everyone to do so.

To Deputy Roffey's point about spending limits and his unease about the fact that the limit is basically, in real terms, being reduced to what it was under the district system. Well, that is not comparing apples with apples, because under the district system candidates started with absolutely zero information about them automatically going to electors. And this system is totally different for understandable reasons because of the unique system that we have, there are universal means of getting information about candidates to electors. Now, I agree that is organised through Government, but I do think some of the claims about this dastardly Cabal etc. and state control have been a little bit overblown. However, I do wholeheartedly agree with Deputy Brouard, that for anyone worried about state control, the answer is for any centralised means of sharing information about candidates, that should be as freeform as possible and as non-prescriptive as possible.

I do not think that Government should be, in any way, airbrushing candidates. I think they should be shown, warts and all, for who they actually are. I totally agree with Deputy Brouard that what they submit should be what gets shown, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) because that is what it would have been under the under the previous system, and that is, indeed, what it is under all the other systems. We have only got these centralised methods because the system necessitates it. Because, as Deputy Burford pointed out, the postal system just could not cope with us all sending out individual manifestos. Or 100-plus candidates sending out individual manifestos.

So these are necessary. These centralised forms or channels of communication are a necessary part of our electoral system. But I would say that the content that goes through those channels of

1300 communication should absolutely be as personalised to the candidates as is humanly possible. I do not think we should be airbrushing. I think candidates should be shown, warts and all. I do think we need to relax or even abandon the idea of templates or formatting for the directory.

I think it was Deputy St Pier, yesterday, who said that the directory, the handbook, the booklet, whatever you want to call it, homogenises everyone. And I think it should be de-homogenised, if that is a word.

1305 My only other comment which might stray beyond the bounds of this this policy letter, but might be the last opportunity I have to say it, as well, is that I do think that one of the things that needs to be thought more carefully about is the regulated period that covers when political spending counts. In the UK, my understanding is they have got a much longer regulated period or the equivalent thereof. And I think that is just something that maybe SACC could consider when they are bringing forward Ordinances. What the appropriate length of that regulated period should be.

1310 Oh, and yes, I suppose I should probably say something about the effects of the successful Amendment 3. I thank the majority of Members for supporting that. That was great. So the effect, as I understand it and, gosh, this could get quite complicated given the advice that we have had from relevant parties ...

1315 My understanding is that the baseline limits will depend on Proposition 1(i). I do not have the Propositions in front of me right now, annoyingly, as amended, but I think it is Proposition 1(i). So the first part will determine the individual spending limit. If that is supported, my understanding is that the limit, as amended by the Falla amendment, will be in place. So that will be £3,000 as an allowance for individual candidates.

1320 The effect of the second part of that Proposition will then determine what the party ... Oh, sorry, I should say that if that falls, then my understanding is it reverts to the £6,000 –

The Deputy Bailiff: If you look at SEV at the moment. We've got the proposed cascade if you just. I think that's probably just saying what you're saying.

Deputy de Sausmarez: It has appeared on my screen. Great, thank you.

1330 So yes, Proposition 1(i), basically, if Members vote in favour of that, then the personal limit, the allowance will be £3,000. And then moving on, if they vote against, then my understanding is that it will be £6,000. Then moving on to the second Proposition, if Members support that, then it will be the same; the party limit will be the same as whatever was determined through the vote on Proposition 1.

1335 So if Members have voted to support or maintain £3,000 as their personal spending limit, then supporting Proposition 2 would mean that the party limit is also set at that same level. If, however, Proposition 1 had been voted against and the spending limit is £6,000, then the party limit would also be £6,000. So that is to mirror it.

1340 So Proposition 2 is basically whether you want a 1-to-1 ratio on the political party to individual limit. And if that is not carried, then the next Proposition would give Members a choice of ... well, would present the option whereby the party limit is 1.5 times the personal limit. So I think that is clear.

So I think I will be supporting Propositions 1 and 2 as my first preferences.
Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Mahoney.

1345 **Deputy Mahoney:** Thank you, madam.

I have just three very quick points. A couple of them for Deputy Meerveld, when he sums up, if you could just clarify stuff.

1350 Deputy Soulsby noted that we had been talking about three or four hours about this stuff and really now we may nearly have got to an agreement on some stuff, but I just wanted to get some clarity on where I stand. And let's just say it is £3,000 and £6,000 are the limits, whatever they happen

to be, and I decide, bugger that, I am going to spend £10,000 and then just face the consequences of that. So I spend £10,000, get elected. I have broken the rules. What happens now? So what is the sanction against me? Just in summing up will be good.

1355

The Deputy Bailiff: Sorry, Deputy Mahoney. I am going to repeat the word, but there was a word beginning with a 'b' that is not appropriate for the Chamber.

Deputy Mahoney: I do not remember saying, but I apologise.

1360

If we mess up then what are the consequences of doing so? Either in error or deliberately so. Otherwise, it is going to encourage, 'Well, if there is no consequence of doing it, why not just do it?' And, of course, that also applies to a party or parties, but if they decide to just flagrantly break those rules, so what? What is the downside of breaking the rules if you, then, are successfully elected? If he could clarify that, hopefully there is something in there. If not, could something be put in?

1365

I fully support the point raised by Deputy Kazantseva-Miller and others, re. certain Committees. Although – sorry I did not write the words down; basically, that could those committees commit to doing something, I think it was the phrase, something along those lines – I think that should be more properly formalised, that if you are on a certain Committee, then those Committees will insist that you are DBS-checked rather than the Committee just deciding let's not bother.

1370

And just finally, just to clarify, and only because we have got it online. I certainly did not know it. There are three types of DBS check: the basic, the standard and the enhanced. I am just reading it straight online:

An individual can only request the basic DBS check. The standard and enhanced have to be done through a corporate body, whatever that is.

