



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 2nd May 2025

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

Volume 14, No. 21

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

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representatives E. Hill and E. A. J. Snowdon

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

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

Absent at the Evocation

Deputy J. F. Dyke (*relevé à 10h 05*) ; Deputy M. P. Leadbeater (*relevé à 9h 47*)

Business transacted

Evocation	5
Billet d'État IX.....	5
20. Amendments to Customs Legislation – Appointment of ports, airports, boarding stations – Propositions carried	5
21. Amendments to the Road Traffic (Construction and Use of Motor Vehicles) Ordinance, 2002 – Propositions carried as amended	9
22. Government Work Plan Monitoring Report and End of Term Committee Reports – Debate commenced	40
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.31 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.</i>	<i>43</i>
Welcome to Deputy Lyndon Farnham – The Chief Minister, States of Jersey	43
Government Work Plan Monitoring Report and End of Term Committee Reports – Debate continued – Propositions carried	44
16. Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Election Observer Mission – Proposition Carried.....	59
23. Schedule for Future States' Business – Proposition Carried.....	63
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 4.04 p.m.</i>	<i>65</i>

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The States' Greffier

EVOCATION

Billet d'État IX

COMMITTEE FOR HOME AFFAIRS

20. Amendments to Customs Legislation – Appointment of ports, airports, boarding stations – Propositions carried

5

Article 20.

The States are asked to decide:–

1. To agree that the Committee for Home Affairs should have power to authorise persons to land goods and passengers at places other than an approved port, subject to specified conditions and restrictions, as further set out in section 3 of this Policy Letter.

2. To direct the preparation of such legislation as may be necessary to give effect to the above decision.

The States' Greffier: Billet d'État IX, Article 20, Committee for Home Affairs - Amendments to Customs Legislation – Appointment of ports, airports, boarding stations.

10

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

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir.

15

I need to start with an apology, sir. I wish to apologise for my tie. It is actually not my fault, it is the fault of Deputy Lester Queripel because at the last meeting of a term he always challenges me to a loud tie competition.

20

I think it was yesterday, Deputy Ferbrache bid Deputy Lester Queripel farewell, and wished him well on his retirement. He is indeed, in my view, a man of the people and he will be missed. Also, I think his speeches will be missed by a future Assembly. I think for me, sir, his standout speech was he was emphasising the importance of sport and he actually tried to name just about every prominent sportsman and woman over the last 50 years, but you did intervene, sir, but even so he managed to sneak in another six after. Sir, I wish Deputy Queripel well.

25 This actually, sir, will be the last Home Affairs policy letter of this term. There is another joint one
to come with E&I, so I think it would be appropriate for me to again thank my Committee. A
commentator said to me that, 'I think the number of policy letters brought by Home Affairs this
term is actually exceptional and probably a record.' In that, I would like to thank some of the
Committees that we work with, actually particularly Economic Development, Education, Sport &
Culture, and of course P&R. The first P&R Committee that we had, I would like to thank them
particularly because a lot of heavy lifting was done (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) in that period around
30 Moneyval and other matters. Sir, I would like to place my thanks to them on record.

The relevance of all this will come clear in my speech around Ports and Airports. This policy letter
seeks States' approval to ensure the issuance of concessions for the landing of goods and
passengers in the Bailiwick at places other than at an approved port, and it is placed on a legal
footing through an amendment to the Customs Law.

35 Under the Customs Law it is an offence to land goods in the Bailiwick elsewhere than in an
approved port or airport which has been appointed for the purpose of customs and excise.
However, there are circumstances where the Committee can issue concessions subject to certain
conditions and restrictions in order to permit a vessel or aircraft to land at a non-approved port.
This is normally in support of a Bailiwick interest, such as tourism.

40 At the moment, these concessions are only administrative, so there is no legal basis for the
Committee to issue them. Also, as these concessions are not underpinned by legislation, if the
associated conditions are not followed there is no deterrent, as no action can be taken by the
Guernsey Border Agency. It is much more practical and effective to allow concessions to be given
within the legislation, which achieves the same outcome that allows the Guernsey Border Agency
45 to pursue those who are not complying with them. Therefore, the proposed amendment to the
Customs Law will not change what happens now operationally, but will ensure that the issuance of
concessions is placed on a legal footing.

In addition, the Committee proposes that Customs legislation will be amended to allow for a fee
to be charged on operators applying for such concessions. The Committee would create an
50 appropriate charging policy for applications, depending on their nature, as some applications may
be for a single movement, whereas others may be required for a regular scheduled occurrence. In
any case, it is anticipated that authorisations will be for no more than 12 months to enable regular
reviews. To be clear, this charging structure will be based on the principle of cost recovery by
considering the additional resources that each authorisation placed upon the GBA.

55 In summary, it is vital to have an effective infrastructure in place for approved ports in order to
comply with the stricter post-Brexit requirements and importantly to protect the Bailiwick's place in
the Common Travel Area and the Customs Union.

Despite my tie, I urge the Assembly to support these Propositions.

Thank you, sir.

60 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

65 **Deputy Gollop:** This policy letter was, in review, short, as was the President's speech, and clear,
albeit perhaps written in a rather, dare I say it, Border Agency/Customs officer style, in that it was
quite administratively robust.

I support it, but I did have some issues in that it defined five ports, I think Braye Harbour, off the
top of my head, the two airports, and the ports at St Sampson's and St Peter Port, and made clear
that those ports, for many security and other reasons, require separation of people and goods.
I understand all of that, but the policy letter also pointed out that Herm and Sark did not quite come
70 into that category.

We all know, as we supported Sark yesterday, Sark is an independent jurisdiction with very
different functions than Herm. The policy letter makes clear that actually both goods and people
who are on the way to those other destinations really have to go through an established port. There
is the possibility of exemptions putting guidelines into legislation, but there was not too much

75 criteria as to what those exemptions would be, but there was a definite hint of a pragmatic approach to people that came from other places in the Common Travel Area, which would include Jersey and the UK, and the common Customs area for goods. But that still did not quite answer two questions in my mind.

80 The first is there was a possibility of exemptions about too much specific criteria being granted, and I hope that, more often than not, that is done if it is appropriate and secure. But those exemptions may or would require fees, and I could imagine that would be potentially disadvantageous to communities like Sark or Herm, or indeed other smaller parts around the Island that might for some technical reason need a landing. So the fees bit and the bureaucracy and the costs worried me.

85 The secondary point is that – this was not a policy letter about the topic but the media, as they do sometimes, chose to take a slightly unusual angle and focused on Sark, and they interviewed the Seigneur and other personalities. Of course, Sark would like not necessarily a full Customs post, although I think they do desire that, but they certainly would like greater flexibility. If they were the sixth point of entry, there would obviously be security considerations, construction considerations, 90 and a substantial cost, both in terms of the infrastructure and the manning by appropriately qualified Border Agency officers and personnel.

Presumably, if that goal is to be achieved, one would need dialogue and a partnership, maybe through the Bailiwick Commission or whatever. But there would be a cost involved, and that cost would have to be either borne not just by the Guernsey taxpayer but by the Sark taxpayer or 95 authorities and possibly businesses in Sark or other places, and I support Herm too of course.

So the policy letter opens a door and it is an opportunity but it has not completed all the picture, but I always respect Deputy Prow and I think his strong sense that our first duty is not only to safeguard the Island and the Bailiwick but to ensure that we maintain in the right place with the Common Travel Area, UK Customs and other places. I want progress but not at any price.

100

The Bailiff: If no one else is going to rise to speak on these Propositions I will turn back to Deputy Prow to reply to Deputy Gollop's comments.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir.

105 I thank Deputy Gollop for both his interest and for the questions he has raised because it does give me a chance to clarify some of the points he has made.

The first point I did make in my opening, which was these arrangements that currently do exist are administrative and that this places us on a legal footing, which actually leads into one of the points that Deputy Gollop has made around security, around partnerships in the Common Travel 110 Area and the Customs Union, where we have an obligation to have very robust controls. There is nothing in this that will change that. What it will do is place it on a proper legal basis so we can demonstrate internationally that we have those controls.

Deputy Gollop makes a very good point. The facilities for clearing both passengers and goods at the airports, including Alderney Airport and our ports, the facilities and the IT, that and indeed 115 the staff resource are all based around those facilities. There is a resource implication if you have to deploy outside of those areas. That is one of the reasons why the cost element comes into it.

What the thrust of this is saying, if a commercial operator, or even a private operator, wants to do something different and not make a clearance in an approved port, the burden cannot be on the Guernsey taxpayer. That burden must shift on to the person that is making the application. Of 120 course that is the difference with these arrangements. The administrative arrangements, we do not apply any charge. That is a positive aspect of it.

Deputy Gollop is absolutely right; media interest around Sark and a customs station there. That is a matter if Sark wants to engage with the Committee for Home Affairs on any such arrangement, but in any discussions that have happened over actually quite a few years, it has been made clear 125 that the cost for that, whether it is infrastructure, whether it is resource, whether it is IT, whether it

is trained officers to manage that, the cost, would have to be met by Sark. It would not be right for the Guernsey taxpayer to have that burden.

130 I think the main point actually that Deputy Gollop has made, and I completely agree with him, is around the ability for the Bailiwick as a whole to have that security both from a customs point of view, both from an immigration point of view, and an anti-terrorism point of view. That is by making sure that vessels do make their clearance in approved ports. If anything happens outside of that, then the legal framework is there to cover that.

That, I think, hopefully replies to Deputy Gollop's questions, and I ask the Assembly to approve the policy letter.

135 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, there are two Propositions, they are interlinked and therefore I will put the two to you together.

140 Deputy Leadbeater, is it your wish to be relevéd before we get to the vote?

Deputy Leadbeater: Yes, please, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you for reminding me.

145 I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on the two Propositions. Your screen is flashing away, Greffier. If you want to turn it round so everyone else can suffer, please do so. I think there are some Members who want to vote who have not been able to vote yet.

There was a recorded vote.

150 *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	Dyke, John
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				
Haskins, Sam				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
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				

Roffey, Peter
Snowdon, Alexander
Soulsby, Heidi
St Pier, Gavin
Taylor, Andrew
Trott, Lyndon
Vermeulen, Simon

155 **The Bailiff:** In respect of the two Propositions, there voted in favour 39 Members, no Member voted against, no Member abstained, 1 Member is absent at the vote, I will declare both Propositions carried.

**COMMITTEE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE AND
COMMITTEE FOR HOME AFFAIRS**

**21. Amendments to the Road Traffic (Construction and
Use of Motor Vehicles) Ordinance, 2002 –
Propositions carried as amended**

Article 21.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter entitled "Amendment to the Road Traffic (Construction and Use of Motor Vehicles) Ordinance, 2002", dated 17th March 2025, they are of the opinion:-

- 1. To agree to amend section 9(G) of the Road Traffic (Construction and Use of Motor Vehicles) Ordinance, 2002 as described in section 5 this Policy Letter.*
- 2. To direct that the introduction of a decibel limit or limits (along with any further measures that may prove effective in tackling excessive vehicular noise) is considered by the Committee for Home Affairs and the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure, informed by a data-collection trial, as set out in section 6 of the policy letter.*
- 3. To direct the preparation of such legislation as may be necessary to give effect to the above decisions.*

160 **The States' Greffier:** Article 21, Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure and Committee for Home Affairs – Amendments to the Road Traffic (Construction and Use of Motor Vehicles) Ordinance, 2002.

165 **The Bailiff:** I understand that Deputy Prow is going to open in relation to this matter, so Deputy Prow please.

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

I am pleased to open the debate on this policy letter, which is a result of cross-Committee work between the Committee for Home Affairs and the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure on the issue of noisy vehicles, which has long been a cause of great deal of frustration locally. **(A Member:** Hear, hear.)

The Committees are today seeking the Assembly's support both for an amendment to the construction and use of motor vehicles legislation and to direct both Committees to consider the introduction of a decibel limit or limits which will be informed by a data collection trial.

175 Turning to Proposition 1, the proposed amendment to the Construction and Use Ordinance, the Committee proposed that the existing provision in relation to the vehicle exhaust systems is amended so that not only must every exhaust system and silencer be maintained in good and

efficient working order, but also the exhaust system of the vehicle must not be altered after the date of manufacture so as to increase the noise made by the escape of exhaust gases.

180 This would mean that it would be sufficient to prove an increase in noise as a result of the alteration for the purpose of the offence rather than having to prove that the noise is excessive, as is currently the case. This would align with the provisions in the UK and Jersey and enable prosecutions without having to prove that the vehicle failed a subjective excessive noise test.

The benefit of this is that the change would be immediate once the amendment came into force. Further, there is evidence that the provision is proving effective in tackling vehicle noise in comparative jurisdictions. The policy letter also proposes that jointly the Committees will undertake
185 a data collection trial to gather data to inform what further remedies, specifically a decibel limit, are necessary to tackle vehicle noise.

It is a generally held view that we need to introduce a decibel limit and the trial will identify the practicalities of implementing noise thresholds and inform any potential future legislative changes
190 to ensure that it is proportionate and deliverable by the police in a cost-effective and efficient manner.

A trial is necessary as it is not as simple as picking a decibel limit. A data collection trial will record environmental conditions, the type of vehicle being tested; for example whether it is a low-powered motorcycle or heavy goods vehicle. This data will help inform whether identification of a
195 single decibel limit would be adequate or whether a tiered system for different types of vehicles would be more appropriate.

A trial is also necessary to identify the process, resource requirements and necessary equipment to meet evidential standards to successfully deliver any additional provisions in relation to an objective decibel test. Importantly, the trial can be undertaken in tandem with the enforcement of
200 the contraventions into the new offence proposed in Proposition 1.

In summary, the policy letter seeks to provide law enforcement with the necessary tools to take action against those who modify their vehicles in a way which produces excessive noise. Motorbikes, mopeds and cars with an excessively loud exhaust have been a grumbling problem in the Bailiwick for some years, and I am pleased that, together with the Committee *for the Environment & Infrastructure* and the Committee *for Home Affairs* have been able to take these steps towards
205 ensuring the issue is properly tackled.

I ask the Assembly, sir, to support these Propositions.

Thank you, sir.

210 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, two amendments have been submitted. I am going to take Amendment 2, before Amendment 1, on the basis that it looks like a Committee-related amendment, and so I invite Deputy de Sausmarez, if she wishes to do so, to open on Amendment 2.

[Amendment 2.](#)

To insert after Proposition 2 the following proposition:

"To agree to amend the Road Traffic (Construction and Use of Motor Vehicles) Ordinance, 2002 in order to –

(a) provide for an additional offence under the Ordinance of driving a motor vehicle on a public highway, the exhaust system of which does not comply with the decibel limit specified as established by means of a stationary test, and

(b) confer on the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure power by regulation to specify all those matters that are necessary for the purpose of enforcing and giving effect to the offence including –

(i) the applicable decibel limit,

(ii) the class or category of vehicle to which any decibel limit is to apply (including the power to specify different decibel limits in relation to different classes or categories of vehicle), and

(iii) the testing method to be used for the purpose of establishing the decibel level, including the persons authorised to conduct tests, and

*(iv) police powers to enable or facilitate such testing, and
(c) provide that any such regulations shall be laid before the States and be subject to the usual power to annul them.”.*

215 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you, sir, and I will start by extending my thanks on behalf of the Committee to the Committee *for* Home Affairs.

This piece of work has been pulled out of a much broader bit of work that the two Committees have been working on in order to improve road safety and its enforcement. But we did think it was a priority to get this particular aspect to the Assembly before the end of this political term. It was not something that was prioritised in the GWP, but we do feel as though it is an issue that impacts
220 a lot of people’s lives. Certainly, that is the strong impression I get from the number of people who contact me on a very regular basis about it. I know that it can have a material effect, so I am glad to be able to, along with Home Affairs, bring this debate to the Chamber today.

In terms of this amendment, it is really a response to Amendment 1. I will explain the difference
225 between the two, because superficially they look incredibly similar. Amendment 1 seeks to introduce a new Proposition. We are absolutely supportive of that Proposition being included in the substantive props; absolutely fully behind that. The difference between Amendment 2 and Amendment 1 is simply this, with Amendment 1, it deletes the original two Propositions, but this amendment keeps all of them in play. I will explain the rationale for why we are doing that. Partly it
230 is hopefully that we have a slightly more concise debate I think is part of the reason. But the Proposition that would be introduced by Amendment 1 and would also be introduced by this amendment is quite specific, and that is something that actually I hope Members will support and it is great, but the original Proposition 2 is actually the work that is necessary in order to inform what this Proposition will do, if that makes sense.

235 So Proposition 2 basically says the same thing. It says that we want to be able to introduce a decibel limit or decibel limits. That is exactly what the wording of this new Proposition would do. This is what it looks like in more granular form.

But Proposition 2 also encompasses a trial, which, as Deputy Prow referred to in his opening
240 speech, is absolutely essential in order to inform how it would work in real life. Because it sounds like it is quite straightforward. We will just introduce decibel limits. Well, as ever, if it had been that straightforward we would have done it years ago. It is not that straightforward at all for a number of different reasons. Mostly that decibel limits tend to be applied to the manufacturing part of the process rather than the use. There is not a particularly standardised way of dealing with decibel limits in real life. It is more complicated in terms of how you test for them, how you can make sure
245 that that testing is robust and the evidence can stand up in court if it has to because of the impact, for example, of other noise getting in the way of that reading, or whether you take it down to a controlled environment in order to test.

The trial is absolutely essential in understanding how to make this new Proposition workable. We do need that trial. Proposition 2 would be knocked out with Amendment 1, but with this
250 amendment Proposition 2 stays in place. The other thing that Proposition 2 does is it has a wider applicability as well. So whereas the new Proposition, which would be introduced by both amendments, is quite narrowly focused on one particular aspect, the original Proposition 2 also encompasses further measures which could look beyond that.

In short, this amendment simply inserts the Proposition that is being proposed by Deputy Gabriel
255 in Amendment 1. We are very happy to insert that into the substantive Propositions but we do think it is more sensible to include the original Propositions as well as this new Proposition rather than have an either/or situation. Proposition 1 has been touched on already by Deputy Prow in his opening speech. I am sure there will be conversation about it but if we approve this amendment then what happens is, in general debate, people can choose which of the Propositions they do want
260 to support or indeed do not want to support and vote accordingly. That is why we are hoping that this amendment will actually mean that we have a more efficient debate. I hope that makes sense.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow, do you formally second Amendment 2.

265

Deputy Prow: I do, sir.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.

270

Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Queripel: Thank you, sir.

Hopefully you will allow me to start by thanking Deputy Prow for wishing me well for the future. That means a lot. I also wish him well for the future in return.

275

On the point of our being involved in the loud tie competition today, Deputy Dudley-Owen is the judge and I certainly would not like to be in her shoes. The loser is going to donate £25 to a local charity, Victim Support, who have a donation bucket out in the Grand Hall, so everyone can witness the loser putting £25 in it later on, should they so wish.

280

But on the issue of my tie portraying the keyboard or the piano, today, sir, I will be playing all the right notes but not necessarily in the right order. This will be the last speech I ever make in this Chamber as a Deputy, which means I have made 588 speeches in my 13 and a half years as a Deputy. Some better than others, sir, it has to be said, but I have you to thank, indirectly, for the quality of my speeches, sir. As you will recall, you and I were in a bidding war for a book at Viaër Marchi some years ago. In fact, 13 years ago. You were distracted momentarily, and in that time, I put another bid in and I got the book. The book is this book that Deputy Taylor is holding up, sir. Great speeches. Speeches that shook up the world. I have said that, sir, because I have modelled some of my speeches on some of the speeches in that book in the last 13 and a half years.

285

I have never once made the kind of speech I am about to make. I say that because at the close of play yesterday I was talking to my friend Deputy Fairclough about this amendment in front of us and I told him it was going to be my last speech as a Deputy, whereupon he said it would be a good idea if I made it in the form of a poem. Now I really liked that idea, sir, but because I was attending, ironically, a poetry event last evening, I did not think I was going to have time. I really wanted to do it so when I got back home at 11 o'clock, I came up with this. It is entitled 'There has to be a limit':

290

Those who do not have hearing problems, or a heart condition, or are of a nervous disposition, may not appreciate or fully understand that this excessive noisy vehicle business is truly out of hand.

Because people with those kind of problems live in fear of having an excessively noisy vehicle anywhere near. Because it triggers their ailment, it puts them under immense duress, it causes them a lot of stress.

And that's not the way it's supposed to be because we've been elected to ensure the well-being of the community. We need to set them free from this tyranny. Islanders are at the mercy of excessively noisy vehicle pollution. They are relying on us to come up with a solution.

We really need to put a stop to it, and we can do that by introducing a decibel limit.

