



**OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF THE**

**STATES OF DELIBERATION**

**OF THE**

**ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

**HANSARD**

**Royal Court House, Guernsey, Wednesday, 9th December 2015**

*All published Official Reports can be found on the  
official States of Guernsey website [www.gov.gg](http://www.gov.gg)*

**Volume 4, No. 39**

**ISSN 2049-8284**

*Published by Her Majesty's Greffier, The Royal Court House,  
St Peter Port, GY1 2NZ. © States of Guernsey, 2015*

**Present:**

**Sir Richard J. Collas, Kt, Bailiff and Presiding Officer**

**Law Officers**

H. E. Roberts Esq., Q.C. (H.M. Procureur)

**People's Deputies**

**St Peter Port South**

Deputies P. A. Harwood, J. Kuttelwascher, B. L. Brehaut,  
R. Domaille, A. H. Langlois, R. A. Jones

**St Peter Port North**

Deputies M. K. Le Clerc, J. A. B. Gollop, P. A. Sherbourne,  
R. Conder, E. G. Bebb,

**St Sampson**

Deputies G. A. St Pier, K. A. Stewart, P. L. Gillson,  
P. R. Le Pelley, S. J. Ogier, L. S. Trott

**The Vale**

Deputies M. J. Fallaize, D. B. Jones, L. B. Queripel, M. M. Lowe,  
A. R. Le Lièvre, A. Spruce, G. M. Collins

**The Castel**

Deputies D. J. Duquemin, C. J. Green, M. H. Dorey,  
B. J. E. Paint, J. P. Le Tocq, S. A. James, M. B. E., A. H. Adam

**The West**

Deputies R. A. Perrot, A. H. Brouard, A. M. Wilkie,  
D. de G. De Lisle, Y. Burford, D. A. Inglis

**The South-East**

Deputies H. J. R. Soulsby, R. W. Sillars, P. A. Luxon,  
M. G. O'Hara, F. W. Quin, M. P. J. Hadley

**Representatives of the Island of Alderney**

Alderney Representatives L. E. Jean and S. D. G. McKinley, O. B. E.

**The Clerk to the States of Deliberation**

J. Torode, Esq. (H.M. Greffier)

**Absent at the Evocation**

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller)  
Deputy L. C. Queripel (relevé à 10h 45); Deputy D. B. Jones (indisposé)

## Business transacted

Evocation .....	3077
Welcome to the Very Reverend Tim Barker .....	3077
<b>Billet d'État XX.....</b>	<b>3077</b>
IX. Education Department and Treasury & Resources Department – Transforming Early Years Education – Funding Options for the Introduction of a Universal Entitlement to Pre-School Education – Debate continued – Propositions carried .....	3077
XI. Environment Department – Biodiversity Strategy – Debate commenced .....	3098
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.30 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.29 p.m. ....</i>	<i>3114</i>
XI Biodiversity Strategy – Debate continued – Propositions carried.....	3114
XIII Treasury & Resources Department – Amendments to the Compulsory Acquisition of Land (Guernsey) Law, 1949 – Propositions carried.....	3151
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.30 p.m. ....</i>	<i>3152</i>

*PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK*

# States of Deliberation

*The States met at 9.30 a.m.*

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

## **PRAYERS**

*The Greffier*

## **EVOCATION**

### **Welcome to the Very Reverend Tim Barker**

**The Bailiff:** Members of the States, just before we start can I draw your attention to the presence in the public gallery of the Anglican Dean, the Very Reverend Tim Barker. Welcome to you.

## Billet d'État XX

### **EDUCATION DEPARTMENT AND TREASURY & RESOURCES DEPARTMENT**

#### **IX. Education Department and Treasury & Resources Department – Transforming Early Years Education – Funding Options for the Introduction of a Universal Entitlement to Pre-School Education – Debate continued – Propositions carried**

**The Bailiff:** We continue with the debate on the Education Department and Treasury & Resources Department's policy letter on Transforming Early Years Education – Funding Options for the Introduction of a Universal Entitlement to Pre-School Education.

Who wishes to speak next? Deputy De Lisle.

**Deputy De Lisle:** Sir, as a Member of the Education Board last term I was always keen on upgrading pre-school education to give youngsters a better start in education, but never in favour of a universal entitlement to pre-school education, which I generally called a Cadillac system of funding pre-school education.

Of the four options presented to the board in 2008, costed at £1.6 million, £1.62 million, £460,000 and £220,000, I consistently opted for the least expensive option at around a quarter of a million, whereby the Department provided additional training to pre-school leaders, where necessary, to comply with the new quality control expectations, the statutory framework.

As I understand it, some of this is currently ongoing. The Department during the past year has been working hard, training pre-school leaders and producing a statutory framework for pre-schools as it became obvious that the budget was limited to finance pre-school education. So,

20 already one of the options is in-train, albeit not the universal £220 million a year option, the  
£1.6 million that has become.

A large percentage of children, sir, already attend pre-school and some in the nursery pre-  
school business believe that this is near universal in that many of the remaining would not  
participate anyway for various reasons, and those in difficult financial circumstances already have  
25 access to States' funded pre-schools or those charitably funded.

In reality, the Education board is to pay for a lot of what already exists, although I take note of  
comments during the debate that 120 children did not receive pre-school education and 170 did  
not get the full 15 hours. We could make that up, but why have the taxpayer pay for the full  
service, currently fee paid, and introduce a new universal benefit at a time when the States are  
30 moving away from this concept.

Running a deficit budget, sir, we need to think carefully before committing to another  
£2.2 million a year on a new universal pre-school education benefit. Remember, this pre-school  
education plan was set up in 2008, before the crash and the new corporate tax policy. There was  
more money available then. The fiscal economic reality has changed.

35 There is also another consideration, sir, that I would like to make: if there are resources around,  
there are many children in States' primaries that need the extra help before entering secondary  
school and many in early years of secondary that need extra help now. If the Education  
Department has money to spend, then these children of compulsory school age should be the  
first to receive it, to cash up. We need to target now where the extra resources are needed in our  
40 existing schools to further the chance of those in need in primary and secondary education.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

45 **Deputy Lowe:** Thank you, sir.

Sir, I want to be clear at the very start –

**Deputy Luxon:** Excuse me, sir, may I just... ? Is it appropriate for Deputy Lowe to stand and  
start speaking without actually letting everybody know that it is her birthday today? *(Laughter)* Mr  
50 Bailiff, is that appropriate? I do not know the etiquette for things like this. *(Laughter)* I mean she is  
the Mother of the House, an *older* mother of the House. *(Laughter and applause)*

Sir, she has got a cherry on! That was worth doing. *(Laughter)*

**Deputy Lowe:** Thank you very much, Deputy Luxon and Members of the States.

55 Right, okay, back to where I was. Enough is enough. Let's get back to States' business.

I want to make it very clear right at the very beginning, I *totally* agree with pre-school. I have  
no problem with pre-school and I support it. The Minister and indeed most of the Members of  
Education are fully aware of my stance on this States' report.

The difficulty I have is with the funding element because, like others have already said, this  
60 universal funding, I struggle with. I struggle with the fact that we are actually looking at Family  
Allowance, which I do not think is appropriate. I also struggle with that there is a huge majority  
who already attend and are able to pay for pre-school, and now they will be given 15 hours free  
attendance.

Another one of the reasons why I struggle with this: this States is becoming really inconsistent,  
65 and I say that because there are many in this Chamber who have said all along, when we had the  
pension and tax review and it was discussed here in this Assembly, we must start means-testing  
for prescriptions, because we should not be handing out prescriptions to those 65 and over when  
they can afford to pay. Yet at the other end of the scale, in this report we have got here we are  
saying, 'Well, you can afford to pay, but never mind we are not going to let you pay any more  
70 because we are going to do it for you.' And all of this is happening during the time when we have  
got a deficit, because we have agreed to a deficit by approving a States' report a couple of weeks

ago. So we are already in a bigger deficit than we were actually looking for. That is why I struggle with it. I just struggle with this inconsistency.

75 I certainly welcome the pre-school and I know when I have discussed it with members of Education there has been concern about some of the standards of the pre-schools that exist already. Well, make it part of the licence. It is all very well saying, 'Oh, that is HSSD'. Well, actually, do you know what, we are a joined-up States. We can change that within. We do not have to do lots of other things when we can talk to HSSD and Education. They can bring a joint States' report to say, 'We want to change the licensing system and the standards have to be changed and this is  
80 what we are looking for.' It does not even have to come to the States. They can actually agree that between them. But, they have not chosen to do that, so we are going down a route – and I accept that they are going through a route now of training, but if we are looking to say that it has to be standardised and it has to be a better standard, well that can happen without going down the route of having free pre-school attendance.

