



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Wednesday, 11th December 2024

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

Volume 13, No. 27

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

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

Law Officers

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

People's Deputies

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

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

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

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

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

E. Gallienne Esq. (Deputy Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

Deputy H. L. de Sausmarez; Deputy P. T. R. Ferbrache (*relevé à 12h 23*);
Deputy S. P. Haskins (*indisposé*); Deputy M. A. J. Helyar;
Deputy D. J. Mahoney; Deputy N. G. Moakes;
Deputy V. S. Oliver (*relevé à 10h 23*); Deputy L. C. Queripel (*relevé à 10h 39*)

Business transacted

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Evocation | 2111 |
| Convocation | 2111 |
| Statements | 2111 |
| General update – Statement by the President of the Committee <i>for</i> Home Affairs | 2111 |
| General update – Statement by the President of the Committee <i>for</i> Employment & Social Security | 2120 |
| Questions for Oral Answer..... | 2129 |
| Bus service – Revenue and passenger satisfaction..... | 2129 |
| Support for the arts – Model of financial support – Commenced | 2133 |
| Procedural – Welcome to the President of the States of Alderney | 2136 |
| Support for the arts – Model of financial support – Concluded | 2136 |
| Billet d'État XXII | 2139 |
| Elections and Appointments..... | 2139 |
| 1. Appointment of Employment & Discrimination Tribunal Panel Chairs and Members and Designation of Convenor and Deputy Convenor – Propositions carried | 2139 |
| Appendix Report | 2140 |
| Public Trustee's Annual Report and Audited Accounts for the Year Ended 31st December 2023 – Motion to debate Appendix Report – Motion carried | 2140 |
| Legislation Laid Before the States | 2142 |
| The Plant Health (Preserved Phytosanitary Conditions Regulation) (Amendment) (Guernsey) (No.2) Regulations, 2024; The Excise Duties (Temporary Variation of Rates) Order, 2024; The Police Powers and Criminal Evidence (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2024 (Commencement) Regulations, 2024; The Wastewater Charges (Guernsey) Regulations, 2024; The Water Charges (Amendment) Regulations, 2024; The Waste Disposal and Recovery Charges Regulations, 2024; The Waste Management Services (Charging) Regulations, 2024; The Harbour Dues and Facilities Charges (Guernsey) Regulations, 2024; The Mooring Charges (Guernsey) Regulations, 2024; The Pilotage Dues (Guernsey) Regulations, 2024; The Airport Fees (Guernsey and Alderney) Regulations, 2024; The Customs and Excise (Safety and Security) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations. | 2142 |
| Motion to annul Police Complaints (Conduct, Proceedings and Investigations) (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2024 – Withdrawn..... | 2143 |
| Legislation for Approval | 2143 |
| 2. The Family Allowances Ordinance, 2024 – Proposition carried | 2143 |
| 3. The Income Support (Implementation) (Amendment) (No. 2) Ordinance, 2024 – Proposition carried | 2144 |
| 4. The Land Amenity Improvement Notices Ordinance, 2024 – Proposition carried | 2146 |
| <i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.33 p.m. and resumed at 2.36 p.m.</i> | 2148 |
| 5. The Severe Disability and Carer's Allowance Ordinance, 2024 – Proposition carried | 2148 |

| | |
|--|------|
| 6. The Rules of the Public Servants' Pension Scheme – Proposition carried..... | 2149 |
| 7. Guernsey Development Agency Update – Propositions carried as amended | 2155 |
| Requête | 2181 |
| 8. The Government Reform (2024) Requête – Debate commenced..... | 2181 |
| <i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.34 p.m.</i> | 2189 |

States of Deliberation

The States met at 10.23 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The States' Greffier

EVOCATION

CONVOCATION

The States' Greffier: Billet d'État XXII of 2024. To the Members of the States of the Island of Guernsey, I hereby give notice that a Meeting of the States of Deliberation will be held at the Royal Courthouse on Wednesday 11th December 2024 immediately after the States of Election convened for 9.30 a.m. to consider the items listed in this Billet d'État that have been submitted for debate.

Statements

General update – Statement by the President of the Committee *for* Home Affairs

The Bailiff: Good morning, Members of the States. Deputy Oliver, you snuck in just toward the end of Roll Call. Is it your wish to be relevéed?

10 **Deputy Oliver:** Yes please, sir.

The Bailiff: Right we will mark you as present.

Well, Members of the States, the first item of business today is a Statement made on behalf of the Home Affairs Committee and therefore I will invite the President, Deputy Prow, to deliver that Statement, please.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir.

I am pleased to present my second Statement to the Assembly this year and report that the Committee has continued to deliver at pace on an ambitious programme of work. I start by updating the Assembly on the Moneyval evaluation. Last week, a delegation attended the 68th Plenary Meeting of Moneyval in Strasbourg, where delegates considered the final draft of the evaluation report and had opportunities to make further changes.

Sir, I take this opportunity to put on record my sincere thanks for the dedication and professionalism of the officers from across Government and the authorities for supporting this process. It is anticipated that the final mutual evaluation report will be delivered in early 2025. The

report will provide key findings and recommend actions, which will need to be considered and addressed by the Bailiwick. The report will be used to develop a programme of work for operational delivery, which will also need to be considered in terms of the resource demands to support the continued and sustained delivery of the Anti-Financial Crime Framework as a business-as-usual activity.

During the next political term, it will be essential that Government continues to demonstrate its commitment to global initiatives aimed at preventing and eliminating economic financial crime and implement relevant international standards, such as those issued by the Financial Action Task Force.

Cyber and telecom security remain key issues for the Committee. This has focused on the work to create a legislative framework and mechanisms for digital and electronic communications security and resilience. Consideration is also being given to the protections provided for by the Online Safety Act and how they might be incorporated into domestic legislation.

Turning to Immigration and Population Management. With a new UK government in place, the Committee has reiterated its commitment to maintaining the security of the Common Travel Area, working closely with the UK and Crown Dependencies. Officers continue to liaise closely with their Home Office counterparts on the roll out of e-visas and electronic travel authorisations to the Crown Dependencies, as well as a range of digital changes and developments under the UK Future Borders and Immigration System.

Monitoring the effectiveness of the combined Population and Immigration Policy Framework, implemented in April 2023, remains a priority to ensure that the framework continues to be responsive, balancing the needs of industry and the community whilst considering pressures on public services and housing.

The merger of the Immigration Service and Population Management to deliver a combined population and immigration service will see improved resilience and sustainable service delivery and improve outcomes for the service user.

The Committee is undertaking a detailed data review of dependants as already announced in this Assembly. This work is considering the distribution of dependants against specific roles, to ensure that any change of policy direction is made on an informed basis. Careful consideration needs to be given to balancing the needs of industry, many of which may be critical to meeting the needs of our community and economic prosperity, with the impact on infrastructure and Government's finite resources.

Following the Assembly's approval of the new Domestic Abuse Law in October, which addressed the most urgent gaps in local legislation, a programme of training is underway to ensure that criminal justice agencies are ready for the implementation of the new Law. Initial training has been delivered to the prosecution and senior police officers. Further multi-agency training is being developed, alongside guidance on the new Law, which will be rolled out before the Law is implemented.

As Members are aware, the new Law was the first phase for a programme of work in relation to domestic abuse and sexual violence legislation. In the last three months, the Committee has consulted with key stakeholders in relation to phase two of the review. Having identified 14 additional areas that it wished to consider introducing, the Committee recently considered the feedback from stakeholders and intends to lodge a further policy letter before the end of this term.

The Willow House Sexual Assault Referral Centre – SARC – is fast approaching its first anniversary, having launched its full suite of services on 1st January. Since October 2023, Willow House has responded to over 120 helpline calls and provided extensive support and forensic services, including forensic examinations, assessments and Court statements. Willow House has also taken on the role supporting children for forensic medical examinations in Guernsey, as opposed to the child and staff being flown to Jersey and as a result staff from Willow House have attended approximately 20 strategy meetings to enable the best care for the child.

The urgent need for a new refuge provision in Guernsey is accepted. The current building presents barriers for various groups of clients and is often full. A site from within the States' existing

property portfolio has been identified for the development of the much-needed new refuge provision. Funding in principle has been secured from the Seized Assets Fund.

80 Currently the main focus of activity has been project governance and the development of procurement of a concept design tender. A project board has been established, working with Safer, who delivered the current refuge provision, and the States' Property Unit. This work will need to continue to be prioritised in the next term.

85 The Committee would like to acknowledge the efforts of its Third Sector partners, including Safer and Victim Support and the Witness Service and the work they do in supporting the community when they are at their most vulnerable in assisting in the delivery of our Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy agenda.

90 In September, the Assembly approved a policy letter and accompanying legislation to introduce Organisation of Vicarious Liability for Police Officers, subject to civil and legal action in their capacity as police officers. Importantly, the policy letter also provided direction to the Committee to apprise a comprehensive review of the police complaints legislative framework and processes. This work is supported by the Policy Complaints Commission, Guernsey Police Association and the Police Senior Officers' Staff Association.

95 As part of the broader review of police complaints, the Committee has acknowledged that public engagement, particularly with those that previously engaged with the complaints process, will be key. The Committee intends to make real progress in tackling this long overdue review before the end of this political term.

100 The Committee continues to progress its extant legislative priorities, including a suite of ordinances brought to the September States required to implement the International Criminal Court Law, 2019. In addition, work has been resourced and ordered to be progress Resolutions relating to the sale of knives to under-18s and the Parole Law. A comprehensive review of terrorism legislation is underway. The Committee has also prioritised discreet amendments, which have been identified by Bailiwick Law Enforcement and are necessary due to their operational impact.

105 As time marches on towards the end of this political term, officers from the Committee are supporting the preparations, which will deliver the 2025 General Election, where there will be an emphasis on encouraging a high percentage of those eligible to vote to register on the Electoral Roll.

110 The Committee remains of the view that responsibility for compiling and maintaining the Electoral Roll is not one that sits comfortably with its safe and secure mandate and would support this responsibility moving to a different Committee. Island-wide voting has resulted in some functions now being delivered centrally and there is some logic in all electoral responsibilities being discharged by one Committee. The Committee strongly suggests this will be a consideration for the future.

115 Critical to discharging the Committee's mandated responsibilities and operational service is its workforce. Pay accounts for more than 92% of its budget. The challenges of recruiting and retaining a skilled workforce have grown during this political term. The Bailiwick is operating in a highly competitive global market and it is essential that, as a Government, there is concerted effort to ensure that we are known as an attractive place to live and work. This should not be limited to attracting an off-Island workforce but should extend to investing in training for our young people and also providing opportunities for the established workforce to develop and remain economically active.

120 The Committee continues to explore the potential for efficiency and long-term financial savings to be made through the transformation of services and the Committee has directed a review of the target operating models for Law Enforcement and Fire and Rescue. Public safety will always remain at the forefront of these considerations.

125 Sir, I would like to take this opportunity to put on record the Committee's thanks to the operational services it represents, who undertake challenging work to keep our Island safe in times of significant financial constraint. One example of this is the efforts of Guernsey Fire and Rescue and the police and other blue light services during the recent Storm Darragh.

130 As I reflected on 2024, the Committee can be justifiably proud of its achievements this year but now is not the time to take our foot off the pedal. I look forward to pressing ahead, in 2025, to deliver on the Committee's ambitions before the end of this term.

Thank you, sir.

135 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Queripel, I do not think you were present at Roll Call, is it your wish to be relevéd?

Deputy Queripel: Yes please, sir.

The Bailiff: We will mark you as present.

140 Now, Members of the States, there is now an opportunity to ask questions on any matter within the mandate of the Committee *for* Home Affairs and I will call Deputy Falla first.

Deputy Falla: Thank you, sir, and I thank the President for his update.

145 I note the reference to immigration arrangements but given the potential boost to the tourism economy that could materialise from the Brittany Ferries timetable for 2025 and beyond, in terms of attracting audiences from France to Guernsey, what more can be done to relax the requirements for passports and ID for French day trippers to the Island?

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

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

The ability for French nationals to travel on French identity cards instead of passports is going to be limited through the introduction across the Common Travel Area of the ETA scheme. The implementation of this has been delayed until September of 2025 and so ID cards will continue to be able to be used.

155 One way of perhaps alleviating the problem that is being alluded to is to encourage French nationals to actually apply and obtain passports. Passports contain security information and are machine read and contain biometric information and they are now the only real acceptable way of travelling across borders.

160 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir,

165 In his Statement, the President referred to the September policy letter and the intention of the Committee to make progress on the issue of the review of the Statutory Police Complaints Regime. In that policy letter, it actually said the ambition is that this work will culminate in legislative changes being presented to the States' Assembly during this political term. If it is not still intended to bring those legislative changes to the Assembly before the end of this term, what has changed in the
170 three months since the publication of that policy letter?

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

175 **Deputy Prow:** The Committee has made it absolutely and abundantly clear, this Committee, this term, that a review of the police complaints legislation is necessary. With the resources that we have, the few resources we have, and bearing in mind distractions that occur to that resource on a very regular and sustained basis, the Committee is still determined to bring a policy letter to the States.

180 That determination I am confident we will decide. I do not want to prejudice or prejudge what the review might find. In answer to Deputy St Pier's question, if it is possible to identify and bring

legislative change to this Assembly before the end of this term, we will do so, but all I am committing to at the moment is a determination to do the review and bring a policy letter to the States. Depending on what that policy letter entails and what legislative change is necessary will depend upon the ability of this Assembly –

The Bailiff: Your time for answering, Deputy Prow, is up. (**Deputy Prow:** Thank you, sir.)
Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you, sir.

In October, Deputy Roffey commended the Home Department on the rollout of the Domestic Abuse Law and the SARC facility. Would the President agree with me, and this may fly in the face of the public narrative, that the work conducted by the Home Department, Policy & Resources and Economic Development on the Moneyval project is a significant piece of progress by this Government?

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: I thank Deputy Inder for his question.

The work conducted across those Committees and indeed the decisions of this Assembly have been absolutely crucial in developing a response to the evaluation. As I said in my Statement, I thank all those subject matter experts, both officers and Members of this Assembly, who have gone the extra mile to produce the quality response to that evaluation and I agree entirely that this is probably the most important piece of work this Assembly, this Government has done this term.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

All States' Members will be cognisant of current concerns in the community in relation to the number and nature of Police complaints and the Police complaints process itself and the President, in his update, just told us how important public engagement is. With this in mind, would he consider holding a public presentation similar to that given to States' Members recently, in order to try and address these concerns that those in our community may have?

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: I thank Deputy Leadbeater for his question. The answer is yes.

The Bailiff: Deputy Bury.

Deputy Bury: Thank you, sir.

I was pleased to hear the President mention in his Statement about stakeholder engagement for the review of the Police complaints process. Could he confirm if that will mean that the President or the Committee will meet with those who have experienced the Police complaints process?

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: I apologise, sir, I did not completely hear the question.

The Bailiff: Could you attempt to repeat the question, then, please Deputy Bury?

Deputy Bury: Will the Committee or the President meet with complainants who have used the Police complaints process as part of the stakeholder engagement mentioned in the update Statement?

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir.

I am not in a position to reply to that question at the moment. I will give a written response within the allowed time within the Rules.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Furthering on from Deputy Falla's question, I think many of us were pleased Economic Development found a way through the ferry tender and are excited that perhaps Brittany Ferries/Condor will seek to provide stronger services to St Malo and encourage more French tourists but will that mean, therefore, the ferry company and the States of Guernsey/Home Affairs do need to make it clear to the French the requirements for day trippers and other travellers from France?

And hopefully make it less bureaucratic and as easy as possible to ensure that we have maximum take up next year and the year ahead and that there are not people disappointed in France that cannot come over because they have not got a passport or even a biometric passport registration, which is something to come, I believe.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow, if you can identify a question in that, you can answer it!

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir.

The first part of Deputy Gollop – and I thank him for his question – I entirely and completely agree with him around the efforts of Economic Development and the tender process. Obviously a very difficult exercise and I add my congratulations to Deputy Gollop. As I have already said, the ability to use ID cards under the scheme will be extended to the end of September and I think that gives us the time to make sure that everything is communicated that needs to be communicated. The other point I would make is this is not unique to Guernsey or Jersey. This is a Common Travel Area arrangement, so French nationals without passports are going to have the same difficulties.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Queripel: Thank you, sir.

Can the President please tell me how much work has been completed to date on the review of the current Police complaints regime he referred to in his Statement?

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: I thank Deputy Queripel for his question. It is a very broad question so I will give a broad answer.

I repeat the points I have made previously. This Committee, not the last Committee or the previous Committee to that, *this* Committee has identified that the Police complaints needs review. This has happened within this term and much Committee energy and time, and officer time has been spent on scoping this review, coming up with terms of reference and working on this.

This is alongside a huge backlog of work around legislation, Moneyval and lots of the other things that will be subject to questions. My summary is an enormous amount of work has already

gone into this and this is not something that was prioritised under the Government Work Plan, which was agreed by this Assembly.

285 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

290 Further to Deputy Prow's comments on the review, can the President please confirm that as a part of the consultation on the review process that those who experienced the process, both complainants and officers, will be included in that consultation?

Thank you, sir.

295 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: I thank Deputy Meerveld for his question.

We have made a commitment and we will undertake consultation. That consultation will include those people who have experienced the Police complaints process. The actual mechanics and arrangements of how that will be achieved, because it will not be an easy exercise, have not yet
300 been scoped and, in answer to Deputy Bury's question, I again give the commitment that consultation will take place.

Just to clarify, and I thank Deputy Meerveld for the question, the arrangements for that, how we will conduct that remain to be scoped.

305 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

310 On the same subject, many other jurisdictions have an ombudsperson for dealing with Police complaints and I just wondered whether Deputy Prow would be able to confirm whether that is one of the things that is being looked at as part of the review?

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

315

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir.

I appear to be having a bit of trouble with my hearing this morning. I missed a key word in Deputy de Sausmarez's question.

320 **The Bailiff:** Can you repeat the question, please, Deputy de Sausmarez?

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir. Yes, of course.

I was wondering if Deputy Prow could please confirm whether an ombudsperson or an ombudsman, as it might have once been called, okay, an ombudsperson, is being considered as a way of dealing with the Police complaints as that is a system that is commonly used in other places
325 very effectively?

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

330 **Deputy Prow:** I thank Deputy de Sausmarez for her question and I thank her also for introducing a very interesting concept around Police complaints. My answer is that the review has not started *per se* around the terms of reference, but the Committee is very open and any suggestions how the Police complaints process can be improved and improved for users would be very welcome. Every consideration, including her very interesting suggestion, will be a subject of that review.

335 My message is to any of the public who are listening to this, the Committee is absolutely committed to conducting a review and it will consult.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dyke.

340 **Deputy Dyke:** Thank you, sir.

Given the amount of discussion and concern expressed about the Police complaint arrangements, could I burden Deputy Prow with one more question, to put it in context? Namely how many complaints have we received over the last year and how many have been actually subject to financial settlements and at what cost. I wonder if he could tell us that.

345 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

350 **Deputy Prow:** I thank Deputy Dyke for his question. I am not in a position to reply to that question at the moment. I will give a written response within the time allowed in the Rules.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Oliver.

355 **Deputy Oliver:** Thank you, sir.

I do believe that we did start looking at the complaints last term but we did not get very far with it, so I do thank Deputy Prow for getting on with it this term. One thing that does worry me is that if you are not happy with the outcome of your complaint in the UK, you can go to an Independent Office for Police Conduct, the IOPC, and I do think that over here we do need this because I am getting a lot of letters at the moment and a lot of emails about very disgruntled people and maybe this independent body could actually really help Guernsey because it will either find them ... misconduct and all of that. I think we actually need to be looking to protect the officers but also help the people as well and this is, I think, a very good way of doing that.

365 Does the President agree with me?

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: I thank Deputy Oliver for her question.

370 The oversight of complaints is not conducted by the Committee *for* Home Affairs. It is conducted by the Independent Police Complaints Commission, who are appointed by this Assembly as an independent body to oversee these complaints. I am also subject to some of the representations that Deputy Oliver refers to and I constantly refer that message to those people who make similar complaints.

375 There is not a direct correlation between Guernsey's Police Complaints Commission and the IOPC but, broadly, they perform the same function.

Deputy St Pier and Deputy Leadbeater, helpfully, asked for the Police Complaints Commission's report, independent report, to be debated in this Assembly and it was debated. If you read that report, it shows the many ways that decisions can actually appeal and they are statutory –

380 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Prow, your time for replying has now passed.
Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, sir,

385 First of all, I thank the President for the presentation that was put on a couple of weeks ago on the Police complaints regulations. But I came out of that still unclear why legislative changes have

been made before the review, which the President has said is so essential. I just wondered whether the President can give more explanation?

Thank you.

390

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir.

395

Yes, I can clear that up, absolutely and completely. There was a policy letter agreed by this Assembly, in September. I would refer Deputy Soulsby to sections 43, 44 and 45 of that policy letter, which was agreed in this Assembly, and I would also draw her attention to Proposition 3 of that policy letter, it is 2024/83, which says: to direct the Committee *for* Home Affairs to prioritise a comprehensive review of Police complaints legislative framework.

400

So not only was this all laid out as I have described in the policy letter, there was also a Resolution, which was approved in this Assembly, to review the Police complaints legislative framework.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Last question, Deputy Matthews.

405

Deputy Matthews: Thank you, sir.

410

First, I echo many of the concerns that other Members have had about the complaints policy and I look forward to the President, I would hope, providing an update where it might be possible for us to challenge perhaps once the new Chief of Police has been installed and been able to get in touch with that.

415

But actually my question is upon an entirely different subject. Guernsey's population increased by nearly 1,000 in 2023 and averaged over 500 over the last five years. This is well over the strategic population objective of 300 a year. The President will be well aware of a shortage of housing in the Island and so I am asking what measures, if any, are being taken to limit the Island's population increase?

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

420

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir, and I thank Deputy Matthews for his question.

425

As I mentioned in my update Statement, the Propositions that were agreed by this Assembly around the Population and Immigration Management Review, are being further reviewed around any policy changes that transpire from the issues that Deputy Matthews has raised. I would say again, the Committee only has limited resources but I can assure the Deputy that a review is taking place around whether those policies need to be changed and there needs to be, perhaps, less dependence on people from outside the Island coming to work.

430

But that has got to be based on data, not on anecdotal accounts. I give the assurance that that data is being thoroughly reviewed. The Committee has already had one lengthy consideration, but that work is not complete. When the work is complete and something tangible can come back to this Assembly or a public announcement made then we will do so –

The Bailiff: Your time has now elapsed once again. (**Deputy Prow:** Thank you, sir.) Members, I am not going to extend question time to the Presidents who are delivering Statements because it looks as though you have got quite a lot of business to get through the next three days.

**General update –
Statement by the President of the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security**

435 **The Bailiff:** I am going to call next the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security to deliver that Committee's update Statement, please.

 So, Deputy Roffey.

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

 In my last Statement, I advised that the Supported Living and Ageing Well Strategy, or SLAWS, which had been a joint project between P&R, HSC and ESS, had unfortunately ground to a halt. It simply proved too difficult to reach agreement on some of the key financial issues, given the three Committees' differing views. Instead, it had been agreed to defer some of these matters until 2026.

445 However, ESS will be bringing forward proposals relating to matters falling within its own mandate, including long-term care benefit rates and uprating policy, as a short-term measure pending that further work in the next political term. We will publish a policy letter this month setting out proposals aimed at stabilising the private care-home market and incentivising growth in the face of projected significant bed shortages from next year onwards. The situation is just too precarious not to do anything during this term.

450 We have put a placeholder in States' Members' diaries for 2 p.m. on Wednesday the 18th of this month, when we will provide a briefing session. I strongly encourage Members to attend if at all possible as it is a complex, but vitally important, area of policy.

 The Prevention of Discrimination (Guernsey) Ordinance, 2022 has been in force for just over a year. The Committee is due to report back to the States with a review of Phase 1 and proposals for Phase 2, which aims to extend the Ordinance's coverage to the grounds of age, and to those grounds covered under the existing Sex Discrimination Ordinance, 2005.

460 I am pleased to report that we recently completed a public consultation in respect of age discrimination. We have received a positive response, including helpful feedback from States' Committees, business representative organisations, employers, Third Sector organisations and individuals. Most respondents were largely supportive of the proposals presented by the Committee, but some valuable points of detail were raised for further consideration.

465 The Committee has also launched a review of Phase 1. I have written directly to over 70 stakeholders, and we are issuing a media statement inviting feedback from anyone who wishes to provide input to the review. This is a general review, so we have not been prescriptive in setting out questions for people to consider, rather we welcome feedback on points of detail or general observations about the impact of the Ordinance.

