



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 21st February 2025

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

Volume 14, No. 9

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

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

Law Officers

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

People's Deputies

S. E. Aldwell	A. Kazantseva-Miller
C. P. A. Blin	J. P. Le Tocq
A. H. Brouard	M. P. Leadbeater
Y. Burford	D. J. Mahoney
T. L. Bury	A. D. S. Matthews
A. Cameron	L. J. McKenna
D. de G. de Lisle	C. P. Meerveld
H. L. de Sausmarez	N. G. Moakes
A. C. Dudley-Owen	R. C. Murray
J. F. Dyke	V. S. Oliver
S. P. Fairclough	R. G. Prow
S. J. Falla	L. C. Queripel
P. T. R. Ferbrache	P. J. Roffey
A. Gabriel	H. J. R. Soulsby ^{MBE}
J. A. B. Gollop	G. A. St Pier
S. P. Haskins	S. P. J. Vermeulen
M. A. J. Helyar	

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

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

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

E. Gallienne, Esq. (Deputy Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

Deputy N. R. Inder and Deputy C. N. K. Parkinson (*indisposé*); Deputy A. W. Taylor (*relevé à 9h 44*);
Deputy C. J. Le Tissier (*relevé à 9h 46*); Deputy L. S. Trott ^{OBE} (*absent de l'île*)

Business transacted

Evocation	3113
Billet d'État V	3113
7. Independent States' Members Pay Review Panel – Final Report – Propositions 1, 2 (as amended) and 5-16 carried	3113
8. The Future of the Guernsey Dairy Industry – Debate commenced.....	3146
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.32 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.</i>	3155
8. The Future of the Guernsey Dairy Industry – Propositions carried	3156
9. Schedule for the States' Business – Proposition (as amended) carried.....	3169
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 3.39 p.m.</i>	3173

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.32 a.m.

THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*

PRAYERS

The States' Greffier

EVOCATION

Billet d'État V

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

7. Independent States' Members Pay Review Panel – Final Report – Propositions 1, 2 (as amended) and 5-16 carried

5 **The Greffier:** Article 7, Policy & Resources Committee – Independent States' Members Pay Review Panel – Final Report. Continuation of the debate.

The Bailiff: Well, Members of the States, good morning. We will turn to Amendment 1, proposed by Deputy Roffey, if he wishes to move that amendment.

[Amendment 1.](#)

To delete proposition 16 and substitute therefor: "16. To agree that the 15% pay in lieu of pensions should be continued, with 10% being consolidated into general remuneration and 5% paid into a Your Island Pension account, and to agree that Members may choose to opt out of such arrangement; in which case they shall receive 13% pay in lieu of pensions included as part of their remuneration which they may use to contribute to a personal pension scheme."

10 **Deputy Roffey:** Thank you, sir, I do.

Before turning to the specifics of this amendment, I want to make a brief comment about the whole idea of amending proposals from independent panels, or whether they should be treated as sacrosanct. I do not mind if a panel's proposals are to be regarded as untouchable, but then they should not come back before this Assembly.

15 We should just say that whatever the panel decides that will be implemented. As it happens, it would have cost the taxpayer rather more on this occasion than it will do, but that is a perfectly legitimate approach. But once you lay a set of proposals, Propositions, in front of a Parliament to debate then they have to be free to either agree, disagree or amend them because that is what Parliaments do with proposals that come before them. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

20 The second thing I would say is I think that this amendment is, actually, very much in line with the zeitgeist of the independent panel's report. They may not have seen the route to actually achieving it but their comments in it are, I think, very much aligns with what I am putting forward now.

25 So, I do fully expect some Members to react to this amendment by saying something along the lines of, how dare Roffey tell us what we should be doing with our own pay, and that is understandable in some ways, because the origins of part of our Deputies' pay may well have been forgotten by some and it is, I think, to the credit of the Independent Pay Review Panel, that they have reminded us of that recent history.

30 When the Deputies Contributory Occupational Pension Scheme closed, by the way a foolish decision in my opinion which sent out all of the wrong messages, States' Members were instead given a 15% uplift in their pay and that was done for a very specific reason. To allow and, indeed, encourage Members to spend that cash on their own private pension arrangements.

35 I genuinely do not know how many Members actually used it for that purpose and I can personally attest that it was not without difficulties if your States' pay was your only income, but that is exactly what they were getting the cash for, for that express purpose. I remember the arguments at the time of closing the Deputies Defined Benefit Scheme. It went something like this, the majority of employees in Guernsey not only do not have an occupational pension, but they do not even have access to one.

40 So, it was deemed to be sending out all of the wrong signals if Deputies did. Talk about looking at a problem through the wrong end of the telescope. Thankfully, this Assembly has taken action to ensure that, in future, every single employee in Guernsey will have access to an occupational pension scheme. Some may foolishly decide to opt out, thus losing their employers' contributions, but no employee will be denied that opportunity.

45 So, now I think the line about the States sending out the wrong message has actually swung to 180 degrees. Before it was, why should we have an occupational pension scheme available when most did not? Now it ought to be, why are we not auto enrolled in such a scheme when we insist that everybody else is? We are hardly, sir, leading by example here.

50 So, given all of that recent history that I have just referred to, I may be being too generous here by saying that two thirds of the 15% uplift, which was given to allow Members to make private pension arrangements, should now be consolidated in their general pay. Well, maybe I am, but there are two reasons for doing so.

55 The first is that psychologically, I think, that has already started to be assumed to be the case by many Members over the last few terms. But the second, and far more important reason, is because some Deputies may actually have been using that pay uplift for exactly the purpose it was intended for. They may have taken out a RAP or some such private pension arrangement. So, by leaving two thirds of the original uplift in their pockets, they can continue to fund that provision without any material downturn in their disposable income.

60 Of course, they could retain 13% if they decided they did not need a YIP on top of their existing arrangement or, alternatively, they could use their YIP account to supplement their existing provision and thereby lose absolutely nothing. Others may ask if 5% is enough to fit into a YIP in order to create a meaningful pension pot. Well, of course it is only a minimum. It is simply the amount that the Treasury would pay in every month. If a Deputy had no other private provision, then they would be very free to contribute more in additional contributions, indeed, I think it would be very wise.

65 I suppose one aspect of my proposal which has created the most pushback is the perceived loss of 2% of gross remuneration if you choose to opt out. Well, I would spin that the other way round. We are being given a 15% pay uplift for the express purpose of funding a pension for ourselves and if we decide not to do so we are still being allowed to keep nearly all of it, 13%, with no strings attached. How uber generous is that?

70 I would use the same argument in relation to those Members of the States who are aged above 75, because they will no longer be able to contribute to a YIP account, so they would have no choice

but to opt out and I do not think there is any other pension scheme where you can continue to contribute past 75, but I stand to be corrected on that. Well, in many ways, if they are no longer able to fund a pension, they should cease to receive the 15% being given purely for the purpose of funding a pension, but they will only actually lose 2% of that income. So, actually, they are being treated incredibly generously.

One Member suggested to me that the scheme fees might mean it was impossible to build up any meaningful pension pot over a four-year term, but that simply is not true. I ask Members to look at the YIP; the fees involved are incredibly low. That is exactly why I have suggested it as the auto enrolment option.

Another question which might be asked is, why should the 5% only be payable into a YIP rather than to any other qualifying scheme? Well, my first instinct was the latter, but the Treasury rightly told me not to be so silly and that would be far too complicated for them to administer and then I went away and thought about it and I realised that, actually, just about every Island employer usually has only one choice of a pension scheme as well and if their employees choose to opt out, either in favour of another type of pension provision or to have none at all, then they automatically lose their employer's contribution.

Now, in future, when the secondary pension legislation works its way through, that would mean losing a minimum of 3.5% of their earnings by opting out. By contrast, Deputies who do so will only sacrifice 2% of their pay. Again, very generous, but at least we would be starting to lead by example. It will not be what the case is now, which has very much become one of, do as I say and not as I do.

Sir, there is a reason why all Guernsey employees will, in future, be automatically enrolled in a qualifying pension scheme and that reason was very much the heart of the debate yesterday. The demographic challenges that this Island faces are massive. Staggeringly so and, therefore, we need everyone in our community to show self-reliance and start to provide more for their old age. But if we do not apply that equally to ourselves then telling others to do that will seem like weasel words. I hope that we vote for this amendment and then we will be saying to Islanders that we are all happy to be treated equally.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez, do you formally Second Amendment 1?

Deputy de Sausmarez: Yes, sir, I do.

The Bailiff: Deputy Taylor, is it your wish to be relevé?

Deputy Taylor: Yes please, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much. Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir.

When I first saw this amendment, I thought I really warm to this, I like this, it is pretty benign, I think that I can, almost, nod this through. But, actually, Deputy Roffey's introductory speech has cooled me significantly because I am absolutely sure that most people in this Assembly will have pension provision, savings provision, however they have chosen to do it for their old age and, I think, that Your Island Pension, the secondary pension scheme, is a really good idea, that is why I supported it once we got to that full debate.

But what I do not like is the moral side of this. I think the pragmatic side of it is absolutely right, I am happy, I will support this but I do not like, sir, being told that this is where we must lead by example when, actually, that could have come forward two years ago when this came to the Assembly with an easy enrolment scheme for Members.

That could, actually, have been put in there to say, we are going to make it easy for States' Members to set up a Your Island Pension account, I know that some of our colleagues do have it, it

has been something that I have been meaning to do. So, I am very happy to go along with this, but I do have my own pension pots as well aside of this. So, let us not be told off for not having done it, if it had been a moral imperative, it should have come forward in those initial proposals.

But whilst I will support it, I am far cooler –
I will give way to Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Just to make clear, I am not telling off any of my colleagues. (*Laughter*) I would not be so presumptuous and I would not be so brave. If it sounded like I was, then I apologise for the tone, but I do believe it is just a question of sending signals – I do not apologise for that – but I certainly am not criticising any of my colleagues. On this! (*Laughter*)

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Sir, I thank Deputy Roffey for that interjection and I hope that, maybe, it is the end of a week where a lot of us are nursing colds and feeling slightly fractious, but I take that. But yes, I will be supporting this and I, actually, as I said, just wish it had come forward right at the beginning of those proposals. But yes.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tissier, you seem to have made a remarkable recovery (*Laughter*) by attending. Do you wish to be relevé?

Deputy Le Tissier: Yes, sir. My appointment was a lot shorter than I thought, but I do wish to be relevé.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: But it is not, strictly speaking, an indisposé if a Member is going to be attending, but attending late. Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: I did not hear you, sir, thank you.

The Bailiff: Would you like me to say it again? Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you that is much clearer, sir! Thank you.
I, actually, think that the amendment is telling us off. I tend to agree with Deputy Dudley-Owen. I think the fact that if you do not do as encouraged then you actually will be paid less (*Interjection*) does exactly that. I will not be supporting this, you cannot have it both ways, we are either self-employed or we are not. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear!)

To say, well, we have to set an example and we insist on everybody else doing it; no we do not. We do not insist on all the self-employed doing it. So, if you want us to be employed, employ us (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and treat us as employed and we will have Social Security as if we are employed. We do not. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) So, no, this is a nonsense amendment and it should be thrown out as quickly as possible and we can move on.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Absolutely. Just building on top of Deputy St Pier's. In fact, I think it is a discriminatory amendment and knowing that it is coming from Employment & Social Security they are, effectively, discriminating against a class on a protected, not a protected characteristic, of Deputies, that we have to be treated as a special class. You have got class one contributions; class two and you have got a self-employed

175 There are clear provisions, in relation to secondary pensions, that I think self-employed are actually not in scope of secondary pensions, as I understand based on the information clarified to me by Deputy Bury. So, we have got to be treated as self-employed and one of the other discriminatory, I think, aspects of this is that for Deputies who have been using that 15% allocation to pay into pension provisions, what this amendment says is that you can no longer do that.

180 You have been doing all of that, you have been providing 15% of your salary into a pension provision, whatever that could be, but now you have got to stop doing that because you can only do two thirds of that amount and then the rest you have got to go and put into the YIP.

So, it is completely and utterly, I think, unacceptable unfortunately and we should –

185 **Deputy Roffey:** Point of correction.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Roffey.

190 **Deputy Roffey:** I am not saying you can only pay two thirds of that if you choose to opt out of the YIP, which you are free to do, you can carry on putting 13% of your pay into an alternative provision.

Deputy Burford: Can I test the Rule 26(1), please sir?

195 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Sir, I have not – *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: No, otherwise it would not have been a point of correction. Deputy Kazantseva-Miller to continue, please.

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

I think the point is that if you were making 15%, or the whole of your 15% available, now you have got to cut that to 13%. So it is another, effectively, cut onto the remuneration package that is being proposed in addition to the wider real term cuts being proposed by this policy letter. It is, I think, completely discriminatory and really should be thrown out as soon as possible.

205 **Several Members:** Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: All right. Can I invite those Members who wish to speak in debate on Amendment 1 to stand in their places. Is it still your wish, Deputy Burford, that I put the motion?

210 Well, the motion is that there has been no further debate other than hearing from those who are entitled to reply to the debate on this amendment, those in favour; those against?

Members voted Contre.

The Bailiff: I will declare that lost.

A Member: Can we have a recorded vote, please?

215 **The Bailiff:** Yes. There has been a request for a recorded vote, so I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on the motion pursuant to Rule 26(1).

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 14, Contre 21, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 0, Absent 3

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

The Bailiff: So, on the motion pursuant to Rule 26(1) proposed by Deputy Burford, there voted in favour, 14 Members, 21 Members voted against, 2 Members abstained, 3 Members were absent and that is why it was declared lost.

Deputy Le Tissier.

Deputy Le Tissier: Thank you, sir.

Now I am opposed to this amendment which, to me, seems to be ill thought-out and simply not practical for a significant portion of Deputies. I have corresponded with Deputy Roffey and I think we will have to agree to disagree. Pensions are arrangements to provide for an income in one's retirement years; that is obvious. Many people enter into these pension schemes at an early age and, when they retire, they get the benefit of their pot of money they have put in and it could be significant.

So, any pension advisor will tell you that pensions are long-term arrangements and I emphasise long-term. We do not need pension advice from Deputy Roffey and Deputy de Sausmarez. One could argue, slightly tongue in cheek, that they should be licensed by the GFSC before giving us advice. (*Interjection*)

But seriously we, Deputies, are only guaranteed a four-year term and if one is unsuccessful in the next election, or one chooses not to stand, in the absence of any other income it is possible, or probable, that the YIP pension would become frozen or paid up to be accessed at retirement age.

On the other hand, if that happens to a member of the public, they lose their job, the chances are they will get another job and they will continue paying. But such an option may not be possible for a single-term Deputy or Deputy that is, shall we say, age limited because all contributions to pensions have to stop at 75. So, it could be a minimum of four years even for the oldest person.,

Now if we look at the age profile of the States, not to put too fine a point on it, but a significant number of Members are at, beyond or approaching normal retirement age. They may already be drawing a pension, but some, yes, or I should say most then, will probably be contributing to their own private pension from their States' salary. These older Deputies, I think, do not need another tiny pension.

Incidentally, I checked; a Deputy on the minimum wage, although I accept it has changed, it is just ballpark figures, paying in for four years might expect £400 *per annum* by way of an annuity.

Of course, returns are not guaranteed they can go up as well as down. Sorry, that is an investment adviser's in-joke. So, it is hardly enough to retire to the south of France.

255 Ah, says Deputy Roffey, you can opt out. But for some unexplained reason, there is a gratuitous reduction of 2% in the Deputy's pay. Why? How did he pick 2%? There is only one way to look at that, it is trying to strong arm Deputies to do as this amendment insists. But at the same time the Deputy may be paying into his private pension, his or her private pension. This amendment has nothing to say about this and I think it is flawed.

260 Now, in the private sector, a person opting out of YIP does not, and I repeat does not, see a reduction in their take home pay and I choose my words carefully. (*Interjection*) That person may well have a private pension anyway and many employers will, upon request, pay their contribution to that person's private pension. But that is absent.

265 Now, I was able to obtain some information from the YIP trustees and they are very helpful people. This may be news to some – or not – but as a self-employed person setting up a pension on YIP there are additional charges not applicable to employed persons. So, I looked up the rules. If you start off with a pot of less than £30,000, such as starting a YIP now without putting any extra cash in, there is a joining fee of £300. It says that on the YIP application form for self-employed persons. So, if you start your YIP from zero you have to pay. Are many Members are going to start off their YIP with £30,000? Maybe they will find it down the back of their sofa.

270 But there is more and probably worse. Now I took the P&R proposals, and I accept it has changed slightly, an ordinary Deputy, not a President or on a Committee just a basic backbencher, would get £3,897.25 per month. This amendment would mandate 5% contribution. Now that is £194.86. Now Sovereign, the pension administrators, tell me, in an email, that the minimum monthly contribution by a self-employed person is £300 per month.

275 So, what Deputy Roffey and Deputy de Sausmarez are proposing just does not work. (**A Member:** It does.) So, you are putting in just under £200 and you have to find another £100, which you may already be using to put into your own private pension, just to put into the YIP. I do not think that works.

280 Now, YIP is very good, I supported it, but it is not really applicable to older self-employed persons, i.e. Deputies. As, I think, one of the other speakers said Deputies, they can have their own YIP if they want, nothing stopping them, but they will need to put in £300 per month, considerably more than 5%.

285 So, I am saying we do not need this amendment. It does not deal with the practical issues or is workable and, I think, has not been properly thought through. It is a knee-jerk amendment, virtue signalling in this febrile pre-election period. So, I would ask Members to please reject this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

290 **Deputy Gollop:** I like gesture politics and virtue signalling, that is the problem. To give a little bit of a history lesson, first of all, I will declare my own interest. I started in the States in 1997, opted for a pension, the scheme, of course, ended in 2012, I was offered a quick sell of it and it did not look a good move, but in later times I did transfer it to a well-known secondary pension provider when I had the opportunity to. So, I am no longer a pensioner of the States.

295 I sat on Social Security too and we were not only supportive of secondary pensions and YIP, but I remember a discussion in the Committee, at least once, when we considered it a good idea if States' Members could be brought into it, as a future thing. That refers back to a comment, I think, Deputy Haskins made.

300 Nevertheless, I am a little bit confused by all this and I will explain why, because one of the attractive features of the YIP scheme is that, from an employee's point of view, it may be slightly less jam today; Deputy Kazantseva-Miller made the point they would not get any less pay, but they would be making a contribution to it if they do not already have a pension. But the employer, and

it is going to go up and up, the point was made in the P&R report in a letter I read only the other day, that the secondary pension is an impact for employers who opt into it. It is compulsory to opt into it.

So, what is happening is the employer is having to contribute extra pay, in a way, for the long-term benefit of their employees. I must admit, I voted to get rid of the pensions in 2012, even though I was under pensionable age and still am. But I had my reasons to do it and I will explain what they were.

The first reason was we are a diverse bunch of colleagues, some of whom are independently affluent or have other interesting careers; some of us do not. The second point is we have diverse ages and some Members who come into the Chamber are above conventional pension age, so it seemed a curiosity.

I rethought about that and think that, actually, we should be offering an attractive and responsible package and so, to that extent, I agree with Deputy de Sausmarez and Deputy Roffey that we are, perhaps, being irresponsible. The other reason I voted against it was I was aware of some younger Members and, in a way myself, who wanted more cash rather than the money taken out and there were arguments going on that although in Deputy Dudley-Owen's framework people mostly put in to their pensions, States' Members of a certain age were not, because living on the States' income is relatively tight and if they, for the sake of argument, had expenses or rents or mortgages or children or whatever, they were, in a way, spending the money, a possibility raised in this amendment, that Members might, in fact, opt out of the YIP and make no pension provision.