And it would appear that the standard DBS would be sufficient:

Standard DBS certificates contain your personal details, such as your name and previous names, along with all convictions and cautions on your police record, whether they are considered spent or unspent.

1375

So that, I assume, would be the one that would be most suitable, rather than going for the full enhanced.

But I think, therefore, Deputy de Sausmarez was correct that a basic can be applied for in your own individual name and only takes 24 hours to 48 hours. The other one must be obtained by a body corporate of some description.

1380

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, madam. I will be extremely brief.

1385

Just on the question of expenditure, I think the debates we have had around the amendments are extremely interesting insofar as, as far as I can see, the outcome and the message to the public is that it is all about candidates' policies, not about how much money they have got. And I shall be, on that basis, supporting – and I thank them for bringing it – the consequences of the Falla/Aldwell amendment.

1390

There has been much talk and discussion, actually, prior to this debate around DBS checks. Of course, I am bound to say this as President of Home Affairs and I am pretty sure I know what the view of my Committee is around it, I would support the initiative that on certain Committees, and they have been outlined, that DBS checks are absolutely essential for Members that sit on those Committees. And I also believe that all Members of the Assembly should, indeed, go and have a DBS checks.

1395

Perhaps my message to any prospective candidates that are listening is there is nothing to stop them going online and getting a DBS check. And I would confirm what Deputy Mahoney has just said around the DBS check versus the enhanced checks.

1400 I will just pick up on something Deputy Gollop said around, I think the inference of what he was saying is that he, as a member of SACC, would like more discussion around the subject. And I think the concentration on that should be, once Deputies are elected, the viability of asking for those DBS checks.

1405 I certainly agree with Deputy Al Brouard. I thank him for his entertaining speeches earlier and I absolutely agree with him: the booklet is too prescriptive and I would urge SACC to relook at that. I will not go over all the arguments. They have been well made.

Also, Deputy de Sausmarez spoke about the regulated period, and I agree with her point. And perhaps, in summing up, I would be interested to see what the President of SACC's view is.

Thank you, madam.

1410 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, madam.

Much has been made of spending limits, and I think we have debated that to death and, practically, nearly coming to a conclusion. So I will not rehash any of those debates.

1415 But on the subject of DBS, and I welcome the Safety Net email that we had and what Deputy Kazantseva-Miller described and also what Deputy Prow has just described around that every Member should request a basic check. But please remember that a DBS only looks back, it cannot look forward and it will only, perhaps, give a guide as to a person's character and I am sure if any misdemeanour happened after election, then, of course, our media would pick it up and report it.

1420 But I do support that a Committee member, and not just Select Committee members, but every Committee member, where they are dealing with the public, with the public's information and the ability to meet with the public one-to-one, should offer some sort of protection as the DBS could offer. Although, noting they are not infallible.

Thank you.

1425 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you. Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you. I will be very quick.

1430 I have to say, though, I am just slightly disappointed – and I am going to say it – I am disappointed with SACC, because I do feel that we had this debate last May and a lot of the things that have come out through the amendments are what we said previously. And I just feel that we are back to square one with all the amendments. And I just urge all of those Committees to listen to the Assembly when we have said, can you go away and look at this. And you have just come back with not what we have said, which is quite frustrating and I just feel this debate has been a lot longer than it needed to be if actually you had taken on board some of the things that were said originally.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Aldwell.

Deputy Aldwell: Thank you, madam.

1440 We had an email from Safety Net and being the lead on domestic abuse and sexual violence and Home Affairs, it had interested me. Because what had been called for was for candidates to let everybody know, or put out, their spent and unspent convictions.

1445 And if you work for the Civil Service you can give all of that information over, but that is kept confidential. It does not go into the public domain and that is between you and your employer. So if somebody was going to be a teacher, working in our schools they would wish to know everything, even if it was spent or unspent. If someone has a sexual conviction in some area, that will have up to seven years before it is spent.

But anyway, I had spoken to the Law Officers on this and I wanted to understand. And they gave me the information, which was this, which I have just said, that the difference being that you have a right to privacy. That is Article 8. And there is also the Right to Rehabilitation Law, when Guernsey and UK politicians also benefit from the Rehabilitation of Offenders provision.

So a Deputy is self-employed and it is only right that they declare unspent convictions. But like any other citizen, they should also benefit from the Rehabilitation of Offenders provision and declaring spent convictions which would make them public. This not only takes away the Rehabilitation of Offenders provision, it also takes away the question of their right to privacy, the Article 8.

But we knew that DBS checks were going to be too complicated going in, but certainly, as everybody else has said, once Deputies are elected, DBS checks should be put in place.

But it was interesting to find out why things could not happen, because we thought we could just put a simple amendment in and have more information, but that is not correct. We cannot do that. People have the right to privacy and once they have served their sentence, that should be then the right of rehabilitation. And that is, as your understanding would be, that is the law.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, madam.

Not for the first time, Deputy Roffey has effectively stolen my speech. So I will try and make this a little bit shorter and just pick up on some outstanding points.

I have always rather thought that a compromise is the solution that nobody wanted. And I suspect that is a bit of the position we are in here today. That, some people want £3,000, some people want £7,500. And the extant position, as Deputy Oliver highlighted, we settled on £6,000 last time. To get to that position of £6,000, it is a simple matter of voting against Proposition 1(i). And I really would urge Members, particularly the 19 who supported the Falla amendment, to give some consideration to doing that. I understand those people do not want £7,500, but I would urge them.

And the reasons are this, I do have a concern at the implications to our democratic standing of severely restricting candidate spending, coming down to 40% of what it was last time (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) in the way that the Falla amendment does. And instead, providing a state-run and managed and curated way of distributing manifestos and other information. And I am concerned at the picture that that is sending to the outside world, particularly when combined with our unusual and even unorthodox system of election, where we individually need to be able to put our message out to 30,000 voters on the electoral roll.

