



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Thursday, 4th September 2025

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

Volume 14, No. 29

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

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

Law Officers

M. M. E. Pullum, K.C. (H.M. Procureur)
R. M. Titterington, K.C. (H.M. Comptroller)

People's Deputies

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

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 A. K. Cameron ;
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	5
Billet d'État XIX	5
Appendix Report	5
Guernsey Police Complaints Commission – 2024 Annual Report – Debate continued – Report noted.....	5
7. Schedule for Future States' Business – Proposition carried as amended	14
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 10.21 a.m.</i>	<i>18</i>

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States' of Deliberation

The States' met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The States' Greffier

EVOCATION

Billet d'État XIX

APPENDIX REPORT

COMMITTEE FOR HOME AFFAIRS

Guernsey Police Complaints Commission – 2024 Annual Report – Debate continued – Report noted

The States' Greffier: Committee for Home Affairs, Police Complaints Commission 2024 Annual Report, continuation of the debate.

10 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Bury.

15 **Deputy Bury:** It was a very brief question. I probably could have asked it yesterday evening, but it was really referring back to a speech that Deputy Leadbeater made last term which was, I think, actually a real stormer of a speech, which is why it stuck in my mind, but it did relate to police complaints. Through the course of that speech Deputy Leadbeater furnished us with lots of data and facts around the rate of complaints that our force receive. Now that he is the President of that Committee I wondered if he has had time to think/discuss with his Committee about how he intends to approach that issue this term.

20 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Camp.

Deputy Camp: Thank you, sir.

25 I just wanted to say Home Affairs should be challenged to bring the police complaints process up to a level where public trust and confidence is engendered by design and not left up to chance. This is not about pointing out mistakes and how we have got to where we are or holding up particular grievances, but ensuring that we do take on the criticisms of the system and learn from them, and critically to affirm that where we are going is towards an arm's-length process that stands

up to scrutiny and which critically ensures that all stakeholders are properly represented. I would like to ask the President of Home Affairs what the intentions are to arrive at that place.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I could talk all day about police complaints, but I am sure people do not want to.

One of the things that certainly we are aware of is that although it is not particularly a priority for me – although I am interested in it now sitting on Home Affairs – what one is aware of is that it is a priority for many of the public, for many people who voted in the election, and I think for many people in the media. So we do have to raise our game collectively on this.

I have actually read not only this report, but last year's report. I looked at it again yesterday, and it is interesting. There has been a slight change in format. but the reports are relatively short. To me, they are written in a relatively technical, administrative language. Perhaps by their very nature, they are discreet and confidential on the nature of complaints that were received, because it would not be helpful if you had anecdotal evidence, especially about cases that were either still ongoing or had been resolved.

But I do think, as a Committee, we are not – as I understand it, the Home Committee is not responsible for this report, but it is part of our oversight. I think, hopefully, we can collectively work, as Deputy Leadbeater already is doing, in ensuring that everything is as positive and transparent as it can be. Because, as the report in 2023 said, it is only right in a democratic society like ours that members of the public are able to make complaints against the police easily.

Now, in last year's report, they wrote:

The role of the Police Complaints Commission in Guernsey is different from the Independent Office for Police Complaints (IOPC).

I would add to that that we have elected, hopefully, democratic politicians on Home. What we do not have is the Ministry of Justice, and we do not have elected police commissioners for counties. I do not quite know how they work. I would like to know more. But it is not something Guernsey does. Whether there would be merit in a Guernsey equivalent or not is a debate for another day. But it says here:

The role of the Police Complaints Commission in Guernsey is different from the Independent Office for Police Complaints (IOPC) who oversee the police complaints system in England and Wales and are set up ... Given that there is a different statutory process in place, it would be misleading to report on and compare different jurisdictions' data on complaints. We have therefore attempted in this report to provide a more robust commentary ...

Deputy Bury has made an interesting and trenchant point about the number of complaints. The good news is it has dropped from 46 two years ago to 39. But I suppose to my lay knowledge, which is not very great, 39 still seems quite a lot because unfortunately, us Deputies sometimes get ...