Now, what this does is to try to get us to save for our older age and I certainly could do with enhancing the pension pot. I am a little bit confused about a few details. If you already have a provider on the Island that would qualify as a qualifying scheme, surely you could have the benefits of this without having the cost or bother of a separate YIP account?

The second is as we are deemed to be self-employed, as Deputy Le Tissier and others have raised, it appears to me no extra money is coming in. So, whereas an employee has the employer giving a generous additional contribution, all we get is what we get. None of us know how long our terms are because we can retire rather suddenly and I would disagree even with the point that somebody made that we have a four-year term. We can be expelled and lose even that; but we will not go into that one.

I think the problem is, I do not quite understand why it is 2% and 5% because, as Deputy Kazantseva-Miller said, that could result in a financial loss. On the other hand, if the States was an employer, and we are not an employer, was contributing it would actually increase the pay envelope for some and that would be a curious thing.

But two areas I would flag up are in the general policy letter, I do not think I will speak generally because we need to move further on, there is the parachute clause, which is in many other jurisdictions, which I support, but as I understand it that will not take effect until after, it is for the people in the next term and this is the same, rather than for any of us.

So, I think, we cannot prejudge who will get in, in June 2025 (*Interjection*) and they may well be younger people who will benefit more from this or people in different circumstances. So, I wish to make that point and the other point that we should make is, many members of the public believe that we are quite well remunerated, and maybe we are, but what they do not see is if you compare our pay with a finance sector employee or maybe even a public sector employee, that person is employed so is getting a contribution for their pension from the employer and has to through the States. We do not.

I would argue it is confusing even as to whether we are self-employed or not because we are self-employed in terms of Social Security so we pay to the Revenue Service a mark-up over what an employee would pay, but we pay ETI as if we are a States' employee and the whole picture is confusing and this amendment possibly adds to the confusion.

But I think, in principle, although it may well need to be tweaked, that we should support the principle of facilitating for the next generation of States' Members relative security and comfort for

their older age. Whether this has exactly the right figures or format, I doubt, but I will give it the benefit of the doubt.

The Bailiff: Deputy Haskins.

Deputy Haskins: Thank you, sir.

I think what Deputy Gollop is saying, is what many Members are thinking and it is what Deputy St Pier has said. We are either self-employed or we are employed. That is the crux of it. So, he believes, like I do, that we should be treated as if we are one or the other, not both. The only point that I think I would make, really, because I think this will be very short and I think Members here, it seems like it is going to be voted out.

The point that I would make is that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, what she is saying is that Members will have pre-existing arrangements. So, whether you have not been a Deputy before and then you choose to stand, you will probably already have a pension that is already in play and then the amount that you will put into that one will be reduced because now you are going to put it into another.

Now, Members I would assume that there are many Members who will have a pension pot here, one here, one there and it is frustrating, to say the least, because there are transfer out fees for each one. Now, one of the other issues that I have with it is that having that pension pot here, one there is throughout anyone's life I might choose, when I am younger, I am going to be slightly riskier so I am going to put mine in, let us say, in Japanese equity, thanks very much I am going to put X amount in there.

Now, as I grow up, I then may say, actually, I am going to start reducing that risk and I will start going to commodities and gold. Now, by accepting this we are stymieing our ability, anybody else's ability, to do so. I believe you are stymieing people's ability to do so or accepting the pay cut.

What I would also mention is the fee for the YIP is 1%, however, you can go for a life cycle. The life cycle is charged at an extra 0.26% per annum and that one, automatically as you invest in it, automatically changes your risk profile relative to your age. If you want to choose the funds that you go into, they are subject to additional fees that are in, relative to each fund, now some of them can be more than 0.26%. Anyway, Members, what I am really saying is I agree with Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, Deputy St Pier and Deputy Gollop. This is this is it is a nonsense; it is a ridiculousness and, Member, this should be thrown out as soon as we can.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: Thank you, sir.

I agree with pretty much everything that has been said ahead of me. I would just like to make one point. This adds complexity and complexity implies expense. So, before we add complexity to anything, and this should be a general rule, we keep passing more and more laws, more and more regulations, more and more of this, is it strictly and absolutely necessary to do it? If not, we should not. This is not necessary, so we should not do it.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you sir.

I am not going to be supporting the amendment and as I pointed out yesterday, I am not going to be supporting any amendments to this and I do not think that we should be even debating this. (Several Members: Hear, hear.) Deputy Roffey, when he stood to speak, disagreed with me because his argument was that if something is laid before the States, it should have the ability to be amended by the States.

Now, I do not think if that, if whatever is laid before the States has been prepared independently and was supposed to be and designed to be completely independent, I think Members should have a bit more discipline than to feel they have to amend it. I have listened to the arguments; I agree totally with Deputy St Pier and Deputy Kazantseva-Miller. I have a YIP myself, by the way, but that is just a matter of fact.

I will be speaking in general debate, sir, I am not going to forego my right to speak again. But I just think this is an absolute nonsense. It is a really poor look. We spent a few hours yesterday debating it; we are still debating it today. As I articulated yesterday, I do get why P&R have tweaked the proposals.

I am not happy with it, I would have preferred if it had been completely independent and we just note it and then we move on, regardless if it is an increase in the existing pay or a decrease in the existing pay or more for the DPA or less for this, that and the other or whatever that may be. It is supposed to be independent. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)**

We are tying ourselves up in knots getting into all the minutiae of this and that and the other and it is a really terrible look. We constantly spend so much time on ourselves. Can we just dispense with this amendment, get to general debate, pass whatever is passed, and then crack on to the next item?

Thank you.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Mahoney.

Deputy Mahoney: Thank you, sir.

Very quick, just to back up everything that everyone has said regarding the discrimination. This is nothing but discriminatory. If there was a Deputies union, I cannot imagine what the unions would be screaming about this kind of thing. Do this or I will dock 2% of your pay that would be a fun day in court, I would bet you.

We are self-employed, as others have said. There are no examples to be set here to anybody. That money is mine, if I choose to spend it on rent, mortgage, beer or anything I want it is nobody's business in here. I will spend it how I want. So, I just cannot believe this was even bought. But anyway, as you may have guessed, I will not be supporting this.

The Bailiff: As no-one else is rising I will turn to the Vice President of the Policy & Resources Committee, Deputy Soulsby, to speak on the amendment.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, sir.

I do not think the Committee has come to a view. We have not we have not discussed it. It is sent directly to all Members. Personally, I agree with the comments made by Deputy St Pier and others. I think we are too much of a diverse group; it is not like we are in an occupation working for an organisation in the same way. So, yes, I will not be supporting it, but from a P&R point of view, we have not got a collective view.

The Bailiff: And finally, I will turn to the proposer of Amendment 1, Deputy Roffey, to reply to the debate.

Deputy Roffey: Deputy St Pier said that we are either self-employed or we are not. That is just not the case. We are neither fish nor fowl; that is the honest thing. In fact, Social Security is the only ones that treat us as self-employed, but that is only if you are below state pension age, you then become non-employed. So, quite a few of the Deputies in here are, actually, designated to be non-employed. *(Laughter)*

But as far as Income Tax is concerned, I get my ETI deducted from my monthly pay as I do Income Tax, but perhaps the biggest difference to being genuinely self-employed is if you are genuinely self-employed and the business that you are self-employed running is not doing particularly well, your income tends to drop.

We are about to pass Propositions which mean that no matter how badly, and we have been hearing in the green paper about how businesses are doing financially, we have a wage and that is that. So, to a large extent, we are parallel to being employed and that is exactly the same answer to Deputy Le Tissier.

He may have corresponded with somebody at Sovereign but I, obviously, went to the local boss of Sovereign to make absolutely sure that what I was putting forward would work before I put it forward, because it would be foolish otherwise, and because it would be deducted by a payroll function all of the extra charges that he referred to would not have to apply. We could be treated in the same way as employed people.

I suspect I am a victim of my own attempt to be fair here. If I had said that there would be no loss if you opted out and you did not lose the 2%, it probably would have landed somewhat better. I was trying to be fair because, although the take home pay that Deputy Le Tissier referred to may not change, if somebody who was employed by a company opts out, they lose part of their package, they lose their employer's contribution into their occupational pension scheme and I wanted us to be treated the same.

I get the message, the detail of what I put forward is not appealing to Members and this is going to crash and burn, but I really hope it may have started some sort of conversation because I do not agree, by the way, that YIP is just not suitable for elderly Deputies. If it was, I would not be a Member of the YIP and I am, like Deputy Leadbeater. I have a YIP account and I find it incredibly useful, I have to say.

But I hope this has started a debate and I hope that P&R, at some stage when they have got nothing left more pressing on their agenda, could consider the options for some sort of pension for States' Members that they can opt out of if they so choose, because we used to have it, we got rid of it for the reasons that I have said; I think it was a mistake. There is a really easy alternative now which is not defined benefit and, therefore, will not build up obligations for the taxpayer as we did last time around and, I think, it is something that should be considered. I would like Members to vote for this but I am not particularly hopeful.

The Bailiff: Well Members of the States, we come to the vote on Amendment 1 proposed by Deputy Roffey, seconded by Deputy de Sausmarez and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Amendment 1 to substitute Proposition 16.

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 7, Contre 26, Ne vote pas 4, Did not vote 0, Absent 3

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	DID NOT VOTE	ABSENT
Brouard, Al	Aldwell, Sue	Dudley-Owen, Andrea	None	Inder, Neil
Cameron, Andy	Blin, Chris	Falla, Steve		Parkinson, Charles
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	Burford, Yvonne	Le Tocq, Jonathan		Trott, Lyndon
Gollop, John	Bury, Tina	Snowdon, Alexander		
Roffey, Peter	De Lisle, David			
St Pier, Gavin	Dyke, John			
Taylor, Andrew	Fairclough, Simon			
	Ferbrache, Peter			
	Gabriel, Adrian			
	Haskins, Sam			
	Helyar, Mark			
	Hill, Edward			
	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha			
	Le Tissier, Chris			

Leadbeater, Marc
Mahoney, David
Matthews, Aidan
McKenna, Liam
Meerveld, Carl
Moakes, Nick
Murray, Bob
Oliver, Victoria
Prow, Robert
Queripel, Lester
Soulsby, Heidi
Vermeulen, Simon

The Bailiff: Will you now please close the voting, Greffier. So, in respect of Amendment 1,
495 proposed by Deputy Roffey, seconded by Deputy de Sausmarez, there voted in favour, 7 Members,
26 Members voted against; 4 Members abstained; 3 Members are absent and, therefore, I will
declare it lost and we move into general debate.

Deputy Ferbrache.

500 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, I do not think I make myself particularly popular, but I am not too
bothered about that, and I am sorry if it offends Deputy Leadbeater when we are talking about
ourselves. But what I say in relation to this is that I commend the independent panel, they are all
good quality people and they did a very thorough report.

But not one Member yet, in the course of the debate we have had over the period of time, has
505 spoken and represented the views of the public, because what the independent panel did was go
out to consultation over a month period or so in April, May of last year and if one turns to appendix
one, public survey results, and page 33 of 34 are the pages I am going to refer to.

Question two, do you think a States' Member's role should be considered a paid professional or
voluntary service? There is a mix of views shared with 51% of the respondents selecting a mix of
510 paid professional and voluntary service, 32% paid professional and 17% voluntary service. So, that
means that 68%, i.e. two thirds are saying that, at best, there should be some voluntary service
involved.

In other words, it is not meant to be a career, it is not meant to be a paid job that you have got
for life, it is public service and everybody in here, I am sure, their prime motive for being a States'
515 Member is that of public service. Page 34, and I agree with this, I agree with this wholeheartedly
with the majority of you, graph three, more than half, 53%, of respondents thought that the current
pay for Deputies was too much, 31% thought it was enough and 17% thought it was too little. So,
the majority of people in this Island think that we are paid too much. I agree with them. Now, 53%,
oh that is only 53%, 377, it reminds me when they had the voting –

520 **Deputy Taylor:** Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Taylor.

525 **Deputy Taylor:** Sir, Deputy Ferbrache has just said the majority of people in the Island think we
are paid too much, I think what he actually means is, 53% of those surveyed think we are paid too
much, which is actually 150 to 200 people. 377 in total were surveyed, not the entire Island, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

530 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Well, that is an interesting point, isn't it? Because, actually, speaking for
myself, I have spoken to a lot more than 377 people over the time. I do not mean in relation to this
specific thing and, I think, it is about 80% have said that the States' Members are paid too much.
We have not done a plebiscite on it, but what they have done is go to a figure. What Deputy Taylor's

comment really reminds me of, and he was not in the States at the time and I do not think I was, when it was the first bout of whether or not we should continue with selection.

When there was a majority saying we should continue with selection, but it was not the right kind of people voting on the right kind of question. So, that was ignored. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Now, if Deputy Taylor and, indeed, any other States' Member do not think that is a commonly held view that States' Members are overpaid, then I disagree with him.

The median wage is about £42,000 per annum, if I have got that right. States' Members under this scheme will be paid circa £49,000 per annum. Now, it is meant to be, as I say, a public service. I do not doubt at all that States' Members are conscientious and work very hard. I fully accept the point made by Deputy Matthews yesterday that this is just the tip of the iceberg, really, because people are on Committees and I further accept that if people are on Principal Committees they have got a lot of work to do.

So I accept that absolutely. I also think every States' Member should be paid exactly the same (*Interjection*) because I have been the President of four States' Committees during my period of time as a States' Member. When I was the President of the Board of Industry and a Member of Advisory & Finance, between 1997 and 2000, I do not think we got any uplift at all. I cannot remember what we got paid. I do not think it was much at all.

When I was President of Economic Development, we did get an up lift, we had an extra X thousand pounds. When I held one of the roles that Deputy Roffey now holds, STSB, we got nothing extra. But when I stood and was elected as President P&R the extra, whatever it is, £30,000 a year, that did not influence me at all and I am sure it did not influence my predecessor, Deputy St Pier and I am sure it did not influence my successor, Deputy Trott. We stood for that role because we thought we should be discharging that role in accordance with our duties as States' Members. So the extra circa £30,000 was not something that influenced any of us at all.

I do not think for a majority of States' Members, it is a full-time job. I know that is almost heinous and sacrosanct, but I do not think it is and I looked at the declaration of interest recently in relation to current States' Members and, I think, in my opinion, I think it is a minority of States' Members that actually would disadvantage themselves by being States' Members financially.

That is my view for reading what people's declarations of interest are. So, it is not a financial sacrifice for many and some will say, oh, it is all right for him. Well, whether it is all right for him is a matter entirely for my opinion, not for anybody in here or anybody out there because we all come into this Assembly equally.

We all have the same duties and responsibilities, I appreciate you can be on a Committee and not on a Committee and you could do that and, as I say, I unreservedly accept that everybody in here does their absolute best. So, it is not a matter of thinking, oh, he could work harder and she works too hard or whatever it may be.

There are people in here that do other jobs. Deputy Trott, if he were here, would be saying yes, he does other work even in his role as President of P&R, he is on boards. Deputy St Pier is on boards, Deputy Helyar is on boards. Deputy McKenna runs his own business; he is on a Principal Committee and runs a business. He works long hours, weekends, etc.

Even when I was President of P&R, although I found that is the only job, and I have had plenty of Committees and responsibilities in my near 15 years in the States, the only job that was even near full-time, in my view, because you could organise your time completely. I go back to when I was a Member of A&F, I have been a litigation lawyer, which means I do not, like some of my corporate colleagues, just produce papers and put signature copies inside and charge lots of money; you have actually got to go into court and tribunals and argue things. I still did it as a Member of Advisory & Finance.

I have got great admiration, and she knows that, for Deputy Oliver. I think she has done a brilliant job over the last four-and-a-bit years as President of what is one of the most unpopular Committees in the States and it always will be. But the bar for me, and I do not mean any disrespect to her, the bar for me was set by Deputy Langlois, because he was President of IDC when it was even more unpopular than it is now, (*Laughter*) he was President of the Housing Committee, he was a Member

of A&F and also he was senior partner of Guernsey's largest law firm and that is when the large law firms were run in Guernsey and not owned by somewhere in the Cayman or Jersey or somewhere else as they are now.

590 So, it was a different world then. He managed it and I do not think anybody, and I was in the States with him I was on A&F with him. Deputy Le Tocq, of course, works, not every day of the week, but some days (*Interjection*), I think he probably works more than some days, and I am not being facetious, I am sure he understands what I mean by that.

So this is not a dig at anybody, but to ignore 53% of 377 people, to ignore what I have heard, 595 and I am sure I am not the only States' Member that has heard that, I think is counter to reality. I think we have got to stand up in the real world. Now, I appreciate that P&R have compressed, by their 3% reduction, as it were, so that the overall package does not increase because otherwise it would have increased by about £800,000 over four years. We have got the exact figures

I think States' Members are well remunerated because they should be doing other things, by 600 and large. If you come here as a 30 or 35-year-old, and Deputy Taylor ran a business, so if you have got energy and commitment to do other things and that is what you should be doing. I am also against this business, if you are not elected or re-elected because the slippery slope, you get a month's pay. I know that is only the £44,000 in one part of the policy letter and £48,000 on the other; why should you get anything? Why should you get anything if you are unelected by the 605 people at all? That is the people's choice.

You know that you have got a four-year term, or whatever it is, that is all you are guaranteed. You should not be making provisions for your life on the basis that you are going to get elected and re-elected and re-elected. So, I am very sorry in the sense, well I am not really, if it causes Deputy Leadbeater any concern, or anybody else any concern, we are paid too much, we make too 610 much of it, we should realise that the public think that we owe them. This is a public service, we are doing it for public service and that is the main reason that we are here.

Deputy Meerveld: Sir, I wish to invoke Rule 26(1).

615 **The Bailiff:** All right. Members of the States, Deputy Meerveld wishes to put a motion pursuant to Rule 26(1). So first, I will invite those Members who wish to speak in general debate to stand in their places. Is it still your wish, Deputy Meerveld, that I put the motion?

Deputy Meerveld: Yes.

620

The Bailiff: So, the motion is that there be no further debate other than hearing a reply from Deputy Soulsby. Those in favour; those against?

Members voted Contre.

The Bailiff: I think I can declare that lost. Deputy Roffey.

625

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

I am not going to do a wide-ranging speech like Deputy Ferbrache. I agreed with some of the points he made, I profoundly disagreed with some of them, but I think that we are in danger of having a very long debate that will not be viewed well. But I do have to say just one clarification 630 about why I will be voting against Proposition 5.

Proposition 5 is to change the basis of future up lifts from the change in median earnings to RPIX. I think that would be a mistake. Median earnings was chosen deliberately so that Deputies were seen to be doing no better or worse than the generality of people working in the Island. But we do have periods, we had one quite recently thank goodness we are out of it now, where there 635 can be an extended period of two or three years where wages do not keep up with prices.

If we change from median earnings to inflation then just at a time that it is really difficult for members of our community, when their wages are not keeping up with inflation, Deputies were seen to be the exception, they were being feather bedded, they are making sure that their wages do keep up with inflation even though that is no longer, that is not typical during that period of time for the community as a whole and I think that would look really bad. Therefore, I would prefer to carry on using median earnings as the yard mark and I say that as somebody who has no vested interest in what the uplift criteria will be in the next term, but I just think it is a better measure to use.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

I just want to talk very briefly about non-States' Members and I think in the report there is a bit of a mishmash between the comments that the Committee, or the people who looked at pay, have used and the result that they have come to because they say, that in the consultation with States' Members confirmed that non States' Members are seen as valuable Members of the Committees they sit on.

Some States' Members felt that non-state Members are not appropriately remunerated for the time and commitment and their contribution and the panel also recognised that if the best possible people are required to support Committees it is essential that they are appropriately remunerated in terms of their experience and their expertise and their time commitment.

