



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Wednesday, 3rd September 2025

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

Volume 14, No. 28

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

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

Law Officers

People's Deputies

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

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 C. P. A. Blin; Deputy G. M. Collins (*absent de l'île*) ;
Deputy M. S. Laine (*absent de l'île*); Deputy J. P. Le Tocq;
Deputy J. D. Strachan (*absent de l'île*)

Business transacted

Evocation	6
Convocation	6
Apologies for late start	6
Statement	6
General update – Statement by the President of the Education, Sport & Culture Committee.....	6
Questions for Oral Answer	18
Violence Against Women and Girls Taskforce – Establishment	18
Burnt Lane, St Martins, Raymond Falla House – Redevelopment and repurposing	20
Welcome to Hilary Pullum (HM Comptroller)	21
Billet d’État XIX	22
Elections and Appointments.....	22
1. Independent Monitoring Panel: New Member Appointments – Appointments confirmed. 22	
2. Appointment of a Public Trustee for a Further Term – Appointment confirmed.....	23
Billet d’État XXII	25
Elections and Appointments.....	25
1. Policy & Resources Committee – Election of a member deferred to next sitting.....	25
Billet d’État XX	26
Elections and Appointments.....	26
1. Scrutiny Management Committee – Election of two members commenced	26
Billet d’État XIX	27
Appendix Report	27
Guernsey Police Complaints Commission 2024 Annual Report – Motion to debate carried....	27
Legislation laid before the States	29
The Excise Duties (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025; The Housing (Standards and Regulation) (Enabling Provisions) (Guernsey) Law, 2021 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2025; The Animal Welfare (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025 (Commencement and Transitional) Order, 2025; The Veterinary Surgery and Animal Welfare (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025 (Commencement and Transitional) Order, 2025; The Immigration (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Rules, 2025; The Animal Welfare (Designation and Control of Pest Animals) (Amendment) Order, 2025; The Animal Welfare (Exception to Glue Trap Offence) Regulations, 2025; The Animal Welfare (Exceptions to Offence of Fur, Skin, Feather, etc. Farming) Regulations, 2025; The Capacity (Advanced Decisions to Refuse Treatment, etc.) Regulations, 2025; The Income Tax (Pensions) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025; The Severe Disability Benefit (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025; The States Housing (Statutory Tenancies) (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025; The Income Support (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025; The Vaping Products (Guernsey) Ordinance, (Commencement) Order, 2025; The Vaping Products (Acceptable Documents to Establish Age) (Guernsey) Regulations, 2025; The Parochial Elections (Castel) Regulations, 2025; The Bovine Semen (Importation)	

(Amendment) Order, 2025; The Animal Welfare (Designation and Control of Pest Animals) (Amendment) (No.2) Order, 2025; The Plant Health (Preserved Phytosanitary Conditions Regulation) (Amendment) (Guernsey) Regulations, 2025; The Capacity (Lasting Powers of Attorney) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025; The Customs and Excise (Relief for Biodiesel) (Revocation) (Guernsey and Alderney) Order, 2024; The Customs and Excise (Relief for HVO) (Revocation) (Guernsey) Order, 2024; The Weights and Measures (Fees) Regulations, 2024; The Land Planning and Development (Fees) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025 and The Lending, Credit and Finance (Equity Release) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025.....	29
Scrutiny Management Committee – Mark Le Page and Charisma Lyall elected as members..	30
Legislation	30
3. The Driving Licences (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025 - Proposition Carried	30
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.34 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.</i>	33
Statement.....	33
Tax Review Sub-Committee - Statement by the President of the Policy & Resources Committee	33
Legislation	39
4. The Education (Guernsey) (Amendment) Law, 2025 – Proposition carried.....	39
5. The Income Tax (Guernsey) (Approval of Agreement with Bahrain) Ordinance, 2025 – Proposition carried	65
6. The Guernsey Financial Services Commission: 2024 Annual Report and Accounts – Proposition carried	67
Billet d'État XXI.....	71
Elections & Appointments.....	71
1. Policy & Resources Committee Membership – Motion to withdraw carried	71
Billet d'État XIX.....	73
Appendix Report.....	73
Guernsey Police Complaints Commission – 2024 Annual Report – Debate commenced	73
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.34 p.m.</i>	75

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States' of Deliberation

*The States' met at 11.10 a.m. in the presence of
His Excellency Lt Gen Richard Cripwell
Lieutenant-Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Bailiwick of Guernsey*

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The States' Greffier

EVOCATION

CONVOCATION

The States' Greffier: Billet d'État XIX, XX, XXI and XXII of 2025. Billet d'État XIX. I hereby give notice that a meeting of the States of Deliberation will be held at the Royal Court House, on
5 Wednesday, 3rd September 2025, immediately after the States of Election convened for 9:30 a.m., to consider the items listed in this Billet d'État which have been submitted for debate. Billet d'États XX, XXI and XXII are convened pursuant to the provisions of Rule 2(4) of the Rules of Procedure.

Apologies for late start

The Bailiff: Good morning, Members of the States. I will apologise once again for the fact of the
10 delayed start. In an ideal world we would only have a 10-minute gap between the States of Election and the States of Deliberation, but it has taken slightly longer to restore the technology.

Statement

General update –

Statement by the President of the Education, Sport & Culture Committee

The Bailiff: The first item of business is a statement on behalf of the Education, Sport & Culture Committee to be delivered by its president, Deputy Montague.
15 Deputy Montague, please.

Deputy Montague: Thank you, sir.

I would like to start by saying what a privilege it is to serve as President of ESC, the Committee
20 for Education, Sport & Culture. As a new Deputy, I would like to thank all those colleagues who have made the transition to this new role less problematic than it might have been.

I am especially grateful for the support of my colleagues on the Committee. Between us, we share a wide range of skills and experience relevant to our mandate. We bring very different perspectives, but share a commitment to work respectfully and collaboratively as momentum builds and challenges arise. Still in our induction phase, we are identifying priority areas, after which we will invite non-voting Members to strengthen the Committee with complementary skills and experience.

Among the areas for our early attention are: the Education Law review, the primary education transformation, collaboration with others on an early years' strategy, phase two of the Les Ozouets campus development, heritage and culture strategies, reviewing the Education Strategy, and looking at higher education funding. So quite a lot.

Given the breadth of our mandate, it is difficult to know where to begin. But I will start with an event taking place this Saturday. It is the island's fifth Joyous Childhood Conference, organised by the States' Early Years Team. For early years practitioners, working mainly in nurseries, preschools, and as childminders, the costs of traveling off Island to hear from sector specialists can be prohibitive. The conference this weekend ensures that they can access high-quality training and inspiration locally. Attendees will hear from respected early years' experts on a wide range of topics, including supporting emerging neurodivergence, the role of movement skills in development, the benefits of outdoor maths activities, the mental health impact of creativity and imagination, and how to discuss race with very young children while recognising our unconscious biases.

Events like these are not nice to have. They build understanding of the physical and neurological development of our youngest and often most vulnerable community members. By working with early years' professionals in this way we create the conditions for strong foundations on what children, families, and those supporting them can build with confidence. Now, alongside other Committee members, sir, I am looking forward to attending Saturday's workshops and learning from these experts.

Looking slightly further ahead, sir, we host our third Pupil Leadership Day on 26th September. This brings together 150 young learners from all States' primary schools for a series of workshops through which they will establish or improve presenting, research, technical, leadership and teamwork skills to support pupils so that they can aspire to roles as digital leaders and librarian leaders in their schools. The event is kindly sponsored by PwC, to whom, through you, sir, we offer our grateful thanks, and partners from the Sports Commission and Guille-Allès Library, who will also be playing a key role on the day.

In October, the Committee will be represented at the launch of 2027 Year of the Normans in Caen. The Bailiwick has a major opportunity to participate in celebrations marking the 1,000th anniversary of William the Conqueror's birth and the Norman legacy across Europe. We are already working closely with colleagues in Normandy. Local workshops will begin this month to shape a programme of events for 2027.

To maximise the opportunities these celebrations and rising French visitor numbers present, visitor materials are being expanded. Leaflets for the Guernsey Museum, Castle Cornet, Fort Grey, and the Naval Signals HQ are now available in French. From next season all permanent Guernsey Museum gallery boards will be bilingual. New learning resources have been developed for French school groups, and French-language tours of Castle Cornet will be offered for large parties.

Finally, there is even something for visitors from Jersey traveling with Islands Unlimited. They can enjoy a 10% discount at Guernsey Museums and Castle Cornet.

As well as looking forward, sir, I must take a moment to reflect on the success of the 80th Liberation Day and extend gratitude to every volunteer and sponsor who made it happen. We now need to look forward to a way to commemorate and celebrate in future years on more modest sums of money.

We should also recognise, sir, and congratulate the hard work and dedication of the Island's sportsmen and women and their coaches, whose efforts placed Guernsey third in Orkney's Island Games with an overall haul of some 59 medals.

The Committee's many partners helped to deliver its mandate and received grants enabling them to do so. We are grateful for their efforts on our behalf and for the patience of those organisations we have yet to meet.

75 Now, if I can turn to education. It has been a time of significant change in our secondary sector. Yesterday, the Committee visited the Sixth Form Centre at its temporary home, the interior of which has been refreshed and is ready to welcome students tomorrow. Our thanks go to the professionals and the many volunteers who have worked tirelessly and so hard over the past six weeks. We are particularly grateful for the artists who produce vibrant murals for some of the classrooms. I cannot
80 remember Les Varendes site car park ever been so full of contractors' vehicles. There is more refurbishment going on over there than I think we have ever seen.

It is now ready to welcome its new year 7 students and those joining from La Mare de Carteret site. There has been extensive planning to make these moves happen successfully for students and staff. Our special thanks go to all those who have worked in their own time to prepare for the start
85 of this new academic year.

In June, the contract with Ofsted, our external inspector provider, was renewed for another four years. This ongoing partnership does ensure a consistent approach to inspection and does enable us to measure progress against robust criteria.

Inspection frameworks usually include governance and we are keen to establish the necessary
90 legislative framework so that governance, too, is reviewed objectively within external inspections. Comparing our inspection outcomes with England, it is clear our state schools and settings are improving. The proportion graded good or better continues to exceed England, with every school judged at least good for behaviour, personal development or, where relevant, early year's provision. Gradings for the quality of education are broadly in line with England.

95 Personal development is a particular strength in our primary schools, where a higher proportion are judged excellent than in England. Importantly, no school or setting in any phase has yet been graded inadequate. While comparisons with England can be complex, benchmarking against areas with similar demographics gives some cause for optimism.

We need to be clear there is so much more progress to be made. Our next step must be to
100 increase the proportion of schools receiving excellent grades as we start the second cycle of inspection visits. Self-evaluation is now suggesting that several schools are close to meeting the criteria to be judged as excellent in a range of areas.

In the secondary phase, three years ago external tests showed maths attainment on entry to year 7 was low. Three years later, when the same children were retested, this is no longer the case. In
105 particular, the proportion of children now in year 9 – that is age 14 – scoring high scores has grown to the extent that our external assessments show that this now at least matches England. At GCSE, the proportion of learners achieving a grade 4 in maths or higher rose by over 3 percentage points this summer, narrowing the gap with England. This is strong progress, particularly given the very low starting points when this cohort entered secondary education five years ago.

110 We remain committed to further improvement, recognising variation between schools, especially in the primary phase. Educational advisers are working with leaders where results are weaker and, once established in legislation, new governance boards will really be able to hold schools accountable for progress.

Externally validated reading results remained strong and above average in most schools.
115 However, GCSE English language results fell this year, which is very disappointing. Analysis is underway, though early signs suggest written work is weaker than reading in earlier years. For the first time, students sat an Ofqual-approved GCSE, which excludes coursework. This may have exposed weaknesses that were less visible under the previous qualification.

Improving work in primary schools, including written work in primary schools, is therefore now
120 a key focus. Early adoption of a new approach shows higher standards, and we anticipate wider improvement as it is rolled out.

In secondary schools, Ofsted has already praised the English curriculum as strong, and this term advisers will monitor how well it is being delivered, with governance boards scrutinising outcomes and ensuring feedback is acted upon.

125 Last September, we launched the three-year High Quality Inclusive Practice (HQIP) programme. This is designed to raise quality for all our learners. The programme has been well-received so far and, over the coming year, every school and setting will evaluate its implementation, identifying strengths and areas for further development.

130 The construction phase of phase one of the Les Ozouets campus is progressing, and the Committee recently visited the site to see first-hand the works taking place, and study plans to see what the finished product will look like. We were impressed by how well the project is being managed. It is running on time and on budget. The new campus will transform The Guernsey Institute (TGI), when it opens in 2027. It will be a strategic asset for the Island, the aim being to provide a vibrant and inclusive centre of excellence for technical, vocational and professional
135 learning to serve industry and our wider community.

Through you, sir, I remind Members that among the many strategic advantages of bringing the component parts of TGI together will be the unlocking of the Coutanchez site for much-needed housing.

140 Supporting our community through skills, learning and knowledge is vital for people to thrive in an increasingly connected world. Each year, almost 4,000 learners engage with TGI. That is around 400 full-time learners, 350 apprentices, over 100 higher education students and 3,000 adults taking courses ranging from career development and technical accreditation to leisure and personal interest. TGI therefore makes a significant contribution to Guernsey's greatest economic asset, a skilled and diverse workforce.

145 To sustain and grow this workforce, TGI, supported by Government Work Plan funding, has created a practical learning roadmap responsive to local needs and aligned with Guernsey's ambition to be dynamic, self-reliant, and sustainable. New initiatives include a programme encouraging graduates to return to the Island, a system for accrediting short courses and units of study, wider adult learning for upskilling, retraining, and career switching, and community provision
150 to strengthen literacy, numeracy, and digital skills.

The Committee will soon spend time reviewing proposals for Les Ozouets phase two, including deepening our understanding of all the options for the long-term home of the sixth form. This will inevitably involve looking at options across the education estate, analysing student population numbers and long-term population projections. Only once we have fully understood all of this
155 information can we begin to make informed plans.

We also need to better understand and explore the interplay between parts of phase two relating to the sports block and outdoor sports facilities, and the outcome of the ongoing sustainability review of Beau Sejour. The Beau Sejour review is moving into phases three and four. The published outcomes from phases one and two tell us that Beau Sejour's role is more than just a leisure and
160 cultural facility. It is a critical asset in improving public health, community cohesion, and individual wellbeing, with a significant social value impact. Case studies, such as stroke rehabilitation and lifelong participation in sport, showcase how Beau Sejour acts as a bridge between health, education and sport. Sir, the next stages of the review will focus on what we need to do to provide sustainable services and facilities in the future.

165 Finally, sir, later in the meeting, the Assembly will consider a Projet making States-approved changes to Education Law to support a new approach to the governance of States' education settings in Guernsey, and we hope, subject to the processes in the States of Alderney, in St Anne's School.

170 I will reserve further comment on the Projet and the sursis motivé. Suffice to say that the Committee recognises the less-than-straightforward history of the subject and looks forward to a constructive debate.

Sir, I thank you.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, there is now an opportunity to ask questions to the President on any matter within the mandate of the Committee.

Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

I thank the President for his update, and there was a lot that was very interesting and encouraging contained within it. I was particularly pleased to hear him reference their ambition to increase the proportion of students achieving excellent grades, and my question relates to curriculum choice. Is it true that the standard number of GCSEs offered at secondary schools will be reduced to eight, which compares, I believe, with 10 at the colleges? If so, will subjects such as languages and triple science be protected? Will the most able students, keen to demonstrate that they are capable of achieving 10 high grades at GCSE, for example, because they aspire to Oxbridge or a career in medicine or other competitive field, be able to take additional GCSEs within the timetable?

The Bailiff: Deputy Montague.

Deputy Montague: Sir, I thank Deputy de Sausmarez for that really interesting question, which is very close to my heart.

One of the things we genuinely need to do is to drive up those standards in our States' provision. With regard to numbers of GCSEs taken, sometimes there has been a tendency to think more GCSEs equals good. That is not quite the case. There were times when people took GCSE exams early in year 10 so they could do even more, and that was demonstrated to be slightly counterproductive. But thank you to Deputy de Sausmarez for giving me advance warning so I am able to provide this information to the Assembly.

I will take an example from one of our high schools. This year 13% of students took 10 GCSEs, 34% took nine GCSEs, 30% took eight, 7% took seven, 5% took six, and 13% took five or fewer GCSEs. We need to remember there, sir, that the reason why those students might have taken lower numbers is they were taking other courses at TGI. It is not the case that students will not be able to take nine GCSEs. It is not the case that any student will not be able to take three separate sciences. But there is a word of warning on that as well. Some evidence suggests that you do not necessarily need to perform well in those three separate sciences to access all three sciences at A-level. It might not be appropriate for some students to do so.

In summary, sir, we are focusing as a Committee very strongly on making sure that our more able students genuinely are stretched and can do as many GCSEs as they want with the proviso that more does not always mean better.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

I am a trustee of the Sports Commission. I was at a trustee's meeting last week. There was talk of the Beau Sejour review, and I heard a whisper that the main sports hall was going to be cut down by a third in size. There was concern that there would not be adequate room for the sports that use that, like basketball, volleyball, and netball, etc. Could the President confirm to me that they will adequately consider all the sports that currently use that facility and ensure that they will have a home?

The Bailiff: Deputy Montague.

Deputy Montague: I thank Deputy Leadbeater for his question, sir.

225 A fascinating one and one which, as having a background in education in schools, I have learnt so much over the last eight weeks about sporting provision on Island. The first thing I would say is that in my update statement I mentioned that when we look at phases three and four of the Beau Sejour review, we have to map in what is going to be happening at Les Ozouets campus.

230 We are a small island. We often say you can stand in the middle of Guernsey and in 25 square miles there are very few sports you cannot do. But as we go forward, we must make sure that we really develop that. We cannot cut back on that provision. We know it helps with long-term wellbeing. We know it helps with long-term health. I can guarantee that the Committee will be looking very closely when we look at phases three and four of the Beau Sejour review. We will be reaching out to as many stakeholders as we can because that is not something we can get wrong.

235 We need to be imaginative about tying in with the private sector as well. It would be nice that if in a couple of years' time we can say if you stood in the middle of Guernsey there is no sport that you cannot do. Whether we will get an ice skating rink in the Velodrome I do not know, but we can always aspire.

Thank you, sir.

240 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Oswald.

Deputy Oswald: I am concerned – a concern shared I am sure by Deputy Montague and his Committee, and indeed many in our community – about the level of absence from school in the secondary sector. Deputy Montague's predecessor stated in April this level was running at about 245 16%, a figure itself which may be an underestimate as those who receive the bare minimum of alternative provision are recorded, I am told, as 100% attendance.

250 This has knock-on effects for the HSC workload. Referrals to the multi-agency support hub, otherwise known as MASH, are on course to double this year compared to pre-pandemic levels. MASH is, of course, the gateway into Children's Services. MASH is currently receiving around 200 referrals every month. Education and the police vie for the position of top referral agency. Absence from school is rarely quoted as a sole indication for referral, but such absence is an almost inevitable concomitant and co-contributor to the need for MASH –

255 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Oswald, your time for asking the question has elapsed so you cannot answer that Deputy Montague.

Next one please.

Deputy Gollop.

260 **Deputy Gollop:** While I was gratified to hear the work that has been done on Beau Sejour and the references to sports Deputy Leadbetter asked, has the new Committee had time yet to consider what improvements and strengthening they would like to see for the arts and heritage community, because I think we often forget that it is called education, sport and leisure?

265 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Montague.

Deputy Montague: I do not forget it is called Education, Sport & Culture, in fact there is a Deputy here who taunts me by saying that it should be known as education, school and colleges, and we are pushing firmly back against that. It is education, sport and culture.

270 At the very beginning of my update I did say that an arts and culture strategy really needs to be looked at.

In a similar answer to the question about sport, there is an incredible rich cultural environment we are blessed with on this Island, and we need to see that we are using taxpayers' money in the most appropriate way. We do need to investigate what we subsidise, what we take taxpayers' money 275 for to enrich the cultural life of the Island.

I think the question was: can I guarantee – can I assert – that we will look very carefully at making sure that we do not ignore that? Absolutely. It is in our list of priorities and it is something we have already been addressing with some of the groups with which we work very closely.

Thank you to Deputy Gollop for the question, sir.

280 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Thank you, sir.

285 Can the President please explain what the Committee are doing about absenteeism in schools?

The Bailiff: Deputy Montague.

Deputy Montague: I am so glad I have got the opportunity to answer this question.

290 Over the past few years we have seen a rise in lack of attendance at schools and it has a significant impact, not only on those individuals, on their classmates as well, and on teacher workload. It is an absolute drain on educational progress in all our settings. The question is: what are we doing about it?

295 First of all, we need carefully to analyse what the causes of it are. Too often we just say we have an epidemic of anxiety-induced lack of attendance, a fear of coming to school. But every student is different, and every student needs that concern. We presented to P&R on our budget request that we will be needing some resources to really carefully look at how we can get those students back into school. But this is not just a school problem; it is a community-wide problem. All Committees will be needing to work together, sir, to ensure that we make progress on this. Because we cannot
300 continue with these extremely high rates of lack of attendance at school. There is significant blight.

One of the things that we do hope is once we get the governance boards genuinely up and running, they will be working with their individual schools to carefully analyse what is going on in those schools. They will be setting targets for the senior leaders in those schools that they must meet. That will begin to engage the whole community in that problem. Because I would like to
305 reiterate, sir, in summing up, it is not just a schools issue. This is a problem that we face as a community together, and together we will be never taking our eye off it.

I thank Deputy Parkinson for the question.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Hill.

310

Alderney Representative Hill: Thank you, sir.

I would like to ask, in the last Assembly we passed an amendment which was about the private colleges providing digital classes for the public sector. It was done by Heidi Soulsby. Is that going to be rolled out? Because, potentially, we could take advantage of that in Alderney, where we cannot
315 offer all the subjects.

The Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy Montague.

320 **Deputy Montague:** I thank the Representative from Alderney for the question.

I am looking forward to answering it. Unfortunately, I am not in a position to answer it at the moment. I will endeavour to get an answer to the Representative within five days. It is, I am afraid, not something I have completely got my head around yet.

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

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Sir, I was very pleased to hear the President's reference to the changes being made to the museum's marketing to make it more bilingual. With the growth of our trade, tourism and cultural relationship with France, thanks to the ferry contract with Brittany Ferries, would the President and his Committee consider that it is important to review the language and cultural exchange strategy, with the view that potentially the French language provision should be improved for both adults and children in Guernsey?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Montague.