Deputy Curgenvén: Point of correction.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Curgenvén.

Deputy Curgenvén: I am sorry, sir, thank you, sir. Sorry, Deputy Gollop, to interrupt.

That was not the total amount of police complaints received, it was the total amount of police complaints that the Police Complaints Commission were legally allowed to oversee. I think the total amount of police complaints, and please I may get this wrong, was 93 in 2024, and it was possibly 130 or 140 in 2023. I think we are the only police force in Great Britain and the Crown Dependencies to have ever received more complaints than serving officers. We have actually done that three times,

whereas no other entity of the data I checked – sorry, no other police force over about 46 jurisdictions has ever done that. We have actually done it thrice.

Thank you, sir.

80 **Deputy Gollop:** They are interesting points that I think we all as Members, particularly us on Home, need to drill down on and clarify in the fullness of time, because we have hopefully a robust system – well, it is – code of complaints for, say, States' Members. I think I have had two in my time, one of which did not go anywhere.

85 But I think when you think there are 40 of us here, the number of complaints generally is not nearly as large as that, I hope. What we do not know when we hear the word "complaint", and the report does go into this – and the 2024 report actually – is whether that complaint is about a perception at least, if not the actuality, of poor quality of service or process, or whether it was based upon an internal complaint or whether it was a complaint on a comparatively minor issue, or whether it was more significant than that. We also do not know if the same person is making more
90 than one complaint, which may or may not be justified.

95 But I think the thrust of what Deputy Curgenvin was saying was there was perhaps, in the past, a filtering process, as there is for other forms of complaint – administrative review that the Chairman, Deputy Inder, chairs – and if you get a filtering, obviously some get taken out. It is up to us not to micromanage or get in the weeds of those, but to see whether perhaps the legislation and the guidelines underpinning the process are completely robust.

100 The process registering and managing complaints, it says on page 5 of the report we are discussing now, that they look at the nature of the complaint, actions taken to address the complaint, any formal measures imposed, and this comes up several times in the report, lessons learned. Lessons identified for the officers involved or the organisation as a whole. That is an outcome.

105 The consumer, the client, the complainant might not know what the outcome of that is, but we hope to understand, especially with the new management in the police, that there is appropriate behaviour being taken.

110 What this report is not too clear on is how many disciplinary hearings have occurred. The previous report refers to a criminal sanction where an officer did pervert the course of justice. But that was not a complaint, it was a criminal case, but makes the observation that such things are extremely rare, and we do have a lot of faith in the professionalism of our forces.

115 We had in 2024 39 complaints compared to 46 in 2023, of which 12 were supervised investigations compared to 19. Three were satisfied and 12 were satisfied in 2023. I do not quite know what "satisfied" means in this context, but presumably resolved. Another 10 are ongoing. Some – not this year, but two in the previous year – were not pursued.

120 But it makes the point that three out of the remaining 17 complaints about the conduct of officers, which were not considered to amount to misconduct or gross misconduct, were dealt with by informal resolution. Of the remaining 14 complaints, these appeals were made outside the assessment. There was one complaint against a senior officer, which is a slightly different process.

125 The complainants may have raised one or more issues. Twelve were subject to supervised investigations, of which three were concluded with satisfied suggestions, 10 are ongoing. They concluded supervision, including referral last year. One of the matters was not pursued, and another, which was not pursued at the time, is being re-investigated. We see that in France sometimes, actually, that we do have a second look at things, and no appeals.

130 So some of the complaints, as I have said, are filtered because they may not have taken place or it is repetition. Others might refer to perhaps dissatisfaction in the perception of the service user of how their complaint was dealt, but did not pass the threshold to demand further action or informal resolution or supervised investigations.

135 Clearly, there are uncertainties in the report that I think probably some Members or all of us would like to get to know more about. I can give an undertaking – I think we all could – that this

term Home will be very much on top of ensuring that there is as much transparency, customer satisfaction, and progress made.

130 We do have a new team in place, we do have a new structure perhaps, and we need to start things on a good footing. Not only explore how the report and how the process could be made more understandable, but ensure that any bottleneck in the system is resolved, and that in the future there are less complaints, because everybody is happier with the standard of service that they are getting, and any misunderstandings are resolved.