You know what that equals: £2,556 *per annum*, it is it is a very minimal sum for non-States' Members and we have been very fortunate on HSC, we have had Mrs Carey and we have also had Dr George Oswald, who have been invaluable to our Committee; absolutely invaluable. I know that is not always the case on every Committee. I know some Committees have had one-trick ponies over the years, who just look at one particular issue. But in the main, I think non-States' Members add a very value extra slice to a particular Committee and then to go and say that they are very valuable and then we say that the value is £2,500 per annum, I think is a little bit of an insult.

I appreciate that in the panel's recommendation they recommend a review for SACC to undertake of the role of non-States' Members and how they can be remunerated and I would just urge SACC Members to take that forward and have that noted in their work to do list because, I think, non-States' Members do provide us with a valuable tool.

Thank you very much, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Aldwell.

Deputy Aldwell: Thank you, sir.

I am going to agree with Deputy Brouard with regards to non-voting Members. I have worked with superb non-voting Members and they have done everything that we have done. They should be applauded for putting in the hours, with never ever a complaint. They are wonderful and I thank them for it, and yes please SACC, please look at that.

But I just wanted to quickly say I think it is the most challenging, the most fascinating and most frustrating job in the world. (*Laughter*) I think that Paul Luxon had it when he said that if you do not cope with frustration, do not join the States and it certainly is frustrating at times.

But we do have brilliant support with our civil servants and they work incredibly hard. I think they are a wonderful team but, certainly more than anything else, I think we are extremely privileged to be in the roles that we are in and I think we are paid very well for what we do. So, it was just to say, again, anybody thinking of standing it is challenging, it is fascinating, but my goodness, it is frustrating.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Falla.

Deputy Falla: Sir, thank you.

690 I have taken the unusual step for me of abstaining over the two amendments and I will also
abstain on this Proposition and the reason is that I just think it feels very grubby to be talking about
our pay in this way. I agree with Deputy Roffey, really, that it should not be brought for debate, it
should not need to be brought for debate, it should be something that P&R can take the advice of
a panel appointed to do a responsible job, which they have done, and then for that just to be put
through.

695 The Independent States' Members Pay Review Panel worked very hard, they did research, they
consulted, I took the opportunity to go and speak to them and I absolutely felt heard. So, I would
like to thank them for that and in Deputy Trott's words, they came up with sensible proposals. Why
cannot we just leave it there? It is like having a dog and barking ourselves. So, my abstention is
really a protest vote in that way and I would like to get on with other business.

700 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Queripel: Thank you, sir.

705 I am in dilemma regarding Proposition 12. I think I am going to vote against it for the reasons I
am about to relay. But I am not an immovable object; I could be persuaded to support it.
Proposition 12 is a very much compassionate Proposition and I normally welcome compassionate
Propositions with open arms.

710 But there are some fundamental reasons why I do not think I can support this Proposition and,
to state the obvious, as we all know, standing as a candidate in an election is a gamble and everyone
taking that gamble is only too aware that they could lose and that has always been the case. So,
why has it become an issue now?

On page 38, we are told that:

The purpose of the loss of office payments is to give an income for a short amount of time to Members who lose their
seats at an election, to support them in their transition back to employment and the payment also allows Members time
to adjust to a change of circumstances during what could be an emotional or distressing time for some who had not
anticipated leaving their role in Government Re-entering employment, after being away for a number of years, can be a
challenge and without recent experience it might prove difficult to return to a similar salary.

715 Sir, my response to that is the same as I said earlier, that has always been the case so why has it
become an issue now?

Further down the page we are told that being a States' Deputy is not a full-time job, I dispute
that claim wholeheartedly, I always have done and I always will do. The people who say that need
to, actually, get standing and get elected and see what it is like. I have been a Deputy for 13 years
and I have never worked less than 45 hours a week. (**A Member:** That is true.) In fact, in my first
720 term back in 2012-16, I was working 60 hours and sometimes even 70 hours a week because I knew
I only had four years and I wanted to do a lot in those four years.

I worked very closely with colleagues on a number of issues who were also working those kinds
of hours because they had a lot of initiatives they wanted to pursue as well on behalf of the
community. Now, that is in tandem with all the other duties as a Deputy, reading and digesting
725 policy letters, undertaking research, pursuing amendments and requêtes, doing all their Committee
work that needed to be done, attending Committee meetings and States' debates, responding to
an endless chain of emails every day of the week, including Saturdays and Sunday and, as we all
know, when we are due to debate a major issue we get dozens, sometimes even hundreds, of emails
in a couple of weeks.

730 The previous Assembly, when they were due to debate assisted dying led by Deputy St Pier,
received just over 700 emails in a couple of weeks. When we were due to debate abortion we
received just over 500 emails in a couple of weeks. When this Assembly was due to debate GST, we

received just over 400 emails in a couple of weeks and even when there is not a major issue on the horizon, we still receive between 20 and 40 emails a day, seven days a week.

735 I know I am not the only one, sir, I have spoken to colleagues who have also received that amount of emails and, of course, there are all the phone calls. Even on a normal day, that could be a dozen or more to take and make. Then we must not forget all the one-to-one cases that a lot of Deputies take on.

740 Some do not, for the reasons only known to them. But when Islanders ask you to help them with their problems, some of those cases are so complex they take months to resolve, especially when parents have had their children taken away because they have been accused of sexually abusing them.

745 I am working on a case that has been going on for 12 years. Now, I have worked on several of those, which has meant meeting after meeting and phone call after phone call and those meetings can take place in the evening, they can take place on a Saturday or a Sunday when Islanders are free to meet.

750 There are all the meetings with representatives of different associations and organisations to attend, as well as States' presentations on a regular basis. Sir, I could go on and on. There is a lot more Deputies should be doing and it is not only in my experience, I have spoken to colleagues over the years who also, as I said earlier, work an incredible amount of hours.

I did relay all of that to the panel when I met them. I commend them for all the work they have put into this. I also relayed my experiences of being physically assaulted by members of our community on three occasions, as well as having to endure verbal abuse on dozens of occasions, as I know many of my colleagues also have to endure.

755 I remember saying, actually, during a debate back in the day when former Vale Deputy, the much missed, in my view, and many people I speak to, Matt Fallaize, he was President of Education, Sport & Culture, he could have been Minister, who knows, we keep changing titles it is difficult to keep up on.

760 When I said in a speech I worked 74 hours that week, he said in that case, I was working for less than a minimum wage and he was absolutely right because, like many of my colleagues, I was; and we do that because we care about our community. We want to do our utmost to have a beneficial influence on our community in our four-year term.

765 Moving back to what we are told in this policy letter. We are told that due to the fact Guernsey does not have redundancy payment for employees in place by Law, that the introduction of loss of office payments to States' Members will likely not be received very well by the public who do not receive such a payment should they lose their jobs.

770 I resonate completely with that statement, sir, on the grounds that we would be rewarding ourselves and giving ourselves an advantage whilst disadvantaging every other employee out in our community and that is borne out by what we are told further down the page, where we are told that both the 2016 and 2019 panels considered loss of office payments, but did not recommend them on the grounds that individuals seeking election and re-election are aware that it is a fixed term with no guarantee of extension, so they should be prepared for it to come to an end.

775 The 2019 report argued it was important to be mindful of the electorate, who have decided to not elect a Member so would not want to see them continue to be paid after losing their seat. The 2024 public consultation found that the majority thought States' Members are either paid enough already or too much, so adding an extra payment for those who do lose their seat might well be received critically by the electorate.

780 Also, I would say that is an understatement bearing in mind, as I said earlier, we would be awarding ourselves and giving ourselves an advantage at the same time as disadvantaging every other employee in the Island. How can that be fair? Especially when everyone knows that standing as a candidate in an election is a gamble. It is a win or lose situation, which every sitting Deputy standing for re-election has understood for decades. So, I ask the same question, why is this an issue now?

785 Sir, moving towards a close, we need to be mindful of what we are told in paragraph 1.1, where we are told that it is, 'incumbent on the States to reduce costs'. Well, here is an opportunity for us to keep costs down by rejecting Proposition 12 and for the benefit of Islanders listening on the radio, I know quite a few people who have listened to the States' debates on the radio, who may not be aware of the level of savings we are talking about here, 11 Deputies who stood for re-election back in 2020 were not re-elected and if this payment had been in place back then, the cost to the taxpayer would have been £44,200.

790 This is all in the policy letter. So, bearing in mind the approach adopted by SAC when it comes to elections is that candidates need to realise, they have to stand on their own two feet, which is what they said in response to the amendment Deputy Bury and I laid, which sought to retain the States' grant for candidates.

795 Well surely the same approach applies to the time when sitting Deputies look to be re-elected and do not get re-elected. As we all know, sir, the world of politics is a tough world to be in and in the words of a song that was a worldwide hit for Billy Ocean back in 1986; when the going gets tough, the tough need to get going and accept that they are gone. *(Interjection)*

Thank you, sir.

800 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Cameron.

Deputy Cameron: Thank you, sir.

805 As other Members have already stated, we are being asked to approve changes to the States' Members pay that go against the advice of the Independent Review Panel we commissioned. If we are going to ignore their recommendations, why did we bother contracting them in the first place and how much has this independent review cost the taxpayer?

810 The panel spent months consulting Members and the public, carefully considering fairness, responsibility and affordability yet P&R has discarded their conclusions in favour of politically convenient changes. We should be noting the Independent Review Panel's recommendations. P&R forcing their version on States' Members blaming the Budget is not acceptable.

815 This is part of a much wider problem, the public often criticises the States for contracting consultants. What annoys the public even more is when we hire consultants and then choose to ignore their advice wasting not just consultants' fees, but far greater sums when poor decisions lead to higher costs further down the line.

The Agilysys contract, for example, had the correct expertise been involved right from the beginning of the project, it could have saved the taxpayers tens of millions of pounds and our digital infrastructure would be far closer to where it actually needs to be but those in charge decided that they knew best.

820 I strongly believe in seeking expert advice when facing complex decisions, this is why we contracted an Independent Review Panel to ensure pay decisions are fair and free from political bias. Apart from our Alderney Representatives, no sitting Deputy can amend this policy letter to include the review panel's recommendations without risking electoral consequences. That is precisely why this process was meant to be independent. *(Interjection)*

825 Yet here we are overriding expert advice with political judgement. This is a classic case of the Dunning-Kruger effect, where those with a limited expertise overestimate their own knowledge. P&R asked for professional input then assumed they knew better, this is not reasonable leadership it is poor decision making.

830 While I supported the Burford Oliver amendment yesterday because it improved the fairness of the policy letter, I cannot support the amended policy letter itself. To do so would be to endorse poor governance and wasteful use of taxpayers' money. I will be voting against all Propositions and I urge others to do the same.

Thank you.

835 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

I just rise very briefly in response to Deputy Cameron. He is quite correct that we sought advice and we seek advice in this Assembly about many things. We seek legal advice, but that is exactly what it is at the end of the day, it is advice and it is fully open to us to consider a different way forward and, I think, in this case, when so many people in our community are really struggling to make ends meet that a wage rise for this Assembly of £200,000 a year is simply not tenable. I fully support P&R's move in bringing forward a different analysis which, subsequently, slightly modified by amendment, but which keeps pay within the current levels.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Thank you, sir.

I do concur with many of the concerns expressed about the fact that we are, effectively, ignoring the independent pay panel review. But there have been two key elements which have financial implications in relation to the independent pay panel review and the implications of the Propositions.

The first one has been the restructure of the pay bands which the independent panel proposed to be achieved with an additional cost of the cost envelope and which was, consequently, amended by the original Propositions from Policy & Resources and then also successfully further amended by Deputy Burford. So, that deals with the structure and the types of pay bands and who is in which pay bands and we have been able to achieve it in, what is currently, the current pay envelope.

However, there is a second part to the pay structure and also referenced in the independent panel report, which is in relation to how that existing structure gets up lifted in line with inflation and the cost of living and that is quite an important part because it allows for Deputies salaries to be kept in line with the cost of living.

I appreciate that for some Deputies such upkeep with the cost of living may not be important whatsoever and they have got other income, etc. but I know that for other Deputies and for many who probably will be standing, that is actually quite important because in high periods of inflation, like we have had over the last couple of years, your pay can get really quickly out of whack.

So, if you read page 26 of the policy letter, which is the independent panel's report, there is a paragraph about the effective date of the uplift that they would be expecting and I quote in full:

The automatic adjustment for any percentage change in the median earnings happens on 1st May each year. This date was established when States' terms commenced on the 1st May following an April election.

So, there was a clear expectation, election happens and there is a pay adjustment following that.

The panel recommends that the date of adjustment for RPIX should be aligned with the start of the political term on the 1st July by using the March RPIX figure.

So, I think if I take that paragraph in full, my reading of it and the recommendation again of the independent panel review is that, first of all, an adjustment continues, that second an adjustment is aligned with the start date of each political term and a separate recommendation is that they suggest for this adjustment to be linked to RPIX rather than median wages

So, that is how I would read the recommendations of the report. But, I think, if you look at the Propositions, I am not clear whether the RPIX would be adjusted on the 1st July of this year and because if it is not going to be adjusted and let us take as a proxy the figure from December 2024 for RPIX, which was 4.6%, hopefully in March this year that will figure will reduce, but let us just take that as 4.6%.

If that was the case and the future Deputies' pay structures were not adjusted by RPIX, there would be a quite significant real term reduction in pay, pretty much, across all the bands, except for Presidents of STSB and DPA where we have had that restructure and I do not think, actually, the

level of those real term reductions has been properly detailed and shared in this policy letter, and that the implications of those real term reductions are actually understood –

I am not going to give way.

885 I have sent an email with a table to Deputies last night, which outlines those real term reductions that would be in place if the current amended Propositions were approved, but if RPIX did not apply and what the difference would be against just keeping the existing pay structure. The real term reductions would equate to a negative 7.3% for about 14 positions, 18% for the Presidency of SACC and Scrutiny and a 2.5% reduction for about half of the Deputies as well.

890 So, I think, the issue I have got is that I do not think, if that is the implications of the policy letter and the intention of P&R, this is another major policy direction that goes against, what I understand is, the recommendation of the independent panel review, and B that I do not think the implications have, actually, been properly outlined and shared with the Deputies and I feel they are, actually, quite substantial and unfair given the cost of living crisis. So I have tried to seek a –

895 **Deputy Burford:** Point of correction.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Burford.

900 **Deputy Burford:** I think the implications are exceedingly clear, perhaps a little less clear in P&R's policy letter but that has, of course, been superseded. But the implications are abundantly clear, which is why in the amendment that was successful, I produced a table so everybody can look at that table and see exactly what the pay rate will be from the 1st July 2025, which will then be increased on the 1st July 2026 and all Julys thereafter and I am very pleased to note that His Majesty's Comptroller is nodding his head as well.

905 Thank you.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Sir, well I do not think it is as clear as Deputy Burford is outlining because I do not think that it is clear and I have not received a definitive answer from, I have asked P&R to provide clarification about the intention of their policy letter because, again, that is something that fundamentally goes –

I give way to Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: I thank Deputy Kazantseva-Miller for giving way. I confirm that is the Committee's understanding. These new rates come in from the 1st July this year. Any uprating would happen a year, an annual year, from that event. So not from this year.

920 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** I thank Deputy Le Tocq for confirming that finally in debate today, but, having heard that, I still would like to get a definitive clarification from yourself, sir, or his Majesty's Comptroller because, I think, if you read a Proposition 6, which is where this is profiled, to agree that the date of the adjustment of RPIX should be aligned with the start of the political term on July 1st, by using the RPI figure at the end of the preceding March.

925 So, the start of the political term is 1st July, the preceding March will be the March coming, 2025, so the way I still read it is that, notwithstanding the restructure of the bands, etc. that has been agreed through successful amendments, that actually Proposition 6 would still stand. So, I would like to seek a definitive clarification of what would be the case and also what would be the implications of not voting for that Proposition?

Thank you, sir.

930 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Bury.

Deputy Bury: Thank you, sir.

I actually apologise for speaking because like many others I find the whole thing very uncomfortable and quite unbecoming, which is why I voted for the Rule 26(1), which I very rarely do because I do not believe in and shutting down debate. But, on this occasion, I thought it might
935 be best.

But because points have been raised in debates that I feel necessary to challenge, I am brought to my feet and it is a narrative that regularly comes out around Deputies' pay and I do not think it is, necessarily, invalid or to be dismissed, about how much we get paid, whether it is a full-time job, etc.

940 Deputy Ferbrache made many points, from his point of view, which he is, obviously, very entitled to do but they are from his point of view and his point of view is quite a different one to many peoples in the Island. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) It is, indeed, about public service and I agree with him and hope that anybody that comes in, that is what they are coming in for; that is why I came.

However, in the real world, the warm, fuzzy feeling of public service does not pay my rent or my
945 bills and, as a person that does not have a declaration of interest as long as my arm, the salary is something that is important to be considered. I had a spreadsheet before I decided if I was going to stand. It was a slight drop in salary for me and I also lost out on the corporate benefits that you get, such as health insurance, pension and those things.

But it was still doable and it was something I wanted to do as a public service. Unfortunately,
950 that sounds very me, me, me but it is a challenge to the earlier speech that was from a different point of view and I really believe in representation and I do not think we have enough of it in here. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Everybody is from a certain level of socio-economic status and, obviously, that changes when you come as well, depending on where you came from and the salary that you are then receiving here.

955 I do not think we have enough representation for people from the lower socio-economic categories (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and the salary is important for that. Then that ties into, is it a full-time job or not? Well, again, that depends on who you are. So, if your name is above the door somewhere else you can, probably, choose your working hours and be quite flexible around that.

If you are employed, as I was, and like I said do not have your own business interests, nor do
960 you have the money or backing to do that sort of thing, then you rely on an employer. Now, that could really affect how much you are able to apply yourself to this role. You could say, I cannot work three days every month because I am in the States and I have got a Committee meeting on this date and that could be agreed.

But then what happens when ESC says we have got an ad hoc really important presentation
965 about this policy letter? Will my employer just let me hop off for that? And that happens multiple times a week, etc. So, in order to apply yourself appropriately, be diligent, I see that if you were to be employed it would, actually, be quite difficult unless you had an exceptionally flexible employer. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

So, I thought it was important to put in that counter point of view because I do think that
970 representation is important and I think that probably that was one of the reasons that, many moons ago, the decision was made to move to paid Deputies because, I believe, it was becoming that only a certain person could afford to be in here. Whether they had their own business, so they could take the time out or they were wealthy, so they did not need to be doing anything else and that is not representative of our population.

975 So, while the public do often say, and the stats do show in there that about half of people surveyed said, that we get paid too much, I also hear a lot that they think we are out of touch, that we have got no idea what is going on in the real world. So, actually, perhaps having people that are a bit more representative would feel less out of touch for people.

To that end, I think, I have a slightly different view of the loss of office payment than Deputy
980 Queripel. It is, again, very uncomfortable. I know it happens in other jurisdictions. I like the fact that it is only on application rather than an automatic thing but I think for people who live month to month their salary is what they have got and yes, it is a gamble but do we want to put off people

who do not have that potential buffer from standing, because it is not a gamble that they can afford to take.

985 So, those are my alternative views to some of the things that have been said. I was really interested in Deputy Roffey's point about the RPIX versus the median and I am a little torn on that because I take his point and I think it is quite valid but I am also with a lot of the other people around, well what a lot of other Members have said around, really, we should not be messing with the Propositions too much. So, I do not know if Deputy Soulsby will refer to that in her summing
990 up, but I could take an alternative point possibly.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Matthews.

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

As Deputy Bury, I was employed when I became a States' Member and I did have a very flexible employer, which I was very lucky to have. But I have found that it is not really compatible with States work to be able to have a normal job, the hours are too variable and it is too difficult to do. So, while I respect Deputy Ferbrache's view that you should be doing other things, it depends on your
1000 line of work.

