



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Wednesday, 2nd July 2025

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

Volume 14, No. 23

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

C. P. A Blin	M. P. Leadbeater
Y. Burford	J. P. Le Tocq
T. L. Bury	M. Malik
A. K. Cameron	A. D. S. Matthews
H. L. Camp	L. J. McKenna
G. M. Collins	P. S. N. Montague
R. P. Curgenven	A. J. Niles
H. L. de Sausmarez	G. A. Oswald
D. F. Dorrity	J. M. Ozanne
S. J. Falla	C. N. K. Parkinson
A. Gabriel	S. R. Rochester
J. A. B. Gollop	T. M. Rylatt
L. T. Goy	A. S. Sloan
S. T. Hansmann Rouxel	G. A. St Pier
M. A. J. Helyar	J. D. Strachan
N. R. Inder	L. C. Van Katwyk
B. R. Kay-Mouat	S. P. J. Vermeulen
A. Kazantseva-Miller	S. Williams
M. S. Laine	

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representative E. A. J. Snowdon

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

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

Absent at the Evocation

Deputy R. M. Humphreys; Alderney Representative E. Hill (*relevé à 9h 45*)

Business transacted

Evocation	5
Convocation	5
In Memoriam: former Deputy Harold Allen.....	5
Billet d'État XII.....	6
Procedural – Article 7(1) of the Reform (Guernsey) Law, 1948 – Motion lost.....	6
1. Election of Members of the Policy & Resources Committee – Election commenced	15
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 10.18 a.m. and resumed its sitting at 10.27 a.m.</i>	<i>16</i>
Election of Members of the Policy & Resources Committee – Election concluded – Deputy St Pier, Deputy Le Tocq, Deputy Parkinson and Deputy Falla elected	16
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 10.28 a.m.</i>	<i>16</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

CONVOCATION

The States' Greffier: Billet d'État XII of 2025. To the Members of the States of the Island of Guernsey, I hereby give notice that a meeting of the States of Deliberation will be held at The Royal Court House on Wednesday, 2nd July 2025 at 9.30 a.m. to consider the item listed in this Billet d'État, which has been submitted for debate – Article 1, Election of Members of the Policy & Resources Committee.

In Memoriam: former Deputy Harold Allen

The Bailiff: Members of the States, I thought it was appropriate to deal with the death of former St Sampson's Deputy, Harold Ross Allen, who died on 9th June, at this meeting.

Harold Allen, seemingly also known as H, although I will use his full name, was born in Guernsey on 14th July 1932. Approaching his 8th birthday, he was evacuated to Glasgow in 1940. After the end of the Occupation, it was decided that he should return to Glasgow to complete his education, but he ran away and returned here to his mother. He left education at the age of 14 and had various jobs until he married into the Le Page plumbing business, which he duly joined. Subsequently, he and his wife owned some flats near where they lived at Sandy Hook until those flats were later sold.

Harold was elected to the States at the 1985 General Election. He left at the 1991 General Election after failing in his bid to be re-elected. During his first spell in the States of Deliberation, he sat on a range of States' Committees, when there was far more of them than there is now. In an era of three-year terms of office, he became a member of the important Board of Administration in September 1985, to which he was subsequently re-elected. He also spent time on what was then known as the State's Insurance Authority and the Tourist Board, with the majority of his time serving on the Recreation Committee, which was appropriate for his sporting interests, and shorter spells on the Agriculture Committee, the Board of Trade and Industry, and a year on the Constitution of the States' Review Committee. Nothing has really changed, has it?

Harold was again elected to the States at the 1994 General Election as a St. Sampson's Deputy, serving for two consecutive terms before then losing his seat in 2000. During his second spell in the States, he served only on the Board of Health, which he joined early in 1995.