135 Also, of course, sometimes I believe that everybody, States' Members, civil servants, officers, lawyers, whatever, we could all do sometimes with induction and in-service training, and that training might be on people on spectrums, with mental health issues, perhaps who are suffering from addictive issues. I think if we ensure that everybody is fully trained and included in that, we will also see further progress on this.

140 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Vermeulen.

Deputy Vermeulen: Thank you, sir.

I have seen over the last five years, each year sitting on the Home, the police complaints report and they are taken very seriously, I can assure Members. Even though there is currently a review
145 going on, Members must be assured that at the moment the police are taking those very seriously. They are considered and investigated where necessary.

It is accepted that all governments should have a process to deal with police complaints, and in Guernsey people can complain about anything. Since its inception, the police complaints has not been reviewed. We are currently reviewing it, but we do take those complaints extremely seriously
150 and indeed people have lost their jobs over certain complaints that have been made in the past.

We are lucky in Guernsey, it is a safe and secure place to live and work in. It is not like the UK or London where there are constant serious crimes and murders and knifings and terrorism and all the rest of it. So the nature of the complaints that we receive in Guernsey can be very different to the nature of the complaints that are given over in the UK and other places, which are far less safe to
155 live in.

That is what Home is doing; it is doing a review. It will be conducting discussions with all Members on that and interested parties – obviously the police – of how we can improve that system. Basically, we need to speed up the process by which we conduct those complaints and try and streamline it where we can, make it easy to navigate. If you look on the website to other places in
160 the world, it is very easy to navigate a complaint online and there is full guidance given, so we can improve in many ways.

But yes, let us take this seriously. Let us remember that we have always taken police complaints very seriously, and we will try and improve the system where necessary.

Thank you, sir.

165 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Ozanne.

Deputy Ozanne: Thank you, sir.

I do welcome this review. As I mentioned in a speech a couple of weeks ago, there is 30% of Island, according to Island Global Research, who see crime, law and order and immigration as important issues on the Island. But the Social Capital Report, or in fact actually I think it is the Island Global Research itself, showed that 48% of those in the lowest financial quarter are dissatisfied with the police, versus 16% in the upper financial quarter. So we have an access, or a perceived access, to a justice issue.
170

As I understand it, the police complaints system looks at the process of the complaints, but not the actual ruling itself. It is that that has caused so much, I think, inequality and concern and a perception on the Island that the rich can get justice while the poor get the law, to quote. I have
175

been trying to work out who that quote was. I think it was Oliver Goldsmith, but it might have been Henry Lloyd.

180 I hope when we look at and review the police complaints system we will look at how the system is perceived among Islanders and among all Islanders, and particularly those who sadly often find themselves having to be on the sharp end of the law, and ensuring that they have access or feel that they have had justice and not just for law.

Thank you.

185

The Bailiff: You have already spoken Deputy Curgenvin, so you cannot speak again, I am afraid. But Deputy St Pier can.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

190 I just thought I would rise to make a few comments about the nature of this particular debate. Of course, the Proposition for a debate in relation to an Appendix Report is merely to note it, which for Members' benefit, of course, is neither a negative or an affirmative Proposition. It is neutral.

I think it is a reasonable question to ask of, well, what is the point? Why are we debating it? What does it add? This is certainly the second, possibly the third time this Annual Report has been
195 debated in this Assembly in the last three or four years, and certainly the last occasion was on a motion moved by myself and Deputy Leadbeater.

I think it is really to make the point that actually the issues that were raised then, I think were acknowledged by the Committee at the time, led by the former Deputy Prow, and of course Deputy Vermeulen, when he was the Vice-President of the Committee. The Committee did
200 acknowledge some of the challenges that existed then, and that there was a need for a review, which I am delighted that the new Committee, under Deputy Leadbeater, have decided to pick up and progress at some pace. Indeed when he responds to the debate, I think it would be useful for Deputy Leadbeater to give an indication to the best of his ability of the anticipated timeline for that work.