I think as a States' Member you put in as much as you want to and that is up to the public to decide whether they think they are getting value for money from the people who they elect and, in my case, I did not find it was possible to fit full-time or half-time work around States work. But I do also agree this discussion does not feel right for us to be having here about our own pay. It feels
1005 like it is a potential car crash debate and we should not really be having it.

The only real reason that we should be discussing States' Members pay is to talk about how we can change or encourage people to stand and to represent our Island and also, as Deputy Bury says, the pay is there to enable more people from regular employment to be able to take up the challenge of becoming a candidate and becoming a Deputy and that is why, I think, it is worth being there
1010 and that is why, I think, we should really be respecting the output from the independent review.

But it does also feel like any changes to it just feel like gesture politics. The independent panel noted that the total States' Members pay would be about £2.3 million across all of us and the P&R change saves about £195,000 from the uplift. Now, what we are not discussing, while we are discussing this, is we are not discussing the public sector pay bill which, I am looking at the
1015 2025 Budget, is £340 million.

So, that is more than two orders of magnitude different and there is a 5% pay rise that is being discussed at the moment, or being agreed, that represents, crudely, approximately £17 million. That is not being debated here and we could, perhaps, be using our time more wisely than we are. But only one thing that I did want to mention just because Deputy Queripel mentioned about the loss
1020 of office payment and it does say in the report that it might not be received because the Island does not have statutory redundancy pay.

At risk of going off the subject, my view is that we should have statutory redundancy pay and that is something that is very much missing from the Island. (*Interjection*) We are one of the very few places that does not have it. If Deputy Queripel would like to join in a requête perhaps we
1025 should do this.

When I asked Deputy Roffey about it, the answer has been they do not have the resources to bring it in earlier, on in on this term. Members will remember that other than us thinking outside of ourselves, there have been cases like Woolworths when it closed down and people who had served there for years were at risk of not having any payment and just having their pay cut off short. So, if
1030 anything, I hope it is an encouragement to the next term to consider bringing in statutory redundancy pay for the Island which, I think, is very much needed. But other than that, I think, my view is, that we should have just accepted the output of the independent review panel.

Thank you, sir.

1035 **The Bailiff:** Representative Snowdon.

Alderney Representative Snowdon: Thank you, sir.

I am going to be quite brief. I think we have got an independent review panel that, basically, put their recommendations forward and it feels a bit like it is a conflict of interest us going on different tangents of it. It was an interesting debate, but it is a conflict of interest because there is an interest between it.

I am actually going to abstain on all of it. Myself and Mr Hill will obviously, hopefully, be here in June with the new Assembly and I do not think that it is appropriate and, hopefully, this debate comes to an end soon because you have got a massive amount of policy letters still to deal with.

1045 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: Thank you, sir.

1050 I will be brief. On the point as mentioned, the suggestion that Policy & Resources and Deputy Burford should not have varied from the independent advice we were given, I do think that is a bit of a red herring. We get advice, and we have consultants, we get advice from all over the place.

On Planning we have had some quite extraordinary advice. It is up to us, at the end of the day, to look at the advice, consider it and then decide what to do, which may follow it closely or not closely at all. So, I think, P&R were quite right to look at it and make some minor changes. I actually, and I did say this when we were asked to talk to the review panel, in my view to put this matter to bed forever we should have just said that States' pay should be linked and equal to, for the basic Deputy, median wage and should go up and down with it and then, at that point, you are hooked into the rest of the community and you do not have to talk about it again.

1060 They did not do that which, in fact, if we had done that, I think that would have given us a slightly lower salary which, I think, would have been more appropriate to link it with median earnings. Anyway, that was not done and so be it. The only point of contention, I think, here is Propositions 12, 13 and 14; the parachute payment.

Deputy Matthews made points about redundancy pay but we are not employees, we are officers, we hold and know that we hold this office at the pleasure of the community who will vote us out as and when they deem fit and I just do not think it is right that we should have some sort of bonus payment when we are fired from office. So, I will not vote for 12, 13 and 14 but I will vote for the rest of it, as amended, by the Burford Amendment.

Thank you.

1070

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, I have to stand to, first of all, apologise to the Assembly for managing to vote the wrong way on the Roffey/de Sausmarez amendment and to reassure the Assembly that I definitely was not converted by the arguments in that debate at all. *(Laughter)* By way of explanation, I think it is the first time I have ever done it with the electronic voting system, I feel that, in my head, I must have been voting for a guillotine; enthusiastically voting for a guillotine.

On the substantive issue before us I, like others, feel uncomfortable that P&R have amended the report. I think it would have been far better to have accepted it in its entirety. However, the Burford amendment, I think, if we are to tinker with it, the Burford amendment was an improvement and hence my support for that. I too do feel uncomfortable as others have done with the termination payment but, again, I accept it as a recommendation from the panel. So, I really rise simply to explain my rather odd behaviour.

1085 **The Bailiff:** Well, as no one else is rising, I will turn to the Vice-President, Deputy Soulsby, to reply to the debate, please.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, sir.

A number of people have said how uncomfortable they feel in the debate and I get that. I have always felt that and I have never contributed or taken part in any of the debates in previous terms when we have discussed our pay. Unfortunately, I do have to now, but I will, because of that and I feel like I want to contribute as little as possible. It will not be the longest summing up but I will make just a few points.

Deputy Ferbrache, talking about whether it is part time or not but, I think, it depends on the individual. Some people can make it part time others, probably, can fill the time doing what they want. I know my husband always says that I can find work to do in a phone box, so I know that other people might not. They might be quite happy just ticking by.

So, I think it depends on the individual. I think that is the point, we are all so very different and that is what makes this a very difficult job and it is not an exact science. People have spoken about the independent panel and that we must support what they say and, actually, that is where I do feel we should. But it is not an exact science and how do we balance the opinions of Deputy Ferbrache with those of Deputy Bury? They have, equally, got valid points to make but they are different viewpoints. There is no exact science behind it.

Deputy Roffey made a valid point on RPIX but, of course, it can work the other way. I see what he is saying when the balance is as it is but it can work the other way. But, again, it is just the parameter that you use. *(Interjection)* Non-voting Members, people are talking about that. I do think this needs to be sorted. I have always seen the value of non-voting Members. In fact, I think, one thing I would like SACC to do when they look at the Machinery of Government is to see why we cannot have non-voting Members on P&R. I think this is one Committee that really would benefit from it, at least are having people on there on a rota basis, if nothing else. I think that was always a problem with the changes that we had that did not allow P&R to have non-voting Members on them.

We did wonder about, in terms of this debate, whether we should do more in relation to why we have to have this debate and, again, I think it would be good for SACC, as part of that Machinery of Government review, to see whether we could look at Members pay in a different way than we are currently doing and having to have a report from an independent panel, which then we have to debate. Whether it can be a means where we are kept out of it because, I think, that would have been easier.

Now, Deputy Cameron, and I think Deputy Burford covered this off quite well, said we are blaming the Budget which is why we are reducing what was proposed by the panel. But no, we are dealing with economic realities and, quite frankly, I think if P&R had just brought what the independent pay panel had suggested, I think, we would have been criticised for that, actually, for not taking into account the economic realities, which is not something that the panel themselves would have been considering.

He says I cannot support anything. Well, that does not make sense because all that has, actually, been changed is Proposition 2, really. There are a few other Propositions, but the heart of it is very much what the panel considered. Deputy Burford, as I say, I thank her for her comments. But yes, we did not have to follow, exactly, what was put by the panel. I felt uncomfortable by that –

I will not give way because I think we need to finish this debate.

I will leave it; it is not essential. Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, I think Deputy Burford has made it very clear and the advice that we had from His Majesty's Comptroller was that, really, with the Burford Amendment Propositions, has actually clarified what P&R's intention was all along. That what new Members will get at the start of the term will be exactly what is set out in that table and there will only be an uplift in the following year. So, I think that that is clear.

Deputy Matthews says, why are we not discussing public sector pay, it is so high? Yes, well we did that in the Budget and yes, it is something that is a consideration, but this is a policy letter, whether we like it or not, and I think I would rather we did not have to do this, but a policy letter on States' Members' pay.

Alderney Representative Snowden talked about it all being a conflict of interest. But of course, it is a potential conflict of interest should some of us still be in the Assembly next term or we lose our seat when we try to fight it. But it is a potential conflict of interest, not a conflict of interest. But I think I will leave it there, sir. I think that the debate has gone on for long enough. I wish we did not have to have it, but we have and, hopefully, it is the last time it has to happen.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Mr Comptroller

The Comptroller: Sir.

The Bailiff: Amendment 4 has been circulated. (*Interjection*) It has been proposed by Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, seconded by Deputy Blin. (*Interjection*) I am not prepared to accept that amendment on the basis that it only came round to States' Members after I called Deputy Soulsby to reply to the debate. So, as far as I am concerned, under Rule 17, it means that that amendment cannot be laid at this stage.

The Comptroller: Sir, I would agree with that.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much. Now, do not sit down, Mr Comptroller. (*Laughter*) Let us just talk about the Propositions and the effect of those Propositions. What I was going to do and, at the same time Members, I will explain what I am likely to put to you and you can tell me if you do not like what I am proposing.

Proposition 1 is put on its own first of all.

The Comptroller: Yes.

The Bailiff: Proposition 2 arises from Amendment 2 and the clarity there is that from 1st July those are the amounts that Members will be paid. (**The Comptroller:** Yes, sir.) Whoever is in the Assembly after the general election. If Proposition 2 were not approved, there is no substitute for a new arrangement moving forwards and, therefore, the, I think it is the 2016 pay award to States' Members will simply be carried forward, subject to any other changes that would be made. Is that correct?

The Comptroller: That seems certainly logical to me. I am assuming the pay award or the decision on pay in 2016 was not subject to any caveat.

The Bailiff: Well, my understanding is that on the last occasion the States rejected (**The Comptroller:** Yes.) the proposals in 2020 for this current term, which is why there has been a continuity of the pay arrangements that is in the rules in the Blue Book, as it currently is, going forwards and there is, at the moment, a median earnings uplift.

The Comptroller: I agree. Yes, I am with you.

The Bailiff: If Members choose to take it and some Members have said that they do not. So, we then get to Proposition 5. I was proposing to take 5 and 6 together because I think they are linked. But we cannot have a vote on Proposition 7 unless Proposition 6 is carried. So, I was going to take Proposition 7 separately.

I was also going to take Proposition 8 on its own, which deals with non-States' Members and then I was going to take Proposition 9 on its own, because that is a direction to the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee to do some work on non-States' Members.

1190 I was proposing to take Propositions 10 and 11 together because this deals with the States' Investment Board and removing them from these arrangements and then I was going to take Propositions 12, 13 and 14, because they are interlinked, together. Then I was going to take Proposition –

1195 **Deputy Taylor:** Could I request 14 is separate?

The Bailiff: Okay, so 12 and 13 together.

Deputy Queripel: Can I request 12 is separate please, sir.
Thank you.

1200 **The Bailiff:** Okay well we will go 12, then we will go 13, then we will go 14, then we will go 15 and then we will go 16. You want me to subdivide one of these do you, Deputy de Sausmarez?

1205 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** I would just like to seek some clarity, if that is okay, please, sir. For the avoidance of doubt, am I correct in understanding that if Propositions 5 and 6 are to not carry, are not carried, then the practice or the rule pertaining to median earnings will continue?

The Bailiff: That is my understanding, Mr Comptroller, that in particular –

1210 **The Comptroller:** Sir, I agree, yes.

The Bailiff: There will not be a move from median earnings to RPIX from the 1st July 2026.

1215 **The Comptroller:** Correct.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, sir.
I ask for clarity can the Comptroller confirm that if Proposition 2 is not supported, but 5 and 6 are, there would be a double uplift in 2025 of median earnings in May and then an uplift in July 2025?

1225 **The Bailiff:** I think that will only occur if Proposition 7 is carried (*Interjection*) – if Proposition is lost.

Deputy Soulsby: Okay.

The Comptroller: Yes.

1230 **The Bailiff:** So, you would only get the uplift in May of 2025 by virtue of median earnings if Proposition 7 is lost. (*Interjection*) It is all crystal clear, Members! (*Laughter*) So, apart from combining 5 and 6, as they stand, and 10 and 11, there will be separate votes on every Proposition.
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, you rose earlier, do you still want to seek any clarity?

1235 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** No, it has been covered now, sir.

The Bailiff: Okay. Thank you, Mr Comptroller.

1240 **The Comptroller:** Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: So, hopefully, that is sufficiently clear. We will start with an easy one. *(Laughter)* Proposition 1 on its own, please and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 1, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 1.

Carried – Pour 23, Contre 7, Ne vote pas 6, Did not vote 1, Absent 3

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

1245

The Bailiff: So, in respect of Proposition 1, there voted in favour, 23 Members; 7 Members voted against; 6 Members abstained; there are 4 Members who are absent for the vote and, therefore, I will declare Proposition 1 carried.

1250

Proposition 2 derives from the successful Amendment 2, with a table which you will not necessarily see on your screen and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 2, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 2.

Carried – Pour 24, Contre 6, Ne vote pas 6, Did not vote 1, Absent 3

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	DID NOT VOTE	ABSENT
Aldwell, Sue	Cameron, Andy	Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Leadbeater, Marc	Inder, Neil
Blin, Chris	Fairclough, Simon	Falla, Steve		Parkinson, Charles
Brouard, Al	Ferbrache, Peter	Hill, Edward		Trott, Lyndon
Burford, Yvonne	Haskins, Sam	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha		
Bury, Tina	Helyar, Mark	Prow, Robert		
De Lisle, David	Mahoney, David	Snowdon, Alexander		
De Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dyke, John				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Le Tocq, Jonathan				
Matthews, Aidan				

McKenna, Liam
Meerveld, Carl
Moakes, Nick
Murray, Bob
Oliver, Victoria
Queripel, Lester
Roffey, Peter
Soulsby, Heidi
St Pier, Gavin
Taylor, Andrew
Vermeulen, Simon

1255 **The Bailiff:** So, in respect of Proposition 2, there voted in favour, 24 Members; 6 Members voted against; 6 Members abstained; same 4 absent. So, I will declare Proposition 2 carried, which means we have a new regime.

We now take Propositions 5 and 6 together please and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Propositions 5 and 6, which is about median earnings or RPIX.

There was a recorded vote.

Propositions 5 and 6.

Carried – Pour 16, Contre 13, Ne vote pas 7, Did not vote 1, Absent 3

POUR

Aldwell, Sue
Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina
De Lisle, David
Dyke, John
Fairclough, Simon
Gabriel, Adrian
Gollop, John
Le Tocq, Jonathan
Moakes, Nick
Murray, Bob
Oliver, Victoria
Queripel, Lester
Soulsby, Heidi
St Pier, Gavin
Vermeulen, Simon

CONTRE

Brouard, Al
Cameron, Andy
De Sausmarez, Lindsay
Ferbrache, Peter
Haskins, Sam
Helyar, Mark
Le Tissier, Chris
Mahoney, David
Matthews, Aidan
McKenna, Liam
Meerveld, Carl
Roffey, Peter
Taylor, Andrew

NE VOTE PAS

Blin, Chris
Dudley-Owen, Andrea
Falla, Steve
Hill, Edward
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Prow, Robert
Snowdon, Alexander

DID NOT VOTE

Leadbeater, Marc

ABSENT

Inder, Neil
Parkinson, Charles
Trott, Lyndon

1260 **The Bailiff:** So, in respect of Propositions 5 and 6 there voted in favour, 16 Members; 13 Members voted against; 7 Members abstained, same 4 absent but I will, therefore, declare Propositions 5 and 6 carried, which means that we now need to vote on Proposition 7.

Once again, I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 7.

1265 *There was a recorded vote.*

Proposition 7.

Carried – Pour 20, Contre 8, Ne vote pas 8, Did not vote 1, Absent 3

POUR

Aldwell, Sue
Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina
De Lisle, David
De Sausmarez, Lindsay
Dyke, John
Fairclough, Simon

CONTRE

Brouard, Al
Cameron, Andy
Ferbrache, Peter
Haskins, Sam
Helyar, Mark
Le Tissier, Chris
Mahoney, David

NE VOTE PAS

Blin, Chris
Dudley-Owen, Andrea
Falla, Steve
Hill, Edward
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Matthews, Aidan
Prow, Robert

DID NOT VOTE

Leadbeater, Marc

ABSENT

Inder, Neil
Parkinson, Charles
Trott, Lyndon

Gabriel, Adrian	McKenna, Liam	Snowdon, Alexander
Gollop, John		
Le Tocq, Jonathan		
Meerveld, Carl		
Moakes, Nick		
Murray, Bob		
Oliver, Victoria		
Queripel, Lester		
Roffey, Peter		
Soulsby, Heidi		
St Pier, Gavin		
Taylor, Andrew		
Vermeulen, Simon		

The Bailiff: So, in respect of Proposition 7, there voted in favour, 20 Members; 6 Members voted against; 8 Members abstained, the same 4 Members were absent. So, I will declare that carried, which means you will not get an increase in May.

1270 Proposition 8, on its own, please and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 8.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 8.

Carried – Pour 25, Contre 5, Ne vote pas 6, Did not vote 1, Absent 3

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

The Bailiff: So, in respect of Proposition 8, there voted in favour, 25 Members; 5 Members voted against, 6 Members abstained, same 4 absent. I will declare Proposition 8 carried.

1275 Proposition 9 next please on its own and I will invite the Greffier to open voting on Proposition 9.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 9.

Carried – Pour 26, Contre 4, Ne vote pas 6, Did not vote 1, Absent 3

POUR

Aldwell, Sue
Blin, Chris
Brouard, Al
Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina
De Lisle, David
Dyke, John
Fairclough, Simon
Ferbrache, Peter
Gabriel, Adrian
Gollop, John
Helyar, Mark
Le Tissier, Chris
Le Tocq, Jonathan
Matthews, Aidan
McKenna, Liam
Meerveld, Carl
Moakes, Nick
Murray, Bob
Oliver, Victoria
Queripel, Lester
Roffey, Peter
Soulsby, Heidi
St Pier, Gavin
Taylor, Andrew
Vermeulen, Simon

CONTRE

Cameron, Andy
Haskins, Sam
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Mahoney, David

NE VOTE PAS

De Sausmarez, Lindsay
Dudley-Owen, Andrea
Falla, Steve
Hill, Edward
Prow, Robert
Snowdon, Alexander

DID NOT VOTE

Leadbeater, Mar

ABSENT

Inder, Neil
Parkinson, Charles
Trott, Lyndon

The Bailiff: In respect of Proposition 9, there voted in favour, 26 Members; 4 Members voted against; 6 Members abstained; same 4 absent. I will declare Proposition 9 carried.

1280 Propositions 10 and 11 we will take together and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Propositions 10 and 11, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Propositions 10 and 11.

Carried – Pour 26, Contre 2, Ne vote pas 8, Did not vote 1, Absent 3

POUR

Aldwell, Sue
Blin, Chris
Brouard, Al
Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina
De Lisle, David
De Sausmarez, Lindsay
Dyke, John
Fairclough, Simon
Ferbrache, Peter
Gabriel, Adrian
Gollop, John
Haskins, Sam
Helyar, Mark
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Le Tissier, Chris
Le Tocq, Jonathan

CONTRE

Cameron, Andy
Taylor, Andrew

NE VOTE PAS

Dudley-Owen, Andrea
Falla, Steve
Hill, Edward
Mahoney, David
Matthews, Aidan
Moakes, Nick
Prow, Robert
Snowdon, Alexander

DID NOT VOTE

Leadbeater, Marc

ABSENT

Inder, Neil
Parkinson, Charles
Trott, Lyndon

McKenna, Liam
Meerveld, Carl
Murray, Bob
Oliver, Victoria
Queripel, Lester
Roffey, Peter
Soulsby, Heidi
St Pier, Gavin
Vermeulen, Simon

1285 **The Bailiff:** So, in respect of Propositions 10 and 11, there voted in favour, 26 Members; 2 Members voted against; 8 Members abstained; same 4 Members absent and, therefore, I will declare Propositions 10 and 11 carried.