I take on board the comments, particularly, made by Deputy de Sausmarez, about how the manifesto booklet is presented. And I am sure every Member of SACC will back me up when I say that I have been, probably, a complete pain in SACC meetings – Deputy Fairclough certainly will agree – in pressing for us to just have a manifesto booklet where people, just whatever they send in, that is what we print.

And I said, forget the template, forget everything else. If they send it on a scrap of shopping paper that is what we print. Because frankly, that is where we were before for years and years and years. So why should that be so difficult? And this has been dragged up over successive SACC meetings with, we have had experts from the printing industry come in. We have had whole timetables of how long something is possible to take, because none of this can be done on-Island. And we are told that whilst some small changes to the layout can be made, due to things like pagination, margins – Deputy de Sausmarez will understand more about that – I have pushed and pushed and the advice is that the risks of some people's manifesto not appearing at all are so great. And can you imagine if that was your manifesto, however it was presented, if for some reason, some printing glitch, because you had a different format that was going in, because people are sending them in in all different formats.

1500 Yes, I know. I am still very much of the mind that we have got to push for that as far as possible, but please do not assume it is straightforward. And everyone in this Assembly would have had an experience on their Committee of where something seems straightforward and all of a sudden people go, 'Yes, but ...' And you realise that, as they say, to every complex problem, there is an answer that is clear, simple and wrong. So we are looking to do that, but nevertheless, it will not go to the extent that stops this being a States-produced, collated and distributed piece of information on the candidates. And we have to stop and think at where else does the States send out the information on the candidates that you can vote for?

1510 So I think the solution to that, in such as we can within the confines of this electoral system which really is where the issues arise, is to go for the middle ground of £6,000 by voting against Proposition 1(i). It can then be modified for the parties as people prefer with Proposition 1(ii) and Proposition 1(iii), but Proposition 1(i) to vote against. Because what that is also doing is it is setting a limit of £4,800 in real terms when compared to last time, because £6,000 now, we have had a significantly inflationary period, it would have been the same as people being given £4,800 in 2020.

So I will just close by urging people to vote against Proposition 1(i).

1515 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, madam.

1520 I was not going to speak. It is just that on the DBS check – because, clearly, this has been mentioned, this is an issue, this is something that we have received emails about – I just want to point out that DBS checks are an indicator of someone's past, because there are limitations, because you know what they have been prosecuted for in the past, but you do not know exactly what people have done in the past, because the most successful criminals will have a clean DBS check. And I just wanted to point that out.

1525 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

1530 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Madam.

Just so Deputy Burford is absolutely clear, I am not going to change my vote on the point, so I hope the other 18 also stand firm.

1535 But in relation to it, just a couple of points, because I hope, really, we have now spent a day on this and I do genuinely like, most of the time, what Deputy Burford says. I often do not agree with it, but I like what she says. But when we talk about pagination and stuff like that, it almost caused me to fall asleep, because those are matters of detail that I do not think we are bothered about really, today. Those could be picked up in due course.

1540 A very good friend of mine once said, 'Saints are in heaven, not on earth'. Now I know that my most respected – I suspect, I should say, that my most respected – political colleague, Deputy Trott, may not agree with that. But in relation to where we are concerning DBS checks, etc. – and I believe Deputy Meerveld will confirm that he is in agreement with this and if not, he will say – that they should be as detailed as they can be for everybody wanting to stand for election.

1545 I fully appreciate the point that Deputy Gabriel made, you are looking backwards with these checks rather than forward. And again, not wanting to embarrass any individual, but we recall, of course, a candidate from the last election who got over 5,000 votes, then went to jail a few months later for stealing money. So Deputy Gabriel's points are best ... you can only do what you can do and I think his point is well made.

1550 But I end up really agreeing with Deputy Leadbeater. And I hope that we could come to a vote on this matter very quickly.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Falla.

Deputy Falla: Thank you, madam.

I will not rehearse the previous debate or, indeed, the May debate which captured the same sentiments regarding candidates' ability to afford to stand for election or perceived ability to afford. The vote for the amendment this morning was a vote, after all, for fairness and affordability. And to default to £6,000 without the grant – because that would be the difference; it is a disadvantage on the previous time – will undoubtedly be off putting to some potential candidates.

So, like Deputy Ferbrache, I would encourage supporters of the amendment to hold their mettle and vote in favour of amended Proposition 1(i).

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you. If nobody else wishes to speak in general debate, I shall ask Deputy Meerveld to reply.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, madam.

I was hoping to make it short, but I have quite a few questions to answer.

I think, just going on Deputy Falla's last statement, £6,000 would discourage people from standing, well, last time we had 119 candidates at the limit of limit of £6,000, so is he hoping for many more?

I will give way.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Falla, what is your point of correction?

Deputy Falla: Thank you.

There was also a grant at the last election.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Yes, well, moving on.

Deputy Roffey recommends voting down Proposition 1(i) and, effectively, going back to £6,000 and I would strongly advise Members to do that.

Deputy Oliver questioned, why didn't we 'go away and come back and tell the Assembly what we told you we wanted?' Well, no, we were instructed to go away and look at it. We looked at international standards, we looked at all the different permutations, and we came back and said, we think our recommendation originally was correct. And I still stand by that.

Again, if Members want to instruct us on what we should think in advance, maybe the instruction needs to be clearer.

As far as the candidates' directory –

Deputy Mahoney: Point of correction.

The Deputy Bailiff: I did not hear that. Point of correction, yes, Deputy Mahoney.

Deputy Mahoney: Thank you, madam.

I think the Assembly was very clear. It instructed you to go away and look at lower limits and not to come back with the same thing.

Deputy Meerveld: And we went away and looked at lower limits but did not agree.

Again, if people want to tell us what we should write when we come back, maybe the instructions should be clearer.