205 It is also an opportunity, sir, to thank Deputy Leadbeater for engaging with myself and Deputy Curgenvin in relation to the terms of reference, as the President said when he opened debate. His offer to extend that to other Members of the Assembly, I think, is most welcome. Again, I publicly reaffirm what I said when I met last week, that certainly I stand ready to assist the Committee in any way that would be of use as the review progresses.

210 The main reason in rising, sir, is really just to emphasise the value sometimes of these debates which can, in isolation, seem to be, as I said, a pointless debate in the context of a neutral Proposition, but to the extent that they provide an opportunity to shine a light on some issues and enable them to be moved on in a considered and responsible way. I think they are to be welcomed. So I am grateful again that the Committee have engaged with this particular debate this year. I
215 would certainly hope that by the time the report comes back next year, there will be significant progress.

But my one question really for the President, and it was a question I asked in private, and I know it is challenging with other projects and resource constraints, but I think the interest around this from the community that has been reflected in this debate does suggest that there is a need that it
220 is concluded as expeditiously as is possible, because clearly any changes will themselves probably require some changes to legislation and some time to bed in. There is a lead time to change as well, which needs to be reflected.

But I am grateful for the opportunity to raise these issues today, sir, thank you.

225

The Bailiff: Deputy Matthews.

Deputy Matthews: Thank you, sir.

I will not be long. I do not have any prepared comments on this, but it was really just to say to – I am sure Deputy Leadbeater will recognise from his time on the Committee *for* Health & Social

230 Care that these reports that come through about complaints that are very highly summarised, that really only give lists of numbers and without any detail into the complaint, really provide very little detail to elected members of a Committee, or in this case to the States, about what really lies behind those numbers.

235 To some extent, it will seem a little bit like a box-ticking exercise to say that this summary has been provided to Members and we have had a look at it. If you were somebody who was making a complaint, you might have been assured, well, this process is being overseen by the elected Members, by the Committee and by the States, when in reality these lists which just have a list of numbers in them does not really mean very much to us. There is very little that we can do to dig into those just from this information.

240 My question really to Deputy Leadbeater was around, at the bottom of this report it talks about the membership of the Police Complaints Panel and that those individuals are appointed by the States on the recommendation of the Committee for Home Affairs. Is the President satisfied that process of selecting and appointing, recommending individuals to that panel, is robust and ensures independence for those Members who are able to at least have some more insight as to the process of the complaints, as they have better access to the complaints than we do, looking at this summarised information?

Thank you, sir.

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

250 **Deputy Leadbeater:** Thank you, sir; and I thank Members for their contributions, it has been really helpful.

I am not going to touch on absolutely everything that everyone said, I am going to summarise a little bit. I will try and catch some of the points and then I will just go back and do what I was going to do, which is just talk about the review that we intend because I think that is the important thing because the Commission's report is the Commission's report and the contents within it are owned by the Commission and not by the Committee. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) So something that I cannot really talk about.

260 Deputy Matthews, I totally agree. Sometimes I remember, both Deputy Matthews and myself – Deputy St Pier, Deputy Bury will obviously remember – when we had papers come to us with complaints on HSC, it was really difficult to try and understand exactly what they were. Some of the commentary in there did not really make much sense, so maybe there is an issue across the way that we report that as a Government; I am not quite sure. But possibly that is something that could be looked into in a broader piece.

265 Deputy St Pier, I thank him once again. It is great to have Deputy St Pier on board and he is a highly experienced individual and we will look to him for guidance if we need to during this process. It is good that Deputy St Pier is our link towards P&R, so we will try and keep him as close to this process as possible so we can continue the benefit of this guidance.

270 The timeline he speaks about is the one thing that I cannot commit to at this point today, unfortunately, but we are working on that and I will ensure that I will get an answer on the timeline to Deputy St Pier and the wider Assembly as soon as practically possible.

275 Deputy Ozanne talks about the Commission can only note on the process and not the actual outcome of the – they can note if they are satisfied with it but I totally take all this on board. What we are teasing out here is all the issues that are wrong with the regime as it is, and we are capturing all of that and we are looking to amend that going forward. This is all taken on board.