Now, Proposition 12 on its own please and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 12.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 12.

Carried – Pour 17, Contre 11, Ne vote pas 8, Did not vote 1, Absent 3

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

1290 **The Bailiff:** In respect of Proposition 12, there voted in favour, 17 Members; 11 Members voted against; 8 Members abstained; same 4 Members absent and, therefore, I will declare Proposition 12 carried.

1295 Proposition 13, on its own, next please and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 13.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 13.

Carried – Pour 26, Contre 5, Ne vote pas 5, Did not vote 1, Absent 3

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	DID NOT VOTE	ABSENT
Aldwell, Sue	Gollop, John	Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Leadbeater, Marc	Inder, Neil
Blin, Chris	Haskins, Sam	Falla, Steve		Parkinson, Charles
Brouard, Al	Helyar, Mark	Hill, Edward		Trott, Lyndon
Burford, Yvonne	Le Tissier, Chris	Prow, Robert		
Bury, Tina	Mahoney, David	Snowdon, Alexander		
Cameron, Andy				
De Lisle, David				

De Sausmarez, Lindsay
 Dyke, John
 Fairclough, Simon
 Ferbrache, Peter
 Gabriel, Adrian
 Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
 Le Tocq, Jonathan
 Matthews, Aidan
 McKenna, Liam
 Meerveld, Carl
 Moakes, Nick
 Murray, Bob
 Oliver, Victoria
 Queripel, Lester
 Roffey, Peter
 Soulsby, Heidi
 St Pier, Gavin
 Taylor, Andrew
 Vermeulen, Simon

The Bailiff: So, in respect of Proposition 13, there voted in favour, 26 Members; 5 Members voted against; 5 Members abstained, same 4 Members absent and, therefore, I will declare Proposition 13 carried.

Now Proposition 14, on its own, and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 14, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 14.

Carried – Pour 17, Contre 12, Ne vote pas 7, Did not vote 1, Absent 3

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

The Bailiff: In respect of Proposition 14, there voted in favour, 17 Members; 12 Members voted against; 7 Members abstained; 4 Members were absent and, therefore, I will declare Proposition 14 also duly carried.

Proposition 15 next, please and I will invite Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 15 please.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 15.

Carried – Pour 21, Contre 7, Ne vote pas 8, Did not vote 1, Absent 3

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

1310

The Bailiff: So, on Proposition 15, there voted in favour, 21 Members; 7 Members voted against; 8 Members abstained, the same 4 Members absent. I will declare. Proposition 15 carried.

Finally, Proposition 16, in its original form, and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 16 please.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 16.

Carried – Pour 29, Contre 2, Ne vote pas 5, Did not vote 1, Absent 3

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

Murray, Bob
Oliver, Victoria
Queripel, Lester
Roffey, Peter
Soulsby, Heidi
St Pier, Gavin
Taylor, Andrew

1315

The Bailiff: On Proposition 16 there voted in favour, 29 Members; 2 Members voted against; 5 Members abstained; same 4 Members absent and, therefore, I will declare Proposition 16 carried and, therefore, all 14 Propositions as amended have been carried.

Greffier.

COMMITTEE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

1320

8. The Future of the Guernsey Dairy Industry – Debate commenced

Article 8.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter entitled "The Future of The Guernsey Dairy Industry", dated 20th January 2025, they are of the opinion:

- 1. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to transfer, in addition to the existing £1,025,000 Dairy Farm Management Payment budget, an extra £925,000 from the 2025 Government Work Plan allocation to the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure's 2025 Cash Limit (making a total of £1,950,000), and subsequently to transfer £1,325,000 per annum in addition to the existing £1,025,000 Dairy Farm Management Payment budget (making a total of £2,350,000) from 2026 onwards, and to increase this total amount annually in line with RPIX, and to direct the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure to allocate the total annual budget to the revised dairy farm support scheme described within Section 8 of this policy letter.*
- 2. To note the work that the Policy & Resources Committee will soon complete to review the Future Dairy Project's Outline Business Case. The review is assessing the optimal solution for milk processing and the likely cost of that solution.*
- 3. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee, in consultation with the States' Trading Supervisory Board and the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure, to complete investigations into and then recommend to the Assembly the most appropriate, efficient, and cost-effective ownership, funding, management and governance model for the milk processing solution recommended by the review described in Proposition 2.*
- 4. To direct the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure to undertake a review of the whole dairy industry by the end of 2030. This will include an assessment of the financial support required by the industry after taking account of any new dairy facility which is operational, or which there is a reasonable prospect of being operational, at that time and the subsequent cost efficiencies arising from it.*

The Deputy Greffier: Article 8, Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure – The Future of the Guernsey Dairy Industry.

1325

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

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

The Guernsey cow is integral to this Island's heritage and international identity (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and our and our dairy industry plays a big part in our environment and the aesthetic of our rural landscape, helping to protect our countryside and biodiversity. Oh, and then there is the milk. Not just delicious but also high in health promoting A2A2 protein and the butter, cream and other produce that sustain Islanders with respect to our dairy needs.

But our dairy industry and, indeed, our iconic breed of cow is facing a worrying future. While it is fair to say that everyone has felt the pinch recently our farmers have been absolutely clobbered. In the last few years agri-inflation has run many times higher than normal inflation, sending the cost of essential inputs like feed and fertiliser through the roof, on top of the inherently high costs of farming in the Island.

While Guernsey milk is a very high-quality product for the majority of households it is a staple and in setting the gate price, the price at which the retailers buy milk, the Dairy is acutely conscious that there is not much headroom at all in what the average household can afford to pay for it.

The extreme economic stress our farmers are under cannot, therefore, be mitigated simply by putting up the price of milk. Too high and it could accelerate the decline in milk sales, fuelling a negative feedback loop or doom spiral. Neither can it be mitigated by bringing farming costs down by any significant extent in the immediate term.

While local farms have become a lot more efficient in recent years, there are certain unavoidable factors that mean they will never be able to produce milk at a cost comparable to, say, UK dairy farms such as our scale and size of fields, the natural milking capacity of the Guernsey breed and high land labour and importation costs.

Part of the problem has been the very significant decline in the States' financial support for the sector over the last decade or two. The 2014 review of the dairy sector made some very sensible suggestions and helped to modernise the sector, but it could not have foreseen the economic pressures affecting the industry over the following decade.

In real terms, the amount of money farmers receive from Government has dropped to just a quarter of its real terms value in 2001, a 75% reduction in support. Meanwhile, in comparable jurisdictions like Jersey, the Isle of Man, the UK and the EU, government support is substantially higher on a *per capita* basis and by *per capita*, I mean humans rather than cows, Guernsey farmers receive about two thirds less than Jersey farmers, five sixths less than UK farmers and nine tenths less than EU farmers.

In recent years, this has become a perfect storm where reduced financial support has collided with vastly higher costs. As a result, our herd sizes are falling and farm profits, where they exist at all, are too low to inspire the investment we need to sustain the industry long term. Without our support, Guernsey's dairy industry faces a bleak future.

There is a clear parallel, oddly enough, between our dairy sector and our long-term care sector, as per the policy letter we were debating and, indeed, approved yesterday. Like the situation relating to our care homes, profitability and business confidence is too low right now to ensure our dairy farms can invest enough even to meet demand and, without additional funding, the sector faces irreparable decline.

As in long-term care, the measures we are proposing now, through this policy letter, are aimed at initially stabilising the sector and guarding against damaging decline; and creating that stronger foundation from which to transition to a more sustainable future. Like in long-term care, there is a bigger bit of that jigsaw that needs to come together in the medium-term. In this case, that bigger picture is the Dairy itself.

Now, Members will be well aware that the Guernsey Dairy operates at a loss. Part of this derives from the physical constraints of a building built in 1951, that has long since ceased to be fit for purpose. Its replacement, in the form of the Future Dairy Project, is a pipeline project that I very much hope can be progressed in the next political term because, in its current form, the Dairy is inherently and increasingly cost inefficient.

However, the Dairy is also impacted by the financial strain that is so badly affecting our farmers. If it were run on a purely commercial basis, it would, no doubt, pay less for the raw milk that it

processes, but in the Guernsey context, that would render our farms utterly unviable. The Dairy pays farmers what is known as the producer price per litre of raw milk and then, having processed and packaged it, sells it to retailers at the gate price.

1385 The Dairy has to operate on the difference between the two, but it is ever mindful of the fact that the producer price has to remain high enough to keep the farmers from making a loss, or too much of a loss, and the gate price has to be low enough so that the retailers can sell it at a price consumers can afford. This puts an additional squeeze on the Dairy's operating budget and undermines its own profitability.

1390 As with our care homes, the evidence shows that our farms are cripplingly underfunded and there is no option to stabilise the industry in the immediate term without increasing financial support. To extend the parallel with SLAWS, the measures that we are proposing now complement rather than compromise the next steps with respect to that bigger picture.

1395 So, although the location and ownership, operational and governance arrangements of a future dairy facility are yet to be decided, we need to increase support for farmers now to ensure that there is milk to be processed there at all in the years to come. While I appreciate that there is a lot of interest in the Future Dairy Project, I urge Members not to go down that rabbit hole in this debate because, as Propositions 2 and 3 underscore, questions on that future facility cannot be answered now, but Members can rest assured that a lot of work is under way to answer those questions and bring forward recommendations to the next Assembly. So, in the meantime, this policy letter's focus is on issues that are clearly understood and can be addressed by this Assembly today.

1400 So, if we accept that Guernsey's dairy industry and our iconic eponymous breed of cow are worth saving, and I very much hope that everyone in this Chamber does, then we need to act. The Committee has looked at the problems in detail and is proposing a set of solutions that aim to do two things.

1405 In the short term, so that is within five years, to ensure that the dairy industry returns to a position of stability following the recent pressures, so that the public goods it provides to the Island are retained and in the long term, within 10 years, that this stability provides a platform for the dairy industry to transition to a fully environmentally sustainable industry which maximises the delivery of public goods and where the methods of regenerative farming are normal practice across all farms.

1410 How? Well, we are proposing three pillars of support which, together, form an holistic package reflected in Proposition 1. The first pillar is dairy farm management payments, a scheme that already exists to support the Guernsey pedigree breed and high animal welfare standards. We are proposing to modify this scheme slightly and make it contingent on farms meeting the criteria of the proposed new Public Goods Credit Scheme, the second pillar of that package, so that we can better align the payment of public money with outcomes that benefit the whole community.

1415 Now, public money for public goods is one of the core principles here and I will briefly explain what it is all about. Most obviously there are the direct tangible goods. Edible goods, I suppose, the cream, the milk, the butter, the cheese and the ice cream that the majority of our population consume and, if they are anything like me, enjoy.

1420 But why should someone who does not touch dairy produce support, by virtue of their hard-earned tax contributions, this local industry? Because our dairy sector also provides a range of wider benefits, such as the protection and improvement of our rural landscape and biodiversity, our food security, climate regulation, air quality, soil stability and resilience against flooding, to name just a few.

1425 Our policy letter explains those public goods in more detail, but there is just one that I would like to draw out here because it is pertinent to the recent news of our tourism numbers. While overall visitor numbers fell year-on-year, those coming here for leisure or to visit family and friends bucked that trend and increased and the top answer that they gave to the question of what attracted them to Guernsey was the natural beauty of the Island, while many also cited the natural environment as the most enjoyable aspect of their trip. Our farmers deserve much of the thanks for that as the chief custodians of our beautiful countryside.

1430

1435 The proposed Public Goods Credit Scheme is similar to an initiative that has proved very successful in Jersey, among other places. It will be designed to support the delivery of environmentally sensitive methods of managing farmland, including landscape features such as earth banks, hedges, woodlands and grasslands, better soil management, reduce pesticide use, flood alleviation and biodiversity recovery, carbon sequestration, diversification and encourage new entrants and deliver high quality, high value products.

1440 The third pillar of the package that we are proposing is a farm advisory scheme that will encourage innovation and efficiency, giving farmers access to advice, training and guidance. That support will help farmers make good investment decisions and successfully adopt new technology, for example. This pillar is essential to the success of the support framework.

1445 Interestingly, it is the one recommendation of the 2014 review that was not progressed and with conditions in the industry having become so much more challenging since it is more important than ever. Advisory support will maximise the effectiveness of the necessary increase in financial support, helping farmers achieve greater efficiency over the coming years.

1450 These three pillars, in combination, will provide the support the industry needs to stabilise in the short term and build a strong platform to become more economically and environmentally sustainable in the longer term. There is no sugarcoating the fact that this will come at a cost. These proposals will require an increase of up to £925,000 in 2025, to a maximum total of £1.95 million.

1455 This money has been earmarked, or this additional money has been earmarked, in the F&IP for this purpose. In 2006, it is anticipated that an additional £400,000 will be required, totalling up to £2.35 million from then on, keeping pace with RPIX from 2027 onwards. I would like to remind Members, however, that although this is no insignificant amount of money, it is still around half the level of support provided to the industry in 2001, were those levels have been sustained in real terms since then.

1460 Further, I would also ask Members to bear in mind the potential costs of not providing the support. Profitability and business confidence are very low and herd sizes are falling. Without intervention they could soon tip below the level necessary to sustain the industry in a way that meets the Islands milk demand.

1465 As our policy letter, I hope, makes clear if that tipping point is breached it could well sound the death knell for any dairy farm in the Island at all and imperil the future of the Guernsey cow. However, the proposals in front of the Assembly offer the industry and the breed a much brighter future, supporting it to stabilise in the short term and become much more economically and environmentally sustainable in the longer term.

1470 Members can take reassurance from Proposition 4, which directs the Committee to carry out a review of the whole industry taking into account any decisions made and/or implemented with respect to the new Dairy facility by the end of 2030. We will continue to work with the industry to ensure that the extent and types of support remain appropriate and effective and are an efficient use of public money in return for the many valuable public goods our farmers provide us.

1475 I am sure that Members will agree that the idea that the Guernsey cow, which is known, admired and celebrated around the world, one of our best ambassadors internationally, could, without the support outlined in this policy letter, slowly disappear from its Island home and with all of the benefits I have described. To me, that is just unthinkable and that is what is at the heart of the matter today and I really resisted using any cow puns, up until now, but it is really not a moot point. *(Laughter)*

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle.

1480 **Deputy de Lisle:** Sir, I am very pleased to welcome this policy letter to the States.

I have to declare an interest as I have interests in the dairy farming sector, particularly on the land-based side. I support the policy letter with the aims that the Committee put forward and I would like people to turn to page 10 and just note them. The Committee's aims are twofold.

1485 First of all, in the short term, within five years, to ensure that the dairy industry returns to a position of stability, which is extremely important. Secondly, in the long term, that this stability provides a platform for the dairy industry to transition to a fully environmentally sustainable industry. By that, we are talking about moving to methods of regenerative farming to be the normal practice across farms.

1490 Now, I would like to see, actually, that it is all done within five years or, at least, the long-term movement toward environmentally sustainable industry – in other words, bringing in regenerating farming methods – that comes in at the early stage or, at least, some aspects of it come in. Because I just feel that if we are going to provide another million in terms of the Farm Management Payment, then there has to be some commitment from farm producers, in other words, the farmers themselves, to make change towards regenerating farming.

1495 That is just a matter of going back, actually, to the way that farming was continued, really, in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s before the import of massive amounts of inputs in terms of fertiliser and chemicals, herbicides and so on. So, as part of the increase in the budget of £1.3 million a year to the Dairy Farm Management Payments structure then, I think, we should try and almost immediately eradicate the practice of using chemicals as weed killers on the farms.

1500 It is up to owners, too, to make this point. I have made it very clear on the property that I have in St Pier du Bois that those chemicals, particularly glyphosate, should not be used on the property. So, already, if you like, owners can move towards this themselves but it is a matter of also encouraging the farmers themselves to move in this direction very early in terms of their contribution directly to eradicate certain practices and become, immediately, more regenerative in their methods of practice.

1505 So, I would like confirmation, really, from the Committee that that is something that they will consider. Really there is a trade-off there, farmers will get this extra but they have to immediately begin complying, particularly in terms of the inputs that they are committing to with regard to fertiliser and chemical inputs. Because this is part also of the Biodiversity Strategy to reduce the use of pesticides and herbicides to a minimum with regard to the fact that we know of their contamination of land and the water supply and, of course, we have put in earlier a requête with regard to glyphosate.

1510 So, the recommended schemes, as stated in the policy letter, are intended to address the short- and the long-term issues the sector is facing, so the dairy industry can return to a level of economic stability that will provide the foundation for farmers to transition to regenerative agricultural practices in the future, increasing the wider public benefits that can be delivered through that means.

1515 I have to say that I am also pleased to note the fact that the policy letter makes the point with respect to bringing back the agricultural adviser, which I have thought for some time was another mistake in withdrawing that particular function. Also, one thing that is not mentioned are the veterinary services as well where the farmers have to rely, really, on somebody coming in and, very often, by the time they come in the issue has passed on the farm and we are losing cattle as a result of that.

1520 But getting back to the to the Propositions, sir, the first one is, in reality, going back to what we had in terms of payments and in terms of regenerative farming practices. We did have the £2 million Farm Management Payment up to 2019 and then we decided to change at that point down to £1 million. I think we made a mistake there because, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) essentially, we had to then up the level periodically of the price of the milk which, of course, had, as was stated earlier by the President, a negative effect, really, on consumers purchasing the product and perhaps moving to other suppliers of milk products.

1530 But also you can say in terms of the regenerative part of the issue, basically, we are going back, if you like, to the way that farming was carried out in the fifties and sixties, let us say, and before that, very successfully bringing in wrack from the seashore and also using, of course, manure from the farm itself on the land, which can reduce the costs in terms of fertiliser application and chemicals on the farm holdings.

So, what I am saying is, number one, perhaps another £325,000 *per annum* in addition to what we had pre-2019. But essentially what it is doing is bringing back what we had. Proposition 2, to note the work of the Policy & Resources Committee to complete the review of the Future Dairy Project's outline business case, I think we need that fairly desperately in terms of the Dairy itself, the milk processing side, and the likely cost of that solution.

There have been two solutions put forward, one is a new Dairy altogether, but the other is rehabilitation of the existing site and, perhaps, extending that site into the agricultural field next door, to some degree, because another line is desperately required in terms of the milk cartons manufacturing process.

The third Proposition is to complete investigations and recommend to the Assembly the most appropriate, efficient and cost-effective ownership, funding, management and governance model for the milk processing solution; a build on Proposition 2 and the fourth Proposition, to direct the Committee *for the Environment & Infrastructure* to undertake a review of the whole dairy industry by the end of 2030.

This will include an assessment of the financial support required by the industry after taking account of any new Dairy facility which is operational by then, or which there is a reasonable prospect of being operational. Having served on the board and dealing with the Dairy issue, one gains a quick understanding of the fact that we had a Dairy established in 1953 that has not gone through a lot of a change since then and it is fairly desperately in need of rehabilitation, or total renewal.

So, I would like to leave it at that but support, in total, what we have in front of us because the dairy industry has a tremendous history. It is also, not actually stated here, but we are getting quite a production from the Dairy, not only of milk, but also of butter – £1 million, you can say, coming in in terms of butter sales and milk sales up in the region of £6 million. So, it is an industry that we need to look at for the future and we need to secure that and stabilise it for future generations in Guernsey.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: Thank you, sir.

I will not speak for long because I am supportive of this policy letter. But I do want to emphasise, particularly in light of some of the comments that Deputy de Lisle has made, that this is effectively a sticking plaster over a situation that is ongoing, has been for some time, and that if we are to move in this direction, and as I said I am supportive of that, it is going to cost us money and we have to be realistic, therefore, about where we are going to get that money from.