Candidates' directory – as Deputy Burford mentioned, we are looking at alternative ways of doing the directory, as was raised and suggested by Deputy Brouard, de Sausmarez, Falla and Prow, specifically.

1605 But as you also mentioned, the devil is in the details. We have had pushback on various different options we have presented, saying it would be technically difficult or it might be hard to edit it and present it. But it is something I am hoping that SACC will be able to come back and inform Members of shortly of what we propose.

1610 But I think certainly if the expenditure level is dropping to a level whereby an individual cannot send out their own manifesto, then we should look at a more free format approach to the candidates' directory, so at least they can present their information in the style they wish. So that is something that we will come back on.

1615 DBS checks – we looked at it in length and in depth, and for all the reasons, I think, other Members have given, there are complications in invoking DBS checks as a requirement. But as Deputy Ferbrache asked, I would absolutely support the idea of DBS checks, I think, post-election, potentially. And I look forward to working with the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture on the way that they have handled it. And then suggesting Committees write it, effectively, into their procedures and mandates going forward, so that certain Committees whose Members may have exposure to vulnerable people or young people, unaccompanied, should go through that process. Certainly, I am very happy to do a DBS check on myself – the basic one – and publish it before the election. And I think, considering public concern over this, it would be a good idea for other
1620 candidates to do the same. But I do not think it is something, because of the way it works, that we can necessarily stipulate in law.

1625 Talking about law brings me on to Deputy Mahoney's question about what would happen if somebody exceeds the expenditure limit, either intentionally or unintentionally. And what I can do is I can read from the legislation from the previous law governing election expenditure in 2020. It says:

Any candidate who contravenes, whether by himself or by his servant or agent any of the provisions of the Article, or of any Ordinance made, thereby, shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding level 5 on the uniform scale. And in addition to such fine shall, if a successful candidate, and if the Royal Court so order on the application of Her Majesty's Procureur, forfeit his seat.

So somebody exceeding the expenditure limit is committing a criminal act, faces criminal prosecution and being removed from the Assembly. So I would think that is the legislation we will bring back again.

I give way to Deputy Roffey.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: I thank Deputy Meerveld for giving way.

1635 So in relation to parties, if they spent more than their limit, presumably, His Majesty's Procureur could suggest that every single candidate ever elected under that banner should be removed from office? Just could he confirm that is correct.

Deputy Meerveld: It says here:

If a political party contravenes any provision of Section 1(6), the leader and treasurer of that party shall each be guilty of an offence and shall be liable of a conviction to a fine not exceeding level 5 on the uniform scale.

1640 So very much like a limited company, directors may be held accountable, but I do not think necessarily the shareholders.

Yes, I will give way again to Deputy Roffey.

1645 **Deputy Roffey:** If neither the leader nor the secretary was it or the – (**The Deputy Bailiff:** Treasurer.) oh, treasurer are actually candidates, as they may not be in a party, then all of the candidates elected under that party banner could retain their seat here, despite the fact that they ... Can I suggest that they look at changing that for the legislation that comes forward this time?

Deputy Meerveld: I think that is a very astute observation and we definitely will.

Going on to other ... So again, the Deputies who have mentioned DBS checks were Deputy Soulsby, Dudley-Owen, de Sausmarez, Kazantseva-Miller, Gabriel and Ferbrache. We will definitely look at it and how we can work it in so that certainly, the concerns of Members and the public are assuaged.

I have covered that one. Regulated period. Deputy Prow asked about the regulated period. SACC has looked at it and I cannot remember if we changed it or not. Anyway, there will be recommendations on the regulated period coming back to the States as part of that legislation and I think it will be discussed then. But certainly, adopting, I think, the UK's one year before election, I think we could not do it retrospectively. But again, it is something this Assembly may want to start discussing, potentially, for setting down as guidelines for the future.

Let me just see if there is any ... Oh, the one last thing, Deputy de Sausmarez. She did mention about, basically, we need to make our own rules because of our unique style of election. And it is unique and it has, yes, invoked some interest internationally. But it is not a 'get out of jail free card'. It does not mean that we need to make all our own rules and we can just ignore international standards.

The Venice Commission and the UK Election Commission give guidance on all democratic elections. They do not give guidance on if you have got this type of democratic election, you should do this and if you do that type of a democratic election, you do something different. And very much, SACC was guided in its research and in its recommendations and coming back saying, we consider we have got the original numbers correct, bearing in mind the advice from people like the Venice Commission and the UK Electoral Commission and international standards. And so, I think, again, this is another reason for rejecting Proposition 1(i).

I think if we drop, in real terms, the amount that a candidate can spend by 40%, I think it is going to raise a lot of eyebrows, and potentially candidates who believe they are being restricted from being able to compete with the advantage of sitting Members, to be able to get in and raise their profile by our limit on expenditure, or members of the public may view it very dimly as things proceed.

So whilst I think Members are trying to do it for well-intentioned reasons, it may well not end up being perceived that way. So I would strongly encourage Members to reject Proposition 1(i).

Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

As previously discussed, the amendments have been separated out. So the first one is just in relation to the candidate expenditure limit, moving down to up to £3,000 in money or money's worth for individual candidates.

So I will ask the States' Greffier to open the voting on that individual item, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 1(i)

Carried – Pour 19, Contre 17, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 2, Absent 1

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	Blin, Chris	None	Inder, Neil	Haskins, Sam
Bury, Tina	Brouard, Al		Roberts, Steve	
Cameron, Andy	Burford, Yvonne		Snowdon, Alexander	
De Lisle, David	Dyke, John			
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	Fairclough, Simon			
Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Gollop, John			
Falla, Steve	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha			
Ferbrache, Peter	Matthews, Aidan			
Gabriel, Adrian	McKenna, Liam			
Helyar, Mark	Meerveld, Carl			

Le Tissier, Chris	Murray, Bob
Le Tocq, Jonathan	Queripel, Lester
Leadbeater, Marc	Roffey, Peter
Mahoney, David	St Pier, Gavin
Moakes, Nick	Taylor, Andrew
Oliver, Victoria	Trott, Lyndon
Parkinson, Charles	Vermeulen, Simon
Prow, Robert	
Soulsby, Heidi	

1690

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to the first Proposition, there voted *Pour* 19; 17 voted against the Proposition; 3 were absent at the time of the vote. And, therefore, I declare that the Proposition has been passed.