Because then motorists will have to make sure that their vehicles comply with the law.

295

Thank you, sir.

(Members applauded.)

300

Deputy Inder: 26(1), sir.

The Bailiff: Just a minute, Deputy Inder.

Deputy Dyke, is it your wish to be relevéd?

305

Deputy Dyke: Yes, please, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you.

310 Can I invite those Members who wish to speak in debate on this amendment to stand in their places? Is it still your wish, Deputy Inder, that I put the motion? Well, the motion is that there be no further debate other than hearing from the proposer of this amendment. Those in favour; those against? I think I can declare that lost.

Members voted Contre

315 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, sir.

Bear with me while I get my speech up in front of me. Forgive me, I may stray into general debate, sir. Please call me up if I do.

320 It should come as no surprise to Members that I am commenting on this amendment and indeed the policy letter. Most of my late teens and early 20s were spent under a bonnet of a vehicle or around an engine when I had that spare time preparing it for motorsports events on the Island. Some Members may recall Billet XXV of Wednesday, 25th November 2020, my maiden speech was concerning the transfer of function of motorsports events from Home Affairs to E&I, where I did
325 mention, among other things, economic contribution of motorsports to the Island and more specifically and relevant to this, standards that apply.

I asked then how many times Members have checked under their bonnet or around the engine of their vehicle. The Motorsports Association and the Auto Cycle Union are the governing bodies of motorsport in the Island and they use exceptional standards to scrutiny of vehicles and safety
330 equipment in motorsport. But I will come back to that later on, sir.

The main policy letter, which this amendment addresses, unamended states that it is proposed to make it an offence to the existing construction and use legislation under section 9G of the 2002 Ordinance as amended so that altering an exhaust system after the date of manufacture so as to increase the noise made by the escape of exhaust gases is an offence. From my observations, sir,
335 and many of those in the industry, Proposition 1, while well-meaning and seeming to address the problem of excessively noisy vehicles, is totally unworkable and over the top. Many performance-enhancing modifications to vehicles can involve replacing exhaust systems.

Sir, if you happen to visit Sausmarez Park in mid-June on a Sunday for the Guernsey Classic Vehicle Club's annual show, you will see many modified vehicles with great attention to detail spent
340 there. Many hours spent polishing and individualising vehicles, returning them to former glory, some including replacing worn out or damaged parts and some of those might be exhaust systems, and they might not be exactly as the manufacturer intended and could be noisier than the original, they would fall foul of Proposition 1.

On many modern-day vehicles, these replacement exhausts, which, while increasing the performance and efficiency of a vehicle, may look on inspection to be as per the manufacturer's design. To ascertain if a system has been modified to produce more noise could result in the system
345 having to be removed or disassembled to such an extent that would deem that system unusable or even destroyed. This would take significant resource too, such as time in a specialist facility to inspect the vehicle and detailed knowledge of the vehicle, including comparative data from the manufacturer to determine the baseline noise level expected from that vehicle, including the model
350 and the variant, which is what Proposition 1 tries to address.

The subjective nature of Proposition 1, again to me, is unworkable. How would any inspection by an officer or trained technician ascertain if a vehicle is noisier than what the original manufacturer intended? The helpful explanatory note that we are discussing in Amendment 2, when mentioned
355 cumulative noise, states that studies show that modified exhausts are typically 8 to 9 decibels louder than the exhaust that they replace. How does the human ear determine an 8 to 9 decibel increase without accurate measuring equipment? Proposition 1 does not address that. There is no measurement system planned for in Proposition 1 to measure how a replacement system is noisier than the original, except perhaps a Bailiwick law enforcement officer's ear.

360 Many vehicles have loud exhaust systems as factory fitted by the manufacturer and included in
the type approval that can register over 100 decibels and are excessively noisy. They also have
various driving modes such as Sport, Corsa or Strada which affect the exhaust note and the
performance of the vehicle, and those are built in to the vehicle as standard, as factory fitted, as
manufactured. Proposition 1 does nothing to address this and I think the Man on the Clapham
365 omnibus would class these vehicles as excessively noisy. But as the exhaust systems are not modified
and factory fitted, they would be deemed perfectly legal under Proposition 1.

Many original exhaust systems on vehicles fail because of the salty atmosphere in the Islands
and driving style as well in our Islands. In the main, original exhausts are not considered lifetime
parts but considered a consumable part. Replacing an exhaust system with a patented part from an
370 exhaust centre, perhaps down at Pitronnerie Road, is very likely not going to be the original
equipment specified by the manufacturer and be of a pattern to that original design. On occasion,
they might create more noise than the original system fitted. That again, under Proposition 1, would
be deemed illegal.

Further, the policy letter claims that for difficult cases, someone with the expert knowledge of
375 vehicles, such as a police vehicle examiner, may need to comment on how alterations to an exhaust
system would have an impact on the noise it emits, which without a comparative baseline or set
limit to measure against, is again subjective and relies entirely on the vehicle inspector, the
surroundings, and the vehicle use, be that static or under load. But what are they measuring against?
The only measurement is that it is more noisy than the original system. Again, that is entirely
380 subjective. What is noisier to one may not be to another.

Manufacturers' documentation could be informative regarding the maximum noise level that
the original exhaust system would be expected to emit. There are already strict regulations in
European community law regarding noise limits at the point of construction, but only available since
2016 on the type approval document. The current proposal is unworkable as vehicles manufactured
385 before 2016 will not have a decibel limit set in the type approval and there will be no comparison
to ascertain whether the exhaust system is noisier or not. Easier cases would be where it is
immediately obvious that the silencer has been removed or the exhaust system has been poorly
maintained in which case officer observations supported by photographs or body-worn video might
be sufficient to prove that under the current legislation, section 9G(2), they could be reported for
390 the offence. So, in my view, there is no barrier to that being undertaken now.

Picture the scene, sir, a vehicle passes an individual at speed and they think it is very noisy and
they also see it weaving around a corner. That very next corner, it passes a Bailiwick law enforcement
officer who has got a calibrated hand-held speed gun, he is trained in its use, and its speed is logged
and measured against the set limit in Law and can be prosecuted for exceeding the speed limit. The
395 officer also suspects that the driver is under the influence of alcohol. They can use a roadside
breathalysing equipment to inform their decision on whether to proceed to the station for evidential
test. That same vehicle they think is also noisy, but it is got a factory fitted exhaust system, nothing
can be done to limit the noise or penalise the driver even though it is perceived a nuisance and
noisy.

400 Proposition 3 gives powers to the future E&I to set the decibel limit in Law and goes on to
describe how they can specify the method to measure that vehicle noise emissions in a pragmatic
way. For example, an officer could use a roadside mobile phone application to inform their decision
on whether to proceed to an evidential test. Giving powers to E&I to set that decibel limit will set
the way that the public are expected to behave with defined limits, not subjectivity or guesswork.

405 The wording in Proposition 3 is a direct copy and paste of Amendment 1. On this occasion, the
plagiarism is welcome, as I also welcome the compromise that Deputies de Sausmarez and Prow
have come to by laying this amendment, by agreeing to include the decibel limit in their
amendment. If passed, I will be supporting it becoming a substantive Proposition. But I will urge
Members to not vote for Proposition 1, or even 2, and support Proposition 3.

410 A good friend of mine in Jersey, a Minister in Jersey, has got a great saying, JDI. I questioned him one day what that acronym meant, thinking that perhaps it was a Jersey department of something. He said to me quite plainly and simply, just do it.

In my view, sir, we should jump to the solution. There are many frustrated individuals out there who suffer the brunt of excessive noisy vehicles and we should implement Proposition 3, if the amendment passes and it becomes a substantive Proposition. Proposition 3 will address the problem immediately and, by statutory instrument, limits could be set or changed.

I know, sir, from a one-hour roadside unofficial test with an interested party, using his calibrated handout equipment, that some vehicles can emit up to 100 decibels relatively easily, and the tone of pitch I thought contributed – I will give way to Deputy Prow.

420

Deputy Prow: I thank Deputy Gabriel for giving way.

I just want to clarify whether I heard him correctly. Is he suggesting that he is supportive of the amendment but will vote in the way he has described in the final debate? Was that my understanding of what Deputy Gabriel said? I am sorry to interrupt your flow.

425

Deputy Gabriel: To clarify, I support Amendment 2 in its entirety because it adds in Amendment 1's full text. If Amendment 2 passes and there are three new Propositions to the policy letter 1, 2 and 3, I will likely only support Proposition 3, which is the introduction of the decibel limit by E&I. I certainly will not be supporting Proposition 1 for the reasons I hope I have explained and I will go on and try not to use all of my 15 minutes.

430

So, yes, I took some advice and conducted my own unofficial roadside test using a calibrated handheld decibel meter and some vehicles, as I was saying, as they were passing us, their tone and pitch, I thought, contributed to an excessive noise. That simple handheld piece of kit calibrated once a year for my – the person I was with's work category produced this unofficial drive-by test. I even tested my own little motor scooter, sir, which is a 300 cc four-stroke, and many Members might have seen me on it and not perceived that to be that loud, and that produced a test, a static test, using MSA standards, which was right at the start I said the Motorsports Association and Autocycle Union's test specifics, are very standard and published, that being a 1.5 m away from the exhaust, set at a 45 degree angle, using 50% of the maximum engine speed. My motor scooter emitted 84.6 decibels.

440

So practical uses, sir. Most UK and French racetracks have decibel limits and vehicles that take part in their MSA events, be they specialised machines for racetrack track use or more importantly road going cars, are tested in a controlled environment with specific limits set by the track owners, operators or the governing bodies. They do not use the subjective position to ascertain if a vehicle is noisy or not, they use the tried and tested method with calibrated equipment. Extending these practices to everyday vehicle use will ensure consistency and fairness.

445

Proposition 3 enables this Assembly to make those changes to reflect this and enable our enforcement officers to use tried-and-tested methods with no need to go down perhaps a lengthy trial costing time and money, whereas a straightforward and consistent method is already in place, and would reduce ambiguity in any legal proceedings. Of course, an enhancement to this method, once we have set a decibel limit, could be to include those decibel limits in the periodic vehicle testing regime, commonly known in the UK as the MOT, and exceeding any decibel limit set could result in a failure of the test.

450

Members, as I explained, if Amendment 2 passes, which I hope it will, and I am confirming in my support with it, I will urge you in the main Proposition to vote down Propositions 1 and 2 and support Proposition 3 for a pragmatic solution to a problem that many of the Island's community contact us about and perceive as a disruptor to the quiet, peaceful enjoyment of our Island.

455

Thank you.

460

The Bailiff: Deputy Falla.

Deputy Falla: Thank you, sir.

465 I thank Deputy Gabriel for his speech because he has addressed some of what I believe are the anomalies in this which have been bothering me, and therefore I think I am thinking along similar lines to Deputy Gabriel. During my campaign for the 2020 election I was greeted on one doorstep by a gentleman who was most insistent about the traffic noise situation and I think I was one, if not the first, to raise it in the beginning of this term, although I appreciate it goes back much further than that.

470 I am not convinced that a trial is absolutely necessary and I think the decibel level test is the way to go. I think a trial might just delay this further and we might find we are still here in another four years. It needs to be as simply dealt with as possible and as quickly as possible.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater.

475

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

480 I read this policy letter when it was first published and I have got to admit I thought – because here we are on the last day of the term – this was an election issue, so it has taken the entirety of this long term to produce this short policy letter and these Propositions within it. I am picking up on Deputy Falla and Deputy Gabriel's points about the trial. The first thing when I read that about the trial, I thought, 'No please do not do that, please do not go and do a trial. We do not need to reinvent the wheel or the exhaust', whichever it may be. But the policy letter in section 6 talks of the testing trial and 6.3 says that:

485 Regard would be given to international best practice with respect to decibel limits, for example as set out in UNECE Regulation No. 51 (External Noise of Motor Vehicles) and UNECE Regulation No. 41 (Noise Emissions of Motorcycles).

Blah, blah, blah. It goes on to list, by way of example, most passenger cars in the EU are limited to 72 decibels, it goes on through different engine sizes and the decibel limits that they are restricted to. We have already got this. I do not understand why we need to go and do a trial and reinvent the wheel.

490 Certainly, consultation with stakeholders, consultation with motorcycle groups, with the motor industry, with all stakeholders and with the public I think to nail down if these decibel limits as prescribed here from the EU are going to be correct. Taking Deputy Gabriel's point about his motorcycle, I am unsure, I am not going to decide what the decibel limits should be on the floor of this Assembly but I do not think we need a trial. It is disappointing that we have been through an exceptionally long term, right the way through the term, and we have got this which is woolly in my opinion. We heard from people in the industry that manufacture exhausts that it would completely decimate their business if we agree the Propositions as set out in the original policy letter.

500 I am hearing Deputy Gabriel and what he says and I will probably do the same, because I was quite happy to support Amendment 1 by Deputy Gabriel and Deputy Helyar, but I will support this amendment and I will be voting the same way as Deputy Gabriel to the substantive Propositions if this is successful.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

505

Deputy Gollop: Yes, I follow on from the last two speakers.

510 This is a confusing area and it is certainly not an area, although I have raised it in questions many times, like Deputy Blin, that I am an expert on or a practitioner with. I think Deputy Queripel made a really great speech today with his poem. Yes, he did, because he was reminding us of the effect this noise has and it affects people in different ways. There are some people to whom it almost might be entertaining or a part of the community would have a chuckle. Other people who are

vulnerable, who may have tinnitus, who may be on the autistic spectrum, or whatever, find that this is very distracting. I have been at seminars and workshops in the Chamber offices, for example, in Fountain Street and there it is a real noisy tunnel.

515 Sometimes we pass legislation or policies for legislation which are important but, for example, when we looked at the debate on public harassment, for example, there was a degree of subjectivity in that legislation because, again, inappropriate or unpleasant conduct will affect different people in different ways and maybe the onus should be on the perpetrator to not just go ahead because what might be okay for some members of the community is not for others. I think the same arguments apply here.

520 I did not particularly like the policy letter in every sense because it seemed amazing that we have waited nearly five years for it. I thought from the start that the police officers of the law could stop people and go after excessive noise levels and use the old legislation. Now I believe in the Royal Court and the Magistrate's Court and the respect the police generally have across the Bailiwick. I believe – maybe this is really true half a century ago – that if a police officer went to the court and said, 'John Gollop has been driving his motorbike in a really noisy way' before the magistrate, the acting magistrates in those days who were jurats or stipendiary magistrates would probably believe the police officer for good reason, especially if there was really coherent evidence, and the culprit would be punished.

530 Actually, I think a more efficient way of doing it would be on the stop fines and more of a parking ticket or an internet digital basis of that rather than tying up the court system in numerous cases. But I cannot believe that this excessive noise problem cannot be stopped. It was not even clear in the policy letter whether the police had the power to stop someone and direct them to do a test. It seemed to be more of a request. Yet we do need to identify the excessive noise. I believe that modern technology – use phones, use digital.

535 I have just been to an artificial intelligence briefing and these guys in China and America and Paris appear to be streets ahead. We can do it. We do not need this cautious approach. I really believe Home Affairs – they have got a new senior leadership team in place now as well – can get on with this and voting for something that is concrete, the legislation idea of Deputy Gabriel, Deputy Leadbeater, makes more sense to me, although I will support the amendment obviously to get it all together.

540 That is a very important move forward. The other thing is, as Deputy Ledbetter says, we have been advised there are consequences, and I did not understand the logic whereby a change in the exhaust meant it was an offence, but the exhaust to begin with did not necessarily make an offence, and we are expanding it beyond the context of cars and all sorts of vehicles. I think we should go back to first base and have some legislation. I actually think it would have a deterrent effect, even if a very able lawyer or culprit or perpetrator or alleged perpetrator could argue their way out of it. I actually think it would work, it would have a deterrent effect if licence points were put on and it would solve the problem.

550 Let us get on with the action.

Deputy Inder: Sir, I am going to try 26(1) again.

555 **The Bailiff:** All right. Can I invite those Members who wish to speak in debate on Amendment 2 to stand in their places. Is it still your wish that I put the motion?

Deputy Inder: If it fails, a recorded vote, please.

560 **The Bailiff:** Okay. The motion is that there be no further debate other than turning back to the proposer of the amendment. Those in favour? Those against?

Members voted Contre.

565 I will declare that lost but we will now have a recorded vote because Deputy Inder has requested it. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on the motion proposed by Deputy Inder. Can we now please close the voting, Greffier?

There was a recorded vote.

570 *Not carried – Pour 17, Contre 20, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 2, Absent 0*

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

575 **The Bailiff:** So in respect of the motion proposed by Deputy Inder that there be no further debate under Rule 26(1), they voted in favour 17 Members, against 20 Members, 1 Member abstained, 2 Members were absent, and that is why it was declared lost. But now nobody is rising. I call Deputy Prow.

580 **Deputy Prow:** Thank you, sir. I did second this amendment and I did ask Deputy Gabriel if he supported it, which he did not, but I think actually if I speak now –

Deputy Gabriel: Point of correction sir.

585 **The Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: I do support Amendment 2 in its entirety to get it into the main policy letters.

The Bailiff: That is what Deputy Gabriel said in his speech.

590 **Deputy Prow:** Yes, I beg your pardon, Deputy Gabriel. Yes, I actually said the complete opposite of what I meant. I apologise. It is a worry. Perhaps I should just sit down now.

595 I was resisting the temptation to speak at all but I think if I speak now, sir, I might hopefully save some time in general debate because it seems to me some of the comments that have been made have actually alluded to how Deputies feel about the other Propositions, should this amendment be successful. I completely respect Deputy Gabriel's experience and knowledge around this subject, and I applaud and support his interest in motorsport in general.

Perhaps what I should point out, and this perhaps answers the point that other Deputies have made, this was done in discussion at I think possibly two, possibly three, joint meetings with Environment & Infrastructure and Home Affairs. Of course in that environment we had the benefit of the subject matter experts, in particular the police and the law officers.

While the policy letter might be short, it actually hopefully does deal with what the professionals have fed back to us, which is about trying to find the best and most effective legal position to make enforcement as simple as possible. Deputy Gollop has mentioned fixed penalties, and I think that would be a desirable solution to be able to deal with offenders, particularly in the first instance, through fixed penalties. But you still have to prove the offence.

The question of how you enforce the decibel limit, how you evidence it, was detailed at those meetings and the Committee did listen to it, as did Deputy Gabriel, because at that particular time, I think he was in favour of the policy letter. What we have done – and Deputy Leadbeater said, and I agree with him, that we should not be debating what the exact decibel limit should be on the floor of the Assembly. I thank him for that comment because I think that that is absolutely right and that is one of the reasons why we are proposing the trial.

What we need to do is to examine how best this can be enforced because in truth what I think I want and the Committees want is to deal with this once and for all. If you have all the options in Proposition 1, together with the options in this amendment, then I think we are more likely to do that. What I would highlight actually, because nobody who has spoken yet in debate has mentioned this, is all Proposition 1 is seeking to do is to align Guernsey's legislation on noise levels emitted by exhaust with the UK and Jersey's, which will make it legal to modify an exhaust system in a way that makes the vehicle noisier after it has a type approved, after it has been checked to meet environmental safety standards.

The UK and Jersey wording better achieved what the Guernsey legislation was originally intended to achieve. But because Guernsey's legislation is worded less specifically, it is currently not as effective. This alignment, which is quick and easy in legislative terms to implement, has been proposed by the Committees in this instance. That is precisely why both Committees have settled on that approach.

We have listened to the law enforcement officers and they have had successful prosecutions in Jersey using that wording. So some of the difficulties that Deputy Gabriel and others have put forward do not appear to be the case in those jurisdictions. It is enforceable. But I think what has absolutely come clear to me so far in this debate, is the annoyance caused by noisy vehicles has got to be tackled. Why has it come so late in this term? I can tell you why it has come so late in this term, and Deputy de Sausmarez has already mentioned this, it did not make the cut of the Government Work Plan. I think the workload of Environment & Infrastructure and Home Affairs this term explains entirely why this has not managed to get the priority that perhaps most Islanders would have liked it to have had. I apologise to them for that, but that is the fact. The fact is we now have a policy letter before you.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tissier.

Deputy Le Tissier: Thank you, sir.

I will just rise briefly because I am going to speak in general debate. But as regards this amendment, Amendment 2, there are several things I find strange about this policy letter. Why is it taking years and years to get – no, I think you should let me finish. Why is it taking years and years to get this letter which purports to solve the problem of noisy vehicles? Does it have anything to do with the election coming up? Surely it could have come before the previous Assembly. It is not too difficult. It has come to this Assembly, so it could have come to the last Assembly. So while it did not meet the Government Work Plan, and Deputy Prow has explained that, it is still long, long, long overdue.