Deputy Vermeulen, thank you very much for pointing out the difference between the nature of complaints that we get in Guernsey compared to the nature of complaints that some jurisdictions receive, certainly some parts of the UK. It is difficult to compare like for like even though I stood in this Assembly last year and did exactly that. But it is difficult when you do look into it.

280 Deputy Gollop, thanks for his contribution and sharing with everybody how he sees and how he reads the report and how he sees things and talked about the filter, etc., and some people think it

is a good thing, some people think it is a bad thing. The discussions I have had with the head of Professional Standards and Counter-Corruption tells me that it is – I think the benefit today is that there is much more body-worn camera footage and stuff like that available initially to have a proper snapshot straightaway of what the complaint is, and if there is body-worn camera evidence that says that it is probably vexatious that is when the filter comes into play.

I am just trying to let Members know exactly how that works and that is how it was put across to me by our new head of Professional Standards and Counter-Corruption that has been brought in actually for this work. We have people right at the top of their game that are helping little old Guernsey in our efforts to improve the situation.

Deputy Camp, I fully agree we need a proper root-and-branch review, which is what we are committing to now. It is going to be a completely comprehensive, fundamental review of everything, including the makeup of the Commission, how the Commission is selected, etc. There is nothing that is off the table for this review. Nothing whatsoever.

Deputy Bury, how to approach the number of complaints and stiffing up our professional standards, I suppose. We have got new guys in at the top of the tree. They bring different techniques and methods. I cannot really comment if there was some sort of culture that developed within the organisation or not. I have no idea whatsoever. But we are committed to seeing those numbers go the other way and at this point we have had none. They have completely tailed off. I do not know if someone has been busy but they have completely tailed off. *(Laughter)*

I will go on to Deputy Curgenvin now because there were quite a few points that I would like to cover. He asked what is the Commission, what they do and suggests the Annual Report is confusing and does not aid this understanding but I am not sure I fully agree. Section 1 of the report clearly sets out the role and function of the Commission and its statutory responsibilities, and as a Committee we do value the role of the Commission and we are grateful for the responsibilities that they discharge even though they have not got the powers that we would like them to have.

However, it is acknowledged by both the Commission and the Committee that there are limitations to their statutory role, which is one of the aspects that the review will consider. I would absolutely agree though that the current statute regime is complex and should be reviewed to ensure the process itself does not hinder timely and proportionate outcomes, ensuring that every level of complaint is dealt with appropriately.

He states that the Commission do not oversee every complaint nor does it have the statutory ability to do so, and that is correct. Yes, he is right. The Commission provides independent oversight of investigations, reviews complaint handling and handles appeals. It does not conduct investigations itself but it can direct further action, if necessary. However, as the Commission report notes, complaints must be recorded in official registers which the Commission inspects regularly to ensure accountability and transparency.

The role of the Commission is one of the aspects of the review, how and should their role and responsibilities evolve. The Committee has agreed that the definition of a complaint should be broadened to encompass not only matters of conduct, which the Commission is currently limited to considering, but also to give direction and control and service delivery. This will undoubtedly improve confidence in the process.

To Deputy Curgenvin's point that the Commission have not identified any issues, but this is correct. Quoting from the Annual Report:

Three appeals were made against the assessments made by the appropriate authority, under regulation 56, with one upheld in part. The two appeals not upheld identified learning for the organisation. One appeal outstanding from 2023 was concluded. The appeal was upheld in part and a direction given to the appropriate authority to provide further information about the assessment.

So to suggest that no appeal has ever been successful is not fully accurate. I am advised that since the inception of the Law in 2011 there have been a total of 31 appeals, six have been upheld at least in part with various directions given to the appropriate authority and that information has been provided by the Commission.