470 I have recently attended pre-consultation meetings with some stakeholders in respect of the grounds covered under the existing Sex Discrimination Ordinance. The message I received was that it was important that the Committee does not rush the development of policy proposals on these grounds of protection, just because we are nearing the end of this term of Government. Given the complexities and controversial nature of some of the policy questions that arise in relation to sex and gender and the fact that legal debate is ongoing in the UK, the Committee has decided not to proceed with this aspect of Phase 2 during this term of government.

475 To be clear, the Committee is still aiming to publish a policy letter in relation to the outcome of the review of Phase 1 and proposals for age discrimination legislation in March next year – but the sex grounds will be handed over to the next Committee.

480 Lastly, on that topic, it is really pleasing that the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, in its periodic review of the United Kingdom, has welcomed the development of Guernsey's anti-discrimination ordinance, identifying this legislation as one of the 10 key highlights from across the whole UK State Party.

 My Committee was directed in October last year to report back to the States with proposals for a progressive restructuring of the Social Security contributions system by the end of 2024, in lieu of any decisions having been taken at that time in respect of tax reform. The overarching aim of the

485 restructure being to reduce inequities across different classifications of contributors to make the system fairer and avoid the current cliff edge for low earners.

I can report The Committee has made excellent progress on this workstream during 2024, but we paused this work in the autumn while we awaited the outcome of the Budget debate.

490 Members will no doubt recall that the Assembly agreed last month to introduce GST, alongside major reforms to the Social Security contribution system which will help to make the whole package progressive – so the States’ direction to report back to this Assembly *separately* with proposals for a progressive restructuring of the Social Security system by the end of this year overtaken by events.

There will still be points of detail that need to be decided upon, but decisions now need to be made by P&R and ESS regarding next steps and the timetable for that ongoing work. And I can tell
495 Members our intention is to move forward in a timely way.

I am pleased to report that progress is at last accelerating with the Affordable Housing Development Programme. Construction at La Vieille Plage, 14 units of specialised housing, has progressed to the stage of making the units wind and watertight including roof tiles being laid. Groundworks are well underway at Oberlands Road where 15 units of key worker housing are to be
500 provided alongside private market units, in a joint venture between the GHA and Infinity Construction.

Crucially, at Parc Le Lacheur, it looks as though, at long last, we are close to a resolution of issues with flood mitigations which will allow the GHA to crack on with the provision of around 154 housing units. The intention is to develop this large site in phases in order to ensure that the first
505 homes come on line as soon as possible.

Further to planning permission being granted for the development of 57 units at Domaine des Moulins on the former CI Tyres site, the GHA, having taken account of feedback from the Open Planning Meeting, is currently working up detailed costings, final design and unit numbers with a focus on making the most efficient use of space, improving sustainability, ensuring value for money and exploring alternative and faster construction methods.
510

Pre-application discussions with the Planning Service regarding Braye Lodge are taking place with a view to refining the plans for the development of the site to take into account planning feedback. And, separately, discussions with the MSG to finalise arrangements for site purchase are ongoing. In respect of the Pointues Rocques site, commercial negotiations with the landowners’ agent are ongoing with a view to ensuring best value for money for the public purse.
515

Members will be aware that there are several designated housing sites in close proximity in the north of the Island, which between them have the potential to deliver more than 1,000 new homes. My Committee is keen to make sure that these sites can be developed sympathetically and effectively, bearing in mind the things that these communities will need, and the impact they will
520 have on surrounding neighbourhoods and infrastructure.

The Committee, working closely with DPA and E&I, has appointed Savills to work with key stakeholders such as the Douzaines, the owners of the sites, utility providers, the GHA and internal subject matter experts on topics such as biodiversity, transport, etc to ensure that these sites work alongside each other and the surrounding area. That framework is due to be delivered in the first
525 quarter of next year.

Re-energising the Affordable Housing Development Programme from a standing start has been my Committee’s top political priority throughout this term. It has proved hugely frustrating but there are now signs that hard work will soon be bearing fruit.

Secondary Pensions successfully launched on 1st July, with employers in Guernsey and Alderney
530 with 26 or more employees required to automatically enrol eligible employees into an approved pension scheme. On 1st October, this obligation extended to employers with 11-25 employees and smaller employers will come into scope in phases, until October next year.

Initial on-boarding for the Your Island Pension scheme – or YIP – has been encouraging. As at 15th November 294 applications had been received from employers wishing to set up pension schemes under YIP. Of those, 186 pension schemes have now been launched, 31 schemes have
535 been signed off and were awaiting launch, and a further 77 applications are being processed.

The approximate expected membership numbers in relation to these 294 applications is over 3,500 employees. And of course, the number of people who have started contributing to an occupational pension scheme since the Law came into force is likely to be higher than that as employers are not obliged to use YIP.

On the subject of pensions, just a reminder that the States' pension age is now 65 years and 10 months and will be increasing to 66 from 1st March. Pensions often fly under the radar publicly because they are very much business as usual for ESS but financially, they are by far the biggest issue we deal with.

As of 16th November 2024, there were 19,100 people in receipt of a Guernsey pension. This figure has been increasing year on year with a total increase of around 2,000 people in the last 10 years alone. In 2023, pension expenditure was £154.2 million. That expenditure this year is expected to be £169.1 million.

The last actuarial review projected that there would be a 74% increase in expenditure on pensions over the 15 years between 2025 and 2040. So we can expect that in 2040 the expenditure, in today's terms, will be around £296 million.

The current balance of the Guernsey Insurance Fund is approximately £745.8 million, that compares with £736.8 million at the beginning of the year. The estimated operating deficit this year will be £26.1 million in 2024 but up to 3rd December, investment returns of £34.3 million were paid. Therefore the fund has increased by £9 million in cash terms, but it has reduced both in real terms and, crucially, in terms of the number of years expenditure it covers.

In 2024 it is forecast that the balance of the fund would cover 3.8 years of expenditure. Last year it would have covered four years of expenditure and five years ago, it would have covered 4.8 years of expenditure. This is a trend which has to be arrested, and this is exactly what the current 10-year plan is designed to do.

As of 1st October 2024, the Adult Minimum Wage in Guernsey went up to £12 an hour. This was a positive step, but we will soon be left behind again by both the UK and Jersey. Jersey's minimum wage will rise from £11.64 to £13 per hour on 1st April as a first step towards implementing a living wage by April 2026. In the UK, the National Living Wage for those aged over 21 is due to rise to £12.21 in April 2025. If we are not to fall well behind comparable jurisdictions then I predict quite a significant rise will again be required next year.

I am also happy to report on the continued success of our Supporting Occupational Health and Wellbeing (SOHWELL) initiative. This has transformed the way we approach work rehabilitation by focusing on occupational health and early intervention to help sickness benefit claimants identify ways back into work. The SOHWELL team has reported a 120% increase in the number of people undertaking a gradual return to work after illness or injury when compared with the years 2022 and 2023.

In addition, indications are that numbers of new long-term sickness benefit claims continue to reduce. This is a crucial area of work due to the high level of expenditure on long-term sickness benefit. The hope is that focused interventions such as the ones I have talked about to prevent long-term absence from the workplace will enable us to avoid the situation the UK has found itself in where the number of people not working due to long-term sickness has risen from just over two million in 2019 to very close to three million in the first quarter of 2024.

It is vital we avoid a similar trend here and all of the signs are that thanks to good work of the SOHWELL programme we will avoid it. I would like to thank the officers and health professionals involved for their continued support which has been key to the programme's success.

Lastly, as always, I would encourage anyone who is struggling with the ever-increasing cost of living, but may be unsure if they qualify for benefits, to contact our staff who will more than willing to check in a helpful, confidential and always completely non-judgemental way, whether or not they may be eligible for any financial support.

It has been a delight to deliver my penultimate update Statement on behalf of ESS and I look forward to questions.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, it is an opportunity to ask questions in the context of the mandate of the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security, and I will start with Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, sir.

I am really pleased to see the success of the SOHWELL initiative that some of us thought it would be, when it was first devised last term. My question is in relation to Discrimination Law. I think, as the President will be well aware, at the time before it was brought in there were lots of gloom and doom stories about how the whole service would be overrun by claims and everybody thinking that they could claim off various people all the time. Could the President confirm that the Employment and Equal Opportunities Service has not been overwhelmed by inquiries since it was established last year?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: There were two claims, I think, when we were trying to bring the Law in. On one hand we were being told it would be overwhelmed, as Deputy Soulsby suggested. Other hand, people said there is no discrimination in Guernsey, it does not happen here, so why are you wasting your time?

I can tell Members that actually the balance has been very much between the two. The Office has been kept ticking over. It has certainly had, I think it has had 47 pre-complaints, of which 17 involved at least one claim of discrimination, because of course the Office now deals with both employment and discrimination. So it has been relatively well used, but I can confirm absolutely it has not been overwhelmed in the way that some people have predicted.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir. Is the President able to advise what progress if any has been made during this term in reviewing Carers' Allowance?

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: I report on that, really, every time we have an update statement about the interim steps that we have taken. We have made three measures. Once we increased Carers' Allowance by more than RPI, or RPIX, which is what we use, and then twice we used more focused measures by increasing the disregard in relation to Carers' Allowance for the poorest carers, i.e. those on Income Support. But I have to confess that a wholesale review of the whole system has not proved possible within the limited resources within this term of the Assembly.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, sir. I thank the President for his detailed update.

I would like to ask him about the Your Island Pension (YIP). I think I heard that there were 192 applicants in the 11-25 employees taking up about 3,500 members. But the next break point is 1st January for employers of six to 10. Is he confident that of the 28,000 employees we have got that these Members will be signing up and everyone will be adequately catered for with YIP or other schemes?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

640 **Deputy Roffey:** It is not a question of signing up. Everybody will be auto enrolled, but it is
voluntary. They do have the right to opt out. Experience elsewhere is that when auto-enrolment is
in place the level of opt out is relatively modest. Time will tell what the level will be over here. But
as I say, so far, the figures are quite encouraging, particularly when you bear in mind that the first
phase, with larger employers, many of them already had occupational schemes and therefore you
645 would not expect new people to be signing up and yet, as I said, about 3,500, mid-November, was
the estimate for the number of new people that will be under those schemes.

It is encouraging so far but time will tell and I will be able to report on my final update statement,
which I think is in March or April this year, on exactly and more fulsomely about where we are with
this.

650 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Sir, just following on from Deputy Soulsby's question, if the Equality Service has
not been overwhelmed, would the President agree that employers in Guernsey are far more fair,
655 reasonable, modern, safe places to employ people than some would have had us believe through
that debate?

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

660 **Deputy Roffey:** I do not have the qualitative data to prove that one way or the other. What I
would say is what was always said at the time, the main purpose of the Ordinance was to set out
what our expectations were, not just of employers but also in the provision of services and all sorts
of other areas, the way people should behave, and we always expected that most people would
follow that and therefore complaints would not be necessary because people followed the Law.

665 But the main purpose of the Law was that cultural change. I actually think it is a huge success if
we are not actually overwhelmed by complaints.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

670 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Sir, I understand the Committee took a piece of work, this political
term, to value the social housing stock with a view of seeing whether the stock could be moved to
the GHA or other options. Would the President commit to sharing more information and perhaps
publishing the work and the findings around this report more publicly?

Thank you.

675 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: I have no objection to that. It was a joint piece of work with P&R. I think P&R
are actually probably the lead Committee on it and I can say that my own Committee were quite
680 happy to proceed with the stock transfer to GHA because we felt that might have been a quicker
route to the upgrading that is, particularly now our amendment did not pass in the Budget debate,
a quicker route to the upgrading of some of the stock that needs upgrading than was the case. But
the P&R of the time saw that, I think they were quite surprised by the modest valuation because
they were valued not just as homes but homes that could only be used for social housing and
685 therefore that affects the valuation.

I think we will need to consult with P&R about the release of the figures. I do not know whether
they were made public at the time or not. I cannot remember. But I certainly have no objection.

The Bailiff: Deputy Oliver.

690 **Deputy Oliver:** Thank you, sir.

ESS are in charge of the affordable housing and we have the GHA, which are providing the affordable housing. Is ESS content and happy that GHA can actually provide all the housing that we actually need or do we need another similar GHA?

695

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: We certainly need another delivery mechanism, because the GHA are expansionist and they will expand, they will provide more. But they only have about 1,000 units. They have unearthed quite a few snagging issues, I have to say, that they have to look after their existing tenants and therefore there needs to be some focus on that.

700

If you need another 1,000 units, to expect a small third sector, almost, organisation to double in size in next to no time, it is probably slightly unreasonable. So whether it is another housing association or whether it is building more 'States' houses' we know that E&I are very well advanced in looking, on our behalf, at the best way to actually have a separate delivery mechanism because one will be needed.

705

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: When I was on the Committee, one issue which vexed us was the cold Winter Fuel Payments and we have seen the UK issues there, with the new Labour Government, etc. When is the Committee, ESS, really going to get working with Environment & Infrastructure in ensuring that the payment makes more sense because it is paid to people who have very warm, modern, insulated homes and to those who are freezing in old fashioned properties? I am sure it could be better spent if targeted to those in particular need.

710

715

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: I am slightly confused by the reference to the UK because our system is entirely different. Pensioners have never had a Winter Fuel Allowance here because they are pensioners. It has always been means tested and it goes beyond pensioners as well.

720

Of course, Deputy Gollop is right in principle, but he knows from his own time on the Committee, that this may actually sound like a really simple thing to do, give more money to the people with poorly insulated homes and less to the people with very insulated homes. Actually designing that system and administering it, is a heck of a lot more complicated than it sounds.

725

I actually think we would be better off putting most of our efforts in actually improving the thermal insulation of all homes, rather than shovelling money to people to put coal on the fire because the winds will sweep through their house.

730

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Just a point of interest really. Deputy Roffey may have answered this elsewhere. In one of the storms that seem to be all named by Irishmen, the last one was Darragh, the one before was Ciaran, I think it was. One of the gables of the Bouet fell off. I just wondered, not many gables have fallen off and it does occur to me sometimes, or rather I think the question I will ask, is the President satisfied or has he spoken with the GHA to ensure that the build quality for any further work is of a standard so gables do not fall off in a storm?

735

740

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: I am not a spokesman for the GHA but I think it is fair to say they are, and therefore we are, dissatisfied with the build standards of a number of their earlier developments including the one referred to and it was an issue with the construction that led to the incident that Deputy Inder referred to.

But as there may well be claims and counter claims between the GHA and the builders I do not think I should probably go into more detail today.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Sir, we have got the situation, as happened in the last debate, where the non-contributory benefits, Social Security, are debated separately to the wider Budget debate and there is a mismatch between when expenditure and income is agreed versus when the agreement on setting of non-contributory rates is agreed.

Would the President support the principle that the financial position of the States should be debated part and parcel through the Budget and that necessary changes should be made to whatever processes that we have got that this debate, the non-contributory debate, should be merged into the Budget debate from next year?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: I think this is a question that falls within the mandate of SACC rather than ESS but of course they used to be debated in separate months and it was decided they ought to be debated at the same Special Meeting, which is why the Budget is now debated in November rather than December, because we could not go to December.

The question would be, I do not mind them being part of the same document. You would have two people therefore opening and it is key to ESS's policy responsibility to recommend what the increases should be in benefits and therefore you would have to have two Presidents opening and closing on different parts of the Budget.

I hand it over to SACC. I am sure that they would be able to address that and come up with a logical way of doing that but I do think we are in a much better place than we used to be, the fact that they are now debated at the same Meeting.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Just following on from the question about insulation, with which I do not entirely disagree, and this is really again with his political role, would the President agree with me, or at least consider having discussions with the GHA, it would be far better environmentally and economically to actually re-clad some of the existing States' houses, or States' housing, rather than pulling them down?

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Absolutely and that has been a fundamental part of our policy during this term and I am pleased, it has taken longer than I expected, but we are finally able to start going out to tender for recladding of Pre de L'Aumone, which is a very large estate of post-War houses. But as well as doing that, because they are quite similar to a lot of the other homes we have got around the Island that would actually be a test run, if you like, and P&R have been very supportive of us doing that because it will allow many decades of life and improve the living standards of the people there.

The Bailiff: Deputy Matthews.

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

The President will be aware, in his role, of the long waiting lists for States' housing and for GHA housing, and gave an extensive update on the planned works that are in train to try and increase the amount of social housing that we have.

800 Given that it will take some time for these projects to work their way through the planning system and to actually be constructed, is the President of the view that Guernsey has an urgent need to look at a greater amount of temporary or emergency housing to help deal with the immediate effects where people find themselves without a home or without somewhere to stay and many people may find themselves wanting to leave the Island for want of available accommodation in the private rental sector? But does the President believe there is a need for a greater quantity of that

805 type of accommodation in the immediate term?

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

810 **Deputy Roffey:** You are damned if you do and you are damned if you do not. Yes, of course there are people who are sofa surfing or whatever else, who would welcome emergency accommodation and move into it. If you put too much of your focus on emergency accommodation you are not focusing on solving the end problem and people just end up unable to move on from that emergency accommodation.

815 But it does give me the opportunity to actually thank those third sector organisations that are largely responsible for emergency accommodation in Guernsey and do a sterling job. But I think the short answer is, yes, I think there is some case for that. Slightly strangely, emergency housing does not fall under the mandate of my Committee but I know that it is an absolute top priority for E&I and that the emergency housing workstream will be commenced right at the beginning of next

820 year.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

825 Another longstanding commitment of the Committee has been to review the Winter Fuel Allowance. Does the President agree that it is a matter of regret that during this term, when fuel prices have increased so substantially, that a full review of that and therefore ensuring that it is properly directed to those who really need it, is unfortunate and it really does need to be prioritised now?

830

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: I refer the Member to the answer I gave some moments ago to Deputy Gollop.

835 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I was proud to be a Member of the Committee when we were involved with SWBIC and looking at benefits and the various reviews academics from Loughborough University and elsewhere did on requirement rates on minimal liveable incomes. But anecdotally it has become

840 clear to me this year that many single, middle-aged individuals, are struggling financially more than they were. I do not think that is necessarily true for families. Will the Committee look to review the liveable income of people who, for health or other reasons, are very much dependent on income delivered by the Committee?

845 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: The full review of the minimum income standards is a massive undertaking, that takes up a huge amount of officers' and Committee time for many months on end. So I do not think we are going to be doing that within the normal cycle. What I will say is Deputy Gollop is quite right, the income requirements under Income Support only allow for really a very subsistence living.

The idea that you are on some kind of gravy train is completely misplaced and particularly for those people perhaps in private rented accommodation, where we have seen very big increases in their rent, where we have not been able to increase the rent allowances that we can give to the same extent, I am sure that they are very much feeling the pinch. Unfortunately, we can only do what we can do within the financial resources and other Members of the Assembly are always decrying the fact that their Income Support budget tends to go up.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: Thank you, sir.

I thank Deputy Roffey for his interesting report over various areas. There are all sorts of interesting points that one could question but could I perhaps raise one point that he did not focus on. There is now, I think, a level of concern over the extent to which housing licences are now bringing in dependents with costs for benefits and that sort of thing. In this area we do not actually have the facts, we have a lot of anecdotal information. Is that something he is monitoring or has the figures on or is proposing to get a handle on?

The Bailiff: Deputy Dyke, the Population Management regime falls within the mandate of the Committee for Home Affairs, not the Committee for –

Deputy Dyke: No, I was thinking more of the costs of the benefits that follow on from that so that would be more Deputy Roffey's area, I think.

The Bailiff: If it is a question about benefits, then it is permissible. But can you phrase it as a question about benefits, then?

Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: I think where the population trends impact on my mandate are on housing and there is no doubt the rapid increase in our population is exacerbating the housing issues and Deputy Prow says it needs to be a balance because it is also helping to fill vacancies that are crucial.

As far as benefits are concerned, I will revert to him within the five days I have got with the best information we have. I do not know how much information we do have. I am aware of some one-offs, for instance some of the refugees from Ukraine as a result of the war, when they initially came, were on Income Support but they have found their feet and found jobs. I am not aware of a wholesale problem with the dependants of people coming here to work being on benefits. I think the issue would be far more likely to be, in my napping colleagues thing about their strain on the health care budget rather than on the benefit budget.

The Bailiff: Last question, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Sir, the application for CI Tyres or Domaine des Moulins was approved in an open Planning meeting in March this year, nine months ago. Based on the update provided by the President, it sounds like further changes are likely to be made to this site. Are we going to be expecting new planning applications for this site?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

900 **Deputy Roffey:** I think that the DPA can expect contact from GHA with discussions. Whether it will require a fresh planning application I am not going to spike their guns but I believe that they believe they can make even better use of the site and provide additional accommodation, maybe in a more cost-effective way but I do not want to – I have just done it, haven't I? – send the media down knocking on their door because I think they want to announce it in a controlled way.

Questions for Oral Answer

COMMITTEE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

Bus service – Revenue and passenger satisfaction

905 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, we will move into Question Time proper now and there are two sets of questions. The first is to be posed to the President of the Committee *for the* Environment & Infrastructure by Deputy de Lisle. So your first question please, Deputy de Lisle.

910 **Deputy de Lisle:** Thank you, sir. I am not sure my mic –

The Bailiff: Your minute is counting! *(Laughter)*

Deputy de Lisle: Now in order, sir, thank you.

915 The first question, In terms of revenue from bus passenger journeys, what passenger receipts are derived from passenger fares over the latest period for which numbers are available on an annual basis and what proportion of the total cost of the bus service do the passenger receipts make up?

920 **The Bailiff:** The President, Deputy de Sausmarez, to reply please.,

Deputy de Sausmarez: Sir, for 2023, £1,385,629 of income was obtained from passenger fares and this equates to 23% of the total annual costs.

925 **Deputy de Lisle:** Sir, if I can ask a supplementary on that?

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy de Lisle.

930 **Deputy de Lisle:** Comparable data from England show that public funding accounts for 44% of all bus industry income. With the rest coming from fares – and that is 56% of the income from fares, compared with our 23% that has just been given – this suggests that fares here are less expensive and comparatively cheap. Is this fact under consideration by the Department?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

935 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Yes, the Committee is very well aware that there is a very significant difference between the UK and here. The cost of transport in the UK, and I would say that in the Budget that was just recently debated, six weeks ago, is putting a significant increase into investment in public transport because it needs to increase the level of service. We have got a better level of service but we need one. But the economic dynamics are totally different. For example, we

940 do not charge for parking here, so our bus service has to compete with free parking. It is a very different dynamic.

But at the end of the day a bus service is an absolutely essential public service that connects people with work, with education, with health care, with leisure activities and it is important that we adequately fund it. We have got a different economy of scale because we are a small Island and we think we do have a good service that provides those essential connections at good value for public money.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Gollop.

950 **Deputy Gollop:** I have got possibly two supplementaries. The first is, would the President agree, as she has already intimated, that the Island's bus services, the longest route being seven or eight miles, really, are subscale and therefore the kind of fares paid in the UK are for a different market and in any case both UK governments have capped the fares at £2 and £3 recently.

955 **The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Yes, that is true.

As with many areas of public service, our economies of scale really work against us, but we have also got to take into account very localised considerations such as the cost of living and the cost of accommodation housing here, so we really do have a very different economic dynamic.

I would say that actually a recent report by CPT in the UK, published in September of this year, has reaffirmed that, for every £1 invested in public bus services, it generates a return of around £4.55 on average, so it is a very worthwhile investment in this important public service.

965 **The Bailiff:** Second supplementary, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: The figure of 23% might seem low. I appreciate there are discount tickets, which are useful too, but my question is does the subsidy, which is not just on fares, also include fares for scholars and fares for senior citizens who are nearly 66 and above, who of course are entitled to free travel?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

975 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Yes, our concessions are, of course, part of that overall equation and it is really lovely to see a Public Gallery full of people in education at the moment and I am really proud, actually, of the fact that they all have the ability to access that bus service to get to school and back at no cost and I would like to just make the point that, were that not the case, I think we would see a very significant increase in congestion around our schools.

980 Again that is another key difference, comparing us with other jurisdictions, because we really do have a far greater density of car traffic *per capita*, car ownership. So I do think we have to think about some of those wider impacts but I think it is very important that we do provide access to our young people trying to access education and also to our older people, who may feel less confident driving, that we can give them that kind of independence that bus travel can give.

985 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Only briefly, sir, and it maybe not a question for today, maybe something that the President could answer in writing or indeed may have already answered and I have just forgotten. Bit of scuttlebutt it goes around about the subsidy from the general taxpayer, the subsidy per journey. I have heard £2.50; I have heard £3.20. Would she commit at some point, not necessarily

answering today, to give the Members and the wider public a rough indication of what the subsidy is per passenger?