650 Now I would say why on earth are we trying to go down the route of exhausts, trying to regulate
exhaust systems. One can argue the case that an exhaust, which is a physical piece of metal, is or is
not identical to the OEM version. It is a fine piece of work for our wonderful advocates. They need
the work. But that is okay because the Committees are proposing a trial of a decibel limit. Our close
neighbours have a decibel limit but little old Guernsey wants to go its own way again. Do not
reinvent the wheel. I see it as a binary decision with decibel limits above or below the limit. There is
655 no argument to that on whether it is an original exhaust. As Deputy Leadbeater said, we are not
going to debate what those limits should be and I am not qualified and probably no one here is
qualified to set limits. We can look to Jersey and the UK if we want to see what the limits should be.

660 Just to finish up this short speech, as a banker, in case Amendment 1 fails, I am probably going
to support Amendment 2 but, in the same way as Deputy Gabriel mentioned, I will only be
supporting Proposition 3 if this goes through.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Matthews.

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

Sir, I intend to support the amendment. I think that the amendment – the original amendment
– from Deputy Gabriel and Deputy Helyar was an improvement over what we had from – well, it was
originally actually from the Committee *for* Home Affairs and it was sent to the Committee *for the*
Environment & Infrastructure for comment. On the Committee *for the* Environment & Infrastructure
670 they had quite a lively bit of debate about whether this was the right way to tackle it or whether
there were other improvements that could be made. In fact, we have had conversations in the past
about whether existing legislation would tackle the issue or whether anything else could be done
about it.

675 I will be supporting it, but I do feel though that there is much more that could be done with this.
One of the aspects that I had presented at Committee, but I did not manage to win the argument
at Committee, was that we ought to really be looking at the categories of licensing and particularly
the licensing for the P category for up to 50 cc motorcycles, which is where I think is part of the
issue.

680 I wanted to read, sir, briefly, an excerpt from an email that was sent, it was sent actually to all
members of E&I and Home Affairs, but I can read some excerpts from it. It is from a gentleman who
says, I will read:

We cycle as much as we can: commuting, school run, local trips at the weekend, and for pleasure. I have two children
and both are highly competent and confident in cycling on the roads. They are hugely motivated to use their bikes.
However, noisy motorbikes, in particular, have had and continue to have seriously negative impact on cycling with the
kids. Both kids are scared of the noise from loud motorbikes, typically 50 cc bikes, occasionally bigger bikes, when
cycling. My daughter, in particular, is absolutely terrified of noisy motorbikes going past. She has been since she was
young. It is at a point that if we are preparing to leave home and cycle to school and she hears a noisy bike in the lane,
as it is usually the same people every morning at the same time, she will ask to be driven instead. It also threatens her
safety when cycling, and despite my attempts to calm her and to have a plan to stop safely and wait until they have
passed, she loses focus if a noisy bike is near: looking around for it, breaking without notice and generally panicking.
The risks to the safety of her and her younger brother too when we cycle together have a potential domino effect. We
have had a number of near misses.

685 Sir, that is an experience that I relate to. I have a young nine-year-old son who is on the autism
spectrum and actually for children on the spectrum loud noises are particularly impactful. It is really
quite an impact for children with these loud bikes. Members may notice that the correspondent
refers to 50 cc bikes, which are generally two-stroke bikes. The two-stroke engine design is such
that modifying the exhaust – unlike four-stroke engines, modifying the exhaust greatly increases
the performance.

690 On a four-stroke engine, a degree of performance enhancement can be gained, but on a
two-stroke bike or engine the performance gain is really dramatic. Of course, in addition, because

our licensing category is 50 cc, because they are very low power, there is a reason to ride them at very high revs, at very high RPM in order to gain the maximum performance from the very small engine. Of course, kids who ride them tend to ride in groups, which amplifies the amount of noise that you get from these 50 cc cycles.

695 Sir, unusually in Guernsey, our licensing is set so that 14-year-olds can ride in this category. I believe the reason for this was originally to coincide with the school-leaving age, when the school-leaving age was 14. It was thought that it was useful to have this category that kids who had left school would be able to get around and get to their work, if they had left school, which of course we have raised that age now.

700 So my feeling is, although I will be supporting the amendment and I will be supporting the amended Proposition, or it will be Proposition 3, my feeling is that much more could be done in terms of the licensing of these 50 cc bikes, the two-stroke bikes. I actually think that if this legislation is not successful the next E&I really does need to look at that as a change that could be brought in. I think we could be looking to bring it in now, but I was not able to persuade the Committee for E&I to bring that as an amendment.

I think that in general this category is becoming obsolete, because we now have e-bikes that 14-year-olds are able to ride that does nearly everything that these small cycles are able to do. This, I think, is most of the problem. When people refer to noisy bikes, they are not, in general – although there are some issues with bigger bikes and with cars, I think in general most of the time they are talking about these small bikes which have this very loud tinny exhaust, often modified, and I think in this day, it is really unnecessary.

I will be supporting the amendment and the Propositions, particularly Proposition 3.
Thank you, sir.

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

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Sir, I genuinely was not going to speak because this is genuinely not my area of expertise. I have only had one car in my life. I still have it, it is about 12 or 13 years old. I would not know what to do with the exhaust or any other parts of it. But I just want to bring some – and this is why I need to look at things in a simple way and see whether they make sense. So if we look at the Proposition, the core Proposition from the policy letter – and I am straying into general debate – so I will not speak in general debate, is to agree to amend section 9G of the Road Traffic Ordinance, as described in section 5 of the policy letter.

720 So section 5 of the policy letter on page 4 suggests that the Ordinance will be amended so that altering an exhaust system after the date of the manufacture so as to increase the noise made by the escape of the exhaust gases is an offence. That means any change to the exhaust that increases the noise level, even by 1 decibel or 5 decibels or a couple of decibels effectively becomes an offence. I think that Deputy Gabriel referred to that in his speech.

730 We received a very detailed letter from James Larbalestier, from JL Innovations, who are a company who are the sole provider of exhaust pipes for cars and motorcycles in the Island. He gave some really relevant examples of what this offence would mean. One example is, for example, if you have an old car or motorbike where the exhaust pipes are no longer manufactured and you need to get a new exhaust pipe and that exhaust pipe might be slightly noisier than your previous one, effectively this will become an offence.

735 But more seriously, for example, if you have bought a car that does not have the sports mode, that does not sound sporty, but you would like to fit an exhaust that is a little bit noisier, it makes it sounds a little bit sportier, effectively that would not be allowed. But the same exhaust on a sport car, which is sold on the market completely legally, is allowed. So you are allowed to drive, let me quote, an Audi RS model legally but you would not be allowed to fit the RS exhaust model on to another Audi because that would not be legal.

740 So I just think that does not make any sense. It just does not pass the Guernsey common sense test. I think the principle is that we are trying to align ourselves with Jersey and the UK. There is no

745 explanation of what that means. Are we aligning to 100% or are we just aligning with a few things?
Any time we try to just purely align ourselves with someone else without explaining why that is the
case, it does not pass my common sense.

So the actual co-proposal from the Committee to create an offence which makes changing the
exhaust with the intention to increase the noise, no matter how much of that increase is, 1 decibel
will effectively make it an offence. I am sorry, but it does not pass the common sense test. It is a
750 blanket ban, which I think will have real repercussions for the whole industry.

So I think under no circumstances I will be supporting Proposition 1. I think the approach
suggested by effectively the original amendment, as will be amended by this amendment if
successful, I think that is absolutely the right approach. Whether we need a data collection trial or
not, I do not feel particularly strongly about. I think effectively what is being proposed under this
755 amendment is absolutely the right way of directional travel.

What I am slightly surprised about is that – I think it is pointed by Deputy Inder in an email to
Deputies – this policy letter was unanimously approved by the Committee. Sir, I am happy to give
way to Deputy Gabriel, because I do not think he will be able to speak otherwise in this debate,
whether – what has changed his mind of why his amendment was brought and he would not be
760 supporting the Propositions that he originally supported. I give way to Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: I thank Deputy Kazantseva-Miller for allowing me to give way.

Effectively, I should have written a minority report, but it was only after that I had taken my own
consultation with industry, with entry body interested members of the community, how this would
765 impact them; effectively an impact study. Perhaps I did my own trial and came to the conclusion
that, yes, common sense should prevail, Proposition 1 is unworkable. Which is why, with the help of
Deputy Helyar, I laid the amendment, which is where that has come from.

In my view, Proposition 3 as amended is a much more workable, practical, pragmatic solution
rather than the blanket ban to warm up one little left toe rather than the whole body.
770

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Thank you, sir.

I hope that explains better Deputy Gabriel's change of heart to some extent. So I hope that is a
small contribution. I really do not fully understand the details, but I think just on the very high level,
it does not make sense what is being proposed by the policy letter, and I will be supporting
775 Proposition 3 and possibly Proposition 2, depending how the general debate goes.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Vermeulen.

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

Sir, I was lucky enough to attend all the meetings with E&I, and I must say I was really surprised
at how many people we had around a board table to make sure we got this right. I was quite
concerned to hear of the number of complaints which we have had about these noisy vehicles –
particularly in town late at night where it affects people's sleep patterns – motorcycle or a motorcar
785 going past flat out.

So in those meetings we had the discussion of how it would be checked and policed was brought
up. You have to remember that Guernsey does not have an MOT system where you can check
exhaust systems to see if they have got their emissions right, their catalysts are working and the
rest of the vehicle. We have not got those testing centres in Guernsey at all. I do not think they have
790 got that in Jersey either. I do not believe that Jersey has a decibel limit set at the moment.

We looked at the regulation that Jersey had and they had some parts about modifying exhausts
from the UK, which had been lifted, and that is what we are doing. The test idea is a good one. You
should all be supporting it, because how does Guernsey police things like this? We know everyone
wants a decibel limit, which is all well and good, but how do you bring this into place in Guernsey?

795 I think a test is a very good idea. It could be used like a rectification scheme for motor vehicles. Again, you should be supporting it.

We have heard loud and clear where you want to get to, but it is just how we gradually bring it in, how we identify what testing equipment is going to be needed, what facilities are going to be needed on Island to check these limits out.

800 So a stunning speech from Deputy Prow, he was absolutely spot on. It will not be PC Deputy Gollop that is going to be policing it. It has to be brought in by our own industry experts, which we had advice from at all the meetings. I am going to be supporting this amendment. I will be supporting 1, 2 and 3 as well and I would advise Members to do the same.

805 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: I heard that sigh. Thank you, sir. *(Laughter)*

I am just going to make a really short speech, I think Amendment 2, as Deputy de Sausmarez explains it, is just right. But I do agree with Deputy Kazantseva-Miller that the original proposal, which focuses on adjustments to the exhaust system is actually focusing on the wrong thing. It may be that in certain cases you have adjustments to the exhaust system and decibel limits and they will overlap in the middle and cover some cases. But what you should be focusing exclusively on is the decibel issue and not the exhaust system issue.

810 So I think that Deputy de Sausmarez's amendment is correct and should replace Proposition 1. I will give way to my learned friend.

Deputy Vermeulen: I am grateful for Deputy Dyke. He is, in fact, clearly wrong on this. *(Laughter)* I did spend some of my youth working for the Kawasaki Motorcycle Centre in the Rohais many moons ago. A motorcycle or any engine, four-stroke, two stroke, emits noise through an exhaust system, which can be modified in many ways. It can be modified by straight piping, it can be modified by putting on an expansion chamber, adjusting end pipes, de-catalysing. Even motorcycles nowadays, they have catalysts in their systems. So it is clearly exactly the right spot which has to be monitored, is the exhaust system.

825 Thank you, sir.

Deputy Dyke: I thank Deputy Vermeulen for his contribution. I think for the first time ever, we are going to have to disagree on that. *(Interjections and laughter)*

Deputy Vermeulen: Where does the noise come from?

830

Deputy Dyke: I will take you back to 1985 when I was a young innocent 28-year-old. In that year, the States of Guernsey were passing the noisy vehicles Law of 1985. Now 40 years on, I am 68, and we still have not actually prosecuted any noisy vehicle and we are having another bash at the same thing. We have to get it right this time and get it through. Otherwise the next time I am going to be 108 when we are discussing this *(Laughter)* and I do not think I can wait that long.

835 Thank you.

The Bailiff: I am going to turn to the proposer of Amendment 2, Deputy de Sausmarez to reply to the debate, please.

840

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

I do appreciate that much of the debate on this amendment has actually been debate in general, so I will do my best to keep it focused. I will start with a very focused comment that technically all this amendment does is add in a new Proposition, as drafted and proposed and supported by Deputy Gabriel, and that will allow Members to basically take their pick of any that they may or may not want to support. That is the technical effect of this amendment.

845

Really it is very straightforward, but there have been lots of interesting debate, which has strayed very much more into general debate. I will try to keep my comments in response to debate as focused as I can to the purpose of the amendment.

850 Deputy Queripel, gosh I think it is only appropriate – oh, he is not even in the Assembly, I am sure he is tuned in on his radio in another room. It is only appropriate to respond to him also in verse: His speeches number 588; his last, I feel was truly great. My speech, yes, a lot shorter than many of his, but I am sure they have all been very much appreciated. He does assure me that he has got hard copies of all 588, if anyone would like a copy. (*Interjection*) Volume 2, to be awaited.

855 I thank Deputy Gabriel for his support for this approach. This is where it is a tricky judgement call about how much to go into general debate and not. Yes, I am tempted to go with 'not' really, except to say that Deputy Gabriel's main argument was against Proposition 1, which I accept. His mind has been changed since this policy letter was agreed, and that is absolutely fair enough. That is a matter for Members to make their own judgement call on. I would say that certain of his
860 comments about, 'Well, it is totally unworkable', which other people picked up. Well, it not in the UK and Jersey; this is the point.

So our initial legislation was drafted to have the same effect as the UK and Jersey's, but Guernsey's wording was very much woollier, which has allowed a different situation to arise. I do not think it can be accurate to say that it is not workable if we have got evidence of it being workable
865 in exactly that form in other places.

But, anyway, this amendment is not about having an argument or a debate over Proposition 1 at all, it just adds in a new Proposition. Also I am very supportive of Proposition 3, I will be supporting it, but I do not think it is fair to characterise it, as Deputy Gabriel did, as immediately addressing the problem, because there is a whole tranche of work that needs to go into that before
870 we can actually do what Proposition 3 says on the tin. That is what Proposition 2 is all about. The racetracks and everything, that is a very different scenario; I will come on to that more in a minute.

Deputy Falla, yes, the core point here, which a lot of the debate hinged on, it is all very well and good to say, 'Well, all we need to do is put decibel limits in.' We need to understand what those decibel limits are and how they can be enforced, how we can test for them. It all boils down to this,
875 we need to find a method to check – typically, all the decibel limits that are listed and cited, including in our policy letter, relate to the manufacturer of the vehicle, not the real world roadside impact. So it is a very different thing.

We need to understand. The purpose of Proposition 2 is to find a method to check the exhaust sounds pressure level when the engine is operated at realistic load and a method to check the
880 exhaust sound pressure levels against a general noise limit for categories of road vehicles. So this is the point, when vehicles are being tested at type approval stage, that is a very different environment to the same vehicle nine years later or something bolting down the West Coast Road, or wherever it might be or in town, when there is a lot of background noise.

So the purpose of Proposition 2 and the purpose of the trial is to understand in very practical
885 terms what the most appropriate decibel limits are in the Guernsey context. Quite rightly drawing from having regard to decibel levels that may be set for manufacturing purposes, but it is about real-world applicability. That is what this is all about. There is no point in us doing just a desktop exercise, sticking our proverbial finger in the air and going, 'Ta da! We are going to stick these decibel limits into Law', because we do not know if that is appropriate or indeed how it is going to
890 work. The whole purpose of Proposition 2 is to do that work to understand that.

I thank Deputy Prow for explaining that. Just before Deputy Le Tissier asked the question, he did explain again, as I did earlier, why it has taken so long. I would agree with him, Home Affairs has had a very productive term, as has E&I. We have been, I think, probably two of the most productive Committees. This was not a core workstream. As everyone will remember, the reason we have got
895 a Government Work Plan is precisely so that we can focus our time and effort and resources, our scant resources, on the work that the Assembly feels is the highest priority.

As Deputy Prow said, this issue, although it is an issue that means a lot to people, was not prioritised through that process because there are also a lot of other very big issues that we have

900 had to deal with between the two Committees. We have taken it upon ourselves, however, because we felt very strongly about this issue and the broader work that sits around it to move it through as expediently as we possibly can. It has been a frustrating process for all of us. I think Deputy Prow and I have PTSD, in particular, about the timeframe that it has taken. But we have managed to get it through in this political term, which is what we were determined to do. So I am very pleased that we are able to debate it today.

905 Deputy Le Tissier asked why regulate exhausts. Well, the reason for that is because, as Deputy Vermeulen explained, that is typically where the noise is generated. But also he said, 'It is simple, we should just be looking to the UK and Jersey.' Well that is literally exactly what we have done. So our close neighbours, he said, 'We can just take their legislation and use that here.' I was a bit confused by that argument, because that is literally what Proposition 1 is saying and he does not seem to like the sound of Proposition 1. Maybe that is for general debate.

910 I thank Deputy Matthews for his comments. He was quite right to draw attention to the impact and why this is an issue that does need dealing with. It does have a real-world impact. The licensing issue is, to my mind certainly, a much wider issue with much wider applicability than sound alone, and I think it deserves not being shoe-horned into something that potentially would not be able to look at all of the issues in that broader sense.

915 Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, it was really general debate and talking about Proposition 1. I would say in terms of the comments, and I will come on to – actually I think it is addressed with Deputy Dyke. So in terms of alignment with the UK and Jersey, as I have explained, when – all three jurisdictions have got some legislation trying to tackle this issue. Jersey's and the UK's is identically worded. Ours is similarly worded but ours is woollier. Therefore, as Deputy Dyke pointed out, whereas we have not been successful as a jurisdiction in using this legislation in any way, shape or form, Jersey and the UK have had a different experience. So it is just because Guernsey's wording in the legislations that currently stands is woollier.

920 I thank Deputy Vermeulen for his comments. He is quite right that one of the differences certainly between us and the UK is we do not have the equivalent of an MOT, which would be a periodic vehicle inspection, but as the explanatory note to the amendment makes clear, that interface is exactly one of the things we would be looking at through the work specified in Proposition 2. I think it is important just to bear in mind that this is about practicality and workability. It is all very well finding some numbers and sticking them into legislation. I would be worried with that approach without having first done the work that we need to understand what those numbers should be.

925 Deputy Dyke talked about adjustment to the exhaust system. If he reads the new Proposition that would be introduced by this amendment, which would become Proposition 3, it is exactly focused on the exhaust system. So to quote it does provide for:

935 an additional offence under the Ordinance of driving a motor vehicle on a public highway, the exhaust system of which does not comply with the decibel limit specified as established by means of a stationary test.

940 It then goes on in (b)(ii) – yes, this is the interesting thing, and I think this is probably more of a general debate thing, but you could end up with exactly the same effect, because the new Proposition also includes decibel limits to be applied per the class or category of vehicle to which any decibel limit is to apply. Yes, sorry, I have mucked up the wording of that:

including the power to specify different decibel limits in relation to different classes or categories of vehicle.

945 So, again, we need to understand, because the easiest way to do that – if we did not have the work in Proposition 2, the easiest way to do that would be to look at the type approvals categories per decibel level and just transfer those across, which would actually have exactly the same effect as Proposition 1. So I think it is important that the Committees are able to go off and have those conversations with the people on the front line of actually enforcing this, the police; have those

conversations with industry and that is all the work that would actually inform what we need to put into the legislation as per the new Proposition 3.

950 I have not managed to keep that strictly to the amendment because debate to the amendment was so wide-ranging, but I was very glad to hear of the general support for this. I do urge Members to support this amendment and we can take it hopefully on to general debate on all Propositions. Thank you.

955 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, it is time to vote on Amendment 2, proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez, seconded by Deputy Prow. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Amendment 2, please.

There was a recorded vote.

960

Carried – Pour 37, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 0, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	Helyar, Mark	Hill, Edward	None	None
Blin, Chris		Snowdon, Alexander		
Brouard, Al				
Burford, Yvonne				
Bury, Tina				
Cameron, Andy				
de Lisle, David				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Haskins, Sam				
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				
Roffey, Peter				
Soulsby, Heidi				
St Pier, Gavin				
Taylor, Andrew				
Trott, Lyndon				
Vermeulen, Simon				

965 **The Bailiff:** So on Amendment 2, proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez, seconded by Deputy Prow, there voted in favour 37 Members, 1 Member voted against, 2 Members abstained, no Member was absent. I would declare the amendment carried, which means that there will be a fourth Proposition.