States' Greffier, would you put up the first part of the cascade Proposition.

1695

Members, you should all now have on your SEV, the second Proposition. Would you open the voting, please, on this, States' Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

1700

Proposition 1(ii)

Carried – Pour 22, Contre 13, Ne vote pas 3, Did not vote 1, Absent 1

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

1705

The Deputy Bailiff: There voted in relation to this Proposition, *Pour* 22; 13 against; there were 3 abstentions and 1 Member was not in the Chamber at the time of the vote. I, therefore, declare that this Proposition has been passed and, therefore, there will be no need to lay the third element.

Thank you very much, everybody.

REQUÊTE

**8. Establishment of the Committee for Housing –
Motion sursised**

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the Requête entitled "Establishment of the Committee for Housing" dated 1st July, 2024 they are of the opinion:

- 1. To agree to establish a new principal committee called the Committee for Housing, the constitution, mandate and operational functions of which shall be as set out in Appendix 1 to the Requête, and to modify the mandates of the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure, the Committee for Employment & Social Security and the Policy & Resources Committee accordingly.*
- 2. To agree that £155,000 is allocated in the 2025 budget to establish the Committee for Housing, to accelerate housing delivery through additional resources and to transfer, for the use of the new Committee, the relevant portions of the 2025 budgets of the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure, the Committee for Employment & Social Security and the Policy & Resources Committee that are allocated for housing functions for which the new Committee is to be responsible.*
- 3. To agree that these changes will come into effect on July 1st 2025.*
- 4. To agree that a review of the Committee for Housing should be undertaken before the end of September 2032, the terms of which will include: a) its mandate, constitution and operational functions b) budget and resources and c) the need for its continuation or dissolution.*
- 5. To direct the preparation of such legislation as may be necessary to give effect to the above decisions.*

1710 **The States' Greffier:** Article 8, Requête – Establishment of a Committee for Housing.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Thank you, madam.

1715 I guess we are in an interesting position: just before lunch and we have got the further motion of sursis later which, it is my understanding, will be successful. But it has been suggested to me that I should perhaps withdraw the Requête and relay it for the December debate. But I did not feel that was an appropriate option, because that is not how the motion of sursis works.

1720 So I am afraid I have to open the Requête, but I will keep it on the short side of things. And I do hope that we can finish the debate and I would perhaps seek a motion to extend into the lunch period, depending on where we were on that point. But I am not intending to speak for 40 minutes. So just to make that make that point.

1725 So I just wanted to outline some of the key issues which propelled me to seek this solution to establish the Committee for Housing. The core one has been the chronic undersupply of homes that we have had for decades. The needs indicator, over the years, has been that we needed about 300 units on average per year to meet the needs of the community, but the actual delivery has been a fraction of that.

1730 In the full seven years since the IDP adoption and the dissolution of the former Housing Committee, between 2017 and 2023, 835 units of housing, or about 40% of the 2,100 that has been required were built. So a real chronic undersupply and that extends well into the years before. That chronic undersupply of homes has led to the real lack of affordability and the house price to earnings ratio is as bad today as it was 10 to 15 years ago. It is around the 15 times benchmark. You can find this information well presented in the latest update of the Guernsey Housing Plan.

1735 And while we have had a dip in the market between 2015 and COVID, this ratio was still above 12 times which is still well above what is considered to be at sustainable levels.

I think it is shortsighted to assume that our housing crisis has arisen in the past two years as a result of COVID, population and inflation. It has been truly brewing for years. You could see this potentially as a systemic failure for decades, that we have been asleep at the wheel and we have come to accept that such unsustainable levels of house prices were somehow the norm.

1740 In my view, it was a big mistake to dissolve the previous Committee *for* Housing, while the undersupply and affordability issues remained unresolved. And I have spoken on that subject to various people who were, at the time, working on Housing, including different Deputies who were strongly opposed to the dissolution.

1745 So not only we have been asleep and have put the foot off the pedal of housebuilding, we have also added constraints. And notably, planning constraints on the housing in a market which is already highly constrained by being in a small jurisdiction, the transport costs, tighter labour market etc. GP 11 being one such constraint. You could also consider the SLUP being another.

1750 The dissolution of the committee appeared to create a political vacuum. The Guernsey Community Foundation said in their Homelessness Report in 2023 that housing, 'dropped off the radar'. This meant that, this term, the committee has had to practically start from scratch, especially in relation to the land supply for affordable housing. This absence of a principal Committee creates a political yo-yoing, where mandates can be deprioritised and fall off the radar if they are not ring-fenced into their own political structure.

1755 The States' Strategic Housing Indicator paints a grim picture. Over 1,500 homes are required by 2027; 844, private market, 721 affordable housing. And this number does not even include the requirement for keyworker housing which is likely to be in the hundreds. But 20 months on from when the indicator was published, we are way behind. By my calculations, the rate of home building would need to more than double for private market homes and to increase seven-fold for affordable housing for us to meet the indicator by 2027. As we stand today, there is zero – and I repeat zero! – chance that Guernsey will meet this housing indicator.

1760 The Guernsey Housing Plan update, published recently, tells us that unaffordable housing, eight sites are currently prioritised for delivery which are being progressed by the Guernsey Housing Association with the support of Government capital funding. Five sites are mentioned, La Vieille Plage, Oberlands, Braye Lodge, Domaine des Moulins etc. But they are going to be for keywork and specialised housing. While I am absolutely delighted that we have got those sites coming, these affordable housing niches are currently not included in the Strategic Housing Indicator which means those sites are not helped by the figure of the 721 affordable housing units we need to build, will not be helped by those sites listed.