Harold believed in giving back to his community. He was known for trying to do the right thing. He was what might today be described as old school and was a gentleman. Harold, his son, Craig, and grandson, Ross, may possibly be better known to you as footballers. Harold himself was

manager of the Guernsey team. During his three-year tenure as its coach in the early 1980s, the team beat Jersey twice in the Muratti, and he was the first manager to choose the team himself rather than by way of a selection committee. In May, I had the honour and privilege of presenting the Muratti Vase to Harold's grandson, Ross.

Following a varied playing career, for many years Harold served as the coach of Rangers and led them to two Priaulx League championships, although the Upton Cup eluded them.

When he was younger he had also been an accomplished softball player for the island. Harold's wife, Pat, pre-deceased him, but he leaves children, Judith and Craig, along with their spouses, four grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren. To all of them, and his extended family and his friends, we extend our sincere condolences.

Members of the States, will you now please join me in rising for a period of silence to honour the memory of former States' Member, Harold Allen.

Thank you all very much.

Billet d'État XII

Procedural – Article 7(1) of the Reform (Guernsey) Law, 1948 – Motion lost

To vary Rule 16(5) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees, for the purposes of the current meeting of the States only, to the extent necessary to permit the following:

The Presiding Officer shall allow Members, whether there are four or fewer candidates or the election is contested, to question the candidates before voting takes place; Provided that:

1) the questions shall relate to areas of the policy included in the mandate of the Policy & Resources Committee;

2) no Member may ask more than one question, save that if before the expiration of the period prescribed in sub-paragraph vi there are no further questions, Members who have already asked a question may be permitted to ask further questions;

3) the questioner may not speak for more than 30 seconds;

4) each candidate shall be entitled to respond to each question, but no response shall exceed 1 minute;

5) candidates shall answer the first question in the order in which they are nominated and thereafter the order of answering the questions shall, after each question has been answered by the candidate, be rotated by moving the name of the candidate at the top of the list to the bottom of that list;

6) the session shall conclude at the expiration of the period calculated by multiplying 10 minutes by the number of candidates; and

7) no Member shall be entitled to speak other than in accordance with the provisions of this sub-paragraph.

The Bailiff: Before I invite any nominations to the Policy & Resources Committee, I understand that there should be on your desks a motion under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Reform (Guernsey) Law, 1948, as amended. This is, if it were approved, to vary Rule 16(5) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation to enable questions to be put to any candidates, however many candidates there are in relation to this.

This, I am afraid, means that it is a proper debate on a particular matter, so any new Members who would be making their maiden speeches will be making their maiden speeches at this point.

55 I simply alert all Members to that so that you can think about whether you wish to use your maiden speech on this particular motion.

But Deputy Inder, you are going to move the motion and I invite you to do that now, please.

Deputy Inder: Thank you very much.

60 Could I ask the Greffier to read the – just for the *Hansard* record – first two paragraphs of the motion, please?

The Bailiff: Greffier.

65 **Deputy Inder:** Just the first two paragraphs, please, sir.

The States' Greffier: Proposed by Deputy Inder and seconded by Deputy Camp:

To vary Rule 16(5) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees, for the purposes of the current meeting of the States only, to the extent necessary to permit the following:

The Presiding Officer shall allow Members, whether there are four or fewer candidates or the election is contested, to question the candidates before voting takes place;

Deputy Inder: Thank you, Greffier.

70 Members, yesterday we elected Deputy Lindsay de Sausmarez as President of Policy & Resources, and I would like to put on record my congratulations to her success.

75 Today we look to appoint her team and the news, via the media, it appears to be Deputy St Pier, Deputy Le Tocq, Deputy Falla and Deputy Parkinson. That does not include anyone who may put themselves up from the floor. Under the current Rule, if the election is either contested or uncontested, there will be a proposal speech, a seconder will make themselves known, and a short speech from the candidates, and we go straight to the vote. The die is cast, this is your top team for the rest of the term, and no challenge whatsoever.