85 Of course, there are some parents who *choose* not to send their children to pre-school. We spoke yesterday about freedom of choice for Sunday trading and we are not really looking to have the freedom of choice for parents to be able to send their children to pre-school. I say that because I know that some parents have already felt guilty with the current system because they have not actually taken their children to pre-school, because they have chosen to keep that child home for reasons of their own choice.  
90

There are also many pre-schools who actually take in children, because for reasons unbeknown to me but are known to the pre-school, where the parents are unable to pay and a lot of the pre-schools see it as their moral and responsibility to actually help those families by taking those children, so they are not penalised and they are able to attend pre-school. I thank those pre-schools for doing that.  
95

So that is where I struggle with this, because I really do agree with the pre-school. I agree with tightening up the standards and making that better for all the children that are attending. I am aware of some children that have not been to pre-school and yet they have gone to start 'big school' and they have been able to write their name and count, better in some cases than some that have been to pre-school. So I really do not want to see those that *choose* not to do so now  
100 saying, 'Well, there are 15 hours on the table. You should be utilising that.'

Also, there is no doubt that those that attend pre-school ... They go for Tuesday and Thursday for the first year; the second year they do Monday, Wednesday and Friday and then they start school the following year, so there is a two-year lead in of them having those few extra hours for the third day. Under this scheme, it is likely that those children will be going five mornings a week, where currently they are doing two and three mornings a week, because that is when the majority  
105 attend the pre-school.

So there are all these different issues as well which ... There are parents who have spoken to me and they have concerns about how the guilt will be put upon them, because they have  
110 enjoyed doing things for their children – which they see is part of the learning process – that under this scheme they are going to be frowned upon, because they are not going to be taking up those hours. It is a dilemma for some parents that we really need to consider that as well.

But my concern of this is actually the funding, this universal funding. I cannot support where it is a free-for-all, when people are ready to pay, when we are actually turning round and we are  
115 saying, 'Well, for prescriptions we are looking for means-testing.' You cannot have your cake and eat it. We have either got to be consistent right across the board or not, and I do not think we are at the moment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Conder, Deputy James and Deputy Le Pelley.

120

**Deputy Conder:** Thank you, sir.

I am sure the Minister will deal with the points raised by Deputy De Lisle and Deputy Lowe. I might touch on them as well, with his permission.

125 Sir, colleagues, the arguments in support of universal pre-school education are utterly compelling. It is really difficult to add further dimension in a case that has been so well made by Deputy Sillars and so many other people on different occasions in this Assembly. This initiative is so important to this Island and when introduced will generate such significant long-term benefits in terms of social behaviours, social inclusion and economic return that it should be difficult to refute.

130 I think and I hope that most colleagues in the Assembly know that I am, by temperament and political persuasion, against utilising taxpayers' money for initiatives of dubious benefit. In these very challenging financial times all of us need to be convinced that any proposal that is presented to us and which will require additional funding or the transfer of funding from other areas, must be able to demonstrate clear and unambiguous merit in terms of social benefit, economic return and competitive advantage. But this initiative, adopting the funding model we have proposed and  
135 which we approved yesterday, does meet all of those criteria.

Sir, I do understand the Deputy Chief Minister's concern in respect of that part of the funding element to rely from transfer in Family Allowance. On fiscal matters, indeed on nearly all matters, I rarely disagree with him, but as I said yesterday Family Allowance simply places cash in an individual's hands, to spend however they wish, which is of course their right. On the other hand, in the case of universal pre-school, a Government service is provided with known and very positive investment returns, which the populous can choose to take up or not. This is not exchanging one universal cash benefit for another. It is targeting Government funds or cash from an uncertain benefit or economic return to a certain and proven benefit and return.

145 We have discussed this issue on many occasions and many sources of research have been brought in aid of the argument by various sides and I will not fall into the trap of quoting long sections of research reports. I will, however, attempt to address one point that Deputy De Lisle made and possibly Deputy Lowe. I refer to the Institute of Fiscal Studies found that, amongst other things, pre-school education was found to markedly 'increase the probability of obtaining qualifications' and for the recipient to find secure employment in later life. The benefits go right  
150 the way through life. Not surprisingly, it also noted that pre-school attendance has positive

'... effects on average for children in families with serious difficulties ...'

That suggests that:

'... in the early years, pre-school may play an important role in protecting such children from some of the potentially harmful effects of growing up in their [disadvantaged] family environment.'

In other words, pre-school is making up the deficit that exists within the family. Disadvantaged children benefit more from universal provision in comparison to gains in targeted provision, but  
155 more advantaged children also receive significant benefits in excess of investment costs.

Sir, if I may just turn to Deputy De Lisle's concerns about the use and direction of limited cash assets. Pre-school addresses those issues that may occur at primary and secondary by simply giving, particularly disadvantaged children, a head start, a leg up, a chance not to have those problems in primary school and secondary. The benefits are so manifest that the problems that  
160 Deputy De Lisle referred to in terms of where we should place our cash, we may not need to place our cash in those areas because we address them at pre-school.

In addition, the Institute for Fiscal Studies' report showed that school readiness is not just a problem with the poor. School readiness: that deals perhaps with the point that Deputy Lowe made. School readiness is whether a child is able and ready to attend school at five. Anecdotally,  
165 we are made aware by our teachers and our professionals that they absolutely can see, when they receive a child at reception, whether that child has benefited from pre-school or not. The child's induction, if you like, into the reception class is markedly different. If they have had pre-school, they are much more confident. And that applies not just to children from disadvantaged backgrounds but young children from middle-income families. They also benefit in terms of



170 school readiness. The research shows that universal programmes have larger effects than targeted programmes for the most disadvantaged children.

I just turn to the issue that Deputy Lowe made about current provision. The research shows that high-quality standards and benchmarking of programmes for all children are required for effective universal pre-school programmes. This proposal, this States' report, has embedded within it key benchmarking and quality standard. Indeed, the amendment laid by the Chief Minister yesterday required the Department – and I was thoroughly supportive of it – to come back to this Assembly with quality measures. That means that every child who goes to pre-school, unlike now, will receive a quality-marked, quality-standard, universal pre-school education, if they choose to take to take it up.

180 Sir, the conclusions of that piece of research – and we can all quote research – are that voluntary, universal, pre-school programmes – note the word voluntary – providing access to high-quality pre-school education to all children are more educationally effective and economically efficient than targeted programmes.

There is incontrovertible evidence that the provision of an entitlement to universal pre-school education offers long-term societal and economic benefits which outweigh the investment costs many times over. Our competitors, both friendly and hostile, recognised the importance of universal pre-school education many years ago and are now reaping the benefits in terms of educational outcomes and economic return.

Of course, sir, Guernsey is different and proudly so, but I can see no reason for being proud of being different when that difference means worse educational and lifetime opportunities for our young people. Such a difference, sir, is not noble. It is perverse. This Assembly has the opportunity to correct a shortcoming in our educational provision which is harming lives and will, if it has not already, impact upon the long-term economic welfare of this community.

195 If we wish to leave a real and sustainable legacy when we leave this place in April next year, this is one such opportunity.

Sir, this proposal is in some ways a voluntary reduction in the age when children are introduced and commence their education. We are reducing the school starting age. Nearly every developed economy and most certainly our closest competitors have recognised that fact. If today we were asked whether or not children should start their schooling at five, I doubt many of us would disagree. Of course, when more than 100 years ago such a provision for universal schooling at five was first introduced some people did question the efficacy of introducing universal schooling at five. Farmers in my home county of Norfolk were outraged that children would go to school at five, because there would be no more small children with nimble fingers to pick stones out of their fields. If we decide, for whatever reason, that the clearly demonstrated advantages of offering all pre-school children exposure to pre-school education are not for us, then are we not placing ourselves in the same position as those Norfolk farmers at the turn of the twentieth century, and what will our successors think of us?

205 Sir, it seems to me that if we refuse to fund and introduce universal pre-school education, as we agreed in this Assembly last year, we will make a conscious decision to deny comparable educational and economic progress to large parts of this Island. We will make an unconscious decision which will ensure that over the coming years we will condemn our collective home-grown workforce to achieve lower levels of education than our competitors; achieve less qualifications than our competitors and to be less productive than our near or our worldwide competitors. That would be a ridiculous investment appraisal decision.