Thank you.

995 **The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

1000 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Yes. When you look at bus statistics from elsewhere, there are many different ways you can do that but, yes, you can pretty much work it out from the data that is already given but if Deputy Linder – no, no – if Deputy Linder wants some more information, wants different ways of crumbling that cookie, then that is fine.

1005 A point that I will add, actually, is that the 2023 figures include a week, or actually over a week I think it was, of entirely free travel that we provided for the Island Games, which again I think was a really worthwhile concession. There were actually over 54,000 bus journeys taken in that week and again I think that provided a range of wider benefits and goes to show how the bus service can really benefit the community in many different ways.

1010 **The Bailiff:** Your second question to the President, please, then Deputy de Lisle.

1010 **Deputy de Lisle:** Thank you, sir.

1010 My second question relates to punctuality and satisfaction with the service. The question: what bus punctuality data and bus passenger satisfaction data are measured with reference to the performance of the local bus service and what results are obtained?

1015 **The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez to reply, please.

1015 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** The bus provider is required to provide data regarding passenger numbers, the total number of services operated as a percentage of the timetable, average number of services arriving on time at the Town terminus and complaints and compliments.

1020 **Deputy de Lisle:** If I can ask a supplementary on that, sir.

1020 **The Bailiff:** Yes, Deputy de Lisle, supplementary.

1025 **Deputy de Lisle:** Will bus punctuality and bus satisfaction data be open to the public for scrutiny in reports on the bus service in the future and will this be provided against comparable data in England?

1030 **The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

1030 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Well, yes, if there are any future reports on the bus service, I am sure that is exactly the kind of data that can be included.

1035 **Deputy de Lisle:** If I can ask a supplementary, sir?

1035 **The Bailiff:** Second supplementary, Deputy de Lisle.

1040 **Deputy de Lisle:** I did ask the question which was, essentially, whether the public will be informed with respect to punctuality of the service and satisfaction with the service? I would like an answer to that, directly, please. I do not think I got an answer from the *exposé* from the Member.

1040 **The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

1045 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** I think the question Deputy de Lisle asked was whether that information would be included in reports in the future and I answered that question. However, I am happy to make that information public, of course. Currently we have got the average number of services arriving on time is 81.5% and the main reason, of course, for any late arrivals, is the sheer number of diversions, which I think we can all appreciate, this is something that I have answered questions on before and it relates to the amount of investment in our infrastructure, in terms of our electricity grid upgrades, in terms of the fibre rollout and water. Water grid network upgrades.

1050 So we have got a lot of reasons why the roads are up at the moment and that is having an impact on bus punctuality. In terms of customer satisfaction, there were 24 complaints and 18 compliments over the period between January and the end of September. And 99.9% of the bus timetable was operated. Hopefully those data will help Deputy de Lisle and I am sure they can be included in any reports in future.

1055 **Deputy de Lisle:** Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop, supplementary.

1060 **Deputy Gollop:** Yes, thank you, sir.

Does the data that Deputy de Sausmarez alluded to about customer satisfaction, punctuality, performance, do they differentiate between local travellers and seasonal visitors and are there therefore trends or issues that can be resolved, perhaps more on a seasonal basis to support the holiday sector passenger as well as our local passenger?

1065 **The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

1070 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** I do not actually know whether it is even possible to differentiate but, yes, I think where that is made clear, that kind of qualitative feedback would be picked up and acted upon. But, yes, there are sometimes obviously some inherent tensions between the needs of the visitor bus users compared with the local commuters and that is something that the Committee has been navigating as best as possible over the last few years, I think quite successfully as well.

1075 **The Bailiff:** Supplementary, Deputy Inder.

1080 **Deputy Inder:** Would the President agree with me that a quick email to Visit Guernsey may give an indication of the satisfaction of the Guernsey bus service, possibly even an email to the hoteliers? I think she will find that the tourists are very complimentary about Guernsey Bus Service and often state how cheap it is.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Yes, absolutely, we do get some of the feedback, so I completely agree it is very good value for visitors and locals alike.

COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

**Support for the arts –
Model of financial support –
Commenced**

The Bailiff: No one else is rising, so we will turn to the second set of questions. This time they are going to be posed by Deputy Gollop to the President of the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture. So your first question, please, Deputy Gollop.

1090

Deputy Gollop: Thank you, Mr Presiding Officer, sir.

Has the Education, Sport & Culture Committee considered an analysis or appraisal of, for example, the Jersey States' model of supporting arts with a guaranteed formula of financial support for arts culture, heritage and language, based on a percentage of Gross Domestic Product/Gross National Product or in fact in Jersey's case, States' overall budget expenditure?

1095

The Bailiff: The President, Deputy Dudley-Owen, to reply, please.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir.

1100

I am aware that in 2022 the States of Jersey committed to invest 1% of its Government's overall spend in arts, culture and heritage. Given the current finances of this Island, as Deputy Gollop knows, investigating an alternative investment model for arts and culture in Guernsey has not been prioritised as part of the Government Work Plan this term.

1105

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Gollop?

Deputy Gollop: Yes, I thank Deputy Dudley-Owen for the answer and appreciate the question but would the Committee perhaps like to see, looking at a more sustainable investment model for next term, or at least make the preparations in a handover?

1110

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir.

1115

I think that that would be something that the Committee would be very receptive to considering. Obviously, the resources that we have are limited and the time that we have in this term is also limited but we realise that there has been significant, and rightly so, attention on the Education side of the mandate. We also know, as we have an Arts Commission and a Sports Commission, that actually heritage and culture also needs to have some attention as well. But, yes, that is certainly something that I will be recommending is looked at by the future iteration of the Committee next term.

1120

Deputy Gollop: Yes. At the risk of going beyond the answer to the question, I would also ask would the Committee be open to looking at maybe a restructuring of the mandates so, for the sake of argument, heritage became more of a commission or there was greater collaboration with Economic Development in the arts and leisure mandate?

1125

The Bailiff: I am not sure that arises out of the answer but Deputy Dudley-Owen, if you want to reply, please do.

1130

Deputy Dudley-Owen: I could be naughty and just say indeed, but actually I think, in looking at this matter, then possibly a restructure might well be on the cards and actually Deputy Gollop did start to talk into one of his future questions, so I will save the response on that.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Falla.

1135 **Deputy Falla:** Thank you, sir.

Are there other ways in which ESC can support the arts, non-financial ways in which to broaden the support for the arts generally?

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

1140

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you to Deputy Falla for his question and it actually starts to speak to one of the future questions, the last question that Deputy Gollop has raised, in regard to what can we do to stimulate private investment or third sector investment. But also collaborative working amongst Committees is always a key that we can achieve in terms of that network of support from the Government.

1145

Also, there is the resourcing, not just financially but also of Government systems and Government networks that could be used or advice helpfully used by the arts and heritage sectors in Guernsey. But it is joint working, collaboration and joining a lot of the activities and going on, which I think is really helpful. The arts scene is thriving in the Island. I think we all know that but would that we could give it more financial investment, that would be helpful.

1150

The Bailiff: Your second question to the President, please, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Will the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture commit to working jointly or collaboratively with Economic Development, to appreciate the commercial benefits of arts to our society and indeed with Health & Social Care to integrate with social prescriptions efforts?

1155

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen to reply, please.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you.

1160

The Committee takes opportunities to work collaboratively with any other Committee to enhance the delivery of public services. However, if the question points to setting up a separate workstream, the Committee cannot commit to that in the time remaining this term. To reassure the Assembly, the Committee already works with Economic Development and Health & Social Care on a number of initiatives through the museums and via Guernsey Arts.

1165

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Gollop?

Deputy Gollop: Yes. Hopefully that collaboration would apply to galleries and I know what is done in the Hospital galleries as well. So my question is, although I appreciate there is limited time, could the Committees meet at some level to see how they can improve the outlook for arts for the summer of 2025?

1170

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

1175

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir.

I think it is worth a conversation, whether it is a formal Committee meeting, I would hesitate, just in the time left between the Committees and the amount of work that is on. Certainly, I have a list here, which I am very happy to circulate, in accordance with the Rules, of work that gives examples between Economic Development and HSC and the work done with the Guernsey Arts.

1180

But certainly, we need to start viewing this through the lens of economic enablement and possibly when viewing it through those lenses, the next iteration of the States could come to see their way through to giving a greater amount of funding to this particular sector of the Government public services and community work.

1185 **The Bailiff:** Supplementary, Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you, sir.

I do welcome Deputy Dudley Owen's answers to all the questions but what could actually create a little bit less talk on this matter is that the DPA ... we have spoken to the Art Commission and they have said that the hardest thing is actually finding locations for a lot of the art that they actually do. Within the development frameworks, we actually now say that where art can be please can you put. So apparently that should make it a bit easier, but I would welcome the Arts Commission coming back to the Development & Planning. Does the President agree with me?

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

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Yes, Deputy Oliver, I do agree with her and it is a great example of that collaborative working across various Committees and services of the States that allow the arts, whilst within the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture's mandate, it could equally sit within Economic Development's mandate, as it does in Jersey and actually it should not be seen just as a preserve of this Committee because actually there are threads that run through many other Committee areas and many areas of the community. We are just those who are mandated to ensure that it is preserved and safeguarded, enhanced, but it does not make it just our business. So I welcome the work that is done with the DPA.

1205 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Inder, supplementary.

Deputy Inder: Yes, it is a supplementary, actually, and maybe, I say it again, Deputy Dudley-Owen might want to consider in her response but it does occur to me sometimes that something like the Guernsey Arts, which has a portion of her Committee's budget and also gets access to, effectively, public land, fairly cheap rates and also a guaranteed budget, which it will get every year, whereas the private sector does not, might there be a danger that because Guernsey Arts and those portions become so dominant in these spaces actually the fact that they exist suffocates to a degree innovation elsewhere?

1215 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: I am taking that as one of Deputy Inder's thoughts on his feet, which stimulates a much wider conversation in response than I am able to give in the time allotted. Yes, it is an interesting thought but I do not actually really think that it does dampen innovation at all and suffocate innovation. Guernsey Arts Commission came to see the Committee yesterday and, certainly, their 2024 update was brimming with examples of innovation and creativity that the Island has benefited from in so many different ways and, as I say, I have got a list of examples here, which are too many to list in the time available, that I will send around. No, I would not necessarily agree with Deputy Inder's assertion.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: Thank you, sir.

1230 Could I ask Deputy Dudley-Owen about Victor Hugo and how that is featuring with her Department? How are they working with the Committee that is dealing with the development of the Victor Hugo Centre and is Victor Hugo part of our curriculum for our youngsters?
Thank you.

1235 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dudley-Owen, I am not sure that that really arises out of the answer to the original question but if you want to comment, please do.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: I do not think it does, either, but certainly we are very supportive as part of the mandate of any efforts and certainly the efforts on behalf of that Committee, to raise sufficient funding to open the Victor Hugo Visitor Centre. Obviously, it is part of our culture and our heritage. The visitor offering and the enhancement of that product is really key for tourism in Guernsey and also our cultural links with our cousins in France.

The history curriculum, we want local history to be taught and actually it was a factor of our Education Law proposals, which I seem to recall was not particularly popular within the Assembly, of requiring local history to be taught within the curriculum, but I for one am very supportive of that. I think it is essential for our young people to be grounded and rooted in the Island in which they live and their environment to know about their history and their culture.

**Procedural –
Welcome to the President of the States of Alderney**

The Bailiff: Members of the States, it is always a pleasure to welcome a visiting parliamentarian, who attends in the Public Gallery. I see the President of the States of Alderney has made an appearance and I invite you to welcome him in the customary fashion. *(Applause)*

COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

**Support for the arts –
Model of financial support –
Concluded**

The Bailiff: Having done that, Deputy Gollop, your third and final question to the President, please.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you very much, sir, and welcome.
Can the Committee stimulate more charitable giving, sponsorship and philanthropy to support Guernsey Arts and other musical, cultural arts organisations to ensure arts have a future on the Island beyond this political term?

The Bailiff: The President to reply, please.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you.
The Committee sought, via its 2025 Budget submission, additional funding for Guernsey Arts to enable it to achieve just this. The request was not supported by Deputy Gollop's Committee. The Committee continues to work with grant-funded organisations to determine how they can be better supported in and maximise the benefits of their fundraising efforts to increase their activities and their reach. But we have to accept the reality that the more we constrain the States' spending in these areas, the greater the competition for grant sponsorship and philanthropic giving will constrain the growth of this area.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: In thanking the President for her positive answer about innovation and conversation, I do ask, though, with her comment of accepting the reality the more we constrain the States' spending, would she and her Committee agree that arts can act as a creative and

economic enabler and are actually useful, not only for society but to ensure that people, including high net worth people, find the Island a comforting and useful place to live?

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir.

I did not catch the preamble to Deputy Gollop's question but based on the question that he did ask, absolutely. I have just stated that in the answers to previous questions and it is therefore for that reason that the Committee supported the additional funding request for Guernsey Arts, which we submitted to the Policy & Resources Committee for the Budget.

We understand that we are financially constrained and not every request could be granted. We absolutely understand that and respect the decision of the Committee. However, the irony is not lost on me that Deputy Gollop is asking these questions and he was part of that decision-making process.

But it absolutely is an economic enabler and we do need to start to look at it through those lenses, rather than just a soft-sided nice to have.

The Bailiff: Second supplementary, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I might have been in a minority but I accept the collective wisdom of the decision. A counterpoint I would make to the argument that P&R were perhaps miserly, we not only increased what we gave to St James' and other things but, surely, what policies does ESC have in allocating ratio between their education mandate and their arts and leisure mandate because it could be argued the resource we were giving to non-education based was in fact relatively small?

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you. That is a really very interesting question, actually, from Deputy Gollop and insightful.

My personal view is that the education budget needs to be ringfenced for education and actually I do not know the answer but looking the legacy transfer of budgets over I do not think that it would be too dissimilar than what was received and possibly an increase in real terms, obviously with RPIX, since the changes in the Machinery of Government a couple of terms ago.

So the funding for that area of the budget has always been in the round and Deputy Gollop will know that from his days on Culture & Leisure, which was a precursor to the S&C side of the ESC mandate. But yes, it is a strong view of mine that we need to ringfence these budgets and they need to grow according to their own individual need, rather than cross-subsidising areas and, in actual fact, as I say, it could go over to the Committee for Economic Development with ease, because it equally sits and complements their mandate.

But it is an area that both of us should be interested in and next term I hope that when things have stabilised in a post-COVID environment, there will be focus of this Assembly on this and it will make it into a Government Work Plan.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Queripel: Thank you, sir.

Does the President agree with me that we should revert back to having separate Education and Culture & Leisure committees in order that those committees can focus exclusively on their respective mandates?

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen to reply.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: I have seen Deputy Queripel looking very intently at me whilst I have been answering the questions and I know this is an area that he is very passionate about and has been tenaciously and consistently so. I could not answer his question now on my feet because I would have to think a little bit more about it and look at the information.

It is a real shame that we were not able to get the review of the Machinery of Government back to the Assembly this term but it is really interesting, with the Requête that we have got coming from Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, it looks as if this Assembly is starting to want to break off bits of different mandates and actually start to go full circle, back to what we have moved from, 20 years ago or so, where actually we had multiple, smaller Committees, dealing with certain mandated areas and then we merged them together into bigger ones and we are now looking to go back again.

It seems to be a cyclical issue. As I say, I would not be averse to it but there would have to be a little bit more information at my fingertips to be able to give a definitive at this time.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel, supplementary.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, sir.

In her reply, the President mentioned sponsorship and it has been focused on, financial sponsorship. But would she agree with me that there are other terms of sponsorship and, in particular, the buildings that the States owns are effectively blank canvasses and those could be used for street art or any other type of art and could be donated, that space donated and used – I said sponsorship, it does not all have to be financial, we have acres of space available to us even green space that could be used for art installations?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Yes, thank you and thank you to Deputy Gabriel because it is that type of creative thinking that we need within our States, to be thinking of the States of Guernsey assets held in a fiduciary manner for the people of Guernsey and what we can do and how we can sweat those assets in many different ways. It is not just about the financial setting of those assets, it is also about the greater use of them for the greater good.

I think we have seen that to great example at Le Murier School, where a mural was done on the side of the building. Obviously, the market buildings as well, where similar has been done. So yes, there is already that type of thinking going in place. It would be wonderful to see different, larger art installations in and around our schools as well. But this takes resource, it takes people, it takes time, and the projects take some management and collaboration. There is a myriad of possibilities and it is that type of creative thought process that is really helpful.

The Bailiff: Well, Members of the States, that therefore concludes Question Time. We will move on to the first item of business, please, Greffier.

Billet d'État XXII

ELECTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

COMMITTEE FOR EMPLOYMENT & SOCIAL SECURITY

1. Appointment of Employment & Discrimination Tribunal Panel Chairs and Members and Designation of Convenor and Deputy Convenor – Propositions carried

Article 1.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter entitled 'The Appointment of Employment & Discrimination Tribunal Panel Chairs and Members and Designation of Convenor and Deputy Convenor', dated 4 th November 2024, they are of the opinion:

1. To appoint the people in the following table to the Employment and Discrimination Panel, with effect from 1st January 2026 until 31st December 2027 for Mr Stephen Glencross, and with effect from 1st January 2025 until 31st December 2027 for everyone else, subject to appropriate, satisfactory checks with the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS).

Dr Sarah Brewer; Rebecca Hunte; Paula Brierley; George Jennings; Alan Brown; Pamela Johal; Racheal Coleman; Alice Joy; Alex Crosland*; Christine Le Lievre; Joanne de Garis; Alysa Rixon; Darren Etasse; Amy Rollings*; Karen Ferneyhough; Steve Roussel; Stephen Glencross; Georgette Scott; Susan Gordon Hardy*; Jason Shambrook; Richard Hanstock*; Robert Shepherd*; Patrick Hardy*; Andrew Vernon; Jason Hill*; Thomas Williams*.*

Those marked with an asterisk are legally qualified and will be able to chair Panel hearings.

2. To designate Jason Hill as the Convenor of the Panel and Paula Brierley as Deputy Convenor of the Panel from 1st January 2025 until 31st December 2027.

1370 **The States' Greffier:** Article 1, the Committee for Employment & Social Security – the appointment of Employment & Discrimination Tribunal Panel chairs and members and designation of convenor and deputy convenor.

The Bailiff: And I will invite the President, Deputy Roffey, to open the debate, please.

1375

Deputy Roffey: Thank you for that, sir, but I think actually the background to these proposed appointments is very clearly set out in the accompanying policy letter.

1380 **The Bailiff:** I do not see any Member rising to debate this matter. Can I simply ask is any Member wishing to vote differently between Proposition 1 and Proposition 2 or can I put both of them to you together? No requests. In that case I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on both Propositions, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 34 Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 5

POUR

Aldwell, Sue
Blin, Chris
Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina

CONTRE

None

NE VOTE PAS

None

DID NOT VOTE

Mahoney, David

ABSENT

Brouard, Al
Ferbrache, Peter
Haskins, Sam
Helyar, Mark

Cameron, Andy
De Lisle, David
De Sausmarez, Lindsay
Dudley-Owen, Andrea
Dyke, John
Fairclough, Simon
Falla, Steve
Gabriel, Adrian
Gollop, John
Inder, Neil
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Le Tissier, Chris
Le Tocq, Jonathan
Leadbeater, Marc
Matthews, Aidan
McKenna, Liam
Meerveld, Carl
Moakes, Nick
Murray, Bob
Oliver, Victoria
Parkinson, Charles
Prow, Robert
Queripel, Lester
Roberts, Steve
Roffey, Peter
Snowdon, Alexander
Soulsby, Heidi
St Pier, Gavin
Taylor, Andrew
Trott, Lyndon

Vermeulen, Simon

1385 **The Bailiff:** In respect of both Propositions, there voted in favour, 34 Members; no Member voted against; no Member abstained; 6 Members did not participate in the vote and therefore I will declare both Propositions duly carried.

APPENDIX REPORT

COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**Public Trustee's Annual Report and Audited Accounts
for the Year Ended 31st December 2023 –
Motion to debate Appendix Report –
Motion carried**

Motion:

To resolve, pursuant to Rule 20 of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation, to debate the Appendix Report to Billet d'État No. XXII 2024 entitled "Committee for Economic Development – Public Trustee Annual Report and Audited Accounts for the year ended 31 December 2023".

1390 **The States' Greffier:** The next item, sir, is a motion to debate an Appendix Report. The Committee for Economic Development – Public Trustee's Annual Report and Audited Accounts for the year ended 31st December 2023.

The Bailiff: In accordance with Rule 20, I would invite the proposer of the motion, Deputy St Pier, to open the debate, please.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

1395 I shall be brief. As is explained in the explanatory note, given the significant exposure for taxpayers from the grants made to the Public Trustee by the States, totalling £5.9 million at the end of December 2023, which has increased by £1 million since 2022 and those grants may or may not be subsequently recoverable from the Trust structures within the responsibility of the Public Trustee it is moved that public scrutiny of the Public Trustee's Accounts through a debate enabled by this motion is warranted.

1400 I understand that the Committee do not oppose the motion and I would therefore urge Members to support it, sir. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.

1405 Deputy Gabriel, you are seconding the motion to debate, formally?

Deputy Gabriel: I am, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.

1410 Deputy Inder, you are the only other person who can speak in this debate. What would you like to say?

Deputy Inder: For the first time in my life, sir, I have nothing to say!

1415 **The Bailiff:** Do you think it is possible, Deputy Inder, that there might be a second and a third time at some point in relation to that? *(Laughter)*

I will now put the motion to debate the Public Trustee's Annual Report and Audited Accounts for the year ended 31st December 2023 to the vote and I will ask the Greffier to open the voting, please.

1420 *There was a recorded vote.*

Carried – Pour 31 Contre 0, Ne vote pas 3, Did not vote 2, Absent 4

| POUR | CONTRE | NE VOTE PAS | DID NOT VOTE | ABSENT |
|-----------------------|--------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Aldwell, Sue | None | Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha | Mahoney, David | Ferbrache, Peter |
| Blin, Chris | | Moakes, Nick | Taylor, Andrew | Haskins, Sam |
| Brouard, Al | | Oliver, Victoria | | Helyar, Mark |
| Burford, Yvonne | | | | Vermeulen, Simon |
| Bury, Tina | | | | |
| Cameron, Andy | | | | |
| De Lisle, David | | | | |
| De Sausmarez, Lindsay | | | | |
| Dudley-Owen, Andrea | | | | |
| Dyke, John | | | | |
| Fairclough, Simon | | | | |
| Falla, Steve | | | | |
| Gabriel, Adrian | | | | |
| Gollop, John | | | | |
| Inder, Neil | | | | |
| Le Tissier, Chris | | | | |
| Le Tocq, Jonathan | | | | |
| Leadbeater, Marc | | | | |
| Matthews, Aidan | | | | |
| McKenna, Liam | | | | |
| Meerveld, Carl | | | | |
| Murray, Bob | | | | |
| Parkinson, Charles | | | | |
| Prow, Robert | | | | |
| Queripel, Lester | | | | |

Roberts, Steve
Roffey, Peter
Snowdon, Alexander
Soulsby, Heidi
St Pier, Gavin
Trott, Lyndon

The Bailiff: On this motion to debate, proposed by Deputy St Pier and seconded by Deputy Gabriel, there voted in favour, 31 Members; no Member voted against; 3 Members abstained; 6 Members did not participate in the vote and therefore I will declare the motion carried, which means

1425

that we will pick up the debate in accordance with Rule 20, later in this Meeting, or whenever.

Can we lay some legislation, please, Greffier?