80 This motion merely asks Members to vary that Rule and allow a short period of questions and answers to that team. To quote from an exchange of emails overnight, where I shared this with Members, and this from Deputy Camp, and I thank her for seconding this motion, I will read her paragraph:

The P&R Members are held to at least the same import as Committee Presidents, as evidenced through the pay allocations as one example, and yet there is no scope to ask them to discuss their motivations, etc., for wishing to sit on the most senior Committee (and all that entails), except through a prepared speech, whereas Committee President candidates will be challenged to think on their feet.

85 Ten minutes of time per candidate. At least 40 minutes of your time to date at worst, or at best rather. Sixty or 70 minutes, if there are more than four candidates, to satisfy you, as the new Assembly, that you have scrutinised your top team, and you are satisfied that you have made the right decision to set this new Assembly on its path for the next four years.

90 What reasonable or open candidate who wants to advance transparency and openness would vote against from being challenged for their important position? Who would vote against that as a candidate? Members, please do not hide behind the Rules to avoid scrutiny on this important election.

Thank you, sir.

95 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Camp, do you formally second the motion?

Deputy Camp: I do, yes.

The Bailiff: Thank you.
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

100 **Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** Thank you, sir.

I will be brief. Just to add a different perspective on the motion by Deputy (*Interjection*) – Deputy Inder, thank you. The purpose of the Rule of questioning Presidents is there for a reason. The role of Committee President is materially different from that of ordinary Committee Members. As a President, you are required to provide Update Statements, face questions, both prepared and spontaneous, and leading and laying policy letters and responding in debate.

The ability to perform these functions under pressure, I believe, is a core reason why the opportunity for Members to question presidential candidates ahead of election is an important embedded part of the process.

110 Ordinary Members of the Policy & Resources Committee do not routinely perform these functions. Their role, while important, is collaborative rather than front-facing. They do not present statements or answer questions to the Assembly in the same way as a President does. On this basis, it does not follow that the same pre-election questioning session should apply.

115 I would offer a different perspective on the statement given by Deputy Inder that voting against this motion would be a vote against openness and transparency. That is his opinion. It is your opinion to apply the Rules as stated, and is there a purpose in changing the Rules other than to have extra time to consider something which yesterday we, as an Assembly, had the opportunity to question the President of the Policy & Resources Committee and understand what her mandate is and how she will apply it. Thus why she would choose the people that she is choosing to represent the Policy & Resources Committee.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Hill, is it your wish to be relevéd?

Alderney Representative Hill: Thank you, sir.

125 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: Thank you, sir.

130 I just want to address a few of the comments just made by Deputy Hansmann Rouxel. Actually, the Policy & Resources Committee, firstly, is a little different than other Committees and certainly, in the last term, there were quite a number of times when the Committee chose to delegate the responsibility to lead and to respond to questions and to give statements to other Members of the Committee because of the way in which work is done. That was appropriate, it worked very well.

135 Certainly in most of the international affairs, it was me that was responsible for that. So I do think there is a difference here. Although other Committees have similarly done that, maybe not so often, but the senior Committee is slightly different.

140 Having said that, Deputy Inder knows that I feel that changing Rules of Procedure on the hoof is not a wise thing to do. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Having said that, I believe we have got far too many Rules anyway. It is a bit strange that we – I think, when I was first elected in 2000, the Rule Book was about six or seven pages. Look at it now, it has grown like Topsy.

145 But if we just create new Rules and then when we want to just drop them, what is the point of having Rules? We need to be disciplined about it. But I note in Deputy Inder and Deputy Camp's amendment that it says 'just for this particular occasion'. Because the best way to change a Rule ultimately is for the Committee responsible, SACC, to look at the Rules and see how this might affect other things and whether it does need to be changed. That is far better than doing it here right now in the middle of time when we should be focusing on something else. I am not going to die in a ditch on this one, and I am happy to support it.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: I did give this serious thought when Deputy Inder circulated it last night, but on balance I do not believe I can support it. I spent some time this morning on the new parliamentary website looking for Billet XXII from 2015, which unfortunately was not actually there, it was linked to Billet XX, but once I got around that, I discovered that that was the Billet in which this Rule originated, as it was part of the States' Review Committee in 2015. Correct me if I am wrong, but I think that was Deputy Falla and Deputy Le Tocq leading on that.