Deputy Montague: I thank Deputy Kazantseva-Miller for that intriguing question. Another topic that is very close to my heart.

I am very concerned about the decline in language speaking in schools. It is a nationwide problem across the UK, but that does not mean, because it is a nationwide problem, we need to acquiesce. We are so close to France. I genuinely think it is incredibly important that we build those links.

One of the problems is that a good few years ago we would take students on exchange visits more easily. We need to investigate why, through finances, ferry times, some of the health and safety requirements, that is no longer so easy, particularly for some of our younger children. But that is absolutely something we need to embed.

We have already met with the Language Commission to discuss how we can look at our own language and embed that and understanding of that into our primary schools. But French as well is something that we are incredibly keen, and I personally am very keen, on pushing. I believe that many people in the education sector are on side with this as well. I know it is something that Committees can work together on to really pursue progress in that sphere.

So I thank you for the question.

The Bailiff: Deputy Curgenvén.

Deputy Curgenvén: Thank you, sir.

A relatively straightforward question for Deputy Montague, please. What percentage of States-maintained school students, if I can word that correctly, completing year 11 at the end of 2024 and 2025 academic year, received GCSEs in both English language and maths at grade 4 or above?

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Montague.

Deputy Montague: Sir, I thank Deputy Curgenvén for that relatively straightforward question, which does not have a relatively straightforward answer. And I thank him for the advance warning late yesterday evening for that.

I did want to say that, previously, maths and English, five GCSEs, grade 4 and above, including maths and English, had been a regular score, but that was either English, English literature or English language. This year, the Education Department did not release those results in line with changes in Jersey and England. So, we released a number of sets of results about grades attained in maths, in English, and on attainment 8.

That data I can get to the Deputy, and I will commit to doing so within five days. I will meet with the Deputy afterwards just to clarify the issue about whether he is insistent it is only English language. Traditionally, when that metric was used historically, previously, it was either English subject and maths. So when we said GCSEs in English and maths, it was either English. So I am looking forward to speaking to Deputy Curgenvén as soon as possible, and I am making a commitment to get that detailed information to him as soon as possible.

The Bailiff: Deputy Falla.

Deputy Falla: Thank you, sir.

This question touches on Alderney Representative Hill's question. During the college funding debate last term, the three private colleges expressed an interest in having much more collaboration with the States' schools. Is this something that the new Committee is keen to pursue?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Montague.

Deputy Montague: I would like to thank Deputy Falla for the question, another one that I find incredibly fascinating.

When I first came back to Guernsey 30 years ago, one of the first things I observed was this strange relationship where 30% of our youngsters are in the grant-aided colleges. We are a small educational environment, and it is obvious we need to work much more closely together.

I am pleased to say that, following that debate, principals of the secondary school partnership centres and the principals of the grant-aided colleges met together and began that process of looking at some ways that they could harmonise. Sharing resources, both physical resources, but also intellectual resources, is the way we can go ahead, and there are some very easy wins here.

One easy win is to ensure that, when we get any experts over from the UK, anyone doing presentations, we cannot be selfish with regard to having got that person and present them to our school. I was pleased to hear just recently this week we have Christine Counsell, who is coming over to present to States' schools, history teachers and senior leaders. She is a leading educational academic in the UK, and we have already arranged to ensure that the invite is given to our grant-aided college colleagues as well.

So I can guarantee we are working on it, the principals are working on that, and they have begun to make steps in what I believe is the right direction.

The Bailiff: Deputy Bury.

Deputy Bury: Thank you, sir.

Within the statement, Deputy Montague mentioned that Les Varendes is ready, so I just wanted to seek some clarity on the work that was supposed to be done over summer at both Les Varendes and La Mare de Carteret to prepare it for sixth-form students, and just ask: was all the work that was supposed to be done achieved over the summer?

The Bailiff: Deputy Montague.

Deputy Montague: I am very grateful to Deputy Bury for asking what I think is a very interesting question.

I did say, 'Ready to welcome students', and I was at Les Varendes yesterday afternoon at four o'clock, and I spoke to a range of people and asked them that very question. 'Are you going to be ready on Thursday morning to welcome students so that they can get on and learn?' I should tell Deputy Bury that I got a range of responses, but the bottom line is they believe they are ready to welcome students.

However, I do not know, as I said in my speech, the Les Varendes site has ever had so much work done over the year. There are one or two elements that are still outstanding, but they, I am told, by people working there, will not impede the learning of the students as they come in on Thursday morning.

It is important to remember as well that refurbishment work is ongoing. There is only so much that you can fit into a six-week summer break, so there will be ongoing works on replacing the windows. That building is 40 years old. Sometimes the States are accused of not maintaining their

buildings. But the ongoing work was that there is some of it which was not meant to be constrained into the summer break. There are one or two areas that have overrun, but I think I am answering Deputy Bury's question by saying it is ready to welcome students for learning tomorrow morning.

435 I do not know if I have got time to continue. I am going to continue until I am told to stop. We also, as a full Committee, visited the Sixth Form Centre.

The Bailiff: Now your time has ended, Deputy Montague. It is not a challenge to try and fill the whole 90 seconds through a response.

Deputy St Pier.

440

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

445 Sir, the President was very candid in his statement about his disappointment with the GCSE results and some of the English GCSE results and the challenges there. He also was pleased that maths performance had improved and was at a level comparable with England. I was particularly interested to know whether he is in a position to provide the Assembly, either now or in due course, with any benchmarking information for similar areas, as he referred to in relation to Ofsted, so that we have got a better comparison than looking at England as a whole.

The Bailiff: Deputy Montague.

450

Deputy Montague: Once again, sir, I am incredibly grateful to Deputy St Pier for what is a fascinating question.

455 I may not be able to get all the information out in the next 90 seconds, which I will attempt not necessarily to fill. However, benchmarking against the UK is incredibly difficult, 70% of our youngsters taking GCSEs are in the States' sector, 30% are in the grant-aided colleges. So finding benchmarking with the UK is complex. However, the Committee was presented with information a week or so ago where that attempt is genuinely being made. It really is, whether it is a science or veers into the art, it is a very technical process.

460 We are not quite up to the level of England with regard to maths. One thing I want to be clear about, as I have watched this issue from the other side as a teacher, is that you cannot turn things around incredibly quickly. If we take specifically maths, if you remember your maths learning at school, it is about foundations. If you do not get the foundations right, it is very hard then to suddenly turn it on at the end.

465 There are probably many Deputies in this room, sir, who have had children where we have observed just that phenomenon, that a missed year in year 4 causes problems later on. So I am disappointed with the English. The maths has made an improvement, it is not there yet. I am making a commitment now to communicate that benchmarking data as clearly as we can, bearing in mind it is a very complicated activity because of the problems with comparison. I am making a commitment to get that in.

470

The Bailiff: Your 90 seconds are up, Deputy Montague.
Deputy Goy.

475 **Deputy Goy:** Sir, many of the jobs we see today will not exist in five to 10 years' time due to advancement in AI and robotics. How are we preparing our students today for that inevitable future? Most importantly, how knowledgeable are the members of the upcoming governance board about AI and robotics in education?

Thank you.

480

The Bailiff: Deputy Montague.

Deputy Montague: Thank you, sir.

That is another incredible question from Deputy Goy. Fascinating. If I focus on the AI issue first, this is something that is really taxing all of our colleagues working in schools. It is such a fast-moving area. I was just relating earlier that there was an article demonstrating that ChatGPT use fell off a cliff in July and they were thinking what has happened, and then they realised it is because all the students had gone on summer break.

A lot of teachers are just playing catch up. We have got an awful lot of work in schools to try and help teachers understand how we can help students use AI to learn. What is crucial is whatever does the thinking does the learning, and this is something we are making very clear to our students. If you export your thinking to AI, you are also exporting the learning. I am sure we have all seen in our own lives how we have unwittingly deskilled ourselves by the use of AI. So that is the first thing I would say.

I would also say there are changes coming up to qualifications. I know that the International Baccalaureate Organisation is genuinely considering holding back on its coursework. It is no longer a functional thing to do in a world driven by AI.

Your final question is how knowledgeable we are. I would like to say to Deputy Goy, probably not as much as he is, but we would love to get to that point.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Snowden.

Alderney Representative Snowden: Thank you, sir.

Sorry I did not give you advance warning of this question, but do you feel we have got enough host families for Sark and Alderney students, and could we welcome some engagement with your Committee when you have got some time to talk about steps forward regarding host families?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Montague.

Deputy Montague: I have been speaking with Alderney Representatives about this over the last few weeks. It was raised as an issue over the summer. As someone who has worked for a long time in the Sixth Form Centre, I am well aware of the difficulty of finding host families. It is such an important thing that these people do to look after students from Alderney and from Sark. When it works well, it is amazing to see. It really enriches their lives.

But very often it is a problem. I am really looking forward, and I have already spoken of this to the Representative from Alderney, we are really looking forward to working on this. It is a tricky problem. But I am sure, knowing the Guernsey community as I do, that there are people out there who are unaware that this is something that we need. If we get the publicity right, we can make progress. I am looking forward to speaking with both Alderney Representatives about this matter.

The Bailiff: Well, Members of the States, I should have explained that I will continue to allow you to ask questions to the President of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, at least for a little bit longer. But nobody will be entitled to ask a second question, because there are still Members who have not yet asked a question. Deputy Sloan.

Deputy Sloan: Sir, thank you.

May I welcome the President's support for the Cultural Strategy revision review. It was a two-part question.

Is he aware that public funding of the arts through grants in Guernsey is nothing more than 0.006% of Government expenditure compared to 0.17% of Government expenditure in the UK, a good benchmark clearly? Is he prepared to commit to a four-year term of trying to increase that level of funding?

I express an interest, sir, I am on the Board of the Guernsey Arts Commission.

535

The Bailiff: Deputy Montague.

Deputy Montague: Thank you, sir; I thank Deputy Sloan for his question.

540

To answer his first question; no, I was not aware of those numbers. I am aware that funding the arts is crucial for a vibrant, strong community.

545

To answer his second question, we will do everything we can to use resources as carefully and effectively as possible to drive up support for the arts. However, I need to warn everyone that at times where finances are under pressure, decisions will need to be made. We will need to be very shrewd, working with our colleagues on the Arts Commission and various other groups, to ensure that we get the biggest bang for our buck in everything that we do.

So, to answer the first question: no, I was not aware of the numbers. To answer the second question: we will do our best.

550

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you; and thank you for your update, Deputy Montague. It is a good start to your career, I hope.

555

AI is not here to write your speeches, pass your exams, it is here to take your jobs. That is the reality. It may not be a question that he can answer right now. It would suggest the curriculum is probably going to change relatively quickly to effect the tech changes.

Can I ask, therefore, as part of the Human Capital Development Plan and the Skills Board, which is there to influence potentially the curriculum and the future technology, the way the industry is going, has that been set up and could you give us a bit of an update as to where we are with the Skills Board and the Human Capital Development Plan?

560

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Montague.

Deputy Montague: I thank Deputy Inder for that complex question.

565

There is so much to respond to there. First of all, it is a genuine concern what we teach our youngsters in school when we look forward and work out how it is going to prepare them. I am wary, however, of thinking that we can withdraw all knowledge content from the curriculum and load students up with skills in some kind of vacuum. I genuinely believe this does not work. We do need to give our youngsters genuine knowledge, because engaging – you might have all the digital skills in the world, but unless you have a grounding, a skeleton of knowledge, you will struggle. So that is the first warning I would give.

570

I would also want to say that some of the skills that I do not think we focus on, and I was talking to Reverend Datta about this just this morning, is genuinely finding a solution to how we can bring up children with more resilience. We talk a big game about resilience. We speak about it in classrooms. You cannot talk someone into being resilient. Youngsters only become resilient by experiencing hardship in life, and *resilire* means to bounce back. Whatever happens in the future with regard to their roles, we need to find a way of getting our students to bounce back from hardship. That is absolutely crucial, and that is fundamental to answering a whole range of those questions.

580

We need to look around the world to find out where that is. It might well be that we as a society have become too risk-averse with our young people.

The Bailiff: Deputy Montague, your 90 seconds are now up.

585

I did say, Deputy Gollop, that I was not going to call anyone to ask a second question. But if there is anyone who has not asked a question to the President who wishes to, then leap to your

feet now. But, if not, then we will draw questions to the President to a close. Thank you very much, Deputy Montague.

You have already asked a question, Deputy de Sausmarez.

Questions for Oral Answer

COMMITTEE FOR HOME AFFAIRS

Violence Against Women and Girls Taskforce – Establishment

590 **The Bailiff:** We are now moving to question time proper. There are two questions that have been posed in accordance with Rule 11. The first of those is from Deputy Rylatt to the President of the Committee for Home Affairs.

So your question, please, Deputy Rylatt.

595 **Deputy Rylatt:** Thank you, sir.

As outlined in the 2024 Bailiwick Law Enforcement Annual Report, the volume of sexual offences reported last year were up 46% from 2023 levels. While recognising that boys and men are also the victims of sexual crime, women and girls are generally impacted at a higher rate, and so will the Committee prioritise establishing a Violence Against Women and Girls Taskforce, similar to the model successfully implemented to Jersey?

600

The Bailiff: I invite the President, Deputy Leadbeater, to reply, please.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

605 The Committee sees the increase in reporting of sexual offences as a positive. It suggests that victims of sexual offences are feeling more confident in being supported by the police and specialist agencies.

The Jersey taskforce was set up in 2022 to understand the issues in that jurisdiction. This resulted in a report and recommendations completed in November 2023. Our Domestic Abuse Strategy was established locally in 2008. When this was taken back to the Assembly in 2016, there was a direction to consider the need for a Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy. As a consequence of the work undertaken to discharge this direction, in 2022 the Assembly supported broadening the scope of the Domestic Abuse Strategy to include sexual violence. The Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Strategy ensures that Government, public services and voluntary agencies are focused on the co-ordinated and effective delivery of services geared towards tackling and reducing domestic and sexual violence.

610

615

While Jersey have taken a different approach to identifying and tackling this issue, it would not be correct to suggest that we are behind our neighbours, as our strategy continues to support the delivery of improved legislation and services locally. Home Affairs remain committed to this work, and we have already received a comprehensive briefing on the objectives of Deputy Leadbeater for this term.

620

One of the inevitable outcomes of improved services and modern protective legislation will be an increase in reported crime and, in due course, prosecutions. An increase in this type of statistics in what has historically been a hidden crime should be recognised as a positive outcome.

625

The Bailiff: Supplementary question, Deputy Rylatt.

Deputy Rylatt: I am grateful to Deputy Leadbeater for his answer, and agree that any signs suggesting that victims feel more comfortable in reporting offences is indeed very positive.

630 However, the 2022 Sexual Offences Survey found that only 15% of individuals who experience sexual offences report it to the police. One purpose of an independent Violence Against Women and Girls Taskforce is to capture the prevalence of offending and experience of victims who have not engaged with the police or support services.

635 So, how will the Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Strategy effectively address violence against women and girls without data that captures the experience of all victims?

The Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater to reply.

640 **Deputy Leadbeater:** I do not think there should be any suggestion that the Committee and the strategy is not looking to collect all this type of data, because it is. We have just taken a slightly different approach to Jersey. We have broadened the strategy; it was supported last term. Deputy Rylatt has been in contact with our Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Strategy co-ordinator, and she is willing to give a proper briefing and update to Deputy Rylatt, and anyone else who is interested.

645

The Bailiff: Second supplementary, Deputy Rylatt.

Deputy Rylatt: In 2024, our then Deputy Chief Officer said, quote:

If Jersey's taskforce is not a call to arms in Guernsey, I do not know what is.

650

Does the Committee believe that the existing strategy, which the President has referred to, meets the standard of response that professional voices who have worked on the front lines are urging us to adopt?

655

The Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater to reply.

660 **Deputy Leadbeater:** It is, but we have to consider that the strategy currently is due to expire this year, so there is a refresh being undertaken at the moment to establish exactly where we are, what we are doing, and to see if there is any improvements that could be made. But we will certainly pass that on to the Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Strategy co-ordinator for further consideration.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy St Pier.

665

Deputy St Pier: Sir, will the President and the Committee, in considering the refresh, give consideration to whether there are lessons that can be learned from Jersey's taskforce in identifying the scale of the challenges faced for violence against women and girls?

The Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater.

670

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir; and I thank Deputy St Pier for his question.

Yes, certainly, we are going to be looking at other jurisdictions to see how they are doing things, any lessons learned that we can take. This is a very serious piece of work, a very important piece of work, and we need to build on the solid foundations that were delivered through the previous Committee last term.

675

COMMITTEE FOR HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE

**Burnt Lane, St Martins, Raymond Falla House –
Redevelopment and repurposing**

The Bailiff: The second set of questions, a single question, is from Deputy Gollop to the President of the Committee *for* Health & Social Care. So your question, please, Deputy Gollop.

680 **Deputy Gollop:** Thank you very much, sir.

My question to the President of Health & Social Care, Dr Oswald, and I thank him and the Committee for their answer, is will the new Health & Social Care Committee consider as a priority the redevelopment and repurposing of the Burnt Lane, St Martins, Raymond Falla House as an appropriate setting as a children's service, family service, and social care hub, fit for purpose, as soon as possible, to bring into use by 2028?

685

The Bailiff: I call on the President of the Committee, Deputy Oswald, to reply, please.

Deputy Oswald: Sir, I thank Deputy Gollop for his question.

690 The Committee *for* Health & Social Care is fully supportive of the redevelopment and repurposing of Raymond Falla House for a children and families hub. The project aims to co-locate multiple community services which support children and families on to a single site. The benefits of this are to improve the experience for children and families receiving community health and care services, to provide access to multiple services in a single fit-for-purpose facility rather than across numerous sites and ageing buildings which are not designed for this purpose, and to exit four sites so they can be put up for sale or repurposing.

695

Committee Members recently undertook a tour of the existing sites which highlighted the severe limitations of the existing estate. The Outline Business Case is currently being finalised and subject to the relevant approvals. A Policy Letter will be brought before the Assembly seeking your support for this substantive investment. It is not possible to confirm a timeline for completion of this project as this will be dependent on confirmation of the preferred design, approval of the outline business case, and the availability of construction partners through the tender process.

700

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Gollop.

705

Deputy Gollop: I have two, thank you, sir.

My first supplementary is, I thank the President for outlining these important benefits of improving the experience for clients, providing access to a single fit-for-purpose facility, and to exit four sites so that they can be put up for sale or repurposing, maybe for housing.

710 But, would the President and Committee not also agree a fourth benefit is improving and enhancing the morale of the professional workforce who really need the right 21st century facilities to achieve the best outcomes for themselves and the community?

The Bailiff: Deputy Oswald.

715

Deputy Oswald: Thank you, Deputy Gollop, for that supplementary question.

I totally agree with him. I think, as a Committee, we were really surprised by the state of dereliction of the properties from which our current staff are operating. I, for one, asked specifically one of the leads, 'How is the morale of the team that you are working with in this rather decrepit building?' I am surprised that any of them choose to carry on working for us in this state of affairs.

720

Having said that, it reflects the skills of the team building which has occurred and the leadership qualities of those who are in charge that we are being able to retain a very highly skilled workforce. But clearly we need to move on to make the working environment as appropriate as possible.

Thank you.

725

The Bailiff: Second supplementary, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I also thank the President for what I consider a very positive and proactive answer about the Outline Business Case being finalised, and a Policy Letter coming to us hopefully sooner rather than later.

730

But my question is: is the Committee satisfied that it has the resources, both internally and externally, in terms of staff and budget to ensure that this project is managed in co-operation with other Committees, especially Policy & Resources? Although I appreciate the good intention, can the President reassure us that the Committee has the resources for the task, and if they do not, will they seek them as soon as possible, perhaps through this Assembly?

735

The Bailiff: Deputy Oswald.

Deputy Oswald: Thank you, Deputy Gollop.

740

Clearly, that is a complex question for which I do not immediately have an answer. At the moment we have been concentrating on the physical presence at Raymond Falla House. The questions of staffing and resources to finance and staff it appropriately will be subject for further discussion and probably bringing back to this House.

Thank you.

745

The Bailiff: I do not see anyone else rising to ask a supplementary question arising out of the answer that Deputy Oswald gave.

Welcome to Hilary Pullum (HM Comptroller)

The Bailiff: Before we move on to the next item of business, this is the first meeting at which His Majesty's Comptroller, who was sworn into office last week, is attending, and I simply want, on behalf of all of you, to welcome her to the States of Deliberation and hope that she has a very productive time advising Members in due course on any business that needs to be dealt with in this Assembly. You are very welcome. *(Applause)*

750

Billet d'État XIX

ELECTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

COMMITTEE FOR HOME AFFAIRS

755

1. Independent Monitoring Panel: New Member Appointments – Appointments confirmed

Article 1.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter dated 27th May 2025, of the Committee for Home Affairs, they are of the opinion:

- 1. To confirm the appointment of Mr Theo Hannah as a Member of the Independent Monitoring Panel for a period of four years with effect from 27th May 2025.*
- 2. To confirm the appointment of Mrs Kim Bougeard as a Member of the Independent Monitoring Panel for a period of four years with effect from 27th May 2025.*
- 3. To confirm the appointment of Ms Lizzie Edwards as a Member of the Independent Monitoring Panel for a period of four years with effect from 27th May 2025.*
- 4. To confirm the appointment of Ms Dillen Mare as a Member of the Independent Monitoring Panel for a period of four years with effect from 27th May 2025.*

The Bailiff: Greffier.

760

The States' Greffier: Billet d'État XIX, Article 1, Committee for Home Affairs, Independent Monitoring Panel: New Member Appointments.

The Bailiff: I invite the President, if he wishes to do so, Deputy Leadbeater, to open the debate on this.

765

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

It is straightforward, just re-election for Independent Monitoring Panel members, and I ask the Assembly to support the Proposition.

770

The Bailiff: I do not see anyone else rising to speak on this matter. There are four Propositions. Are you content, Deputy Leadbeater, that we put all four of them at the same time?

Deputy Leadbeater: Yes, sir.

775

The Bailiff: In that case, I will invite the Greffier to open the voting, please. You might want to admit those who are waiting at the moment as well first. Is technology not wonderful? I will now invite the Greffier to open the voting.

There was a recorded vote.