LEGISLATION LAID BEFORE THE STATES

**The Plant Health (Preserved Phytosanitary Conditions Regulation)
(Amendment) (Guernsey) (No.2) Regulations, 2024;**

The Excise Duties (Temporary Variation of Rates) Order, 2024;

**The Police Powers and Criminal Evidence (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance,
2024 (Commencement) Regulations, 2024;**

The Wastewater Charges (Guernsey) Regulations, 2024;

The Water Charges (Amendment) Regulations, 2024;

The Waste Disposal and Recovery Charges Regulations, 2024;

The Waste Management Services (Charging) Regulations, 2024;

The Harbour Dues and Facilities Charges (Guernsey) Regulations, 2024;

The Mooring Charges (Guernsey) Regulations, 2024;

The Pilotage Dues (Guernsey) Regulations, 2024;

The Airport Fees (Guernsey and Alderney) Regulations, 2024;

**The Customs and Excise (Safety and Security) (Bailiwick
of Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations.**

The States' Greffier: The following legislation is laid before the States: The Plant Health (Preserved Phytosanitary Conditions Regulation) (Amendment) (Guernsey) (No.2) Regulations, 2024;
The Excise Duties (Temporary Variation of Rates) Order, 2024; The Police Powers and Criminal Evidence (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2024 (Commencement) Regulations, 2024; The Wastewater Charges (Guernsey) Regulations, 2024; The Water Charges (Amendment) Regulations, 2024; The Waste Disposal and Recovery Charges Regulations, 2024; The Waste Management Services (Charging) Regulations, 2024; The Harbour Dues and Facilities Charges (Guernsey) Regulations, 2024; The Mooring Charges (Guernsey) Regulations, 2024; The Pilotage Dues (Guernsey) Regulations, 2024; The Airport Fees (Guernsey and Alderney) Regulations, 2024; The Customs and Excise (Safety and Security) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2024.

1430

1435

**Motion to annul Police Complaints (Conduct, Proceedings and Investigations) (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2024 –
Withdrawn**

Motion

To resolve that the aforementioned Regulations made by the Committee for Home Affairs, in exercise of the powers conferred on it by sections 13 and 21 of the Police Complaints (Guernsey) Law, 2008, and all other powers enabling it in that behalf, be annulled.

1440

Deputy St Pier: No, sir, following a very useful meeting with the Committee for Home Affairs last week, it is not intended to move that motion.

1445

The Bailiff: Thank you very much. We will pass over that one swiftly and we will move to the next item of business, please, Greffier.

LEGISLATION FOR APPROVAL

COMMITTEE FOR EMPLOYMENT & SOCIAL SECURITY

**2. The Family Allowances Ordinance, 2024 –
Proposition carried**

Article 2.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled "The Family Allowances Ordinance, 2024" and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States

The States' Greffier: Yes, sir.

Article 2, the Committee for Employment & Social Security – the Family Allowances Ordinance 2024.

1450

The Bailiff: Once again, I will invite the President, if he wishes, to open the debate.
Deputy Roffey.

1455

Deputy Roffey: I think it may save time if I say that three of the next four items – I am not responsible for Land Amenity, but three of the next four items – are all basically the legislation that flowed from the decisions we took on the non-contributory uprating debate and therefore I would have nothing to say on any of them.

1460

The Bailiff: I do not see any Member rising to debate the draft Family Allowances Ordinance of 2024, in which case I will invite the Greffier to open the voting as to whether you are minded to approve it.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 34 Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 3

POUR

Aldwell, Sue
Blin, Chris
Brouard, Al

CONTRE

None

NE VOTE PAS

None

DID NOT VOTE

Mahoney, David

ABSENT

Ferbrache, Peter
Haskins, Sam
Helyar, Mark

Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina
Cameron, Andy
De Lisle, David
De Sausmarez, Lindsay
Dudley-Owen, Andrea
Dyke, John
Fairclough, Simon
Falla, Steve
Gabriel, Adrian
Gollop, John
Inder, Neil
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Le Tissier, Chris
Le Tocq, Jonathan
Leadbeater, Marc
Matthews, Aidan
McKenna, Liam
Meerveld, Carl
Moakes, Nick
Murray, Bob
Oliver, Victoria
Parkinson, Charles
Prow, Robert
Queripel, Lester
Roberts, Steve
Roffey, Peter
Snowdon, Alexander
Soulsby, Heidi
St Pier, Gavin
Taylor, Andrew
Trott, Lyndon
Vermeulen, Simon

The Bailiff: In respect of this draft Ordinance, there voted in favour, 36 Members; no Member voted against; no Member abstained; 4 Members did not participate in that vote and therefore I will declare the draft Ordinance Proposition duly carried.

1465

COMMITTEE FOR EMPLOYMENT & SOCIAL SECURITY

3. The Income Support (Implementation) (Amendment) (No. 2) Ordinance, 2024 – Proposition carried

Article 3.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled "The Income Support (Implementation) (Amendment) (No. 2) Ordinance, 2024" and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

The States' Greffier: Article 3, the Committee for Employment & Social Security – the Income Support (Implementation) (Amendment) (No. 2) Ordinance, 2024.

The Bailiff: I simply invite any Member who wishes to speak on the Ordinance to stand. If nobody does, then we will move swiftly to the vote.

While we are waiting – of course you can, Deputy Ferbrache, welcome, and if you get your machine out really quickly, you will be able to vote! There might be a bit of a delay at the moment, we are just looking for a Proposition.

1470

1475 I tell you what, Members of the States, we will treat the Proposition that is on my screen at the moment, which relates to the Family Allowances Ordinance, as being the right one, which is the Income Support (Implementation) (Amendment) (No. 2) Ordinance, 2024, because I have just checked and what you voted on last time was the wrong Proposition! *(Laughter)*

1480 When we are rushing through like this it is not surprising that we make slips like that so, for the Family Allowances Ordinance 2024, simply read in the way that you want to vote on this particular one. Hopefully it will be the same result as last time and therefore we will not have to worry about it but rather than re-run the last vote, let us just be pragmatic about it and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on this draft Ordinance, which is the Income Support (Implementation) (Amendment) (No. 2) Ordinance, 2024.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 39 Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 0, Absent 1

| POUR | CONTRE | NE VOTE PAS | DID NOT VOTE | ABSENT |
|--------------------------|--------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| Aldwell, Sue | None | None | None | 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 | | | | |
| Inder, Neil | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |
| Roberts, Steve | | | | |
| Roffey, Peter | | | | |
| Snowdon, Alexander | | | | |
| Soulsby, Heidi | | | | |
| St Pier, Gavin | | | | |
| Taylor, Andrew | | | | |
| Trott, Lyndon | | | | |
| Vermeulen, Simon | | | | |

1485 **The Bailiff:** Of course, the numbers are different, but we will change them after the event. So, in respect of the Income Support (Implementation) (Amendment) (No. 2) Ordinance, 2024, there voted in favour, 39 Members; no Member voted against; no Member abstained and 1 Member is not participating in the vote and therefore I will declare it carried on that basis.

DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING AUTHORITY

**4. The Land Amenity Improvement Notices Ordinance, 2024 –
Proposition carried**

Article 4.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled "The Land Amenity Improvement Notices Ordinance, 2024" and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

1490

The States' Greffier: Article 4, Development & Planning Authority – the Land Amenity Improvement Notices Ordinance, 2024.

The Bailiff: I will invite the President, Deputy Oliver, to open the debate if she so wishes.

1495

Deputy Oliver: We only spoke about this a year ago. This is just what we have said put into Law, so I encourage everybody to vote for it.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

1500

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, I will just be very brief. I just hope the DPA have got those notices ready to go out to the offending parties. It does look like one site might already be looking at dealing with their issue ahead of today but I do hope the DPA can actually treat this as a priority.

Thank you.

1505

The Bailiff: It is not coming into force until regulations with the Authority.
Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Queripel: Sir, I merely rise to ask the President, does this include land owned by the States or not?

1510

The Bailiff: Deputy Taylor.

Deputy Taylor: Thank you, sir.

1515

I do not need to speak long. I think if Members cast their minds back to when this was debated as a policy letter, I set out my objections then, I will not rehearse them now, I do not think it will change things.

I do not envisage us ever having the resources to tackle the proper eyesore sights. There are not the resources within the DPA at the moment and there is no motion or proposition within the DPA currently to increase resources in this area, so if it is effective, I think it will just prove to be an intrusion into people's lives, although thankfully it is not applying to domestic curtilage.

1520

So my conclusion is that this has been a waste of legal draftspeople's time when they could have been tackling a big pile of far more important legislative needs for the Island. For those basic reasons, I will continue to vote against this and I would urge many other Members to vote against it with me.

1525

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: I will turn back to the President, Deputy Oliver, to reply to that short debate, please.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you.

1530

I do urge people to vote for it. It is a very important piece of legislation. People keep saying to us that we need action on this. Well, this is the action so please can you actually vote for it.

In response to Deputy Taylor, since 2009, we have had a lot of cases that go to enforcement but none of them have cost the States actually any money, through having to take direct action. In other jurisdictions you see that enforcement action –

Deputy Taylor: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Taylor.

Deputy Taylor: It is probably a difficult one in terms of where do you count your wooden dollars, but there has been quite a high profile case that has come before the Royal Court quite recently and taxpayers would have incurred a cost for that. So it is incorrect to say that no costs have been incurred by enforcement action.

The Bailiff: Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: I have got those from the Director of Planning, so I think he probably knows what he is talking about. There is no States' money through having to take direct action. Sorry about that.

In response to Deputy Heidi Soulsby, it will be coming into force 10th February. I cannot wait for that. The reason why there is quite a lag in it is because it has got to go to the Court and the Court has got to make sure that it has got all its i's and t's crossed. So we are working through that.

Yes, the States-owned land has been included, as per the amendment, so that is all in there. I hope that everybody will vote for it. It is a really important piece of legislation that actually gives power to the DPA to actually make a difference for our Island. There are a lot of parishioners, particularly Douzaines, that come and say, 'Please can you do this?' 'Sorry we cannot, we have got not powers.' This is the power we need.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, without further ado, I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on the single Proposition, whether you are minded to approve this draft Ordinance.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 33 Contre 4, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 2, Absent 1

| POUR | CONTRE | NE VOTE PAS | DID NOT VOTE | ABSENT |
|--------------------------|------------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Aldwell, Sue | Inder, Neil | None | Roberts, Steve | Haskins, Sam |
| Blin, Chris | Leadbeater, Marc | | Snowdon, Alexander | |
| Brouard, Al | Matthews, Aidan | | | |
| Burford, Yvonne | Taylor, Andrew | | | |
| 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
Mahoney, David
McKenna, Liam
Meerveld, Carl
Moakes, Nick
Murray, Bob
Oliver, Victoria
Parkinson, Charles
Prow, Robert
Queripel, Lester
Roffey, Peter
Soulsby, Heidi
St Pier, Gavin
Trott, Lyndon
Vermeulen, Simon

1565 **The Bailiff:** There voted in favour, 33 Members; 4 Members voted against; 2 Members abstained; 1 Member is not participating today and therefore I will declare the draft Ordinance Proposition duly carried and we will now adjourn until 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.33 p.m.
and resumed at 2.36 p.m.*

COMMITTEE FOR EMPLOYMENT & SOCIAL SECURITY

5. The Severe Disability and Carer's Allowance Ordinance, 2024 – Proposition carried

Article 5.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled "The Severe Disability and Carer's Allowance Ordinance, 2024" and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

The Deputy Greffier: Article 5, Committee for Employment & Social Security – the Severe Disability and Carer's Allowance, 2024.

1570

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey, is there anything you wish to say on this one, just for anyone who forgot what you said this morning?

Deputy Roffey: No, there is not, sir.

1575

The Bailiff: Does anyone wish to debate this draft Ordinance?
In that case, I will invite the Greffier to open the voting.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 36 Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 3, Absent 1

POUR

Aldwell, Sue
Blin, Chris
Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina

CONTRE

None

NE VOTE PAS

None

DID NOT VOTE

Brouard, Al
Dudley-Owen, Andrea
St Pier, Gavin

ABSENT

Haskins, Sam

Cameron, Andy
De Lisle, David
De Sausmarez, Lindsay
Dyke, John
Fairclough, Simon
Falla, Steve
Ferbrache, Peter
Gabriel, Adrian
Gollop, John
Helyar, Mark
Inder, Neil
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
Roberts, Steve
Roffey, Peter
Snowdon, Alexander
Soulsby, Heidi
Taylor, Andrew
Trott, Lyndon
Vermeulen, Simon

1580 **The Bailiff:** In respect of the single Proposition whether you are minded to approve the draft Ordinance, there voted in favour, 36 Members; no Member voted against; no Member abstained; 4 Members did not participate in that vote and therefore I will declare the Proposition duly carried.

I should perhaps have apologised for the late start. Those who were in here will have realised that the computers were not working properly. So, urgent question on the Agilisys contract possible! (*Laughter*)

1585 Next item.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

6. The Rules of the Public Servants' Pension Scheme – Proposition carried

Article 6.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the policy letter entitled 'The Rules of the Public Servants' Pension Scheme' dated 4th November 2024, they are of the opinion:-

1. To approve the States of Guernsey (Public Servants) (New Pensions and other Benefits) Rules, 2016, as amended, as appended.

The Deputy Greffier: Article 6, Policy & Resources Committee – Rules of the Public Servants' Pension Scheme.

The Bailiff: I will invite the President of the Committee, Deputy Trott, to open the debate, please.

Deputy Trott: Thank you, sir.

The policy letter makes minor technical amendments to the rules of the Public Servants' Pension Scheme in response to the recent introduction of secondary pension legislation, in order for it to comply with the secondary pension requirements. The changes revise eligibility for membership so to include any employee engaged on a contract of three months or longer, earning in excess of the lower earnings threshold for Social Security contributions. The numbers of additional employees admitted and in turn associated employer costs will be minimal.

It also revises the vesting period, the qualifying period for benefit entitlements, to three months from the current two years. Now, the cost of reducing the period are estimated at a one-time cost of £150,000 for members' benefits and *circa* £180,000 *per annum* for dependants. This will be borne from the scheme.

It would also remove the ability of scheme members to take a refund of their own contributions once the member has reached the vesting period in order to protect the accrued rights and it will allow a refund of defined contribution benefits to the extent permitted by the Income Tax Law in the existing scheme for Members who are 50 years old or older. So, in a nutshell, sir, this is obligatory in order to comply with secondary pensions legislation.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Just briefly, sir. When Deputy Trott opened, he called this a minor, technical amendment. I just want to refer Members to page four, 7.1 and four, 7.2. This is just purely for my clarification because this really is not my area. I think it said the amendment proposed to allow members to join from three months' service, rather than one year, are negligible but carry a one-off estimated cost of £150,000. Under our rules with compliance with Rule 4 it repeats that, the financial implication for the States of carrying the proposal into effect are no more than £150,000.

Fine. Rules complied with. Can I just Deputy Trott's attention to 7.1 – this may be just my misunderstanding:

The amendments to the existing scheme required to comply with the Secondary Pensions Legislation have an estimated annual cost of £456,000 *per annum*.

I would like to understand what that means. Because either £150,000 as a one-off cost, or it is £456,000 on the total cost, which over 10 years is £4.5 million.

I am not entirely clear what that means and I would seek some clarification at some point but I see two different figures but it seemed relatively clear to me that it is not £150,000 one-off, it is £4.5 million over 10 years. If I may make a point, it would have been nice to know these things sometimes when we voted for the initial policy letter.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Yes, when we were still district Deputies, I used to have the pleasure of attending the Douzaine. I do now because I have become a Member. I used to chuckle sometimes and one of the Douzeniers accused me of taking the mickey out of the Douzeniers. What used to amuse me was they would say things and I would know that in reality that things were different but I could not say. This is possibly one of those examples because it is put across as a minor change and it is utterly essential that we do it because we have agreed secondary pensions and the States above all have to comply and conform. So that is mandatory.

But I would argue that, although there is no choice here, it is not minor in everybody's eyes. It is perhaps minor in our scheme of things but it is still a lot of money because, to put it another way, I was always a little bit ambivalent about secondary pensions because I could see the policy advantages and the long-term benefits it would give many people but, at the same time, it is a cost

to the state, it is a cost to business, it does potentially pull money out of the economy and it has possibly narrowed the appetite of both Government and the public for other kinds of tax rises.

Then we discovered, on P&R, that there were some technical changes that needed to be made. As I understand it, and it is complicated, the broad, indicative estimate of the change in member benefits is a one-off, one-time cost of £150,000. For dependants, *circa* £180,000 *per annum*. Then you look at another figure, 5.3, where a refund is taken, the employer contribution remains in the fund, the broad indicative estimated cost of the change as has been outlined, is £276,000 *per annum*.

So, there is a one-off cost and then there are two technical additional costs per year. None of us States' Members, or most of us did not know about this when we voted for secondary pensions. There was a big swing during the run-up to that debate. There appeared to be a lot of hostility but in the end, many Members who were sceptical supported the change but we have to take it on the chin that there have been some run-off costs and, yes, there is not just a one-off cost but as I understand it, a cost over £400,000 a year.

But we must hope that that cost will come back in different ways, not only because of a locally administered scheme but in the long-term people when they age will have more money to spend in our economy and also potentially more money in tax. So I hope that satisfies Deputy Inder.

The Bailiff: Deputy Mahoney.

Deputy Mahoney: Thank you, sir.

Just briefly, I think it might be useful, certainly for me and anyone listening, a brief explanation, I guess. The secondary pensions, obviously, we are all well aware of those and finally we got that in but for those people that primarily do not have a pension, this was our way to force the savings into a pension plan, if you like, through the States-run secondary pension scheme.

Then of course we have the very generous public sector, Public Servants Pension Scheme. Again, an entirely different animal in just about every respect and those two things are obviously entirely different things, chalk and cheese. I am a bit confused so, perhaps for anyone listening, when he sums up, could the Chief Minister confirm, we are saying here that there is a legal requirement for us to change our pension scheme to comply with secondary pension legislation. I think I have got that right. Of course, a not insignificant sum, of £456,000 a year.

By that definition, are all current pension providers on the Island, the banks, the insurance companies, the industrial companies, etc, also then going to have to change their pension rules? If we are having to because secondary pension says you have to, then is it the case that a bank on the high street will also now have to change their pension rules to comply with this secondary pension legislation, which does not seem to make sense to me, at obviously cost to them and that is certainly something they would not have been expecting, I suspect.

Just some clarity on why we now suddenly have to include people at three months, when previously it was a two-year period. I do not recall seeing anything about that in the legislation. I assume that legal advice we have taken from that, is that external legal advice or Law Officer legal advice that has told us we must do that? That would be useful to know whether it was external or internal advice on that.

Just a bit more clarity, sir, it is a very thick policy letter, but I do not see where the crossover is between an entirely separate secondary pension, which we are making people do because there are people less fortunate that do not have a pension on-Island, and this is obviously the long-term planning we are looking at, versus the very generous current public sector Public Servants Pension Scheme we have got. I do not see the crossover and why one is affecting the other. As I say, if when he sums up, he could say whether HSBCs and the Credit Suisses, etc, are also going to have to change their pension rules?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

1690 I was not going to speak but I wonder if I can help here. Under the secondary benefits legislation, which was approved by this Assembly, employers can auto-enrol their employees either in the default scheme, which is the YIP, or in any other compliant scheme. Does everybody have to change their schemes? No, because some of them are already entirely compliant with the secondary pensions legislation. Some, however, in minor ways, are not compliant and that was true of the
1695 States' superannuation fund and that is why some minor changes are going to have to be made.

I have to say that the main cost is actually that people will not be able to take all of their own contributions out, which was a benefit to the scheme because the States' contributions stayed in but the obligations disappear to pay a pension so that was actually a benefit. But actually it was an incredibly foolish thing for that employee to do and they probably usually did it when they were
1700 pretty desperate and therefore actually what is going to happen is they are going to be less likely to need Income Support, I suspect, as a result because unless they are very foolish, they are only going to be taking their own contributions out and foregoing their employers' contributions in circumstances where it is *force majeure* and they have to do so.

But no, not every scheme will have to be adjusted but it was quite clear, I think, when we debated
1705 secondary pensions, you could use the YIP or any other compliance scheme. Ours is 99% compliant but there were a few little ways that it was not and that is why P&R are making these adjustments today. I am not trying to answer on behalf of Deputy Trott, but I think that is right.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

1710

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir. I believe I should declare an interest because I am in a scheme. Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

1715

Deputy Gabriel: Likewise, sir, under Rule 17(15), I am a member of a scheme and I would like to declare a special interest.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

1720

Deputy Brouard: I hope to be a member of the scheme, sir!

The Bailiff: Deputy Matthews.

1725

Deputy Matthews: Likewise, sir, I am also a member of the scheme.

Deputy Roffey: I know I have already spoken, sir, but if this covers the States' Members Pension Scheme as well – I am looking to P&R whether it does – then I have an interest to declare. Not yet but I will eventually!

1730

The Bailiff: Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: Thank you, sir.

I am not a member of the scheme. The point I wanted to make is there not another way of
1735 approaching this? We are in a position where we are severely stressed for cash so this proposal appears to be adding something approaching £500,000 a year to our cost, which I would have thought was the last thing we want to do. Is it not possible, rather than do this, to make the Civil Service scheme comply with the secondary pensions regulations, make provision to the secondary pensions regulations that they do not apply to Government employees who are or will become,

1740 after the appropriate period of time, members of this States' scheme? Wouldn't that be a better way of doing it and thus not adding another half a million to our costs?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: As I do not see any other Member rising to speak in debate, I will turn back to the President, Deputy Trott, to reply to the debate, please.

Deputy Trott: Thank you, sir.

1750 I am going to start with Deputy Mahoney, because he was asking what other schemes, particularly pertaining to banks, may look like. Of course, the chances are they are all different but if they faced the same problem, i.e. they had a scheme that did not deal with the changes to secondary pensions legislation, they would have to modify their rules if they wished to go the route we are going, and that is to have one scheme, rather than the complexity and cost of two.

We are in the luxury, as an employer, of being able to incorporate into an existing scheme – I give way, sir.

1755

Deputy Mahoney: Thank you, sir, and I will use it properly. No speeches.

1760 I thank the Chief Minister for that. Could he confirm, then, that one of the reasons is the three-month to two-year qualification period, for want of a better phrase? That is one of the reasons why we have to change down to three months because that is one of the reasons we are failing in the current Public Servants' Pension Scheme.

Deputy Trott: That is precisely the case and more or less word for word what I said in my opening remarks, so yes, easy to confirm that. I am grateful to the Vice-President for the Policy & Resources Committee for helping me draft this narrative because as we understand it, the £150,000, which is the declared cost under the Rules is the cost to the States because of the vesting period reducing from one year, not two years as Deputy Mahoney said, but from one year to three months and it relates to the employer pension contributions, which will increase as a consequence of that.

1765 The £456,000 is a cost to the scheme. It will be borne by the scheme and that is why it is not separately disclosed under 7.3.

1770 I believe what we have said is accurate. In the unlikely event that it is not, I will ensure that Members are advised quickly thereafter. The point is that this is being put together with actuarial advice by professional pension administrators and is entirely in keeping with legislation this Assembly has previously agreed to as explained by Deputy Roffey –

I will give way to Deputy Inder.

1775

Deputy Inder: Thank you, Deputy Trott.

Just so we are absolutely clear, because this is quite crucial, 7.1, I am just going to read it out, just so we are clear, on the advice by the actuarial advice and the advice by officers who put this together, and I am going to read it again:

The amendments to the existing scheme required to comply with the Secondary Pensions Legislation have an estimated annual cost of £456,000 per annum.

1780 The reason it is not in Rule 4, because it is not a cost to the general taxpayer. It is a cost that comes out of the scheme. So the Guernsey taxpayer will not be getting a £456,000 bill if we vote for this today? Could he just confirm that, please?

1785 **Deputy Trott:** That is the case. Effectively those charges will come from the employer contributions but in the same way as it would for any employer. So the answer to Deputy Inder's question is yes.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, there is a single Proposition for you to vote on and I will invite the Greffier to open the vote please, in respect of that Proposition.

1790

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 31, Contre 6, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 1, Absent 1

POUR

Aldwell, Sue
Blin, Chris
Brouard, Al
Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina
Cameron, Andy
De Lisle, David
De Sausmarez, Lindsay
Dudley-Owen, Andrea
Fairclough, Simon
Falla, Steve
Ferbrache, Peter
Gabriel, Adrian
Gollop, John
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Le Tocq, Jonathan
Leadbeater, Marc
Matthews, Aidan
McKenna, Liam
Meerveld, Carl
Moakes, Nick
Murray, Bob
Oliver, Victoria
Parkinson, Charles
Queripel, Lester
Roberts, Steve
Roffey, Peter
Snowdon, Alexander
Soulsby, Heidi
Taylor, Andrew
Trott, Lyndon

CONTRE

Dyke, John
Helyar, Mark
Inder, Neil
Le Tissier, Chris
Mahoney, David
Vermeulen, Simon

NE VOTE PAS

Prow, Robert

DID NOT VOTE

St Pier, Gavin

ABSENT

Haskins, Sam

The Bailiff: In respect of this Proposition, there voted in favour, 31 Members; 6 Members voted against; 1 Member abstained; 2 Members did not participate in that vote and therefore I will declare the Proposition carried.