Now, sir, I do believe that the general public in Guernsey want us to retain our dairy industry, even if some of them have chosen fairly, what I consider to be, silly eating habits these days, (*Laughter*) I do think it is not just the dairy industry we are talking about. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I do still believe that farming is the best way to keep our countryside and I think if you ask that question to the average person in Guernsey they would not say, oh, we can get rid of it and import countryside from somewhere else. (*Laughter*)

I am the son of a farmer, but the son of a farmer that moved to growing because farming was not making enough profit for him. But I do remember from an early age learning to milk by hand, I loved that, it was free child labour I suppose from my family's point of view, but the point is we are now in a different era and we do need to see innovation.

I am supportive of moving in that direction. I have always felt that we could innovate more and partly because if you look at how Guernsey is viewed from the outside world there are certain parts of the world that see us through cows and primarily through cows. We have a profile, and I find this particularly on the international stage and in External Relations particularly, that know us, primarily, through that.

It has changed, certainly, years ago, when I used to go to America or meet Americans, sometimes they would say, oh, you come from Guernsey and I would say, do where that is? Is it named after the cows? (*Laughter*) I said, well, actually it is the other way round, but at least it is a point of talking.

Now, we have the *Potato Peel Pie Society* connection and you can talk about that and a little bit of knowledge about the Occupation. But we still are known, particularly in America, through our export of the cattle breed and, for that reason alone, I think it is worth noting that if we do not have a presence here on the Island that we are losing something significant.

It was the same reason that I felt very strongly, as I know others did, that we had to get the right deal on fisheries in the Brexit situation because it is not that fishing is ever going to be a major part of our GDP or employment in the Island, but had we lost it we would have lost something that then would have affected everything else in our culture. I think it is a price worth paying; that is what I am saying.

But in terms of what this policy letter does, it does not achieve everything that we are going to need to do. For example, sir, I point people to the table 5.2, just before paragraph 5.27, and if you look at the support that we give, currently, to agriculture in Guernsey, in general, compared to other neighbouring jurisdictions; it is pathetic.

Now, I am not suggesting that we need to take the EU in general as our leading jurisdiction, but if we are going to be serious about this, we have to decide to support it more. There is just no other way around that, otherwise, we will lose it. We might as well, as I alluded to before, sir, I think, just choose to lose other things because there is quite a lot of things in Guernsey that require and will require our support in some way.

That is not to say that with innovation and I really do believe, there could not be, and this will probably involve some partnership maybe some things that certain Members might find unpalatable, but it will involve, I think with innovation, it could become something of a selling point again. Not that the dairy industry is ever going to be a major income earner, but we need to make use of the fact that we are well known for our cattle breed.

I have a friend who farms in the Midwest in America, married a Guernsey girl, that is how I got to know him, he has a ranch, probably about the size of the Vale. and he loves Guernsey for cattle and when he comes here, he says, why aren't you doing this, why aren't you doing that? There are all these ideas that he has got.

Members may be aware that after the Second World War, the American Cattle Society gave a building to the Royal Guernsey Agricultural Society and there is still a plaque, that I think is going to be repositioned soon, there is also a plaque in the market, near the old beef market, the meat market, that celebrates the people of America recognising the Guernsey cow and I think there is something there that should, at the very least, make us not just look at this and say, okay, well, let us put a few sticking plasters over it, but let us be serious in the future about how we make sure that the Guernsey cow still has a place here, and that it is something that some of our young people, not many perhaps, but some could aspire to get into.

It is an industry, I think, that should require that. When I went off to university in the mid-eighties, there were still some of my age that were thinking of going into farming. I do not think that is the case anymore and we need to do something about that. We need to raise the profile of it and that, sir, will require us to invest more, not just now, but in the future as well.

So, it is a bit of a signal to the future. I am very supportive of this. I want to see innovation. I want to see something appropriate for our culture today. I am glad that more is being done by the Dairy in terms of taking milk into schools and all of those sorts of things that can encourage people. We need to get innovation. We need to look for the niche markets that we could benefit from. That is going to require us to invest. I am a supporter. I will be supporting this, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir.

I can be very brief and that is mainly because you called Deputy Le Tocq before me and I absolutely agree with everything he said. What I would just, perhaps, add is that I also fully support all the Propositions and I thank E&I for bringing it. I think, for me, in the policy letter, if you look at Section 1.5 and the bullet points, it spells it out very succinctly for me.

It talks about the proposed revenue allocation which is outlined and it is in the bullet points, maintain a dairy industry in the Island that can provide milk and related dairy products to meet Island demand, keep the iconic Guernsey dairy breed, which Deputy Le Tocq has covered, as a feature of the Island's cultural heritage and landscape, improve the delivery of the States' environmental objectives and improve the economic environmental sustainability of the industry. What is there not to like? And very succinctly put.

Deputy de Sausmarez drew attention to the far more generous subsidies in play in other jurisdictions. Again, Deputy Le Tocq has drawn that out and he is absolutely right to do so. He drew attention to Section 5.26 and Deputy de Sausmarez also mentioned that the Dairy Project is languishing in the capital projects pipeline list.

I just want to make one observation around this, if you if you look at the table at 5.2, which mentions the jurisdictions where they do make a provision of financial support, all those jurisdictions have a consumption tax. It is quite interesting. In that list the Isle of Man is included and Jersey is included and I repeat a point I made in an earlier debate this week; Jersey, in nine years collects £1 billion, the Isle of Man in three years collects £1 billion. This is, perhaps, where those two jurisdictions can afford to subsidise these absolutely essential industries on their Island.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Aldwell.

Deputy Aldwell: Thank you, sir.

As you well know, sir, I have a neighbour who is a farmer and I know how very hard that farmer works. I know because I hear him at 4 a.m., across the valley, and he is working through till 10 p.m. at night. There is nothing as wonderful as walking the cliffs and seeing all the cattle out in the fields. All the fields are well looked after and they have a great deal of pride in their cattle and I know they have a very old dear that they have there and she has a mattress so she is comfortable because they do not want her to be uncomfortable when she comes in of a night.

They absolutely adore their cattle. They know them all by name. They have 120 of them and one of the things which is really, for me, also interesting is how they invest. So, I know that in 2020 they invested in the RSPCA, seal of approval to make sure that we have high quality milk, that the life of the cattle, they live well and we have happy cows in Guernsey. It is not often that you have that, it is a happy place for them. They have a wonderful life here. We have lost our flowers; we have lost our tomatoes but the one thing that we have left is our Dairy and I 100% support this. I am very pleased it has come and I know that they will be very happy that it has finally come, so, thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

Just to declare an interest, I rent some land to a mixed farmer. One of the things about the policy letter which I found was missing, a bit like the Dairy stall, but we talk a lot of in the policy letter about the support and what support is given elsewhere, but what it does not do is talk about why we are giving the support, why is the industry not able to support itself? And I just was wondering if Deputy de Sausmarez, when she sums up could just give us a little flavour as to the profitability of the farming industry.

We always say in here we want to see the evidence, but that evidence is not in here. I can understand for commercial sensitivities and that but just in broad terms it would be very helpful to know why the industry needs our support in this way and I will be very supportive of it, but it would just be helpful, I think, just to have on record as to why we are actually moving this way.

Thank you very much, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Vermeulen.

1695 **Deputy Vermeulen:** Yes, sir.

I think the Guernsey cow is world famous. The Dairy, the milk that it produces, the cream it produces, the cheese that comes out of the Guernsey Dairy really is first rate and world class. Deputy Aldwell said it is the only thing we have got left. Well, we have got our heritage left; we have got a lot more. We have got the famous Guernsey jumper, which is also well known and they have a fantastic website, if anyone is thinking of purchasing one, with all the details, the history of them and it really is super marketing. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

1700 I think we could do far better with our marketing. It is usually, as a rough guide, between 3% and 5% of the turnover of a business which should be invested in marketing. I realise that it is a monopoly, the Dairy, it is the milk which people can choose to order or not. But I do think, when I compare what is done in the Isle of Man with their dairy, how they promote their cheeses on world flights with Virgin Atlantic, how Jersey's website looks for their dairy, I really do think we need to push more to get more sales to also support the Dairy, but I will be supporting this in full.

1705 Thank you, sir.

1710 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you, sir.

Just very quickly I will be supporting the policy letter, but just one thing that I think that Deputy de Sausmarez missed out is actually how innovated the farmers are with. They probably use technology to the best that they can and, I think, it is great to see that they are just not stuck back in the times.

1715 They have really moved with the times and they have, actually, really tried to help themselves. So, I fully support this. It is not a declaration, but my in-laws, over in England, some of them are farmers, mostly arable not cattle. But just really do support the farmers. I think it is great, we support so many other things and this is one thing that we do need to support.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

1725 I feel very strongly about this because I was President of the Agriculture & Countryside Board back in 2001, when we had four times the real value of subsidies for our farmers that we have today. Although I have not done the calculations, I am pretty sure that we had considerably cheaper retail price for milk, in real terms, back then as well and the two are not unrelated.

1730 Of course, back then the retail price was actually fixed by the States, now we have a gate price and the retailers charge what they want. So, there is a range of retail prices these days, but it is too high and the reason it is become so high is that, basically, when considering what the producer price should be the STSB has had to consider the minimum amount that they can pay the farmers in order to keep them alive, not alive, but alive as businesses and viable.

1735 We bring in independent experts to review, if there is a disagreement between the STSB and farmers about how much they do need, then they go through their accounts, they go through them very carefully and we basically have to pay far more than is a commercial amount for that milk. Then obviously that goes on to the gate price at the other end and that influences the retail price.

1740 So, I am really hoping that, and it sounds very strongly as if it is going to be approved, maybe even this morning if we keep going for a little while, that this would take the pressure off. Obviously, we would still have to, we have not done the calculations yet, but this will have an impact on the viability of farms and so when that independent exercise is done to see how much the producer

price needs to be in order for them to have a reasonable return and to be able to invest in their businesses, it will no longer be so reliant on the producer price that is paid.

1745 I very much agree with Deputy Le Tocq that it is right that the burden should not just fall on the milk consumer, because the benefits are absolutely far wider than that. That was brought home to me very starkly. I used to be a frequent visitor to Alderney, I still do pop up from time to time, but I used to be a frequent visitor and they went, within a year or two, from having two dairy farmers to having none.

1750 The impact on the landscape and the natural beauty of Alderney was absolutely stark. It really was grim and it was only, I think, it was Jackie Main, actually encouraged a young farmer to come over and set him up that suddenly it got back to the state it is in now. So, I really do not want to see that happening in Guernsey.

1755 I do agree with Deputy Oliver that, actually, we should not do down the level of innovation amongst our small number, 11, dairy farmers, some of them are moving to full robotic milking parlours for instance. Which, yes, we need to see more of that Deputy le Tocq, we need to see more innovation. But, nevertheless, I think that is important.

1760 I cannot sit down, I know Deputy de Sausmarez, has said not too much focus on Propositions 2 and 3, which is about the Dairy itself and she wants us to look at the udder (*Laughter*) Propositions instead, sorry for my miss pronunciation. But it is crucial. One of the frustrations I will have in leaving this term is that I leave a very inefficient Dairy, where the revenue costs of running it are far higher than they should be, not because of bad practice, just because the nature of the building makes it impossible.

1765 I thank P&R for providing some interim capital investment to actually, hopefully, stop the thing from actually falling over. But renovating in-site will never ever, apart from the fact that it is difficult because you have got to keep a Dairy running and operating while you are trying to upgrade it, just the nature of the building and the space means you will never ever get the type of efficiencies in revenue costs that you will with a new Dairy.

1770 So, £150 million is not much to spend across the next capital portfolio. I hope it would be more than that because of looking at raising more revenue in other ways, but I do hope that the Dairy is not allowed to just get to the point where, if it does fall over we will have to allow imports and if it falls over for a month, I think, it is going to be very difficult to close the stable door once that has happened. So, I really urge the next P&R and the next Assembly to realise that, okay, it is not a school, it is not a hospital but the Dairy is incredibly important. So, please support our Propositions 2 and 3 as well.

1775

The Bailiff: Can I just get an indication as to how many Members want to speak in debate on this item. I think on that basis we are now adjourned until 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.32 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

COMMITTEE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

**8. The Future of the Guernsey Dairy Industry –
Propositions carried**

1780 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: Thank you, sir.

I am sure everyone wants to get away, so I just wanted to make a couple of brief points. Obviously, along with everyone else, I think we have to support the combination of our dairy industry and our Dairy, we cannot just leave the fields to turn into brambles and gorse, although
1785 that would be great, presumably, environmentally for some. So, I will be supporting this.

I will just raise a couple of points. One is the standard thing that I raise, I note that we have got the dreaded advisers coming in at £200,000 and I wonder what they are planning to do and what they are seeking to achieve. I note that they are either supplementing or replacing the one member
1790 of staff who currently gives advice to the farmers. So, I would be happy to hear what that is all about and what they are planning to achieve.

The other thing, I would just say on the subject of marketing, I just wonder if the Dairy could do more and maybe do a great website, advertising in some of the Sunday glossies for the products. I do see a number of, even chilled, products being advertised, you have got Loch Fyne Salmon
1795 advertising that they can deliver it to you in special chilled packaging. I do not know whether we could do some of that.

In central London, in SW1, there are a lot of very expensive cheese and dairy shops that I wonder if we could not be marketing into along, perhaps, with Visit Guernsey, marketing the two together, the Island and its cows and our great Dairy products, whether we could do some more marketing
1800 in Guernsey because, as I say, in central London they can bear quite high prices in some of these shops. Quite eye watering prices, which, no doubt, our kit would end up requiring but if we could do more on that we could both advertise the Island at the same time as we advertise our products, conceivably. So, that is all I had to say by way of a couple of suggestions and like everyone else, I am sure we will all be supporting this.

1805 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Murray.

Deputy Murray: Thank you, sir.

I think I should declare a conflict of interest, I drink nothing but Guernsey milk, (*Laughter*) and I only consume Guernsey butter. But I have got a complicated relationship that goes back to childhood with milk, actually, as it happens, and it is not what you might think. As a four-year-old child in a Scottish school, sir, milk was forced upon the children because of the prevalence of rickets. I hated it, and I think it is testament to the humour in the Scottish educational system in the 50s
1815 that they, therefore, made me a milk monitor. (*Laughter*)

However, fast forward a year and I find myself in the wilds of St Saviour's as we moved over to Guernsey when I was five and assailed by the smell of muck spreading which, as a town-dweller from Glasgow, I had never smelled anything like it. However, moving forward another five years and as a child at Oakvale School we, actually, did the tour around the Dairy.

This is a Tetrapak which is nearly 60 years old. It is not much of a Tetrapak now because it has travelled a bit, (*Laughter*) but it clearly had an impact on me because I have kept it. I do not know if anybody else in this room has actually ever seen one of these, maybe one or two of us that actually have. I am more than happy for you to pass it around so you can examine it if you wish. It is a bit of a show and tell, isn't it, really?
1820

So, I am actually very supportive of the dairy industry. My problem, I think, comes to the one of the sustainability, which we touched on earlier this session. My concern is that by putting a five-year
1825

timeline on when P&R is supposed to come back and try to provide a future vision for the dairy industry, I think it is going to be very costly because I think, as Deputy Roffey mentioned, at any time now, I think, the Dairy could fall over.

1830 Now, at the moment I think we have got about a £40 million plus price tag for a new Dairy. Now that may vary once we have done a little bit more research into it, but it is a huge amount of money and I do not know where it is going to come from. But if that does fall over, we do not have a dairy industry at this point in time and I do not know what we are going to do about that.

1835 So, again, my concern about the timeframe that is suggested in here gives me concern because I think we have to deal with this far quicker. However the result comes out, waiting five years is not really an option because I suspect that we will be in trouble before that.

1840 I would say one other thing. I do not think that we actually have a viable industry in the dairy sector in its current form. I think it will have to be much smaller to be viable and as a consequence of that, and I think it has been said quite a bit today, there is more of a cultural requirement here for us to keep this than there is actually for its contribution.

Maybe that is something that, perhaps, we can all take on board, whether we are actually looking here for the opportunity for children and visitors to be visiting a particular cultural centre, maybe something like the old Tomato Centre was many years ago because it was another icon of Guernsey in those days.

1845 So, I think we need to think a little bit outside of the box if we are to be able to create an environment whereby our signature Guernsey cow can remain alive and prosper. But I do not think it is going to be, unfortunately, as a consequence of what is proposed here. I think this is going to take us too long and I would urge Members, obviously, to bear that in mind when they are voting.

Thank you, sir.

1850

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, sir.

1855 I will be brief. I just think it has been quite a refreshing debate, actually, and certainly more refreshing than the last time we debated the Dairy back in, I think it was in 2015-16, where it was dominated by what we did with the milk retailers. It has also been refreshing because I do not think anybody has actually mentioned, why cannot we bring back yoghurt? *(Laughter)*

Usually every meeting has that, but there we go, well, there is always going to be somebody who mentions –

1860 Oh, gosh, I have got to give way to Deputy Roffey, he is looking at me!

Deputy Roffey: There has been a specimen product range for a new efficient Dairy when it was built and in it is included yoghurt. So if P&R can see their way through a few tens of millions of pounds for a new Dairy, then Deputy Soulsby we can have her yoghurts.

1865

Deputy Soulsby: I did not say I wanted the yoghurt, *(Laughter)* I said every debate wanted yoghurts. But no, I do support this policy. I have to thank Environment & Infrastructure for actually listening to P&R as well. The President came to P&R and we discussed the policy letter and issues that we had and dealt with those very well and also the Committee has dealt with the concerns we had with the original proposals which would have meant that we would have had an in-year increase, more pressure on the 2025 budget and they have moved that on.

1870 It does not mean that we have not got that pressure for 2026 but they have listened in terms of this year. So, I do thank them for it. I hope this is a way to go. I have got a soft spot for the industry. One of my favourite times in the States is when I sat on what was the old Dairy Management Board, and so, I do hope this is a good start.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Blin.

Deputy Blin: Thank you, sir.

1880 So, I am going to stand up, initially, to say that I will be supporting this but, like others have of commented, I have heard everyone else and I would like to milk this opportunity as well to talk about the future. In 5.13 we talk about the current Dairy facility built in 1951 and last refurbished 35 years ago. We all know where this is heading. So, for this aspect I will support it.

1885 But I would like to bring back the timelines as mentioned by Deputy Murray and some concerns by Deputy Dyke. I remember in 2022 we had some conversations and I believe, I do not know if Deputy Helyar will remember, but we had some conversations with some entrepreneurs from South Africa who were involved in dairies and they saw an opportunity, and thanks to Deputy Helyar opening up the door to talk, we did set up a meeting and they were talking about the real opportunities of the Dairy.

1890 So, first of all, fit for purpose and size. There is a fundamental question we all have is whether or not this is about the dairy industry or whether it is about the protection of the Guernsey cow and we are all very adamant that we must protect the herd and the Dairy. But with the technology, with sustainability, all the aspects there, we are never going to get into a situation where the price of milk is going to come down; it is always going to go up.

1895 So, therefore, we have to change our thoughts and our plans accordingly. So, when we come to this, I believe Deputy Murray said it is £40 million, I think I remember the figure, £37 million or something for the potential Dairy, but maybe we have to look about whether it is fit for purpose to deliver what we need to do.

1900 Now going back to this conversation we had going back all those years there was talk about milk powder, UHT, collagen, amazing profits and opportunities with collagen as a health product which could be developed from there. Now that conversation, and please correct me if I do not remember all of it, but it did not go much further than, maybe, some meetings and some conversations and then it stopped.

1905 I would like to put on record that when we come to this point there, we take great care because I, for one, have always purported that we have got to cut costs accordingly and adjust to our cloth, etc., but here there is an opportunity which, if we use the technology and the opportunities and we go to the right people and consultants, and this particular group of individuals were willing to get involved as well, there are great opportunities.