What I want to say is there was perhaps a suggestion yesterday that maybe this was not actually considered. I can assure you, particularly with those two people on that Committee, that this was considered most carefully, as indeed everything else was.

But I did not want to stop at that point, so I did message the parliamentary team, and I am very grateful for their response to me this morning on this subject. It does not differ greatly, in fact, from what Deputy Hansmann Rouxel has said. It points out that the President's role is to chair and to be the voice of the Committee in the Chamber, and have the ability to respond to questions and intuit the mood of the Assembly, which the question time would replicate.

The current system is not designed for members of the Committee to do this regularly. As Deputy Le Tocq points out, this does happen on P&R, but it can certainly happen on other Committees, and I do not believe we are proposing to question all members of other Committees as well.

I will not repeat too much of that because it has already been said, but I think the other thing I would say, again endorsing what Deputy Le Tocq says, if Members during this term have concerns with any of the Rules, then take them to SACC. It is inevitable at some point during the term that a review of the Rules will be brought forward, which will be an amalgamation of all the input from Members at that time.

I think the one other point that makes me uncomfortable with this on-the-hoof change, to be fair, is that the candidates who were standing for these positions, who have perhaps known for about a week that they were doing that, did not believe that they were going to have to do this. I am not saying that we should not be challenged. I am quite sure anyone could speak to them afterwards and ask them about anything they want, but I just think giving them notice from either this morning or from last night, if they happened to check their emails, just is not reasonable in that timescale.

I would encourage Members to vote against this, although I do see the attraction on the surface. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop:

Deputy Gollop: I will consider voting for it even though the last three speeches have made some valid points, but let us look at the context. The first is apparently we heard through the media who was standing for P&R but is proved to be *[Inaudible 09.51.08]* rather than through P&R themselves. SACC *[inaudible 9.51.18]* and I would hope, backing up Deputy Burford, that not only would SACC leadership look at these things but would look at them sooner rather than later.

I stood for Policy & Resources at the latter end of the mid-term and there were eight or nine candidates for four seats. I do not know if there will be competition today or not. That is one of the snags of this process.

But let us get to the material point of our asking and answering questions. Under the Rules, which are curious in themselves, and here I have got some sympathy with Deputy Le Tocq, if I understand them right, and they are put, on page 24, 16(4), whatever it is:

On a proposition to elect a President of a Committee the Presiding Officer shall (a) first invite Members to propose eligible candidates ...

Even if there is only one candidate:

... (or the candidate if there is only one), first the proposer to speak for not more than five minutes and then the candidate to speak for not more than ten minutes ... if there are two or more candidates, allow Members to question the candidates ...

Presumably that does not happen if there is only one candidate. But that is for all Presidents. Not sure of the Rules for Overseas Aid & Development, as that is a special case. But it means that, for the sake of argument, if the Transport Licensing Committee is contested there will be a lengthy session of questions, even though that role is largely non-political, purely regulatory and really should not exist at all. The Committees that are perhaps not considered principal Committees, I think Planning was a principal Committee – it was at one time – but at the moment DPA is not a principal Committee, nor is scrutiny, nor is SACC. They all have that Rule. And yet the Membership of Policy & Resources does not.

I wish to make two points at that juncture. The first is the Members who will sit on Policy & Resources have the good fortune of being on the senior Committee, as it is frequently referred to, and of having a senior level of pay uplift, similar to a principal Committee. So we regard them in a higher tier.