1795

Before we call the next item of business, you should have had notification that an amendment has been submitted and I am going to ask the Sherriff to distribute copies of that amendment before I then invite the opening of the debate, once it has been called.

Does everyone now have a copy of Amendment 1?

Greffier.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

**7. Guernsey Development Agency Update –
Propositions carried as amended**

Article 7.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the policy letter entitled 'Guernsey Development Agency Update' dated 30 October 2024, they are of the opinion:

- 1. To endorse the Guernsey Development Agency's strategic vision for the Bridge as set out in section 3.5.*
- 2. To agree the Land Transfer Policy as set out in section 5.3.*
- 3. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to prepare a Land Transfer Portfolio for approval by the States by November 2026;*
- 4. To note the Annual Report and Accounts of the Guernsey Development Agency for the period ended 31st December 2023.*

1800 **The Deputy Greffier:** Article 7, Policy & Resources Committee – Guernsey Development Agency Update.

The Bailiff: I am going to invite Deputy Murray to open the debate on behalf of the Committee.

1805 **Deputy Murray:** Thank you, sir. I sense a slight incredulity in your voice! *(Laughter)*

As P&R's representative on the Political Oversight Board, I am very pleased to bring this update on the considerable progress being made by the Guernsey Development Agency to the Assembly. The significant potential of Guernsey's east coast and seafront has long been recognised. In fact, several Assemblies have attempted to identify opportunities and deliver regeneration of the east coast, in many cases without material success.

1810 The States-approved Island Development Plan identifies the regeneration potential of the east coast by designating areas around St Peter Port and the Bridge as Harbour Action Areas. When the States resolved to establish the GDA in July 2023, it was recognised that the optimal way to realise the potential benefits afforded through the regeneration of the east coast was via an arm's length body, which would have the time and expertise needed to focus on this important area and drive beneficial development forward over many years.

1815 The GDA was established in part so that the approach to the regeneration of the east coast would not be unduly constrained by the cyclical nature of Government and that continuity across terms of Government could be provided both in terms of the approach to and delivery of longer term development.

1820 It was also recognised that an arm's length body, such as the GDA, would be able to bridge the gap between Government, the local community and potential investors and developers, ensuring that proposals for development are in line with existing and emerging relevant strategies, policies and that Government priorities are supported by the general public and, perhaps most importantly, are commercially viable so that the burden of funding development does not fall solely on the public finances.

1825 Conscious of possible concerns expressed during the original July 2023 debate, the GDA, following its formation last year, has made it a priority to seek the views of very many stakeholders, including Government committees, interest groups, businesses and of course the general public and this latter and arguably key audience were surveyed and over 1,100 respondents provided feedback, permitting the GDA to have confidence that it had extrapolated the views of some 70% of Islanders in support of enhancing the east coast, including identifying priorities such as traffic management, green spaces and waterside access.

1830

1835 Addressing such aspirations led inevitably to the recognition of the suitability of the significant potential offered by the Bridge and further community stakeholder engagement was undertaken. Following the high-level concept development of the vision, the Guernsey Construction Forum commented:

We strongly encourage the decision makers ...

– that would be ourselves –

... to fully support this plan and see it as a major instrument in resolving the Island's housing crisis over the next 10-plus years, whilst regenerating a hugely valuable asset for Guernsey in the Bridge area and Marina. It will also provide a fantastic destination for visitors, domestica and international, and a wonderful living space for Guernsey residents.'

1840 If the Assembly will indulge me, I should also like to quote from the President of the Chamber of Commerce, who said the following:

We support the GDA's vision for the Bridge. This ambitious plan will create a vibrant environment, where businesses and the community can thrive together by enabling and facilitating the delivery of strategic infrastructure this lays the foundation for sustainable growth, supporting innovation and enhancing the quality of life for all. This is an exciting opportunity to reimagine the Bridge and for it to play a critical role in addressing Islanders' wide priorities.

Sir, many Members of the Assembly have already had the opportunity, either as Members of their Committees or individually to see a video representation of the GDA's vision of the Bridge and I think it is fair to say it was very well received. The strategic vision establishes four key themes, which will guide development. One, supporting and maximising the value of the marine economy. Two, creating a lively and modern public realm, along the waterfront, which supports commercial and recreational activities. Three, establishing the much-needed provision of hundreds of new homes and accommodation. Four, providing transport choice and connectivity, which effectively supports the resident and visiting population of the area.

1850 To date, the GDA has operated through a very small team of three non-executive directors, on a relatively limited budget, with great effectiveness, and I would like to take the opportunity to thank them on behalf of P&R and my ED and E&I colleagues on the political oversight board for their strenuous efforts.

1855 This commitment has enabled the GDA to set the foundations upon which an effective plan for the regeneration of the east coast can now be built. However, it is now necessary to provide the GDA with an appropriate level of funding in order to undertake detailed feasibility analysis of the proposed developments for the Bridge, in order to understand the commercial and physical viability of each development and move it on from concept to the next stage.

1860 This is a critical phase for the GDA in preparing its key infrastructure delivery programme and business and funding plan, which the States have resolved and which this policy letter confirms should be submitted to the Assembly for approval in 2026. The next 12-18 months for the GDA will be focused on utilising this funding to gather the necessary evidence in order to present a comprehensive and deliverable plan for the regeneration of the Bridge.

1865 To further support the work of the GDA in preparing this plan, it will be necessary for the States to agree a portfolio of land to be transferred to the GDA for development. Whilst it is proposed that this portfolio will be presented to the States for approval, alongside the key infrastructure delivery programme and business and funding plan in 2026, a Land Transfer Policy has been prepared, which will enable the Policy & Resources Committee, States' Trading Supervisory Board, and GDA, to engage openly and effectively in order to identify the areas of land, which may be appropriate to transfer to the GDA and the financial and operational considerations associated with said transfers.

1870 Ultimately, by November 2026, the States' Assembly will be presented with a costed plan for development at the Bridge and which sets out (a) what development will come forward and when; (b) the funding needed to undertake or facilitate development; and (c) the land required to facilitate development.

1875 And only if these three elements of the GDA's work are presented as a package can the States make an informed decision to signal the GDA's move from its planning phase to a delivery phase. In preparing its concept for the Bridge, the GDA has worked closely with the relevant Committees of the States of Guernsey in order to ensure strategic alignment.

1880 Most significantly, the GDA has been a key stakeholder in the process of preparing a Local Planning Brief for the St Peter Port and St Sampson's Harbour Action Areas, which is currently being undertaken by the Development & Planning Authority and which will provide the essential gateway land use policies that are needed for development to progress in these areas.

1885 Once approved by the States' Assembly, the Local Planning Brief will set a high-level policy framework, which will facilitate delivery of the GDA's key infrastructure delivery programme. The Local Planning Brief is currently undergoing an inquiry process and it is hoped to be brought before the Assembly before the end of this term.

1890 The GDA's strategic vision for the Bridge is consistent with the policies currently set out in the Local Planning Brief and the GDA has previously written a letter of support for the draft Local Planning Brief, confirming that the draft policies are aligned with and would support delivery of the developments at the Bridge, which they will be investigating further.

It is important to note that the GDA's strategic vision for the Bridge does not impact the States' ability to bring forward other strategic infrastructure projects in the future. This includes initiatives such as the Pool Marina proposal, any investigations into a potential future harbour, as well as delivery of strategic coastal defences and infrastructure.

1895 The GDA has also been engaging with Savills, who have been appointed to prepare a strategic delivery framework for the various housing developments around the Bridge. Sir, at a time when public finances are constrained, and the community is facing increased charges for the delivery of essential services, it is vital that Government looks at ways of supporting and growing the economy and facilitating inward investment, to balance this pressure. I believe the work of the GDA will do just that and will be an important economic enabler for Guernsey for many years to come.

1900 Now, sir, in closing I can update the Assembly that since publication of the policy letter the one issue identified in the auditor's report as outstanding, which recommended that each director have a formal employment contract, has now been addressed, and all three directors have now complied with that. Sir, I would encourage the Assembly to endorse all the proposals in the policy letter.

1905 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, you will have seen that a single amendment has been submitted by Deputy Murray, to be seconded by Deputy St Pier. Is it your wish now, Deputy Murray, to move that amendment?

1910 **Deputy Murray:** It is, sir, thank you.

The Bailiff: Would you like it read, because it has come in so recently?

1915 **Deputy Murray:** By all means, since everybody has only just received it now.

The Bailiff: Greffier.

The Deputy Greffier read out the amendment.

1920 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Murray.

[Amendment 1.](#)

To insert before "." at the end of Proposition 2:

"subject to replacing section 5.3.8 with: Land transfer arrangements may be approved which do not maintain or improve the financial sustainability of the Ports subject to review by the Policy & Resources Committee to assess wider social, economic and/or environmental value".

Deputy Murray: Thank you, sir.

1925 This amendment, which is supported unanimously by P&R, was prompted by a late suggestion from Deputy St Pier, to whom I am grateful, who is seconding it. Although there are no currently identified areas, we are limiting the transfer of future land to the GDA, presenting difficulty to the Ports, it would be preferable not to limit all possible opportunities to that of maintaining or indeed improving the financial viability of the Ports. Some degree of discretion would ensure that, in the
1930 eventuality of a future opportunity arising, which may not directly fulfil that criterion but represents in totality a net benefit to the Island overall, can be considered on its merits, subject to oversight, consultation, and the approval of P&R.

That said, the Committee are very cognisant of the challenging circumstances facing STSB in operating the Ports and support their efforts to find ways and means of ensuring funding matches the considerable investment required now and in the future. Consequently, the purpose of this
1935 minor amendment, which is also supported by the GDA, is essentially a hedge against the possibility of such an eventuality occurring and is not any intent to have it as any sort of primary focus.

I would therefore ask the Assembly to support it in that spirit, thank you sir.

1940 **The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier, do you formally second Amendment 1?

Deputy St Pier: I do, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.
1945 Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

I have no doubt that in later debates in the States' Meeting, there is going to be an awful lot said about late amendments and their perils and I have to say, this one is a complete stinker, in my
1950 view, because I would refer people, Members, not people – but they are people as well – to paragraph 5.2 of the policy letter, which makes clear that the Land Transfer Policy was debated and agreed between three parties, the GDA, who I am surprised to learn have backed this amendment, because they have raised no objection with us whatsoever to the agreed policy that was arrived at, P&R and the STSB. That was agreed policy put forward.

1955 It almost sounded like Deputy Murray was saying that somehow this policy could block the release of a piece of land that could do something marvellous for the Island. There is nothing in the policy, as in the Billet, that would block the release of any piece of land whatsoever. If it was needed for the wider benefit of Guernsey, it would be released. What would have to happen is some kind of compensatory arrangement to make sure that the Ports as a business were no worse off.

1960 Now, I do not think it will come entirely as a surprise to Members of the States, but STSB, actually believe that the Ports should be run far more commercially than they are now. In fact, believe that they should be run at arm's length as a company, very much as like Ports of Jersey and the Members of this Assembly would have the opportunity to discuss exactly that proposition during the rest of this Assembly. It is going to come before the election, a policy letter to suggest that.

1965 What kind of position will that company be in when they have got a set of assets that they know could be taken – fine if we take them away if the owner is the States of Guernsey, the people of Guernsey, of course they can be taken away – with no financial obligation to make sure that they are not worse off? What kind of financial planning are they able to do under those circumstances? What kind of loan capital, commercial loans, are they able to take when they do not know what is
1970 going to happen to their income stream and it may be damaged?

The Ports, forget the STSB, I do not care who it is under, the Ports are an absolutely crucial operation, the commercial ports in particular, a crucial operation and we simply have to get them back to a stage where they are able to wash their own face and, most importantly, invest for the future.

1975 The STSB has been taking some very difficult decisions to actually arrive at that and to have a situation where, without even being consulted, as I read this policy letter, it is just a P&R decision, basically, although eventually it will be this Assembly, but what comes to this Assembly will be a P&R decision where their financial situation is undermined yet further.

1980 As I say, I am not asking for any kind of veto on what land is released or what property is released or whatever else, simply as agreed by the three parties that then a compensatory action has taken place so that the ports are no worse off.

1985 I first became aware of this amendment last night, when I had had hints of something similar through Deputy St Pier, but I thought he had gone away on it, to be honest. The first I heard from P&R was our staff picking up mild rumours from about teatime yesterday and there was no confirmation it was actually going to come forward just running it past us.

Of course, the States will do what the States will do, but all I am saying is if you really want your trading assets to run on a commercial basis then this is, I think, an appalling example to set.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

1990

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

I think Deputy Roffey has covered the governance point that I was going to make and has a far better perspective to do that than I do, because he is more directly involved. I really just wanted to talk about the wording of paragraphs 5.3.8 and paragraph 5.3.9.

1995 Actually in the context of what Deputy Roffey has just said, I think 5.3.8 should actually be worded a bit better because the way that Deputy Roffey has just described it means that there must be some financial compensation, which is not actually what paragraph 5.3.8 really says. I suppose it could be interpreted as that. But it could be interpreted as a sort of blocker, which is I think what this amendment tries to respond to, and I do not blame Deputy St Pier for interpreting it like that

2000 and he is indeed nodding his head.

So, actually, first of all, I think the problem is more in the wording of 5.3.8 but the second problem I have with –

And I give way to Deputy Roffey.

2005 **Deputy Roffey:** Can I invite the Deputy to read 5.3.8 in conjunction with other paragraphs, and in particular 5.3.4, which I think actually clarifies it?

2010 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Yes, the first thing I will say is I am really glad that that give way was under two minutes! Paragraph 5.3.4 says that any loss of net income to the States' Trading Supervisory Board and the States' Property Unit, from land transfer to the GDA will be replaced from other sources. In that case I think actually 5.3.8 is superfluous, especially given 5.3.9, which says:

Land transfers will be considered in the context of other key strategies agreed by the relevant Committees ...

2015 And that wording gives me far greater reassurance than the wording in the amendment because the amendment says that this is subject to review by the Policy & Resources Committee and when we are talking about access to assess the wider social economic and/or environmental value, I am not persuaded that P&R is always going to be the most relevant body to do that. I do think there are likely to be circumstances in which other Committees are better placed to assess that value.

So, actually, I am minded to vote against this amendment. I would actually be more supportive, given what Deputy Roffey has pointed out about 5.3.4 and what is written in 5.3.9. I think that the problematic wording that is currently in 5.3.8, so far as it is quite ambiguous and could interpreted

2020 in the way that Deputy St Pier has interpreted it, actually, I think it may be better just to leave that. But I think supplanting what is currently there with what is proposed in this amendment is a step backwards. I think it is less helpful, so I do not intend to support this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

2025 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Sir, I have completely the opposite point of view to Deputy de Sausmarez because actually I think it is quite important that we support this amendment. Actually, my understanding, and I have spoken to the Chair of the GDA, they did not want this point in the policy letter but they got a resistance from the Civil Service and it was put in.

2030 It is a bit unfortunate it is coming a bit late, but I think it is better late than never that we address this fundamental point. Because I think this should go back to the reason of actually why we set up the Development Agency in the first place and it is very much to unlock development and investment across the eastern seaboard.

2035 The Ports have had plenty of time and opportunity to look at unlocking investment within the current area of their ownership and there are many areas, which require a huge amount of investment. There will be small areas, like the Boathouse, Pier 17 and lots of other places where, unfortunately, the Ports have had plenty of opportunity to look into them but they have not come forward.

2040 I am not saying this is what the GDA wants to do but I think what we are saying is that we want that flexibility for potential projects, whatever they might be, because ultimately the GDA has been set up to be of benefit to the Island and this is what we are trying to do. This tiny agency, with a tiny budget of just three independent people have been able to do more than STSB has been able to do in showcasing an actual vision for investment into infrastructure and the type of opportunities we could have.

2045 My understanding is that what we have got today is we have got a bit of STSB sitting with their land and saying no tanks on my lawn, GDA you do a bit in St Sampson's but we do not want anything else. This is exactly what we are trying to prevent from happening. So I think it is very important that we give the flexibility in the land transfer policy and, by the way, today we are not agreeing to which assets will be transferred, we are just agreeing to the principle that there will be flexibility, 2050 that the GDA can look at opportunities, which might have an effect on Ports but they might unlock other value elsewhere.

To assure Deputy de Sausmarez, because she is right to point out, there are actually plenty of other guardrails and safeguards in the same Land Transfer Policy, so 5.3.3:

Only land which is not critical to the operation of the harbours will be considered available for potential transfer to the GDA.

2055 That is quite an important protection. There is clause 5.3.4, which does say any loss of net income to the States' Trading Supervisory Board and SPU should be compensated elsewhere. There is also 5.3.10, in accordance with a States' Resolution:

... all proposed land, buildings, or asset transfers from the States of Guernsey to the GDA or to its agents, investors or partners must first be approved by the States of Deliberation.

And 5.3.11:

The GDA will not be able to dispose or sell any land or assets transferred by the States of Guernsey to third parties ...

2060 So there are lots of guardrails to make sure we are not just selling off, transferring land and we do not understand the full benefit. So I take the opposite view. I think we have to start with the right principles to say the GDA should have the flexibility to look at land and parcels, where they think

they can bring faster, quicker, benefits to the wider Guernsey and the Ports' financial position is a separate matter in this.

I would ask the Assembly to support that so we do start with the right principles but reassuring everyone that actually there are more than enough safeguards attached anyway, to ensure that the right parcels of land are transferred in here.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you.

The response by Deputy Roffey seems entirely protectionist of what is one of our greatest enablers, which is the harbours, which have not really enabled the economy for a very long time. Deputy Roffey complained bitterly in another debate, when we were talking generally about paid parking. Yet I understand that the Salerie Corner effectively comes under, for example, is effectively owned, for want of a better word, by Property Services. Yet Deputy Roffey has complained that it was up to harbours to maintain it.

Under the new scenario, what this would actually mean, if there was a great scheme for Salerie corner and if it came at a cost to STSB, it might be the case that STSB should pay the GDA for it to go away because there has been no benefit whatsoever that I have seen over the last 15 years and I have watched masterplans, I have watched harbour plans, I have watched missions and absolutely nothing has happened east of Quay Street over the last 15 years.

Deputy Ferbrache is nodding and furiously agreeing with me. I am glad he is, because for two years he was a President of STSB also. I am going to accept this amendment because I just have not seen, and I am sorry Deputy Roffey, members of STSB, I have not seen that harbour move on in one iota since the North Beach scheme was built so many years ago. If we have got to get out of the way, Deputy Murray said, quite wisely, three NEDs on a small budget have got us this far. It was also said, I think it was Deputy Kazantseva-Miller who said those three NEDs who worked very hard, quite quietly, no fuss, and the whole, I say the whole of the Island might be going a bit far, there has been no massive reaction against the scheme.

We have got to allow talent to move on and sometimes Government has got to get out of the way and this amendment maintains that process of Government getting out of the way. So I would encourage Members to keep Government out of the way. Let the three people carry on, support their Budget and move this Island forward. We cannot keep doing the same thing they have been doing for the last 40 years, at the harbours, which has been absolutely nothing.

The Bailiff: Deputy Helyar.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, sir.

I would just like to echo the words of those Members who have commended the Development Agency on the work it has done. Imagine what great work it could have done if we had not almost completely emasculated it with all of the amendments that were brought at the time that the policy letter was brought in.

One of the things that we have recently been debating and will be debating again in the New Year is the lack of money that we have, whether it be revenue, or now in the position that we are in we cannot spend our capital because of the fear of losing our investment return on it. One of the only things that we do have sat there static, not earning us anything whatsoever, is property, and that is what we should be using as leverage to enable development so I fully endorse and support this amendment and we should be thinking of even more creative methods for using what we do have, which we are not using properly at the moment, or certainly gaining any direct financial benefit from in order to improve our economy.

So I wholeheartedly support this amendment.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Oliver.

2115 **Deputy Oliver:** Thank you, sir.

I feel that the sign of things, when we just keep doing the same thing we have done over and over again, I do think that the GDA has actually produced some really good quality work. When I saw the amendment, I thought this could have gone actually further. But I understand that we need to get it through the Assembly and everything, so I accept that.

2120 Considering that the GDA have actually said they are happy with that, then I will be happy with that. But I remember a meeting that we had when STSB came into the Development & Planning Authority and said, we want to do this. We said, that is fine, you can. The STSB were a little worried because of the LPB that was coming forward and we have got things within our policy that we can actually bring things forward, if they are of benefit economically, socially. So it could have come
2125 forward quicker, through MC10.

Anyway, I just really want to say that we just need to move things on and the sign of madness is always doing the same thing over and over again and not learning from our mistakes and taking from what Deputy Helyar said, that we have got no money, we actually really could do with the GDA actually drumming up support for a lot of this.

2130 Although St Sampson's, the masterplan of it looks really good, it is a 20-year project. There are a number of things in St Peter Port that could be picked off first and this amendment will definitely help that, so please do support it and thank you for Deputy Murray and Deputy St Pier for bringing it.

2135 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thanks to Deputy Oliver for not only being very positive but for reminding me that of course it should have been yesterday, but there is actually the harbour planning inquiry, which is an important part of the process, which will be next Monday, for stakeholders and others
2140 to raise issues about the vision they want to go.

I thought we had excellent speeches from Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, Deputy Helyar, Deputy Inder, basically saying we do need to do things differently. I will use some of Deputy Oliver's words in another context for a different debate. Yes, can I be unanimous, like Mrs Slocombe? No. I very much supported the amendment.

2145 I think we took the gem of Deputy St Pier's ideas and adapted it because we want to keep Ports onside and STSB onside and there was an indication that they were, to a degree, supportive of the outlook for Deputy St Pier, but we did not see it as a sort of non-negotiable point and basically the revised wording seeks to provide greater flexibility, noting that while the sustainability of the Ports is an important consideration, there will be occasions when the States be considered in the round
2150 and wider opportunities.

I point out there that, for a long time in this term, there was talk of a lot of the Ports activity moving to a completely different part of the east coast, that was not aligned to St Peter Port or St Sampson's. I do not think we should just be about maintaining the financial sustainability of the Ports because they are a States' asset.

2155 We need to embrace the private sector; we need to look at what Jersey have achieved and improve upon it. One thing they have done – they have made mistakes there – but one thing they have done quite well is they have built a lot of apartments, both social and non-social. We really do need to utilise a get-up-and-go philosophy of making things happen but at the same time have social objectives, tourist objectives, environmental objectives. Not just objectives of sustaining the
2160 Ports.

We do not want that kind of block on what we do. We want vision. There was a vision. That did not go anywhere, either. Although I know Deputy Le Tocq really tried to make it work. But we were stymied somehow and we have got to give the Development Agency the flexibility to move forward

in the future in partnership with the States, to actually achieve capital growth, achieve ecological sustainability, make the blue economy work. We are not doing that enough.

Maybe we will have a big economy. Deputy Vermeulen always says, no more taxation, let us improve our economy. Well we will not even get to that point if we do not go through the barriers and we do not have a more commercial approach on occasion to letting the land go. So I say support the policy letter today and support the amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, I have worn many hats in relation to this. Deputy Inder referred to my previous presidency of the STSB. I am a great supporter of the Ports and Harbour Board and I always have been. I was also, though, one of the prime movers of the Development Agency, ably assisted by Deputy de Sausmarez and by Deputy Inder, and I was also going to second the amendment that Deputy St Pier, because the genesis of it is his idea and it has been, I suppose I have to say grudgingly, it has been approved by Deputy Murray and others.

It is a good amendment because I do not see anything in this amendment, which will hinder the matters that Deputy Roffey referred to. I really do not. We want to be as expansive as we can be. So I think this should be, it is not a sticking amendment, it is a stonking amendment. It really is a good amendment in relation to where we are.

What I say in connection with this is that we should be encouraging, as Deputy Gollop said at some length, in relation to the development of our economy, because we have not done much so far. Let us finish off with two points made by Deputy Helyar. Firstly, the States tried to emasculate this GDA, when it was being put forward. Thankfully, it got through by the skin of its teeth. Secondly, commend the three individuals who on about four pence ha'penny a year have brought forward some really constructive proposals.

It is quite clear to the presentation they gave this is just a starting point. So let us vote conclusively in favour of this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

High praise indeed from Deputy Ferbrache, wanting to be associated with a stonking amendment! It is a missed opportunity for the States that he and I could not have been associated with the same amendment! My thanks to Deputy Helyar and Deputy Kazantseva-Miller for their support of this. They absolutely grasp what the amendment is seeking to achieve.

In response to Deputy Oliver, who said she felt it ought to go further, indeed I agree. My proposals, which Deputy Ferbrache describing as a 'stonking' proposal, was to delete 5.3.8 entirely. So the compromise that P&R have come up with is one very much that I can live with because it achieves the objective that I was setting out. But I do agree with her, it probably could have gone further.