We will work out what number it might be given in due course. There is nothing on the face of Amendment 2 to say renumber the following Propositions, so strictly it should be 2A. *(Laughter)*
970 But, anyway, the Greffier will work out what to do.

Deputy Gabriel, is it your wish to move Amendment 1?

Deputy Gabriel: No, sir, now that it is included in the main Proposition.

975 **The Bailiff:** Thank you very much. We move back into general debate then on the four Propositions.

Deputy Inder: I am going to try 26(1), sir.

980 **The Bailiff:** All right. Can I invite those Members who wish to speak in general debate to stand in their places? It is still your wish, Deputy Inder, I could imagine?

Deputy Inder: Yes, sir.

985 **The Bailiff:** Thank you very much. In that case, the motion is that there be no debate. There would not be anything for the President to reply to, other than the comments that have been made in general debate on the debate on the amendment. Those in favour? Those against?

Members voted Contre

990 **The Bailiff:** I will declare that lost.
Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: Thank you, sir.

995 I welcome this policy letter and the amendments. I remember a time when I was Home Minister and we had these sorts of problems, so it is good to find a solution and to pick up – I cannot remember who it was, which Member, said, 'Why has it taken so long?' It has taken so long, because we had a system that just could not be enforced in an appropriate way, and it was not dissimilar to other places. I am glad that we have been able to, as Guernsey does sometimes, follow behind
1000 others once they have tested whether it works or not, and then we can say, 'Right, now we can get in there'. I just hope it does not backfire.

The Bailiff: Deputy Blin.

1005 **Deputy Blin:** Thank you, sir.

I did not expect you to be so quick there, Deputy Le Tocq. So the first thing I would like to say is I am hugely grateful that actually we got to this within the term. However, and I will take on board what Deputy Prow and Deputy de Sausmarez's comments were, it has taken a long time of the GWP, all the aspects there. But I think I echo the voice of many people in our community that they have
1010 been waiting a long time to see something happen.

If I were to say that there was going to be a huge party in mid-June celebrating the success of the new Deputies or those who are here are going to stand again, etc., and there is a lovely party in one of our Deputies' houses with lovely music and everything there, how long would it take before there was a knock on the door for disturbance of noise. I know if I play the music or you play the
1015 music there would be a challenge.

Yet in that practical sense here, as much as I am finally pleased that we are taking this step to vote on this and hoping including the practical, pragmatic reasons, as Deputy de Sausmarez's has said, that you do need time to test and to go through the process. But that is going to lead, what, to another year? I do not see any solution for it, but that is going to be another year on top of the

1020 five years, and then before we get to something else. So there is a frustration there, because although this is not a priority – housing is a priority, the other areas are priority – there is this feeling that this has been something ignored.

The reason I say this is above all, for members of the public who are going to finally be pleased – I have had various calls and communications that, 'Is this going to be debated in this Assembly?' and the answer is yes, and it will be today. Have we taken the common sense approach, like Deputy Kazantseva-Miller has spoken about, the Guernsey common sense? Well, when we talked about electric scooters and things there, we would say, 'Well, we are just going to put announcements by the Home Affairs, the police, all the authorities, etc.' I wish we had that approach, just reminding people of the common sense of disturbance and noise in the same way as we have disturbance and noise in the house.

I am very particularly pleased Amendment 2 went through, and it is actually thank you for speaking with Deputy Prow yesterday on that to understand specifically the difference of the impact this would have. So I am glad that is through. I think the other points, to be fair, are just – I could just talk about we are creating a statutory hook, we are having some enforceability, all the things that this is going to do is positive, but we have to go through this trial in one.

I very much appreciate Deputy Gabriel's change of stance for a very pragmatic reason. That is appreciated as well. I think everyone's conversation during the – everyone's speeches during the amendment talks technically did not stray, but were more talking towards the policy letter.

Really nothing further to add. I just think that we need to have the clarity, capacity and consequence. Clarity, we need to know what the numbers are going to be, that will be the test, the capacity we can do, and the consequence of what type of penalties we will have for this. So I very much look forward to the decision on this.

Thank you, sir.

1045 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Taylor.

Deputy Taylor: Thank you, sir.

I did not stand when the 26(1) was called, but I am a little bit confused on which way I am going to vote here, so I feel the need to pipe up. I will not drone on, people are getting exhausted. (Laughter) But this has been an interesting journey for me, because I love motorbikes. I love loud exhausts. I love the V8. I love burning petrol. But I also like to sit in the garden and listen to birds. So I am genuinely conflicted. But I have supported this from the beginning with Home Affairs. I said to begin with I was very much in Deputy Helyar's and Deputy Gabriel's camp in why could we not just go down the route of using the track day example? It seemed so simple to do.

I have come around to thinking that is not necessarily the right way forward, because if you attend a track day and your exhaust is too loud by their test, you will be told that you cannot drive your car. It is hardly going to result in court action with a summons. If they say your car is too loud, you are not going to be put before the magistrates and you are not going to employ an advocate to then argue your case, and then you are not going to then appeal if you lose. It is a much more simple process, so it does not have to stand up to the evidential test in a real-life scenario like we are looking at here.

I very much came round to the idea that was being put forward about this modification test. Sir, I have absolutely listened to the comments that were made by Mr Larbalestier. I should confess, he is a friend of mine. I was actually in the process of booking in my Audi to have its exhaust changed with him. (Laughter) I do not know whether that is a declaration of interest or not or a declaration of intent maybe, sir.

Sir, I was comforted by the wording with paragraph 5.1, which is:

The Committees propose that the existing offence under section 9G, ... is amended so that altering an exhaust system after the date of manufacture so as to increase the noise made ...

1070 This is a point that I did discuss with the – I think Deputy Gabriel would have been there, when
we had the meeting with the relevant Law Officer, and the police were present and the two
Committees, and asked on this point the importance of those two words ‘so as’. If you modify an
exhaust for other purposes, it might not necessarily be an illegal act, but if you modified it ‘so as’ to
1075 increase the noise it would be. So I was working on the assumption that if you cut the silencer off
you would be modifying it so as to make more noise. There is no other reason you would cut the
silencer off.

But if you had a classic car that there was not an exhaust available, off the shelf, the manufacturer
did not make any more, you could have a custom one made. If it made slightly more noise, you
would not necessarily then be guilty of an offence. That seems to have been challenged. I have
1080 checked with Mr Comptroller and I posed that question. Admittedly it was a very quick question
that was posed to him, his initial view was coming back that, no, that is not the right case.

So I just wanted to either float the question out there, put it on record. I had that in mind and
I also then was drawn to paragraph 5.5, which talks about the reasonable defences that should be
1085 considered as part of the drafting. Because we do not have the exact draft of what the Ordinance is
going to be, so it needs to be considered what the reasonable defences would be. The only example
given is that a motorist whose vehicle is damaged in an accident is able to get to a nearby garage
to get the exhaust system fixed, will not be penalised for taking that sensible course of action.

So it is sensible to have a nearby garage fix your exhaust in an accident, but there should be
other reasonable reasons that you would have your exhaust worked on. It might then slightly differ
1090 from the manufacturer’s stated requirements or their decibel limits put in place at the time of
manufacture. I am going to support all of the Propositions, but I would just want to put on record
my sincere hope that those reasonable defences will be reasonable that it considers. So it is not just
an illegal act to modify an exhaust slightly, but it is only if that modification results in an excessive
noise.

1095 I appreciate that brings us back to a difficult point of: what is excessive noise? But that is just
where I am at, sir. I will be supporting it. I do not know if Mr Comptroller wants to provide any other
comment on that for Members’ benefit.

Thank you very much, sir.

1100 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: I just want to pick up where Deputy Taylor was interpreting paragraph 5.1, sir.
This is what I think is a problem and I think maybe Deputy Kazantseva-Miller’s point. What it says is
1105 if the exhaust is amended:

... after the date of manufacture so as to increase the noise made by the escape of exhaust gases ...

So if you modify your exhaust and not – I do not think it requires intent, as drafted here, but if
the effect is to make it noisier then that is an offence. But it covers something that it does not really
1110 need to cover. What if you have an exhaust that is all but silent and you change it and it makes it
very slightly noisier, that is an offence albeit that it might be a very quiet exhaust even after it has
been amended. That is how I interpret 5.1, what I do not think is really what we would want to
achieve. Whereas Deputy de Sausmarez’s proposal is perfect. That is my analysis at the moment,
but I will listen to what everyone else has got to say.

Thank you very much.

1115 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Haskins.

Deputy Haskins: Thank you, sir.

1120 Very quickly, I have just two points. It was Deputy de Sausmarez that really brought me to my
feet. Deputy de Sausmarez said that as part of the GWP this was not in it and, therefore, we could

not do anything. But it was my interpretation, it was my understanding, that the Committee right at the start of term chose what to put forward in the GWP. I seem to remember, myself and I believe Deputy Gabriel, asking the Committee to put this on the GWP.

1125 My only question for the President is can periodic testing of vehicles that the decibel limit, however it manifests itself to different vehicles having different limits, etc., whether the periodic testing, however that comes about, will have a facility to enforce this? That seems like one of the most sensible ways of enforcing this in the future.

Thank you.

1130 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Helyar.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, sir.

1135 As Deputy Trott very often tells us, Deputy Ferbrache is not short of a few bob. As far as I am aware, he did not make all of his enormous business empire by representing large numbers of 15-year-olds with 50 cc (*Laughter*) motorbikes appealing against sentences for loud exhausts. The idea that anybody has been contesting these sorts of prosecutions, in my view, is complete nonsense. This could have been resolved simply by amending the Law to say, 'In the reasonable opinion of a police officer.' Then it would have to be proven that the opinion was not reasonable or the reasonable opinion of the motor examiner.

1140 There is absolutely no need for most of this stuff, in my view. It just needed a little bit of common sense. We seem to have lost it with that. I am going to support what was effectively our amendment – myself and Deputy Gabriel – because we do not need to do any monitoring. We do not need to understand what a noisy bike is. Everybody knows what a noisy bike is. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) There is no understanding required. A cursory search on Google in 10 seconds will give you half a dozen different countries' decibel limits and how they are measured. This is not complicated. It should have taken five minutes at the beginning of the term.

1145 So, yes, I am not going to support any of the other Propositions. I think we should just crack on with it. We need to be solution driven, not problem driven. We are told about subject matter experts. We have had high-flying pigeon experts, diving board danger experts, we have had all sorts of advice this term that we should have rejected because it was nonsense. I think we should just crack on with the proposal that Deputy Gabriel put forward.

1150 Thank you.

1155 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Very briefly. It was referenced by Deputy Helyar to Deputy Ferbrache, I think I have said in this Assembly before that I was the tender age of 16 when Deputy Ferbrache represented me for my only ever encounter with the law. We lost, (*Laughter*) as I have mentioned before; something I have never forgotten, even if it was 40, 44, 45 years ago. But, sir, this is our final day together, so I am sure we will allow ourselves a little amusement.

1160 I want to talk about my small car collection. I have got two cars that are entirely electric and they do not have an exhaust, so they do not make any noise at all. I have two vehicles that have a button in the cabin that if you press opens the valves and it makes a delightful noise as a consequence. I also have two cars that are just standard, one is diesel and one is petrol. That is an example of how you please all of the people all of the time. (*Laughter*)

1165 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache.

1170 **Deputy Ferbrache:** My remarks have got nothing at all to do with this debate, (*Laughter*) but there are three points. Firstly, and I think it shows the accord and the thinking processes of Deputy St Pier and Ferbrache are both the same, because we are both wearing pink shirts today. Secondly, the book that Deputy Queripel outbid you on, sir, 13 years ago, there is going to be a

new version and it is going to enclose speeches of Deputy Trott and myself. The only trouble is the publisher has quality control (*Laughter*) and he says at the moment he cannot find any useful additions.

1175

Thirdly, the words – happiness has got no limits, because, thirdly, this debate is going to conclude with another wonderful speech from Deputy Prow. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) So happiness abounds and I wish everybody a happy election process.

Thank you, sir.

1180

The Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, sir.

1185

We know, as many people have described, that noise does have a material effect. Emails to us prove that. As Deputy Matthews described the father escorting his children to school by bicycle, his children being scared by noisy motorbikes, that has a very negative impact. Proposition 3, if it is going to be called that, or 2(a), gives flexibility by giving powers to E&I to set a decibel limit, which will set the way that the public are expected to behave within the defined limits, not subjectivity or guesswork about whether an exhaust might be noisier or even whether it has been replaced or not.

1190

A trial is not necessary. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) Just do it. Let us have some action on this. We know what a noisy vehicle is. Nothing precludes E&I from doing this work. This Assembly does not have to create a resolution to direct them to do that, to implement what would be Proposition 3. I know from working with Deputy de Sausmarez and all the other Members on E&I and the collaboration that we have done on Home, that decisions are taken using subject matter experts and those decisions do not have to be taken with a States' resolution.

1195

A trial seems over the top. Why do we have to do a trial set by resolution? There are already methods in place, and I will reiterate again the MSA and the ACU, or even some are set by MOT regulations. So how it works with the MSA and the ACU: a hand-held meter, which is calibrated once a year. It is placed a set distance away from the exhaust pipe, the vehicle engine speed is set to 50% of the maximum or 2500 rpm and the meter is set at a 45-degree angle, and the reading recorded and measured against set limits.

1200

Proposition 1 does nothing but enhances the subjectivity. It makes an immediate change to start with, which perhaps for some is a good thing. But, again, it is just subjectivity. Has the exhaust been replaced? Is it noisier than the original? What was the original? Where do I find the original sound? Is it noisier? There are no measurement criteria at all. Back to that fictional Clapham omnibus passenger, I think they will agree that action this day is needed on this issue. A trial is not required, as described in Proposition 2. We know the problem and a decibel limit will address this immediately.

1205

There is even scope for adjustment by regulation, statutory instrument, to the limits or even the method measurements, if those change or need changing. Giving flexibility that any trial could dictate and, in my view, a trial could be a one-day trial. Let us set up a bay at the Victim Recovery and Digital Suite (VRDS) premises at the police station, get an examiner to use a hand-held calibrated piece of equipment: box there, set that up, set distance, 1.5 m, 45 degrees. What do I produce? I produce X from X vehicle.

1210

Take that vehicle down to the East Arm, for example, when there are not much other contributing factors like walls bouncing off sound or anything like that. Do exactly the same test. If you get the same reading, plus or minus 1 or 2 decibels, in my view then that is a trial and will set the method about how a decibel limit could be measured.

1215

As Deputy Helyar said, a quick Google – and, of course, we have subject matter experts who do not even rely on Google – will define what limits could be in place. It does not have to be a blanket limit of 105 decibels or 100 decibels because we know that different vehicles perform differently. An HGV carting an 8 t load up the Val des Terres will be making much more noise than something pootling through town, or the same vehicle even pootling through town while it is not under load.

1220

1225 A static test is the way to go, as the Motorsport Association, all over Europe and the ACU do at the moment.

I have not even mentioned about the penalties. To address Deputy Taylor's point about penalties, you are not allowed to race at a racetrack if you exceed your decibel limit and off you go home. So it could be, again, something relatively simple. Home have got the power to set fines. The current legislation has a maximum fine at level 3. But what if, for example, you use the fixed penalty notification fine system and set it as the highest band? You fail the test, write out an FPN, bang, off you go, you are fined for circulating a vehicle exceeding a decibel limit.

1230 There is no court time, there is no prosecutor time, there is no advocate employed or anything like that. Sorry, Deputy Ferbrache. *(Laughter)* Again, we know that fines are not hypothecated, but I am sure that Treasury will be happy with any net gain; although this is definitely not the main purpose of the policy letter.

1235 Deputy Dyke is correct, a classic vehicle owner that replaces a vehicle's exhaust that is quiet but slightly noisier than its original would fall foul of, in my view, Proposition 1, because they have replaced the exhaust and it is noisier than the original or what the manufacturer intended. Again, how anyone would know, I do not know, because there is no decibel test.

1240 Setting the legal noise limit ensures that anyone who wants to modify their vehicle could be done responsibly and knows where the limit is. This balance still allows enthusiasts to enjoy their hobby without negatively impacting the community with excessive noise. The explanatory note in Amendment 1, which was not laid but I am hoping some Members would have read it, describes how many local motor enthusiasts already comply with a decibel limit. As we have heard described by Deputy Taylor, EU and the UK have noise limits. Many Islanders will travel to those tracks, take part with road-going vehicles – and that is the point, it is a road-going vehicle – and comply with those decibel limits. Extending these practices to everyday vehicle use ensures that consistency and fairness.

1245 The defined decibel limit gives law enforcement a clear criterion for assessing and addressing noise complaints. Again, as I described, it could be a tiered arrangement or just for specific classes of vehicle, and Proposition 3 or the amended Proposition gives that flexibility for the future E&I to do that. I am glad that Deputy de Sausmarez recognises those benefits as she opened on the amendment.

1250 A defined limit makes enforcement more straightforward and consistent. It reduces ambiguity in legal proceedings. The common sense approach in Proposition 3 to introduce a set limit is a pragmatic solution. I urge Members not to vote – or to vote contre for Proposition 1 and 2 and to support the amendment, Proposition 3 or whatever the number is going to be, if it is going to be 2A, which is to set the decibel limit.

1255 Thank you.

1260 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, sir.

1265 I would like to thank Deputy Gabriel, not so much for his speech which has actually convinced me how I am going to vote, but for actually mentioning the annual classic vehicle show, which is taking place on 15th June, so a perfect opportunity for those who are standing for election to be seen and also to witness me being the chief judge *(Laughter)*, and where you can also have the opportunity to find out my less than successful times trying to restore an MGB GT. I will leave more of that to anybody who wants to turn up on the day, so I thought I would take that opportunity, sir.

1270 I know totally irrelevant to this debate but it had to be done.

The Bailiff: It did. *(Laughter)*
Deputy Le Tissier.

1275 **Deputy Le Tissier:** Thank you, sir.

I believe in the KISS principle, K-I-S-S, and that is 'Keep it simple, stupid'. I am sure most people know. (*Laughter*) But as I previously said, a decibel limit is a binary decision. If the meter says you are over the specified limit, well, it is a fair cop, see you in court or maybe get a ticket. It is just like a speed gun or a breathalyser, binary choice. Everyone knows where they stand.

1280 Talking about standing allows me to segue into my last comment. This may be my last speech in the Assembly. (**A Member:** No!) I do not know if I am going to stand but whatever, it is up to the public. As Alice Cooper states, 'School's out, it's our last day'. I bow to Deputy Queripel's expertise in getting titles into speeches and the States will miss him.

1285 Sir, let us not kick this further down the road. Deputy Gabriel has mentioned action today and it used to be a saying of Deputy Ferbrache. So please support Proposition 3, i.e. decibel limit, and throw out 1 and 2.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

1290

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

I will talk briefly about Proposition 1. I think there is an important distinction to be made between the effect of noise from individual vehicles and their impact collectively. I totally accept the argument that Proposition 1, it would not be immediate changes, Deputy Gabriel suggested, at all. There would be an enactment and then there would be a commencement date some time hence and the legislation would need to be put through the normal processes, etc. So it would not be an immediate change at all and it would be a political decision about what that lead-in time would be.

1295

I think the point is that the evidence does suggest that when people do tend to modify their exhaust systems the decibel limit does tend to increase and it does tend to increase on average by about 8 to 9 decibels, which might not sound like very much but it is worth remembering that decibels is a logarithmic scale. So it could be quite significant. While that might not mean that one individual exhaust is louder than another one that has not been, it does mean that if we are multiplying that effect over a large number of vehicles, which by the correspondence we got does seem to be potentially the case, what we are doing is we have created an environment in which Guernsey traffic is like-for-like noisier than any comparable situation in other jurisdictions.

1300

1305

So it is totally a matter of judgement. I totally understand and am quite sympathetic in fact to the impacts that Proposition 1 may have on one particular business in particular, but I do think it is only fair to point out that actually if we are concerned about noise pollution in general and the effects that that can have on people's health and well-being, then it is worth remembering that actually if we do want to continue modifications of exhaust systems to make them noisier, then that will have a cumulative impact as well on general traffic noise. So that is what I want to say on Proposition 1. I do appreciate there are some important points to consider and I do think it is worth considering the impact on that particular business.

1310

Basically, as others have pointed out, it would not mean that you could not replace an exhaust system, it just means that you could not replace it so as to make that exhaust system noisier. I do not see what is so difficult or subjective about that. In fact, the UK and Jersey do not seem to find that in any way subjective or difficult to enforce, so I do not think we would anticipate that either.