215 The Education and Treasury & Resources Departments have striven hard over the past months to construct a viable funding model that will allow us to achieve an outcome that will benefit generations of children and the adults they become and that we have achieved. Please do not throw this important social, educational and economic initiative away. It is the right thing to do. We have found a funding model that works and the case is irrefutable.

220 Please vote for these Propositions, as amended.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy James. I am sorry, Deputy De Lisle?

**Deputy De Lisle:** Can I provide a point of clarification?

225 It is just that I would like to make it very clear that I support pre-school education and my  
quest is to see that we live within our means and that we target the additional resources –

**The Bailiff:** Is this a further speech, Deputy De Lisle? (*Interjections*)

Deputy James.

230

**Deputy James:** Thank you, sir.

In the Minister's opening speech, he made reference to currently 120 families not accessing  
any form of pre-school education and I think the other figure he quoted was 160 or 170 families  
that were not accessing the full availability. Sir, it is on that basis I would ask the question, what  
235 evidence or indication do you have that those families – and I think you highlighted them with a  
view to suggesting they are the families in most need – should this be adopted, that those  
families would indeed take advantage of this provision?

The reason I am asking this question is because I, like many people in this Assembly, have had  
difficulty with the funding model. I think that the amendment gave us a reasonable compromise,  
240 but I think in Deputy Lowe's speech I could identify with what she was saying, because this is  
going to cost the States of Guernsey an awful lot of money for a relatively small group of families  
that currently do not access pre-school education.

Deputy Conder in his speech has just stolen my thunder because I found myself wondering, to  
make it true value for money why did the Education Department not come to this Assembly with  
245 the proposals of actually lowering the starting age of children in school? I would much prefer to  
have seen that as a proposal.

In having said all that, I am totally supportive of the proposals in terms of pre-school  
education, because the educationalists give us irrefutable evidence of the huge value of it. So I  
would be appreciative if the Minister could address those two issues.

250 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Pelley.

**Deputy Le Pelley:** Thank you, sir.

255 Yesterday Deputy Sherbourne mentioned leading lights from the 1970s who had been in  
support of provision for pre-school education. What, of course, he did not mention is that he was  
one of those leading lights as well, because he and I both were members of the NASUWT, which  
for years was arguing for pre-school provision. And as he mentioned yesterday, 40 years on, we  
have not got it.

260 I fully support the idea of pre-school provision, but I want to touch on one or two issues – and  
Deputy James has mentioned it and also Deputy Conder. Two issues: the first one is about the  
actual age when people start. I would prefer to see the school age being reduced, rather than pre-  
schooling, actually having education starting at four or whatever, but younger and *compulsory*.  
This idea that it is going to be optional means that people who really should not may well opt out,  
265 and how are you actually going to achieve anything when those people have decided that they  
are not going to partake? The very people that you may very well wish to give a better chance to.

The second thing that I want to raise is about the funding issue. I would like the Minister when  
he sums up to knock this idea on the head. I really hope he can, because it seems to me there is  
an element here of Robin Hood philosophy in reverse: a robbing of the less well-off to pay for the  
270 much better-off. For example, I am concerned that a parent or parents with one, two or three  
children aged between seven and 10, who are just above the level where they could apply for  
social benefit payment will lose £2.40 per child, per week, for up to ten years, to help pay for  
those who currently manage to pay for pre-school provision. That to me, sir, seems like it is taking

275 money from those who are nearer the limit of living well to those who are doing quite nicely already, thank you very much.

I would like you to address those two items please, sir.  
Thank you.

280 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize and then Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.

We have been six and half hours now and we have largely debated things that we have already settled. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) We have debated Sunday trading, which we voted on a few weeks earlier and now we are having a debate about whether to introduce pre-school education. Well the States have already voted to introduce (**Two Members:** Yes.) the universal pre-school education. The title of this policy letter is 'Funding Options for the Introduction of a Universal Entitlement to Pre-School Education'. (**A Member:** Yes.) In May of last year the States agreed to the introduction of a universal entitlement of pre-school provision of 15 hours per week for the equivalent of 38 weeks a year for all three and four years, delivered through a partnership approach with the private and voluntary sectors. This is meant to be a debate purely restricted to how to pay for a scheme that the States have already agreed to. With the possible exception of Deputy Parkinson, who was not here when we had that debate and so is perhaps entitled to offer a view on the concept, the States have already settled the concept and agreed to it.

295 As far as the funding is concerned, the only point I wish to make is that I dispute this idea that only a few people will benefit who are not benefitting at the present time if the funding model is approved. If this funding model is approved and that allows the introduction of universal access to pre-school education, it will clearly assist those people who at present, for financial reasons, are unable to access pre-school education and/or quality pre-school education and/or the hours that are the very minimum recommended for children of age three and four.

300 It will also benefit those children who at the present time may be accessing some form of pre-school provision but where the standard or the quality is not adequate, because through the scheme there will be an opportunity for the Education Department to raise standards.

305 It will also benefit the very many children who access good standard pre-school education at the moment but for less than 15 hours per week; not through parental choice, but simply because the parents cannot afford it. I think that we understate the number of children who fall into that category. I think there are very many children whose parents are some way above what we would regard as in the lowest income brackets, who can afford to access some pre-school but it is nowhere near 15 hours per week.

310 Now when you total up all of those children, we will be assisting hundreds of children. We are not simply introducing a universal service at the cost of around £2 million a year to benefit a very small number of children. We will be benefiting hundreds of children every year.

315 So that is why I think the States voted in favour of the universal scheme. The other benefit of a universal scheme is that, if you means-test and you means-test out – let's say 50% or more parents – because you take the view that, 'Well, they can afford it already', the Education Department will not have the leverage to raise standards across the whole sector, because if you only provide States' funding – let's say for 25% of children – it will be insufficiently attractive to enough providers to become part of the scheme and, unless it is a comprehensive scheme, the Education Department will not have the power within the vouchers that they are giving – or however they are going to fund it – to raise standards across the board.

320 So those must have been foremost among the reasons that the States voted to introduce the universal pre-school education. It would be absurd today, if by voting out these proposals we stopped universal access to pre-school education having endorsed it by a substantial majority only 18 months ago.

325 If Members disagree with the funding option then they should have laid amendments, because there could have been any number of options to have funded this scheme which the States have

already agreed to. But the only funding option that is now on the table – unless Members have other amendments and it is not too late to lay amendments – is the one that the States voted for, I think unanimously, yesterday in the Sillars/St Pier amendment.

330 But we are not meant today to be debating whether to introduce universal access to pre-school education. We have already settled that earlier in this term. We are here to decide how to fund it and that alone.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

335 **Deputy Gollop:** Thanking you, sir.

I would love to go into a diverting discussion on the historic politics of Norfolk and the arguments between the Anglican Squirarchy and the non-conformist radicals, but that is beyond our topic. *(Laughter)*

340 But what is more interesting, and I think a point that perhaps nobody has mentioned to this extent: if you look at the so-called Joint Boards' policy letter, it is written in a very interesting style. I will draw Members' attention to two paragraphs. The first is on page 2934, 1.2 in which it clearly says:

'The Treasury and Resources Department did not support the original Education Department proposals concerning a universal entitlement to pre-school education and all voted against the 2014 propositions. The position of the Members of the Treasury and Resources Department in that regard has not changed.'

Well maybe it has a bit because we have reached perhaps a good compromise, but that was in the text.

345 Then when one goes onto page 2939, we come onto 4.13 and 4.14. It says:

'The Joint Boards stated that effective targeting of expenditure to the areas it is most needed is key to long-term expenditure control. Within the Policy Letter the focus was on the redirection of expenditure away from the provision of universal benefits<sup>3</sup> within the Social Security system, such as Family Allowance, towards other priorities within social policy.'

Well it is not clear at that point whether the Joint Boards are referring ... Well in that context it is referring to the planning and sustainable future of the Personal Tax, Pensions and Benefits Review.

350 Then it goes on to say that there was opposition to the continued provision of non-contributory universals benefits tool. But of course you could argue, as Deputy Trott has on many occasions, that the calibre – and it is generally a high calibre – of universal education we provide is a kind of universal benefit.

355 I remember about a decade ago a Member, who at that point represented St Sampson, had the temerity to suggest that maybe more affluent parents should contribute towards the education in the state sector. He was not only shouted down at the time but he lost his seat at the subsequent election.

I think the point I am making is that there are benefits or benefits in kind that we as a States provide along with most governments, and I would be amazed if Education supported the line in that particular policy letter for those reasons; although of course we do target support, as Deputy Lowe knows, to university students depending upon the parents' or the students' means.