I say that because Deputy Kazantseva-Miller described what she described as safeguards. Others may see them as hurdles. This policy letter would make a good script for Yes Minister. We have the KIDP and the BFP that need approval by the PAG and also P&R and also the States of Deliberation. There are so many hurdles for the GDA – there is another set of initials – to move anything forward to delivery that having this in the land transfer policy was yet another potential barrier for them.

So I think this is the smallest possible improvement that could have been achieved but we absolutely need to recognise that there are already enormous and significant, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, being polite, safeguards, but I would describe it as hurdles, which the GDA need to leap in order to be able to deliver any of their ambition, through the approval of the Key Infrastructure Delivery Programme, the Business and Funding Plan, for those that are not keeping up with the initials, the approval of the Political Oversight Group, which contains representatives of P&R, Environment & Infrastructure and Economic Development, and then it all comes back before the

States and we all know what the States can do with the final set of proposals, which Deputy Helyar has alluded to.

There will be plenty of opportunities, if Members do not like what is proposed in relation to land transfer, for it to be derailed and changed or whatever language you choose to use. I think, actually, the wording of the explanatory note, which Deputy Gollop has referred to at the bottom, really does absolutely sum it up very well, it seeks to provide greater flexibility, noting that the sustainability of the Ports is an important consideration. We all need to recognise that. But it is not the be all and end all, which is what 5.3.8 currently says. It says it 'must' manage or improve financial sustainability.

No, clearly that is just not appropriate, and there will be occasion, as the explanatory note says, where this needs to be considered in the round of wider opportunities. That sums it up nicely. I very much hope that it does reflect the majority will of this Assembly. I am very grateful for P&R considering this at relatively short notice, with the support of the GDA and it needs to be approved so we can move on with the rest of the debate.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: I will turn back to the proposer of Amendment 1, Deputy Murray, to reply to the debate.

Deputy Murray: Thank you, sir.

I would like to remind the Assembly that we are the custodians on behalf of Islanders of all of the land that actually is under our control or direction at the moment, other than perhaps where we have it leased from the Crown. So it is not a matter of which part of the States needs to be involved in this, it is very much trying to do the best with what we have got. Too often, unfortunately, we introduce these swim lanes, or guardrails, simply because we are trying to ensure that particular Committees, if you like, are not disadvantaged by some of the activity that we agree in here.

Far from trying to damage STSB in any shape or form or block STSB in any shape or form – and I did in my introduction mention that P&R most particularly are very concerned to support STSB to try to maximise the values of Ports, such as they are – the opportunity actually here is far greater than that.

I also do not think, necessarily, that this is going to be some kind of free for all. I think it was Deputy Oliver that mentioned there are many opportunities along the seafront that would not necessarily have any real impact on the Ports but which in themselves could be maximised and the maximisation is for the benefit of the Island. Not for STSB, not for P&R, not even for this Assembly. It is for the Islanders.

That is where we sometimes forget that we are representatives here, acting on their behalf, in their best interests. And I think what the GDA have managed to do is to create that bridge, which is necessary, because we cannot do that. We cannot do that. We are hide-bound by tradition, custom and practice, and indeed many rules.

But the GDA are a free agent in that regard but they are not irresponsible. What they have chosen to do is to create a vision that I do not think, so far, I have heard from any quarter that there is a difficulty with it. They have a difficulty in trying to achieve it. But that is just the Bridge and that is where their major focus is going to be for the foreseeable future. But it should not exclude them from when the opportunity arises elsewhere to be able to look at that opportunity and consider it on its merits.

The States on behalf of the Island will not lose out here. There was concern about what would be the criteria – I think it was from Deputy Roffey – over what would be paid or what would the compensation be? That will come back as part of the Land Transfer Policy, which, as Deputy St Pier said, we will be the final arbiter. If we are not happy with it, we are not happy with it. But they need to be able to go into the marketplace and negotiate as far as they can with these opportunities when they present themselves. That is what they can do and what we cannot.

So I would urge all of the Assembly to support this. It is not an attempt to usurp the STSB, it is an attempt to maximise the assets that we have got and the GDA are the correct vehicle to be able to do that.

Thank you, sir.

2270

The Bailiff: Members of the States, it is now time to vote on Amendment 1, proposed by Deputy Murray, seconded by Deputy St Pier, and therefore I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Amendment 1, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Amendment 1.

Carried – Pour 28 Contre 6, Ne vote pas 3, Did not vote 2, Absent 1

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

2275

The Bailiff: In respect of Amendment 1, proposed by Deputy Murray, seconded by Deputy St Pier, there voted in favour, 28 Members; 6 Members voted against; 3 Members abstained; 3 Members did not participate in that vote, but I will declare Amendment 1 duly carried, which means that Proposition 2 has been modified.

2280

General debate – Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, sir.

At the risk of delaying Members while I was still crafting some of my speech but, Members, the year is 1803. Lieutenant Governor John Doyle has just been elected and he had a vision, much like Members of the GDA. His vision was to fill in the Braye du Valle, which was achieved in 1808, and he created major infrastructure changes in our Island, some of which we now know as the Bridge, and I welcome the vision that the GDA have had and been the figurative bridge between us and the people and infrastructure changes, it is what we very desperately need.

2285

2290 So I really welcome this policy letter to regenerate the Bridge again and part of that, I understand, is to put a bridge over the Bridge. So, there we are, three bridges in one sentence. Again, it is a significant opportunity for us, as an Island, and specifically the Bridge, and I will declare a special interest again. I live about 200 metres from the Bridge. I traverse it daily, with my dogs and various shopping, make use of it. I will certainly benefit when this comes about.

2295 Section 3.5 describes some of the infrastructure, including permanent flood and sea level rise mitigation measures, which we desperately need to regenerate the Bridge and, again, the area of the Braye du Valle. We have heard in previous updates today from Employment & Social Security how Parc La Lacheur is now scheduled to come on board, albeit very much delayed.

2300 So I support the reorganisation of the Bridge as a whole, especially the parking and the circulation of through traffic, which, while I hope will still maintain reasonable access for those using the retail premises and any regeneration of there.

2305 Deputy Murray mentioned the hundreds, yes hundreds of homes and the policy letter says some 400 to 600 new homes to be realised at the Bridge, some of which are to be allocated as rental, although some, I suspect, will be for residential owner-occupiers, too. This got me slightly worried because we all know currently we have the looming GST ship on our horizon and coming into dock in 2027. A higher GST rate will likely interest the overall cost of construction materials and services and this could lead to higher prices for new housing units, potentially making them less affordable for buyers.

2310 Because, if the increased GST leads to higher housing prices, buyers might need larger mortgages, larger loans, which could increase their debt burden, and mortgage providers, I am sure, will take into account affordability, that is the key thing here, when assessing applicants for mortgages. With GST in place, their funds available to service the mortgage the loan, with GST in place, may reduce impact on their purchasing power.

2315 With this in mind, will developers and investors want to make that leap? They might become more cautious, potentially delaying or scaling down any new projects until the market adjusts to the new regime, and this could slow down the pace of the new housing developments, which I very much hope it does not because we desperately need them and we desperately need to see reinvigoration, not only on the Bridge but there are other opportunities on the eastern seaboard.

Will we, as Government, be asked later on to introduce measures that help the developers, the GDA, such as subsidies or even more land transfer under the policy that this policy letter creates?

2320 Just one final thing. Section 5.3.4, Members have already been alerted to it earlier and it was the subject of a discussion. It states:

Any loss of net income ... to the States' Trading Supervisory Board and States' Property Unit from land transferred to the GDA will be replaced from other sources.

2325 Now I would really like to understand what those other sources are. If it is from the GDA or from whoever benefits from the land transfer, will it be rents, will it be financial? Because my understanding is that the GDA does not have any assets at the moment, so how will they be able to replace that land transfer value from other sources? Perhaps if Deputy Murray, when summing up, could allude to where that is going to come from or will it just mean that we are transferring and we hold an investment value in the land and it is able to be transferred back or is there any nominal value attached to it? I would look to understand that a little bit more.

2330 But in summary, I support the policy letter and I will be voting for it, as amended, and welcome the development of the Bridge and the bridge over the Bridge, on the new Bridge from the governor in 1808.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Sir, you will be glad to know I have not really got much to add and the reasons are because we have had two very good speeches, particularly from Deputy Murray and the second, on the other amendment, was Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, which has effectively covered my point.

2340 Members, this has had a very difficult birth, it really has, and this goes all the way back to probably 2011-12, if not before. The previous harbourmaster told me that he had stacks and stacks of paperwork under his desk where there have been multiple attempts at creating some kind of vision and the great mistake always appeared to be, not his words these are more my interpretation of his words, is that Governments had to touch it last.

2345 What we have done here, and hopefully, I cannot see this not going through the Assembly, it would be insane if it did not, what we have finally accepted is that the individual Government, individual Members of the Government, do not need to have the input they so often desire. Sometimes, and I think this is going to be a very good example, accepting what Deputy St Pier ... there are many claymores possibly along the way, the fact that we have got it out of Government is so important. It is not politicians with their visions, these are unelected members quietly going
2350 along their way, talking to members of the public and selling quietly. No show, no baggage, not elected – which sometimes is a good thing – three decent people talking properly to business. This is actually a good thing.

I was always critical of the seafront enhancement and I think Deputy St Pier will accept it did not really amount to much. I had been in a couple of meetings in the last term and they were not particularly well organised. Again, it was the same problem, a bunch of politicians sitting in a room getting – and Deputy Taylor will love me for this – getting the colouring pens out, as usual.

2355 This is really good news for Guernsey. This will move this Island on and I genuinely hope those who have always said that they want to move the economy on or boost the economy or grow the economy, this is the one opportunity we will have to move this conversation on. I am not in fear here, today, because I do not think this is going to lose. This should be fully adopted by every single Member of this Assembly, who really has been involved in it. I do thank the President of E&I, Deputy Murray, and those three Members for quietly, competently, getting us to this point.

2360 This is actually a good news story for Guernsey. I know people do not want to hear it, but this is good news for Guernsey and this moves this Island forward.

2365 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: I am not sure who these people are that Deputy Inder thinks do not want to hear the good news, because I have not come across any. It is important after the debate on the amendment to make sure that neither myself nor STSB are characterising it in any way as being dog in the manger or trying to stop this moving forward. We have had excellent relationships with the GDA, we have discussed their plans, we have enthused over their plans around our table. The question of whether ... well that has gone, so let us move on.

2375 In many ways, I think the message we were trying to get across when we brought the commercial ports policy letter early in this term was do not just concentrate on the cost, which is what everybody did, but look at what it frees up, an enormous amount of commercial opportunities, which would have involved the private sector and investment. It would not have all been done by the States but I think that debate did not really grasp that but now I think we are beginning to grasp the fact that
2380 there are absolutely extraordinary opportunities available and I am delighted that they are starting with St Sampson's.

I have the same feeling for St Sampson's as Deputy Gabriel. My granddad was nightwatchman at St Sampson's during the height of the granite trade. In fact, it was the granite trade that brought him over here as a sailor. That is when the Roffey name arrived here. I am passionate about the Bridge and the idea of taking off the through traffic, through the Bridge, is probably one of the
2385 most positive things I have heard for a very long time.

So I do not think anybody is looking to stop the way, put in the way here. I hope it is not entirely comparative with the Braye du Valle – no, I am not going to give way – because the driver there was the fear of invasion by the French, of course, that they might land at L'Ancrese, because the anti-tank wall was not there to stop them then, at a time when the tide was up and therefore only a little bit of militia may be down there and Fort George groups would not be able to march down to see them off.

Actually, partly as a job creation scheme, because one of the worries with the French, was that so many young Guernsey people were going out to the colonies to Australia and Canada and other places like that, because there was not enough work in Guernsey, that others, these days you cannot get enough people to do the work, they wanted to create jobs to make sure that the young men of fighting age, in particular, were here to make sure that the French were able to be seen off, if they did arrive; which they did not. That is deterrence, I suppose.

I am very excited by these plans. I think there needs to be some reality check over parts of it. For instance, a lot of this is predicated on moving the flood defences for the Braye and the Bridge area and behind it, right the way through to the Vale Pond, from what is going to be done, hopefully very quickly, by E&I, on the Bridge side, right out to the entrance of the harbour. That can only be done when we no longer need to bring fuel ships into, as I understand it, St Sampson's; which means there needs to be, let us go full circle to where STSB were at the beginning of this process, that means that commercial vessels need to go outside of the harbour in order to allow that to happen.

Yes, with light fuel, we could take the tankers out, in order – are you alright, Deputy Gollop? – and use a buoy that you can hook up to but for the heavy fuel, that is used by the power station, that needs a heated pipe, so at the moment that is a number of years away. This is a long-term plan but I think the GDA are fully aware of that and there are bits that can move more quickly than others, but it is a jigsaw and I hope it will do better than the masterplan for St Peter Port Harbour, or whatever, but do not think there are not going to be many slips between cup and lip.

My main message here is I really did want to put the record straight that neither myself nor the STSB are in any form of blockage here. There is no scheme or no land that we will not consider favourably if it is to the benefit of the Island to release. All we were trying to say is that if you can try to do it in a way that does not damage the business that is the Ports, because they are absolutely crucial to our success as a community, they are probably, the harbours even more than the Airport in some ways, the most important bit of infrastructure that we have.

But I am encouraged by this. There are one or two little bits, I think every one of us probably have 90% of the plans that we agree with and then there are one or two bits that we look askance at, but that is fine, that will all come out in the mix. I am not picking up any kind of opposition to this at all. I would almost encourage you, sir, to invite people who want to vote against these proposals to stand next because if there is nobody, we may be wasting our time here.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: Thank you, sir.

I will speak briefly on this. I think the sense of the Assembly is to vote in favour of this. I am very much in favour. Those on Development & Planning have had cause to meet with the GDA on a number of occasions. They do seem to be a shaft of bright light, very intelligent people, and I think they are coming up with very good plans, from what we have seen so far.

I agree with what Deputy Roffey has said, some of this is more long-term, particularly where it comes to potentially long-term plans for moving the power station, which I think is probably a few decades away. But there are some early impacts that we can take advantage of and one of their earlier proposals – and a very sensible one – is Longue Houge can be used for storing waste and raising the entire site, as part of the flood defences, by a couple of metres, which gives us an early win in terms of dealing with building waste and that sort of thing, which can have an early impact.

On that, perhaps I could ask Deputy Murray if, when they are considering our straitened financial circumstances in their upcoming mini-Budget, they can take that point into account and deduct

from the Budget £500,000 from double handling of waste, which I think is not going to be necessary, because it can be used at Longue Hougue, where it is currently being dumped.

One other point, I would agree with a point that Deputy Gabriel has raised, that was slightly tangential regarding GST putting up building costs. Yes, if you are putting together a property that has a building cost, excluding the land of £500,000, then at 6%, that is £30,000 onto the cost of a flat, or whatever it is. It is a major issue, which we should all be inclined to take into account when we are considering the costs that we impose on our people. Everything we do needs to have one eye to what is the cost. But on this subject, the cost is much outweighed by the benefit so I cannot think why anyone would vote against this particular proposal.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Thank you, sir.

I am certainly not going to oppose the policy letter and, like others, I applaud the work that the GDA has done in producing some exciting plans for St Sampson's and the Bridge. However, Deputy Murray in his opening remarks referred to the development of the east coast and, of course, or the eastern seaboard, what has been done so far is a long way short of proposals for developing the eastern seaboard.

Fundamental to realising the potential of the east coast in developing the blue economy, for example, is a decision on where the commercial ports of this Island get located. Members of the STSB bear the scars of debates earlier this term, where we came forward with a very thoroughly worked policy letter saying here are all the options, we consider that these ones are the frontrunners and we need a bit more money to take the research forward and the States fundamentally said no.

It was out of that debate that the GDA was born. In many ways it is a great idea, because clearly when you are talking about long-term infrastructure projects, it is useful to have somebody in the pilot seat who is not subject to the political cycle that the rest of us are subject to and can take a long-term view and indeed take a view on sources of funding outside the States of Guernsey, etc.

So I think the GDA is serving a very valuable purpose. The problem is that we have asked it to do much. Basically the States abdicated responsibility for deciding where Guernsey's commercial ports should be located and have basically appointed these three very able people in effect to tell us what the answer is. Now, I said at the time, that is not the way governments normally use a development agency. Governments normally make a decision that they want a train to run from London to Birmingham, or something, and then tell somebody else to get on and design and implement the railway.

We have not told the GDA what we want them to do and fundamentally that is not a responsibility that politicians can duck. The GDA, very able people, hard-working, full of virtues, but ultimately this is a political decision about where Guernsey's commercial ports get located and without that decision being in place, nothing very fundamental can be agreed on the shape and future of St Peter Port, in particular.

Now, St Sampson's is affected too because, as Deputy Roffey reminds us, the fuel tankers have to be moved outside the area that will be locked in by the harbour gates. I believe, actually, there is in the plans a berth for fuel tankers outside the harbour gates, but within the sort of fairway to St Sampson's so there is a sort of contingency there in the event that the States do not decide anything more fundamental on what happens to the fuel tankers, if indeed we need fuel tankers, but they have been able to cope with the contingencies or eventualities of what might happen on the commercial ports decision in the context of St Sampson's and the Bridge and have come up with these great ideas.

Unfortunately, it seems that it will fall to the next Assembly to make fundamental decisions about the commercial ports facilities and therefore, flowing from that decision, what can be done with St Peter Port.

2490 Those bigger issues that are yet to be addressed, we have been long stymied as STSB in doing
work around the Ports by the absence of the Local Planning Briefs for the Harbour Action Areas and
it is nice to see some progress being made on that now. But Deputy Kazantseva-Miller was
suggesting earlier that STSB could have just gone on and done stuff and the reality was we were
2495 very constrained. When we were considering options, for example, for the Boathouse area, we were
told all you can do is extend the existing lease by a maximum of no more than three years –

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

2500 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** This really illustrates the problem we have had with the STSB of
pointing figures at the Planning and other departments. We have for those specific purposes called
a meeting with STSB, probably over a year ago, to specifically tell them that there are policy avenues,
policy MC10, through which development was not constrained in the harbour and could be
2505 progressed, subject to different considerations. We specifically made that point, year on, still
nothing has come through the harbour.

Well, sir, even if we accept that may have been the situation for the last 12 months, that was not
the situation before then –

I give way to Deputy Roffey.

2510 **Deputy Roffey:** Thank you.

As Deputy Parkinson, I do not think was at the meeting with the DPA, I have to inform him it was
a bizarre experience where the political Members were absolutely at odds with the professional
advice we were being given by their officers about what we could and could not do. I am afraid,
2515 when we are told by professional officers you cannot give a lease beyond a certain period, it is very
difficult to attract outside investments.

Deputy Parkinson: Yes, I think there are different views on what the position has been but even
as I say, even if we accept the views of political Members of the DPA that for the last 12 months the
2520 road blocks have been removed, the reality is that for most of this States' term and the previous
terms, there were clear roadblocks in place, which may or may not continue to exist, and it was
virtually impossible and I know from my time as President of the STSB, because we very clearly
wanted to do something on the Boathouse site and we were very clearly told no you cannot.

I think it is pretty unfair to say that the DPA in the last however many years has done far more
2525 than STSB ever did. The reality was STSB could not.

Fortunately, progress is now being made on the Local Planning Briefs. They are not there yet but
they will be there and clearly what can be done around the Ports will become clearer.

In summary, I applaud the work of the GDA. I think they have done a great job and I support the
Propositions of this policy letter but I hope that the next Assembly has the courage to make the
2530 fundamental, strategic decisions, which this Assembly has dumped, around what happens on the
eastern seaboard, because the GDA is doing great work on St Sampson's but St Sampson's is not
the eastern seaboard.

Deputy Queripel: Rule 26(1), sir, please.

2535 **The Bailiff:** Can I invite those Members who wish to speak in debate to stand in their places?
Is it still your wish, Deputy Queripel, that I put a motion to –?

Deputy Queripel: Yes, sir.

The Bailiff: Well, Members of the States, the motion is that subject to hearing from Deputy Murray in reply, there be no further debate. Those in favour; those against?

Members voted Contre.

The Bailiff: I will declare that lost.

2545 Before I call anyone else, is there any Member present who wishes to speak against any of the four Propositions, including Proposition 2, which has been amended?
Deputy Brouard, then.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

2550 I was hoping just to stay oblivious and in my seat, nice and quietly, but Deputy Roffey has basically poked me into life. *(Interjection)* Woke me up, I suppose! Thank you so much for that, Deputy Roffey. Although I have listened to every word of your entire conversation.

One of the reasons I came into politics was because we were starting, back in 2002, to sell off utilities. All those privatisation ideas. I think about then people were considering selling off Guernsey
2555 Water and Guernsey Electricity. A mistake would have happened had that been and I joined politics.

I was in China some time back and I visited a very large, new building, really shiny, really tall, probably on the east coast of somewhere in China. Really tall; really big. At the very top penthouse you went up as a tourist and they showed you the plan of the area before they built the skyscraper and the Chinese had a tiny little plaque and said, first of all, we removed the indigenous population
2560 and there is a little picture of a few huts and things. They were just moved! They were just gone. Reading this, I just had that sort of vision that anything that was there already, sorry, we are coming through, it is the new east coast development.

Now, Deputy Parkinson made some interesting points. It is probably our fault because we did not make a decision on the harbour. We were about to make one, which was a really sensible one,
2565 which said actually we are going to extend St Peter Port, rather than put a new harbour on a beach, copying what Jersey did with their harbour. But we are just not brave enough, sometimes, to make a decision. If you are going to extend the harbour, extend the harbour; fine. The idea that we are going to somehow have a new harbour at Longue Hougue is, I think, foolish.

I am a bit cross, as well, with Deputy Inder, 'getting your colouring pens out'. A lot of people
2570 have spent a lot of time over the years with some really good ideas of what to do and it is just a shame that we have not been able to, as a States, put those ideas together. Some of the hydro-port ones and things have been going on, about 2012, I think it was. Some really good, interesting ideas of what to do with the east coast, to put a lagoon, be able to have some fantastic sailing, to be able to have a hydroelectric plant to run through as a lagoon drain and then filled up again. There is
2575 some fantastic stuff. So I hope things like that do come about with this Agency.

Probably, where I cannot quite get there yet –so I am not going to vote against it; I am probably going to abstain – it is around 5.3.10, which is all land and buildings are assets transferred from the States of Guernsey to its agents, investors or partners must first be approved by the States of Deliberation. I am just not keen to sell off our east coast. Perhaps some of it has to go but I am
2580 probably not the one to be signing the papers on it.

Something Deputy Murray can perhaps help me with, in 5.3.11, not that I am going to be voting for it, so he probably will not bother, but if he does but it is, 'The GDA will not be able to dispose or sell any land.' Disposed, does that mean lease as well? Because you can quite happily put a piece of land out of action for 100 years by leasing it and, therefore, they have got around the idea of selling
2585 it, etc. Just some clarification on that.

In some ways I welcome it. I am just a little bit nervous. I am probably one of those that like to own the asset and manage it that way but I wish them well with it, but I probably will not be voting for it.

Thank you, sir.

2590

The Bailiff: Deputy Mahoney.

Deputy Mahoney: Thank you, sir.

2595 At least I was not totally alone, although Deputy Brouard said he was probably just going to abstain. I still have not decided. I really just wanted to put a few words of caution out there. It is very easy to get drawn, looking down the road at lots of shiny new things and shiny new buildings and penthouse apartments looking over the sea, etc, and those plans that I think most of us have seen.

2600 Like everyone else, I commend the three individuals for the work they have done. There is some great visionary stuff there. I have no issue with any of those things and certainly the enthusiasm that has been shown in the Assembly today and previously for the development of the eastern seaboard, or whatever we are calling it, and the Bridge area.

2605 But really the reason I have stood is to say that an element of realism in all of this, a cautionary tale, that for many years, there is another scheme being proposed in the north of the Island, at Leale's Yard, that we have kicked down the road for a long time; certainly all of this term, and made no decisions on it unless P&R have made decisions that we are not aware of yet. That is a bunch of people that have come up with an idea for housing and supermarkets and light industrial, blah, blah, blah.

2610 Whether you like it or not that is fine; it does not really matter. But we have not really done much with that, have we? In the great scheme of things what is being proposed here is partly that. It is some housing and it is a harbour and other bits and pieces. All I am trying to do is raise a note of caution that even should this all go ahead, it has still got to get past this hurdle, or whatever we are calling it here, and we are great at building that really, really high, so that nobody can get over it.