1315

I would like to just explain a little bit more about why Proposition 2 is in fact the common sense approach that people seem to be calling for. I really do not buy this whole, 'All we need to do is vote in Proposition 3 and all our problems are solved.' Far from it. I think Members should be aware and alive to the fact that if we were to just vote in Proposition 3 and not also do the work specified in Proposition 2, what is likely to happen is that we are going to get the effect of Proposition 1. That is the most likely scenario because the easiest way to do that would be to look at the manufacturing decibel limits. As I explained earlier, the decibel limits tend to apply to the manufacture of vehicles.

1320

As per the wording set out in what I think will be the new Proposition 3, although the Bailiff will correct me if that is not now the case, each individual category or class of vehicle could be ascribed a different decibel limit. So the effect could really be exactly as per Proposition 1. In fact, it could be

1325

even tighter. So that is the danger of voting in Proposition 3 without also supporting Proposition 2. I think it is only fair to explain that potential impact to Members.

1330 Yes, so it is really important to understand how we can make this workable. It is really not simple. Even when Deputy Gabriel stood up and said, 'Well, you could do it this way', well, yes, you could do it that way but we do not know if that way is going to work. We do not know if another way might work better. We do not know what is going to work in the Guernsey context, and how many times have people stood up in this Chamber and said, 'Oh, we need to make things appropriate for
1335 Guernsey. We need to make sure that they appreciate the local context'? Well, that is exactly what Proposition 2 is all about. So I think actually Deputy Gabriel made quite a good case for why we do in fact need a trial. I am not going to give way because I am hoping we might be able to complete this debate before lunch. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

1340 But also in terms of, okay, fine, Deputy Gabriel challenged this and said, 'But why do we need it to be a Resolution of the States?' Well, precisely for the reason that Deputy Prow and I have been hopping up and down to try to emphasise today. The reason it has taken us so long to get to this point, to bring this item to the States for debate, is because we have not been able to prioritise it. It has not been prioritised through the GWP process. If there is an active Resolution of the States, then it is going to be much easier for our successor Committees to be able to prioritise that work,
1345 and let me assure Members there is a lot of competing work up against it.

So supporting Proposition 2 is the best way to get Proposition 3 in in a timely manner, because otherwise we are either just going to make it up and you are going to end up with the effect of Proposition 1, or we are going to struggle or it will not be as easy to prioritise this work for successor Committees, and it could take longer to actually come up with anything to fill in the blanks of
1350 Proposition 3. Proposition 3 is not an answer on its own. Proposition 3 says you need to figure out what all these things are. Proposition 2 is about exactly how you figure out what those things are in a way that is appropriate in the Guernsey context for us as a jurisdiction.

Deputy Le Tissier said that a decibel limit is a binary thing. It is absolutely not. That is why we need to understand the testing environment, how we are going to do it, what kind of latitude we are going to give. I will explain why. Because even if we carry out the kind of test procedure that
1355 Deputy Gabriel explained, and absolutely that is a type of test that is carried out in some places under some circumstances, even if we were to do that, would it be fair to say, 'I am sorry, you are one decibel over this, it is a binary thing, you are creating an offence' when actually that person said, 'Well, hang on, that was not my engine making that noise, that was the engine roaring past.'
1360 If you are going to say, 'Well, okay, fine, we need to take it to a controlled environment', then what are the parameters you put around that? What facilities are we going to use? Even someone taking it down to the Esum(? 11:53:17) could say, 'Well, actually Condor was busy honking its horn at the time, it was not my vehicle, Guv' or whatever.

So we need to figure out the resourcing as well. We need to understand how this is going to be workable in the context of the Guernsey resource. I think it would be foolhardy to just go and pluck
1365 some numbers out of the air, fill in the blanks according to Proposition 3 and then expect the police to get on with it. I do not think the police would thank us for that either because they would then potentially be left with legislation that is not necessarily practical or workable.

Deputy Helyar's suggestion, gosh, if only we had thought, 'What is the simplest way of getting this done?' at the start of this political term. I can assure Deputy Helyar that his idea was exactly the
1370 first one that we discussed and it is not that simple. Actually, if you look at the evidence from elsewhere, you will know – and I have actually got a report somewhere in the million open windows on my laptop. I have a report up that surveyed a very significant number of police forces in the UK about their different approaches to tackling this issue. This is part of the issue. There is not a standardised way of testing for this. This is why there is not an off-the-shelf solution that we could
1375 be confident will work for Guernsey.

In this report, which surveyed a good number of police forces across the UK, the ones which relied on reasonableness were exactly the police forces saying, 'Please give us some more specifics.' So to Deputy Helyar's point, it is absolutely not that simple. I do support Proposition 3 but I would

1380 warn Members that Proposition 3 without the work on Proposition 2 could well backfire, to use a pun that has already been used.

So yes, I am sure Members will make their own judgement on Proposition 1 but I think certainly Proposition 2 and Proposition 3 very much work symbiotically. They are mutually beneficial to each other. There is no time that is going to be saved by just voting in Proposition 3. In fact, I think it
1385 might be quicker to go with the Proposition and the trial first because then at least you have a Proposition directing action, directing something to actually happen, and then we can be confident that when the legislation does come forward we can be confident that it is practical and enforceable and workable in Guernsey.

Thank you.

1390

The Bailiff: I will turn back to Deputy Prow to reply to the debate, please.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir.

I thank everybody who has contributed to the debate. It has gone on long enough in my view,
1395 sir, so I will be as brief as I can.

Starting off actually with Deputy de Sausmarez, the first thing I should say is I would like to thank her for all the effort and work and research that she has put into this and for all the conversations we have. One of the ironies in politics is where you are trying to get an end result that everybody wants done very quickly, it gets frustrated in the complexities of it all. But I can assure this Assembly that there are no two people keener in this Assembly to come to a resolution, and we believe these
1400 Propositions do.

Very eloquently, I think one of the main points that Deputy de Sausmarez has made is how all the Propositions hold together. It is a package. I think the late great former Deputy Eric Waters was mentioned I think by Deputy Ferbrache. He had an expression, 'You can't make omelettes without
1405 breaking eggs.' I think this is a comprehensive solution to noisy vehicles. The very fact that the long debate we have had, the varying views, just shows how complex it is. Both Committees, Home Affairs and E&I, have had the benefit of discussing this with our experts. So I thank Deputy de Sausmarez. She said it is practicality and workability and I completely agree with her.

Deputy Le Tocq, thank you for introducing some human to it. He is right. This has been a
1410 long-standing problem and we might be being criticised for bringing it in at the end of this term, but at least we have. Deputy Le Tocq very helpfully actually outlined why it has taken so long for any Assembly to get some sort of solution.

Deputy Blin, I actually thought his contribution was a very thoughtful overview of where we are, and I thank him for that. He did make a point about his concerns around how long is this going to
1415 take; another year? Just on that point, if we agree to amend Section 9G in Proposition 1, we will have an immediate effect. So we will immediately be able to do something about addressing noisy vehicles. I will tell you exactly what that is because this answers some of the points that have been raised by Deputy Gabriel. I will quote from the policy letter, which is at 4.3 to 4.5. By amending the legislation slightly to be the same as they have in Jersey – they have enacted a provision identical
1420 to 54(2) of the UK Regulations under their Article – Jersey statistics indicate that within a five-year period there were 110 successful prosecutions. We do not get any. So if you agree to option 1, we have an immediate tool in the box to be able to address it. So that is one point.

Deputy de Sausmarez has already outlined that any trial and any research around equipment that we are going to need is going to have to happen anyway, whatever happens. One of the things
1425 is there is no suggestion in the policy letter that we are not going to have a decibel limit. It is just arriving at the right one, how we can enforce it and what equipment we need and the practicalities. If we have a decibel limit, that work has to happen and that is where we are, whichever option we go. So I thank Deputy Blin for his contribution.

Deputy Taylor very helpfully actually outlined the question of the – he referred to 5(1) of the
1430 policy letter. The point he is making, the policy letter does actually serve as drafting instructions to

the Law Officers on this. This is what the policy letter says, this is what the drafting instructions will be:

Altering an exhaust system after the date of manufacture so as to increase the noise made by the escaping of exhaust gases is an offence.

1435 This is what this is all about. This is all about noisy vehicles. So that to me will assist the Law Officers in those drafting instructions.

He has also pointed out about reasonable defences and he is suggesting – there is an example given there, but he is suggesting that that could go wider. Well, absolutely, why not? I am sure the Law Officers will agree with that. So I thank Deputy Taylor very much for that.

1440 Moving on to Deputy Dyke, he basically was, ‘How do you compare something with very little noise with something that makes a little bit more noise?’ and any issues around prosecution. Well, of course, the Law Officers have an ability to decide whether a prosecution is in the public interest and it is not for me to suggest to the Law Officers what may or may not be in the public interest. But I cannot see that the time, energy, law enforcement, Law Officers’ time would be taken prosecuting somebody in that example.

1445 Deputy Haskins referred to the testing period. If I have understood what he was suggesting, I think Deputy de Sausmarez has already covered that. Any test that is conducted will only – I give way to Deputy Haskins.

1450 **Deputy Haskins:** I am grateful for Deputy Prow for giving way.

My question was in relation to periodic testing, so something that we are under resolution for for essentially a MOT style. So I did not like it anyway, but if it was to come in and it is every year that there is a test, one of the tick boxes was, ‘Is the decibel limit under that?’ (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Yes, thank you very much.

1455 To me, it has been staggering how this is seen as complex whereas I think it was brought right at the time what one could do is change the age limit of petrol 50 cc motorbikes from 14 to 18. Keep the electric one so you can have that, just increase the age limit, phase it over four years, job done. It would have been very simple.

Anyway, thank you.

1460 **Deputy Prow:** I give way to Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I thank Deputy Prow for giving way because I am probably better placed to respond to Deputy Haskins’s points, which indeed I did intend to when I spoke but I just missed them, I am sorry.

1465 I think it is important to understand – Deputy Haskins may remember from his time as a member of E&I – that actually even when periodic technical inspections are introduced, they will not be introduced for any vehicle, any car, until they are five years old and only every three years thereafter. So it is not an annual test at all like the MOT and therefore you cannot rely on that. I think it is an important facet of this, but it is not the only thing that you can rely on to tackle it.

1470 I cannot remember what was Deputy Haskins’s second point. (*Interjection*) Yes. As I did mention in response to Deputy Matthews, in terms of ages and all of that, it is a much broader issue than simply noise alone and I think it would be foolhardy to look at that exclusively through a lens of noise. I think it would need to be looked at in consideration of a much broader range of issues.

1475 Thanks.

Deputy Prow: I thank Deputy de Sausmarez for that.

1480 Moving on, trying to make some progress with this (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) Deputy Helyar, who is an advocate and a Deputy I hold in the greatest respect, on this I am not sure that I agree with him. I will explain to him, through you, sir, why I do not.

1485 In this matter, as I have previously outlined, we have sat down, the two Committees, and discussed this very thoroughly. We have had legal advice. We have had enforcement advice. While I have a great deal of sympathy with the view that basically says we draft something in the reasonable opinion of a police officer, the police officers that are actually going to be going out on the ground and doing that would not have been comfortable in that environment. Actually, if I remember, and I am sure the Committee members do, some examples were cited, practical examples, where they would find difficulty with that. That view was not shared by the Law Officers.

1490 As I said right at the start of all this, this is a package of Propositions to solve a problem. What I do not think, and I would urge the Assembly not to do, is to dance around all this and to find it has not been as comprehensive and has not achieved what we wanted it to. If you have examples of what happens in Jersey successfully, and I have just outlined it, why oh why should we not take them on board? I am not going to repeat the points. Deputy de Sausmarez has made them loud and clear around why we need a trial.

1495 So going on to – I shall not give way. I really think we need to make progress. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) Deputy Gabriel has made his point. We have all listened to his point so I will not dwell on this too much. I will just pick up on a couple of things he said. Just go for a decibel limit. Well, if you go through all the Propositions you will get a decibel limit. You will get a properly researched decibel limit. You will understand what equipment is going to be used. The Law Officers will have a much better chance of delivering a decibel limit that does the job.

1500 What he also says, 'Well, a trial could be done anyway', so in one hand he is asking us not to support the Proposition which directs a trial and then saying, 'But a trial can be done anyway.' Deputy de Sausmarez has already outlined in detail why it is needed.

1505 Another point he has made, there is nothing to stop with the Propositions a fixed penalty route to dealing with this. I favoured that approach all along. It was discussed by both Committees and there was no opposition to that. I think, sir, that this has gone on well long enough so I shall sit down.

Thank you, sir.

1510 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, there are four Propositions. Proposition 3 has been renumbered as 4 and the successful Amendment 2 has been inserted as Proposition 3. I am going to have four separate votes on the basis that I got the impression during the debate that people might want to vote differently in respect of each of the four Propositions. So we will have Proposition 1 from the original set of Propositions first, please, Greffier. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 1, please.

1515

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 23, Contre 14, Ne vote pas 3, Did not vote 0, Absent 0

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

Parkinson, Charles
 Prow, Robert
 Roffey, Peter
 Soulsby, Heidi
 St Pier, Gavin
 Taylor, Andrew
 Trott, Lyndon
 Vermeulen, Simon

1520

The Bailiff: In respect of Proposition 1 there voted in favour 23 Members; 14 Members voted against; 3 Members abstained; no one was absent. Therefore, I declare Proposition 1 carried. Proposition 2 next, please. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 2.

1525

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 28, Contre 10, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 0, Absent 0

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

1530

The Bailiff: So in respect of Proposition 2 there voted in favour 28 Members; 10 Members voted against; 2 Members abstained. I will declare Proposition 2 also carried.

Proposition 3 next, which derives from Amendment 2. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 3, please.

1535

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 38, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 0, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	None	Hill, Edward	None	None
Blin, Chris		Snowdon, Alexander		
Brouard, Al				

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

1540 **The Bailiff:** So in respect of Proposition 3 there voted in favour 38 Members; no Member voted against; 2 Members abstained. Therefore, I will declare Proposition 3 also carried.

Finally, Proposition 4, original Proposition 3, to direct the preparation of legislation. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 4, please.

1545 *There was a recorded vote.*

Carried – Pour 38, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 0, Absent 0

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

Le Tissier, Chris
Le Tocq, Jonathan
Leadbeater, Marc
Mahoney, David
Matthews, Aidan
McKenna, Liam
Meerveld, Carl
Moakes, Nick
Murray, Bob
Oliver, Victoria
Parkinson, Charles
Prow, Robert
Queripel, Lester
Roffey, Peter
Soulsby, Heidi
St Pier, Gavin
Taylor, Andrew

1550 **The Bailiff:** So in respect of Proposition 4, there voted in favour 38 Members; no Member voted against; 2 Members abstained; everyone was present. Therefore, I will declare Proposition 4 also carried, which means that all four Propositions as amended are carried.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

22. Government Work Plan Monitoring Report and End of Term Committee Reports – Debate commenced

Article 22.

The States are asked to decide –

Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter entitled “Government Work Plan Monitoring Report and End of Term Committee Reports” dated 20th March 2025 they are of the opinion:-

- 1. To note the 2024-25 Government Work Plan Monitoring Report at Appendix 1.*
- 2. To note at Appendix 2 the End of Term Handover Reports prepared by all Committees (which includes Authorities and Boards).*
- 3. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to return the Government Work Plan to the successor Assembly as soon as practicable further to working with the Principal Committees to update the strategic portfolios with the work to progress the wellbeing of islanders and the economy that must be delivered in the next political term by States Committees.*
- 4. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to bring forward a term-by-term policy development and legislative drafting programme for primary and secondary legislation, phased to support the objectives of the States’ Government Work Plan.*

1555 **The States’ Greffier:** Article 22. Policy & Resources Committee – Government Work Plan Monitoring Report and End of Term Committee Reports.

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

1560 **Deputy Murray:** Thank you, sir.

As the States’ roadmap throughout this term, the GWP helps the States make the best use of limited resources to maximise efficiency and effectiveness. It has evolved and slimmed down as the States have come to realise the delivery constraints when faced with the volume of work outstanding from previous Resolutions and ongoing Government strategies and policies that

1565 Committees are working to implement, the impact of geopolitics on our community, domestic
policy and legislation, and international compliance demands we must meet as an independent
jurisdiction. This leaves little capacity to focus on horizon scanning. To move forward, to help this
Assembly focus, it has agreed three strategic portfolios designed to focus States' resources on key
priorities. They are: maintain public service resilience, security and governance; sustainable health
1570 and care services; and housing, infrastructure and the economy.

The Committee has kept this policy letter concise. It wanted to focus on the information in the
supporting reports, ensuring the community and the successor Assembly is well informed on the
breadth and depth of ongoing work and, very importantly, the business ahead. It is hoped that the
endorsement of the GWP by this Assembly will assist its successor to bring forward co-ordinated
1575 policy, legislation and delivery proposals in the most critical areas without delay incurred by
extensive revisiting. The new States will therefore be able to ensure that their energies and limited
resources are invested in productive work from the outset.

The Committee is therefore reporting on progress in its final Monitoring Report for this term,
which is before States' Members today. The end of term policy letter also conveys detailed reports
1580 from each States' Committee, Board and Authority. These are important documents to read and the
Committee will make sure the content is readily available for the new States. It will recommend to
its successor that the information it has received from Committees on emerging issues is considered
quickly in Committee settings. The successor Policy & Resources Committee can then bring forward
a plan reflecting the emerging issues that the Assembly can endorse.

1585 Without a shared focus on what is important and why, the new Assembly will lose critical time
on the actual work. I speak from experience. It takes time to absorb all the valuable information
available to Deputies and to work through policy, legislative and operational solutions that are
proportionate and affordable. Guernsey's qualities include a thriving business environment, safety,
family life, community spirit, scenic beauty and a rich heritage, and we must protect these traits as
1590 we invest in housing, infrastructure and healthcare.

Interpreting our competitive advantages and leveraging opportunities should be instrumental
in shaping our business climate, society and international identity. This will allow us to navigate
challenges, diversify our economy and enhance our position as a safe and secure Crown
Dependency in an increasingly uncertain world. The next Assembly has an enormous advantage in
1595 undertaking this mission, inherited from this one. Evidenced work has resulted in a high plan
identifying what needs to be considered. The new Assembly has the influence on what that will look
like and feel like for the community.

Finally, sir, given the prospect of a long weekend stretching tantalisingly ahead of us, the
Committee asks Members to simply note the reports and support its successor by affirming the
1600 next steps to sustain focus.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

1605 **Deputy Brouard:** Thank you, sir.

I would just like to touch very briefly on the challenges and gifts of HSC. A local reporter recently
struggled to understand why the increase in HSC's budget from £130 million to just under
£250 million this term. Well, that is because of the increase in demand, the changing demographics,
the improvements in treatment, but also HSC took over the secondary healthcare contract, which is
1610 the Medical Specialist Group (MSG), Guernsey therapy, primary care consultation grant, prescription
costs, off-Island travel, visiting consultants, etc., which was a switch of budget from Employment &
Social Security of £54 million in 2022 alone, plus inflation. So no wonder our budget increased. So
I hope that reporter understands why the budget did increase. Also, we took on a care home as
well, just to add another piece.

1615 So to repeat, sir, the budget of HSC is not out of control. The pressure on the budget reflects
the ongoing and increasing demand for health and care services. HSC will continue to need to

expand, including prevention, as it is reflected in other western countries. The real issue is who pays and what services are provided free at point of access. That is the real question of sustainability because demand will be there; it is who pays. We will need to move more budget to prevention where the real long-term saving or slowing of costs lie, so the pressure is on to treat those we have in front of us but also prevent or slow down those who would need treatment.

Key worker housing still rankles with me and those who prevented the building on Le Bordage Seath, which would have gone a long way to help our budget and staff and lift housing, especially for Islanders because we could release properties that we are using now. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

There is an open day for recruitment – I am going to do my advertisement as well – this Saturday, at St Martin’s Community Centre for those who are interested in taking up a career in health and social care. So I hope Deputy Queripel will be there with his CV. (*Interjection and Laughter*)

I would like to thank our staff at Health & Social Care. The Island is very fortunate to have such dedicated professionals. My thanks also to my Committee who have gone through thick and thin and been a pretty solid team for the last four years, so thank you.

For me, sir, it is 21 years, five elections on the bounce, and I am conscious this is the last time I will speak or my name mentioned in this Assembly until my return in 2029 (*Laughter*) or my obituary (*Laughter*). I wish you, sir, and Members, families and loved ones – in some cases – well. It has been fun.

Thank you very much.

(Members applauded.)