1770 The next three are Pointues Rocques, Fontaines, Belgrave Vinery and Parc Le Lacheur. Well, we are told by P&R, through the IDP review, that the Fontaines, Belgrave Vinery is not available in the next five years and that that is the position of DHA as well. The Committee for E&I does not seem to be aware of this fact. Why is that? Parc Le Lacheur has infrastructure issues, likely to be flood, none of which are likely to be quick fixes, and we have not seen a flood defence strategy come through.

1775 So as we stand today, only Pointues Rocques, due to deliver 41 affordable housing units, has any chance of completion before the life of the Strategic Housing Indicator. That is 6% of the total affordable housing needed by the indicator. So right now, the Guernsey Housing Plan has a delivery programme to meet only 6% of the Strategic Housing Indicator by 2027.

1780 The Affordable Housing Programme is also not fully funded. It currently costs over £120,000 of taxpayer money to subsidise every unit of affordable house building. So delivering over 721 units required would cost £89 million. This funding is not in the Funding & Investment Plan and so the Affordable Housing Programme currently remains unfunded and the model appears unsustainable.

1785 So while we have got a real emergency situation, we have not been able to act in an emergency manner. Continuing with what is, in my view, an inefficient, slow-paced wave, with Housing being fragmented across seven Principal Committees and attempts at cross-committee subgroups such as the Housing Action Group that seem to die of silent death.

I have outlined the rate of change in the homebuilding that is required and for Guernsey standards, it requires some radical changes to how we work on Housing and Government and in collaboration with industry. This is the reason why I, together with the requérants, feel strongly that maintaining the status quo is not acceptable and we have the responsibility to try all the different tools at our disposal.

The way we organise ourselves to progress priority areas is a crucial part of the equation. There is a lot of discontent with the overall Machinery of Government and its ability of this political system to make timely and good decisions. In my view, this is particularly acute in complex areas where mandates are split. But whether you like it or not, our system of government is designed around the committee system. And Housing is foundational enablement of wellbeing and economic prosperity, equal in its importance to health, education and other public areas.

Given how important it is and the long-standing complexity, I believe it is no longer appropriate that housing remains a sideshow across different committees. And when Deputy de Sausmarez gave her presidential update in April this year, housing was one of the 13 workstreams mentioned. It is simply the fact that with such broad and diverse mandates, committees cannot have the same bandwidth and capacity to work on complex issues and cannot dedicate the same level of time and effort as a single committee would.

The Rules of Procedure already allow us to create and dissolve committees. So technically, this is not a big change to the Machinery of Government. The proposals are also time capped, with a review of the committee proposed before the end of its second term. Will this be a *panacea*? No, but it will create a central, accountable political and decision-making body—one voice on all housing matters, laser focused on accelerating the delivery of homebuilding. It will help us cut through the bureaucracy, the political risk and disagreement when mandates are so fragmented.

Time is not on our side because of how much catch up we have got to do and any structures that improve this decision-making and our ability to act are crucial and this will be enabled by bringing the different mandates under one committee. Perhaps it is the CCA-lite version for Housing.

I am pleased that the publication of this Requête has brought into much sharper focus the States' plans and delivery on housing and has led to the increased communication and updates from the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure and I really welcome that. I also have no doubt that our colleagues on that Committee and especially its Presidents, as well as many other Deputies involved in housing this political term, have tried their best within the current system of government to rescue that political vacuum that was inherited. And I thank them for that.

The Guernsey Housing Plan has not been debated in the States, so we can only go by the information contained in the recent housing update. I cannot gather from that update a meaningful plan to ensure we can meet that Strategic Housing Indicator by 2027.

This Requête is a vote against the status quo and in favour of a better structure next political term, to be able to act faster, avoid political fragmentation, have clarity, responsibility and mandate, one voice for housing matters, internally and externally.

The differences in political opinions across committees responsible for housing are a significant risk and this is one of the reasons complex issues requiring cross-committee work get consistently stalled and delayed in this Assembly.

Now, while I do not want to go into the details, I must also address some of the responses that have been made by committees to bust some myths that are being created and avoid the debate going into the rabbit holes. The first one that was made this week by Deputy de Sausmarez is that this new committee will cost £500,000. More than that. I think this is a complete and total scaremongering and nonsense and seems to be a diversion tactic to the backlash E&I has had for their own proposals to hire six senior civil servants.

The actual act of creating a new committee will absolutely and categorically not cost £500,000. The details of the proposed costs are outlined in the Requête. And the vast majority of that cost is to support the policy delivery which seems to be needed whether it remains within the committee or E&I or outside of the new committee structure.

1840 This proposal is to hire two policy officers to support the team of three which would be transferred under this Requête from E&I. The second point made by ESS is that the provision of social goods, such as social housing, should be kept under Employment & Social Security. The key focus of the new committee would be unlocking the rate of home building on the Island and ensuring the delivery of homes to meet the indicator. What is required to deliver that and the skills, the expertise, have little relevance or synergy with the core of what ESS does, which is the operation
1845 of the benefit system, which is largely financial.

Once those homes are delivered and created, it would be important that the setting of the correct rent allowances or other financial criteria required in relation to the social housing programme is developed with ESS. However, the States' role as landlord, developer or overseer of that process is very removed from the core activities of the committee surrounding the operation
1850 and management of the benefit system. This is why, for example, the keyworker accommodation team, the team that is responsible for running the keyworker housing for the States of Guernsey, has been moved away from ESS to the States' Property Unit. And it is exactly the same theory that would apply, in my view, to the oversight, maintenance and tenancy management team that currently sits under ESS.