780

Carried – Pour 33, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 0, Absent 7

Pour

Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina
Cameron, Andy

Contre

None

Ne vote pas

None

Did not vote

None

Absent

Blin, Chris
Collins, Garry
Laine, Marc

Camp, Haley
Curgenven, Rob
de Sausmarez, Lindsay
Dorrity, David
Falla, Steve
Gabriel, Adrian
Gollop, John
Goy, David
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah
Helyar, Mark
Hill, Edward
Humphreys, Rhona
Inder, Neil
Kay-Mouat, Bruno
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Leadbeater, Marc
Malik, Munazza
Matthews, Aidan
McKenna, Liam
Montague, Paul
Oswald, George
Ozanne, Jayne
Parkinson, Charles
Rochester, Sally
Rylatt, Tom
Sloan, Andy
Snowdon, Alexander
St Pier, Gavin
Van Katwyk, Lee
Vermeulen, Simon

Le Tocq, Jonathan
Niles, Andrew
Strachan, Jennifer
Williams, Steve

785 **The Bailiff:** So, in respect of all four Propositions confirming the appointments of the individuals named in those Propositions, there voted in favour 33 Members. No one voted against, no one abstained, but there were 7 Members absent at the vote, and therefore I will declare all four Propositions duly carried.

COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

2. Appointment of a Public Trustee for a Further Term – Appointment confirmed

Article 2.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, consideration of the Policy Letter entitled Appointment of a Public Trustee for a Further Term' dated 3rd June 2025, they are of the opinion:

1. In accordance with paragraph 1(4) of the Public Trustee (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Law, 2002, to agree to appoint Mr Brian Williams as Public Trustee for a further term of five years ending on the 31st October 2030.

790 **The States' Greffier:** Article 2, the Committee for Economic Development, Appointment of a Public Trustee for a Further Term.

The Bailiff: I will invite the President, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, to open the debate, please.

795 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Sir, I am pleased to place before the Assembly the Proposition to reappoint Mr Brian Williams as Public Trustee for a term of five years. The Office of the Public

Trustee is a statutory role created under the Public Trustee Law 2002. It provides an essential safeguard for our trust industry to ensure there is always an independent office available to act as trustee of last resort where no other person is willing or able to do so.

800 Mr Williams is a chartered accountant with over 20 years of senior experience in regulated businesses, including managing director and finance roles within the trust sector. He has also spent a decade in complex trust litigation. Since joining the Office of Public Trustee in 2019, he served as Deputy Public Trustee and, since May 2024, as Public Trustee. I ask Members to support his reappointment.

805 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Well, as no one else is rising to speak on the appointment of the Public Trustee for a further term, I will invite the Greffier to open the voting, please.

810 *There was a recorded vote.*

Carried – Pour 34, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 0, Absent 6

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Burford, Yvonne	None	None	None	Blin, Chris
Bury, Tina				Collins, Garry
Cameron, Andy				Laine, Marc
Camp, Haley				Le Tocq, Jonathan
Curgenven, Rob				Niles, Andrew
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				Strachan, Jennifer
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Inder, Neil				
Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Montague, Paul				
Oswald, George				
Ozanne, Jayne				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rochester, Sally				
Rylatt, Tom				
Sloan, Andy				
Snowdon, Alexander				
St Pier, Gavin				
Van Katwyk, Lee				
Vermeulen, Simon				
Williams, Steve				

815 **The Bailiff:** On the single Proposition to appoint Mr Brian Williams as the Public Trustee for a further term of five years, there voted in favour 34 Members, nobody voted against, nobody abstained, but on this occasion there were 6 Members absent at the vote and therefore I will declare the Proposition duly carried.

Billet d'État XXII

ELECTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

1. Policy & Resources Committee – Election of a member deferred to next sitting

Article 1.

The States are asked:-

To elect a sitting Member of the States as a Member of the Policy & Resources Committee to complete the unexpired term of office, that is to 30th June 2029, of Deputy Jonathan Le Tocq who has resigned from that office, and a transcript of whose letter of resignation is appended hereto, in accordance with Rule 16 of The Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

The States' Greffier: Billet d'État XXII, Article 1, Policy & Resources Committee, Election of a member of the Policy & Resources Committee.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Sir, I would like to request that the Assembly considers deferring this item, if I may.

The Bailiff: Until when?

Deputy de Sausmarez: Until the next meeting.

The Bailiff: Until the next meeting, okay.

Well, this is a procedural motion, Members. Does anyone wish to discuss it?

In that case, I will put to you that the Proposition from Deputy de Sausmarez is that the election to replace Deputy Le Tocq on the Policy & Resources Committee should be deferred to the next meeting. Those in favour? And those against?

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I will declare that carried.

Billet d'État XX

ELECTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

1. Scrutiny Management Committee – Election of two members commenced

Article 1.

The States are asked:-

To elect two voting Members of the Scrutiny Management Committee who shall not be Members of the States, to serve until the 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.

The States' Greffier: Billet d'État XX, Article 1, Election of two members of the Scrutiny Management Committee.

The Bailiff: I will invite the President of that Committee, Deputy Sloan, to put forward his two candidates, please.

Deputy Sloan: Sir, may I nominate Mr Mark Le Page and Ms Charisma Lyall.

The Bailiff: Are those nominations seconded?

Deputy McKenna: They are, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy McKenna.

Are there any other nominations to the Scrutiny Management Committee? No? In that case, I can put that to you, but it has to be a secret ballot, and therefore there are two candidates, that is Mark Le Page and Charisma Lyall, both proposed by Deputy Sloan and both seconded by Deputy McKenna. If you wish to support either or both of those candidates, please will you write their names on a sheet of paper, and that will be handed to the Sheriff.

Are there any more voting slips? There is one being waved in the air. While the votes are being counted, we will move on to the next item of business, please, Greffier.

Billet d'État XIX

COMMITTEE FOR HOME AFFAIRS

APPENDIX REPORT

Guernsey Police Complaints Commission 2024 Annual Report – Motion to debate carried

870

The States are asked:

To resolve, pursuant to Rule 20 of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation, to debate the Appendix Report to Billet d'État No. XIX 2025 entitled 'Guernsey Police Complaints Commission 2025 Report'.

The States' Greffier: The Committee for Home Affairs, Guernsey Police Complaints Commission 2024 Annual Report, motion to debate.

875

The Bailiff: I am going to invite the proposer of this motion, Deputy Curgenvén, to deliver his maiden speech. So, Deputy Curgenvén, please.

Deputy Curgenvén: Sir, can I just clarify, this is my maiden speech?

880

The Bailiff: Yes, I have just said it is your maiden speech, which means nobody should interrupt you at all, please.

Deputy Curgenvén: Thank you, sir.

885

I will be brief, given that I understand the Committee for Home Affairs do not oppose this motion, and I am grateful to Deputy Leadbeater for his engagement.

890

I am also grateful to Deputy St Pier for his support in seconding it. It is worth recalling that both Deputy St Pier and Deputy Leadbeater brought a motion to debate the Commission's report last year, which was supported by the vast majority of this Assembly, with only three Members voting against it. However, despite that clear support, many of the fundamental concerns remain, and indeed have done for years. If we are honest, how many of us here could confidently explain how the Police Complaints Commission operates? If we, as elected representatives, are unclear, then it is difficult to see how we can fairly expect the public to place their trust in it.

895

Over the years, questions have been raised about the effectiveness of the Commission, particularly its lack of meaningful powers. Rightly or wrongly, then, there is a perception that it is not fit for purpose. Such concerns are not new, but they are becoming harder to ignore. At a time when public trust in both the police and politicians is more important than ever, I believe it is essential that we are willing to reflect on these worries in an open and constructive way.

Therefore, I urge Members to support this motion and let us do what the public rightly expect of us, provide real openness, transparency and accountability.

900

Thank you, sir. *(Applause)*

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier, do you formally second the motion to debate?

905

Deputy St Pier: I do, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.

The only other person who can speak at this stage is Deputy Leadbeater as the President of the Committee concerned.

Deputy Leadbeater, please.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

The Committee does not oppose this motion to debate and, to be honest, I quite welcome the opportunity to update States' Members on where we are now in the process.

The Bailiff: Well, this is a secondary Proposition, so I hope that there is an electronic vote, Greffier. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 33, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 0, Absent 6

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Burford, Yvonne	None	Sloan, Andy	None	Blin, Chris
Bury, Tina				Collins, Garry
Cameron, Andy				Laine, Marc
Camp, Haley				Le Tocq, Jonathan
Curgenven, Rob				Niles, Andrew
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				Strachan, Jennifer
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Inder, Neil				
Kay-Moua, Bruno t				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Montague, Paul				
Oswald, George				
Ozanne, Jayne				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rochester, Sally				
Rylatt, Tom				
Snowdon, Alexander				
St Pier, Gavin				
Van Katwyk, Lee				
Vermeulen, Simon				
Williams, Steve				

The Bailiff: On the motion to debate the Guernsey Police Complaints Commission 2024 Annual Report proposed by Deputy Curgenven and seconded by Deputy St Pier, there voted in favour 33 Members, no Member voted against, one Member abstained, 6 Members were absent at the vote and, therefore, I will declare the motion to be carried, which means that later in the meeting there will be a Proposition to take note of the report.

LEGISLATION LAID BEFORE THE STATES

The Excise Duties (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025;
The Housing (Standards and Regulation) (Enabling Provisions) (Guernsey) Law, 2021
(Commencement) Ordinance, 2025;
The Animal Welfare (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025 (Commencement and
Transitional) Order, 2025;
The Veterinary Surgery and Animal Welfare (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025
(Commencement and Transitional) Order, 2025;
The Immigration (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Rules, 2025;
The Animal Welfare (Designation and Control of Pest Animals) (Amendment) Order, 2025;
The Animal Welfare (Exception to Glue Trap Offence) Regulations, 2025;
The Animal Welfare (Exceptions to Offence of Fur, Skin, Feather, etc. Farming) Regulations,
2025;
The Capacity (Advanced Decisions to Refuse Treatment, etc.) Regulations, 2025;
The Income Tax (Pensions) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025;
The Severe Disability Benefit (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025;
The States Housing (Statutory Tenancies) (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025;
The Income Support (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025;
The Vaping Products (Guernsey) Ordinance, (Commencement) Order, 2025;
The Vaping Products (Acceptable Documents to Establish Age) (Guernsey) Regulations,
2025;
The Parochial Elections (Castel) Regulations, 2025;
The Bovine Semen (Importation) (Amendment) Order, 2025;
The Animal Welfare (Designation and Control of Pest Animals) (Amendment) (No.2) Order,
2025;
The Plant Health (Preserved Phytosanitary Conditions Regulation) (Amendment) (Guernsey)
Regulations, 2025;
The Capacity (Lasting Powers of Attorney) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025;
The Customs and Excise (Relief for Biodiesel) (Revocation) (Guernsey and Alderney) Order,
2024;
The Customs and Excise (Relief for HVO) (Revocation) (Guernsey) Order, 2024;
The Weights and Measures (Fees) Regulations, 2024;
The Land Planning and Development (Fees) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025 and
The Lending, Credit and Finance (Equity Release) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025

930 **The Bailiff:** Greffier, why do we not rattle through the legislation that is being laid next, please?

The States' Greffier: Yes, sir.

The following legislation is laid before the States: The Excise Duties (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025; The Housing (Standards and Regulation) (Enabling Provisions) (Guernsey) Law, 2021
935 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2025; The Animal Welfare (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025 (Commencement and Transitional) Order, 2025; The Veterinary Surgery and Animal Welfare (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025 (Commencement and Transitional) Order, 2025; The Immigration (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Rules, 2025; The Animal Welfare (Designation and Control of Pest Animals) (Amendment) Order, 2025; The Animal Welfare (Exception to Glue Trap Offence)
940 Regulations, 2025; The Animal Welfare (Exceptions to Offence of Fur, Skin, Feather, etc. Farming) Regulations, 2025; The Capacity (Advanced Decisions to Refuse Treatment, etc.) Regulations, 2025; The Income Tax (Pensions) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025; The Severe Disability Benefit (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025; The States Housing (Statutory Tenancies) (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025; The Income Support (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025;
945 The Vaping Products (Guernsey) Ordinance, (Commencement) Order, 2025; The Vaping Products

(Acceptable Documents to Establish Age) (Guernsey) Regulations, 2025; The Parochial Elections (Castel) Regulations, 2025; The Bovine Semen (Importation) (Amendment) Order, 2025; The Animal Welfare (Designation and Control of Pest Animals) (Amendment) (No.2) Order, 2025; The Plant Health (Preserved Phytosanitary Conditions Regulation) (Amendment) (Guernsey) Regulations, 2025; The Capacity (Lasting Powers of Attorney) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025; The Customs and Excise (Relief for Biodiesel) (Revocation) (Guernsey and Alderney) Order, 2024; The Customs and Excise (Relief for HVO) (Revocation) (Guernsey) Order, 2024; The Weights and Measures (Fees) Regulations, 2024; The Land Planning and Development (Fees) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025; The Lending, Credit and Finance (Equity Release) (Amendment) Regulations, 2025.

The Bailiff: Well, Members of the States, have you not all been busy? All of these measures are laid before the States today. I have received no motions to annul any of them but there will be another opportunity at the meeting later this month.

**Scrutiny Management Committee –
Mark Le Page and Charisma Lyall elected as members**

The Bailiff: Let me announce the results of the election for members of the Scrutiny Management Committee. Mark Le Page received 33 votes. Charisma Lyall received 32 votes. There were no spoiled papers but there was one blank paper, therefore I will declare both Mark Le Page and Charisma Lyall elected to membership of the Scrutiny Management Committee.

Shall we try to tackle something else, Greffier, before we break for lunch?

The States' Greffier: Billet d'État XIX, the Committee for Home Affairs, Independent Monitoring Panel: New Member Appointments.

The Bailiff: I think we have already done that one, sorry. So this is Groundhog Day. We will see if you can get it better this time around. Let us move on to the Driving Licences Ordinance, shall we?

LEGISLATION

COMMITTEE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

**3. The Driving Licences (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025 -
Proposition Carried**

Article 3.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled "The Driving Licences (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025" and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

The States' Greffier: Article 3, the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure, the Driving Licences (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025.

The Bailiff: I will invite the President, Deputy Gabriel, to open the debate, if he wishes to do so.

Deputy Gabriel: I do so, thank you.

This Ordinance, Members, provides for consequential amendments to the Driving Licences (Guernsey) Ordinance 1995, the principal Ordinance. While the Ordinance is correctly listed as an item of Environment & Infrastructure legislation, given its mandated responsibilities, it was in fact considered and agreed by the former Committee *for* Home Affairs before being lodged with the States at the end of last term.

The (Amendment) Ordinance sets out consequential amendments to the principal 1995 Driving Licences Ordinance as a result of the introduction of the new hazardous driving and drug driving offences which were approved by the States in February 2024, following consideration of a Policy Letter submitted by the former Committee *for* Home Affairs and the resultant suite of legislation approved by that States at their meeting on 5th March this year.

In closing, sir, I hope that Deputy Leadbeater will be able to elaborate more on the Ordinance as President of the Committee *for* Home Affairs.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

I am struggling to find my paper that I have prepared for this because I was not expecting it right now, so please forgive me.

This adds to the list of the criminal offences in schedule 1 to the principal Ordinance pursuant to which a pass certificate must be produced if a person has their licence revoked as a result of committing one of those offences. These consequential amendments were identified following a question raised by former Deputy Heidi Soulsby, ahead of the March 2025 debate on the legislation. As the Ordinance deals with consequential amendments, no resolution in the original Home Affairs Policy Letter provides a specific direction for these amendments.

Rather, the Ordinance is a consequence of creating new or substituting offences in the suite of legislation approved by the States at their meeting on 5th March this year. This Ordinance simply inserts a number of the more serious offences into schedule 1 to the principal Ordinance. This is a straightforward Ordinance which I ask the Assembly to support.

The Bailiff: Are you going to be long, Deputy de Sausmarez?

All right, Deputy de Sausmarez then.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

I appreciate this is quite an awkward phase because this is an example of legislation coming forward that is a result of decisions made by the previous Assembly and therefore we have probably a differential in terms of understanding, but Deputy Gabriel and Deputy Leadbeater have done quite a good job of explaining the provenance of how we got here.

The only reason I wanted to very briefly comment, mindful of how close we are to lunch, is that I know that we have received a very detailed and heartfelt representation from at least one member of the public on this particular issue and I just wanted to add my reassurance, I suppose, or put my reassurance on the record that, while it would not have been possible or indeed perhaps appropriate to try to amend this legislation for a whole bunch of complicated reasons that I do not intend to go into, I would like to just really put on the record that I hope that the two Committees involved in this will keep an eye on the ball.

This is a really important part of the legislative suite to bring our legislation up to date and it was very sorely needed, so I am very glad it was prioritised as it was by the previous Home Affairs Committee, who did a very good job on it. Environment & Infrastructure also had a lot of input into it at that stage. But I do think there are possibly other junctures coming up, for example a sentencing review which might address some of the concerns that were raised in that representation. I know a

number of Members did get back to that person and there were some conversations, so I just thought it would be appropriate to put that very, very briefly on the record.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: As I do not see anyone else rising, I will invite Deputy Gabriel, if he wishes to, to reply to that short debate.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, sir.

I have not a great deal to add other than to reiterate, Deputy de Sausmarez's concerns and also put on the record the concerns of that individual could well be addressed in a different format, but in collaboration with my colleagues on Home Affairs. So, in closing, sir, I will ask Members to support the Ordinance.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, there is a single Proposition, whether you are minded to approve the draft Ordinance, and therefore I will invite the Greffier to open the voting, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 34, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 0, Absent 6

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Burford, Yvonne	None	None	None	Blin, Chris
Bury, Tina				Collins, Garry
Cameron, Andy				Laine, Marc
Camp, Haley				Le Tocq, Jonathan
Curgenven, Rob				Niles, Andrew
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				Strachan, Jennifer
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Inder, Neil				
Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Montague, Paul				
Oswald, George				
Ozanne, Jayne				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rochester, Sally				
Rylatt, Tom				
Sloan, Andy				
Snowdon, Alexander				
St Pier, Gavin				
Van Katwyk, Lee				
Vermeulen, Simon				
Williams, Steve				

1055 **The Bailiff:** On this draft Ordinance, there voted in favour 34 Members, no Member voted against, no Member abstained, 6 Members were absent at the vote, and therefore I will declare the Proposition duly carried.
We will now adjourn until 2.30.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.34 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

Statement

Tax Review Sub-Committee - Statement by the President of the Policy & Resources Committee

1060 **The Bailiff:** Hon. Members of the States, I had given permission in principle for a statement to be made on behalf of the Policy & Resources Committee. That statement has now been received. It should have been received yesterday or earlier, but it was not. Therefore, what I will do is interpose that before the next item of business is called. Deputy Parkinson will be making the statement on behalf of the Policy & Resources Committee and this is pursuant to Rule 10, paragraph 3.
1065 Deputy Parkinson, please.

Deputy Parkinson: Thank you, sir.

Members of the Assembly will know that I have long held the view that Corporate Tax reform has the potential to play a significant role in addressing our financial challenges. That is why I am
1070 delighted that my colleagues on the Policy & Resources Committee have asked me to lead the work of a Tax Review Sub-Committee, which will examine the options for addressing our structural deficit and will in large part focus on Corporate Tax.

Over the next few months, P&R will be running two separate but linked workstreams with the intention of enabling this Assembly to make a final decision once and for all before the end of
1075 quarter two next year on the tax reform option or options it wishes to implement. The first of these workstreams is the Tax Sub-Committee, charged with delivering recommendations to the Policy & Resources Committee regarding the best overall package of sustainable revenue-raising measures. At the heart of this Sub-Committee's work will be a detailed examination of the taxation of company profits and whether a system of territorial Corporate Tax should be implemented.

1080 It is of utmost importance to stress that this work will have due regard to the need to maintain a tax system which is competitive, internationally acceptable and maintains tax neutrality. The Sub-Committee will also review the tax package which has become known as GST-Plus and which was agreed by the last Assembly, to which I will return in a moment.

Given the amount of work already undertaken over the last decade in examining our tax system
1085 and possible additions or replacements, the Sub-Committee will have ample material on which to draw. However, with this in mind, it has also been decided to specifically exclude certain workstreams which have already been examined and discounted. These include changes to personal Income Tax rates and the introduction of capital taxes including inheritance tax.

1090 The Sub-Committee has been tasked with following a set of principles in arriving at its recommendations. These include, among others, that the tax system must be capable of raising the revenues needed to balance public finances over the next 10 years, that it should be resilient to demographic changes and that it should create reasonable certainty and stability to enable businesses and individuals to plan for the future.

1095 The full terms of reference for the Sub-Committee have been published on the States' website today and contain the full list of principles. As I have already said, I will be chairing the Sub-Committee and will be joined by the Vice-President of the Policy & Resources Committee Deputy St Pier. In addition, I am delighted to report that we have three international tax policy experts joining us on the Sub-Committee. In alphabetical order, these are Mr Bill Dodwell who was head of tax policy at Deloitte between 2005 and 2018 has been president of the Chartered Institute of Taxation and a director at the Office for Tax Simplification in the UK.

1100 Secondly, Professor Peter Harris is a lawyer whose primary academic interest is in international corporate and comparative tax law. He is a professor of tax law at the University of Cambridge and has acted as technical assistance adviser to the IMF since 1998 and, thirdly, Mr Mike Williams, the former director of business and international tax at HM Treasury in London where he was responsible for all business taxes in the UK including company tax and Value Added Tax.

1105 These experts not only have enormous experience but also are independent in the matter of our system so they will give impartial advice which is important to the credibility of this process. Further, we have secured the expertise of Mr Tony Mancini, former tax partner at KPMG, who is head of tax for KPMG and the Crown Dependencies until his recent retirement as an adviser to the Sub-Committee.

1110 I have also given a commitment that the Sub-Committee will engage with States' Members through the development of its proposals, will have open meetings when practical and helpful and that it will, subject to permission from you, sir, update this Assembly on a regular basis. We are hoping to complete our work in quarter one 2026 with a draft Policy Letter for the Policy & Resources Committee to consider.

1115 The second of the two tax workstreams being progressed by the Policy & Resources Committee is the package which has become known as GST-Plus. That includes the introduction of a GST but also – arguably often missed out of the discussion – reforms to Income Tax and social security that mitigate the impact of GST. This was the package approved by the last Assembly. We do not as yet know whether this package will form part of our final proposals.

1120 However, given the significant lead-in time and policy decisions which remain outstanding, it is essential to keep planning for its implementation. This will mean that, early next year, we will be asking the Assembly to consider those outstanding policy decisions including, for example, whether GST should be added to food or not. We will be doing so purely to ensure that we have a full GST-Plus package ready to go if the States later decide to proceed with it.