My second point is that when Policy & Resources started its life as an amalgam of elements of the Policy Council and Treasury & Resources, it was very important; it was to concentrate resources into one and it gained, among other things, Property Services and other responsibilities en route. In fact, it has become, in my opinion, a mini-Cabinet. It is only five of the 40 Members. I think there is an argument to expand it, but that is a point for another day.

But think of this, in the first era when Deputy St Pier chaired the Committee, it was a group of five, of whom three Members did a lot of external affairs and the other two were more perhaps Bailiwick bound. But when we had a change in 2020, and Advocate Ferbrache became the President, there was a change in culture. Not only were newer Members on it – we cannot tell at this stage who will stand – but Deputy Ferbrache delegated. So we had, sitting close to me, a Treasury lead, who was effectively Guernsey's Chancellor of the Exchequer for three years.

I consider the role of Treasury lead – Deputy Soulsby performed that role more recently – as extremely important for the Island. It could not be more so at the present time with the financial position and the many debates about the different kinds of technical taxation. External Relations, of which Deputy Le Tocq particularly has been admirable in performing in that role, is very important too. It is a forward-facing role. I would argue that it has a higher profile role, not just within the Island but off the Island than many principal Committee or secondary Presidents. So when you consider that we are not just electing a collegiate team, we are electing people who are effectively a Treasury Minister and External Relations – not Foreign Minister exactly.

I had the role, the dubious privilege perhaps, of doing some of the payrolls. I was once part of the Civil Service Board or Public Sector Remuneration Committee, and I was alone in that most of the time, and yet I did not have to do any questions and answers for what was effectively a presidential role.

Deputy Bob Murray, when he was on the Committee, had an enormous range of responsibilities from the Government Work Plan to IT to fronting up when we changed contract on our service provider to Property Services. I consider that the members of Policy & Resources have an extremely large amount of work and responsibility, and that strengthens the argument to question them. I think Members who are opposed to this change should ask themselves, yes, the Rules need reform, but is it logical that we do not question senior Members for these kind of roles, yet we will spend maybe half an hour questioning the Scrutiny President or the SACC President?

Deputy St Pier: Sir, Rule 26(1), please.

The Bailiff: Can I invite those Members who wish to speak in debate on this motion to stand in their places. Deputy St Pier, is it still your wish that I put the motion? So the motion is that there be no further debate on this matter other than hearing from Deputy Inder in reply. Because it is a procedural motion, I will put it to you *aux voix*. Those in favour? Those against?

Members voted Contre.

The Bailiff: I think I can probably declare that lost.
255 Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

260 Interesting some of the points made by Members, and I get that. I am not going to support this. I do not think it is a good look. I do not think it is good governance to start amending procedures while we are actually going through the procedure. We have elected one person so far. We have still got plenty of other positions that we need to elect, and this is coming from the former President of the States' Assembly and Constitution Committee. That is the Committee that should be making these changes in advance of an election like this.

265 Notwithstanding the arguments that have been put forward by various different Members, I advise Members to dispense with this and crack on with the elections.

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

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

I think Members will quickly realise that this argument about either hiding behind the Rules or saying no, the Rules are there to be varied, will be used depending on which side you end up in many arguments this political term. This is just a good example of one.

275 I think the problem with this specific Rule around the election of Members of P&R is that generally a political Assembly only uses it once. Last term we had – I would not say the luck, but we used it twice because we had to elect the membership again. But because you do not come across it often, it is not top of your mind. But when actually Deputy Inder – and I actually applaud his efforts for thinking on his feet quickly and acting on that – came with the suggestion, actually it makes complete sense because we will be set with the senior Committee, hopefully, for the rest of the term, and it is an extremely important Committee.

280 While I accept the arguments that Deputy Burford put forward that the Rules were previously drafted, and they are probably about 10 years when they were last drafted with the last change of Machinery of Government. The P&R Committee, certainly last term, has really changed. The members of the Committee have taken lead roles on a number of very significant portfolios and pretty much the majority of them either led – certainly led on policies and made representations and led on debate, closed on debate, led on questions for the Policy & Resources Committee.