2615 We are being asked to put aside £1.5 million – £1.6 million, thank you – to investigate and fund this further. That is quite a lot of money, in my book, £1.6 million. I appreciate the spend to save and speculate to accumulate and all of those things. I get that. But it is still, at a time when we do not have very much/any money, we are being asked to spend another one-and-a-half million pounds to fund some investigations and further work on something, which when the plans come forward, this is obviously going to fly through today, we do not have the money to build anyway.

2620 We do not have any of those funds to do that.

If it is all going to be done by private funds; I will eat my hat! That is just not going to happen. Everyone always wants some public money. We have seen that recently with something. So my fear is at some point in Jan or Feb we are going to have P&R stood up saying there is no money and the F&IP, we are going to cut this and cut that and cut the other. At the same time, we are about to give away £1.6 million funding. All I would do is urge Members, this is going to sail through, just to give that some consideration. Should we do this and they come up with some brilliant plans, who is paying for the stuff at the end of the day, because we do not have the money to do it?

2625

That is all really, sir. Thank you.

2630 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Christmas, two weeks today, and we are going to be here tomorrow, no doubt. So if anybody wants to bring any presents and leave them in the Members' Room for me, I will be very grateful. They can do them anonymously, if they want!

2635 I think in relation to where we are to this and let me just say, a point that Deputy Roffey has made a couple of times, in my time as President of P&R for three-and-a-bit years, I discussed with Deputy Roffey and his colleagues at STSB the issue of the Development Agency, other matters, on a number of occasions. And it was always positive; from him, his colleagues and the Civil Service, it was always positive.

2640 So I do not think he needs to apologise. I think he is right to highlight the issue. There was no negativity in connection therewith. We have had some historical references from Deputy Gabriel

and ancestral references from Deputy Roffey. He comes from the north of the Island, I come from St Peter Port, so I cannot match those on this particular occasion.

2645 In relation to where we are, I think that Deputy Mahoney, he did not sound too much like a Christmas humbug, he was right to just mention a few comments of caution in relation to where we are, because I am 100% in favour of this project, in relation to the situation that has been raised, but we are at the foot of Everest. We are not going to even get in the next 10 years to the top of Ben Nevis. So we have got a long way to go before we get there.

2650 But Deputy Le Tocq has made the point on a number of occasions that in the time of the Napoleonic Wars, Guernsey was bust, we had no money. So what did our forefathers do? They built the market; 1822, 1830. Twenty-odd years later, built the harbour. They went and they borrowed and they got a lot of money and by the time of the First World War, it was all paid off. They were brave and they were resilient and they had foresight.

2655 I am not trying to draw an exact analogy between the two but we have not got the money, Deputy Mahoney is right. We do not have the money. But that does not mean you cannot start somewhere. We had this bit of a skirmish between Deputy Kazantseva-Miller and Deputy Parkinson and others about the Boathouse. I actually know a fair bit about the Boathouse because in 2008 we actually put proposals to try and develop it and we were told by the relevant authorities, do not worry, it will be done next year. Well we have had 25 Tory prime ministers between then and now
2660 and it still has not been done!

So I think we are right to move away from the problems and look forward with a degree of optimism. But we have got a long way to go. Certain characters get lost in the history of it. Now the person who used to be the Deputy Chief Minister of this Island, used to be a non-States' Member on STSB during my time and I think on Deputy Parkinson's time and on Deputy Roffey's time, Stuart Falla, CBE, was the prime mover of this agency. The prime mover of it. And said that this is the way to do it because the previous incarnations of it had got nowhere. So let us do this. He was the man who was moving it forward.
2665

In the spirit of Christmas, we ought to say thanks to him. I certainly say a personal thanks to him because we would not be here without his considerable efforts and foresight in relation to where we are.
2670

I am completely in favour of it. We should be looking at things. We have talked about St Sampson's, quite rightly, because that has been neglected by our Islands for many years, even when – I cannot remember was it grandfather or great-grandfather was a nightwatchman – probably even before then, down at the Bridge; things have not been done. It is in a sad state and it needs to be improved.
2675

Deputy Helyar, in a different context, has referred to Leale's Yard. Let the people get on with that. For goodness' sake let them get on with it, let us actually build some houses without finding reasons for another 26 objections to everything. So I commend everybody, be realistic and vote in favour of this proposal.
2680

The Bailiff: Deputy Taylor.

Deputy Taylor: Thank you, sir.

2685 To start, I would probably say that I echo a lot of the comments made by Deputy Mahoney. I really want to pick up, I suppose the costs to date, because I think when we spend £50,000 or we donate £50,000, however you frame it, and the Guernsey Development Agency have achieved an awful lot and I have got to say I did not support them when this policy letter was put to the States but credit where credit is due, they have produced a lot of decent ideas; credit to them.

2690 But, to apologise in advance to Deputy Helyar who will not like me mentioning Leale's Yard, to pick up on the point that Deputy Mahoney has made, these things do get progressively more difficult as you put more detail on. The colouring crayons is the easy part at the start but when you start putting meat on the bone, that is when these things get difficult and that is when the progress starts to slow down because the reality of actually doing the work ... The £1.6 million is going to, I

think, need to achieve an awful lot to meet the expectations that I think this Assembly now has for the Guernsey Development Agency.

I suppose, like Deputy Mahoney, a degree of caution in what we might see coming forward I suppose in the next year, that £1.6 million, it is in the 2025 Budget. So we should be seeing, if we scale it up from our £50,000 investment so far, an awful lot more than just a couple of sketches.

The next point I want to make, just touch on, was, Deputy Ferbrache just touched on it, this difference between STSB and DPA. From where I have been involved, it seemed to me that the Planning professionals, the officers, had been advising to STSB along a certain line and then actually when we have been politically more involved, raised the question about how policy MC10 will actually be used in practice and if it will be our decision as politicians to decide whether that policy is enacted and could be used without a Local Planning Brief. At that point then a conversation was had with STSB.

I raise that because I think – Deputy Roffey has left the room – a certain amount of defence is needed for STSB. I know they have not produced a whole load of sketches of detailed ideas about cafes and bits and pieces. I do not think they were ever given, I might stand to be corrected, I do not think they were ever given a brief to come up with all these detailed ideas. It is more about the actual commercial aspects of the harbour.

Deputy de Sausmarez is shaking her head so perhaps I have got that wrong. I suppose, just to end, I will be supporting the policy letter. The only one I feel I have got to mention, I am not entirely sure I have got confidence to support Proposition 3, directing the Policy & Resources Committee to prepare a land transfer portfolio for approval by the States. I am confident it would require approval by the States but based on my experience of how the land transfer for Richmond went, it does not fill me with much confidence.

So I am going to abstain from Proposition 3, but on the whole I am supportive of the proposals going forward.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Sir, I think it is important to have caution and have a balanced approach, but I do want to still focus more on the positives and as Deputy Inder said, this is a very positive news story and we should be learning quickly from this positive news story that this I think came through the amendment that Deputy Helyar originally brought to the harbour policy and we have got a GDA, which with only three people working part time, with a budget of under £100,000, has achieved in a year – not more than a year – more than anything the States has been able to do to date, whether it was the seafront enhancement or other iterations of subcommittees or forums created by the States.

For me, this really is a great case of small, dedicated teams of people, with the right skill set, working together to a common, mandated goal. This topic will come into focus a bit later with a different requête. I do wonder whether we should be thinking bigger and wider and really learn from this very positive experience so far. For example, in the Isle of Man, they have also got a development agency that looks at developing Isle of Man state-owned brownfield sites. In Jersey there is a development corporation that has significant tranches of land allocated. The question, really, to this Assembly and perhaps to the next political term, is whether we should be thinking bigger and enabling more of these kinds of structures to develop assets owned by the States that are currently not being developed.

One of them that comes to mind is the Guernsey Business Park. It is a huge investment and at the rate the States is going, there is no chance this will be developed in any kind of close by future, even though, from a planning perspective, we are currently earmarking it into the IDP Review. There is no chance with the rate of how the States work, with the amount of Committees involved, and just the pace of how we move, the snail pace of how we move, that anything will be done?

2745 So I would really encourage whoever is going to be standing, whoever is going to be listening, to think bigger, be more ambitious and while we are the bottom of Mount Everest, we are further than we would have been if this was done in the States because nothing would have happened. I really encourage everyone to see how we can put this kind of structure for other types of development or perhaps even enlarging Guernsey Development Agency's mandate and say, do you
2750 know what, you have got the Business Park now, you go and have a look at what could be done there, to actually develop the housing we desperately need, light industrial, whichever it is.

Because I can guarantee that things will happen quicker because this is exactly what has been happening with the enabling structures we have put with the GDA. Let us be more ambitious, let us start putting these kinds of structures in place so we can unlock the investment and home building
2755 and development that our community needs.

The Bailiff: Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you, sir.

2760 I do not want to repeat what everybody else has said but I think one thing that the GDA has got going for it is its longevity and this is what it needs because the seafront enhancement, which was set up last term, it was very slow moving. But just towards the end, it actually started doing some positive things with the likes of the Vallette pools and the ... [*Inaudible*] there. It needs time to bed in and this is what, it has really hit the floor running and done some really good master planning.

2765 I do just want to address a small thing that Deputy Roffey did say because he said it was a very confused meeting. Well, sometimes you are damned if you do and you are damned if you do not. I remember, I think it was Deputy Ferbrache, or Deputy Inder, I cannot remember who, they would say their officers said there was no way they could deliver an Island-wide election within a time. We also got told that there was no way that you could change GP11 and yet somehow we seemed to
2770 do that.

The DPA does sometimes look outside the box, which might surprise some people. We look outside the box and see if we can actually just get things done. That is what we did with MC – (*Interjection*)

2775 **The Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Deputy Inder and I in fact said the direct opposite of what Deputy Oliver said. He was President of SACC and I was one of his Members, who said we would get it done and did get it done. Nice for Deputy Oliver to say it, but I think she should have got it the right way
2780 around.

The Bailiff: Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Sorry, I did say, I think. Okay, I take that. But anyway, it was still done. That is
2785 what I am trying to say.

Going back to the GDA, we just need to have a more can-do approach and get things done and let us get the GDA, let them get on with it and see what they can actually achieve because so far, they have achieved a lot more than the Government has been able to.

2790 **The Bailiff:** Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Thank you, sir.

I am very supportive of these measures that are being brought forward by this group, the GDA. I think it is very important to remember that this is a very distinct region of Guernsey, with a huge
2795 amount of potential. Having worked in the area for seven years, I realised very quickly, running field

trips and that type of thing in that particular locality, that we had an under-development situation in that region.

So we have to support forward planning across Guernsey, of course particularly in the two Town areas, really. Our Town here and that at the Bridge. Some of the ideas, too, that have been brought up, are very useful. The flood defences, the green promenade that I look forward to, of north side, and the delivery of further housing in that particular area, which has been a popular area for people to reside, in terms of movement from other parts of the Island over the years.

One point that I also want to make is that we also have to be conscious of expenditure and putting money into projects across the Island and we have got to realise that in other areas, in other jurisdictions, money is being placed where, of course, one can get the best value for the buck, if you like, and in that Guernsey is falling behind, rapidly, in terms of competitive jurisdictions – our nearest neighbour for example is going ahead a lot faster than we are, in terms of development – when we look at that, we can see how they have concentrated their development budgets in the central town and they have not gone really for decentralisation to that extent.

Guernsey has been perhaps moving too much in the area of decentralisation so I call upon some consideration here for centralisation of growth because that is what leads to a very, more competitive environment and I think that we have to look at our Town, particularly, as being a central growth pole for Guernsey and we have not got to neglect it. As I say, in the past we have been decentralising our growth too much, actually, rather than centralising in order to get the value for the Island's economy as a whole.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

I do think that we are in danger of a slightly unfair narrative developing here, with respect to STSB being the bad guys and the downers on anything having happened in terms of development of our east coast and I think Deputy Parkinson did a good job of addressing some of those points. I have to say I, too, was struck with a little bit of the irony about where the criticism was coming from. But I think Deputy Parkinson's points have hopefully straightened that out.

Deputy Parkinson also raised a concern, I think, that an arm's length body, or a more independent body was actually doing the politicians' work for them in terms of deciding the strategic direction and I would just like to build on that. I think it is a point that Deputy Taylor also raised. Because this is not, of course, the first debate that we have had on the Guernsey Development Agency. Obviously, we remember its birth, it came about in this iteration in June 2021, when we were trying to make a decision on the future strategic direction of the harbours and I have to see our non-decision on that has been the key blocker to development on the east coast.

But, anyway, we found some workarounds and this is one of them, the work the Development & Planning Authority are doing on the Local Planning Briefs and the Harbour Action Areas is another one and they join up, of course.

But we also debated the purpose, I suppose, and the formation of the Guernsey Development Agency a year and a bit ago, now, back in I think it was July 2023 and, to refresh Members' memories of what we agreed then, we agreed that actually we, as an Assembly, would be setting the strategy and through that policy letter we agreed some core principles and those principles included, for example, consistency with the States' strategic priorities, enhancing the public realm. We had some around energy and decarbonisation and climate change and health and quality of life, and that kind of thing.

We also agreed some really much more specific objectives and they were around infrastructure, protecting the east coast from environmental threats around modern and resilient harbours, around transport infrastructure that improves connectivity, around infrastructure that supports our housing requirements as an Island, and around infrastructure that supports and creates new economic opportunities and supports business activity.

So we have, actually, already agreed the strategic principles and objectives to which the GDA have been working. All of their plans have been based on those principles and geared around meeting those objectives. We also agreed that the GDA would develop a delivery programme, essentially, and that would really put the specifics on those principles; what they look like in real life. And they would have timescales and resource implications and requirements.

We also agreed, in order to make sure the two matched, the formation of a Political Oversight Board and that is the board of which I am a member, along with currently Deputy Inder and Deputy Murray. But by mandate it is required to have representatives from the Committees of Policy & Resources, Economic Development and Environment & Infrastructure. It was previously Deputy Ferbrache and I will actually commend him for being a real driver in this.

Our job, as a board, is to make sure consistency with the work that the GDA is doing and the strategic direction that the States has set, and it is also the job of that board to make sure that the strategic direction is reviewed from time to time and approved by the States. So it is always this Assembly who has the final say, the ultimate say, on the strategic direction of the work that the GDA is doing. I just wanted to provide Members with that reassurance, in case it kind of got lost in the mists of time.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller has suggested that we look into a delivery vehicle. Of course that is one of the things that we are already very well advanced on. That is one of the things that we have been working on through the Guernsey Housing Plan, is looking at the establishment of a delivery vehicle, and there are lots of different ways you could do that and the two that she referenced in relation to the Isle of Man and Jersey are of course two of them, and they have been two models that we have looked at very closely but there are also a number of other different ways that a delivery vehicle could be set up. So I am sure Members will hear more about that soon. Its primary focus would, we envisage, be on housing but there is nothing to say that such a delivery vehicle could not have a wider mandate, as it does in other jurisdictions.

Really, on the issue of resourcing, and I think the people who have raised this have been quite right to do so, it has been said many times, and I do feel it is worth reiterating, that I think we are getting absolutely fantastic value for public money from the GDA and the work that they have done to date and the work that I know they will continue to do. They are such a motivated, driven, productive, group of people and I know that they have got absolutely no intention of letting that pace drop. I think we are in good hands in that respect.

I would say that, through the Budget, we have agreed some funding, but we have not actually agreed the amount that would have been more optimal for them, so we have already clipped those wings. But I know that they will make the absolute most of anything budget that they have got and certainly they have proven themselves to be very creative and adept at making the most of their budget, that limited budget, and getting the most value of it.

With respect to the point that Deputy Mahoney raised around how these things are going to be funded, I would say that they have got particular expertise in that kind of area and they have got some very good ideas. Of course, these projects do need to be funded. But as one example, I know that they have been looking at build-to-rent, which is a model that is widely adopted in other places but we do not really have it here. Of course that is really great because it is quite an attractive proposition for institutional or even ethical investors because even though the returns are over quite a long period, they are really reliable so it is an attractive investment proposition and actually we have just seen a very significant inward investment in Jersey for similar.

So they do have some good ideas, in terms of income streams, but I would warn, in the very early days when we were talking about the Guernsey Development Agency, there was a slightly pie in the sky, in my view, idea that within a couple of years it would be financially washing its own face, and I think had we ever pushed for that, we would have been going off in so completely the wrong direction, because we would have been chasing all the wrong goals. We would have been chasing short-term financial gains, very much at the expense of those bigger strategic objectives. So I think it is quite right that we have reassessed that. We are taking a much more pragmatic and realistic view of the funding.

2900 But ultimately, this is a project overall, which does have commercial elements and does have potential revenue streams and they are really good. They have got really good experience in how these things have worked in other places to make the most of that.

2905 So I really do commend the work that they have done. I am sure this will go through, as it deserves to, with resounding support. I would just like to thank them for all the work they have put in and encourage the ongoing support and involvement, actually, because they are very keen to involve all the relevant Committees and individuals within the States, and indeed community stakeholders.

2910 I think that is one of the things that they have done particularly well; they have gone out, they have become a conduit, they have become that touch point, they have gone out and talked to different stakeholders within the community, all the different, relevant people, who have got particular expertise or a particular interest, so they have done a very good job on that. I hope that the States' Assembly will continue to support them going forward.

Thank you.

2915 **The Bailiff:** I will turn back to Deputy Murray to reply to the debate, please.

Deputy Murray: Thank you very much, sir and thank you to the Assembly for a very informative debate, I think, expressing obviously some concern but by and large I think it has been a very positive debate.

2920 There are a couple of questions that I was asked to answer, so I will endeavour to do that. Starting with Deputy Gabriel, you mentioned very much, obviously, flood defences are part of a long-term solution, which is absolutely correct. But he will know probably even better than I do that E&I have got an interim arrangement there, which we are hoping will do the job until such time as we have that more permanent arrangement. Because it does affect so many people, actually not just in the
2925 immediate Bridge but beyond, as he mentioned.

I would have to say I am not entirely sure if GST is the particular challenge that we are going to have with building costs. It may very well contribute. There is a much larger picture, unfortunately, that is driving building costs, particularly in Guernsey and it is a challenge right the way across the piece. What the GDA are doing, if you like, is having to entertain that but it is not any different to
2930 any of the other projects that we are trying to achieve at the moment. It is a challenge for us all. It is running, I think, at about 8% at the moment, in terms of building costs, on top of where it had already got to. So it is a very difficult situation and I do appreciate that.

On the recompense issue, the only thing I can say at this point is that it will probably be on a case-by-case basis because the circumstances in each situation may give us other opportunities or
2935 levers that we can pull to try to ensure, obviously, that there is no debit on the ledger as a consequence of that to STSB or indeed anywhere else. But it is far too early, unfortunately, to say that, but Government, of course, does have a great many levers that it can pull when it is looking obviously, to maximise the benefit that might come from letting go or leasing an asset.

Deputy Inder, thank you very much. It is a good news story. I think that is definitely the case and
2940 I think it is something that we should celebrate. It has been brought about by being given the guardrails that Deputy de Sausmarez was talking about and they have been fulfilled. They have been fulfilled at a speed, which I think Deputy Kazantseva-Miller mentioned, we probably could not do, because they are a small, agile agency, very committed and that is why they have been able to achieve what they have done in just over a year. I do commend them for that.

2945 Deputy Roffey, I do not think there was any suggestion that STSB was being seen to be blocked. I know the GDA have got a good relationship with the STSB and they are very supportive of the overall direction as the various individual parts of the vision as shown and I do agree with him, it is an extraordinary opportunity that actually this has presented.

2950 On the flood defences, he mentioned about the tankers and so forth and he is absolutely right. I think we are now aware that the tankers are coming to the end of their commercial life, so we do have to start making provision for a different solution. It is difficult to look too far ahead. I know

that obviously at the moment, in terms of what is being proposed by the GDA that the possibility exists, to have a void so that we can have offloading outside the harbour, but that would depend obviously on having the right fuel that actually can be pumped and at the moment some of the heavy diesel is not capable of doing that at this point in time. But it is a longer term solution that we might be able to encompass.

Deputy Dyke, supportive, shaft of bright light. Yes, I would agree with that, absolutely, He raised the question for the issue of the inert waste, which I know that we spent quite a bit of time on just a few months ago. He is right to raise it. But what is certainly very apparent and what the GDA are suggesting is that Black Rock, for example, can be, for probably as much as 10 years, a place where we can actually use that, or re-use that inert waste, to give us a benefit in the longer term for actually the provision of housing.

It is not a million miles away from Longue Hougue. We may obviously in the meantime, until we have made such legislative changes and so forth to make that possible, but actually they are thinking of using as much, of maximising as much as possible of the existing resources that we have got. Even the stuff we throw away.

So I would certainly say that they have that on board, Even Longue Hougue itself, obviously, has potential in there, raising sea defences and so forth. I do not think we have got a problem with where we are currently using that inert waste. But we have plenty of opportunity in the long term to actually maximise the benefit from it.

Deputy Parkinson is not in the room at the moment. I think we went down a little bit of a rabbit hole, with introducing the harbour. I know the importance of it. I did mention from the outset that the GDA, what they are currently proposing, would not interfere with any future decisions about harbours, or the Pool Marina, for example. They are at this point in time able to still come back to the States when and if a future States makes a decision about that.

I would not worry too much about that. I would say that I do not believe they were charged with making a decision, which is something that I inferred from what Deputy Parkinson said, about actually where a harbour should be. I do not think that is actually what they are currently expecting that it is something they are making a decision over.

Deputy Brouard, yes, I do understand, obviously he has some reservations. Leasing is an option and obviously that would be on a case-by-case basis. I know, from discussions with Deputy Brouard, that the loss of Guernsey Telecom is something he took very personally and I do understand that. In fact, I was in a completely supportive position on that.

Once bitten, twice shy, he does not necessarily want to see, and I do not think any of us would want to see, the loss of any particular asset that could not be retrieved or could not be put to better use. But in the meantime, obviously, anything that is lying perhaps to some extent fallow really should be maximised to get the best result that we can from it.

I think the GDA are very cautious. They need to know that they are in a position to approach landowners or building owners or business owners with opportunities to show them. In respect of the Bridge regeneration, there are a couple of very key things that are going to have to happen and I only mention one of them. One is the blast zone. If they cannot get those tanks moved, then it is going to cause a major problem.

Far from just running off with a blank cheque and doing all of this, that will not be the case. They are going to have to negotiate, they are going to have to do this in the right order and I am very much aware of that. But they need to know that they have got the opportunity to make these deals, which again will be reinforced, or hopefully reinforced, when these things do come back as part of the land portfolio for this Assembly, sorry the next Assembly it would be, to actually endorse.

They are in a position, I think at this stage, they have already made preliminary discussions about many of these things but they were not in a position to take them any further forward, and that is what the money that was now being asked for would do. It would allow them to start making businesses cases.

On the issue of business cases, I would point out, they are not just going to go off at £1.6 million, each issue that comes before us will have a business case that P&R will have to actually endorse, so

they are not just running away freely here. They will have to make the case for every bit of that money that they want to use for whatever part of that jigsaw they need to spend it on.

So there are checks and balances here and whilst the money is a sizeable amount of money and I think Deputy Mahoney is absolutely correct on that, I think what Deputy Mahoney was warning us was, on past performance perhaps, it is quite often that we will block things because we cannot agree. I understand that.

I also understand from what he was saying, we do not have that much money but one of the major planks I think that the GDA are very much aware of is where they can generate private sector involvement, they will. That will augment whatever it is that we are in a position we can afford to give them.

It is another source of income, ultimately, that we probably cannot unlock ourselves, necessarily, but they can. I think a very good example of that is the leasing of apartments, because they are going to do that in terms of generating income for themselves, to be able to proceed with the rest of the portfolio that they want to do. So they have thought through all of these revenue streams, the order that they need to do things in, but what they are ultimately creating is many benefits and I think, whether people are renting or buying, if we are able to create more accommodation, that has to be a good thing. That is the number one priority that we have actually made for ourselves here.

Deputy Ferbrache, very supportive, and thank you very much, as many Members have been, and again I understand Deputy Taylor's concerns, his reservations, but on the whole I think he is very supportive going forward, which I do appreciate.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, I probably echo her sentiment and very much everything she said over what they have achieved by being a small, agile agent, or agency, and be ambitious, she said, and I completely endorse that. Deputy Olivier – I have done it, as well! – Deputy *Oliver*, I have raised you to great heights! A key issue, longevity is actually what is offered by utilising the GDA that we cannot again, because of our term of office, we cannot actually do that over any real period of time beyond the term. Even that proved very difficult.