360 Now given the perhaps slightly unusual demographic of this Assembly, with its preponderance of successful, older people; people who are home owners; people who have saved money in many cases, we probably see £30,000, £40,000 as a very large sum of money to be carefully looked at. But I suspect that for younger people in the community, looking at virtually starter homes at £400,000 each, £40,000 does not go fantastically far. One only has to look at the rents for family houses to see that point as well.

365 I think when you start to define, as we have heard from other speakers, people who are needy and people who do not need the money and so on, the actual numbers will be higher than we realise, because we do not want to get into a position whereby in helping some people we

370 marginalise others. I still think that in certain instances there are cases for universal entitlement.  
We accept that case for example with the subsidised bus fares and maybe subsidised air fares.  
That is another point. I would be reluctant to give that point away just like that.

It is quite interesting, sitting on Social Security, that we heavily means-test different kinds of  
benefits but we are not always in a consistent fashion – and I am not talking here the television  
licence that of course we are reforming. We do provide – and they have been renamed recently –  
375 the Carer's Allowance and the Severe Disability Allowance and they are means-tested. But the  
amount of money that you are entitled to have before you are not able to get the, hopefully,  
relatively generous support from the Department is believe it or not – and we have seen it last  
month – £90,000 a year. Not £19,000, not £39,000. It is only therefore a benefit that perhaps the  
particularly well-off are not entitled to gain.

380 So I think it is possible – and as I say that is a precedent – for a means-tested system to  
actually have quite a high level of means before it kicks in, because what we do not want to see is  
a disadvantaged, aspirational category of person as well as disadvantaged people lower down the  
scale. I think we have to be very cautious with means-testing because, as we have seen even in the  
UK, persons like the Chancellor of the Exchequer, George Osborne, had to retrench some of his  
385 views on targeting wealth and benefits.

So 'be careful' is my warning here. I think perhaps we are seeing a new consensus emerging  
from what was quite a divisive policy letter, but I think we do need, especially where families are  
concerned, to maintain universal entitlement as far as we can, because otherwise we put off  
people having families. We also deter families from staying on the Island and contributing to our  
390 society and economy and we deter other families who we might want to attract to live on the  
Island from settling. We cannot just see ourselves as a society that is focussing on the needs of  
the corporate sector or the retirement community.

I have to say, those words in the policy letter do smack of a certain economic adviser that we  
like to recruit, who very much advises us against increasing the public spend, but we have on  
395 occasions wider duties than that and we also need to spend to save.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

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

400 I think as Deputy Fallaize said the decision in principle to proceed with this policy was made in  
May last year and as the Minister said in his opening speech yesterday both Departments were  
then directed by this Assembly to go away and work on the funding solution.

As Deputy Gollop said, Treasury & Resources – and indeed the text of the Billet makes the  
point – did unanimously oppose the policy in May last year. We had many of the same concerns  
405 that Deputy Lowe articulated in her speech. We argued to the best of our ability that in our view it  
was not the best use of limited resources and there would be other higher priorities, for example  
Early Years possibly; or that public funding would simply replace private funding; or because it  
was not compulsory, as Deputy James said, it might not reach those most in need. But we lost that  
argument in that debate. Maybe we did not argue in the way that we should have done but  
410 nonetheless it matters not. We lost that argument.

There are many, sir, in this Assembly who would never regard a defeat in this place as any kind  
of impediment (*Laughter*) and would seek every opportunity to revisit the same arguments. (**A**  
**Member:** Hear, hear.) (*Laughter*) But my board, sir, are not amongst those. (*Laughter*) We have  
been subject to a number of defeats this term and whether it is GST, which Deputy Langlois  
415 mentioned yesterday, or pre-school education, we have to accept those willingly and not  
grudgingly as the decisions of this Assembly. The Assembly has made its bed and we must lie on  
it. So whilst we continue to have reservations about this policy and whether we could have  
obtained better outcomes by spreading elsewhere in the system, we have lost that argument and  
we support this funding package which delivers the policy within our fiscal rules.

420 It is just worth pointing out again, because it did not come up in yesterday's debate on the amendment, we have effectively, if this package is approved, we will be pre-prioritising £192,000 of spending in 2017 and £187,000 of spending in 2018 above other Committee's needs. In other words, if we are to live within our no real-terms' growth in expenditure constraint, then other budgets will have to give and the Assembly needs to understand that if it approves this package.  
425 But this we do believe is the package which is a sensible package that delivers the policy that, as Deputy Fallaize said, the Assembly have already approved.

**A Member:** Hear, hear.

430 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gillson.

**Deputy Gillson:** Thank you, sir.

I supported pre-school when we last debated it. I voted for it. I think there is a good case for it. That case has been made, but I have concerns about the funding of this.

435 In effect, it is a new service or a service extension, but it is certainly a service we are not providing now and so it needs therefore new money into it.

We have got, 2016, a budget deficit of about £19 million, funded by transfer from Capital Reserves. The projection for 2017 is a deficit of £9.7 million. The projection for 2018 is a deficit of £3.5 million. So I will just take the opportunity to go to a section of the Budget, if I can find ... Bear with me. I am trying to be paperless and probably failing. 4.52 ...  
440

In the Budget the deficit for 2017 is £9.7 million; for 2018: £3.5 million. It is similar to the black hole in terms of magnitude and that took a number of years to clear.

I am going to go back to section 4.54 of the Budget which said:

'The General Revenue Account Reserve is projected to be substantially exhausted by the end of 2015, resulting in the recommendation for a one-off reduction in the appropriation to the Capital Reserve .... The only means of replenishing the General Revenue Account Reserve is by generating surpluses and, until such time, there is no mechanism to fund any future budget deficits.'

We are in a position of the next three years having budget deficits. Now, as Deputy St Pier said, 'the only way of funding the £192,000 is by top-slicing existing budgets.' So we are looking at  
445 2017 ... Unless there is an increase in income or something changes, which we are not projecting, the only way is to reduce other department's budgets. Now that is probably not going to be Health because it is ring-fenced and protected. It may not be Home, because Home, hopefully it is going to be benchmarked and logically it will be protected. So it is other budgets. *(Laughter)* So we are looking at that.  
450

We are at a time when we need to demonstrate financial restraint. Many Members entered this Assembly and have spoken since then about financial restraint, making difficult decisions. Well we are here now. This is a position where we have got a difficult decision. Pre-school is a good idea. The case is proven and, as Deputy said, 'This debate is about funding it'. And we are trying to fund  
455 it at a time when for the next three years we know that we have got deficits, significant ones like the black hole, but no plan to fill it.

We are facing more costs on top of that. There is going to be a request for money for Biodiversity. We have got SWBIC coming which will need money; we have got SLAWS; we have got Early Years. We have got lots and millions of possible expenditure coming to this Assembly in  
460 the next few months.

The Budget for next year and the following two years are deficits and I find it difficult to hand over those deficits to the next Government. So I find it even more difficult to vote in a way which I know will increase those deficits or worse or just as bad top-slice future budgets.

We are likely to be, in the next few weeks, on a bit of a spending spree with regard to all these policies and promising strategies and policies of such a level that we will put the next Government  
465 in a position where they will have no option but to introduce GST. We are heading I believe to

that tipping point, where the next Government will come in and say, 'Well sorry, folks. We are going to end up bringing GST in, because the last lot promised you all these things and has committed to them.' Now that to me is not a good thing to do. We are trying to run services of 30p in a pound on 20p in the pound taxes.

I think the very first debate the next Government should have is whether it is going to introduce GST and raise taxes or decide to live within its means. That needs to be debated early on, so that then it sets the tone for the future Government. I doubt it will happen but that is what needs to be done, because we are looking and speaking as though we are back on a positive Budget. We are not! We are handing over to the next Government overdrafts of £10 million for the next year and no sign of those overdrafts being cleared. Yet we are saying, 'Okay, let's increase the overdraft to the future Governments.'

Deputy Conder, I have heard about 'leaving a legacy'. Well that is not the sort of legacy I want to leave. I do not want to leave a legacy for the next Government which puts them in the position of having to bring GST in.

It may be that GST has to come in. It may be but that should be on the back of a debate as to whether the people of Guernsey and the States' Members think it is better than not having it, not on the back of, 'We have already made a decision.'

I will give way.