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

I will be brief, as Deputy Murray has encouraged. We are noting this. Sir, there is a certain touch of irony that Deputy Murray introduced this as having been the cut-down version of the GWP. Here we are with I do not know how many – it still has not got enough page numbers on it, several, probably 100-and-something pages, most of which will not be read by anybody, certainly anybody outside this Assembly. It is certainly thousands of hours of preparation have gone into the GWP, its preparation, its annual monitoring reports, and this so-called handover document. This handover document is very pretty to look at. It has some nice stock images. The typeface is readily accessible to those who might otherwise struggle with the normal format, which is all very admirable. But, and perhaps I am addressing Deputy Ferbrache here as he noted our choice of similar attire today, I think he too will perhaps recognise some of the challenges of a Government in actually delivering when it is spending so much time producing this kind of material. I certainly know from the Committees that I have been involved with in responding to the timelines, which were very tight, almost unachievable, that I am not sure the quality of the responses would necessarily have been ideal in any event.

So it is what it is and the Assembly will, of course, note it before moving on, but I regret to say I really do not think it is the best use of a significant quantity of time that has required its preparation across the States. When our public express frustration at what they regard as the inefficiencies of the States, it is this kind of material which they can really point to in evidence (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) as not actually demonstrating added value or delivering, from the words that opened the States, action this day.

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir.

1670 I shall also be very brief. Deputy St Pier draws reference to the Government Work Plan and the size of it and the complexity of it. I would suggest that one of the reasons why we have a Government Work Plan is because we do not have an executive system of Government. So you have a Principal Committee with P&R but all the other Committees are at the delivery end of Government, and P&R are in a situation where they have to try and co-ordinate things. Without that system of government, the Government Work Plan and its predecessor where Deputy St Pier was President of P&R, these are the mechanisms that we all have to use. So in my humble view, sir, unless we change our system of government, a cumbersome and a much criticised – he is possibly right, sir – system of Government Work Plan is, I am afraid, the only tool in the box.

1675 Just following on from Deputy Brouard, I have already previously thanked my Committee for all their work, but he was absolutely right. I think it is right to record on *Hansard* the absolutely fantastic work that our frontline officers and all those who support them do, not only in Home Affairs but across the States. They often get much maligned, much criticised, often very unfairly, and I think it is good where you look at a Government Work Plan and you will see a lot of things that have been achieved.

1680 I think in the debates we have had today there are two speeches, one from Deputy Fairclough where I think he opened by saying, 'Remember the Government Work Plan'. I think he was right to do that and the Government Work Plan has delivered a lot of essential things. I am not going to go through the things that I believe Home Affairs have achieved. I had the benefit of doing the last update Statement so that is all recorded on *Hansard*. One of the things it does do is show the enormity of the issues and problems that we have. So I enjoyed that speech and where he teased out some of the things that had been achieved and had not been achieved.

1685 I will tell you one thing, we often dwell on the negatives. I will tell you one thing that we have achieved and I make no apologies for saying this. This Assembly got us through a Moneyval evaluation. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) We have an absolutely fantastic finance industry and we rely on them so much in so many ways. So that I think is a success of this term and it is down to everybody in this Assembly, which actually includes the first P&R.

1690 I alluded to two speeches. One I think was a very unfortunate speech, which spoke about the ineptitude of the first P&R Committee. I think that that was entirely unnecessary. I would like to say both to the previous P&R and the current P&R I have enjoyed working with them. I very much enjoyed the support at the beginning of this term. Do not forget we started this term with COVID and I sat on the CCA. It was very well run, very well chaired and so on and so forth. All these things seem to get forgotten. I have mentioned Moneyval. A lot of good things were done this term. The heavy lifting was done in the first time. With the second iteration of P&R, again I have enjoyed working with them and their support and I very much thank them.

1695 Just perhaps finally, can I wish Deputy Brouard all the very best? He has a big smile on his face at the moment and is certainly an asset to this community. I wish you all the best.

1700 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: We now adjourn until 2.30.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.31 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

**Welcome to Deputy Lyndon Farnham –
The Chief Minister, States of Jersey**

1710 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, before I call anyone else to speak, at the risk of it sounding like buses, we have another visiting parliamentarian who is in the public gallery today. It

is a real pleasure to welcome Deputy Lyndon Farnham, who is the Chief Minister over in our sister Island of Jersey. I would invite you to welcome him in the customary fashion.

1715 *(Members applauded.)*

**Government Work Plan
Monitoring Report and End of Term Committee Reports –
Debate continued –
Propositions carried**

The Bailiff: Deputy Mahoney.

Deputy Mahoney: Thank you, sir.

1720 A very brief one; I know everyone wants to finish this up. This is obviously going to be my last speech in the Assembly and, given the entire scope of the open subjects in the booklet here, I did wonder if it was an opportunity to have a stab at Deputy Ferbrache's record but, of course, our 15-minute rule put a stop to that.

1725 So this really is, as someone said, just a note, so I think we should just take it home and read it. But I do just want to take the opportunity to thank everyone here for the highs and lows of this term. It does add, I think everyone would agree, to the experience of being a Deputy; good and bad. I do wish good luck to everyone here that is standing in June, although if I am honest I do wish more luck to some of you than others. *(Laughter)* I have got to be honest.

1730 Sir, finally, just to put on *Hansard*, thank you to you, sir, for (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) – we will call it guidance through the term. *(Laughter)* I obviously extend that to Madam Deputy Bailiff and, of course, the incredibly hard-working court staff. Thank you, everyone. Really just to finish with the words of Douglas Adams, really, 'So long, and thanks for all the fish.'

(Members applauded.)

1735

The Bailiff: Deputy Aldwell.

Deputy Aldwell: Thank you, sir.

1740 I am going to be very brief but I just wanted to mention about the Government Work Plan. There has not been much praise for the Government Work Plan but, sir, I am a fan. I actually tell prospective candidates when they ask me for my advice on standing as a Deputy to read it. Coming into the Assembly and sitting on P&R's Government Work Plan sub-committee actually opened my eyes and gave me a good overview of the work done across the States. I need to put my glasses on. *(Laughter)* I was thinking, 'Why can I not read this?'

1745 Yes, coming into the Assembly and sitting on P&R's sub-committee actually opened my eyes and gave me a good overview of the work done across the States, which I would not have fully appreciated sitting on Education, Sport & Culture. Committees had been asked what projects they would like to put forward and there had been a huge array and a huge quantity from some Committees, though a limited number had been specified to be lodged. There was a great deal of reflection needed on what was possible, both within the time window and the funding available, which had to be curtailed. The Government Work Plan details the array of work which has been completed this term, and actually there has been a great deal. It also gives an insight into the work which will be needed to be completed next term, so I wanted to say thank you to all those who have put together the Government Work Plan. I, for one, think it is a valuable steer for the next Assembly.

1755 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, sir.

1760 I thought I would stand up – I was not intending to speak in this debate; it is probably the last
time I say that but I am going to say it now anyway – to really thank Deputy Prow. I have to say
I agree with every word that he said. I am not surprised, though, because Deputy Prow has always
shown absolute understanding of what the Government Work Plan was about and really supported
it. To be fair, I would say that for all the Presidents. I hope that they found that it has been useful
1765 for them to be able to focus on the work that they see as a priority.

We did not have that at the beginning of the term. We had this huge thing, Policy & Resource
Plan, which had what everybody wanted in it and you could always point to it. We started off at the
beginning of this term and it was actually something that was in my manifesto back four years ago
saying, 'I think we need a plan' because we do not have a party system where we can have a majority
1770 which can just put their manifesto in. We do have a rather unique system of government, and to be
able to get some kind of co-ordination and discipline, such a plan where we could combine policy
and the resources together was a way I thought we needed to go.

I never expected, and it certainly has not been the perfect article at the beginning. Going from
nothing to putting something together, and it was done in quite a short space of time as well so we
could get up and running as quickly as we could, was not a difficult thing. The intention was always
that it would be an iterative process, as it has proven to be. It is not the finished article yet and I do
wish the next States the best of luck in trying to hone it and making it work for what we have at the
moment. We might not need it in the future but at least it gives that start for the next States. I do
thank Deputy Murray for all the work that he – he took it on after I dumped it on him, quite frankly,
1775 but he has done an excellent job. I think it has moved on to something much more mature.

Just to respond to Deputy St Pier who said, 'Look at all these pages', well, it is no worse actually
than what we inherited from last term. But also this is what the States approved because it is not all
about what will be the annual Government Work Plan. The reason why there are so many pages this
time is because the States agreed that there would be handover documents from every Committee.
1785 I think those documents have been really helpful. Deputy St Pier, again I have to correct him when
he says nobody is going to read it outside this Chamber. Well, no. Deputy Aldwell made the point
very clearly that it is an excellent document for any candidates who are not sat in this room who
might be listening in. Please read it (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) because it will show what we are
inheriting, what the challenges are and what has been already considered and done for the future.

So I do wish the next States the best of luck with this. I thank Members for actually embracing
the Government Work Plan in a way. I was a bit nervous at the beginning whether that would
happen because we are all a bunch of individuals and it could be very easy for people to dismiss it
as just a bit of administration that just gets in the way of everything. But I really do think there has
been an embrace of that. In fact, it came out very much when we were talking about traffic noise,
1795 the reason why it was not a priority at the time, because the States said we do not believe it is a
priority. We know what priorities we have. There are some that we have not yet finished or
completed, but we know what our priorities are and they are the big ticket items that the
Committees need to focus on. So I do thank the Assembly for embracing the Government Work
Plan and I wish all those returning and having to deal with it next time the best of luck.

1800 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I thank Deputy Soulsby and it is a pity it may be her last speech for a while, but
1805 you never know when this will be the last speech from any of us or whatever. But going back, I thank
Deputy Soulsby and Deputy Murray, and I think Deputy Helyar contributed a lot at one point to the
Government Plan. Because I have been involved with other plans, I sat on the sub-committee of
Deputy Parkinson's, what they called the States' Strategic Plan in those days, with the late Mike

1810 Garrett and Deputy McNulty-Bauer and others. It is a challenge, it is a lot to read, and this is perhaps the wrong time to read it.

Deputy Aldwell is right about the candidates having it as a resource. But the thing is, even in the introduction, it stresses the importance of the plan delivering essential infrastructure and essential housing. That raises other questions about capacity and capability, and as Deputy Murray and others always remind me, of the money and how we are going to resource it. That is the big question.

1815 Today is a unique day because we do not have just one political superstar called Lyndon, after the famous American president, President Johnson, who was in some ways the most socially liberal of all American presidents of his great society and civil rights. We have another superstar, Lyndon, and I often listen in to the States of Jersey, and I hate to say it, or maybe I do not hate to say it, but sometimes what they do is very useful and very interesting and part of me admires elements of their executive system and the way in which the new Government, under Deputy Farnham, has made attempts to restrain the growth of the Civil Service while expanding social provision. Although I did notice on the news there have still been a few hundred extra health workers there and 100 people in the private sector, so they are going in the ratio as well.

1820 But they have a plan. Their plan has been very effective in delivering not just economic and infrastructural goals, but social and environmental goals, as have ours. But why I spoke particularly today, apart from to thank the team at Policy & Resources for putting up with me and all the rest of it in that time, is I probably do not go quite as praiseworthy as Deputy Aldwell does, because part of me was really interested in the keynote speech, telling speech, and unexpected in some ways, from Deputy St Pier, who questioned why we are so dependent on a really lengthy plan that in itself takes up resources.

1825 Of course these plans, as I have already said, have been going around for five or six terms. I think they started in the Chris Brock era, who was also a Deputy as well as a senior civil servant. A real political issue that does not come up often enough, and should do at a time of change at the election, is not only our relationship to a plan, as Deputy Soulsby identified, partly based on our system of government, as Deputy Prow and others would remind us of, but also how far the priorities of States' Members mix with those of the senior leadership team and the politicians that are part of that.

1830 A telling point again from Deputy Soulsby, that noisy vehicles were not part of that. Yet, Members should have put that in, in a way, because there was clearly a public outcry on it. It is not the most important strategic issue, but it was something. Sitting on Policy & Resources, possibly one area where I get a bit chastened is I suspect the direction of travel with the plan is not only for more cohesive managed leadership from the top, which many people would say is a good thing, but a reduction in the number of opportunities for a policy planning debate.

1835 As I understand it, we will not have one every year, maybe only really one per term. Now that saves money and saves resources and should give consistency and longer-term planning. But on the other hand, it takes away some of the excitement of the 38 of us, which then raises the question: are there too many of us? Is the committee system wrong? How do we work together? Should we work together in groupings some more? I do not know.

1840 But I do believe that every candidate in the election and subsequently should engage with what they want out of planning of this nature and, if it is something we want, the plan needs to be clear. It needs to be adaptable to the needs of the public and the States' Members. But, above all, as Deputy Murray reminded us, it needs to be implemented in a consistent way with a unity of approach and not U-turns and the resources, both human, infrastructural and financial, to guarantee it. Otherwise, in four years' time, there will be a plan that promised a lot and did not deliver.

1845 But I support to note it.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

1850 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Thank you, sir.

So I was around on the first, it was called Government Business Plan, that Stuart Falla chaired and then Deputy Geoff Mahy and myself were members of. It was debated in 2007. I remember, we tried to keep the number of items on that Government Business Plan down to below 10. We got as far as 14 and then in the debate Deputy de Lisle, if I remember correctly, added a 15th.

1865 But I thought at that time – in fact, it was a long debate, if I remember correctly – and when the team that spent so long putting it together eventually celebrated at some pub somewhere, we gave one another T-shirts that said, 'Government Business Plan, it is better than nothing'. It was at that time because we did not really have anything beforehand.

1870 But I do wonder whether we are getting to the stage where it might not be better than nothing. Because my problem with this, and this is not to negate anything that has been said by Deputy Aldwell and Deputy Soulsby. I do think it is essential that candidates, if they are elected, understand where we are and the system that they are working in, in order to change it.

1875 But I really do hope that, if it teaches us anything, it teaches us that it is far better to do a few things well than to try and do many things, and do only a few of them, and some of them pretty badly.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

1880 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Sir, I am really glad we have the opportunity to end this States with looking at what we have collectively been able to achieve in a streamlined version. So I do take the view that these kind of documents are very important.

1885 We already have the community and candidates standing crying out for more communication, for more transparency, for more collaboration between the States and the community; not less. Not doing a wrap-up of the collective work would be a real disservice to the collective effort we have put in.

1890 So it does not only demonstrate what we have been able to achieve, notwithstanding the comments from Deputy Le Tocq about the importance of prioritisation and doing a few things better, but it also underpins the invisible work of 5,000-plus public servants, front-line workers, civil servants in our offices. Because it is not what we have achieved, the 40 of us or the 38 of us, none of it would be achievable without the quiet work behind the scenes of all of the public service.

1895 This document is also almost a wrap-up and I do not know whether it is a celebration, but a recognition of the effort of those who are not typically seen, who are not probably as present in the community. So I do want to, I am sure everyone will agree, on behalf of this Assembly, really truly recognise that this Government Work Plan is thanks to not just the role of a few politicians in this Assembly, but the collective work of Government.

1900 I was a bit sad coming in yesterday and today because it felt that the atmosphere felt quite flat, almost like an anti-climax to an end of a very long term. I am sure it has been a rollercoaster to all. So it has been wonderful to hear some of the speeches from Deputies who may no longer be with us from the next political term, or in a different way from Deputy Brouard and Deputy Mahoney and others. Because we are coming to an end, even though the work of the Committees is still continuing, so we are still all in post until 1st July or 30th June. So there is still quite a lot of hard work of Committees, but it has been a real rollercoaster journey.

1905 There is so much. We have all come into it with the best intentions, best will to really contribute to our community. We can see how hard it is once you are in Government to make things happen, notwithstanding we have achieved quite a lot. So we should celebrate when we can, notwithstanding learning the lessons of what could be changed in the future.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

1910 **Deputy Trott:** Sir, I would like to take the slightly unusual step of talking about something that has absolutely no relevance to the matter we are debating. Some would argue it is an unusual step.

1915 But I would like to take this opportunity to thank personally Deputy Lyndon Farnham for finding the time to travel over from Jersey and treat me to lunch on this last day of our parliamentary service. This is at his own expense. It is a demonstration of the high regard and mutual respect that exists, not only between he and I, but between our two Bailiwicks, and long may that continue.

1920 I am sure he will not mind me recounting a very funny story he told me just a few moments ago of a speech he gave in the Jersey States on 14th December 2023. It was a day after I had been re-elected to this office. He says that he got home from work that evening, the 13th, to hear the news on Channel Television that Lyndon had been elected Chief Minister following a vote of no confidence. He said he was somewhat surprised and had to pinch himself before he realised that it was me, it was Lyndon Trott, rather than he himself, Lyndon Farnham. Thank you ever so much for taking the time and trouble and our best wishes to all in Jersey.

1925 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you, sir.

1930 I will be really quick. I just want to talk about the timing of this document because this is where the document falls down a little bit; only a tiny bit. But it is because these things take so long to produce because it is a really thick document and there is a lot of information in here, some of it really relevant and some of it not so relevant, in my opinion. But a lot of the Committees were asked to give what they have done and what is still yet to be done. I am looking at the DPA one, some of it is way much further ahead than the document says.

1935 But these things take so long to do and this document is more about what the States is because things do take a long time to do, and it is a little bit like sometimes walking through treacle trying to get things done. But overall there are some really positives within this document, and I do want to thank Deputy Bob Murray for doing the Government Work Plan for the second time around.

1940 But one thing that I would say is, if you are going to be standing as a Deputy, do have a look at the end-of-term bit, the beginning bit in my opinion is a little bit of waste of paper. But what the Committees have done is really useful stuff and do have a look at it if you are standing.

But thanks so much for the document.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

1945 **Deputy Inder:** Sir, only briefly, and if it helps I have got no intention of speaking to the Item whatsoever. This is just a brief thanks, sir, for your management of the Assembly and, as always, the parliamentary officers for their tolerance, mainly of me. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) It was a joke, you are not supposed to be agree. (*Laughter*)

1950 Certainly, to my Committee members, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller for her work on Digital, Deputy Falla for sometimes being maybe the foil sometimes to my style of management, Deputy Vermeulen for his work on tourism, and Deputy Moakes as well. He is one of our quieter Deputies who has just solemnly gone out and worked and represented the finance industry on my behalf, and it is a genuine thanks to Deputy Moakes.

1955 Also particularly my NSMs, Mr Mancini and Mr Andy Niles, who happen to be in our gallery at the moment. Someone asked me once why have I got NSMs, and my response was to stop the Committee from doing anything stupid. I genuinely appreciate their work and counsel over the years.

1960 But the three main topics that the Committee, I believe, should recognise the hard work of the staff, and I know it is unfashionable because we have got to get rid of the Civil Service, eradicate the Civil Service, but there is no two ways about it, as mentioned by Deputy Prow, Moneyval was significant – 88 pieces of legislation through this Assembly – in the main driven by the Home Department. We had our role under IO5 and I have to thank all of the officers who worked extremely hard to get us into the great position that we are today.

1965 Particular mention must go to the registry staff. The group project was immense for them. While we were at home on Facebook and Twitter, shouting at each other, they were in the office working. They were in the office working, putting out the group project. That is real work and I have a general thanks to them.

1970 The only real Infrastructure project that we have done as an Assembly is a digital rollout. That will be completed by the end of this year, if not mid-2026. That lights up the whole Island and that was joint work between the former Policy & Resources and our Committee. That is a significant piece of work for this Island.

1975 I am just going to talk briefly on infrastructure, which is not related, and this will come as a surprise to people. There are other ways of doing infrastructure. Maintaining what you have got. So I am going to say thanks to a Committee I normally do not say thank you to, but by maintaining our seawalls is an infrastructure project. This stops them from falling down, so that alone, maintaining stuff, is an infrastructure project and I have just gone off on one.

1980 He has gone, so I can talk about the ferries contract now. *(Laughter)* I was going to anyway. We will be at war within a week and we will still win. This has been a significant piece of work for our Committee. In the main, again back to the former Policy & Resources, but I have to pay homage to the work that we have from the Law Officers, one of which is sitting in our gallery at the moment. She has done an exceptional job for us. Procurement as well, and there was a small team – I am going to say seven or eight people – and I will not mention names mainly because I have forgotten them. But those are the people that have done the real work to get us to the point that we are today.

1985 Me and two or three officers felt very alone for a long year but that support came from the Committee eventually when we told them the position that we were in. So that has been a great piece of work for our Committee. To that, like everyone else, this will be my last speech. There will be no more 26(1)s. Not this term anyway. I genuinely would wish all of those who are standing the best of luck.

1990 This job is not easy. We landed in the land of COVID. We had to deal with Brexit as an Assembly. We have had high interest rates. We have had our own internal strife as well. I would like to have thought that a future President would have had probably an easier ride than this President had, just generally because of where we landed, but what with the American election and who knows what is around the corner. This job will always be difficult. I genuinely wish everyone the best of luck in whatever they choose to do post the candidate declaration day.