285 The arguments that the Rules or debate, leading policies, led to us being able to be quick on their feet to answer questions, I do not think that applies because I think that they will be quite important in leading on policy letters going forward as well.

290 What is important is that the suggestion from Deputy Inder is that it is not about a permanent Rule change, it is just for today, and I would certainly encourage any future SACC President to certainly look into this Rule, because I think it is actually a really good idea that it is looked at. I do not think it was fair to criticise Deputy Inder, who was the President for a number of years on SACC, that he did not look at it, God knows how many years ago. I think when we find something, a good idea that actually will make a difference, and I understand there will be other Members standing today, as I imagine they will. I think this is an opportunity for other Members to also have a little bit more air time and to see how they perform in such circumstances.

300 I really think this is actually a no-brainer to go for, because why would we be hiding behind less scrutiny a lot more, and I think we should really embrace this and get on with it.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Matthews.

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

I intend to support this Proposition for the simple reason that I think it would be very useful to hear the answers from the candidates to the questions that are posed from the floor. But I think it has been mentioned an awful lot of consolidation and centralisation. There has been a real trend towards this with P&R and many functions including our Property Services, IT and Digital, HR and the whole employer-employee relations part and Procurement have all been centralised with P&R. That is an awful lot of centralised responsibility to have in one Committee.

310 Functions have been divided up between different Members with Deputy Ferbrache, I think. So I think in general it will be useful to have the question and answer, and to hear the answers from the questions. For that reason I will be supporting the Proposition.

315 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

320 The reason that I called a Rule 26(1) motion, the guillotine motion, was because here we are on, not even really on day two, we are on our second half day. Coming into the Assembly today, sir, I was explaining to one new Member that it is a little bit like primary school. You are eased in gently into the States. You only do half days to start with before you build up to longer days. Here we are on our second day not discussing the business before us, but yet again discussing the Rules, something that this States loves to do, and hence the guillotine. But the will of the States is that we do indeed debate this.

I should perhaps, actually when I stood, have declared an interest in the motion. I believe I am to be proposed for position on the Committee. I am no neophyte when it comes to either asking or answering questions, so I have got no fear of the question time, if indeed that is the will of the States. However, having reflected on this overnight, I cannot support the motion for the reasons that have been expressed by others of, in essence, making it up on the hoof as we have been known to do in the past.

330 Deputy Le Tocq, when he rose, reminded me of the last occasion we did this at the beginning of a States' term in 2012, when the States were in a desperate rush to amend the Rules to allow a particular candidate to be able to stand for the position that was then known as the Chief Minister, and it produced quite a contentious debate at that time, and the Rules were indeed changed. I argued against it then, in fact that was my maiden speech there on the very first day arguing against it then, so I am being consistent with my own position.

335 As to Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, and indeed Deputy Gollop, who have noted that the last Policy & Resources Committee has sought to organise itself in such a way that there have been leads in certain areas. Well that of course is a matter entirely for the Committee and whoever is elected to the new Committee. The new Committee may decide to reorganise themselves and the mandate a completely different way.

340 The idea that there can be questions posed with anticipation for particular leads or whatever, I think, is to misunderstand the flexibility which the Committee has to organise itself as it sees fit, other than of course the only Rule that is provided is that the Committee must identify an External Relations lead. But of course we do not know who that will be. We may seek to presume but we do not know who that will be until after a new Committee has been elected and has met.

350 Sir, for all those reasons, I regret that I will not be supporting the motion and encourage others to vote against it too.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: I rise simply to say that I believe I will be a candidate in the election for P&R, so I will abstain on this vote.

The Bailiff: Deputy McKenna.

Deputy McKenna: Thank you, sir.