1125 Sir, Members may also be interested to know that I understand you have given permission for Deputy St Pier to provide the States with a statement at its next meeting updating Members on the States' financial performance in 2025 ahead of the publication of the 2026 Budget on 7th October. This will help provide the context of the fiscal challenges we face emphasising that the status quo is unsustainable.

1130 Sir, we appreciate that there is a lot going on in the tax reform space and it is a highly technical field with plenty of acronyms and terminology. To that end, we have updated the website with additional information including an info graphic of how everything fits together and now I am more than happy to take questions Members may have on this statement.

1135 **The Bailiff:** Well, I have given permission in principle for Deputy St Pier to make a statement at the next meeting, provided of course that the text of it is supplied in advance of the meeting. It is an opportunity now for Members to ask questions but only within the context of the statement that Deputy Parkinson has just delivered. Does anyone have any questions they wish to put to him?

1140 Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you.

1145 I think I heard Deputy Parkinson say that they do not want to rehash old ideas about taxation that have been looked at in the past for the tax group which included, I think capital, taxes but also changing personal Income Tax. Now bearing in mind there is a degree of that with the social security

package, Deputy Parkinson will recall on several occasions I was involved with a fruitless desire to raise tax by perhaps 2%. Does that mean to say that the view that Income Tax might be raised for some or people in different income categories is not going to be looked at?

1150 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Yes, indeed. Deputy Gollop is correct that the GST-Plus package does include some amendments to Income Tax provisions and to the extent that that is already, as it were, an extant resolution of the Assembly, that will be a point of comparison for any research we do. But it is not the intention of the Sub-Committee to re-examine issues like raising the rates of Income Tax or introduction of capital taxes, as I have just explained.

The Bailiff: Deputy Matthews.

1160 **Deputy Matthews:** Thank you, sir.

Deputy Parkinson mentioned the taxes which have been included such as capital taxes and Income Tax. The question I would ask is: does that also extend to taxes such as taxes on property noting that, for example, the UK Exchequer has recently been said to be considering changes to stamp duty and council tax in the UK? Will that be part of the Tax Sub-Committee's remit?

1165 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: No, we are not going to look at things like motoring taxes or taxes on property because, although those could play a useful part in an overall fiscal policy, what we really need to decide as an Assembly is what is going to do the heavy lifting? Now there are only really two tax areas that could produce a really significant amount of tax. The GST-Plus package which, in a sense, is our benchmark, is supposed to produce a net £50 million a year for the Treasury.

So Corporate Tax reform has the potential to raise amounts of that order, and possibly even more, but we cannot expect to get from property taxes, motoring taxes or secondary taxes anything like that amount of money. So the essential thing is for the Assembly to decide basically which of two routes it is going to go down in terms of the tax reform which is going to do the heavy lifting. There will no doubt be consequential changes to other smaller taxes which will help to fill in the deficit.

1180

The Bailiff: Deputy Camp.

Deputy Camp: Thank you.

Clearly, the Committee liaison is welcome. Why has the membership of this Sub-Committee not been extended to relevant Committees?

1185 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: This is a Sub-Committee of the Policy & Resources Committee and it is a technical group which is looking at technical options to advise the Policy & Resources Committee on the direction it wants to take. So that is why the composition of this Sub-Committee consists of basically experienced tax professionals who will come up with the advice that P&R needs.

1195 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Ozanne.

Deputy Ozanne: The group that have been proposed is eminently qualified and experienced. But I do wonder what experience they have of other jurisdictions like Jersey and the Isle of Man and whether the remit will be to look at the impact of our relationships, particularly with Jersey, should we make decisions that interact with that financial business that we do across the Channel Islands. Perhaps you could explain if they have that understanding.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Well, the comparison between the Guernsey tax system and those of Jersey and the Isle of Man are obviously relevant, if only in competitive terms, because we have to ensure that the Guernsey tax system remains competitive. On the other hand, the advice of the technical Sub-Committee will be to advise Guernsey what Guernsey should do or to advise Policy & Resources what Guernsey should do having regard to the fact that we have two close competitors in the other Crown Dependencies.

Just speaking personally, I very much hope that we can take the other Crown Dependencies along with us in this process, and if they want to send observers to our meetings or to meet with us, then I would be more than happy to do so.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sloan.

Deputy Sloan: Sir, may I ask Deputy Parkinson, through you, did I hear correctly that your timetable is with quarter two next year, which appears to be short to me. If so, do you plan for that to be a regime that is modelled, tested and practical implications assessed qualitatively and quantitatively by that point and at what point you would expect a proposal to be brought to this Chamber for a decision?

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: We are hoping that the Sub-Committee will report to P&R in quarter one next year. P&R will have to take decisions about what direction it wants to go in in terms of tax policy and the intention is that P&R will bring a Policy Letter to the States in quarter two. The timelines are indeed compressed, but one of the considerations that we are certainly very acutely aware of is that uncertainty is not helpful to business, and we need to restrict the period of uncertainty while the review takes place to the shortest period possible.

If it proves impossible to deliver recommendations to P&R by Q1 next year, then the timelines may become extended but, as I say, we are trying to do this as quickly as it can be done, consistent with it being done well and thoroughly.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

I think, clearly, there are some people in this Assembly who would have experiences of value or relevance to such a Sub-Committee and there would appear to be nothing to preclude P&R from having gone out for expressions of interest to widen the membership slightly outside of the Committee. So does Deputy Parkinson think that perhaps that should have been undertaken?

In any case, what is the programme and the plan for engaging with this Assembly during the process because it would seem to me that that approach might give it its best chance of success when it finally does come to the Assembly with Propositions?

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: It is our intention that the process is as open and inclusive as possible and, as I have already said, we hope to hold some of the meetings of the Sub-Committee in public. It is also my hope that, where the Sub-Committee is able to persuade expert witnesses in key areas to come to the Island to talk to us about technical issues, we may be able to persuade those witnesses to give public speeches on their technical area of expertise and to allow themselves to be questioned by members of the public, including States' Members, on those specialist areas.

But I am afraid to say I do not share Deputy Burford's view that there are a lot of Members of this Assembly who have technical expertise at the sort of level that the members of the Sub-Committee will have.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Snowdon.

Alderney Representative Snowdon: Thank you, sir; and thank you to Deputy Parkinson for the update.

I think my question really is: how are you going to take the public on the journey with you? And I think you mentioned some engagement with the public. Will that be programmed into your timeline so there are Qs and As, presentations and everything so that we hopefully come to whatever outcome is at the end of that journey? How do you take the public along with you with this important work?

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Yes, I entirely agree with Alderney Representative Snowdon. We need to take the public with us in a way that previous debates on tax in this Assembly have not taken the public with them. Now that will be done, we hope, through conducting a very open process obviously inviting in people whose representations we want to hear. But frankly, trying to conduct as many meetings as possible as open meetings which the public and interested parties will be able to attend and, where we can, reaching out to the community to share with them the advice we are receiving which is helping to form our opinions.

The Bailiff: Deputy Niles.

Deputy Niles: Sir, I welcome the speed at which this Sub-Committee has been formed. However, I have a question in relation to previous work that has been carried out extensively in past governments and the outcomes of that work that looked at the relative sensitivity of our Island and also the industry and the potential loss of business, that we are to take control and to implement tax reform. However, we have to understand that there is a sensitivity in business and we do have the potential to lose business. Will that work be looked at again, Deputy Parkinson?

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Well, the Sub-Committee will be able to draw on all of the previous work that has been done on tax policy in the States and that may help to shorten the timelines – to go back to Deputy Sloan's question – to enable us to get to conclusions quicker. We will also incidentally be using artificial intelligence extensively to assist our researches but, yes, we are well aware of the competitive issues along with the necessity of complying with international rules and norms and all of that will be taken into account.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorrity.

Deputy Dorrity: Thank you, sir.

1300 I was hoping that Deputy Parkinson might provide more detail in respect to the process used for selection of the corporate type of specialists that he mentioned.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

1305 **Deputy Parkinson:** Well, we did not advertise the positions. We did not conduct a round of interviews. We contacted people who we thought had specialist knowledge that would assist the Sub-Committee, and I am very pleased that such distinguished tax experts have been willing to give their time – sometimes for a small fee but generally at very advantageous rates for Guernsey – to assist our cause.

1310

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Sir, we have been through a number of these processes before and the answers were fairly clear. GST-Plus is required probably along with a number of other taxes as well but they have to come in a certain order. It does feel to me like the same film but different actors. The question for Deputy Parkinson is: is there any danger that his sub-group will look entirely political and that they want to get into the point where he really wants to get himself into which is corporation tax? What has changed?

1320 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: The credentials of the Sub-Committee speak for themselves. These are experts on areas including consumption taxes and these are people with international reputations to protect and they are not likely to simply come along and parrot what I or anyone else wants them to say. They will express their opinions and their opinions will be noted and reported on and will be open to inspection by anyone.

1325 So Deputy Inder may have little faith in the process but the reality is we are doing this as well as we can and we are doing it as quickly as we can.

1330 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Helyar.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, sir.

We have only had a few minutes since this has been published to review it so it is difficult to ask any meaningful questions about the content, but could Deputy Parkinson please explain because, in terms of reference, it says that the proposals should seek to achieve tax equity. Could Deputy Parkinson explain what he believes that to mean?

1335 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson.

1340 **Deputy Parkinson:** Generally, it means equity between taxpayers. We should not end up with a tax system where some people, a minority perhaps, are able to walk away from any tax obligations while the majority have to carry the burden, so we need a system which is fair between taxpayers.

The Bailiff: Deputy Rochester.

1345

Deputy Rochester: Sir, I have just had a look at the terms of reference and it talks about considering revenue raising measures to address structural deficit in the States' finances, and that of course is a function of greater revenues than just corporate territorial tax and GST. I know it is out of scope for the windfarm revenues, which is understandable given the time it will take to generate revenue from that economic stream, but I am interested to understand whether, in Pillar Two taxation, it will be passed to the Committee for consideration.

1350

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

1355 **Deputy Parkinson:** Pillar Two is a given. It is already in effect in Guernsey and it is already producing substantial sums of money for the exchequer in Guernsey. Now Pillar Two will be a fact of our fiscal life whether we vote for the GST package or vote for a wider Corporate Tax reform. We are not looking at that because it is a done deal. It is just part of the tax background for this review.

1360 **The Bailiff:** I think the 15 minutes are up and therefore we will not have any more questions on this matter. Greffier.

LEGISLATION

COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

4. The Education (Guernsey) (Amendment) Law, 2025 – Proposition carried

Article 4.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Projet de Loi entitled “The Education (Guernsey) (Amendment) Law, 2025”, and to authorise the Bailiff to present a most humble petition to His Majesty praying for His Royal Sanction thereto.

The States’ Greffier: Article 4. The Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, The Education (Guernsey) (Amendment) Law, 2025.

1365

The Bailiff: I will invite the President, if he wishes to do so, to open the debate on this matter. Deputy Montague.

Deputy Montague: Thank you, sir.

1370 I do wish to do so not least because although this Policy Letter was passed overwhelmingly in February, there are many of us here today who were not in the room then and I think it really does, if I beg the patience of the Assembly, bear a little bit of a closer look.

1375 So the Propositions and supporting Policy Letter from which this Projet was drawn were agreed by the Assembly in February, but please do not think for a moment that we, the new Committee, have simply picked up and thoughtlessly gone through the motions despite what you may have read. We have spent hours debating whether this was the way forward towards genuine education governance. Our Committee has a very wide range of views on education and this topic was no different.

1380 We managed to disagree agreeably generally on several areas but collegiately and only after much thought, we were resolved to progress the Projet as the right tool to get the job done. While some commentators still seem to be fighting battles of the past, we have chosen instead to take a pragmatic approach. What is the best thing to do now at this point for our learners? We are not discussing abstract principle of governance here. This is not theoretical. It is about improving the educational outcomes for all our young people.

1385 Sir, I am reminded and have been thinking about a conversation I had with a headteacher 15 years ago. This colleague loved working in Guernsey and they made a significant positive impact on our school. Yet they were choosing to leave. Why? Because they were frustrated. Frustrated that they could not make the decisions that they knew would take the school to the next level. That is

not an isolated conversation. Anyone here, sir, who has spoken to anyone in schools will have heard similar stories.

Of course, things have not stood still since the much discussed Mulkerrin Report of 2012. I met Mr Mulkerrin several times and when we were not talking about boxing, we spoke openly about the barriers holding our schools back. Some of the barriers have been removed, some progress has been made, and if you have not yet done so, I encourage you to read appendix 1 of February's Policy Letter because it shows clearly what changes have happened and how much still needs to change. Sir, after 30 years working in Guernsey's education system, I am convinced of this.

Our schools need significantly more autonomy. The Education Department should be there to provide educational support and expertise. Not to control. The political Committee should focus on overall strategy and policy direction and ensuring that the operational deliveries are aligned with it, it is as effective as it can be and our schools should be led by empowered, leaders supported and challenged by effective governance laws. The journey ahead is not simple. It cannot be a simple big bang. Change must be iterative, deliberate, sustained and flexible and it needs to start now.

Sir, if I may, I would like to spend a moment speaking specifically about how education governance works. Education governance is not entirely the same as corporate governance. While corporate boards are primarily concerned with regulation compliance and profit, education governance must also focus on social value. That is the lived experience and success of learners and staff.

Education governance plays a vital role. They ensure the safeguarding and wellbeing of learners and staff are actively protected and promoted and that learner behaviour and attendance are consistently supported and improved. The voices of all key stakeholders are heard and that is students, staff, parents and the wider community. They ensure the achievements of every learner are promoted especially those who are disadvantaged or have additional needs. The setting and its learners need advocates in their local community.

Sir, to be clear, the things I have just listed are not things we are just going to ask them to do. They will be translated into functions for our governance boards. Functions like ensure attendance improves towards the target figure; contribute to a proven monitor setting strategic development plan; ensure that education-based safe recruitment guidelines are demonstrably followed in selection processes for staff; monitor and take steps to improve evaluated progress and attainment and report annually to parents and carers on the work and impact of governance boards. The list goes on.

For the avoidance of any doubt, sir, these types of things and more besides will be set out in subordinate legislation. I can say this with absolute certainty because Resolution 1 of the February debate on the education governance Policy Letter instructs us to establish a new education governance system as set out in sections 4 and 5 of that Policy Letter. Section 4.2.1 of that letter includes:

The overall purpose of governance boards will be included in the revised legislation.

It will be. So we are seeking approval for the high-level legal framework today flowing from which will be more detail in an ordinance and even more detail in ensuing regulations. So much for that social value governance but of course in some jurisdictions, education settings also hold greater autonomy in areas such as HR, finance, premises, procurement, IT systems, health and safety and risk management.

Where this is the case, governance boards provide essential oversight to ensure these functions operate efficiently and effectively so we are calling that function-based governance. From our starting point, the social value-based governance can happen far sooner in legislation through functions, but that social value-based governance can happen sooner. The later function-based governance will happen later and we do not know how far it will go.

I would just to spend a little bit of time talking about where we are now and why it is not enough. At present, there is no modern governance structure overseeing our 20 educational settings. There

1440 are 18 schools in Guernsey including the Sixth Form Centre, St Anne's in Alderney and the Guernsey Institute. This leaves us out of step with almost every progressive education system and it is to the detriment of our learners.

1445 Sir, education governance matters because it brings together the skills and experience of the local community to drive high standards and enrich the learning experience for every student. Yet our current arrangements fall short. Several schools do have Committees but the current law does not allow every setting to have one. Even where they exist their reach is extremely limited. Through no fault of their own their governance and safeguarding functions are weak or, in some cases, non-existent. I reiterate; that is through no fault of their own. Worse still, school committees require political membership from the members of ESC. That is hardly the arm's length governance that we need.

1450 We firmly believe it is not appropriate for politicians to operate at that level. Our role is to provide system-wide oversight; not to sit inside individual schools. Now, school committees have been aware for quite some time that they will be replaced by governance boards. Their members have been invited and encouraged to apply for these new roles, and some now serve in dual capacity as both committee members and interim governors.

1455 In February of this year the Assembly agreed to create a modern governance structure and to amend local education Law to give it legal force. In preparation we now have around 70 interim governors in place. That includes headteachers and staff representatives, others are respected professionals from many sectors drawn from across our community, bringing a wide range of expertise. They serve as volunteers, devoting many hours to training on key issues like inclusion, additional learning needs, school budgets. Every interim governor is fully DBS checked and has completed mandatory safeguarding training because the safety and wellbeing of our learners must always be the highest priority.

1460 They are working on the clear understanding that new legislation will be in place by early 2026, so that they can step fully into their roles and begin to provide the governance our education system so urgently needs. They are also fully aware that steps are being taken towards much greater levels of devolution and delegation in the longer term. They come to the role with their eyes wide open about how their functions will evolve over time. One final thing on the current situation: our busy headteachers and principals have to attend both the school committee and the interim governance board meetings.

1470 I would like to take us on now to where we need to go next. Right now our interim governance boards are stuck in first gear. They cannot remain in this holding pattern any longer. They are ready, willing and eager to do more and we must let them. We know the current plans will enable them to get into third gear. From now and until a temporary investigation and advisory committee has completed its work, reported back, had its recommendations debated and the outcome of that debate acted upon – a process that could take up to 18 months – we face a choice. Do we put our interim Laws on hold or do we formalise them and empower them to make genuine impact in our schools and settings during this time?

1475 We believe to do nothing would be a mistake. It would completely misunderstand the purpose of education governance. If we follow the resolutions, overwhelmingly agreed by this Assembly in February, we can move these boards into action, shifting them up through the gears and unlocking the social value that governance can bring, not just to our schools and settings but to the lives of our learners beyond their full time education as they begin to support our economy and become responsible citizens in the wider community.

1480 The first step is clear. We remove civil servants from chairing the boards. That requires legislation. Having civil servants chairing those boards is not what governance is meant to be. It is not a role they want to be fulfilling and certainly not one that we want them to be in. It is a temporary measure that bridges a safeguarding gap. That safeguarding gap will disappear only when the legislation is in place; the sooner the better. We already have five designate chairs ready to lead five of our eight groups of governance boards. They cannot take up those roles until the legal framework is in place

because it is that framework that gives them structure and powers and two-way safeguards, for them and our settings. Once that happens the boards will be able to make a meaningful difference.

The most powerful early win will come through performance management. Chairs of governance boards must be integral to setting and monitoring targets and appraising the performance of our head teachers and principals. This will reorient the leadership away from answering solely to the so-called centre and towards the governance board. It will make governance real. If any of you doubt that, think about an experience in your life where you have had to be appraised, had performance management meetings. That shifts your focus. Those chairs will also work together in what the Policy Letter describes as Council of Chairs. This body will provide a strong, independent voice, able to press for action from officers and politicians.

Let us be clear, this is not the final destination we want to get to; that will come later. But by approving the Projet we take a significant step towards far stronger, more relevant and more effective governance than we have today. But there are some other easy wins as well that we are already working on that will manifest more fully when we give these interim governance boards the next step of power. One of the most crucial ones is recruitment, but also budget flexibility. For the first time, boards will be able to work with heads and principals to carry forward parts of their non-pay budgets across financial years. Now, this is a small but important step towards the wider financial autonomy we hope to see in due course, and it enhances fiscal planning and oversight where it has been lacking.

Also, we want to engage the parent and community voices. Governance will give parents and local communities a genuine influence over school development plans, something schools have long needed but lacked in practice. That has to be baked into legislation. We cannot rely on Facebook groups, thinking that they are advising and shaping schools by posting comments online. It needs to be through meaningful governance.

Finally, regular school visits. These governors and chairs will be present in schools. If such visits had been routine, even in third gear governance, I am confident – and I feel particularly qualified to say this – that some of the recent challenges in our secondary sector would have been identified and acted on far sooner. These may not be the hard powers of full autonomy, and I have had conversations with people when they talk about it they say, ‘But your governors, they will not be able to sack chemistry teachers’. Sorry about picking on chemistry teachers, but I will let you into a secret: sacking chemistry teachers is not our problem; recruiting them is. Governance boards will assist with that. They are not the hard powers of full autonomy. That will take us to later on; we will need to get into fifth, perhaps even sixth gear. But these are meaningful steps because education governance is not about corporate profit or regulatory compliance; it is about social value. Even these soft powers will have a real positive impact on our schools, our staff, and above all our learners.

Now, I understand there are those who do not believe that you can have a meaningful governance board unless you have worked out every single detail of their corporate authority. But in education this is not the case in Guernsey right now. There is nothing that we would do in that short term that would stop the later, more full, hard powers of governance occurring. I cannot see any jeopardy in that motion.

So we move on, to use this rather annoying driving analogy, and apologies to those people who only drive automatic cars, but how is it that we are going to get into fifth or sixth gear? Well, now we come to an entity that has started to haunt my dreams, possibly even my nightmares, it is the EDDIAC. Deputy Niles emailed me to say that is one of the worse acronyms he has ever heard. The Education Development & Delegation Investigation & Advisory Committee. The name sounds like a mythical monster like the jabberwocky but that is not what is upsetting me. I used to work with a wonderful woman called Betty Waite, a good old Guern, and when something disgusted her she would say, ‘Oh, budiacks’. Now, in my mind, and probably in yours, the EDDIAC will be associated with budiacks; I am sorry about that.

But that temporary Investigation and Advisory Committee – and here I refer Members to Rule 53 of the Rules of Procedure; this is not something we are making up, it is something that is set up

by the States and tasked. Now, I may be a newcomer to Guernsey politics, but I know this: giving up power is never easy, for individuals and for systems. It is really hard. Even those who say they want to give up power are sometimes trapped in a system that does not let them, and sometimes they are just not being honest.

There is a persistent narrative that civil servants are not willing to devolve power or that the Committee might not exceed the will of this Assembly when it comes to formalising its decision via regulations. Yet, here we are, presenting legislation that seeks to demonstrate quite the reverse. That EDDIAC will be us. There will be five Deputies on that Committee, it will have to report back to the States, and the Committee – through regulations – will have to enact those things that we agree. We are not outsourcing this; it is on us to make this work.

That is precisely why this task and finish Committee is so important. Without it we will not move beyond third gear. Let us be clear, third gear is better than where we are today but it is still not where we need to be. The mandate of the EDDIAC, which is set up clearly in section 4.4.4 of the February Policy Letter, is to investigate and propose the right level of devolution and delegation for our schools. To do that it will need to draw on a wide range of expertise, but crucially it will also need functioning governance boards already operating in third gear to feed back and inform the progress. That feedback loop is essential, otherwise EDDIAC will not have anything to work from. It will be working in a vacuum.