That is about it, sir. That is it from me.

Thank you.

2000 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Helyar.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, sir.

2005 Very briefly, just to thank a few people. I thought Treasury was a tough job, but if there was a name for the ministry responsible for the Government Work Plan, it would be called the Minister for Cat Herding. *(Laughter)* I would like to pay tribute to Deputy Soulsby in that regard. We had a pretty stressful ride and from time to time tempers were frayed and things were said that perhaps should not have been, which I regret. She did a wonderful job with that and I wish her all luck going forwards.

2010 Likewise, Deputy Murray, who took on the Cat Herding Ministry, I do have some sympathy with some of the words that Deputy St Pier expressed, but this is a very valuable document for those – I was a first-timer this term, and this kind of document did not really exist in this format for somebody to pick up who is standing and really try to get an in-depth understanding of the breadth of what is going on.

2015 This is not all of it., this does not deal with the business-as-usual stuff and all of the other stuff and the constituency stuff and everything else that goes on. So, for everybody that has contributed to it in a positive way, thank you and good luck to everybody in the election.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

2020

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you.

I, like others, have found this document extremely helpful, and there are some really useful bits of information in there, and they should not be discounted on the fact that it is too much for people possibly to read. I found the results of the productivity report within the GWP really interesting and I really recommend that, not only prospective candidates, but also members of the public and also Members of this Chamber, whether they are outgoing or whether they seek to come back, read that.

2025

The picture is not yet complete and will need updating as more data becomes available, but it is clear that the States are actively advancing supportive changes to the key workstreams prioritised in the Government Work Plan, and that is what it is all about.

2030

I will not go through in detail in relation to the work of our Committee. I will just do the headlines because I would like people to read it, because there is so much to be said about education in Guernsey, so many really positive things. So I encourage people to look at what has happened with the COVID recovery, teacher recruitment, the National Association for Special Educational Needs (NASEN) review, continuous improvement, external inspections, work on Activate, education governance, etc. It is all in there and there is much more, so I am sure that any of the members of the Committee would be pleased to speak to prospective candidates about the work of the Committee because it has been immense.

2035

I will focus a little bit more on one area that is the most recently approved by this States, and that is education governance. The Committee's approach to governance has been praised by external governance experts who provided training for Members, which Deputy Vermeulen was part of, and we really were grateful for Deputy Vermeulen's commitment to that policy development. It has also been acknowledged by headteachers and principals as a pragmatic approach, bringing meaningful benefits to learners through school improvement.

2040

I handed over to our newly appointed governing members earlier this week and it was wonderful to hear them networking, getting together. They are the first of what is envisaged to be 170 of a new stakeholder group. This is massive stuff, and because there has been so much negativity about education, people are just dismissing this and they really must sit up and look at the work that has been done this term.

2045

Also, give yourselves a pat on the back for getting behind the governance and thank you very much here in the Chamber, sir, for seeing how powerful education governance is going to be. So that is a great step forward.

2050

However, in the context of governance, the Committee has sadly yet again been at the sharp end of some very bad governance in terms of recent leaks made to the media. It is clear that there is a concerted effort yet again to knock the confidence of the community in States' education. This really must stop. If there is one message that I can hand on to prospective Deputies who are successful, please encourage the media to be the best that it can be. The single source of balanced, professional reporting, because that is what this Island deserves. But, instead, I am afraid it is cannibalising itself and it is very detrimental.

2055

Like Deputy Brouard, I will use this opportunity to set the record straight, sir, in this instance regarding the Transforming Education Programme. The figure that the press published a couple of weeks ago was done in response to a request from Policy & Resources for all Committees with capital projects. But barely had the ink been dry on the Committee's sight of those figures, which were on their way to P&R, that they somehow escaped the confidential confines of good governance and were given entirely out of context with absolutely no supporting information to the press.

2060

I would like to emphasise that the figure that was released was the worst-case scenario and is the four-year forecast for the completion of all elements of phase 2 of the Les Ozouets Campus

2065

2070 build. The primary causes of the increase sit outside of the control of the Transforming Education Programme and these are namely updates to the cost of the per square metreage to build the facilities, which reflect more recent market intelligence than was available in January 2024; the impact of inflation through to an assumed 2029 completion date; the need to replicate some processes and costs as a result of this being run as a separate procurement and construction exercise to lock phase 1, because of course this States decided to phase the delivery.

2075 So Members need to be under no illusion that there is a cost to delaying infrastructure projects, and not just the cost of delivering services from substandard accommodation, but also the inflationary impact of delay. The Fiscal Policy Panel, who have been mentioned more than a couple of times this week, recently shared their views with States' Members that making good infrastructure decisions and implementing them promptly is a cost saver in the long run.

2080 As I have said in the Assembly many times, it is our decisions or non-decisions in this Chamber that are the cause of increased costs to the public purse. The decision to phase lock construction is a prime example of this. The next Assembly, in my view, needs to approve the next phase as an urgent priority to keep the project within affordability.

2085 So this Committee is not – I am not afraid of scrutiny, not one bit. It is worth mentioning how engaged the Committee is and has been right up to this last States' session in the process of being held to account. Transparency, openness and a willingness to tell the story. We have been rigorously scrutinised this term, and given the background to this particular area of Government over the last decade, it is not really surprising. I have personally been pleased to receive these. So keen that one of the four scrutiny panel hearings this term I attended, despite being really poorly from my
2090 chemotherapy treatment. In addition, we have received approximately 59 Rule 11 questions, over 247 Rule 14 questions, and 46 freedom of information requests. We may have topped the record this term.

2095 Finally, sir, in summary, when electing the Committee in 2020, the States of Deliberation made it my job to find a way forwards along with the members of the current Committee. I, with their support, have worked tirelessly to find the right solution to realise the States' decision. We have put in place a strategic approach to delivering education. We have organised the delivery of secondary and post-16 education. We have implemented a new governance structure for education, enabling parents and interested Islanders to get involved at a school and settings level. Most importantly, we have stabilised the system, enabling staff to concentrate on the job that they want to do and
2100 supporting them to improve the delivery of education and focus on the outcomes for our students.

We have also welcomed the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) as an external inspection partner to objectively evaluate the work our schools are doing.

2105 During periods of change, there is a tendency to focus on the problems and challenges rather than the progress being made. We have been undergoing a period of significant change. The short-term disruptions in the last three years have made it difficult for the community to see the long-term improvements, which is starting to be evidenced. Again, I would point people who are listening, prospective Deputies, those in the Chamber who have not seen it yet, our latest Education Strategy report for 2024 is available.

2110 I know not everyone will agree with the structure that is being implemented, but it was one that was widely supported in principle during the 2020 election, and the States has set the direction we are taking. My strong view and heartfelt plea is that we must all now get behind our headteachers and their teams. I must give a really heartfelt thanks to all of them in the schools that do this difficult job day in, day out, and also to our Education office team and all those who help to support, to deliver the highest level of education and their aspiration to make excellent education for all of our
2115 children and young people.

2120 I cannot finish today, sir, without talking about those ties. Deputy Prow and Deputy Queripel have their termly competition and I have got an announcement to make. It has been a really difficult decision and I do not know if anyone wants to drumroll. The winner is a draw. I am too nice. I am too nice. But honestly, Deputy Queripel, for creativity, for a bit out there with his piano tie, that is full marks. But, for a little bit of style and panache, Deputy Prow has also got full marks as well.

But suffice to say, my best wishes to everybody who is not going to be intentionally returning to this Chamber. Best of luck to those who are standing in the next election. Yes, hopefully we will end today on a good note.

Thank you, sir.

2125

The Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Sir, I too must congratulate Deputy Murray and others and the public servants for the document that they have produced, which is certainly a more holistic work plan than that we had in 2007-08, which Deputy Le Tocq was mentioning a little earlier.

2130

As he said, some of us were fighting for more than just an economic focus of Deputy Falla at that time into Environment – looking at number 15, incidentally, was a part of the business plan which was brought in by myself in terms of environment and biodiversity. Of course, we have seen that biodiversity has taken a long time to come into its foray. Now it is very much part and parcel of the natural environment and the focus on natural environment.

2135

Then there was the focus on the social side that came in with a work plan for social as well as environmental and economic. So today we have something very holistic, very broad, and it is something that has to be continued as a focus of Government, not only for the end of term but for the beginning of a new term. That provides certainly a major focus for the new Government in the summer plus this year.

2140

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Matthews.

Deputy Matthews: Thank you, sir.

2145

I found the Government Work Plan quite an unwieldy beast to deal with. It is quite a complicated set of trying to combine more than one objective in one document. To some extent, it is combining the sort of thing that in other democracies that party manifestos would do to prioritise objectives. But at the same time, mesh that in with what the delivery capability is. I find that the constraint is quite difficult to understand, certainly when I started at the beginning of term, about what resources we have got available and what we can assign to things. It is quite a difficult thing to work with.

2150

We ought to acknowledge, sir, that one of the things that when I started on Health & Social Care, I did think of the first few meetings, when do we start to set the agenda and do new things? Through the course of this term what we have done an awful lot of is continuing the direction that had been previously set. We need to acknowledge that it is very difficult, the way that we came in during the middle of COVID and during lockdown to do anything radically new or different to turn things around. We have managed to do these course corrections and keep things going and keep things moving along.

2155

Deputy Brouard has summed up what HSC has achieved during this term. Obviously, we have still got some big events, big projects to go with phase 2A to complete. But one of the things that we will be completing in the summer of 2025 is the Electronic Patient Records (EPR), so that will be something that will be a new platform for the new HSC. It was one of the last things that the last HSC Committee had committed to do and it has taken the whole of this term to complete and to put in.

2160

But it is something that the next States will probably be wanting to do some work in terms of thinking: how can the structure of Government be improved and how can we make things more efficient and more decisive going forward? But this is a good starting point to at least give the next States somewhere to start off from.

2165

Thank you, sir.

2170

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

2175 I will try and keep my comments really brief. But I would certainly like to add my voice of thanks
to my political colleagues, members of the Committee *for the* Environment & Infrastructure, past
and present, and also my ESS colleagues and wider States' colleagues, and to extend my particularly
grateful thanks to the officers who make things happen. Because it is a really hard job that they do
in the face of a lot of public criticism. I hope that this is a tanker that is turning, because I have been
2180 saying this for years, and I do sense that there was a particularly antagonistic narrative, probably
about this time last term, and I am hoping that that tanker is now turning and maybe people have
had their own personal epiphanies as well, which is very welcome.

But just a word on one of the Propositions itself. Proposition 4 is:

To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to bring forward a term-by-term policy development and legislative drafting
programme for primary and secondary legislation, phased to support the objectives of the States' Government Work
Plan.

2185 It is really just my perennial plea to resource the legislative drafting as well as we can afford to,
because one of the great frustrations is the amount of time it can take. I do appreciate that is not
just down to legislative drafting resource, because, of course, a lot of it is also interdependent on
the policy development resource. But it is a really important function and, wherever possible, it is
best practice for legislation to be approved by the same Assembly that agreed the policy where
2190 that is relevant.

Beyond that, in terms of E&I, we have had a very busy term. I will note, print out and frame, the
praise from Deputy Inder. I thank him very much for that. But infrastructure, big and small, is very
important, as I am very glad the independent Fiscal Policy Panel's report emphasised.

2195 There is an awful lot that we do. So we do, as Deputy Inder says, the coastal defences, the roads,
the utilities, the co-ordination of it. Things like our crumbling cliffs and access to them. Things like
the animal incinerator, which is now combined with the health side of things as well, or will be very
soon. All those things are not necessarily very glamorous, but they are really important in terms of
the Island functioning. It does not get an awful lot of attention, partly because most of the time,
touch wood, it works well. It speaks volumes for the proactive approach. We have made a real effort
2200 in recent years to make sure that we are being proactive in terms of that everyday infrastructure,
and that does save us an awful lot of money and it is a much more effective way of working as well.
So that does pay off.

In terms of some of the bigger stuff that affects infrastructure, of course, even just yesterday,
gosh, it feels like a month ago already, we have had important decisions on Les Vardes and Black
2205 Rock, before that on aggregate.

But the Electricity Strategy was a really important strategy that, again, has catalysed an awful lot
of investment in infrastructure. That is, again, the infrastructure that we need for our economy to
thrive and for the community to benefit as well. It contributes to our energy security. It impacts the
affordability of energy, the sustainability.

2210 There has been a lot of work on transport as well. A lot of the work on transport has been just
bringing things into the modern age, modernising standards, improving services. So really pleased
to see the bus service go from strength to strength. We have had important modernisations with
respect to live data and apps and things like that with buses and taxis and improvements in driving
instructor safety and all sorts of things that does not get an awful lot of airtime, I suppose, and it
2215 has seen really good results.

We have seen some really excellent progress in transport. One of those things is we have been
very conscious to take a more holistic approach to it. So not just looking at things in a really granular
site by site. We have made a concerted effort and we have worked with planning very closely to
take a much more joined-up approach. That is how we like to develop a lot of our policy, and we
2220 have done that.

The States, this Assembly in particular, has been criticised for being factional and tribal or any
other pejorative that is typically thrown at us. But we have worked very collaboratively and cross-

2225 Committee on a whole range of areas. Not just within internally to the States, but also we have been very keen to involve the relevant stakeholders in policy development. The Electricity Strategy, housing, the Guernsey Housing Plan are two really good examples of that.

There has been an awful lot of stuff that has happened. I am not going to go through the list, it is all there in the report. But I really do want to just finish on a note of housing. Someone was mentioning earlier, I think it was Deputy Kazantseva-Miller was talking about the benefit of this report is that it helps us communicate with the public.

2230 I remember I was in a presentation, it was a presentation followed by a question and answer session, and there was a question, it was on offshore renewables or something like that. Someone in the audience stuck up their hand and said, 'Why are we not working with Jersey on this?' and I said, 'We are. It is something that we have had all these conversations', and I explained a bit about it. So she said, 'Okay, so why have you not told us?' and I said, 'Well, I have, I have written this article and I have been on these media outlets talking about it. So I have done everything, I have publicised it on social media, and I have spoken about it in the States and etc.' Then her third question really flummoxed me because her third question was, 'Well, why have I not heard about it then?' It does speak to the difficulty of adequately and effectively communicating with the public, even when we throw everything we have got at it.

2240 So this is helpful. I am with everyone else who does encourage people, especially those interested in the States and considering standing, to read it.

2245 But, yes, housing, it is great that this Assembly has recognised the importance of housing and has made it a priority. I just want to finish on a note of continuing that focus. So we have done an awful lot of the thinking. We have started an awful lot of work. But by its very nature, it is a long-term issue. It is a complex issue. There are lots of interdependencies. So we do have a really solid bit of groundwork there. It is so important that the next Assembly picks up that baton and continues to run with it as quickly and effectively as they possibly can.

But, anyway, thank you to yourself, sir, and the parliamentary team and all of the people who make everything happen behind the scenes.

2250 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Snowdon.

2255 **Alderney Representative Snowdon:** I am just going to be very brief, just because we are going to travel back to Alderney very soon.

But could I just say on behalf of myself, Mr Hill, Mr Roberts, and also Members of the States of Alderney, that we have really enjoyed working with all of you, and thank you for the support you have given us over the years. We wish you all the very best, the ones stepping down, and best of luck to everyone that is going to re-stand.

2260 Thank you and good luck.

The Bailiff: Deputy Haskins.

Deputy Haskins: Thank you, sir.

2265 It is a very useful document for members of the public and prospective candidates. But if I am turning to the Propositions themselves, I just wanted to highlight Proposition 3. I am going to read it out:

Whether they are of the opinion to direct the Policy & Resources Committee to return to the Government Work Plan to the successor Assembly as soon as practicable ...

2270 All I wanted to mention was, as a new Deputy, that was quite a tall order. There was so much going on. There are a lot of new things and to then go, 'Right, okay, set the priorities for the whole

of the term', it was very challenging. So I just wanted to highlight that and that is probably why I am in support of all of this. I just did want to highlight that.

2275 But it is why this document is so useful, so that you do have all of this information there. So you can be pre-emptive and go, 'Right, okay, I do understand what has been happening and what is going to happen and what is likely to happen.' Because there are some challenges that are not in here that are very real challenges for the future. So that is all I will make, but, yes.

Thank you, sir.

2280 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

2285 I am not going to talk too much on the Government Work Plan. Clearly it is a document that is needed. I think the current format is better than the unwieldy beast that was the P&R plan that we had to grapple with last term. If you fail to plan, you plan to fail. So we need some sort of document. Deputy Brouard would have one sheet of A4 from every Committee and that would be it, and there is merit in that because everybody has a wish list of stuff. Every Committee has a wish list of stuff that they have inherited, legacy stuff from previous Committees and stuff that they would like to do, and there is just not enough time. We have not got the resources to be able to do everything.
2290 So, unfortunately, not everything in the Government Work Plan is going to be attended to in the course of a four-year term. But it is a document that is needed, and I thank everybody involved in it.

I would like to say thank you very much to Deputy Brouard. I did not really know Deputy Brouard last term. We did not come across each other. I worked on a few Committees, but Deputy Brouard was on P&R and we had not really met properly until the start of this term, and it has been a brilliant experience. I have learned a hell of a lot from Deputy Brouard. I learned from everybody I have worked with. I learned how to do some things and learned how not to do other things. But Deputy Brouard has taught me a lot and I would like to thank him considerably, and everybody else, all the experienced politicians and those that have just come along for the first time that are not going to be around anymore, I wish you all well.
2300

I would just like to say, because obviously a lot of the times in this Chamber we are in completely polarised positions to other Members and we do not really know those Members that well. But I just want to say I do like everybody in here on a personal note. Nothing is personal and sometimes I have been kind of shouty and stuff like this when I have stood up and I have got quite irate. But it is just because there is passion that comes along with this job. It is really important. It plays on you and you think about it, but we have to learn to leave that in this Chamber when we walk outside of it. That is really crucial. I have learned a lot this term, it really has taught me a lot this term. I have learned a lot of lessons, certainly from the President that I have worked with on HSC and other Members on HSC, and Deputy Bury as well that I have worked with earlier on this term.
2305

2310 So I would just like to extend my thanks to everybody and my best wishes, and also to you, sir. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

2315 **Deputy Burford:** Yes, sir. The immortal words, I was not going to speak, but the Government Work Plan, when it appeared, my Committee set up our Government Work Plan Scrutiny Panel. So I would just like to thank the Members who sat on that panel during this term and, more widely, all of the Members who not only sat on various panels operated by scrutiny, but also all of the States' Members who were scrutinised by those panels. Thank you for your participation. Without it, the scrutiny process is not possible. It is appreciated.
2320

Thank you.

The Bailiff: As I do not see anyone else rising to speak, I will turn back to Deputy Murray to reply to that debate, please.

2325

Deputy Murray: Thank you, sir.

Nobody paid any attention to my plea to try to be very short, but never mind. We started off with Deputy Brouard, and I thank him for emphasising the challenges that HSC has got, and I completely agree. I have to say, I recall him stepping into the presidency when nobody else would, right at the start of term. I thank him for that. At the time, I certainly thought it a very selfless thing to take on. But now with his talk of obituaries, I have to wonder if, in fact, he wanted to ensure that it was in a fit state, so that when he departed the States we could look after him. But we will see.

2330

Deputy St Pier, production of material. Yes, it is a hefty document. I would have to say, though, it is matched probably by the amount of time this Assembly takes debating even the simplest of things. So we have to accept we have a lot here that has to be dealt with. But I am sure he recognises that the GWP represents a compendium of what Committees want.

2335

P&R's job is primarily to find the finances. It does not dictate, and the Assembly decides what should be prioritised. The solution, of course, to streamlining the whole process lies in the comments of Deputy Prow, and not the only one to mention the Machinery of Government. So if we want to make any kind of changes, then the next Assembly will have to look again at Machinery of Government. It is just one of those areas that we were not able to come to a successful conclusion on, unfortunately, this time.

2340

Mercifully, I thank him for not listing the many achievements of Home Affairs. He did, of course, pick up on Moneyval, as did Deputy Inder, as a cross-Committee success, and it certainly was. I would like to echo the comments of others that, while it involved a number of us, the real heavy lifting has been done, as usual, by a huge number of officers and Law Officers who deserve attention and mention. I think it is 88 pieces of legislation we passed.

2345

I wish Deputy Mahoney well, wherever he is going. I thank him for his input and his assistance and his humour.