I think what Deputy Curgenvén may be alluding to is the fact that the Commission have not used their powers as set out in sections 10 and 11 of the Law, which allows it to direct disciplinary proceedings. I do not agree with the suggestion that this means that the regime is fundamentally flawed; this is an ultimate safety net. The ability for the Commission to convene a complaints tribunal independent of the Chief of Police or the Committee, it would be argued that if this position provision were used it was because there has been a fundamental breakdown in the process. The Committee has acknowledged the insightful feedback provided by Deputy St Pier, when I met with him and Deputy Curgenvén, that the Commission could be seen as taking a passive role in the complaints process, considering what is submitted to it, and this is something that we will look to address in the course of the review.

Deputy Curgenvén also made some suggestions about how the Committee may have historically discharged its responsibilities and suggested I was shocked by some of the revelations. Some of what Deputy Curgenvén says does absolutely raise concern, however I do not necessarily agree with all of the comments and conclusions and would respectfully suggest that some of these acetations, while may be said in good faith, are incorrect.

I do not believe it is appropriate for me to respond to speculative comments, the Committee do have confidence in how the Commission discharged their statutory responsibilities. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I also agree, as I believe the Commission do, that the role of the Commission can and should evolve as part of the review and ensure that it does improve confidence in the complaints process and the police more generally.

Deputy Curgenvén would like to see a wholly independent commission with the ability to investigate complaints. I have already given a commitment to Deputy Curgenvén, which I also give to this Assembly, that we will look at best practice and other jurisdictions and consider the roles and responsibilities of all involved in the complaints process to ensure that accountability, transparency and fairness – Deputy Curgenvén’s words – are to be seen.

It must be accepted, as pointed out by Deputy Vermeulen, that we do not have the volume and complexity of complaints that are seen in the UK.

There are some points which Deputy Curgenvén and I do absolutely agree on, and that is that most complaints are not vexatious. I am not sure who was suggesting that in the first place, but not all complaints are. Most complaints are not vexatious whatsoever.

The pace of the review and the legislation has been unacceptably low, and we must admit that. This is why the Committee has prioritised this piece of work. We are prioritising the work in the Justice Framework, but this is a standout piece within that because of the necessity to improve the service that we are offering.

I would like to offer assurance to Deputy Curgenvén that the Committee has no intention to just tweak the regime, rather it has committed to a fundamental review, as I have pointed out to Deputy Camp.

What I will do now is just talk about the scope of the review. The review will consider the operation and effectiveness of the current statutory complaints and disciplinary regime, with the intended outcome being a regime which is service-user focused, using an approach which is understood by all parties and enables opportunity to learn lessons for the future, which is simple, allowing the complainant to navigate the process and understand how their complaint is being processed, which is fair, both for the person making the complaint and the officer subject to that complaint, with comparative rights to information and of appeal. It is clear and accountable, incorporating leadership and reporting mechanisms, ensuring that the right people are making the right decisions based upon the right information. It is proportionate, enabling complaints to be dealt with as speedily, informally and cost-effectively as possible, considering the nature of the complaint.

The outcomes of the review will be used to inform recommendations to this Assembly for changes to the Statutory Complaints Framework, which supports the principles of modern policing and ensures that all stakeholders have confidence in the police complaints and disciplinary process.

The review will review the original objectives, which led to the implementation of the Police Complaints Law. It will undertake an assessment on bench-marking of the complaints regime in comparison jurisdictions, including but not limited to Jersey, the Isle of Man, England and Wales. It will review the processes by which complaints and conduct matters are dealt within the Bailiwick law enforcement, including matters which relate to officers' conduct, direction and control and standards of care.

It will consider the roles and responsibilities of those individuals and bodies identified in the statutory complaints process, including the appropriate authority, the investigating officer and the Police Complaints Commission. It will seek representations from all stakeholders, including but not limited to the Guernsey Police Association and the Senior Officer Staff Association and those with lived experience.

It will undertake a review of the standards of professional behaviour and the role that they have in determining the complaint handling, and it will deliver a report and recommendations which will promote public, political and officer competence in the police complaints regime.