So we must empower these governance boards initially to go up to that third gear. This is why change must be iterative and flexible. A big bang approach will just not work. We must bring all stakeholders with us. Accountability for heads and principals will increase and they too are on a journey. Step by step, with the right structures and the right support, we can move towards the greater autonomy that our schools need. Surely that is how we will get finally into fifth or even sixth gear, depending on what we choose.

To finish, I want to bring things back down to reality. Yesterday fortunately I was able to visit two of our schools as they prepare to welcome back students. Had I not been elected to join you here I would be there right now. Colleagues there – and I spoke to two who are on IGBs, the interim governance boards – they are really eager to get going on devolving governance to schools. They have begun to see some benefits and know more will come. They also reported that community and parents are genuinely excited about getting involved in their schools, and that is crucial. This process will make it their schools; not schools answerable to the Education Department or to the Committee, but answerable to their own governance boards.

When I decided to go into politics one of the things I kept saying was I was frustrated that education had been used as a political football. Well, I am going to mix my metaphors here. I am not going to talk about kicking balls but I am talking about kicking cans down the street. Let us not be an Assembly that kicks this can further down the street.

I commend the Projet to the Assembly.

The Bailiff: Well, Members of the States, I did not say it beforehand but that was Deputy Montague's maiden speech. (*Applause*) I think it is because we had heard so much from him this morning that I had rather forgotten that.

Now, a sursis motivé has been submitted. Deputy Camp, is it your wish to move that sursis motivé?

Deputy Camp: It is, sir.

The Bailiff: Okay, in that case I will invite you to do so, and this will be Deputy Camp's maiden speech. Deputy Camp, please.

Sursis motive

To sursis consideration of the Projet de Loi entitled 'The Education (Guernsey) (Amendment) Law, 2025' and to direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to return to the States with a revised Projet de Loi which—

- 1. revises and limits the Committee's regulation-making powers ensuring that powers in respect of the constitution, powers and functions of Governance Boards vest clearly in the States of Deliberation by Ordinance and that the said regulation-making powers remain in-keeping with the scope envisaged by the Policy Letter, being to permit "operational changes to elements of the governance framework" to be made by the Committee for operational efficacy; and*
- 2. sets out in full the proposed constitutional terms of reference of the Governance Boards, including their objectives, responsibilities and delegated and/or devolved powers, to apply from the commencement of the Law.*

1595

Deputy Camp: Sir, thank you.

I stand before the Assembly today as both a proponent of governance and an experienced governance professional with only one ask, that my colleagues do not allow governance boards to be constituted when they have no purpose, no powers and no substance.

1600

Imagine this: the Island determines to set up a fire service. It hires firemen, including the chief, but there are no engines, no hoses, no water, no suits. The chief does not have the power to procure them. In short, the firemen can do nothing to put out fires; only look at them and ponder at the destructive nature of the fire. The fire service is a sham. Nobody would allow this, so why risk it in schools?

1605

The Committee may say my analogy is simplistic, or – as we have pretty much heard – that my 20 years in governance, 15 at senior level including work in a FTSE 250 company, is too corporate to matter in education. But governance is universal. Just look across the UN, the OECD, the World Bank and other standard setters. The same principles are there: rule of law, legitimacy and voice, accountability, transparency, responsiveness, clear decision-making and long-term vision, whatever the endeavour, must all be present for governance to work. Cambridge Governance Labs echoes this. Governance principles are not cultural or ideological; they are universal.

1610

So I ask that colleagues do not get sidetracked by education ideology when it is governance we are considering here. Governance codifies principles into concrete rules, processes and communications so that everyone inside and outside of your organisation can understand. Without this clarity even well-intentioned boards or leaders risk confusion, duplication and mistrust. That means governance is not just a buzz word, it must be real. What the Committee is asking for today is neither real nor good. It is bad practice, mired by complexity and deliberate delay.

1615

It is my view the proposals knowingly create three fatal flaws. First, no clarity of mandate; second, reliance on political trust; third, overreach of powers. I will start with clarity of mandate. If colleagues ask themselves whether Guernsey is implementing a fully devolved model, a partial model, or the status quo of full central control, it would not be possible for anybody to answer, and I have tried. The answer is, until the work of the EDDIAC or similar workstream is completed nobody can know. The Committee certainly cannot know. The EDDIAC has fairly open ended, largely undefined investigatory powers around every substantive item a governance model might contain. This is governance in name only; not really any different to the interim governance boards already operating.

1625

We have heard about the Mulkerrin Report. In December 2011 it landed with a bang, its intention clearly set out to put children first. The most important person in any school, it says, is the pupil. We must all remember that. Nobody is more important than the pupils. In short, the Mulkerrin review took aim at an education system that was outdated and which placed far too much control in the centre. The degree to which education is controlled at the centre, it said, is a major weakness, and nothing has changed since. Mulkerrin recommended instituting a form of local management of schools whereby certain responsibilities would be devolved. His review even goes as far as to set

1630

what is a very clear mandate for what that could have looked like, and yet none of that is on the table today.

The Director of Education at the time told Mulkerrin that as well as formulating policy, the Education Board was also governing the schools. Mulkerrin reported that to imply that this was possible and effective was a nonsense. It simply was not possible. I am not alone in this view and neither is Mulkerrin. Former Deputy Roffey spoke of the dangers of confusing devolution with delegation; the latter favouring the Education Department, who would retain full control and would not be nearly good enough. At this point we do not even know what is proposed. Former Deputy Fallaize has spoken publicly of his view that the Committee's governance proposals are smoke and mirrors. Nothing has changed since 2011 and these proposals fail to change that.

This seems a good junction to mention the schools committees; the only existing form of independent governance present in our schools at this time. Mulkerrin summarised that even that form of governance had no power. He noted that while committee members were generally passionate about their schools they accepted they had no power; something which caused an understandable frustration. In reality, we are being asked to approve the formation of governance boards with potentially even less foundation in those school committees, and all power and resources retained indefinitely at the centre. We continue to perpetuate control by the centre where we do not require that governance boards form a real purpose, real powers, and real substance.

The second fatal flaw is reliance on political trust. The previous Committee's rationale for knowingly constituting governance boards with no teeth was to prevent the risk of doing too much too quickly, destabilising Guernsey's education system. To that I say if schools and teachers are to be trusted, why not decisively grant them the powers now and deliver the support they need to work within that model effectively? Some may be happy to leave this important matter entirely up to chance, but governance cannot rest on good intentions. Political trust, however well meaning, is not and can never be a valid governance model. Likewise, responsible lawmaking cannot exist in the realm of pinkie promises or vague wording like 'hold leadership to account' and 'improve schools' oversight and local responsiveness' yet that is precisely what the Committee is asking of us.

The Committee will likely seek to tell you that I am asking for some awful delay to the introduction of governance boards. This certainly has seemed to have been a suggestion. To put the record straight, I am not. The true risk of delay comes from the continuation of a workstream that lacks certainty and, as time goes on, that risks the loss of political scrutiny, and the risk of so-called governors becoming increasingly frustrated that they can do nothing. I am asking that the Assembly considers its duty to legislate for certainty and not on the basis of political trust. To do otherwise is reckless.

The third fatal flaw is overreach of powers. Under the 1970 Law school committee powers were set by the Assembly by ordinance. That is not the case in the current proposals, but why should this concern anybody? Paragraph 4.1.11 of the Policy Letter asserts that governance proposals will create more appropriate distance between the Committee and its operational, educational settings. The levels of closeness and control by the Committee are consistently raised as an inadequacy of the current education system; a position accepted by the Policy Letter. Creating separation is a key objective in forming governance boards. In fact, I would go so far as to say it is the primary objective.

However, the ordinance to be recommended in furtherance of this law already available will ask the Assembly to grant those regulation-making powers in full to the Committee. This will mean the full and final decision as to whether any service may be delegated to governance boards rests with the Committee alone, with only a cursory requirement to consult P&R and the relevant governance boards.

But Mulkerrin said that power held by the Director of Education, and on paper the Education Board, was a nonsense. How is granting absolute control to the Committee to dictate the extent to which powers may be granted to these boards in any way creating more appropriate political distance between the Committee and its operational education settings? I can see how this happened. Paragraph 4.1.2 of the Policy Letter suggested that the Committee be granted

regulation-making powers in respect of the elements of a governance framework. Having consulted the common understanding of the word 'elements' this clearly means parts of the whole, not the whole kit and kaboodle; a distinction that I assert must have got lost in drafting.

1690 Colleagues, regulation-making powers should be limited to operational elements, as envisaged by the Policy Letter, not to the wholesale granting of withdrawal of authority as the drafting currently sets. Anything more undermines the sovereignty of this Assembly and, it is my belief, fatally weakens the governance of these arrangements from the outset.

1695 As things stand there are three ways governance could go: a fully backed model of governance and devolution, a halfway house model, or a sham model. Without the Committee being able to bring a clear, unambiguous statement of intent, all three outcomes remain equally possible and this Assembly is left in the dark. The Committee should be able to articulate its expectations by now, after all it is the body that employs all the education experts, professionals with lived experience of governance models, and a consultant employed at significant cost as an education governance expert. Yet the only certainty we have is that the Committee has determined it appropriate to 1700 recommend the formation of governance boards in very much the same state of limbo and powerlessness as we leave our school committees.

As it stands, the EDDIAC is required to complete its recommendations by September 2026, which sets a timetable of probably a year from now being the first point at which we would know if these governance boards could be made real in any event. Would it not be better to take that time to get it right from the outset, rather than fudge and cajole a dissatisfactory and empty model? That is what my sursis asks for. 1705

Why the reluctance to articulate intention anyway? We are not the first jurisdiction to take this pathway and yet you would be forgiven for thinking that we are embarking into the unknown. We have the cautionary tales of New Zealand. We can see what has happened in the UK. We could easily have already cherry-picked our way into a recommended model, by now equipped the knowledge of our jurisdiction and the absolute faith that we have a pool of talented volunteers that could easily be tapped up to join governance boards. 1710

Forming governance boards while withholding any powers from them until the work of the EDDIAC is completed is a fundamentally flawed approach. Forming governance boards while knowing that the Committee holds the ultimate power in terms of what they may and may not do is worse. I predict the following: governors will grow frustrated that they have joined boards with no teeth, really no different to the school committees. A cosmetic fix becomes permanent all too soon. School leaders risk being undermined by creating dual accountabilities to the Committee and to governance boards, where the latter has no real authority. Public trust, the very thing in short supply right now but much needed, risks being eroded. Parents and community members expect to make a difference. If their input is ignored they will disengage. This creates cynicism, leading to even weaker boards. 1715 1720

So I implore the Assembly to stop what Mulkerrin termed the nonsense now. We cannot backfill our way to a good outcome after the event. The Committee must be mandated to go away and do its homework properly, whether through the EDDIAC or another means, and return to this Assembly will a fully-fledged governance model from the outset as an absolute condition of allowing these enabling provisions to go ahead. That model should be capable of being flexible and adaptable and iterative, but it must demonstrably create substantive separation of powers from the Committee to ensure it has a purpose capable of being fulfilled. We do not have that today. 1725

1730 Equally as important, it must address the overreach of powers proposed by the current drafting. Please today vote to put the pupils first. Vote to not allow this nonsense to continue and vote in favour of my sursis.

Thank you. (*Applause*)

1735 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Curgenvén, do you formally second the sursis motivé?

Deputy Curgenvén: I do, sir.

Deputy Leadbeater: Can I call Rule 24(4) please, sir?

1740

The Bailiff: Will those Members who support debate on the sursis motiv   please stand in their places. That is clearly more than seven, Deputy Leadbeater, so debate will continue.
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

1745

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Thank you, sir.

Thank you to Deputy Camp for her maiden speech and for laying before us the sursis motiv  . As a new Member of this Assembly, and with this being the first motion she has brought, I want to recognise the thought and care she has clearly put into her arguments.

1750

But what we are debating today is not the Education Law itself but the sursis, and while it is natural for new Members to want to shape the direction of policy, we also have to be clear about what the sursis would actually do and whether it takes us forward. Although Deputy Camp has been clear about her intentions this sursis fails on two grounds. First, it directs actions that do not achieve the outcomes she describes. Second, the very premise on which it rests is based on opinion or misinterpretation, rather than fact. Members, much of what is set out in the explanatory note rests on these same points: that the boards will have no powers, that ESC holds sweeping authority, and that the process is premature.

1755

As I will set out, each of these claims falls away once you look closely at the Policy Letter and the legislation in front of us. Let me turn first to Proposition 1 of the sursis. It asks us to limit the regulation-making powers of ESC to ensure that the constitution, powers and functions of the governance boards rests clearly in the States by ordinance. It cites the Policy Letter, quoting the phrase to permit:

1760

operational changes to elements of the governance framework

1765

to be made to the Committee for operational efficacy. The implication is that ESC has been given powers beyond what the Policy Letter envisaged. But, Members, let me quote the Policy Letter in full. It said:

The ordinance will set out the constitution, objectives, and function of the governance boards. The Committee would be given powers to make regulations to enable operational changes to elements of the governance framework where required for operational efficacy.

1770

The difference is clear. The constitution, objectives, functions are matters for the States by ordinance, which is to follow. ESC can only regulate within that framework to make operational adjustments. So Proposition 1, which is against this Projet, and asking it to come back with this Projet, is built on a misinterpretation. The draft Law is not in conflict with the Policy Letter; it delivers exactly what was agreed. Members of the States of Deliberation will always have the ordinance laid before it and can amend or reject it. The power always rests with this Assembly. In fact, if the sursis is rejected and the legislation is passed, then we will have exactly that opportunity to scrutinise the Ordinance at the next meeting.

1775

Now, Proposition 2, this asks that the new Projet set out in full the proposed constitutional terms of reference of the governance boards, their objectives, responsibilities and delegated powers from the start. In other words, to bake into primary legislation that detail directly. Members, this is not how modern legislation is drafted in Guernsey. It used to be, that is why the old Education Law hard coded school committees into the statute in 1970, and why we are here 50 years later trying to untangle that outdated model. Modern drafting is deliberately different. The primary Law sets the framework; that is what we are agreeing today. The Ordinance, approved by this Assembly, sets the detail, constitution, objectives and functions, and the regulations handle operational matters: membership rules, meeting arrangements, stipend payments or administrative processes.

1780

1785

This model gives flexibility. It avoids us baking in assumptions too early and then having to seek royal sanction every time we want to change the detail. The Policy Letter explained this clearly and the draft Law follows it precisely. So Proposition 2 is also asking us to do the wrong thing: to legislate as though it were 1970 and not 2025.

1790 Wider arguments: let me also address some of those arguments. The boards have been described as empty vessels. It is true that some members of the interim governance boards felt that they were little more than talking shops. There was no statutory basis, no power, no real teeth. But, Members, that is exactly why this legislation is needed. With this Law, followed by the ordinance and regulations, we move from interim groups to statutory governance boards. We move from
1795 talking shops to bodies with legal standing, clear roles, and growing responsibilities.

If the concern is that the interim governance boards were toothless, the solution is not to prolong them, the solution is to pass the legislation so that real governance boards can begin to take shape and operate.

On delay, I accept that it is an opinion when I say the sursis would cause at least a year's delay.
1800 Could it be shorter? Perhaps, but there will be a delay and there will be a need to expend officer time, resources, redrafting, relodging, redebate, a new Projet, and in the meantime progress will be lost. That is not sequencing; it is delay by another name.

Lastly, on to my position. The last thing I want to be doing at the start of this political term is defending the work of the previous Committee, but here we are. *(Laughter)* We have come into
1805 office with legislation already agreed, drafted, lodged by our predecessors. Make no mistake, they lodged it in this way in an attempt to not lose momentum in the Projet. Let us be frank, when they came into office they themselves paused and disrupted the previous Committee's work, that slowed the momentum of the transformation of education, prolonged uncertainty, delayed the Guernsey Institute and those delays cost millions, affected students' transitions across the secondary schools.
1810 So, no, I do not relish the idea of having to bring forward another Committee's work, but simply discarding the work of the previous Committee because we do not like how they did it is not good practice.

The reality is that this is the position we are in and we have had to work to tight deadlines to scrutinise this legislation, ask ourselves honestly is this the right thing or should it be changed. The
1815 first question we asked was whether to pause and review. I get shivers. Ideally, yes, it would have been better to have more time to explain to Members, as well more consultation, more explanation for the public and Members, but the reality is that pausing would have set us back a year, perhaps 18 months. So the question became: is the concern so great that it justifies derailing the timetable?

To answer that we had to be clear about what we were trying to achieve, and I think there is a
1820 broad agreement in this Assembly that we want to devolve power away from centralised education office and towards schools. We want to empower headteachers and local communities. We want to improve educational standards by putting accountability closer to where teaching and learning happens. We are not rubberstamping the previous Committee's work; we are simply using it as the vehicle to achieve what we all want: devolution of power to schools. We are scrutinising, testing,
1825 making sure that where we need to challenge central control we can do that.

We cannot do any of that if we do not even take the first step. As part of that scrutiny we also asked, does this legislation give us the flexibility to adapt to concerns as they arise? The answer is yes. This framework allows us to evolve governance as the boards develop. We will be able to listen
1830 to Members, to governors, to the public, and adjust through ordinances and regulations. This is what makes this the right tool; that it is not rigid, it is responsive.

So where are we at the moment? We still have school committees enshrined in law, they have a statutory duty to continue to exist with the Douzaine-run elections, and an ESC member sitting on each one, as the President outlined earlier. Alongside them we have the interim governance boards. These were set up as a trial with no statutory footing, no powers, governors were recruited and
1835 trained and those boards were initially chaired by the politicians, and now they are chaired by the Director of Education. There has been positive training structure involvement, but there also have been criticisms that they are talking shops, lacking power; creating distance without accountability.

This legislation starts to fix that. It deletes school committees from the Law and puts governance boards into the Law. Because governance boards will now be in Law there will be real changes: independent chairs, not politicians, not civil servants, independent administration no longer tied to Education officers doing that administration. Importantly, the legislation has the flexibility to evolve and adapt to what the new chairs and governors will be doing to support our schools. It is not about locking in every detail on day one, but about creating a living framework that can grow with experience, and also where EDDIAC will play a crucial role. Its task is to look at the full case of devolution and delegation across education, but there is no reason why with these new governance boards in place and with independent chairs we cannot start to see how some of these more devolved powers might work in practice.

For the first time we will have independent feedback coming directly from those chairs, and an administration that is not tied down by Education officers, but set up as part of this legislation. In January 2026 ESC will bring the regulations to switch on the operational functions and set out reporting mechanisms. At that point the boards will begin to operate properly, not just as interim forums. Crucially, by the time EDDIAC reports back in late 2026 these board would have been functioning for nearly a year. We will have evidence of how far Education officers have moved from directing schools to supporting them.

Politicians will no longer be embedded in operational detail but free to make strategic policy decisions. This legislation is not the final product; it is the start. It is not perfect and it is not how I would have designed it if starting with a blank page. But it is progress, it is flexible, it is responsive and it is the right direction of travel.

In conclusion, Members, the sursis is flawed. It misinterprets the Policy Letter, it confuses opinion with fact, and it underestimates the cost of delay. Even if it were technically correct, what it asks for is already in train or will be delivered through ordinance and regulation, exactly as the Policy Letter intended. So the question is simple: do we move forward with the framework we have, recognising it is not perfect but it is progress? Or do we lose another year rewriting primary legislation when what we need is to make progress? For me the answer is clear. I urge Members to reject the sursis and allow us to move forward.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I thought it would be a longer debate than this.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, and indeed Deputy Montague, have made some compelling arguments to support the legislation today, and I had indeed already seen the legislation on the Legislation Panel, along with Deputy Camp who leads the panel, and others. I did of course in the last term support it, but I supported it partly to move the story on, partly out of loyalty to what had become at times an embattled Education, Sport & Culture Committee, and partly because we on Policy & Resources wanted to make progress on this and other areas.

But was I happy with the whole thing? No, because to me there are three issues. Deputy Camp has already outlined I think the main issue that what is being offered is a halfway house; it does not really give self-management, responsibility, or clarity of roles and powers. I was not sure it was still on the agenda actually but the speeches today from Deputy Montague and Deputy Rouxel make clear that the new Committee wishes to go on with the resolutions of the previous Administration to construct – I have been on Committees like PERCC and SWBIC but this is even more of a mouthful. Listen to this: Education Devolution & Delegation Investigation & Advisory Committee Constitution. It has even got two ‘ands’ in it.

Its Chair would be elected by the States of Guernsey, who must have completed a minimum of one complete political term and who is not a member of P&R or ESC, and two members elected by the States, one of whom must have completed a minimum of one complete political term – I do not know why I have built all that in because Deputy Camp has more acquainted herself with this material – and who are not members. Then one member from the ESC and, this is interesting, in my version of the Policy Letter – this is a Freudian slip I would suggest – one member who is the Policy

1890 & Resources Committee's lead officer for Corporate Services. I do not think they mean officer, I think they mean political lead, but it perhaps reflects a thought profile that this is in some respects an officer-led concept.

I appreciate the points Deputy Hansmann Rouxel made. The Director of Education is really only doing this job in a transition from a situation where for many years I think on Education, Sport & Culture and its predecessors – particularly the Education Council – we had the paradox of politicians doing operational roles and officers doing policy roles. Perhaps we are trying to move forward on that. Actually I do support in principle the governance reforms but to my way of thinking they are deficient in three respects.

1900 The first respect is they end parochial autonomy. The parochial democratic contribution that candidates who are residents in the parish, like Douzeniers, could stand and be elected to those roles. Sometimes they were retired teachers or others, sometimes they were not, but they were elected at public meetings or by deferred ballots. They would sit on community schools relevant to their parochial areas, and we are losing that. We are saying goodbye to that tradition, and I do hear there may be substitutes but I think just including, as the legislation suggests, community representatives is not a substitute.

1905 The legislation we reviewed, and we are perhaps passing or sursising today, is a curious beast in some respects because, for example, up to four directors can be on committees but the number is not set, but one of them must represent the interests of Education. It is not entirely clear there. But in the issue of the two schools that we support that have a faith base to them – in this case the Roman Catholic Church – the Bishop of Portsmouth was the decider. So there is not necessarily consistency between all of them.

1910 But the point that comes across is you have got so many different governors. You have got somebody representing the teachers, somebody representing the community, somebody representing the parents, and others being elected by the group within themselves. But nobody directly elected. That is a significant change.

1915 The second element is there is no direction here to the speed. I appreciate now that this new Committee may be formed and that would be helpful, but the point was made that we might have to wait 18 months, two years for this to come back, but is that not the case if we pass it today? To get to the place we may want to get to, and some of us do, we would have to wait a lot longer.