2350

Deputy Soulsby and Deputy Aldwell were quite rightly praising the value of this document and I know it is something of a tome unfortunately, but for new Deputies, as several Members have said, this is invaluable. They really need to pay attention to this, and they will come in forewarned and forearmed about what needs to be done before they start adding to it. That is half the problem. Because, as I did when I came in, and there was not really something as concise as this is, I had ideas about what I wanted to do. It was in my manifesto, why would I not want to? The fact was, we had to pick up where the last Assembly left off and that is forgotten sometimes.

2355

There is a huge amount of work that obviously the States of Guernsey undertakes. But it is documented in here, it is prioritised in here, and even on a Committee basis. So if you have aspirations as candidates for the next Assembly, and you have aspirations for particular Committees, read the Committee reports in here. Because it will give you a leg up, and you will get started much quicker.

2360

Deputy Gollop, I thank him for his reminiscences, as we regularly hear from him. But I am very glad he highlighted finance, which I am sure Members are fed up with me talking about most of the time. Again, he also mentioned Machinery of Government. So there is a recurring theme that has come up here. It sits at the root of many of our frustrations. But it is a very difficult task to deal with, a very difficult task.

2365

Deputy Le Tocq, an emphasis on candidates reading the document. Also, very wise words: do a few things well. I would say not least because of the lack of money that we have available to do most of what is in here anyway.

2370

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, again echoing the public sector support, which we could not do without, to be perfectly honest. Yes, it has been a pretty wild ride, the last four and a half years, for all of us, particularly as newbies, I suspect.

Deputy Trott, emphasising our strong relationship with Jersey. I wondered if he had Jersey Royals for lunch. I know he was given a gift of same. We have not seen anything else of him on P&R.

2375 Deputy Oliver, things do take a long time, absolutely right, they do. It is a frustration for people coming in from scratch, how glacial the lack of movement is in the States. For very good reasons. Governance is really important, we understand that. Possibly coming in for the first time, you do not appreciate how necessary governance is. But I am quite sure that we can streamline things a little bit better, maybe, than we currently do.

2380 Deputy Inder, again, thanking his Committee. He also mentioned non-voting members. Of course, most Committees have got non-voting members, and they are also entitled to a little bit of credit, because without them, of course, we would not have the expertise that they bring to the party, and they are very important.

Cat herding, yes. It does feel like cat herding sometimes, Deputy Helyar.

2385 Deputy Dudley-Owen. Yes, everybody has got an opinion on education. I know I did, but it is usually from a rear-view mirror perspective, and normally from decades ago. That is the challenge, I think; education is moving all the time. Unfortunately, we look at it from our own perspective, and sometimes that was 20 or 30 years ago, or our children's point of view. It is not sometimes as relevant as where we are today.

2390 I would have to say that the focus on the infrastructure costs for the next Assembly that she mentioned, and the prioritising of those infrastructure costs is really important. It is going to be a major challenge. Because we have made it very clear that there is very little money. So prioritising our infrastructure is probably going to be the key thing, I suspect, that the new Assembly is going to have to accept that we cannot do all, perhaps, that they are coming in and hoping for, even potentially some of the things we have already agreed, because the money is going to be very tight.

2395 Deputy de Lisle, a holistic plan, and he is probably right about that. Now I know who is responsible for my favourite topic, which is biodiversity, and I thank him for that.

2400 Deputy Matthews, he mentioned resources, and of course resources underpins everything, or our lack of resources is the limiting factor that we have. I think as an Assembly, as individuals, we have all got very high aspirations, things that we would like to see done. We do not always necessarily agree. That is the point of the Government Work Plan. This is basically what Committees wish to see, to try to achieve, and the Assembly as a whole agrees what resources will be allocated and what will go into this plan. So this is an Assembly Plan.

2405 Deputy de Sausmarez, again, also thanking officers on her Committee. Legislative drafting theme; yes, I quite understand, being on the Legislative Oversight Committee for P&R, one of the challenges that we have, and obviously we get regular lists, and it seems to get longer, although they have done a lot of work on it this term. We have cut out quite a lot of resolutions. One of the problems is it is not always necessarily the Law Officers. Sometimes it is sitting back with Committees, waiting for a report back. That could be either policy, or it could be Committee business, whatever it is.

2410 I have asked a few times on those meetings whether or not every agenda that we have in the Committee, every Committee, that we have a list of the resolutions outstanding. Because half the time people forget, and particularly obviously with the change of Members coming into Committees, what is already on the cards at the moment.

2415 We have done quite a lot of work this term, in a bonfire of the resolutions. But there is more to go. Because some of these go back a very long time. If you are not aware of them, then you do not know about them, and then obviously they just mount up. So I would accept that plea, that we try and do more on the legislative front.

2420 She mentioned obviously Electricity Strategy; very key success this term. It is going to require immense investment, and we all recognise that. But it is very important. Energy costs are fundamental for a successful economy.

She mentioned, of course, and she was probably the only one surprisingly that mentioned housing and a focus on housing, which of course has been our number one priority for this whole term.

2425 Consequently, she is absolutely right, communications with the public is a major problem for us. For all the work that we do, for all the press releases we put out, and social media, wherever we put

it, the public by and large do not pay a lot of attention to what goes on in here until it hits them somewhere. It is just the way things are in Guernsey.

2430 But, unfortunately, with some of the more difficult things that the next Assembly is going to have to deal with, that is going to be a major challenge because we are going to have to take the public with us on some very difficult decisions.

Unfortunately our Alderney Reps have gone, but thanks to them for their support too.

2435 Deputy Haskins, Proposition 3, highlight how much work new Deputies face. Well, I remember a certain first meeting that we had at Education and I was nonplussed by all that was getting thrown at me. That is why, looking at this document before you get into post is really important. It is a lot of reading. A lot of reading. But this is what the job of a States' Member is; is a lot of reading. So do not be under any illusion that once every three weeks in here for three days or two days is the job. This is the tip of that iceberg. Underneath all of this, there is an enormous amount of work that gets done in Committees, an enormous amount of sub-committee work, and reading. So if you do not like reading do not stand, is probably my advice to be perfectly honest.

2440 Deputy Leadbeater, we have not got the resources to do it all. He is absolutely right. If anybody thinks somehow that we can achieve all that is in here, I am afraid they are mistaken. It is the direction of travel, and it is going to take a lot longer than probably a term to be able to make that happen.

2445 Deputy Burford, thanking her Members as well, of course.

Deputy Leadbeater, passion; there is always a lot of passion in here because people feel very strongly about the issues that we deal with. We are here to represent the public the best way that we can. So the decisions we take are really important. So, if we do get a little bit aerated now and again, it is because we feel very strongly about these issues that are in front of us. The public would expect nothing less.

2450 So, yes, thank you all very much for your support with this and have a great time away from this place. Just in closing, if I may, insofar as our time in this place is concerned, for legitimate reasons at least, excepting for next week's commemorative event, we are drawing to a close. So, sir, for all those who are standing again, may I say good luck. For those who are leaving for the time being, I say Godspeed. For those who return, I wanted to say God help you. But instead I will use the immortal words of the late Dave Allen, may your God be with you.

Thank you, sir.

2460 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, there are four Propositions. Does any Member want to vote differently in respect of any of them? No. On that basis, then I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on all four Propositions, please?

There was a recorded vote.

2465 *Carried – Pour 37, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 2, Absent 0*

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	None	Taylor, Andrew	Hill, Edward	None
Blin, Chris			Snowdon, Alexander	
Brouard, Al				
Burford, Yvonne				
Bury, Tina				
Cameron, Andy				
de Lisle, David				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				

Gollop, John
Haskins, Sam
Helyar, Mark
Inder, Neil
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Le Tissier, Chris
Le Tocq, Jonathan
Leadbeater, Marc
Mahoney, David
Matthews, Aidan
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

2470 **The Bailiff:** In respect of those four Propositions, there voted in favour 37 Members, no Member voted against, 1 Member abstained, 2 Members were not present at the vote, and therefore I would declare all four Propositions carried.

STATES' ASSEMBLY & CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE

16. Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Election Observer Mission – Proposition Carried

Article 16.

The States are asked to decide:–

Whether, after consideration of the policy letter entitled Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Election Observer Mission dated 18th March 2025, they are of the opinion:–

1. To note the impending appointment of up to nine Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Election Observers for the 2025 General Election.

2475 **The States' Greffier:** Article 16, States' Assembly & Constitution Committee – Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Election Observer Mission.

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

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

2480 It is like I am really tail-end Charlie presenting the last policy letter of the term, in all probability. In accordance with the Article 72B of the Reform Law, and after consultation with the Policy & Resources Committee, the Committee is pleased to report that the Commonwealth Association Election Observation Mission will send up to nine observers to observe the next election in June.

2485 It is good practice for successive elections to be observed, as this allows the CPA to observe the previous recommendations have been acted upon, and thus give us the opportunity to build upon advice from previous elections.

Furthermore, this will be the first opportunity for a CPA Election Mission to observe an Island-wide election in person as, owing to COVID restrictions, the CPA conducted a virtual Election Mission

2490 for the October 2020 General Election, which nevertheless provided valuable feedback despite the inability to travel to Guernsey.

Details of the 2025 mission: the observers will include academics, analysts, and trained observers who will scrutinise documentation and legislation related to the election. This includes interviews and observations of the political polling process, and the voting count. A full report will be published two months after the Observation Mission has been completed.

2495 Costs: the cost of the Election Observation Mission is anticipated to be approximately £50,000, which can be met from the existing election budget. This is considered to be good value, as the observers provide invaluable feedback on the Island-wide general election, and helps to enhance the integrity and transparency of our election process. Therefore, the Committee asks the Assembly to note the appointment of the CPA election observers in accordance with the provisions of the Reform Law.

2500 Finally, I know some Deputies have raised concerns about the fact we spend £50,000 on this, but it is the cost of doing business as a democracy. To maintain confidence in a democratic process, it is important that we have it independently scrutinised and have that feedback on the process to preserve confidence in it.

2505 Thank you, sir.

Deputy Inder: 26(1), please, sir.

2510 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Inder, you just promised this afternoon that there would be no 26(1)s. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Inder: Deputy Meerveld, clearly it is the first time he has read his speech, so he is not going to be able to respond.

2515 **The Bailiff:** Anyway, can I invite those Members who wish to speak in debate to stand in their places? Deputy Inder, is it still your wish that I put the motion? The motion is that there be no debate on this matter and that we move straight to the vote because there will be nothing to reply to. Those in favour? Those against?

2520 *Members voted Contre.*

The Bailiff: I can declare that lost.
Deputy Soulsby.

2525 **Deputy Soulsby:** Thank you, sir, and thank you, Members.

2530 I was not expecting this to be my last speech in the States, but it is not the biggest topic and not many people would be all that interested in it, but there are a couple of reasons why I am quite pleased it is. The first is, as Members might know, to be able to become an observer in an election, you have to do some training and the CPA require that now. It is not onerous. Deputy Brouard and myself did that and it is because of that that I was able to go and be an observer of the UK election last July. It is quite an honour.

2535 What I would like to ask Members, those returning, please think about doing that training. I was the first person to be able to do that and we can represent the Island off Island. You meet people and it makes such a difference, as the whole CPA does. One of my final words is to say please consider doing that training. I am sure the States' Greffier will be happy to advise you about when the next sessions are.

2540 Yes, I did the UK. The BVI came up, the Cayman Islands as well, I could not do that one, unfortunately. There are some very pleasant warm places you can undertake that mission. But I do have fond memories of the UK election. One of them was spending most of the night in Ilford Redbridge Leisure Centre with Hugh Pym, the BBC's health editor, and his crew. A really nice chap

as well. That was quite a memorable experience. But he was there not for me, he was there to see how Wes Streeting got along. But that was a really wonderful night. The really wonderful thing about it, and this is what happens in every election, is being able to see democracy in action. It is amazing to see people of every age, class, ethnicity, religion, voting in that ballot box. Each and every one, everybody here has the same power. People cannot buy votes. We have a secret ballot system and long may that continue. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)**

Churchill said, and I know Deputy Ferbrache will like to hear this, as my last speech. There is something I am going to next week, which involves him, which I am very pleased about:

Many forms of Government have been tried and will be tried in this world of sin and woe. No one pretends democracy is perfect or wise. Indeed, it has been said that democracy is the worst form of Government, except for all those other forms that have been tried from time to time.

How right he was. We are so lucky to be able to speak here and without any reprisals. We can speak and say what we want without fear or favour, without the threat of imprisonment or death. It is another reason why I am pleased to finish off a link to that with this policy letter. That is because it gives me the opportunity to use a word that I learnt a few years ago now and I have never really been able to fit it into anything we have debated, but this is my one and last opportunity to do so, and that is the word 'pettifogging'. It means to bicker or argue over trifles or unimportant matters. We have had a lot of that from time to time, but I would say better that than not being able to speak at all. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)**

So it is been an honour and a privilege to serve the people of Guernsey for 13 years. The things I never expected to do. There were some really difficult times telling people they were not allowed out of their house. It is one of those that will be etched on my brain. There have been some really great moments like being able to use a digger to knock down the Priaux Garage to enable the development of the Beauville site at Ville au Roi. That was my Dave Jones moment.

I do thank all the people I have worked with both in the Chamber here and in the past. As Deputy Trott mentioned, the people he reflected on. It is funny because there have been people who have not necessarily shared the same political views, but who have had an impression on me and why I have ended up how I have, I suppose.

But I do also like to thank all the officers I have worked with. I know they have worked really hard, done some very long hours and have done so much for us. I absolutely thank them for everything they have done for me from the moment I joined the States. It is because of them that we have been able to achieve what we have.

So, in finishing, sir, whether this is goodbye or *à la perchoine*, I do not know yet. I really do not. We will see what the next four years gives; we will see. But what I do want to say is I do wish all the candidates the best of luck. To those who are successful, I wish you well in the decisions you will need to make. I know it is not easy and I will always have that at the back of my mind, but I thank everybody here for their time and for enabling me to make my final speech.

Thank you.

(Members applauded.)

The Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Sir, I will be brief.

We are asked to note this, which, of course, I will do with enthusiasm as I click my SEV button. But I just wanted to expand on the benefits of the CPA. Deputy Meerveld touched on it. To start off with, this involves them scrutinising us, how we operate, and to learn from their observations and their post-election report when that comes.

Of course, Deputy Soulsby and Deputy Brouard know how that we can reciprocate, how that experience can be shared. But certainly, the benefits of the Commonwealth Parliamentary

2590 Association are far and wide and it gives Members the chance to benefit from inter-parliamentary experience, to represent Guernsey and stretch it across the globe.

Some Members might know that I am a CPA rep for the British Islands and Mediterranean Region. There are nine jurisdictions in that region when I was voted at the British Islands and Mediterranean Region conference, which I attended remotely as their rep. Subsequently, I was also
 2595 voted at another event, the CPA Small Branches Network, Vice-Chair. I do travel quite rarely, annually, of which, of course, CPA UK funds that, being a global position. But also I contribute remotely as well with people who, quite honestly, we do share best practice, but their problems are also our problems. I find that the problems we are encountering, they are encountering in various shades as well. It is a really great learning experience. I would encourage Members to sign up to the
 2600 CPA Academy as well, the online learning platform, where again there is much to be learned and gained from the CPA.

To close, I would welcome Members to note this and the benefits that the CPA mission can bring to Guernsey.

Thank you.

2605

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

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

I absolutely agree with both Deputy Soulsby and Deputy Gabriel. Deputy Soulsby pointed out
 2610 we are very lucky to live in a democracy where we are allowed to freely speak our mind. But it is something that is delicate and needs defending. There are always critics and people who are trying to attack our processes. While I, along with other Members, sometimes begrudge spending the States' money on things, I personally think this money is well spent and a requirement, a cost to doing business as a democracy and to preserve the integrity of that process.

I also concur completely with Deputy Gabriel's observation about the value of the CPA. We are
 2615 very honoured to be part of that group of nations and certainly value their input and shared experience with us, with the trips that we have made to visit other jurisdictions and when they send observers to look at our election and give us their combined advice.

With that, sir, I will commend this, the last policy letter of this term, to the Members.

2620

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, there is a single Proposition and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on that Proposition.

2625

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 35, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 2, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	Roffey, Peter	Brouard, Al	Hill, Edward	None
Blin, Chris		Mahoney, David	Snowdon, Alexander	
Burford, Yvonne				
Bury, Tina				
Cameron, Andy				
de Lisle, David				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Haskins, Sam				

Helyar, Mark
 Inder, Neil
 Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
 Le Tissier, Chris
 Le Tocq, Jonathan
 Leadbeater, Marc
 Matthews, Aidan
 McKenna, Liam
 Meerveld, Carl
 Moakes, Nick
 Murray, Bob
 Oliver, Victoria
 Parkinson, Charles
 Prow, Robert
 Queripel, Lester
 Soulsby, Heidi
 St Pier, Gavin
 Taylor, Andrew
 Trott, Lyndon
 Vermeulen, Simon

2630 **The Bailiff:** In respect of that Proposition, there voted in favour 35 Members, 1 Member voted against, 2 Members abstained, 2 Members were absent, and therefore I will declare the Proposition carried.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

23. Schedule for Future States' Business – Proposition Carried

Article 23.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the attached Schedule for Future States' Business, which sets out items for consideration at the Ordinary States Meeting on 16th July 2025, they are of the opinion to approve the Schedule

2635

The States' Greffier: Article 23, Policy & Resources Committee – Schedule for Future States' Business.

2640 **The Bailiff:** I will invite the President, Deputy Trott, if he wishes to, to say anything on the schedule. We have not received any amendments.

Deputy Trott: Sir, for the last time for me and for the last time for us, I so move.

2645 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, there is a single Proposition, whether you are minded to approve that a couple of matters be dealt with in July, and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on that Proposition, please.

There was a recorded vote.

2650 *Carried – Pour 38, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 2, Absent 0*

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue Blin, Chris	None	None	Hill, Edward Snowdon, Alexander	None

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

2655 **The Bailiff:** In respect of the Schedule for Future States' Business, there voted in favour 38 Members, no Member voted against, no Member abstained, 2 Members are absent, and therefore I will declare that Proposition carried.

Members of the States, that concludes the business for this term, save for the meeting next Thursday at midday when I have convened the States. I do encourage all Members to attend that special meeting which will commemorate 80 years from the meeting of the States once victory in Europe was known and the day before the liberation of these Islands on 9th May to follow.

2660 It would not be appropriate to say what I am proposing to say at that meeting and that is why I will take the opportunity now to say a few words at the end of your terms.

2665 On behalf of the community of Guernsey, what I would like to do is to thank each and every one of you for the part you have played in the Government during this term. It has been a longer term than might have been envisaged but it has been a useful term in any event. The starting point is that none of you had to have your names on the ballot paper back in 2020. You chose to do so. The electorate chose to elect you and the role that you have played ever since has been an important one and let no one forget that.

2670 I very much appreciate the courtesy that each of you has shown to all those of us who have presided in this Assembly. That includes me, the Deputy Presiding Officer, but in particular the three Acting Presiding Officers who shared a meeting between them and learned the experience of what it is like to be in this Chair. *(Laughter)* But I am particularly grateful, because I have presided perhaps more so than anyone else, for the courtesy that you have extended to me. It is an honour and a privilege to be the Presiding Officer in this Assembly.

2675 As other Members have said, some will be choosing not to be on the ballot paper next month. There are others who may find that the electorate choose not to elect them. That is the scope for democracy and democracy, in my view, is something that we should all cherish whatever the outcome. We are fortunate to live in a democratic society. We are fortunate to have an electorate that will, I hope, return the right people to this Assembly so that on 1st July, when we know that the two Alderney Representatives who are no longer with us will be in their seats, but that for everyone else it will be the electorate that decides the outcome.

2680 In closing therefore, in this meeting, I just simply want to say to all of you thank you very much indeed for your service during this term. Thank you. *(Members applauded.)*
Deputy Gollop.

2685 **Deputy Gollop:** May I say, as one of the longest-serving Members, although there are two Deputies precede me, what a pleasure it has been to serve under you and hopefully we have behaved well and smartly and we appreciate the work. As briefly an Acting Presiding Officer, I thank my other two Acting Presiding Officers and I warmly thank you, sir, for the gracious and careful way you preside over us, carefully interpreting the rules and giving us all the democratic chance to shine.

2690 To the Deputy Bailiff and to the States' Greffier and the States' Greffier's parliamentary team, and also, although he is not here today, the Lieutenant Governor, for the interest he shows. We all want to stay together, or some of us do, but it is not for us to decide, it is for the electorate, and therefore I wish everyone either a happy retirement or good campaigning. All the very best.
Thank you, sir.

2695 **The Bailiff:** Thank you very much, Deputy Gollop. *(Members applauded.)*
I invite the Greffier to close the meeting then please.

The Assembly adjourned at 4.04 p.m.