**Deputy Fallaize:** I am grateful to Deputy Gillson.

He is making some interesting points (**A Member:** Yes.) but would he agree with me that it is fundamental that the only increase in General Revenue expenditure occasioned by the vote on the Propositions now before us is £192,000 in 2017 only and £187,000 in 2018 only. There is no long-term effect of increasing the General Revenue expenditure of the States by voting for these proposals, because the money after 2018 comes from the reprioritisation of the budget from Education, Sport & Culture and reducing Family Allowance by the equivalent sum which Education require.

**Deputy Gillson:** Yes and no. Political answer there. Yes and no. That is what is clever about this amendment because it does give that impression.

But the Family Allowance: lots of departments have been earmarking the Family Allowance for different things. Lots of departments have been thinking, 'Well if we actually take away Family Allowance ...' It has already been mooted and almost agreed that that would go and that might be able to help fund SWIBIC or might be able to help fund any of those things.

So our pot of money is limited and so we are pre-slicing this amount of it. In effect, if you are then spending something else, it is all new money, this £2 million. It is just being prioritised in a creative way.

So as I said I do not want to leave this legacy of putting the next Assembly in the position where GST is almost inevitable.

As I said, sir, there is a case for pre-school, but there is also a case for showing financial restraint and that is a case which a lot of people have said they believe in. We cannot spend money we do not have. The next three years already show projections for departments which are over-budget.

I know Deputy Fallaize did say that we approved pre-school last year and this is about funding and it is true, but we approved it last year when we had a different fiscal environment. When we approved it last year, we had projections of balanced budgets, of surpluses. It is a different world now and I do not think we are getting that across to the public. I hope we get this across to candidates next year: that they are coming into a world where we have got a budget deficit. I joined the States in 2008 knowing there was a budget deficit, knowing we would not be able to bring in new services. Well I hope candidates in the 2016 election realise they are coming into that same environment of budget deficits and the difficulty in services.

Sir, it would be a really easy decision to support this, especially since I am not standing again. But I am not going to make that easy decision because that easy decision would not be good  
520 Government. This is one of those difficult decisions we always talk about having to take and we all stand here says, 'Yes, we have got to take difficult decisions.' Well I for one am willing to take that decision. I think it is better to defer the introduction of this until we have got money for it. Revisit it when we have got funding.

So it is with reluctance and with a heavy heart that I cannot support this because we do not  
525 have the money for it and we must show restraint. We must not spend money that we do not have.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson, then Deputy Hadley.

**Deputy Parkinson:** Sir, I was not going to contribute to this debate because clearly the project  
530 has already been approved 14 months ago. Like Deputy Fallaize, I do not believe in reinventing wheels and going round in circles, and the funding mechanism is clearly going to be approved by the Assembly today; notwithstanding that there is some increase in cost to the General Revenue, it is largely achieved by rebalancing money currently committed to Family Allowances.

So I was content to just let the project go through and let this proposed funding mechanism  
535 go through. But Deputy Gillson's comments bring me to my feet, because he raises some interesting points about the general state of public finances and the lack of a prioritisation process. Now like the Irishman asked to give directions, I would not have started from here. If we had had a decision some time ago on a fiscal policy which would credibly rebalance the budget; if  
540 we had gone through a prioritisation debate, which determined what areas of public expenditure were to be favoured in this Assembly, we would have some guidelines to enable us to deal with the very many demands for increased public expenditure which the States will be facing over the next few months and as Deputy Gillson says, 'This is but the first of many'. But we are not in that position. We have no Government service plan and there is no credible strategy in place to resolve  
545 the Government's deficit.

How do we approach that? Clearly the next Assembly, as Deputy Gillson says, will start with a  
difficult position and it will have to bring in a credible fiscal strategy which will eliminate the  
public deficit and bring the Government back into surplus, and it will have to have a prioritisation  
debate which results in a Government service plan or something equivalent which sets out the  
550 priorities for the next four years.

But in the meantime we have to deal with these spending proposals and clearly the default  
position is going to be that there is no money and, unless other budgets can be reprioritised and  
money reallocated, most of these proposals will just simply have to wait until 2016 and the  
prioritisation process which this Assembly has never done and which needs to be done. However,  
555 life is not as tidy as that and life does not stand still. We cannot simply say nothing can happen until 2016 and we get this sorted out.

So, what is my approach to all of these proposals that we will be considering over the next  
three or four months? Well, I apply a three-stage filter to the analysis in each case. The first is what  
I might call the low-hanging fruit. If a proposed project does not really cost a significant amount  
560 of public resources – and I am going to assume that all the projects that come before us have merit and are things that would be good to do – why not go ahead and do it? I would put, for example, the equal marriage proposals that we will be considering later, hopefully in this meeting, in that category, because it does not really cost a lot of money to introduce. It costs a bit of parliamentary draftsman time, but I think we can bear that cost. The default options for everything  
565 else, all the stuff that really does cost some money is going to have to be, 'Well, it will have to await prioritisation in 2016.'

Deputy Fallaize yesterday suggested we could do prioritisation on the floor of the Assembly. I do not think that is a satisfactory position. In a logical process you would consider how many people would benefit from a proposed new service, what the harm would be if the service is not



570 introduced, how much the service costs and you would come up with some kind of cost benefit  
analysis to each proposal. One way of dealing with the prioritisation could be to follow the route  
suggested by Deputy Langlois, where we have a knockout competition between competing  
claims. I do not think he was seriously suggesting that and clearly it would not be a sensible  
575 process, but some sort of process will have to be introduced in 2016 and I believe that process will  
have to be thematic. The new Assembly will have to decide what areas of public service are to be  
considered priorities for development of services in the next States. For example, there might be a  
green theme or there might be an economic diversity theme. I think one of the themes that is  
almost certain to emerge top of the pile is going to be a demographic theme, because I think it is  
580 universally accepted that we have a significant demographic problem. Incidentally, one reason I  
am uncomfortable about taking money away from Family Allowance is I do believe that the  
policies in the new Assembly will have to be very family friendly. However, I am not going to  
revisit the debate on this specific issue, because I think it is a done deal.

So, the default option for projects that require money is going to be, 'Well, you will have to  
wait until 2016 and the prioritisation process', which this Assembly never did. That would be the  
585 clear-cut position, but it is an untidy world and we come into this situation where the States has  
already made commitments. People have made their own planning decisions relying on decisions  
that the States has made. When the States said 14 months ago that it was going to introduce  
universal pre-school education, some people may have made their family plans around that;  
certainly providers of services will have made plans around that, and the reality is that the States  
590 cannot keep renegeing, as the public would see it, on commitments that they have already made.  
There will also be cases where delaying a project into the 2016 prioritisation process would result  
in serious harm. In those situations the States may be put in a position where, in effect – and we  
are seeing a little bit of this in this debate – the States is forced to write a post-dated cheque,  
because if the service realistically has to go ahead and the money is not there now we are going  
595 to have to make the assumption, perhaps a brave assumption, that the next States will have the  
sense to sort out the fiscal policy and put itself in a position to meet an obvious pressing need.

The other question I ask myself when I consider these various proposals coming forward is, in  
my view, is it likely that this project would be prioritised in 2016? A bit of that is reflected in my  
comments about where serious harm would result in delay, but if a project like this one, universal  
600 pre-school education, clearly supports what will, I think, be a key priority area in the next  
Assembly, which is the demographic issue, then I think it is very likely that in the prioritisation  
process which will take place next year this kind of project would receive priority. Where it seems  
to me obvious that this is going in the right direction; that it is highly likely that even if this is  
delayed until 2016 it will go ahead, that also weighs on my mind when I am considering whether  
605 we should allow it to go ahead now.

This is the situation we are in. This project is not a no-cost project, but it is a very low-cost  
project in terms of new money that is required, as Deputy Fallaize has pointed out. It is a project  
that was in the pipeline and the States have already committed to do it. In my view it is highly  
likely that it would have been prioritised and will be prioritised if it is still on the table in 2016.

610 That is how I reached the conclusion that we need to support this. Those are the criteria I will  
apply when considering all of the future applications that are coming towards us in the next three  
or four months.

I commend the project and the funding mechanism, somewhat reluctantly on the funding  
mechanism side, to the Assembly.

615 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Hadley, and then Deputy Dorey.

**Deputy Hadley:** Mr Bailiff, it was Deputy Gillson's remarks that made me get to my feet as  
well, because we are not talking here about a luxury service. It is an essential service and we are  
620 investing for the future. I repeat again that the Department of Education in the UK issued a report

only a few weeks ago saying that children who had had high-quality pre-school education were twice as likely to embark on their AS levels.