1920 Embedding these institutions into place we run the risk of them developing lives of their own and not necessarily developing in the direction we would like.

To my mind we have had a little bit too much uniformity. I do not think as a society we have looked as much as we would like to on independence, on raising standards, on parental choice, on a degree of competition, on a degree of specialisation, on a degree of free schools, on a degree of mixing up social areas and demographics, and of giving schools more autonomy over their budgets, over their subjects perhaps, we heard today. A very interesting question from the Chief Minister, Deputy de Sausmarez, about whether there was reductions in courses. We are informed that is not the case.

1930 We want to raise standards, we want to commit to community. I think we want a degree of difference. I think we want a degree of autonomy and a general feeling that everybody, or nearly everybody, is doing better, raising standards and involving the community. That is why, partly to keep the democracy from the parishes, partly I think to have a more thorough look by newly elected politicians, some of whom got in I think by challenging some of the ideas relating to education. Sometimes it seems to me we have elections where candidates get in, sometimes ousting other incumbents, and then suddenly there is no difference. That is what disillusiones the electorate, is they feel they voted for candidate A and not candidate B, because candidate A would deliver the education policy or the tax policy or the arts policy or the police policy they want, and then the policies stay the same. That is beyond being frustration.

1935 We, therefore, need to work all the harder to involve the community and question how best to proceed. So for the reasons of the lack of clarity of the responsibilities and powers of these new bodies, and also the ending of democracy which I think could be installed in a different way, and

1940

also to actually really seriously as quickly as possible – we heard only just now from Deputy Parkinson, to Deputy Sloan’s surprise and maybe some others, that he can deliver a substantial new tax policy in nine months. Well, if that is the case then there is no reason why in less than a year a lot of this work cannot be done, especially as I have a lot of trust in the new Assembly and in the new Education team.

So I am not going to cry completely if this legislation goes through because it will move the story on, but I think we would be wiser to support the sursis and actually devote more resources, time and engagement to this work.

The Bailiff: Before I call the next Member to speak I am just going to remind Members of what it says in rule 24(5), which is when a sursis of a matter has been proposed and seconded debate shall be limited strictly to the sursis. There has been a little bit of creep, I fear, in a couple of the speeches that we have just heard that has not been limited strictly to the sursis. The paragraph continues:

and no other issues relating to that matter shall be debated until the sursis has been voted upon.

So I would simply remind Members to confine themselves to what is on the face of the sursis, not to stray into debate on the Projet de Loi that it seeks to sursis.

Deputy Sloan.

Deputy Sloan: Sir, you might have just googled me there because I have not got a copy of the sursis in front of me. But I am going to do something which you will in time get to appreciate is very unusual for me; I am going to agree with Deputy Montague in terms of what he said earlier in terms of the need for devolution of schools, and I am going to agree with Deputy Camp in terms of the risks that we run if we do this thing in the wrong way.

However, I have the advantage of having actually read the Ordinance first and not the Projet. Now, I appreciate the Projet is just a bit of an enabling legislation which in actual fact, having reread, enables us to move forward without actually committing to any particular purpose of the governance boards. Because I think that the issue that Deputy Camp has, and I agree with, is you can have no powers without purpose and the purpose of the governance boards is still not set out in the Projet. In the Policy Letter it does actually say in 4.2.1:

The overall purpose of the governance boards will be included in revised legislation.

Okay, that is jolly good. So I would like to see that revised legislation which will, one would assume, be in the next stage. Because in this Projet it says in the governance board 6:

There shall be for every relevant education establishment a Committee to be known as a ‘governance board’, with authority to exercise such powers and to perform such duties in relation to the management and governance of the education establishment, and related matters, as the States shall from time to time by Ordinance confer upon it.

So, therefore, that is the link between the Policy Letter and the reference to that in the Projet today. Relevance to the sursis is – I believe, the sursis is possibly premature. I can actually support the enabling legislation today but I will not be able to support the ordinances tomorrow because the ordinance, as I have already seen, does not set out the purpose of the governance boards. Everything Deputy Camp said about going down that road without a clear idea of what that destination is supposed to be, is an enormous risk.

I have heard some rather spurious arguments about losing momentum and so on, and been lobbied by such persons who were responsible for this in the past, which was a curious move of irony that they never achieved something. But in 15 years of going slowly along this road I am quite happy to move at a canter rather than a gallop. But I will say I can support today but I cannot

support tomorrow until we have that clarity that has previously been promised, and I believe that this Chamber deserves.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Only briefly, sir.

I think there was a very good opening speech by Deputy Camp, some of which, if not under different terms, I would probably have agreed with most of it. But I think really what sold it for me was Deputy Hansmann Rouxel's response, and it was a technical and detailed response.

Mulkerrin has been bandied around since probably 2011. If you strike your minds back to what happened in 2011, Amy Winehouse died, so did Gaddafi, so did Steve Jobs. We were in the middle of the Arab Spring, and the *[inaudible 3:56:09]* Spring happened and the election in 2012. I think what it does show – and I understand the frustration possibly from Deputy Sloan and Deputy Camp – the speed of Government and making decisions. But there has been effectively an educational war from that time, and I am hoping this is the day when we move this on. Trust me, I was the poster child for part of that war because I was right and the rest of this Assembly was wrong. We should never have got rid of the 11-plus, but that is exactly where we are today.

So in short, and it will be short, I will support Deputy Montague and I will hopefully help to defeat this sursis. I think one of the best speeches I saw as an opening speech from a President was Deputy Montague, so I have got full faith in his Committee. With regard to the team that he has put around him, they currently seem sensible. I believe that they want to move it on. Deputy Hansmann Rouxel herself said she was not necessarily a fan of this process previously and finds it interesting, but she is actually supporting her own Committee in Education. Well, more power to her elbow. Hopefully that continues and if she can find a way to support a previous Committee's policy it makes it very easy for me to do exactly the same thing.

But in short, good opening speech from Deputy Camp, good response from Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, but I will not be supporting the sursis.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir. I will be mindful of your comments and try to keep my own on the sursis.

I am slightly fuzzy actually on what the motivé part of the sursis actually is, what it looks like. Are we expecting a Projet to come back? I cannot quite get my head around that because it does not have the detail in the sursis that it did in the Policy Letter, so I am a little bit uncertain about exactly what the motivé part of the sursis is trying to set out there.

But I think Deputy Sloan has put his finger on it. I should say for absolute clarity first of all – I am not sure if it is a declaration of interest – I am actually for the time being a member of a school committee and have been for about a decade, so that will cease to exist. I do not think it is a particularly pertinent declaration of interest. But I should also say for transparency, I was not one of the overwhelming majority that supported the relevant Propositions in the Policy Letter. I had very, very similar concerns that have been expressed very ably by Deputy Camp, and I very much share her frustration that has emanated from her and some other speakers as well, both within the Chamber and I know in some of the debate around this about the lack of powers that the governance boards will have on arrival, if you see what I mean. That really does concern me.

However, the way I am looking at it, as someone who could not support the original Propositions and has been quite critical of the cart before the horse approach that has been taken, from where we are right now I am trying to look at it through a practical lens and to understand what the practical effects are of either supporting the sursis or indeed approving the Projet as before us.

I think one of my main problems with the sursis is that it pauses us in a pretty unhelpful place. My main motivation is I would like to move as quickly as possible away from the situation that we

have today where we have the Education Department, in my view, too involved in that set up – and that is true in the case of the interim boards as well – to a place where we have the governing boards actually calling the shots. My concern, although I fully understand the sentiment behind the sursis – I do agree with Deputy Sloan, I think it has been brought on the wrong part of this process potentially – but my concern is that if we sursis it at this point we pause that whole process in a really unhelpful place, and we will extend that period of toothlessness, as has been described, for what seems to me to be quite an indefinite period because actually here are not any timelines set out in the sursis either.

That is one of my chief concerns. However, I think it comes with a degree of challenge to the Committee as well. Deputy Camp was quite right; she made a comment along the lines of that the full and final decision is delegated to the Committee. Well, quite; that is one of the problems. By the way, what I think is really encouraging is I think this sentiment is shared as far as I can tell, certainly from the speakers today and from a lot of conversations around it. There is widespread support for this idea of genuinely devolving – not just delegating but genuinely devolving – more autonomy and power to schools, which is wonderful.

She is absolutely right that in legal terms we would get the governing boards up and running if the legislation goes through as the Committee proposes, but they would not have any meaningful powers to actually do anything. People have described them as an Aunt Sally or an empty vessel, or whatever it is, and I share those concerns very profoundly. So I think my challenge to the Committee, who I sense are very keen to get to that point where the governing boards have genuinely got more power, is to say, well, walk the walk. Put your faith in them and let us see, as part of the process to help inform the EDDIAC what works and what does not, how much the Committee can actually de facto delegate to these boards. See what works; see what does not. I think that could actually be a really helpful part of the EDDIAC process, so it is not just theoretical but there will be a pilot project running effectively.

I would imagine the EDDIAC will come back with the kind of clarity that we are all looking for, and at that point it may well require some changes to the legislation. That is really a specific challenge or suggestion, however you want to frame it, for Deputy Montague when he replies.

A question for Deputy Camp is – she has mentioned as one of her three key points overreach of powers. I completely agree with her, incidentally, on the lack of clarity on mandate. I think we all appreciate that is a problem. That is something the EDDIAC will be looking to resolve. I am not currently persuaded that sursis could do that any quicker.

We have touched on the reliance on political trust but she also talked about the overreach of powers. Again, this perhaps feeds back to Deputy Sloan's point. I cannot see in the Projet that this is sursising any overreach of powers, but I accept I might have missed it. I would appreciate some clarity from Deputy Camp when she replies to debate on that particular point as well.

I did come into this debate quite open-minded. I think on balance I am much more likely to support the Projet than the sursis, but I do think it has been useful having this debate.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Bury.

Deputy Bury: Thank you, sir.

I will try not to make it too similar, but I do find myself in a very similar position to Deputy de Sausmarez, although I think we are going to fall down on different sides of the decision. I am very grateful to Deputy Camp for bringing this sursis. I think it has been recognised but I would like to say again that it has been very well thought out, researched and very well done in the way it has been brought to the Assembly. I think it is important for this Assembly to have this conversation because there is a lot of history going on here.

Last term, as the term before and probably the one before that, has been quite bruising in terms around education, and this matter came to the previous Assembly quite late in the day after a withdrawal of the main Policy Letter, having given some direction to Education at that time because

the Policy Letter was withdrawn before the opportunity for all the amendments to have taken place, so they did not necessarily get all of the direction from the Assembly. However, I think the direction was quite clear around devolution and governance and when it came back, it was not the direction that had been given.

But we were late in the day, did everybody want to have another fight about education? Some people still gave it a crack, and more power to them for not giving up. But by the time we got to the end of that debate, everyone was quite tired, and I do not mean tired because they have been here all day, I mean tired of the ongoing decades of education battles. It was supported quite massively, even by people who throughout the debate had been totally against it. I think I was the last man standing to be honest. I was quite alone in my red vote on the SEV.

I am being consistent, at least, in being torn, but I have tried to be open-minded, like Deputy de Sausmarez. I termed it more as torn than open-minded. I am really grateful to Deputy Montague. He is really engaged. We have met, we have emailed, very early morning coffee. I have spoken to Education officers as well and educationalists trying to get a rounded view of where people sit on this. But my primary concern is what is raised in Proposition 2 of the sursis and it is around powers, authority and these empty vessels. What can these governance boards do? That is whether now – and we do not know what they will do in the future yet we are baking them into legislation now.

That is my primary issue. It is the major question that I sent Deputy Montague away from our meeting with. It is really: how are these boards going to do what we are being told they are going to do? So the performance management element, what powers do they have to act on bad performance? I am not sure I have had a clear answer to that. I know they are going to be doing the appraisals, but what powers do they have to act on bad performance?

One of the major questions I had as well was around how will these groups, whether it is the Chairs, the Council of Chairs, the various titles that exist, compel the Education Department or Committee to do what they are saying the school requires? If there is an issue with SEND or English and that governance board have said we need resources for this; how are their powers to compel the Education Department or the Education Committee any different to the powers that the current staff, headteachers have? Again, I am not sure I have had a clear answer on that, other than that they will be a powerful group, a lobbying group. I get that, but then I could flip that quite cynically. Are we saying then that there is going to be more respect for what these groups say than has gone previously for headteachers or people coming from the schools?

I have done a bit of a rag rating of the email that Deputy Montague sent me. Recruitment, new processes will be in place in January and the governance boards and chairs will have far more control over recruitment. That one is green, thumbs up. However it was followed up with this does depend on central HR doing what they said they will do. That is in red; it does not feel quite so comforting. So, yes, it is very much about the powers for me because at the moment it feels like they are being set up as talking shops, and what I worry for these groups is they are going to become places of blame. They are going to be held responsible for the performance of schools but with very little levers or powers to do anything about the performance of schools.

Then I worry that when the questions come up about GCSE results or what is happening in this school, why is it not performing, why are the police there all the time, all the questions that we get around education, that education will say that is down to the governance board. The governance board will say we have not got any powers and they will not give us what we need. Will the governance board say that, because will they feel confident and comfortable enough to speak out in public against the Education Department? Will we find ourselves in a position where everyone is pointing at everyone and some people do not feel confident enough to express the challenges that they are facing? I have had it said that this might be about personality politics, and actually if I stick with my vote, then I have proven that I was not doing personality politics last term, because different Committee, same policy, same concerns.

That is where I stand right now, and I have not had, as I have said, what I feel are the robust answers to my questions. Perhaps in Deputy Montague's summing up, he may be able to do what he has not achieved so far.

Then just one last thing was the argument around that the school committees will then still have to run alongside the interim governance boards if we were to support the sursis today or if the sursis was to be successful. Those are the arguments; I think I described it to Deputy Montague. I do not like being backed into a corner and that is what it felt a little bit like last term that the Education Committee did, was walk us down a path and walk us so far down it, then said to us, you cannot really walk back now. But it was not the path we got asked to walk down. When I get backed into a corner, it is probably good for everybody to know, I am less likely to submit and I am more likely to thrash around. I try not to do that but I do not like that argument.

I have had a chat with Education officers. I think that if Education wanted to avoid that they could, by changing, by bringing a different ordinance – I do not know if it would be an ordinance or projet, sorry – to cease the Committees to exist, and the interim governance boards could continue running as they do now, until the EDDIAC had completed their work.

I think those are all the points that I wanted to raise. I am grateful to both leads on each side of this debate because I think both have done an excellent job in engaging, listening and presenting their cases. I have been very torn along the way but I think where I am landing is it just does not quite make sense to me right now and to bake something into legislation that does not make sense and has been done in the wrong order does not feel like something that we should do as a responsible legislature.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

As I popped out briefly just now, Deputy Bury indicated to me was I going to speak and I shook my head but here I am. What I would like to say is that I think this is an excellent debate. The way it is being handled, the aspects that are coming forward, there does not feel to be a scrap of personality in it and long may this continue through this term. Definitely disagreeing agreeably.

As to where I am on this; I am probably with Deputy de Sausmarez and Deputy Bury in this sense, although they are each going different ways and I am still on the fence. Now I echo a lot of the concerns that were raised by both those Deputies. I would also like to say that I really want to congratulate Deputy Montague for engaging to the extent he has. If he has spent as much time with other Members of this Assembly as he did with Deputy Bury and myself, he has obviously been exceedingly busy over the past few weeks.

It is interesting that the two people most against this in some ways are Deputy Camp and Deputy Sloan because there we have the substantial part of our Scrutiny Committee. I think Deputy Montague can certainly expect to have very searching questions when he finds himself in front of the Scrutiny Committee for a public hearing. Maybe that will be a spur as well to this going in the right direction. Of course, there is always the possibility that if Members do feel this is not heading in the right direction, once it is underway, that a raquette could be brought as well to make some firm directions and maybe that for me is the get out of jail free card on this that might enable me to get behind the Committee.

I do agree it could have been done differently, as Deputy Bury points out. I am still on the fence although I am tending towards supporting the Committee and excellent speeches set out by Deputy Montague and, indeed, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Matthews.

Deputy Matthews: Thank you, sir.

2195 I would like to open by extending really sincere thanks to Deputy Camp for bringing this sursis. It takes a lot of hard work and a lot of bottle to bring an amendment to the States early in the term. As a member of ESC, I can testify that this one has promoted or prompted some much more extensive discussion of the proposed legislation than might otherwise have been the case. It is often only through opposition that some issues come to light, and it is fair to say that some of the points
 2200 raised have been quite illuminating. I was one of the few Deputies – there was only seven of us – who voted for the Roffey-Burford amendment to the Education and Governance Policy Letter, which set up the preparation of this legislation. That amendment, back in February last term, called on ESC to change course and instead simply bring its own mechanism to devolve powers as soon as practical.

2205 Now I suppose for consistency, I should vote in favour of the sursis which has similar sentiment, but reading the room I think it would be much more like a sympathy vote than a realistic attempt to change policy. Events have moved on since February, and of those seven who voted in favour in February, or the five who remain in the States, I detect there is a definite sense that the opportunity to change course has slightly slipped away. Also the structure of this sursis is different.

2210 I do not quite share the view that the sursis would have the effect of wrecking progress towards independent governance. My interpretation is it would have a more limited impact. Of course, the sursis does, to an extent, introduce a delay, but I do not feel it would necessarily be disastrous. But, as we have heard, the previous Committee had already started setting up parallel governing boards to run alongside the existing parochial management committees. I found this approach odd and
 2215 quite troubling. By way of comparison, if a company decides to set up a management reorganisation, a new management structure might be expected. However, to recruit and run this new management structure in parallel with the existing management structure would be quite a bizarre approach. Yet that is what has been done here with governance.

We now have two sets of school committees, the old parochial committees and the newly
 2220 recruited interim governance boards running in parallel. I actually think that that approach that had been taken was not very considerate. While there were clearly issues with the existing parish committees, a more considerate approach could have been taken. The comparison I used is it is a bit like the decision you have when your washing machine breaks down: do you get the old machine repaired or shell out for a new one which might have the new features that you want? There is
 2225 clearly some variability between the different parish school boards, and we were told some had struggled to recruit members. The Committee appears to have taken the view that starting afresh with new governance boards would be a preferable way rather than attempt to fix those issues. It is a bit analogous to the issue with washing machines repairs that you get a new one because you cannot get the parts to fix the old one. But within that, there were clearly many volunteers who had
 2230 given their time in service to their community and who will naturally feel let down by having been dumped in favour of a new model.

In my view, the starting point is where we are at now, it is not where we should have come from, but prolonging this parallel run is also problematic. We find ourselves with very little room for manoeuvre. In my view, the sursis would actually do little to correct the mistakes that have been
 2235 made in the recent past, but there are clearly – and if you will excuse the terrible pun – some lessons that can be learned for the future. It is important to recognise that there have been issues not just with the decisions that have been made, but with the process by which those decisions have been arrived at. We cannot ignore that the election results demonstrated a very significant public distrust of the decisions taking place in education.

2240 There was a rejection of the whole process, not just specific concerns about particular schools. If we are to make a break with that legacy, a more consultative, democratic and considerate approach is needed going forward. Governance can make a great contribution to the management of schools, but to do so it will need to be truly independent. The current proposals, for example, include a clustering element where several schools are clumped together under one chair. This is
 2245 not the route to true independence for individual schools. It simply sets up another layer of schools that can become similar to each other.

Improvements to schools will likely only really come about when parents have choices about which schools to send their children to. That competition is a powerful mechanism to drive up standards and it means less power and decision-making in the centre and more in the hands of parents and the community. Those are the decisions that will make a difference and the structure to support them should be developed sooner rather than later. Many of the recent changes to our education system have been counterproductive but this new Committee has an obligation to recognise this and to take a new approach.

In conclusion, my preference is to work with Deputy Camp and others on improvements that can be made to the ordinance that is to follow and the subsequent processes rather than to this particular piece of legislation.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Sir, thank you very much.

I wanted to, like others, compliment as well the opening speeches of Deputy Montague and also Deputy Camp, and a very good technical speech by Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, which I will also build on. I think there is a difference in terms of the narrative that we can hear in our speeches versus then examining the actual technical details in front of us, which is what is going to come through the actual wording. This is where I want to focus my attention because I think ultimately the decision we have got to make today is: does the sursis improve on the original proposals in front of us, which is the primary legislation?

Just as a reminder, the primary legislation in front of us, what it does is offer us a few high-level enabling provisions. When we look at primary legislation, and this is what Deputy Hansmann Rouxel was also referring to, we need to analyse whether it is structured technically in a way that is giving us that soundproofing for future and for being able to bring more detail through primary legislation, through ordinances and through regulation-making powers. In a nutshell, this is what we have in front of us, which is high-level enabling provisions but which are currently lacking any further detail that will come through the ordinances and further ordinances that might prescribe regulation-making powers. This speaks to the point Deputy Sloan was making, is that the detail is not there in terms of what we are actually approving. We are looking, through the primary legislation, to approve very high-level enabling framework.

Then when I look at the sursis, I am trying to analyse whether the Propositions in front of us are effectively trying to improve that primary legislation and how they are trying to achieve that. I think this is where some of those technical problems are starting to arise. Proposition 1 of the sursis is suggesting to revise and limit the Committee's regulation-making powers, ensuring that powers in respect of the Constitution, powers and functions of governance boards vest clearly in the States of Deliberation by ordinance. Well, if you look at the primary legislation, the constitution, powers of constitution, are already effectively in primary legislation by ordinance. That is already covered in the primary legislation. Proposition 1 does not address that because actually that is already in place.

I assume the issue that Deputy Camp was trying to pick up is 6.4, which is the primary legislation is allowing an ordinance under subsection 1 that could be brought to the States to confer on the Committee regulation-making powers. So what we are saying is that the Committee could bring further ordinances that are prescribing regulation-making powers and those regulation-making powers will be in relation to the delegation of functions such as HR, etc. The issue we have got right now is that we have not seen any of those ordinances and even if that ordinance with regulation prescribing powers is brought to the Committee, the power always vests in the States because the States will always be able to annul that legislation.

The issue with Proposition 1 of the sursis is that it also speaks to Deputy de Sausmarez's point, is that it fails to actually pinpoint directly where the problems with the primary legislation are. As I said, I think some of the issues potentially highlighted are already in primary legislation, so I think they have been addressed. The ultimate decision-making powers is always with the States, so the

2300 Committee will never be able to just go and make substantial decisions in relation to delegation of functions without ultimate consent of the Assembly. I think with that respect, Proposition 1 fails on technical grounds in a number of areas for me.