1855 The third point is the response from my colleagues on the DPA. As Requête signatories, Deputy Oliver and myself were obviously recused from the discussions. The DPA response was presented in the media as not being supportive of the Requête. I believe this is misleading. The DPA's letter indicated a concern that it was not clear – I repeat that it just did not seem to be clear – whether the Requête was trying to move the mandate for planning policies relating to housebuilding to the
1860 new committee or not.

For the record and clarity, the Requête is not seeking to move the mandate on developing planning policies affecting house building to the DPA, as prescribed in the statutory plan amendment process. The Requête is seeking to clarify and strengthen that during the IDP policy development stage, there should exist a strong tether between the DPA and Principal Committees
1865 responsible for developing and delivering state objectives.

We are always told by officers that DPA is not a policy making body; it is a policy taking body. So, for example, any review of policies affecting agriculture will be informed by the reviews that Committee *for* E&I brings forward. Or if Economic Development wanted to review the protection of visitor accommodation again, those policies will be informed by the work developed by the
1870 Committee *for* Economic Development. This is how the process should work anyway, but I do not believe it is as strong as it could be. And it is not held by how cumbersome and protracted the statutory IDP process currently is. The Requête envisages that this new Committee *for* Housing would be actively involved in providing the evidence of what would be necessary to achieve the objectives on housing in the development of future IDP policies. The current IDP review process has
1875 been a good, practical example of why a committee would help streamline and accelerate this. Many issues highlighted throughout it fell outside of the mandate of the DPA, such as questions about commercial deliverability of many of the sites.

The DPA, currently, can only act on the evidence collected in relation to its very narrow mandate, but it would have been invaluable for the Committee to have that wider commercial deliverable
1880 plan on how we would achieve the delivery of those homes.

The last but not least, a concern has been raised that the transfer of the Housing team from E&I may have an effect on their infrastructure mandate. Based on the responses to my Rule 14 questions, the current Housing team is made of two policy officers, originally working on affordable housing and transferred from ESS to E&I this year, 2024, plus a junior officer.

1885 We know from the amendment laid by E&I to this Requête that they think that the additional six policy officers. Clearly, they feel that their housing team is already overstretched, and I cannot see how their officers, dedicated to housing, with their relevant housing skills and expertise, have any capacity to do other infrastructure-related work.

So I do not know how removing this team that E&I has only had since 2024 to a new Committee,
1890 would have any effect on infrastructure mandate. Rather, what it does appear, is that E&I have not

resourced its infrastructure mandate appropriately and that they were hoping that this newly created housing team will effectively do some of the infrastructure work.

1895 Finally, I am very grateful and pleased to have worked on this Requête with Deputies, most of whom have had direct involvement and experience with housing this political term. So this is not an academic exercise, this is informed, absolutely about frontline political experience of trying to move the needle on housing.

1900 Deputy Ferbrache as leader or former leader of P&R and also a responsible member of the defunct Housing Action Group. Deputy Mahoney as leader of States' Property. Deputy Oliver as the president of the DPA and also former member of the Housing Action Group. Deputy Leadbeater and his involvement on keyworker housing on Health. Deputy Moakes and his efforts to bring about better engagement with industry. We all – *we all* – strongly agree that the status quo is not fit for purpose and that a single Committee *for* Housing is a key enabling foundation for next term.

1905 We are not alone in these views. The Guernsey Construction Forum is strongly in favour of this Requête as well as the Guernsey Community Foundation who uncovered the homelessness problem in Guernsey and was one of the first to suggest the idea for a central committee or body to be created responsible for housing back in 2023; as well as other stakeholders and consultees, all of whom preferred to remain unnamed because they have very close workings with the existing Committees.

1910 Members, there is a clear case, a cry for change, and I look forward to exploring this argument in more detail over the coming months or today, because housing is too important to continue getting it wrong. I look forward to the full debate whenever it happens.

Thank you.

1915 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Madam, thank you.

1920 I would like to request that the States suspends the Rules of Procedure at this time in order to enable the sursis to be laid. It seems to me that the sursis has a high probability of success. And if we do not do it this way round, we will need to run through the remainder of the opening process only to then, in my view, almost certainly find ourselves in a position where we defer debate on this matter until December.

So my request, madam, is that the Rules of Procedure are suspended to allow the formal process of the sursis to be laid.

1925 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Trott.

1930 You have heard the motion that Deputy Trott has requested, that effectively, the Rules are suspended because otherwise, for those of you who are not all over Rule 28(3), it would require first Deputy Trott, then Deputy Taylor as Vice-President of the DPA and then Deputy Roffey, then Deputy de Sausmarez to all open, as they are entitled to do, before we turn to the sursis, if the sursis is passed. But if we, obviously, if the sursis happens, then that terminates debate then.

The Deputy Bailiff: So, therefore, I put that motion to you, that the Rules, under 28(3) are effectively suspended in order that we can move straight to the sursis which, in turn, is proposed by Deputy Trott.

Those who support the motion say *Pour*; those against.

Members voted Pour.

1935 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I, therefore, declare that motion is passed.
Deputy Trott, you are proposing a sursis.

Sursis.

To sursis the Proposition until the 11th December 2024 Meeting of the States of Deliberation in order that the States may first conclude consideration of their 2025 Budget Proposals at their Special Meeting on 5th November 2024.

Deputy Trott: Madam, thank you, and thank you to the Assembly.

1940 The sursis is a simple one. It is to sursis the Proposition until 11th December Meeting of the States of Deliberation in order that the States may first conclude consideration of their 2025 Budget proposals at their Special Meeting on 5th November 2024.

I intend to only quote from a single sentence within the explanatory note which I think says it all:

... at this time, the Policy & Resources Committee is eager to ensure that the States are as informed on fiscal matters as they can be to consider the establishment of a Committee for Housing, That can only be addressed having first considered the 2025 Budget which will have no material effect on the implementation of the Propositions should they be successful.