625 But of course, it is not just at that level that we are talking about; we are talking about perhaps children who will be less unruly due to pre-school education. Do you know, Mr Bailiff, HSSD are paying £¼ million a year for one unruly child who is placed in the UK? That is twice what we are going to spend now to give pre-school education across the whole Island for many children who are not currently having it. One really does have to keep these things in proportion. That child might not be off Island were we providing pre-school education years ago.

630 So, I do think that we do need to get on and approve the expenditure of this money.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

**Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, sir.

635 It is just as well we did not continue last night, as it is now 10.38 a.m. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

I am just following up on Deputy Parkinson's comments about prioritisation. I totally agree with him that we do capital prioritisation, but effectively we never do revenue prioritisation, although we attempted to do that with new services related to the FTP savings. But the problem with that was we were just looking at new services. We were not looking at existing services and real prioritisation is we have to look at what we are doing now and whether we should continue with them against some new services.

640 The sums we are talking about are relatively small and, even if we cannot reprioritise the budgets, I think it is relatively easy to collect. They are very small sums compared to our overall budget. I think it just highlights to me why last month we decided effectively to subsidise people's holidays, which I cannot see was a prioritisation against the three things that we have discussed in this Assembly this session, or perhaps coming in January: domestic abuse, biodiversity and pre-school education, which to me are all far more important than people paying £1.20 extra on a plane flight.

645 I do agree with the point that Deputy Langlois made yesterday about department budgets, and I think that is a key point that we should be thinking about: that it is easy to raid another budget and that relates back to my point about prioritisation.

I do support, as you have probably guessed, pre-school and I will support this policy letter.

655 Deputy Conder said about Family Allowance being an uncertain benefit. Well, we just noted the proposals about Family Allowance in April, and the most significant public consultation on Family Allowance related back to 2007 and it says that a Family Allowance... The feedback we got from the public was that it was an important part of family budgets, particularly after their take-home pay and their other fixed costs, like mortgages, and it was important to them. I suppose my comment I made yesterday is still very relevant: that it is those families with older children who are going to be the ones affected by this, and that is what I think is unfair about the proposals. It would have been far fairer to have stopped Family Allowance altogether for people who have children of pre-school age, the three-to-four-year olds, saying, 'Look, you have lost the Family Allowance but you have got the benefit of free pre-school', because a lot of them are paying for that. That would have been logical and fairer.

660 I know Deputy Fallaize talked about other people had brought amendments, but I think Deputy Langlois said about the 12 people who were supporting this, so the direction of travel... I think that this is supported, but the other problem would have been that, if you just took Family Allowance away from those three-to-four-year-olds, you would have got less than half the amount of money that you were going to collect from Family Allowance across all ages, so it would not have funded it.

670 I suppose reluctantly I will support it, but I do not think it is a good system of financing it. I think it is a poor system and we are robbing the families, as Deputy Le Pelley said, with older children. They are the ones who will suffer, and I do not think it is a good method, but in order to get pre-school education, I will support it.

Thank you.

675 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Inglis.

**Deputy Inglis:** Thank you, sir.

Some good comments have been made this morning. What Deputy Lowe has emphasised is clearly my thoughts. What Deputy Gillson has made us fully aware of are my thoughts. The reality check has come from Deputy St Pier, that we are all forgetting.

680 Could I ask the Minister, in his summing up, that if we do agree to this, what is going to be the creep? At the moment we are talking about 15 hours. It will not be long before we have suddenly got to finance 30 hours.

685 What Members must be fully aware of is that we understand that the vast majority of people are happy to subscribe to pre-school education. I subscribed to pre-school education 40 years ago, because I felt it was a good investment in my children. What would concern me is, by virtue of providing free pre-school education, the question then starts to resonate: is it childcare or is it pre-school education?

690 What we must also remember is that SSD already provides assistance to three pre-schools on top of the money that is now being required from Family Allowance. In our fiscally difficult times, where we have been accused of idling for four years, we have worked really hard at maintaining the levels of services that people have enjoyed, but now we are talking about providing a new service, when the service is already being accommodated.

695 So, if the Minister could reassure me on the creep to 30 hours, which is happening in the UK at the moment. It will not be long before it happens here, and then we will be back in this Assembly having a debate on how we carry on funding the runaway train that I am reluctant to support.

I am all for pre-school education, but it is the manner in which we are proposing to fund it, if we have to do it at all.

Thank you, sir.

700

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel, do you wish to be *relevé*?

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Please, sir.

705 **The Bailiff:** Then do you wish to speak?

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Please, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Right. You are *relevé* and you may speak.

710

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Thank you, sir. (*Laughter and interjections*)

I totally support these proposals, but I rise to merely seek clarification on something that Deputy Hadley just said. The way I understood it, Deputy Hadley said that the taxpayer pays more to keep one unruly child off Island than it is going to cost to fund the whole pre-school initiative. My understanding is that a child is only sent off Island if they are special needs, not because they are considered to be unruly. Surely that claim was not only misleading to the Assembly but also – I give way to Deputy Luxon, sir.

715

**Deputy Luxon:** I thank Deputy Queripel for giving way.

720

The phrase 'unruly child' or 'unruly children' is inappropriate. Children with needs or whatever, but it is an inappropriate comment, phraseology, that I think Deputy Hadley used.

Deputy Queripel, through you, sir.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, I thank Deputy Luxon for that clarification.

725 **The Bailiff:** I see no one else rising. Oh, yes, Deputy Perrot, you wish to...

**Deputy Perrot:** I rise because I have been persuaded by Deputy Gillson, and in doing so I am afraid I must apologise to my colleagues on Treasury & Resources and to those on the Education Department, and in particular to the Minister, but I am afraid I have changed my mind. I hope that  
730 it is accepted, generally speaking, that in relation to Treasury & Resources I am a team player. I did go along with the proposals to begin with, because I thought that they were a neat way of solving the present problem, but one of the things which struck me some time ago is that we should not be trying to hypothecate Family Allowance or any part of it. In fact, I saw that Family Allowance being a universal allowance simply ought to go.

735 Anyway, I agree now with Deputy Gillson. I am afraid I have got to change my mind and vote against this funding proposal.

I thought that Deputy Parkinson again gave a very good speech. One of the things which he was saying was, of course, you cannot have the States approving something one day and then, in effect, going against it on another day. But the point about the original decision by the States was  
740 that the decision had decided something in principle, but had not decided the funding for it, so it does make it open still to further debate.

So, I do apologise to all those people whom I have mentioned.

One other point, though – I ought to mention it now; I will not probably get an opportunity of saying it again during this States – is that I have not the slightest degree of doubt that Deputy  
745 Gillson is correct and that at some stage... We have not done it, but I think that the only availability for further finance will be the adoption by a future States of GST.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Lièvre, and then Deputy Trott.

750 **Deputy Le Lièvre:** Thank you, sir.

Deputy Gillson made reference to the fact that the world has changed since we last agreed pre-school provision. One of the other issues that has changed – and nobody has made reference to it as far as I am aware, although the Minister might have done in his opening speech, but it was lost on me. When we considered it last time, we were told there were only nine children in  
755 Guernsey who did not receive pre-school: nine out of 600; that is 1½%. Now we are told it is 120. It is 20%: 15 times what it was before, or thereabouts. And we are told that a further 170 only get somewhat less than 15 hours, and we know that some of those less than 15 hours will only be five or six or seven, they will not be 14 hours, although obviously some will. So, whereas we were under the impression and we approved in principle the provision of pre-school, we were under  
760 that impression at the time that there were very few and slightly more who attended part time.

We now know that half the children in this Island do not receive a minimum level of pre-school education. Half the children! We do not know whether that half is split... We know that affordability is a key issue, but we do not know whether the half is split as a result of that affordability. But we can presume quite reasonably that, for many, pre-school education, either  
765 none at all or part time as I have called it, is based on affordability. We know that. We can safely make that presumption because we know there are a significant number of people in Guernsey who do not earn salaries of £70,000, £80,000 or £90,000 a year.

Where you have a key service provision like health... Education is up there with the big important issues. Where you have a provision which is only achieving 50% of the children of our  
770 society, then means-testing is not applicable. Means-testing is not applicable where a provision is only being afforded by half the community. So I would put to one side all of the arguments about means-testing. As I said in the last States' meeting, despite the fact I have worked in means-testing for 30 years, I am not very keen on it. I would have universal provision for all, whether people liked it or not, and the reason I say that is when you get to 50% not achieving what we would ideally like them to achieve, then universal provision is the answer, and better still, statutory  
775 provision.