2305 The second Proposition of the sursis is in relation to setting out – so it is suggesting that the Committee should come back with a new primary legislation, which sets out in full the proposed constitutional terms of reference of the governance board, including their objectives, responsibilities and delegated devolved powers. This, again, speaks to what Deputy Hansmann Rouxel was saying that what the sursis is suggesting is that those kind of details are baked in the primary law, which is really not good practice, in my view.

2310 From a technical legislative drafting perspective, I think that is a really bad suggestion in terms of bringing that into primary legislation. Purely just looking on those technical grounds of how the sursis has been drafted, I think both Propositions fail for me from that certain perspective. I suggest that the Assembly does not support the sursis on those technical basis. I think the other option I want to remind the Assembly they have is to not support the sursis but vote down the primary legislation. I think if what you are trying to achieve is that the Committee brings back the more developed suite of proposals through legislation, just vote down the primary legislation. I think that is the right move forward.

2315 What is effectively being proposed by the sursis, I think, is weak on technical grounds, as I have explained, but also does not achieve the objectives, actually, that we have heard in the speech. I will not be supporting the sursis for those reasons but I think it has been really useful to have this debate because it as a very important subject to make sure we have aired.

2320 Thank you.

The Bailiff: I am now going to call Deputy Ozanne to make her maiden speech.

A Member: Hear, hear.

2325 **Deputy Ozanne:** Thank you, sir.

2330 I was not expecting actually to speak in this debate, but as it has gone on I felt it was important to say a couple of things as the newbie on the Committee. Firstly, can I say how thankful I am to Deputy Camp for ensuring that we have this new tone of debate. Without wanting to stretch the analogy too far, it is first day of school for many kids on the Island today in our primary school and for some of them that will be the first day in school ever. For me, I am feeling it is our first day of a proper, meaty debate, particularly on something like education. Some of you are coming back to school, but your classmates have changed.

2335 The topics that we are studying remain the same, but we are on a train. You have heard about the momentum argument, you have heard about the need for continuity and stability, which is the one thing that every headteacher, teacher, parent and Education officer I know has told me about, which is one of the reasons I took up or asked to sit on Education. In fact, many of my friends said, 'Jayne, why on earth are you taking up what many will call a poison chalice? Why have you gone after it?' That is because I passionately believe in governance. I have seen the impact of poor governance, if I am honest, in the UK, particularly with regards to safeguarding and Church of England schools. I have seen the impact of new governance, new forms of governance here in Guernsey and therefore I would ask for you not to support this sursis.

2345 That is because I think there are some misunderstandings, if I can be honest, about the nature of power and responsibilities and how Education is trying to change the concept of power. That may sound slightly concerning. I have just trained to be a teacher and one of the biggest outlooks I took from that training course is that the nature of education has completely changed. No longer do you have a teacher who stands at the blackboard and spouts at you for 40 minutes, and if you have enough courage you ask a question. The whole nature of education is iterative, that you engage with your pupils, that you look at getting feedback and hearing where people are at.

2350 That is how the EDDIAC is envisioned working, that it will develop those powers and responsibilities hand in hand with the chairs and the teachers and those who have got a voice so that when we come back to you with what those actual powers should be, they will have come out of a process, an iterative process that is not one that starts with us determining what those powers should be but what, in practical experience, those chairs and governors know those powers need to be.

2355 I have just read 'You Are Here' by David Nicholls. Well, while I tried to read it, I had a lot of Education meetings on Zoom over my holiday, but 'You Are Here' is a great book by David Nicholls which talks about a couple who embark on a journey. Actually I do not want to give the plot away too much because that will spoil it for those who are going to read, but the concept is taking a risk, going on a journey, but recognising you can only start from the place you are at. That is where we are as a board. We realised that we had inherited something. Sorry, I should call ourselves a Committee. We are no longer a board, we are a Committee. But we had inherited something which we vigorously interrogated over the summer. We recognised we wanted to continue, we wanted to keep the momentum going and that we did not want to wait for EDDIAC to do everything before we moved to governance boards because we would not have that iterative process that I think is crucial to a new way of learning and a new way of looking at power.

I really would urge you to allow us to continue, to reject the sursis and see us through to the next stage.

Thank you. (*Applause*)

2370

The Bailiff: Deputy Cameron.

Deputy Cameron: Thank you, sir.

2375 I will keep this brief. Members, I was a Member of ESC last term. I have returned for another swig from the poison chalice (*Laughter*), one of the few survivors from the previous Committee. It is safe to say that I did not agree with every decision made by that Committee and often voiced my opposition. But on governance, I have been directly involved from the start. We committed hundreds of hours to training, to meetings with headteachers and Deputies, and to working through the detail of how these boards will function. With the exception of supporting the Roffey amendment, which gave boards more teeth and led directly to the creation of EDDIAC, I support this governance model completely. Why? Because I have seen what works.

2380 Governors and chairs have stepped forward in good faith, giving their time freely, building relationships with school leaders and providing the challenge and support that was missing for decades under outdated school committees. Deputy Montague mentioned headteachers who left in frustration because the system held them back. That cannot continue. Strong governance unlocks the potential. Deputy Camp has compared our model to a fire brigade without any equipment. I disagree. These boards are not being sent out empty-handed. They will have training, access to information, support from officers when needed and statutory backing from this Assembly.

2385 We have a Chair with both an IoD Governance Diploma and Chartered Governance Affiliateship. Hardly the picture of an untrained or ill-equipped body. What they will not have is every single tool on day one, because, like any new organisation, their remit will grow as they prove their capability. These boards already have the basic tools to do their job, independence, training and authority to challenge. That is equipment enough to get started and more will be added as they evolve.

2390 This is where the sursis is so damaging. Delay does not strengthen governance, it prolongs weakness. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Every month we delay is another month with outdated school committees or toothless interim governance boards. It means Douzaines running elections for bodies everyone accepts are ineffective. Deputy Bury is correct that we could remove the school committees by ordinance but it means officers wasting time redrafting legislation instead of preparing governance boards for January. It risks losing the chairs and governors who have already invested hundreds of hours of their own time. If we lose them, we lose the momentum and goodwill that is the foundation for future progress.

2400

Colleagues, let us be clear about cost. We are in one of the most challenging fiscal terms in memory. Every pound must deliver value. Governance boards cost just a quarter per cent of the ESC budget; £12,000 per school. A modest investment compared with the waste caused by delay. A sursis will drive up costs, push officers back to square one and force us to repeat recruitment and training later. That is not value for money.

Some have argued we should wait for EDDIAC but that misunderstands the point. We do not need to carve governance in stone today. Governance must be allowed to evolve fluidly. Adapting as experience grows and as recommendations come forward, this is the whole point of using ordinance and regulations. Far from putting the cart before the horse, this Projet gives us the cart so the horse has something to pull. Without it we are standing still or we are sliding backwards.

Let us not pretend delay comes without cost to outcomes. Governance is not a box-ticking exercise. It is about safeguarding, headteacher support, proper oversight of IT investment and making sure facilities are prioritised for pupils. Good governance makes every teacher, every classroom and every pound go further. Delay stifles those gains.

This Projet is not perfect, no legislation ever is, but it is pragmatic, flexible and responsive. It builds on work already debated and tested. By January 2026, schools will have boards with independent chairs in place, and by the time EDDIAC reports later that year, we will have real experience on the ground to inform further reform. That is far stronger than standing still. The choice is between outcomes for our students or more delay and drift.

I will be voting against this sursis, obviously, and encourage colleagues to make the same responsible choice.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: I will now invite the President, Deputy Montague, to speak on this sursis, please.

Deputy Montague: Thank you, sir.

As I left the Les Varendes Sixth Form Centre at the end of June this year, they very kindly created a trophy to be handed to the student who had the most curiosity and desire for lifelong learning. My desire for lifelong learning is really being tested at the moment. I do not think I have ever learned so much in a few weeks. When I took on this role, or when I was forced to take on this role, if you believe *The Guernsey Press*, everyone made the joke that we have made today, sir, about the poison chalice. I did not think that the first poison I would be sipping at would be the one of governance. But it is.

I said at the beginning of my speech, I was very grateful to colleagues who have helped me – as all the newbies in the room would say – and really helped us understand. But one of the best bits of advice I have had recently was do not try and argue your point by saying, 'Well, if you do not vote for me, the sky will fall in.' We have described this as throwing your toys out of the pram analogy.

I am not going to do that, but what I will say is this. If we vote for this sursis, there will be consequences. We will need to stand down those committees. I think Deputy Camp repeated something that was in *The Press*, which was that the committees are the only legally independent, politically independent organisations working with schools. But they have to have a member of ESC on them. This is not arm's length, as I said in my speech.

The IGBs at the moment are chaired, because of safeguarding, by senior Education officers. So I just want to say, from that side with those two Committees, I do not think it makes sense to stop this process. Furthermore, when I mentioned about headteachers, it was not to try and twist your arm, it was to say this mechanism is causing our incredibly hardworking headteachers and principals to do even more work. But I will say this, if we support this sursis today, in schools and settings around the Island a lot of my former colleagues will be very disappointed. Why? Because they recognise what I try to make clear in my speech, that they are at the beginning of a process.

I understand and I am really grateful to colleagues who tried to say to me, 'But we need to know what that power looks like.' What I tried to articulate earlier was that it is a gradual journey. They are stuck in first gear, and we can get into third gear.

2455 With reference to Deputy Burford's comments: where is that power? I described it in my earlier speech as soft power. Now, soft power is still power. In terms of going back to my comment about will they be able to sack, that is for EDDIAC to deliver the levers on that new mechanism. But that is a journey. As I have tried to make it clear, we cannot have a Big Bang approach to this.

2460 I tried to make clear our intentions as a Committee. Maybe I was not clear enough to Deputy Sloan, who says, 'We still do not know where they are going.' I think there is work to do there and Deputy Sloan and I had a brief conversation over lunch and I think I have begun to understand a little bit more about the conversations we need for us to communicate to the Assembly more broadly what that end picture looks like.

2465 But I would like to say again, sir, we cannot be so precise at this moment. That is because, as I stated, we have 20 educational settings and they are all in different positions. I am going to refer to some and I hope this does not set too many hares running. We have a cluster of a secondary school partnership. We have TGI, The Guernsey Institute, we have St Anne's in Alderney, if we just take those three groups, they could all be moving at different speeds depending on where they are now and depending on their current context. We need the flexibility that the legislation will provide rather than saying we need to bake in certainty now. Now, I understand why that lack of certainty might cause those concerns but I genuinely think that we need to take on board this is a journey, it is iterative, we need to be flexible and I believe that the legislation, as it stands, will work.

2470 We have many references to Denis Mulkerrin. I would ask colleagues again to look at appendix 1 of the Policy Letter. If Denis Mulkerrin came back again today, he would have a very different report. He would still have issues as we have articulated, all of us on the Committee have articulated the problems that we see. By the way, those problems are also seen by officers in Education. So I think we need to be careful about the constant reference to Mulkerrin as though you can pick out a report from 2012, informed by what was going on in England at the time, and think it is absolutely up to date today.

2480 Some people have said it is not about just trusting the new Committee, we need evidence, we need to know that the States still have control. But everything must come back to the States. Every time regulations come back, there are two bites, there are two opportunities to dismiss them. When I met Deputy Burford and Deputy Bury the other day, I was told that they would hold my feet to the fire. Now, that is what this process will do. It will force the Committee to be open with you to communicate and try and make it absolutely clear what we think we need to do. If at any time the Assembly thinks that is not what is happening, well then we will get our feet burned and have to go away and do something new.

2490 I would like to focus a little bit on this lack of power. Deputy Bury and I, have exchanged emails, and I could tell her rising frustration as I was trying to demonstrate to Deputy Bury, I believe this is power and she was pushing back that that will not happen. It will happen ultimately with the fifth and sixth gear post-EDDIAC. But in the short term, the lobby power will be very significant, the power of these senior members of our communities who are going to take on these chair roles to be performance managing our head teachers will give them that power.

2495 Also with regard to that process of EDDIAC, I want to reiterate what I said earlier. We must go to the next stage, because otherwise EDDIAC will have nothing to work on. There will not be that feedback loop. We will not have The Guernsey Institute going forward and trying to develop their governance. We will not have St Anne's and Alderney's experience, because we will have put them in stasis. We must do those experiments. We must understand that we can be flexible and then we must make that progress, otherwise, EDDIAC will not have the information to be able to make those fundamental decisions.

2500 Finally, I would like to say thank you very much to Deputy Camp. We have spent a long time talking together. We have had very civil conversations and what is really interesting for both of us is we both have exactly the same goal in mind, the end goal we agree on. We agree it is for genuine

2505 devolution, not just delegation. My fear is that because of where our institutions are, where our primary schools are, we are going to have to be very flexible. Someone used the example of an old graphic equaliser where you can push some up and some down. We are going to have to flex that and we might have to devolve powers and, occasionally, if that is not working, we might have to bring them back in. But that will all be done openly and transparently.

2510 When I spoke to Deputy Camp, she said, with regard to EDDIAC – and I think Deputy Gollop made some interesting points about the composition of that group. Deputy Camp spotted that there was one role for her on that. If the sursis is successful – if the sursis is successful – we will probably have to set up an EDDIAC. If you do not like the word, I am sure we can come up with something else. I hope that Deputy Camp puts herself forward to sit on that.

2515 If the sursis is unsuccessful and the EDDIAC does go ahead, I hope that Deputy Camp will take up the role and sit on that because I think it is crucial that her insights that we have heard today are brought to bear and keep us honest, keep us open and keep our feet to the fire.

I would just like to say then that I would encourage the Assembly, sir, not to support the sursis, to reject the sursis, but to continue to put pressure on ESC to be really clear what those plans are.

Thank you, sir.

2520 **The Bailiff:** Finally I will invite the proposer of the sursis motivé, Deputy Camp, to reply to the whole debate.

Deputy Camp: Thank you, I shall do my best.

2525 I just want to say from the outset I am not here to fight any war in this Assembly, that does not get us anywhere. What I am fighting for is genuine devolution of governance, as Deputy Montague has quite rightly picked up as my goal. Deputy de Sausmarez earlier said that this law could be a pilot project, and this is really my issue. Using a law as a pilot project is the bad practice that I am speaking of. I do not believe that this sursis succeeding stops any of the other things that people are talking about. I think there are excuses being made in this Assembly as to why that would stop.

2530 The interim governance boards that are entirely at the gift of ESC can exist and could be tweaked to replicate intended governance boards and transplanted when the time is right. The safeguarding measures can be easily covered by the fact that even under the formal proposals there will be a right of attendance of officers and politicians. So all the safeguarding measures are there, irrespective. The IGBs, then, can be the place where that proof of concept is developed and the clarity that so many Deputies have spoken about and agreed with me could be developed.

2535 Now, I appreciate that a couple of Members have pointed out technical difficulties and another technical question on the wording of my sursis. Now, Proposition 1, if I am using the correct terminology – hit me if I am not – basically refers to the proposed sections 6.4 and 6.5 ought to be more properly worded. At the moment, they talk about delegation of services. They do not talk about delegation of operational elements of those services, which is more in line with the Policy Letter. That is why I believe that the Projet de Loi is drafted with far too much power than the Policy Letter proposed. That would then clear up whether the ordinance and the regulation powers thereafter are problematic, rather than us putting a law in place and then deciding whether they are problematic. That is bad lawmaking.

2540 I am sure there are lots and lots of things that other people have said. Deputy Cameron talked about uncertainty extends delay. Well, in fact, the process we are following is where the uncertainty is created. That is precisely what I am asking for; certainty. Then you can start to delay that delay – no, fix the delay would be a better way of putting that. It was proposed that my sursis would drive up costs, would delay recruitment, etc. It absolutely will not. This structure is already in place. As I have said, the IGBs can be utilised as that test pilot ground and then it allows the Committee to come back with something that looks like a direction of travel, some certainty. That can be iterative, of course it can. That is how things work. But starting out at the outset with nothing but an empty vessel is reckless lawmaking and I will maintain that position forever.

2550

2555 We said that it is not possible to carve everything in stone. I agree, but the proposers at the moment only carve things in sand and we all know that is a false practice. We talk about powers and that is really the issue. Everyone is saying about what these boards will do, what they are doing at the moment. I just want to make it very clear, everything those boards do, even if this law is proposed and the governance boards come in before the EDDIAC is considered, is based on goodwill alone. If the Education Department, if the Committee do not like what is being done, it can be stopped at that point and that is where you have lack of clarity, lack of certainty, lack of power, and you have a massive risk of frustration, you have a massive risk of these boards flatlining before they even get going. That is where you risk disenfranchised and, quite frankly, annoyed governors who went in in good faith and that good faith was not restored.

2560 I think on that point I will stop. I can sense the direction of travel, I am glad to have been given this opportunity to raise these points which I believe are critical as we move forward. Whatever the result, I very much would be delighted to join the work on the EDDIAC, and in fact I would be pretty cross if I am not.

Thank you very much.

2570 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, it is now time to vote on the sursis motiv  , which is proposed by Deputy Camp and seconded by Deputy Curgenv  n. I am going to invite the Greffier to open the voting on that sursis. Can you please now close the voting, Greffier?

2575 *There was a recorded vote.*

Not carried – Pour 7, Contre 27, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 0, Absent 5

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Burford, Yvonne	Cameron, Andy	Matthews, Aidan	None	Blin, Chris
Bury, Tina	de Sausmarez, Lindsay			Collins, Garry
Camp, Haley	Dorrity, David			Laine, Marc
Curgenv��n, Rob	Falla, Steve			Le Tocq, Jonathan
Gollop, John	Gabriel, Adrian			Strachan, Jennifer
McKenna, Liam	Goy, David			
Williams, Steve	Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah			
	Helyar, Mark			
	Hill, Edward			
	Humphreys, Rhona			
	Inder, Neil			
	Kay-Mouat, Bruno			
	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha			
	Leadbeater, Marc			
	Malik, Munazza			
	Montague, Paul			
	Niles, Andrew			
	Oswald, George			
	Ozanne, Jayne			
	Parkinson, Charles			
	Rochester, Sally			
	Rylatt, Tom			
	Sloan, Andy			
	Snowdon, Alexander			
	St Pier, Gavin			
	Van Katwyk, Lee			
	Vermeulen, Simon			

2580 **The Bailiff:** In relation to the sursis motiv   proposed by Deputy Camp and seconded by Deputy Curgenv  n they voted in favour 7, against 27 Members, 1 Member abstained; 5 Members did not participate in the vote and therefore I would declare the sursis motiv   lost.

We now return to general debate. Does anyone wish to speak on the Projet? On that basis, if there is nobody responding to the opening by the President, there is nothing –

2585 **Deputy Sloan:** If I may just say something on the debate?

The Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Sloan.

2590 **Deputy Sloan:** It was to the point – I know we had the discussion during the sursis – when I made the point that in the Policy Letter the purpose of the governance boards was to be included in legislation, I said that I expected that to be at the ordinance stage. I had the conversation with Deputy Montague and Deputy Matthews at lunchtime. I would expect to see an amendment to that ordinance proposed with the purpose of the governance board set out. You do not need to detail absolutely everything they do, but the purpose is still missing. That is why I said that tomorrow at 2595 the ordinance debate, I will not be able to support it then. I just wanted the opportunity to make that clear today that would be my intent going forward. I do believe that, as explained today, that will be entirely feasible and possible.

The Bailiff: Deputy Montague, do you want to reply to what Deputy Sloan has said? You do not 2600 have to. I make it perfectly clear, there is no obligation to reply but it is your option.

Deputy Montague: Sir, just to be clear, I am also summing up the debate.

2605 **The Bailiff:** Yes.

Deputy Montague: Okay, sorry.

Of course, I will definitely, sir, reply to Deputy Sloan. Just a couple of things that I was hoping would come up in the general debate, but it falls to me to deal with them. First of all, throughout the election process, sir, many of us in this room spoke about some of the worries about having 2610 Island-wide voting and the disenfranchisement of those parishes.

The Bailiff: Deputy Montague, you cannot do that. The only thing that you can reply to is nothing to do with the sursis, because you have had your opportunity to speak on the sursis. The only person who has spoken in debate on the Projet is Deputy Sloan and you can only reply under 2615 Rule 17(4) to the points that were made by Deputy Sloan.

Deputy Montague: Of course, I do beg your pardon, sir. Thank you very much. Every day is a learning day.

2620 Deputy Sloan, I think has made a very good point there. We are just in the process of trying to shift a briefing to Deputies that we had scheduled for 17th September forward so that we can have this discussion about the ordinances earlier. I will inform the Assembly as soon as I can whether we can bring our scheduled briefing in advance of the ordinances a little bit earlier to enable, if there needed to be, any amendments laid because I believe the deadline was before our previous briefing has been scheduled.

2625 So our briefing had been scheduled for the 17th, the deadline is the 16th. Just in specific answer to this question, we are going to attempt to move our briefing earlier so that we can get anyone who is interested to come and discuss those ordinances, to look at them and see what can be done to facilitate everyone getting on board with this process and it be agreeable to the Assembly. That is exactly what we will do.

2630 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much. Members of the States, there is a single Proposition as to whether you are minded to approve the draft Projet de Loi entitled The Education (Guernsey) (Amendment) Law, 2025 and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on that Proposition, please? 2635

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 32, Contre 2, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 0, Absent 5

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Burford, Yvonne	Bury, Tina	Curgenven, Rob	None	Blin, Chris
Cameron, Andy	Camp, Haley			Collins, Garry
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				Laine, Marc
Dorrity, David				Le Tocq, Jonathan
Falla, Steve				Strachan, Jennifer
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Inder, Neil				
Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Montague, Paul				
Niles, Andrew				
Oswald, George				
Ozanne, Jayne				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rochester, Sally				
Rylatt, Tom				
Sloan, Andy				
Snowdon, Alexander				
St Pier, Gavin				
Van Katwyk, Lee				
Vermeulen, Simon				
Williams, Steve				

2640

The Bailiff: So on that Proposition, they voted: in favour 32 Members, 2 Members voted against, one Member abstained, 5 Members did not participate in the vote. I will declare the Proposition duly carried.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

5. The Income Tax (Guernsey) (Approval of Agreement with Bahrain) Ordinance, 2025 – Proposition carried

Article 5.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled "The Income Tax (Guernsey) (Approval of Agreement with Bahrain) Ordinance, 2025" and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

2645

The States' Greffier: Article 5, Policy & Resources Committee, The Income Tax (Guernsey) (Approval of Agreement with Bahrain) Ordinance, 2025.

The Bailiff: I understand the Vice-President is going to open on this, so Deputy St Pier, please.

2650 **Deputy St Pier:** Thank you, sir.