Deputies, friends, fellow athletes, as you will find out along this term, Deputy Inder is always right. You ask him, he will tell you. I am not going to support this motion because yesterday was a historic day. Congratulations to the Chief Minister. We have put our trust in the Chief Minister, Deputy de Sausmarez, to lead us forward in four years, to give the public hope that things are going to change, and already within 24 hours we are saying the team that Deputy de Sausmarez has selected may not be the right one. We are telling the Chief Minister already that she has picked the wrong team. So I put my trust in the Chief Minister and say give the Chief Minister a chance, a chance to lead the community forward to give hope and a renewed energy that the Chief Minister and her team know what they are doing.

I will not be voting for any other candidate who stands from the floor, sir. I will vote for the Chief Minister's pick, which is not me (*Laughter*) and quite rightly so. I would not have put me on the top table either. Sir, I will be backing the Chief Minister. I am voting against this.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Bury.

Deputy Bury: Thank you, sir.

Just quickly, I will not repeat points that have been made that I agree with, but a point that has not been made is that we do not actually know that it will be a contested election. That is my slight issue with this Proposition. People may have their suspicions, some people may know that it will be a contested election, but we do not as a collective, and I do not necessarily think that if you had four candidates for four seats that questioning them for 40 minutes would be a good use of time. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Blin.

Deputy Blin: Thank you, sir.

I actually want to rise to my feet after Deputy McKenna's comment because actually I had pitched to ask to be on P&R, and I put my best pitch forward, etc. However, I am not the individual who is going to stand from the floor for this because I want to trust, exactly as Deputy McKenna had said, the new President of Policy & Resources and the Committee to start on that right step. I do appreciate Deputy Inder's stance of saying he has identified something. It could be right, it could be wrong, depending what point. We do not know if it is going to be contested. We do not know if it will or will not be, etc. So how about this?

We note for the next SACC to look at that the right way for the future time. We cannot just on the fly change it there. What a picture we are giving. As we say, we are in the first or second half day or longer and we are already showing ourselves to be changing Rules on the fly, almost demonstrating that there are going to be some challenges. We are not sure that there will be some challenges. We are starting off with the wrong message. I please urge Members not to support this, but also to let us understand what we are doing. We have all been reunited here by the electorate and let us try to do the best we can.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: I invite Deputy Inder to reply to that debate, please.

Deputy Inder: Thank you for the relatively short debate.

Members, I think it was Deputy Le Tocq who disabused the notion that members of the senior Committee are the same as ordinary members of other Committees, and I thank him as a candidate for the top bench for his transparency, openness and support in some form of question and answer.

If Deputy Burford is fairly neutral on the matter, then surely as a former Head of Scrutiny the decision should fall in favour of scrutiny for debate, not on the side of no debate.

Thank you, Deputy Gollop, for his support; he makes the point that we only had confirmed the four preferred candidates via the media. Perversely, Deputy St. Pier, as a candidate, not only will he not want the challenge to his candidacy in a guillotine move, he wanted this debate closed as well. But there you go.

Deputy Parkinson, thank you, sir – through you, sir – for abstaining. Entirely appropriate path given the circumstances of candidacy. I think he made entirely the right decision.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, you have identified the issue in the democratic deficit, if nothing else, that we do not get the ability to challenge members of the senior Committee. And it is true.

Deputy Leadbeater, I think it is probably a Rule that I missed at some point when I led SACC but, guess what, I have slept since then.

Anyway, for the last two paragraphs from my original piece, what reasonable or open candidate who wants to advance transparency would vote against them being challenged for their important position? Who would not want to be challenged? Members, please do not hide behind the Rules to avoid scrutiny on this important election.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, it is now time to vote on the motion pursuant to Article 7, paragraph 1 of the Reform (Guernsey) Law, 1948, proposed by Deputy Inder and seconded by Deputy Camp.

It is a procedural motion so it will go *aux voix*, since there has been no request for a division. Those in favour? Those against?

Members voted Contre.