1910 So, I think in summing up for myself, the question is, is it the cattle or is it the Dairy, are we going to make it fit for purpose to work for our Island, are we going to really look forward for when we come to this planning? It is not just about a building and keeping everything the same, it is using the appropriate technologies and changes for our society.

Thank you, sir.

1915 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Deputy Blin often has his finger on the enterprise entrepreneur angle and I would very much welcome his suggestions. Now, I do not want to milk it either – or churn it all out and, to be honest, I could talk till the cows (*Laughter*) come home on this topic and have done over subsequent debates. But I want to go down a couple of rabbit holes, I am afraid, within reason.

1920 The first is, some people, including Deputy Soulsby, have referred to previous debates loosely on this topic, although they were more on the Dairy and maybe the milk retailers' section, and I would very much endorse the experienced and wise voice of Deputy de Lisle. How many times in this Chamber have we heard Deputy de Lisle call for more money to be spent in public expenditure? I would say virtually none.

1925 But on this occasion, he sees the value of the industry and its emblematic identity and he recalls how in the olden days, maybe farmers were more frugal, but it was a different culture. Going back to Deputy Murray and being a milk monitor, I was too young to be a milk monitor, but I was about five as well, and in those days English schools had to give out milk and you had to drink it and I did

1930 not really want to drink it. A few years later, Baroness Thatcher became Education Secretary and took the free milk away so, she became known as the Milk Snatcher, which was very unfair.

But the point is in those days, perhaps, milk was more part of our staple diet than today. But this report indicates, optimistically perhaps, that 90% of the Guernsey consumers still have some milk and I remember during the COVID era, one benefit of what was, in many ways, a disturbing period, 1935 I believe, after a period of decline, Deputy Roffey could confirm this, there was a plateauing out, if not a slight increase, in milk consumption on Guernsey. So, I think, it is misleading to say it is irreversible.

But, yes, I am the person who would like to call for yoghurts and I am pleased the cheese is still there because I think the cheese, at its best, is an award-winning cheese and like Deputy Le Tocq 1940 and Deputy Dyke and, I think, Deputy Blin, I think if the Dairy had a more commercial or commercialised mindset in conjunction with the farming sector, I think we could sell a lot more products overseas. We could think smarter on this and achieve a lot.

So, I do not see it as a dead industry at all or even as a declining one, but I would agree with the consensus that it is not, in itself, a huge revenue earning sector. I am sure if you looked in 1945 guidebooks of Guernsey for a while back, they would say, oh, Guernsey does growing, fishing and farming and that is true and the Guernsey cow is an icon, but we have to consider them as partners that we need to support.

I do not know how many dairy farmers we have left, 11 or 12, but I slightly disagree with someone who said no young people are entering the industry because I can think of a young man from a 1950 distinguished Guernsey family, with political and parish connections, who has entered farming and I think I was one of the few Members who went to the cow show this year, the Royal Agricultural Show, and I did see quite a lot of younger people having great pride in their cows being awarded rosettes by the Governor and so on. So, I very much believe in the industry.

Why are we here today? Well Deputy de Lisle and others have hinted that it was during the, 1955 Deputy Soulsby, time when we were focused more on economies at the Dairy and the milk retailer and, perhaps, ending the traditional licensing arrangements of the of the milk salesman, the milk retailers and I am afraid one negative consequence of that was not only did we not look at the whole picture holistically and we took our eye off the ball, but I think the milk retailers fulfilled a very useful role in promoting milk and dairy products and when they ceased to be in quite that line 1960 and it went more supermarket-based, inevitably a degree of volume of sales were lost and that had a consequence.

I do not really understand, and I have to admit that I am a failure in this respect, I do not know how we let the vision go from Deputy Roffey when he was Agricultural & Milk Marketing Board President of the subsidies for our environment, because that was the mainstream and we let it drop 1965 from an equivalent of £4 million to £1 million over a period of time, but because we were, perhaps, collectively a bit irresponsible in that respect and that is regrettable.

But like Deputy Prow I am aware from the report of the interconnection of things, lots of diagrams here, the Guernsey cow, biodiversity, habitat and so on and Deputy Prow, in particular, referred to subsidies elsewhere. Now, I certainly would not want to see European Union style 1970 farming policies here because, amongst other things, we could not afford them. Remember, we only have a dozen farmers left or so.

But look on page 25 and you have the support *per capita*, which the President outlined earlier. But just to put it into context, we have an outlier with £159 per person from the European Union but what really interests me, Deputy Prow made the point about GST or consumption taxes, but I 1975 would make a slightly different point that the Isle of Man, which is a bigger land area than us, but is similar in other respects, population of 80,000-odd, £128 *per capita*, Jersey a more measly £24, but rising to £53 after their industry has lobbied their Government and their States to get things moving and we are at £16.

So, we are really a tiny fraction. It bears out what Deputy Trott and others would say that, 1980 generally speaking, Guernsey is good value for money and I entirely endorse what Deputy Le Tocq

said about it being part of an international breed. That does not mean to say there are not a few issues here.

I think Deputy Murray was, again, on the money when he said that I do not think the vision here of making the industry more sustainable is complete in a commercial sense. I think the argument being made, if you look at page 10, for example, in the first point, before we have another review, it takes the industry back to a position of stability.

In the second place and the long term, we provide a platform for the dairy industry to transition to a fully environmental, sustainable industry which maximises the delivery of public goods, which I support and where the methods of regenerative farming are normal practice over all farms.

They are very carefully phrased because they show a vision, maybe, of greater viability and greater contribution in terms of public good and another concept that is referred here, not just caring for nature and strategy for nature, but effectively natural capital accounting that Deputy de Sausmarez has referred to.

That is important, but it is a way of putting ecological issues and public goods into the frame. But I do not think, *per se*, this will necessarily give what Deputy Murray might like to see, which is more profit being made in the industry. So, I do think even though I will support it today and want to support it, I think we are admitting, as Deputy Dyke has pointed out, that this is more of a social and cultural thing.

Where I would also agree, though, with Environmental & Infrastructure is, I think, it is not just a benefit to tourism and our community and society and our land use, but I actually think the appeal of the countryside being appropriately managed and the cows helps Locate Guernsey. I think it helps our profile in attracting and retaining people of all demographics and we should bear that in mind as well.

I think there might maybe one or two technical questions I would wish to address and one of those is the gate price, because I think at one time States' Members were happy to think that if we floated the market more, not milk floats, that the gate price would be a loss leader for retailers and supermarkets. But, in fact, there is a differential, significantly, between what the Dairy and farmers get and what it is sold at in the shops.

So, that reduction in price to the consumer and, therefore, possible increase in demand has not materially happened and I think another point is ensuring that individual incomes for the farmers are fair and it attracts and maintains the younger generation of farmers and that we maintain a price for milk that is suitable for people of virtually all incomes, because what we would not like to see, and we have been down this route before, is milk coming in through the back door and us having challenges there. So, I think we very much have to believe in the product and believe that we can find it and re-imagine farming as a community and environmental asset.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, sir.

I am going to build on what a few people have said around how wonderful our cows are and the industry and how our Island relies upon it as a key enabler. I am surprised nobody has picked up on the actual cost of what we are proposing. Proposition 1, £2.35 million, which it does sound an inordinate amount of money and regarding the sums we have talked about recently.

But if you have a look deeper into it and have a look at what we were paying the farmers back in 2001, all the way through up to 2019, which back in 2001 was £2.025 million and then that was reduced by £1 million in 2019. So, £2.35 million is whilst I said considerable amount of money, but if you extrapolated the amount from 2001 at RPIX or inflation linked it all the way up to 2025, that will come out at £4.12 million.

So, the £2.35 million is, let us call it, I am not going to say a saving, but it is significantly less than what we were paying the farmers way back in 2001. But of course, times are different, times have changed and some people have said, and it is described in the policy letter, why cannot the farmers help themselves? They certainly have been helping themselves.

They have been using efficiencies, some of them have even gone to robotic milking and I have had the pleasure of viewing one farm where they have done that, and the Lely robot milker is something to behold. It is completely automated, the cows wear a little necklace around the neck, funnily enough, where necklaces are worn, and there is a sensor on it which tells the machine exactly when that cow was last milked, which lactation they are in and it cleans them to very high standards, milks them, measures the exact amount of milk which is coming out of each quarter of each udder and the efficiency of that cow of it, of its milking.

Now, of course, not every farmer can do that, because this relies on the cow coming in to be to be fed and doing it of its own accord and then being milked. Of course, some cows have to cross roads, and they cannot be doing that unaccompanied or on their own and that points to some of our farmers, who are tenant farmers, they do not own the land and so they have to, again, rent the land where the cows are on, albeit, and we have heard from two of our Members that they are landlords or made a declaration to reflect that.

So, again, it is very hard to be efficient when you are renting land and the cows have to cross roads to be a robot milker. Of course those fields, as described in the policy letters, they are not efficient in themselves because we have got quaint Guernsey fields which are a patchwork. They are not huge, absolute hectares that happen in the UK where you get lots of efficiencies and some of them are not even contiguous. So, they are not even next door to each other. So, again, the herd has to make its own way through gateways, etc., crossing roads just to get to more grazing.

So, perhaps, this is a way of recognising some of the inefficiencies that are there but they are inefficiencies, which are part of the quaint make-up of Guernsey, and it goes towards what visitors want to see when they come to see our breed. We have heard from the tourism survey that people come here for the beauty of Guernsey and some of that beauty is our patchwork of fields with the Guernsey cow in it.

Certainly I know, from personal experience, if I am moving tourists around the Island, they come in on a cruise ship and they are going to a specific destination, they ask me to stop on the way, please can we see some Guernsey cows? And of course, that is quite hard in the summer when there is no grass to be grazed and they are all inside, but in the shoulder months, certainly, diversions are abound and we do stop and see the Guernsey cow.

It is a marketing gem, it markets itself, really, the Guernsey cow; they are certainly quite cute anyway and again the colouring is not what people are used to as well. So again, it all goes to help market Guernsey. It is one of our natural products. I have not even mentioned the milk and the quality of that, although other Members have. But we really do need to preserve this, enhance this breed and the product and what the farmers can do for Guernsey and the breed. So, I would urge Members to support this policy letter.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Helyar.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, sir.

I come from a farming family. My grandfather was a farmer, a dairy farmer. I spent much of my first 10 years of my life on the farm. He was also a Le Page, so the real Mr Le Page, not from Torteval, but from St Andrew's. So, they are real people. It is literally in my blood. But I cannot support this proposal.

I cannot, because if there is one thing it tells you, if you have reached a price point at which people will stop buying a product, then adding a subsidy to it is really just doubling down on a lost position. It is just not a sensible thing to do. I firmly believe in the industry, we asked for a lot of detail when I was a Member of P&R, which we never got and, as far as I am aware, Members of E&I have not seen some of the accounts that are that are concerned here.

So, I have to question why would we be pumping money into businesses where we have not seen the accounts? I certainly have not seen them. We saw them for some of them, but not all of the most successful ones. I do not buy into the environmental stuff either. Grass is a monoculture it

2085 has no biodiversity benefit of any sort. Neither does spraying thousands of gallons of glyphosate onto the fields in order to kill things off and replant them and you can cut a lot of hedges in Guernsey for £1 million a year and plant an awful lot of meadow grass for the benefit of pollinators and other things. So, I just do not buy it.

2090 The other thing that concerns me is that when it, and without being overly critical of the public sector, which I probably have been in recent months, we are not able to do anything quickly and successfully. There was talk yesterday about building and housing and so on, what has the States' built?

2095 Well, there are two examples of things that the public sector has built with States' property. One is a brand-new surgery at Queen's Road with States-owned land that we sold it during this term and the other is a fantastic new sporting football facility down at Victoria. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) That was all done without the States' involvement.

2100 We handed the stuff over to the private sector and it got on with it and that is what we should be doing here. We should be handing these assets over to the dairy industry and letting them manage them for themselves, without Government getting in the way and without all the talk in here and that is something I would definitely support, if and when.

2105 It seems this will pass, so a report will be made. Lord knows why it has to take another five-and-a-bit bit years for it to be finished, that is just really unbelievable considering it has taken four just to get to where we are now. I just do not think it is the right thing to do. I think it is reinforcing a defeat. I think we should let the farmers manage their own affairs much more and stop wasting public money on things which are not going to be any more of a success than they are today.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

2110 **Deputy Ferbrache:** That is an excellent and balancing speech by Deputy Helyar and he has spoken the truth, because there has been a lot of dewy-eyed romanticism in this debate today in relation to where we are. Deputy Murray was talking about his 60-year-old Tetrapak, well, he is a modernist because I can remember before then, and I am sure Deputy de Lisle probably can, well he owned most of the fields in those days, where the milkmen used to come round and your mum used to put a jug out and they would pour the milk into the jug. So, you are a Johnny come lately, Deputy Murray, if I may say so. (*Laughter*)

2120 But in relation to where we are, Deputy Helyar has a raised a point, it is referred to in the policy letter because when we were on A&F we were told there was a crisis and they had to have £1 million for the farming industry immediately. At paragraph 1.4 it is dealt with in the policy report in this document.

The Committee made a request to the P&R Committee for a short-term grant to support the industry. P&R agreed to a grant of up to £1 million, however, the Committee's monitoring and assessment of the industry at the time meant that £729,000, rather than the full £1 million, was paid out across 2022 and 2023.

That is because we never saw the accounts because we were saying, we will pay it out over a period of time, but we need to see the accounts.

2125 It is not that we were doubting anybody we were not saying that people were saying they were making a pound when they were making £1 million; we did not think that at all. But this was public money that we were handing over and we needed, therefore, to see the accounts and we never did.

2130 I get the impression, and I know, Deputy de Sausmarez will better deal with this when she replies, that they still have not seen the accounts. I am not giving way because she has got a chance to make a speech at the end and Deputy Brouard has raised a point in his speech. But we will hear from Deputy de Sausmarez when she speaks in due course.

Now, to ease her concerns, I am going to differ from the Deputy Helyar because he is absolutely right, but I am going to vote for these proposals because I do not want to risk us losing a dairy

industry. I really do not, and I can remember, before the matter I have just referred to, two farmers, one of which, Michael Bray, who was a really good Guernsey boy, well he is not a boy but he is a lot younger than me and another farmer saying, come and have a look at our farms.

I spent time with them going around and they showed me this, they showed me that and they showed me the detail. I am glad I am not a farmer because it is blinking hard work, long hours and you cannot say to your cows, even if it is going to be milked robotically, we are not coming today because it is Christmas Day. They have got to be sorted out every day of the year, come rain or shine. So, it is a horrible job and I am very glad that these people do it.

We talk about 400 farms, which used to have, they were tiny little farms. They had three cows, four cows, five cows, six cows. We have now got 11 and I would anticipate, I do not know any more than anybody else I am just giving my view, that probably in 10 years'-time we will have four or five farms. They may be more economic because even though Guernsey is not a big place there will be some economies of scales.

But we have got to get away from this dewy-eyed romanticism because everybody is saying, this is wonderful and I really do agree and it is a very tiny part of our GDP. It is referred to in the report and Guernsey cows are famous, not as famous as Jersey cows. I know Deputy Le Tocq has got a friend in Wyoming or wherever, he has got a farm the size of the Vale. But there are Jersey farms in the USA, or Jersey connections in the USA, who have got a farm the size of Jersey.

But the Guernsey cow is so important it is part of our psychological, cultural DNA in relation to where we are. So, we have got to continue to give the farmers every opportunity they. But just look at what we are looking at. Deputy Prow, other than Deputy Helyar, is really the only one who has referred, in any way, and he did it obliquely to the revenue and he talked about lucky Jersey, they have had £1 billion over nine years from GST, the Isle of Man, it is VAT or whatever it is, it is £1 million over three years.

Now, we are going to nod through and it will be passed overwhelmingly, an extra several million pounds of expense with no adjustment the other side. We are not going to ever be able to make this industry pay. But Deputy Roffey raised a point, we have got to keep it going. The he raised made the point about the Dairy, which could fall over at any time.

If the Dairy did fall over at any time and the milk came in from the UK for a month, the Guernsey industry is dead because you are never going to get the supermarkets to stop importing this horrible milk that they drink in the UK. It costs about four pence or whatever it is and it is dreadful stuff.

But people will buy it because they will get used to buying it at the supermarkets and they will not go back to Guernsey milk. They might do, Deputy Murray might, he might have another Tetrapak in a few years' time if they bring those back. I smile inwardly and externally when I hear all these people say, well the Dairy could do this to increase revenue the Dairy could do that.

I know from my time at STSB that they did exactly all of those things. They turned their mind to everything in question. Deputy Vermeulen can shake his head till it falls off, but it will not alter the fact that I know in my time, and Deputy Roffey is nodding hastily, that in his time –I am not giving away I am going to just let you shuffle in your seat – but I am not going to give way.

Now, Deputy Dyke may say, near one of his residences in London that they could sell cheese for a great fortune and he may be right, but there is not enough that could be produced consistently and these shops want it consistently because you cannot go down one day and not buy it another. So that is not realistic.

But we are in a position whereby and what we have got to face, Deputy Gabriel gave some figures from 2001, it would be over £4 million now. That was seven years before Zero-10. Our financial position was a lot different then, we were swimming in money. That is right we had so much money coming in that even Deputy Trott managed to balance the books. *(Laughter)* So, we were we were in that situation in those days whereby it is a different world.

But the Guernsey farmers are good people. They have got to be given a chance. But if we make this decision, and I am going to vote for it, we will be subsidising forever because there is no way that this industry can ever make any money. What we also should have done but, of course, we do

2185 not do these things, we should have moved the Dairy to the Brickfield years ago, we should have given that land to the Health Committee so they could build some places up there for their staff.

(A Member: Hear, hear.)

They would not then have Deputy Soulsby and Deputy Roffey looking over the garden gate soulfully and saying, we cannot build in that field, because I think they would have agreed they could have built in that field, up where the Dairy is. We should have done all those things. We have not done them. We have got the consequences of not doing them and we are going to have to make harsh decisions.

2190 So, I am not the dewy eyed romantic. I am not romantic and I am not dewy eyed, but we have got to, I think, follow this through. One good thing about 1951, we heard about 1951 and the Dairy is wearing out, well, I suppose I was born in 1951 and I am wearing out, so I am going to sit down.

Deputy Haskins: Sir, can I ask for Rule 26(1), please?

The Bailiff: Can I invite those Members who wish to speak in debate to stand in their places?
2200 (Laughter)

On that basis, Deputy Haskins, can I avoid putting the motion to Members and simply invite the President to reply to the debate.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

2205 I will just make a general vote of thanks really to everyone who has contributed. I think, on the most part, it has been a good debate and I very much welcome the comments that have been made in the course of that. I do not intend to go through individual speakers one-by-one. I will try to pick up on individual questions and, certainly, some of the more common themes that came up.

2210 Deputy de Lisle asked for an assurance that there was an appetite. He wanted to see that moving towards more sustainable practices, I think, as quickly as possible. That was essentially what he was he was driving at and, certainly, I can provide that assurance. I know personally from my interactions with them that many of our farmers, especially the younger ones, have got a real appetite for this and are very keen to move faster in that direction.

2215 It is actually exactly why we structured the support package in the way that we have, where the Dairy Farm Management payments are actually contingent on the Public Goods Credit Scheme, so precisely for the kinds of reasons that Deputy de Lisle was alluding to. So, I hope you can take comfort from that. But I very much thank him for his support.

2220 The new schemes will include requirements to better understand the use of nutrients, to reduce reliance on inorganic fertilisers and to look at an integrated pest management plan, for example, which are examples of things which aim to encourage a reduction in reliance on pesticides. So, I hope Deputy de Lisle will be reassured by that.