Very briefly. This very short piece of legislation brings into effect a double-tax agreement which was entered into between the Kingdom of Bahrain and Guernsey in September 2024. The legislation, sir, is not entitled a commencement ordinance but, to all intents and purposes, that is what it does.

2655 It brings the agreement into effect with effect from 5th September, from Friday. It is a technical piece of legislation, many of which are items we do see during the course of the term and I hope Members will therefore support it, sir.

2660 **The Bailiff:** Well, no one is rising to debate it, so nobody is going to require Deputy St Pier to reply to any debate. and therefore I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on the draft Ordinance entitled The Income Tax (Guernsey) (Approval of Agreement with Bahrain) Ordinance, 2025.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 32, Contre 2, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 0, Absent 5

2665	Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
	Burford, Yvonne				Blin, Chris
	Bury, Tina				Collins, Garry
	Cameron, Andy				Laine, Marc
	Camp, Haley				Le Tocq, Jonathan
	Curgenven, Rob				Strachan, Jennifer
	de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
	Dorrity, David				
	Falla, Steve				
	Gabriel, Adrian				
	Gollop, John				
	Goy, David				
	Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
	Helyar, Mark				
	Hill, Edward				
	Humphreys, Rhona				
	Inder, Neil				
	Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
	Leadbeater, Marc				
	Malik, Munazza				
	Matthews, Aidan				
	McKenna, Liam				
	Montague, Paul				
	Niles, Andrew				
	Oswald, George				
	Ozanne, Jayne				
	Parkinson, Charles				
	Rochester, Sally				
	Rylatt, Tom				
	Sloan, Andy				
	Snowdon, Alexander				
	St Pier, Gavin				
	Van Katwyk, Lee				
	Vermeulen, Simon				
	Williams, Steve				

The Bailiff: On this draft Ordinance they voted: in favour 35 Members, no Member voted against, no Member abstained, 5 Members did not participate in the vote and therefore I will declare the Proposition carried.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

**6. The Guernsey Financial Services Commission: 2024 Annual Report and Accounts –
Proposition carried**

Article 6.

The States are asked to decide: -

*Whether, after consideration of the policy letter entitled 'The Guernsey Financial Services Commission: 2024 Annual Report and Accounts' dated 17th June, 2025, they are of the opinion: -
To note the annual report and accounts of the Guernsey Financial Services Commission for the year ended 31st December, 2024.*

2670 **The States' Greffier:** Article 6, the Guernsey Financial Services Commission 2024 Annual Report and Accounts.

The Bailiff: I understand that Deputy Falla will be opening the debate on this on behalf of the Committee, so Deputy Falla, please.

2675

Deputy Falla: Thank you, sir.

The Assembly is simply being asked to note the Guernsey Financial Services Commission's 2024 Annual Report and Accounts, but there are a few areas that I would like to highlight.

2680 Moneyval. The Commission worked in conjunction with the States and other parties, and as we know, the Moneyval inspection resulted in a strong outcome for the Bailiwick, its report affirming Guernsey's robust approach to financial crime.

2685 Secondly, technology. Helping to improve the Commission's effectiveness, support industry and enhance the Island's competitiveness. The new applications and authorisations portal will enable firms wanting to do business in the Bailiwick to complete applications online smoothly and effectively. The Commission also established a technology supervision unit and a technology innovation unit.

2690 Thirdly, the Commission has undertaken some policy development in respect of the pensions regime and its use of protected cell companies. With regard to unclaimed client money, the modernisation of investment prospectus rules, amending the Fund Authorisations and Registrations Surrender Rules, and working with the States and the banking sector, finalising a proportionate and low-cost way to comply with international standards on banking resolution.

2695 The fourth workstream was to focus on maintaining international confidence in the Bailiwick, for example, through trade agreements, working closely with the States' Head of International Trade. Also by participating in numerous international regulatory organisations and by implementing international standards in a user-friendly and proportionate manner to maintain the Bailiwick's international licence to operate. The Commission's financial statements show a surplus of £1.9 million in 2024, gained through a combination of running below full staff complement, cost control, and higher than expected discretionary income. This surplus is being used to help fund investment in the data and infrastructure programme to facilitate the effective use of new and developing technologies, including, and importantly, AI. The Commissioners have authorised further multimillion pound, multiyear expenditure on a data project, which will equip it for a new AI normal world. This will be executed using internal resources.

2700 Through you, sir, I ask the Assembly to note the Guernsey Financial Services Commission 2024 Annual Report and Accounts.

2705 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Sir, the GFSC account debate does not usually have a very prolonged debate because it can be a very technical piece of accounts to read. But I think it is very important that we note the financial statements. Just building on some of the points made by Deputy Falla, as we well know, the GFSC is an absolutely crucial pillar of our financial sector and an absolutely crucial stakeholder for us in enabling us to be the international financial centre that we are. It is really heartening to see the ongoing investment and focus on technology and innovation and some of those projects that Deputy Falla spoke to.

GFSC played an absolutely crucial part in the Moneyval process that we are very happy to have behind us, so the evaluation process behind us but with further work to be done in the next five years. I encourage Members, if they are not looking through the details of the accounts, to read through some of the high-level commentary from both the Chairman and the Director General's statements, which I always find are useful and well-written statements that also speak to the wider macroeconomic factors that our jurisdiction is also subject to.

In the section regarding the evolution of regulatory policymaking, especially in the post-Trump era, there is further direction from the EU in terms of the philosophy and in relation to the next cycle of the regulatory approach. On page 8, the Director General's statement refers to Mario Draghi's, one of the EU's most distinguished policy makers, the Draghi Report, published in September 2024, setting out the eloquent critique of the EU's globally influential regulatory approach.

As Mario Draghi put it, we claim to be in favour of innovation but we continue to add regulatory burdens onto European companies, which are especially costly to SMEs, and self-defeating for those in the digital sectors. His advocacy of deep reform and a change in the EU's default pro-regulation precautionary mindset is having considerable influence alongside the robust approach being taken towards embedded international regulatory norms by the Trump administration in the United States.

The Director General further states that what this means is that the international regulatory landscape, so far as the financial services regulation is concerned, has undergone a fundamental shift compared with this time last year, and it may continue to shift further. So we are standing to the Director General's comments at this really interesting moment when we are post the Moneyval evaluation. We will be investing into developing our new finance sector strategy, working very much in partnership with the regulator, GIBA, Guernsey Finance, for us to really look at how, as a financial sector, we innovate and embrace what is coming our way in the next five to 10 years.

I think these are exciting times and I hope that in a year's time, when we look again at the GFSC accounts, we can start speaking to some of those initiatives that hopefully will start coming forward and some of the new business that we will be able to attract to the Island as well.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Yes, I think I am on the same page as Deputy Kazantseva-Miller and Deputy Falla, who of course were prominent on Economic Development last term. Unfortunately, I found it galling that I missed the GFSC conferences and presentation to States' Members because I had Committee meetings all the times thereon. But, nevertheless, it is a useful report and it pays very well, I think, a lot of study. I would agree that there are different strands here, speaking from a home perspective, Moneyval and the contribution the team and staff and institution of GFSC makes is invaluable. That reflects very creditably on the whole institution, an excellent verdict. I think some of the strands that came out of the speeches were about emerging technology and the impact of AI. In the past, GFSC has actually had a conference and workshops on that and also been in the forefront of Green Guernsey environmental initiatives. I think they even owned a bit of forests for a while. I am not sure they still do. They still do.

But there is a tension because the idea that we should have faster incorporation of new institutions is an attractive one, but inevitably speed using digital technology has to be counterbalanced by know your customer and strict rules of careful judgement and adjudication, and those areas of the world where you can set up a company in five minutes are not necessarily

those with the highest reputation. So there is a balance there and clearly this report shows business as usual.

What I found interesting was that they kept pay down to roughly 10% higher than the previous year, which, when you take on board the RPI, was in fact quite good. But I was intrigued by the point that – I think it was Deputy Falla who made it – they have had a good year in terms of increasing their assets and the cash flow. For example, regulatory income in 2023 was £16,622,591 whereas in 2024 it had gone up to £18,947,792, an increase of over £2.25 million, which by my reckoning is 15%, 16%. Now that was fee and financial penalty income. That tells you perhaps two things; that there has been increasing emphasis on financial penalties – very appropriate – which I suppose is on balance very good for our reputation and our sector, but it also suggests that fees have gone up and there is no such thing as free fees because those fees directly take money away from the private financial sector and add to the cost base. So although the GFSC is a vital part of our offer, of our society, it has to be aware that if the fees become too high, that potentially affects other elements of our society and our viability.

I do support it and wish to see more conferences, but I suppose a little moral to put across to other Committees is make sure that we remain competitive in terms of technological developments, including cyber. An issue I remember we discussed a few months ago was how equipped we were for the GFSC to be not only the outstanding regulator it is in all its current areas, but in future areas like perhaps more cyber currencies and blockchains. We have got that to look to and also ensuring we do not go too far on increasing our fees.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sloan.

Deputy Sloan: Thank you, sir.

If you read his statement, I will tell him to his face and very often do, I am more of a New Testament man myself when it comes to the good Book and some of the comments he made previously, I have never heard – it is quite a euphemism to call a discretionary income the financial penalties, but I noticed that had gone up £1.5 million, it doubled one year to the next. Reputation is one man's freedom, fighters is another man's – as we all know. There is nuance and there is balance, as Deputy Gollop said. It is a good thing to have a strong enforcement regime but the pendulum must not swing too far.

In terms of risk, it was very interesting to see the Director General write about the change in the regulatory regime post the financial crisis. Yes, I lived through it and went through it with him and with some of you in the room. The changing circumstances that we see from Europe and from the Americans. The Americans put two fingers up quite regularly to the rest of the world when it comes to international regulatory agreements. But the point that the DG made with regards to Mario Draghi being able to turn around to his own economic block and say, 'Look, we have erred, we have gone down the wrong route when it comes to regulation. We need to ensure that we have got the right approach. The precautionary principle has probably gone too far in terms of undermining our competitiveness as an economic block.' I would, while accepting the report, like to urge Members of this Chamber, particularly those that were responsible in terms of Policy Council and Economic Development to ensure that the approach to risk of the jurisdiction is correctly steered over the next few years and that we bear in mind that the regulator always has one opinion, but that there are other opinions to be had when it comes to risk and a balance must be struck to ensure that we will continue to grow as an economy.

The reason I say that is if you look at the Director General's statement at the beginning where he does say that there were naysayers that said things have not been that great in recent years. To them I say look at the back and look at the statistics. Well, actually if you look at the statistics what they do tell you is a picture of a stagnating finance sector over the last 10 years, which is something that I have made the point of many times. Therefore, in context, I have every confidence in the Commission to undertake its functions and continue its duties but urge those people in the room

whose job it is, to ensure that the Commission's hand is held to steer us in the right path going forward.

Thank you very much, and I will obviously vote to accept the report.

The Bailiff: I will invite Deputy Falla to reply to that short debate, please.

Deputy Falla: Thank you, sir; and thank you to those Members who have contributed to this short debate.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, I note your comments about the investment being made and also the joint work so successfully carried out on Moneyval. Also the welcoming co-operation and working together between government, industry and regulator in achieving some of the things which I covered in my introduction.

Deputy Gollop, I note your comments on the merits of technology focus, which is greater than it has ever been from the Commission. Also, Deputy Sloan, for his observations regarding the approach to risk, which was covered to some degree by the Commission in their presentations to States' Members on these reports and accounts which some of us were able to attend a few weeks ago. I just ask through you, sir, Members to note the Report and Accounts.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, there is a single Proposition: whether you are minded to note the Report and Accounts of the Guernsey Financial Services Commission for last year. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 35, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 0, Absent 5

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

Snowdon, Alexander
St Pier, Gavin
Van Katwyk, Lee
Vermeulen, Simon
Williams, Steve

2840 **The Bailiff:** On that Proposition, they voted: in favour 35 Members, no Member voted against, no Member abstained, 5 Members are still absent, and therefore I would declare the Proposition carried.

Billet d'État XXI

ELECTIONS & APPOINTMENTS

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

1. Policy & Resources Committee Membership – Motion to withdraw carried

Article 1:-

To resolve that the Proposition in respect of the Policy Letter entitled 'Policy & Resources Committee Membership' dated 26th August, 2025 (P.2025/111) be withdrawn.

The States' Greffier: Billet XXI, Article 1, Policy & Resources Committee Membership Proposition.

2845

The Bailiff: Well, there has been a motion to withdraw this Proposition. Deputy de Sausmarez, do you want to speak to the motion?

2850

Deputy de Sausmarez: Only very briefly to say that I am sure Members are well aware of the events around this and the reason is the Proposition is just irrelevant given that the circumstances have changed. So I hope everyone sees the logic in withdrawing it because I think there is no logic whatsoever in trying to debate it.

Thank you.

2855

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier, do you formally second the motion?

Deputy St Pier: I do, sir.

2860

A Member: Just to ensure, sir, I am going to move the 26(1) on this, please.

The Bailiff: Okay. Can I invite those Members who would wish to speak in debate on the motion to withdraw to stand in their places? There is, in the circumstances, no need for me to put – you want a recorded vote? I am not going to put the motion under Rule 26(1) to the States at all because nobody stood. There will be no debate and I will simply put the motion to withdraw to the vote.

2865

This is a motion to withdraw the Policy & Resources Committee Membership Proposition proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez and seconded by Deputy St Pier. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting, please. No, do not worry, if anyone has voted for that, we will declare that a nullity.

Now, we will have the proper motion, please, relating to the Motion to Withdraw. You are not supposed to until I say. *(Laughter)* I might as well not be here.

2870

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 35, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 0, Absent 5

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Burford, Yvonne	None	None	None	Blin, Chris
Bury, Tina				Collins, Garry
Cameron, Andy				Laine, Marc
Camp, Haley				Le Tocq, Jonathan
Curgenven, Rob				Strachan, Jennifer
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Inder, Neil				
Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Montague, Paul				
Niles, Andrew				
Oswald, George				
Ozanne, Jayne				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rochester, Sally				
Rylatt, Tom				
Sloan, Andy				
Snowdon, Alexander				
St Pier, Gavin				
Van Katwyk, Lee				
Vermeulen, Simon				
Williams, Steve				

2875

The Bailiff: So on the Motion to Withdraw proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez and seconded by Deputy St Pier, they voted: in favour 35 Members, no Member voted against, no Member abstained, 5 Members did not participate. Therefore I will declare the Motion to Withdraw carried.

Billet d'État XIX

APPENDIX REPORT

COMMITTEE FOR HOME AFFAIRS

Guernsey Police Complaints Commission – 2024 Annual Report – Debate commenced

2880 **The Bailiff:** Yes, I am going to invite the President of the Committee to open the debate. The Proposition, as I said earlier, is to take note of the Report, but in accordance with Rule 20, paragraph 5, the President of the Committee opens the debate and then those who wish to speak on it can then speak in relation to that and the President can then reply at the end. Deputy Leadbeater.

2885 **Deputy Leadbeater:** Thank you, sir.

Everyone will know that the Annual Report is owned by the Commission. It is the Commission's piece of work. It is not the Committee for Home Affairs piece of work. It is a summary of the activities for 2024. I will not be drawn into speculating about how individual complaints may have been dealt with in the past.

2890 The review that my Committee has promised will be based on a regime that is fair for the person making the complaint and the officer subject to that complaint. It is also clear and accountable, making sure the right people are making the right decisions using the right information and also proportionate, considering the nature of the complaint and also a regime that is proportionate to the needs of our jurisdiction. Along with officers including the new Head of Professional Standards and Counter-Corruption Unit of the law enforcement, I met with Deputies Curgenvén and St Pier last Friday. The Committee had already considered a paper on the review of the Police Complaints Regime on 19th August and we also considered the terms of reference for that review that were endorsed by the previous Committee. I shared those terms of reference and also the paper that we considered at Committee with the Deputy Curgenvén and Deputy St Pier, in advance of the meeting we had last Friday. During that meeting, Deputy St Pier had some very helpful suggestions for inclusion into the TORs, and they have duly been included.

2900 My officers will be listening to this debate and listening to any of the concerns that anyone may have, noting any feedback that we may get, and we are also going to be considering extending the offer of reviewing the terms of reference to the rest of the Assembly.

2905 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Curgenvén.

Deputy Curgenvén: Thank you, sir, and apologies, everyone, for the timing.

2910 I have had a look at it – the Report that is – and what is the Police Complaints Commission and what does it do? I do wonder if anyone here or anyone listening in, sir, can honestly say that they know. Let me ask another question. For those who have read the Commission's Report, are you or they any closer to understanding what it actually does? Because the Report is confusing. Out of 10 pages, just one page sets out the Commission's results. The remaining nine pages try to explain the relevant legislation. Virtually identical wording we see reproduced in every other report.

2915 To explain properly, we need to take a step back. It is standard practice in many jurisdictions for the police to investigate complaints made against themselves. This process includes criminal complaints against officers. Understandably, this creates public unease. Most developed countries have established bodies tasked with looking over the police's shoulder, and in Guernsey this role falls squarely on the shoulders of the Police Complaints Commission.

2920

But the Commission does not oversee every police complaint, for it does not have the legal authority to do so. In 2024, for example, there were 93 complaints made against Guernsey Police, yet the Commission, as shown on page 8 of the Report, was only permitted to oversee 39 of these. Of those 39, it supervised 12 investigations. In other words, sir, the Commission monitored just 13% of all police complaints. That is one in eight.

From the complaints it chose to oversee, it did not identify any issues. Not only this year, but in every year prior to. From its inception in 2011 to today, the Commission has never found fault with a police complaint investigation. Not once in 14 years. What really piqued my interest was a short note on page 10 of the Report, which mentions the Commission met with the Committee for Home Affairs in April 2024, and I quote: 'To consider amendments to regulations.'

Let us not forget the Commission's primary purpose. We will talk about appeals in a minute. The Commission's main job is to make sure police officers follow the law when investigating themselves. It may come as a surprise to learn that in 2023, the Isle of Man Constabulary, while carrying out investigations into local officers, accidentally stumbled upon an uncomfortable truth. Guernsey Police had been rejecting complaints without conducting the investigations required by law. Year after year, senior police leadership had been getting it wrong. The Commission only noticed, quite by accident, when it sought out formal legal advice 12 years following its inception.

Worse, even after external advice, I understand the practice continued without objection from the Commission until the previous Committee for Home Affairs amended the Law in August 2022 to legalise this practice. If the Commission's core responsibility is to make sure police investigate themselves lawfully, why did it not tell us when officers failed to do so? This is not a slight on the current Committee for Home Affairs.

When I met with Deputy Leadbeater last week, he was as shocked, as many will be, hearing this now. But surprise is not a remedy; transparency is. The Commission also handles appeals from complainants unhappy with police complaint outcomes. But in the 14 years it has been up and running, the Commission has never upheld an appeal on the basis it disagrees with the police. Unsurprisingly then, it has been criticised for acting as a rubber stamp.

Even had the Commission wanted to help complainants, it would have been unable to. For its powers are limited to observation only; it cannot change the outcome of a police decision. It is difficult therefore to see how the Commission is fulfilling its stated purpose, shown on page 4, of enhancing public trust and confidence in both the police force and the complaint system. Yet any suggestion of replacing the Commission with an independent, impartial body that has the power not just to oversee complaints, but to investigate them too, is met with the same old, 'We cannot afford it.'

Let me now turn this question around and ask you this: what is the cost of not having a police watchdog? £400,000, maybe more. That is how much it reportedly cost in legal fees alone in 2023 and 2024. We can only guess how much the out-of-court settlement cost to persuade the Director of the GFSC's enforcement decision to withdraw his judicial review over the Commission's refusal to uphold his police complaint. But, sir, more importantly, we must not forget the human cost. Most police complainants are not vexatious. They are our friends, our neighbours, our colleagues, members of our small community.

Take Paul. Many of you know his story. Paul says he was punched, choked, unconscious and arrested for a crime he did not commit. He reports of being mistreated by police officers. Paul tried to complain. The Commission declined to help him. For years, Paul could not pass the place of his assault without suffering from panic attacks. Eventually, he and his family stopped going into town. He stopped working. He could not leave the house. His mental and physical health took a turn for the worst. Sir, this is a man who kept his phone by his bed for 18 years to answer law enforcement at midnight, two o'clock in the morning, 4 a.m., because when the police or customs needed a door fixed or a window boarded, no matter the time or the inconvenience, he went. Paul does not do this anymore. His family's company used to provide their services to certain Deputies, police officers, and so on. He does not anymore. The loss of trust has a face, a family, and a cost.

A functioning independent watchdog could have prevented this. It could also have reduced costly legal disputes and helped restore public faith in the system. Last month, I sat with the Head of Law Enforcement and a domestic abuse survivor who had been let down by both police and the Commission. Although it was not his fault, do you know what the Head of Law Enforcement said, 'I am sorry.' Yesterday, I was sat in the same office with a rape survivor failed by both the police and the Commission. Although it was not his fault, the Head of Law Enforcement said, 'I am sorry.'

Sir, I have enormous respect for anyone who would admit when they are wrong. For people in positions of power, there is a general feeling that saying we got it wrong can feel like the ultimate sin. Too often, it is easier to shelter behind legal counsel and miss tens of millions of pounds of public money, as if admitting an error is more dangerous than repeating it. Yet there is nothing more dangerous, I say, than a culture that never says we were wrong, backed by a system that refuses to put things right.

This is not an attack on individuals. Certainly not on the many officers who serve with integrity. But remember, a strong, independent complaint system protects them too, by distinguishing honest error from misconduct, by fixing what is fixable, and by proving where the police got it right. This is, however, an acknowledgement that the pace of reform has been unacceptably slow, and that the reforms put in motion by the prior Committee are simply not good enough.

Sir, for us as politicians, we have come to a crossroads. Before us lays a choice. We can continue tweaking a system that is fundamentally flawed, hoping patches and plasters will do. Or we can commit to building something better from the ground up, a system that reflects today's standards of accountability, transparency, and fairness. We can keep explaining the law for nine pages and reporting the results in one.

Or we can begin to rebuild trust: for Paul, for the survivors, for the thousands of others, and for the officers across the States who want to work in a system the public believes in. For an Island that trades on being safe, fair, and accountable. This is not about blame. It is about leadership. It is about recognising that a healthy and functional institution or institutions require scrutiny, reflection and, when necessary, reform.

As Ralph Waldo Emerson once said, we aim above the mark to hit the mark. So let us aim higher.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Just to give me a sense of how many people want to speak in debate, would you stand in your places if you wish to speak. I think we will adjourn until 9.30 tomorrow.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.34 p.m