This is our commitment as a Committee to this Assembly. This is what we want to achieve but I do not think we can do it without your assistance because everybody has an idea – we have heard a few bits and pieces of the stuff. Coming in and talking to Deputy Niles and Deputy Ozanne this morning, they are new to this; that is probably the first time they have read this report, and had a couple of questions. Deputy Niles has decided not to rise to speak because we had a little conversation and his questions were answered. But because there are a lot of people new to this we want to have your input, we want to be able to work together, we want everyone to own this piece of work. So if there is any input that you can give us, any feedback, any help you can give us, if you want to meet with me and my Committee and our officers please feel free. We want to receive any feedback that we can.

So, sir, there is nothing really much for me to say but to thank everybody for their input and to give them the assurance that this is a massive priority for the Committee and we will do our utmost to bring a regime which is proportionate, fair, transparent and all the other words that have been used.

Thank you very much.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, there is a single Proposition, whether you are minded to take note of the report. I will ask 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	Curgenven, Rob	None	Blin, Chris
Bury, Tina				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, Williams

420 **The Bailiff:** In respect of that Proposition, there voted in favour 33 Members, no Member voted against, 1 Member abstained, 6 Members are absent at the vote and therefore I would declare that Proposition duly carried.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

7. Schedule for Future States' Business – Proposition carried as amended

Article 7.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the attached Schedule for Future States' Business, which sets out items for consideration at the Ordinary States Meeting on 24th September 2025, they are of the opinion to approve the Schedule.

425

The States' Greffier: Article 7. The Policy & Resources Committee's – Schedule for future States' business.

430 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, an amendment has been submitted. That amendment is dealt with in accordance with Rule 3, paragraph 18, which says that speeches are only permitted by the proposer of the amendment, that is Deputy de Sausmarez, the President of the Committee concerned. *(Interjection)* No, it is not. That means that I will invite, if they want to, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, Deputy Bury and Deputy Montague to speak on it because each of their Committees have an item on the Schedule for future States' business, but nobody else is entitled to speak. But the other challenge is you are restricted to a maximum of two minutes each.

435

Deputy de Sausmarez.

[Amendment 1.](#)

To delete "on 24th September 2025" and insert immediately before "Ordinary States Meeting" the word "next" and to insert two additional propositions as follow:

"2. To agree that, notwithstanding the provisions of Rules 1 and 6 of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees, the meeting of the States scheduled to begin on 24th September 2025 should commence at 9:30am on 25th September 2025 and should adjourn until the next scheduled date of a Meeting if it falls to be adjourned on Friday 26th September 2025.

3. To amend the Schedule to the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees to reflect the change set out in Proposition 2."

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

440 Yes, the effect of this amendment is to delay the start of the States' meeting to Thursday. Originally it is scheduled to start on Wednesday and, if this amendment is not successful, it will continue on Wednesday, the 24th. However P&R is requesting that we start on Thursday, the 26th.

445 Anyone who has looked at the agenda will note that it is light so in fact we are not losing a day, we are in fact gaining a day because everyone should have booked out all three days in their diaries, and what it means is it guarantees that we will not be in the States on the Wednesday so people can use that extra day as they see fit. But I think it is very unlikely that we would need all of the days allocated for this particular meeting.

450 This situation is indeed unprecedented and we are trying to find a pragmatic response. The reason we have put in this amendment is so that I and Deputy Falla can be at the meeting at which an election for the vacant position on P&R is going to be held. What I have not given Members – Members have had advance detail of all of that, the Assembly voted to defer the election to the next meeting in the knowledge that we were going to be placing this request.

455 What I have not done is given Members any details of why we are going to be away. It is a summit between the Channel Islands and neighbouring regions of France, and it is essential for several reasons. I say this as someone who has never missed so much as a vote in a States' meeting before, and this is how important it is.

460 We are there to renew and sign an MOU with those neighbouring regions, Normandy and La Manche, but it is the discussions that will also take place at that summit which are essential. They relate to fisheries, energy policy, including offshore wind, trade and sea links, and that kind of thing. I would stress that being in the very early days of the Brittany Ferries contract and needing to strengthen and consolidate some of those commercial agreements, it is essential that we have senior political representation at that summit in order to shore that up.

The Bailiff: Your two minutes are up, I am afraid, Deputy de Sausmarez.