2225 Deputy de Lisle also touched on the veterinary service and, certainly, the Committee will consider whether the advisory scheme could provide advice on herd health best practice in general. That is already something that has been discussed at the Committee. I think this has probably been covered off by Deputy Gabriel, actually, but when Deputy de Lisle said that we are reinstating the financial support that we used to provide, I think it is worth reminding Members that, actually, it is still only around half, if you re-inflate the level of support from 2001, it is only around half from next year onwards.

2230 Yes, I said I would not go through individual speakers, it is hard not to because I have not managed to pull it together into anything more cohesive. Deputy Le Tocq did say that this policy letter, the proposals within it, do not achieve everything that we need to do and I could not agree more and I think the policy letter is very honest about that and, certainly, I tried to emphasise that fact in my opening speech as well.

2235 He was one of a number of Members that talked about partnership and innovation and, actually, one of the stories he reminded me of when a new marketing director, I worked at Specsavers for many years, and we had just been through a period of time where they had been looking around

for new directions of marketing angles, then a new director of marketing came in and said, what are you thinking?

2240 You have got a catchphrase here that is absolutely, all brands they would chew their right hand off to have something that is so synonymous with their brand, like a catchphrase, like should have gone to Specsavers and he brought that back and I do think there is a parallel there in what Deputy Le Tocq was talking about. I think we do need to make the most of assets that we already have especially in terms of the branding.

2245 Deputy Brouard asked a question about profitability. Historically, farm businesses here have been profitable but the kinds of combinations of factors that I talked about, or that are discussed in the policy letter, and I touched on when I opened on debate, have meant that this is increasingly challenging.

2250 As Deputy Gabriel explained when he spoke, it is very difficult we cannot just achieve the same kinds of efficiencies as can be achieved in other places because there are inherent constraints relating to, for example, the capacity of milk that our cows, by virtue of their breed, can produce, the nature of our field patterns and even, actually, the layout of individual farms.

2255 So, Deputy Gabriel was talking about the robotic milking and it is a wonderful sight to behold, fantastic, and Deputy Oliver mentioned the same. But actually that is not applicable to all farms because it does depend on the layout of the farm and, actually, if there are cows that need to cross roads they cannot necessarily do that by themselves. So, these are the kinds of constraints that mean that we cannot just roll out efficiencies across the board and expect them to work for every individual farm.

2260 But to give Deputy Brouard slightly more detail the margins these days, where they exist at all, are razor thin and I think to a very low number of pence per litre, very low levels of profit, where they exist at all. So, I hope that gives him a little bit more detail, there are commercial sensitivities around some of those but, certainly, we have had a chance to look at those numbers and they make for very uncomfortable viewing.

2265 Deputy Dyke talked about the dreaded advisors. I had a sneaking suspicion Deputy Dyke might be exercised about that. Section 9.3 of the policy letter does explain that we would look to recruit an agricultural officer to the States of Guernsey or procure a delivery partner for the Dairy Farm Support Framework employed using a portion of that budget proposed for the Farming Advisory Scheme.

2270 It has not yet been decided which approach to take but, certainly, we would look at doing that in the most cost-effective way possible. The support that is already provided; Farm Services are a very small and lean team and they are mainly around the breed improvement programme. So, they collect data from the farms and manage that and, actually, some of their services are, indeed, chargeable back to the farms. They do provide some advice, but it is highly limited relating to breed improvements. So, what we have got at the moment is not nearly as broad as, I think, the kind of Farm Advisory Service that we are looking to introduce.

2275 Deputy Murray, I did enjoy his show and tell and actually he reminded me that when I was a child of a similar age I actually told everyone, because I had quite an itinerant early childhood and I was only in Guernsey for part of the time every year and everywhere else, I told everyone that I did not touch milk. I would not go anywhere near the stuff because the only thing that I recognised as actual milk was Guernsey milk and I could not get enough of it when I was here. But yes, I would not touch it with a barge pole anywhere else.

2280 Deputy Murray was one of a number of Members who talked about viability, or equivalence, and I would just like to put this in context. I think it is a bit of a misconception because, as far as I am aware, having looked at how these things work in other jurisdictions, I do not think there are any examples of completely commercial dairies that wash their face.

2285 If we look at the table that has been referenced several times during debate about the different levels of support provided to farmers by governments, we can see that, actually, we are the stingiest by really quite some significant margin. So, other farms in other places may be, superficially, working on a commercial basis but I think we need to recognise that they are not a purely commercially run

operation and there is significant financial input in other parts of that system which enabled them to act more commercially at whatever level we are looking at them at.

But I think it is a bit of a fallacy to think that any dairy operation, really, is going to run on that purely commercial basis and I think it would be completely misplaced for us to think that is in any way a realistic or even desirable thing to aim for in the Guernsey context, where it is even more challenging but where, as has been said, we are starting from a very much lower base in terms of the support that our farmers get.

It is really about becoming more economically sustainable and not totally economically independent which, as I say, just I do not think would be realistic and I think that is justifiable because I do not think this is just about dairy products. I do not think it is a simple, straightforward transaction about money and milk and other dairy products. It is so much broader than that which is what I hope our policy letter really brought to life. There are so many things that people benefit from that do not have anything to do with dairy products at all.

I welcome Deputy Soulsby's comments and she has a long relationship with this subject. I think she was on, possibly even the Vice-President or equivalent, of the Commerce & Employment Committee? Oh, no, well anyway, I think she has been involved with it for many years including the last time it was debated in its full substance.

She gave thanks to the Committee for listening and adapting, according to P&R's feedback, and I would like, in turn, to put my thanks to the officers who have put in so much time and effort on this and, indeed, the farmers. There has been a huge amount of work in co-operation across different Departments and I would just like to put on record my thanks to all of those.

Deputy Blin talked about a fundamental question being whether this is about the dairy industry or the cow. Well, I hope that what this policy letter draws out is that the two are inextricably linked and that we cannot look at the dairy industry as simply a transaction between consumers and dairy products, it is so much broader than that and the future of the Guernsey cow is inextricably linked with the dairy industry on-Island. So, I do not think you can extrapolate the two. I think that is why we have presented it in this way and why we have structured the support package in that way.

He also talked about the timetable. Table 9.3 does set out a timeframe and it suggests that the P&R review should be by 2027, in parallel with STSB working up their build proposals and I would say to those people that have questioned the timelines, I would be supportive of accelerating this as fast as it can possibly go and, I think, everyone. I am sure that sentiment is shared by those on STSB as well.

Deputy Gollop, obviously, had a very wide-ranging speech and I am just trying to pick out some of the more discreet points. He did talk about the price and the profit margin. This was something that Deputy Roffey touched on when he spoke, about some of the constraints that the Dairy has to operate under. But I believe I am right in saying that actually the profit margin for milk retailers seems to have increased quite significantly since the days when the States actually set the retail price of milk.

So, in fact, it has almost had the opposite effect than what was originally envisaged through the reforms brought in on the back of the 2014 review. But obviously, the bits that are in the States' control and, specifically STSB, relates to the producer price and the gate price. Deputy Helyar was concerned that we have not seen the accounts. Well, our policy has, in fact, been informed by the most recent cost of production report and that data has, indeed, been verified. All the accounts have been verified against the accounts to confirm the data's accuracy.

So, I do not have any concerns on that. There was quite a granular level of detail. We could not include any of that in an appendix, for example, because there are so few farms that anonymity would have been a complete sham. So, it was too commercially sensitive to include. But I can reassure him and Deputy Ferbrache, who raised a similar concern, that there has been a good amount of scrutiny and verification of those accounts.

Deputy Ferbrache said that we are not going to be able to make this industry pay. Well, with due respect, I think that misses the point. As I said, this is not a simple commercial transaction about money in return for dairy products. It is so much more than that and without even being dewy eyed

and romantic about it, I think anyone who genuinely is supportive of the dairy industry continuing in the Island needs to understand that those two things are inextricably linked and we do need to provide adequate support to our dairy industry to be able to have that continue and for our breed of cow to continue.

2345 So, I share his frustration about not having moved on the Dairy quicker, I have always been supportive of that. I am just sorry that he did not have a chance to execute that while he was in P&R and get that moving, he would have certainly had my fulsome support and I know STSB's as well.

2350 But, anyway, I am sorry I have not mentioned everyone individually but I do thank people for some very interesting and helpful contributions to debate and I have mentioned them briefly, but I think we do need to pay particular thanks, I think probably on behalf of everyone in the Assembly, to our farmers who work some pretty anti-social hours in some very challenging conditions for very little money and they do a wonderful job.

2355 So, I am pleased that the policy letter and its proposals have had so much support and I think, I just hope that that will come across loud and clear as a vote of confidence in our farmers and in the future of our dairy industry and so I would commend these Propositions, in their entirety, to the States.

Thank you.

2360 **The Bailiff:** Well Members of the States, there are four Propositions. Is there any Member who wishes to vote differently in respect of any of those Propositions? (*Interjection*) Which Proposition would you like taken distinctly then, Deputy Le Tissier?

Deputy Le Tissier: One, thank you, sir.

2365 **The Bailiff:** So can I put Proposition 1 to Members first and then Propositions 2 to 4, inclusive, content? All right, that is what we will do and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 1, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 1.

Carried – Pour 28, Contre 3, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 4, Absent 3

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

Roffey, Peter
Soulsby, Heidi
St Pier, Gavin
Taylor, Andrew
Vermeulen, Simon

2370 **The Bailiff:** Greffier. So, in respect of Proposition 1, there voted in favour, 28 Members, 3 Members voted against; 2 Members abstained; 7 Members did not participate in that vote, and I will declare Proposition 1 carried.

We will now take Propositions 2, 3 and 4 together please and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Propositions 2, 3 and 4.

2375

There was a recorded vote.

Propositions 2-4.

Carried – Pour 30, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 4, Absent 3

POUR

Aldwell, Sue
Blin, Chris
Brouard, Al
Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina
Cameron, Andy
De Lisle, David
De Sausmarez, Lindsay
Dyke, John
Fairclough, Simon
Falla, Steve
Ferbrache, Peter
Gabriel, Adrian
Gollop, John
Haskins, Sam
Le Tissier, Chris
Le Tocq, Jonathan
Matthews, Aidan
McKenna, Liam
Meerveld, Carl
Moakes, Nick
Murray, Bob
Oliver, Victoria
Prow, Robert
Queripel, Lester
Roffey, Peter
Soulsby, Heidi
St Pier, Gavin
Taylor, Andrew
Vermeulen, Simon

CONTRE

Helyar, Mark

NE VOTE PAS

Hill, Edward
Snowdon, Alexander

DID NOT VOTE

Dudley-Owen, Andrea
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Leadbeater, Marc
Mahoney, David

ABSENT

Inder, Neil
Parkinson, Charles
Trott, Lyndon

The Bailiff: So, in respect of Propositions 2, 3 and 4, there voted in favour, 30 Members; 1 Member voted against; 2 Members abstained; 7 Members did not participate in that vote and, therefore, I will declare Propositions 2, 3 and 4 also duly carried.

2380 Before we call the final item of business there is an Amendment that has been submitted and I will ask the Sheriff to give all Members copies of that amendment. Does every Member now have a paper copy of the amendment?

COMMITTEE FOR POLICY & RESOURCES

**9. Schedule for the States' Business –
Proposition (as amended) carried**

Article 9

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 5th March 2025, they are of the opinion to approve the Schedule.

Items for Ordinary Meeting of the States commencing on the 5th March 2025

(a) communications by the Presiding Officer including in memoriam tributes;

(b) statements;

(c) questions;

(d) elections and appointments;

*P.2025/13 Committee for Home Affairs – IMP re-appointments (Chairman and Members)**

(e) (motions to debate an appendix report (1st stage);

(f) articles adjourned or deferred from previous Meetings of the States;

(g) all other types of business not otherwise named;

P.2025/10 - Animal Welfare (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025;*

P.2025/11 - Veterinary Surgery and Animal Welfare (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025;*

P.2025/15 - Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure – Bailiwick of Guernsey's Sanitary & Phytosanitary Border Model;*

P.2024/14 - Committee for Health & Social Care – Review of the Children Law and Outcomes;*

*P.2024/105 - Policy & Resources Committee – Rectories in Plurality**

2385 **The Deputy Greffier:** Article 9, Policy & Resources Committee – Schedule for the States' Business.

2390 **The Bailiff:** I am going to remind Members of the States, I am sure you do not need reminding, but I am going to remind you of Rule 3, paragraph 18, which says that because this is a Committee Amendment, effectively, Deputy Soulsby will open on it, for up to two minutes. Deputy Le Tocq will then formally second it, but the Presidents of the Committees who are affected can also speak for up to two minutes each, but no other Member can.

2395 Now, I think that the Presidents involved are Deputy de Sausmarez, on behalf of the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure, Deputy Prow, on behalf of Home Affairs, Deputy Roffey on behalf of the Committee for Employment & Social Security and Deputy Brouard, on behalf of the Committee for Health & Social Care, on the basis that there is a proposal to insert into the schedule business on each of their Committees' behalf, but no one else can speak. I hope that is crystal clear again. So, Deputy Soulsby, please.

[Amendment.](#)

To insert at the end of the proposition the following: 21st February 2025 "subject to deleting the Schedule and replacing with the Schedule for future States' business attached hereto."

Items for Ordinary Meeting of the States commencing on the 5th March 2025

(a) communications by the Presiding Officer including in memoriam tributes;

(b) statements;

(c) questions;

(d) elections and appointments;

*P.2025/13 Committee for Home Affairs – IMP re-appointments (Chairman and Members)**

(e) motions to debate an appendix report (1st stage);

(f) articles adjourned or deferred from previous Meetings of the States;

(g) all other types of business not otherwise named;

*P.2025/10 Animal Welfare (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025**

P.2025/11 Veterinary Surgery and Animal Welfare (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025;*

P.2025/15 Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure – Bailiwick of Guernsey's Sanitary & Phytosanitary Border Model;*

P.2024/14 Committee for Health & Social Care – Review of the Children Law and Outcomes;*

*P.2025/21 Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure – Legislative Changes for the Implementation of the Open Market Part A Inscriptions Policy**

*P.2025/22 Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure – Introduction of Housing Standards Legislation**

;P.2025/17 Committee for Home Affairs – Road Traffic - Causing Death or Serious Injury by Driving (Guernsey) Law, 2025;*

*P.2025/18 Committee for Home Affairs – Road Traffic (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025**

*P.2025/19; Committee for Home Affairs – Road Traffic (Drink Driving) (Guernsey) Law, 1989 (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025**

*P.2025/20 Committee for Employment & Social Security – Income Support (Implementation) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025**

*P.2025/23 Committee for Health & Social Care – Responsible Officer Annual Report**

Items for Ordinary Meeting of the States commencing on the 19th March 2025

P.2025/26 Committee for Education, Sport & Culture – Blanchelande College, Elizabeth College and The Ladies College Future Funding Arrangements;*

*P.2025/24 Committee for Health & Social Care – Proposed Amendment to the Medicines (Human and Veterinary) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Law, 2008**

*P.2025/25 States' Trading Supervisory Board Incorporating our Trading Business**

Items for Ordinary Meeting of the States commencing on 30th April 2025

*P.2024/105 Policy & Resources Committee – Rectories in Plurality**

*Amendments to the proposed Meeting dates and order are permitted only for those items marked with an *.*

Items for Special Meeting of the States commencing on the 15th July,

2025 P.2025/xx States of Guernsey Accounts

Items for Special Meeting of the States commencing on the 4th November 2025

P.2025/xx States' Budget P.2025/xx – Non-Contributory Benefits Rates.

2400 **Deputy Soulsby:** Thank you, sir.

I do not think I will be anywhere near two minutes. The Committee has tried to fit more into the next meeting by bringing more items that appeared subsequent to us preparing the Schedule and other things that came in later. We have spoken to all the Presidents of the relevant Committees who are happy with the Schedule. So, I hope Members will support it. It means that we are able to, hopefully, fully use the next States' Meeting.

2405

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq, do you formally second this amendment?

Deputy Le Tocq: I do, sir, I do not need two minutes to do that.

2410

The Bailiff: So, Deputy de Sausmarez, do you wish to speak?

Deputy de Sausmarez: Only to confirm that E&I is supportive of this and we do seem to have quite a lot on the agenda. I will use some of my two minutes to give way to Deputy Oliver if she has got a question for me? No, okay, right, E&I are supportive of this approach.

2415

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir.

2420 I feel sure the Committee would support this. There is a lot of business to get through and I thank P&R for bringing the amendment. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)
Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

2425

Deputy Roffey: I have not consulted my Committee, but as somebody that actually suggested we should do something along these lines. I am very supportive of it and, hopefully, next time around we might be able to move some of the April stuff to the 19th March so that we can try and stay on top of our workload.

2430

The Bailiff: And Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

2435 Although I am very supportive of moving the responsible officer's report further forward, I am a little bit concerned that the Policy & Resources Committee issue on rectories in plurality is getting pushed further and further into the long grass and before it ends up in next term or the term after that, I would like an assurance from the Deputy Minister or Deputy Soulsby that we will actually get around to the rectories, because this is a long outstanding matter which actually needs closure and we need to sort out the Common Law belief that parishes have to provide rectories and that should be done at the same time. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)
2440 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Strictly speaking, there is no opportunity to reply to that but, Deputy Soulsby, if you do just want to comment, I will let you.

2445

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, sir.
P&R will discuss this next week.
Thank you.

2450 **The Bailiff:** So, Members of the States, it is now time to vote on Amendment 1 to the Schedule for Future States' Business, which is a wholesale change of it, proposed by Deputy Soulsby, seconded by Deputy Le Tocq and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Amendment 1

Carried – Pour 31, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 4, Absent 3

POUR

Blin, Chris
Brouard, Al
Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina
Cameron, Andy
De Lisle, David
De Sausmarez, Lindsay
Fairclough, Simon
Falla, Steve
Ferbrache, Peter
Gabriel, Adrian
Gollop, John
Haskins, Sam
Helyar, Mark

CONTRE

Aldwell, Sue

NE VOTE PAS

Dyke, John

DID NOT VOTE

Dudley-Owen, Andrea
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Leadbeater, Marc
Mahoney, David

ABSENT

Inder, Neil
Parkinson, Charles
Trott, Lyndon

Hill, Edward
 Le Tissier, Chris
 Le Tocq, Jonathan
 Matthews, Aidan
 McKenna, Liam
 Meerveld, Carl
 Moakes, Nick
 Murray, Bob
 Oliver, Victoria
 Prow, Robert
 Queripel, Lester
 Roffey, Peter
 Snowden, Alexander
 Soulsby, Heidi
 St Pier, Gavin
 Taylor, Andrew
 Vermeulen, Simon

2455 **The Bailiff:** So, in respect of Amendment 1, proposed by Deputy Soulsby, seconded by Deputy Le Tocq to the Schedule for Future States' Business, there voted in favour 31 Members; 1 Member voted against; 1 Member abstained; 7 Members did not participate in the vote but I will, therefore, declare that duly carried.

2460 That is the only amendment to the Schedule. There probably does not need to be any further debate, Deputy Soulsby, on the Schedule and, therefore, I will put now the Schedule as duly amended, which might seem a bit silly when it has been a wholesale change, but there has to be a vote on it, on the Schedule as now amended, and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting, please.

Do not worry, we will leave it open for those Members who shut their machines down!

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 32, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 4, Absent 3

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

Soulsby, Heidi
St Pier, Gavin
Taylor, Andrew
Vermeulen, Simon

2465 **The Bailiff:** So, in respect of the Schedule, as amended, there voted in favour 32 Members; 1 Member voted against; no Member abstained; 7 Members did not participate in that vote, but I will declare the Schedule, as amended, duly carried.

Can I congratulate Members on having concluded all of the business and before 5.30 p.m. so, we will now close the meeting and start afresh next time.

The Assembly adjourned at 3.39 p.m.