As we were told yesterday by a Member of Education, that was ruled out because the private sector has filled the void due to the neglect of previous boards. So, for me, there is no question about means-testing. The amendment covers that at a high level. There is no problem with the money being taken from the Family Allowance. It is a tiny amount: £2.40 a week, less than a pint of beer. If families are going to fall over economically because they cannot afford a pint of beer, generally speaking, then where are we?

So, I would seek a positive vote from this Assembly, that we provide a service for half the children in this Island who are not receiving a minimum level.

With regard to whether there is service creep, as has been questioned, well, bring it on, as far as I am concerned. We do not want our children to fall behind the children of the UK. If we are setting our standards with regard to the format of children in the UK, it is far too low. We should be setting our standards against France, Germany and the rest of Europe – certainly not the UK.

So, please support this policy letter and allow the children of this Island to receive the level of education they so justly deserve.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, I think today is a genuine missed opportunity. I believe we should have a means-tested process in place. I have listened carefully throughout this debate and the previous one about the benefits of using universal application, but this really is a quite farcical situation.

I can think of one easy way of avoiding a regressive GST: it is by introducing policies that are means-tested in a way that does not see the millionaire benefit to the same extent as someone just above the breadline. The irony here is that my very good friend, Deputy Parkinson, in the very first vote on expenditure he is likely to make, will raise expenditure in a manner that sees the millionaire gain to the same cash equivalent as the family on the breadline. That is the reality. I understood his reasons for that, but I still consider that to be an utter nonsense.

I hope I have not used Deputy Lester Queripel's calculator for this, but it would appear to me that, if a child is approaching the age of three at or around January 2017, at today's prices the parent or parents will lose 14 years of weekly benefit at the rate of £2.40. In other words, they will lose, over the duration of that child's eligibility for Family Allowance, about £1,750. And yet it seems to me that people will gain by excess of that figure in the first year alone, because... Let's look at my example. I have already declared an interest, sir: our lovely little daughter goes to pre-school for 18 hours a week, not 15, and that has an annual cost in excess of £7,000. She goes to pre-school because we are fortunate to be able to afford for her to go, and yet we are going to be a beneficiary – not a benefactor; thank you for that correction yesterday – of an unnecessary benefit. It is mad, and yet clearly the States are going to agree to it.

**The Bailiff:** I see no one else rising.  
Deputy Sillars will reply to the debate, when he is ready.

**Deputy Sillars:** Thank you, sir.

Going back to Deputy De Lisle, it seemed an extraordinary speech to me. He was advocating that we had more input into primary and secondary, which we are absolutely doing anyway. We announced and I am sure you saw – and the results are not the be-all and end-all, I fully accept that – the results of primary year 6 coming out were an awful lot better than they have been and they have been improving. And the exams we have out in secondary have been improving.

But the point is, surely, that if we can get to the pre-school children first, it is established – and you will know that, as an educationalist – they will be in a far better position to keep up, let alone catch up over their primary and secondary.

Sorry, sir. Yes, through you, sir. Sorry, I get a little bit wound up on this.

Pre-school will allow *all* these children to start equal, and so there may be savings where, if they have all started as equal, we will not have to put particular things in place for these children to enable them to catch up. I find that extraordinary.

830 Deputy Lowe: Well, we can have the whole debate again, so I guess six hours it will take me to answer all the points she made. The key ones I really wanted to make: the parents will have the freedom of choice? Of course they will. So, if they want to home teach, they can home teach. It is not mandatory. It is not being forced on them to go. I understand that balance, and it is why  
835 Their child will go to school for 15 hours a week; they will have family time, if that is what the family are able to or want to do, and that will enable them to have the choice. It is about choice. So, they do not actually have to go.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

840

**Deputy Lowe:** Thank you for giving way, Deputy Sillars.

The point that I was making: not only the parents who choose not to send their children currently, but also a huge majority of the parents only send their children now on a Tuesday and Thursday for one year, which is far less – we are only talking seven hours – and the following year  
845 they do the Monday, Wednesday and Friday, whereas this scheme will be looking to make people feel that they need to be sending them for at least 15 hours, when currently it is a lot less for a huge majority of those parents.

**Deputy Sillars:** I think it is great to get out into the public domain that actually there is a set  
850 minimum of 15 hours, so that parents can make their choice. They will know that that is a good number to aim for, and if they aim for it they will get the pre-school provision for that. Currently, nobody really knows whether it should be two hours, 15 hours, 50 hours, or whatever, so I think it is excellent that we have started with establishing that 15 hours is the minimum.

I did forget last night's debate, so I just need to refer to Deputy Langlois. Thank you for your  
855 support. I can assure you that there is good provision. We will not destroy it and we want all pre-schools to deliver an excellent service.

There has been much discussion on the quality assurance framework. All private providers have already undergone an internal audit: an initial audit using an international standard, the Early  
860 Childhood Environmental Rating Scale. They are now being supported to improve the quality of their provision, where necessary, and to meet the expected quality standards, and these will be finalised soon. This will inform the regulatory framework which clarifies standards of both care and education provision.

The quality standards and curriculum framework will, of course, be applicable to all providers. This will ensure continuity and consistency with our reception classes in school. Obviously, we will  
865 be measuring the children's abilities on entrance to reception classes to school, as we already do, and measuring individual progress during their time at school.

Deputy Brehaut: The importance of pre-school. I fully agree it is the quality of provision, and, hopefully, I have addressed your concerns in the reply to Deputy Langlois. I thank you for your support.

870 I would also like to thank Deputy Luxon, both for his words of support and for the continued co-operation and close working between the two Departments. Please extend my gratitude to your staff, who have been working so closely with us over the past 12 months or so. I hope we are on the cusp of realising the fruits of both Departments' labours.

Deputy Conder: I thank you for your help and your speech. For me, what came out of that was  
875 the uncertain benefit being replaced by a certain benefit, and that was either misunderstood by one or two... For me, we just pay out the money, and I am sure a lot of parents will use that money wisely. Unfortunately, there are some who do not perhaps use it so wisely. This is actually targeting for the benefit of those children. Just as an interesting fact, an appalling fact actually:

880 there are 400 families with children who visit food banks. It is an extraordinary statistic in this Island of ours.

Deputy James: A good question. We will be encouraging children to attend. Of course it will be at the parents' choice, but, we will be working on that. The CYPP will be covering the first 1001 days and we will be getting that and debating that in February. I absolutely applaud that is the way for us to go. So it will be all joined up, the pathway, as Deputy Luxon was referring to yesterday.

885 Deputy Le Pelley: We considered compulsory and decided not to go down that route. We want to encourage all to attend. The points you have made and others have made is regarding the child allowance. We have noted earlier this year that child allowance could well be phased out, and therefore, for those who go on about 10 or 15 years... From the way it was going, anyway, that debate, I suspect it is going to run out a lot sooner.

890 Perhaps I could use that excuse for Deputy Trott on his point, which will be running out. If you feel strongly, I am sure we would welcome you not to take the money and pay for it yourself. We are not going to force you to take it from us. If there are wealthy individuals out there, it would be great if they do not, and contribute to our society. But of course, if we go to means-testing, for me – and Deputy Le Lièvre convinced me some years ago that it is always those who miss it by a pound or two, or however you judge that. Yes, we have quite a complex HE grant system, which I cannot begin to explain to you now, although I have been doing it for three years. It is hugely complicated and actually has a lot of administration to it to test, to check that people are not unknowingly being dishonest and not telling us exactly what is going on. So means-testing in this area is really not the way forward. We have proved there is enough evidence in the world to show that even those children from well-off families will benefit, as will the children from less well-off and very poor families, who really, really benefit. This is why I am struggling to come to terms with this debate we are having at the moment.

900 Deputy Fallaize: Thank you very much for your support and covering the finance side of this debate and clearing up a number of misconceptions.

905 Deputy Gollop: Yes, you are factually correct, and we have moved on since then.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you for your support. Really, what I want to say is you are absolutely right: there is £192,000 potential in 2017 and £187,000 potential in 2018, but I actually put those figures in my opening speech. and those are the maximum, so that is... When we are looking at the overall money we spend in the States and then look at the overall we spend in Education, it really is a very small amount of money and they are the maximum, so it is accrued. What we have assumed is that virtually everyone will want to have pre-school and every GPLA will join in on that, so they are prudent figures.