465 I am going to turn to the Presidents of those Committees that have business on the Schedule for future States' business. First, let me formally get it seconded by Deputy St Pier. Do you formally second the amendment?

Deputy St Pier: I do, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.

So the first one is the President of the Committee *for* Economic Development, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, if you wish to say anything.

475 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Sir, I am quite concerned about this motion actually for the reasons that Deputy de Sausmarez started explaining. I was invited to attend this very specific summit, but for the reasons that we have got the States' meeting, which the States' meeting are scheduled in advance for the whole of this political term, with my presidential statement due on the day, I could not attend, so we made alternative arrangements. We will have many other cases where Members
480 are not able to attend the Assembly, and I think it is very bad practice that we are effectively making alternative arrangements just because of the absences of a couple of people.

485 As a Committee, and we work as a Committee of five, we have made alternative arrangements so someone else could be present at that summit. I think alternative to the Committee as a Committee of five, they could make arrangements where someone else is presenting the election on the day. I do think this is actually really bad precedent for the future. I would not be inclined to support this motion. I think it sets really the wrong message.

490 Early in this political term Members did not support the motion from Deputy Inder to amend the Rules to allow Q&A for the election of the P&R members, however now we are changing the way Rules of Procedure are working effectively in terms of the schedule. I really think it is very bad practice.

The Bailiff: Next, Deputy Bury.

Deputy Bury: Thank you, sir.

I was inclined to stick more to my Committee's viewpoint, but I will say a little bit more based on what Deputy Kazantseva-Miller has just said. From my Committee viewpoint, the items we are bringing are very light and two days, I imagine, will be absolutely plenty, and we will probably have some to spare.

The situation is unprecedented. We all know that. What is happening right now is difficult. This summit that Deputy de Sausmarez is attending, I can imagine, is very important right now, because we have just lost the person who would usually attend those places. The fact that it clashes with the States' meeting, I understand. Usually, I would always support prioritising States' meetings over everything else. But I think in this set of circumstances, which are unprecedented, it is clearly very important that we have representation to start building relationships with other Members of our Assembly and our neighbouring jurisdictions.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Last, I will turn to the President of the Committee *for* Education, Support & Culture, Deputy Montague.

Deputy Montague: Thank you, sir.

As a result of yesterday's meeting, we do have a lot of homework to do before the next meeting. My Committee and I believe that the two days will be enough to complete that work, so we have nothing further to say.

The Bailiff: Now it is time to vote on amendment number 1 to the Schedule for future States' business proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez, seconded by Deputy St Pier, and I will ask the Greffier to open the voting please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 29, Contre 4, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 0, Absent 6

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

Rochester, Sally
 Rylatt, Tom
 Snowdon, Alexander
 St Pier, Gavin
 Vermeulen, Simon
 Williams, Williams

525 **The Bailiff:** On the amendment numbered 1 to the Schedule for future States' business proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez and seconded by Deputy St Pier, there voted in favour 29 Members, 4 Members voted against, 1 Member abstained, 6 Members did not participate in the vote and therefore I will declare the amendment carried. There are no further amendments to the schedule.

530 Deputy de Sausmarez, is there anything you wish to say about the schedule?

Deputy de Sausmarez: No thank you, sir. I think it has actually been covered more than it normally would have been.

535 **The Bailiff:** In that case I will ask the Greffier to open the voting on the schedule, which has now been amended, so that the meeting will start on 25th September at 9.30 a.m. and make those changes, Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

540

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

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Burford, Yvonne	Inder, Neil	None	None	Blin, Chris
Bury, Tina				Cameron, Andy
Camp, Haley				Collins, Garry
Curgenvin, Rob				Laine, Marc
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				Le Tocq, Jonathan
Dorrity, David				Strachan, Jennifer
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				
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				

545 **The Bailiff:** On the schedule as amended there voted in favour 33 Members, 1 Member voted against, no Member abstained, 6 Members were absent and therefore I will declare the schedule duly carried, which means you can have a day off on Wednesday.

 We will now close the meeting, please, Greffier.

The Assembly adjourned at 10.21 a.m.