The Bailiff: I declare that lost.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Can we have a recorded vote, please?

The Bailiff: Yes, we can now have a recorded vote. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on the motion proposed by Deputy Inder, seconded by Deputy Camp.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 11, Contre 21, Ne vote pas 6, Did not vote 0, Absent 2

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Haley Camp	Blin, Chris	Rob Curgenvin	None	Hill, Edward
Garry Collins	Burford, Yvonne	De Sausmarez, Lindsay		Rhona Humphreys
David Dorrity	Bury, Tina	Falla, Steve		
Gollop, John	Cameron, Andy	Le Tocq, Jonathan		
David Goy	Gabriel, Adrian	Paul Montague		
Helyar, Mark	Sarah Hansmann Rouxel	Parkinson, Charles		
Inder, Neil	Bruno Kay-Mouat			
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha	Marc Laine			
Munazza Malik	Leadbeater, Marc			
Matthews, Aidan	McKenna, Liam			
Andrew Niles	Oswald, George			
	Jayne Ozanne			
	Sally Rochester			

Tom Rylatt
Andy Sloan
Snowdon, Alexander
St Pier, Gavin
Jennifer Strachan
Lee Van Katwyk
Vermeulen, Simon
Steve Williams

450 **The Bailiff:** In respect of the motion proposed by Deputy Inder and seconded by Deputy Camp, they voted in favour 11 Members, they voted against 21 Members, 6 Members abstained, 2 Members did not participate in that vote and therefore I will declare it lost, which means that Rule 16(5) is unaffected and there will not be any questions to any of the candidates, just some speeches.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

1. Election of Members of the Policy & Resources Committee – Election commenced

Article 1.

The States are asked:

To elect four sitting Members of the States as members of the Policy & Resources Committee to serve until 30th June 2029 in accordance with Rule 16 of The Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation, as set out in Section 1 of The Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

455

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez, as the President of the Policy & Resources Committee, do you have any nominations for us?

Deputy de Sausmarez: Yes, I do, sir.

460

I would like to nominate Deputy St Pier, Deputy Le Tocq, Deputy Parkinson and Deputy Falla.

The Bailiff: And are those nominations seconded by anyone?

Deputy Helyar: Yes, sir, all of them.

465

The Bailiff: All four by Deputy Helyar.

Are there any other nominations? Well, on that basis, there will not even be any speeches, because under Rule 16(5), if candidates are proposed and seconded and there are no more vacancies than the number of candidates, then it is put to the vote without speeches.

470

This is a secret ballot, so it is up to you to write the names of those that you want of those four, and I simply remind you of the names: Deputy St Pier, proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez, seconded by Deputy Helyar; Deputy Le Tocq, proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez, seconded by Deputy Helyar; Deputy Parkinson, proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez and seconded by Deputy Helyar; and Deputy Falla, proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez and seconded by Deputy Helyar.

475

Members of the States, are there any more voting slips to be given to the Sheriff? I will tell you what I will do, I will rise while the votes are being counted and then we will come back and declare the result.

*The Assembly adjourned at 10.18 a.m.
and resumed its sitting at 10.27 a.m.*

**Election of Members of the Policy & Resources Committee –
Election concluded –
Deputy St Pier, Deputy Le Tocq, Deputy Parkinson and Deputy Falla elected**

480 **The Bailiff:** So the outcome of the election for Members of the Policy & Resources Committee is as follows, all of whom were proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez and seconded by Deputy Helyar. Deputy St Pier polled 31 votes; Deputy Le Tocq polled 35 votes; Deputy Parkinson polled 31 votes; and Deputy Falla polled 30 votes. There were no spoilt papers but there were two blank papers and therefore I declare all four of them duly elected to office. *(Applause)*

485 There being no further business for this meeting, the meeting can be closed and we will see you again on Friday morning.

The Assembly adjourned at 10.28 a.m.