1945 Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby, do you formally second that sursis?

Deputy Soulsby: I do, madam.

1950 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Can I remind Members that the discussion should only be on the sursis itself in debate. Does anybody wish to speak on this?

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

1955 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** I thought it would be appropriate for me to jump. And we have discussed this motion in detail with the requérants and, on balance, are happy to support it with a small caveat. The main consideration, as Deputy Trott alluded to, was that the Propositions seek to establish the Committee from the next political term. So, a delay would not have a material impact on what we are trying to achieve.

1960 The amendments laid by E&I also indicated that, as we expected, this area has not been resourced properly at the time of the GWP and FNIP debate. And we are also pleased to see that this Requête has prompted the Committee to consider Budget requests. And we would be keen to see more detail on that when the Budget is debated in November. This may affect the Propositions of the Requête, depending on the outcome of that debate.

1965 We are also very keen to see the work that is supposed to be delivered by E&I, I quote, 'over the coming months', to understand how –

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, can we stick to the support of the sursis or not?

1970 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Yes, this is the reason to support the sursis, because we want to see that work being presented so that we can see how this will accelerate the rate of delivery.

We understand and respect P&R's position in wanting to ensure that all financing and resource demands are considered. But we would, with a caveat, like to ask that the funding proposals in this Requête are captured in the Budget, perhaps in the Budget Reserve, so that while the Requête will be debated later and, obviously, subject to approval, is that this is still captured in the Budget.

1975 We are very happy to work with P&R and Committees to explore all the further responses in the time that this sursis allows. We have developed and considered this proposal thoroughly, so we are not afraid to go the extra mile to get it right to ensure the States is best positioned for the next political term to start with a good platform.

Thank you.

1980 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you. Does anybody else wish to speak on the sursis?
Deputy Taylor.

Deputy Taylor: I will support this, madam, because I do not think it makes a jot of difference. This Committee is not going to make a jot of difference. So whether we agree that it will not make a jot of difference in two or three months' time does not make a jot of difference, madam.
1985 But I would have liked to have had the debate here and now today. But I will support the sursis.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

1990 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you, madam. I will keep it very brief.

The Deputy Bailiff: And on the sursis?

Deputy de Sausmarez: Yes, on the sursis.
1995 I think, by virtue of modern communications, I am speaking on behalf of the Committee when I say that the Committee *for* the Environment & Infrastructure also support ... No, actually, sorry. The Committee definitely supports the sursis. That is something we discussed. And I do just, on the rationale that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller put forward, probably, I do just need to correct one
2000 impression that she gave which is that the Housing & Infrastructure team is not resourced properly currently. That is not the case. The Housing & Infrastructure team is resourced as per the original Housing Plan. However, the Committee *for* the Environment & Infrastructure sensed that Members were keen to accelerate that work. And so basically, that is also what the Committee's amendment would do as and when it is placed. But also budget requests may well supersede that.

The only other thing I would say is I think the sursis is a very good idea for all the reasons Deputy
2005 Trott set out, because it also will give P&R and, hopefully, other Members the chance to consider the indirect and consequential costs of what the Requête is proposing.

But in short, the Committee *for* the Environment & Infrastructure is supportive of the sursis for all the reasons set out in P&R's motion.

2010 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you. Does anybody else wish to speak on the sursis?
Deputy Blin.

Deputy Blin: Thank you.
I just wanted to clarify something, because the majority of the DPA are in support of the sursis
2015 and I do not know if that came across with the comment that Deputy Taylor made.
Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.
Your chance to reply, then, Deputy Trott.

2020 **Deputy Trott:** There is only one matter to reply to and it is an assurance to all parties that the Policy & Resources Committee is considering both the views of the requérants and those of the Committees impacted by this Requête. And those considerations will form part of the 2025 Budget for this Assembly's consideration.

2025 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.
Members, you now have before you on your screen the current motion which is to sursis the Requête. I would ask the Greffier to open voting now, please.

2030 *There was a recorded vote.*

Carried – Pour 34, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 2, Absent 1

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

The Deputy Bailiff: There voted in relation to the sursis, 34 *Pour*; 1 against; 2 abstentions and 2 Members were not in the Chamber at the time of the vote. I, therefore, declare the sursis has passed.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

9. Schedule for Future States' Business – Proposition carried

Article 9

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 25th September, they are of the opinion to approve the Schedule.

2035

The Deputy Bailiff: States' Greffier, the last item of business, please.

The States' Greffier: Yes, madam. Article 9, the Policy & Resources Committee – Schedule for Future States' Business.

2040

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Madam, I intended to rise and simply say that I so propose with no amendments. But I am not alone, I believe in not having seen a printed copy within our papers. It is entirely as Members would expect so I am not sure whether a printed copy is necessary, but I just make the point that I am not in receipt of one.

The States' Greffier: Yes, it has electronically.

The Deputy Bailiff: Does anybody wish to delay the vote in order to see the printed copy of the Schedule for Future State' Business?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Madam, may I suggest that we get an email copy?

The Deputy Bailiff: Pardon?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: May I suggest we get an email?

The Deputy Bailiff: I believe there has been an email copy.

Does anybody wish to delay the vote in order to see a printed copy? I am going to take that as a no. Nobody is putting forward. That is a positive motion. Therefore, Members, you have on your SEV the standard Proposition in relation to future States' business? Kindly open the voting please, States' Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 37, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 1, Absent 1

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

The Deputy Bailiff: There voted Pour, 37; there was 1 abstention; and 1 Member of the Chamber was not here at the time of the voting. So I, therefore, declare the outcome as having passed.

2070 That is now the end of our business for this session. Thank you very much, everybody and I will ask the States' Greffier to close the Meeting.

The Assembly adjourned at 12.27 pm.