Clearly, we are talking at least 10 years and beyond to achieve the vision that has actually been painted for us here and I really do wish him well that they do get to that point because it will be a revenue generator. It will improve the growth in the Island, all of the things that we are seemingly not being able to manage this term, I think this will unlock, it will not happen overnight, but I think we are going about it in a sensible way and they have proven themselves to be able to take the bit between the teeth and run with it and now what they want to do is to be able to come back to us with costed plans that we are satisfied that the money is going to be best invested.

Deputy de Lisle, I absolutely understand – do not neglect Town I think was probably what was underpinning a lot of what he was saying. He is absolutely right. That remains the jewel in the crown, there is no question about that. I think what we do need to understand with the GDA, we and the Island need to have some confidence in what the GDA are doing, and I think that they can do very little more than improve the Bridge, whereas, when they start to get to the Town, they need to know that we and the Island are behind them on improving what actually is on offer at the Town. And there is a great deal to offer in the Town.

But I think they do need to demonstrate they have got the capability to do that so that actually the Island will be behind them to achieve those objectives at the end of the day.

So I thank everybody for their contributions and I would urge you all to support the policy letter. Thank you very much.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, there are four Propositions, but I am trying to work out whether anyone wants to vote differently in respect of any of them or whether the vote is, whether it is Pour, Contre, or Je Ne Vote Pas, the same for all four. Does anyone request that any of the Propositions be taken discreetly?

On that basis, as I am not hearing anyone asking for a distinct vote on any single Proposition, we will take all four Propositions together. I simply remind you that Proposition 2 has some

additional words added at the end, from Amendment 1, which you will see on your screen as and when it comes up and, therefore, I will ask the Greffier to open the voting, please, on all four Propositions.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 34, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 3, Did not vote 2, Absent 1

| POUR | CONTRE | NE VOTE PAS | DID NOT VOTE | ABSENT |
|--------------------------|--------|--------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Aldwell, Sue | None | Brouard, Al | Roberts, Steve | Haskins, Sam |
| Blin, Chris | | Mahoney, David | Taylor, Andrew | |
| Burford, Yvonne | | Snowdon, Alexander | | |
| 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 | | | | |
| Inder, Neil | | | | |
| Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha | | | | |
| Le Tissier, Chris | | | | |
| Le Tocq, Jonathan | | | | |
| Leadbeater, Marc | | | | |
| Matthews, Aidan | | | | |
| McKenna, Liam | | | | |
| Meerveld, Carl | | | | |
| Moakes, Nick | | | | |
| Murray, Bob | | | | |
| Oliver, Victoria | | | | |
| Parkinson, Charles | | | | |
| Prow, Robert | | | | |
| Queripel, Lester | | | | |
| Roffey, Peter | | | | |
| Soulsby, Heidi | | | | |
| St Pier, Gavin | | | | |
| Trott, Lyndon | | | | |
| Vermeulen, Simon | | | | |

3060

The Bailiff: In respect of all four Propositions, there voted in favour, 34 Members; no Member voted against; 3 Members abstained; 3 Members did not participate in that vote. I will declare all four Propositions duly carried.

REQUÊTE

8. The Government Reform (2024) Requête – Debate commenced

Article 8.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the Requête entitled 'The Government Reform (2024) Requête dated 23rd September 2024 they are of the opinion:-

1. To approve the reduction of the number of Members of the States' Assembly by 10, down to 28 Guernsey Deputies in total, such reduction to be implemented in time for the general election to be held on the 18th June 2025; and
2. If Proposition 1 is approved, to direct the States' Assembly and Constitution Committee to return to the States as soon as possible, and in any event not later than April 2025, with a policy letter containing such consequential and other recommendations as to committee memberships, representative numbers, rule changes and other considerations as it may consider necessary.
3. To direct the preparation of such legislation as may be necessary to give effect to the above decisions.

The Deputy Greffier: Article 8, Requête – The Government Reform (2024) Requête.

The Bailiff: I will invite the lead requérant, Deputy Helyar, to open the debate, please.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, sir.

I have unluckily drawn a little bit of the graveyard shift, for this one, but hopefully I should be able to keep it short and punchy. First of all, I would like to thank the requérants for their support. If nothing else, this has teased out several amendments, which I think during the course of the debate will enable us to cover a lot of the ground associated with where we stand with Government reform, what our views are about it and how we might be able to take it forward into the next term, for the next Government.

I am going to keep what I say very short. The Propositions in the Requête are very simple. It is to reduce the number of States' Members by 10, prior to or effectively immediately at the next election, so that there are 10 fewer representatives, and to instruct the Assembly and Constitution Committee to consider what amendments it might need to make to the composition of Committees and so on, in the interim.

As I said, the arguments will be teased out in debate. There are several amendments. I am not going to go through it all in detail. I did think of an alternative approach for presenting this, because obviously it is Christmas and the analogy with turkeys and so on. What I did was I wrote down a list and I got to almost two pages of excuses that people could make, so I really like the idea but ... and then a square bracket. I wrote down a whole list of excuses and I was going to print them out as a bingo card and give everybody the opportunity to score them as we went through, so and so has used that one, and you could get double points if you actually matched the name with the excuse that was used.

But I decided that you probably would take the view that that would be undermining the dignity of the Assembly and the process. So I am just going to play it on my own and I will let you know how I go by waving my paper as we get to the various ones.

The basis of this is to cut costs because it will. That one cannot be argued. To save time. It will. That cannot be argued, against, because we do spend a lot of time making speeches we do not need to and too long. I think if nothing else that we take away from this debate it must be that what we have at the moment does not work properly. It does not work for the benefit of Government, it does not move fast enough and we really need to be picking our skirts up and moving faster, if we want to get some of the things done that we need to, in order to improve the speed at which Government achieves change. That is what people want.

So, with that, all I can say is I commend Members, my requérants, again, for their support. Several Members, obviously, have contacted me. Some Members have put in alternative numbers, which might be something you seek to support, but we will come to that when we debate the various amendments and I commend it to the Assembly. I think the public would be delighted if we could deliver, before Christmas, a reduction in the number of States' Members.

Thank you.

3105 **The Bailiff:** I am going to turn to the representative of the Policy & Resources Committee next and I understand that Deputy Le Tocq is going to speak.

Deputy Le Tocq: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

3110 I think I can be brief as well, because Members will be aware that we have submitted a letter of comment but I would just like to say as someone who entered this Assembly over 20 years ago, I have been involved in at least three attempts and variants of Government reform in terms of changing the make-up, constitution, and way in which we do things and I know that each of those has produced a variety of different views. The last one that produced some reform during the 2012-16 term did mean that there was quite a radical change in the number of Committees and the membership of those Committees and the way in which we operated, as well as a reduction in the number of States' Members.

3120 On that basis, when – and Members will be able to see from the Report of the Reshaping Government subcommittee of P&R that I chaired for a while after Deputy Soulsby stood down from her first period on P&R – that we did look at a number of things, including reducing the numbers by five, or up to five. We felt that that was possible.

3125 This particular initiative, as far as the individual Members of P&R, there is a variety of different views, but we certainly felt that it was possible. The difficulty that we had, of course, with that Report was that, as you will see from page three of that report, eventually when Deputy Soulsby stood down, I then took on the chair, Deputy Murray was involved for a while and I think we have had four or five different iterations of Members and constitutional make-up within that Committee and so we have had at least as many different views as we have had Members there.

3130 In fact, I would like to thank Advocate Tom Carey for being a consistent non-States' Member during all of that time, because apart from he, myself and Deputy Meerveld, who changed his views several times during that period, we could not really come to much of a conclusion, although Advocate Carey and I did, I think, agree with those conclusions, sir –

Deputy Meerveld: Point of correction, sir.

3135 **The Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Actually I believe I was very consistent in my views; it was just my views did not agree with the representatives of P&R.

3140 **Deputy Le Tocq:** I am not sure which P&R he is talking about, but nevertheless, the point is we did have a consensus, we did come to some sort of consensus view, but the requirement would have meant a huge amount of resource being put in. We have seen this before, which is why I referred to other changes in the make-up and the way in which Government works, here in our Assembly, because we are all effectively part of Government.

3145 We saw that particularly last time, where the efforts of the Law Officers to change the regulations and change the Law, meant that resources had to be put into that. So, we felt very much, as a subcommittee and bearing in mind we have had several changes as well, of staff support, we could not do more than produce that Report.

3150 The Report is not wasted and that is why you will see we are supporting a move that, in the next term, if that Assembly, or even if this Assembly takes it seriously, the best way to do that is to set up an independent committee that can have the right to focus attention and resources, to look at the implications at what it would mean to change the make-up of this Assembly and reduce – because if you reduce the number of Members, it involves changing the make-up of the various Committees and we need to do that seriously and properly.

3155 As the letter of comment indicates, we are not against the arguments that the requérants have submitted. Indeed the Report agrees with many of those things. It is just that we believe that the make-up, the number of States' Members, and the way in which we do things, are not the only

issues, which affect the way that we could improve Government. Indeed, behaviours, which are to do with people and personalities, have at least an equal effect in any system and we can see that if we just look around us, to the south, to our cousins in Jersey, or to our neighbours in the UK or France. They have different systems, they have exactly the same problems that we do as well.

If we were to think, sir, that reducing the number of States' Members, or changing the make-up of Committees, would make major improvements by themselves, they will not. It requires a cultural change and that is much harder and takes greater time to bring about. Now that is not to say that some of us will be voting for some of the suggestions that we might have during debate here, but it is just to flag up right from the start that it is behaviour ultimately that can make a system work; any system. If you have got that degree of respect and consensus to be able to work with other people and to work constructively and if we put aside our ideologies for a moment and were to do that, I believe even the system we have got today would be better.

We make the point, and this will be the final point that I will make at this stage, sir, that the new system that was brought in during my time as Chief Minister at the end, really only had in a sense it has not really had a full term, to embed and to be tested because COVID certainly upset that and changed the way in which we operated in both this term and the previous term and it was certainly the feeling of the vast majority of the people that served at any point on the subcommittee of reshaping Government that it needed at least two full terms to be able to tell whether the system was appropriate and where the system perhaps needed some change. Otherwise, we were judging it from a position that was not normality in that way.

In just a few words, that is the view of P&R in terms of the Requête and we look forward to the debate.

The Bailiff: The Policy & Resources consulted a single Committee, and that is the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee, so I invite the President, Deputy Meerveld, to speak at this point, if he wishes to do so.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

The Committee opposes this amendment –

The Bailiff: It is not on the amendment yet; this is just the general debate.

Deputy Meerveld: Sorry. Opposes this Requête, I should say, rather than amendment. And has informed in our letter of comment that we simply do not have the resources or the time to make the changes required before the next Election. So if the States were to vote this through, then I think we will need additional resources to be able to consider the changes and also, of course, there are the standing principles that significant changes should not be made in close proximity to an election and I would say that this would result in significant changes, as a reduction in 10 Members may require of even the Committed structures, as I know that some of P&R are proponents for the idea of a three-person Committee rather than a five. Basically me, my friend, plus one. And that would mean significant changes to the way we operate.

So I would encourage Members not to support this Requête.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, you will have seen that a number of amendments have been submitted in respect of the Propositions emanating from this Requête. The order in which I am going to take them is Amendment 1, Amendment 2, Amendment 3, Amendment 5 and then Amendment 4. So it is the same order that is on the Order Paper, except we have got Amendment 5, that has only just arrived, and I mean to pose that before Amendment 4, the reason being that Amendment 4 proposes to wipe out everything and therefore replace it with something else.

So, Deputy Gollop do you want to move Amendment 1, please?

3210 **Deputy Gollop:** Yes, and it will be helpful to me, because I did not quite know in what order they would come, if the Greffier could read the amendment to everybody.

The Bailiff: Greffier, can you read it please?

3215 *The Deputy Greffier read out the amendment.*

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

[Amendment 1.](#)

To delete proposition 1 and substitute the following:

1. *"To approve the increase of the number of Members of the States Assembly by 7, up to 45 Guernsey Deputies in total, such increase to be implemented in time for the General Election to be held on the 18th June 2025."*

2. *To Insert into Proposition 2 after "rule changes" the following ", proportional salary reduction relative to the increase in the number of Members.."*

3220 **Deputy Gollop:** Thank you, sir, and I thank Deputy Matthews for seconding me and some words of support from both members of the community. Even if perhaps this is a matter that I am probably in the minority.

3225 I should say from the outset, nothing I say here reflects any other Member of Policy & Resources or SACC, but I would say I endorse, I think, the gist of what Deputy Le Tocq was saying in the general sense that we are still only at the end of the second term under the new system, which was supposed to bring about revolution in our lives, for the better. Of course, we had COVID, and I would actually argue on the side, here, before I get stuck into the main, that one of the side effects of COVID was everybody supported greatly the work Deputy St Pier, Deputy Soulsby, Deputy Ferbrache and others did. It re-energised the mood that the smaller the number the better.

3230 But of course we were in a way living on what amounted to, with the best possible conditions, a form of dictatorship. We had our liberty suspended in every country of the world and that is what it amounted to. Of course, in that context, you can be decisive, you can show leadership, compassionate leadership in Guernsey's case. But nevertheless I think it was a very unusual circumstance.

3235 First of all, in relation to the excellent and extremely brief – Deputy Ferbrache will be pleased with it – from Deputy Helyar, the points he made. There is a Christmassy feel to the debate, perhaps. I am a turkey who does not want to face a cull, or face chestnut stuffing, or whatever. So I am not wanting to vote for Christmas.

3240 The whole point of this, although there is, to check, Deputy Helyar said three things that I think he is usually, as a person who has been outstanding in finance and law, somebody who always marshals facts and evidence but I am not sure he really provided evidence that his Requête, or the collective Requête, rather, would save time or money. I will come onto both points.

3245 Saving of time is an interesting one because, like Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Trott and Deputy Roffey and Deputy Ferbrache, we were privileged to be Members in a different era, the late 1990s early Millennium period, when we actually had 57 Members and we met for two days. On the time front, we got out of there quicker than today. We actually had less long States' Meetings.

3250 On the money front, I always find, when people talk about restructuring Government, they confuse three completely different issues. There is first of all the issue of how much States' Members are paid, and whether the money is worth it. Then the second issue is how many Members should you have in the States. The third issue is the Machinery of Government, which really means, whether you are having a Policy Council or a cabinet, or a ministerial system, or a different committee system.

But the three are not the same thing and I think that point has to come across very clearly. In fact a lot of the amendments go all over the shop in that respect. The first question I always ask,

well there are two questions when anyone talks about reducing the number of Deputies, the first question really you could ask any member of the public when they have recently come onto the –

I will give way to Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you for giving way.

I am just intrigued, there is a danger with Deputy Gollop, he is now on to talking about the reduction, I thought he was here to argue why we should be increasing the number of Deputies, not whether the reduction of Deputies is good or bad.

Deputy Gollop: Deputy Inder is, I suppose every Member of the States of Guernsey is a Member of the Government because that is how we define ourselves. I would argue that first and foremost in this Assembly, we are a parliamentary Assembly. I have just seen letters recently, a bit like Jersey, the Government of Guernsey, which have related to international/external issues.

Our whole problem, perhaps it is not a problem, Guernsey has been pretty successful over the years, which furthers my point, that we were particularly successful when we had 45 Members, 45 Deputies, or 57. We created Zero-10 when we had 45 Deputies. My point is do not confuse the Government, ministries and departments, with the number of Members in the Chamber. They are fundamentally different.

You look at the United Kingdom, there is a government of 100-odd ministers, of whom about 25 sit in the cabinet, and there is a parliament of 650 of whom, 400 belong to one party and 100 or whatever belong to the other parties. We conflate them all the time and going back to the 45 Deputies, the first question is intriguing to ask anyone, it says there are too many Deputies. I think people say that in the sense that there are too many tax inspectors and yet we actually know we could do with some more! It is a kind of a negative job to have.

People do not say there are too many lawyers (*Laughter*) – well, maybe they do! – but when Deputy Ferbrache started his illustrious career there were 20 or 30 members of Guernsey advocates. Now there is well over 200, probably 300, and many more. They do not say there are too many accountants, the number has exponentially increased. But they do say there are too many Deputies because they do not like what we do, probably.

But when you actually ask them how many Deputies are there, they will not always come up with an accurate number. People have been genuinely surprised. They said, you want to increase the States? I said, well, actually we did have 45 Deputies until 2016, in fact we had it in 2000.

I will give a little bit of history for just one minute here. From 1948 to probably the late 1970s there was a general consensus of agreement that Guernsey had the appropriate system of Government for itself. Then there was a kind of rebellion, a bit of radicalism, that Deputy Roffey might remember, when people particularly questioned the role of the Conseillers, who were like an electoral assembly, a bit like Jurats. And then they looked as Douzaine representatives.

We had illustrious reports from the Bailiffs of the day, the Frossard Report, I recall, and the Carey Report. The Carey Report suggested 45 Deputies instead of 33 and 12 Conseillers. The Frossard Report, I think, suggested just keeping the 33 Deputies, with 10 Douzaine Representatives in those days, and 12 Island-wide elected Conseillers. Now that went around in a cycle. We went for Island-wide elections, we abandoned them and in a way went back to them.

But nobody really wanted to reduce the size of the States. The first reduction was made in 2003, for 2004, when the 10 Douzaine Representatives were almost accidentally eliminated. We had 45 Deputies from the abolition of Conseillers in 2000-04, and we kept 45, as Deputy Le Tocq reminded us, until the end of his Chief Minister term.

Now Deputy Oliver, in a passionate speech earlier today, on the Development Agency, she said it is madness to go on doing the same thing and expecting a different result. It is fascinating that, in 2004, we abolished Douzaine Reps and the Presidents of Committees and we created Ministers and the Policy Council of Ministers and a Chief Minister and we reduced the States by 10 Members. 2016, we got rid of the Ministers, we actually got rid of the Chief Minister, but the honorary title

survived. We got rid of the Policy Council and we changed again. We reduced the States, this time by seven Members.

So twice we have seen that the answer to our problems and our dysfunctionality has been a key reduction in Members. Would many people in the community, or amongst the public, actually say that we are a better States than our forefathers of the late 20th Century, nearly the 21st. that we get on with each other better, that we make faster, strategic decisions, that we get our budgets through without wrecking amendments that we have surpluses, that we are prepared to make difficult decisions from Zero-10 to buying tankers? I do not think so.

I do not think the reduction of Members has necessarily improved our performance. In fact you could make a case that this has not improved our performance. But when you ask the public why they would like to have a reduced number of States' Members, because I think there is a lot of support for the ideas Deputy Inder or Deputy Helyar and others have put, answers tend to be, you need a structured government that is more of a 'do things, get things done,' but then what they actually mean is a different kind of committee system or a ministerial system.

The other answer they will give is to save money on our salaries, but of course there are two answers to that. Up until the year 2000, Members were not paid a salary, they claimed expenses, although some lived on it. You could be paid a lot, the more Committees you attended, so of course we had a lot of Committee meetings in those days – I am a Member in some cases.

Another aspect of that era, which did not match human rights, was if you were a high-earning person or you were married to a high-earning person, you did not get any pay. Now we could introduce means testing for States' Members so we would reduce the pay for some of our a more successful Members in private life. I do not think that is what people mean because, when you look at the Budget that we get every year, it very clearly puts down what is paid to each Member and most Members are taking the full whack they are entitled to –

I will give way to Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: With the greatest respect, we are now 15 minutes into your amendment and I still do not know why we need 45 Members.

Deputy Gollop: I was coming to an objection as to why we would have 45 Members. It usually comes down to many people, especially those people who are less fortunate than us, people who are really struggling, as Deputy Queripel and others remind us, of those who struggle to heat and eat, etc, that we are paid rather a lot. I suppose I do not necessarily want to reduce our money but I thought that an important component part of this amendment, to be fair, is to keep within the envelope. So every Member, for being a Member, that is not about an uplift for presidential work or whatever but the cost as I have calculated, I might be wrong, was basic salary would go down from £43,036 to £36,341.51. A bit below median income but still a lot for many people.

Because what I do not want to do is to give a message that more States' Members would equal more money from the taxpayer. That is not where I am at with this.

What are the actual reasons for putting it across? Firstly, we are actually going against the grain a bit. Since the 2024 boundary revisions, there was a marginal decrease in the number of Scottish MPs elected to Westminster and Wales, because of population. The number of MPs in England increased. The Irish parliament has increased in size at this election. The Welsh Senedd assembly, that we have great Commonwealth Parliamentary Association links with, is surprisingly going up from 60 members to 96 at the next election. And they have never been higher than 60. We have seen an increase in Germany.

The reasons for having a larger Assembly, this is the core of it, are about representation. I do not think we are terribly representative of the community. We have a disproportionately large number, I suppose, of men, of middle-aged, older men, of property owners, of perhaps people who have been in business. We do not have as many women or younger people, or younger families or people who are tenants or people perhaps with disabilities as you would find in the community.

3355 The whole point of the Assembly here is we are fundamentally a scrutinising Chamber and we are a Chamber that approves budgets and we are a Chamber that shapes policy but we are particularly a Chamber that is there not just to question but to represent and act as a legislature, making laws. So you need a large number.

3360 The second reason is that the smaller you go, the more likely it is you will struggle to find things. When I was President of Planning, Members may recall I struggled to find Members to go on the Committee. I hope it was not due to my leadership, particularly, but there were not that many people available. Most people had jobs. Strangely enough, when we made the big change in 2016, we actually increased the number of Committee roles but significantly reduced the number of scrutinising roles. So we ended up with a shortage of talent.

3365 One of the reasons why you need a large Assembly is there will always be some Members who, for various reasons, are unwell or unfit, or have family reasons, who cannot necessarily do a full workload all of the time. You also have people who want to move on and you need a number of people who can be promoted, who can fill in, who can do those Committee roles, who can move up.

3370 More importantly than any of that, the point of the Assembly is to represent more accurately our community of citizens and to participate in Government, be ready to serve on Committees or other roles but, to use the expression, I know they are not popular in America with some people, but DEI, diversity, equality and inclusion.

3375 The reason why many assemblies are looking actually to increase is to increase diversity, increase inclusivity, allow more people to serve. I was at a function the other day, where I think most people were broadly supportive of the ideas Deputy Helyar and his requérants might have. But I also met somebody who, like me, remembered an older era and said that the Island would have lost talent. He mentioned a particular politician who effectively served as president of Advisory & Finance, in a different era, and he said he got in in his parish in tenth position.

3380 Sometimes the people who are popular are not the best politicians. I have survived longer not because I am the best but because, I do not know. I think some of the thinking behind the requérants is to improve the calibre of States' Member and improve the calibre of decision-making but it does not necessarily follow because you run the risk, the smaller you go, of people who please the electorate or choose populist bandwagons do better than people with real commercial experience, who are more introverted or perhaps represent a minority voice, whether it be environmentalism or more concern about social issues or different parts of the Island.

3390 So my argument is a more balanced Assembly of 45 Members should actually bring better behaviour. I think we had less factions and less obsession with parties when we had 45 Members and the 16 years from 2000 to 2016 were generally less contentious than the period we have now. So let us go down to 28 and see what happens! I think we will have perhaps an even more challenging Assembly, with everyone wanting their place in the sun and everyone wanting to score points.

3395 We could end up with 20 out of the 28 people being from broadly the same ideological base or even for the same type of person. If you want communities and Committees to work, you actually need people with different skills, different personalities, different attributes. People with public sector background, people with private sector background, academic, commercial. So for all of those reasons I think we would be much more secure and we would have a greater chance of reviving the success of former Assemblies if we actually take this opportunity to increase our number from 38 to 45.

3400 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Matthews, do you formally second Amendment 1?

Deputy Matthews: I do, sir, and I would like to reserve my right to speak.

3405 **The Bailiff:** Of course you can.

Deputy Matthews: Can I speak now?

The Bailiff: No! *(Laughter)*

3410 It has just gone half-past five. The only reason I was pausing was to see if anyone leapt to their feet with a procedural motion –

Deputy Inder: I was, actually, sir, going to test whether there were more than eight people – I have forgotten the name of the Rule – how many people wanted to debate this.

3415

The Bailiff: As a former President of SACC you cannot remember the number? *(Laughter)*

Deputy Inder: No, sir.

My dirty secret, sir, is I had not read that book in the two years of presidency!

3420

The Bailiff: Well, Rule 24(4) is what I think Deputy Inder is testing. So I am going to invite the Members who support debate on Amendment 1 to stand in their places.

It is just above the requisite number, so we will continue debate on Amendment 1 in the morning. We will now adjourn until 9.30 tomorrow.

3425

The Assembly adjourned at 5.34 p.m.