915 Deputy Gillson: Well, I have scratched out half of what I was going to say because I need to be polite, but we are not asking for other budgets to be reduced, so you are incorrect there. We need to look at the long-term, not the short-term. It saves us money and it is an economic enabler. If pre-school is implemented... Twenty years, we have been trying to get this implemented – 20 years! There were mentions of seven years last year, but a retired head teacher spoke to me the other day and said that for 20 years they have been trying to get this in place. If we had implemented it 20 years ago, I wonder what a different position we would be in now. The £2 million is not new money. We have had several speakers explain that. Education is reprioritising its budget to contribute a million or so, and the existing Family Allowance is already paid out, so it is again what Deputy Conder said: an uncertain benefit replaced by a certain benefit.

920 Deputy Parkinson: Thank you for your explanation.

925

**Deputy Gillson:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Yes.

930 **Deputy Gillson:** As amended, item c): increasing the cash limit by £200,000 in each of the next two years. As Deputy St Pier said, that is a pre-allocation of those budgets for those years, so if the States does not see more income coming in, the only way of doing that, with all things being equal, is to reduce other departments' budgets.

935 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, could I make a point of correction?

**The Bailiff:** Yes.

940 **Deputy St Pier:** It is not merely a matter of other income coming in, because the constraint is the real-terms' limitation on spending, so it is irrespective of income.

**Deputy Sillars:** I still stand by my point that this was a maximum amount and being prudent in the amounts.

945 Deputy Parkinson: Thank you for your explanation. Yes, we are living in a very untidy world, but I thank you for your support.

Deputy Hadley: Thank you very much.

Deputy Dorey: Yes, thank you for your support. I know it is reluctant, but thank you very much for your support. They are small sums and I agree with that, but the returns we will get are immense.

950 Deputy Inglis: 15 hours is the recognised minimum that we should have. The real point I would make is that pre-school is not childcare, and I think there was some confusion there, so whether another States will want to bring up whether it should go from 15 to 20 to 30, I have no idea. That is for another States to do that. What we have done is gone for 15 hours, which is the minimum, and you could, as Deputy Le Lièvre, applaud that the UK has now gone for 30 hours. They see the benefits of this. It is not childcare; this is pre-school. It goes back to where Deputy Brehaut was saying it was for childcare at the time, some of the schools, but we have gone into... We are working with the GPLA to raise those standards in the sense of pre-school.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you for your support.

960 Deputy Perrot: Well, I am sorry you have changed your mind. I cannot say more than that, I think.

Deputy Le Lièvre: You are absolutely correct and I agree, and thank you very much for your support.

Deputy Trott: I think I have covered yours. We will welcome your – Sorry, I will give way.

965

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Laurie Queripel.

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Thank you, sir, and I thank Deputy Sillars for giving way.

970 I was hoping that he might address Deputy Le Pelley's point and I was wondering if Deputy Le Pelley would stand up and ask that question. It seems to me, if we are going to be accessing Family Allowance at least in part to fund this services initiative, there will be two groups of families that will miss out because of that. There will be the groups of families that have children that are under five years of age and could qualify to go to pre-school but will choose not to send them to pre-school, so they will miss out to the tune of £2.40 per child without benefiting from the service.

975 There will also be the groups of families that have already been mentioned, who have children above the pre-school age so they do not qualify for pre-school, but they will also lose £2.40 per child from their Family Allowance. The question was asked yesterday: will those families, if they need that money, be able to access that money via Supplementary Benefit? So, there are two groups of families at the moment that will miss out, if they do not or cannot access the service, by

980 losing their money from their Family Allowance. How will that money be made up in order to help those families who need that money to be replaced?



**Deputy Sillars:** Yes, you are absolutely right, I did leave that out, and I apologise.

985 What we were told by SSD was that, where you have got the families who will be dropping  
down an area financially, where the £2.40 will have an effect on them, then they will be covered by  
SSD. What I have also been told – just to get the absolutely right facts out, as I have understood  
them – is that there is, of course – which I think the States put in place – a £600 a week limit, so  
that still would apply and therefore they would not get the benefit from that.

990 I am going to try without paper now. Members, this has been a lengthy and passionate debate  
over a couple of years, but as we approach the moment for actually making a decision, I would  
remind you of the importance of this issue. This is about investing in our community's future;  
giving future cohorts of children the opportunity to be the best they can and the best possible  
foundations for their future lives. The decision we are about to make has the potential to make a  
profoundly beneficial impact on hundreds of families each year whom we represent.

995 During our last meeting, when this policy letter was due to be debated, I found myself in the  
unusual position of being accosted by members of the public asking, 'Has the States approved  
pre-school yet?' On one occasion I was asked by a gentleman and I asked why, and his answer  
was simple: 'It means so much to my wife and I. It means we will be able to get on the property  
ladder and buy our own home.' It is an economic enabler.

1000 The Department at the Grange has also been fielding calls from the public asking, 'Has pre-  
school been approved yet?' It really goes back to what Deputy Parkinson says: there is a huge  
expectation that it has. Many families are looking to us to help them and their children. Let us not  
fail them.

1005 In my opening speech, I gave you the facts and figures. I gave you the evidence and I set out  
the compelling arguments for supporting this policy letter. As I said previously, let us actually do  
something today that future generations will thank us for, by making Guernsey a better place with  
the foundations for a stronger community, with a better economy and improve the lives of our  
citizens. Support this funding proposal and you boost our workforce and increase active  
participation in the labour market. Support this funding proposal and provide gender equality and  
women's rights and financial independence. Support this funding proposal and we make  
1010 Guernsey more attractive than we currently are for critical workers such as nurses and teachers,  
and those whom we want to come and be part of our community and economic success. Support  
this funding proposal to release the reform dividend from this early intervention for future  
Assemblies and taxpayers. Support this funding proposal and let's give young families the  
foundations for their success and enrich their lives. But most importantly, support this funding  
1015 proposal so that we can finally address this oversight in public service delivery and give our young  
people the best start to their lives, which is an integral part of HSSD's Child and Young People  
Plan, which we will be debating in February. They and the wider community will reap the benefits  
of it in the future. Our children deserve this investment and I commend this policy letter to the  
Assembly.

1020 Can I have a recorded vote, sir?

**The Bailiff:** I have a request for a recorded vote.

1025 I remind Members that the Propositions that you are voting on are those set out in the  
successful amendment that was proposed by Deputy Sillars and seconded by Deputy St Pier.  
Those Propositions replace the original ones and they have been amended by the addition of the  
extra wording in the amendment that was proposed by Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Soulsby. So  
you are commenting on a combination of those two amendments, in effect, rather than the  
original Propositions.

*There was a recorded vote.*

1030 **The Bailiff:** Members, I think while those votes are counted we could move on to the next  
Article – if you would call that, please, Greffier.

**ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT**

**XI. Environment Department –  
Biodiversity Strategy –  
Debate commenced**

**The Greffier:** Billet XX, Article XI, Environment Department, Biodiversity Strategy.

**The Bailiff:** The debate will be opened by the Minister, Deputy Burford.

1035

**Deputy Burford:** Thank you, sir.

This policy letter seeks approval for the adoption and funding of a Biodiversity Strategy for Guernsey. If approved, it will form the foundation to deliver a key component of the Environmental Policy Plan. The Strategy is not so much a set of specific actions to protect our valuable wildlife and habitats, but a framework to prioritise scarce resources and to direct those resources to achieve the greatest returns.

1040

I do not intend to, and indeed should not need to spend time now making the case for the protection and enhancement of our cherished habitats and wildlife. The need to do that has already been agreed by the States and is now a matter of policy which is enshrined in the States' Strategic Plan. Let me remind Members of the principle which we signed up to. It states that we should adopt policies which protect the natural environment and its biodiversity by accounting for the wider impacts that human activity has on it.

1045

The issues are not whether we need to protect our habitats, species and ecosystems and whether we need a biodiverse environment, but rather how do we achieve that, and in particular whether simply carrying on doing what we are doing now is adequate.

1050

Our living environment has never had to face so many pressures at once: development, disturbance, climate change and a genuine lack of awareness all take their toll. During the last decade or so, 15 species of bird, including the Skylark, Cuckoo and Dartford Warbler have stopped breeding in Guernsey, and another 15 species, including the Puffin, Oystercatcher and Song Thrush, have seen serious declines in their populations. Nearly half of all semi-improved grasslands have been lost in just 10 years, and 13 other important habitat types now make up less than 3% of Guernsey's land area, putting several species at risk.

1055

Whilst the Environment Department does what it can within its limited budget to support biodiversity on the land it administers, and whilst organisations such as La Société and the National Trust work hard to acquire and manage land through charitable donations and voluntary work, the fact remains that large areas of land and sea are not managed in the best way. Educational resources are limited and fragmented. Data collection remains sparse and in formats that do not conform to international standards. This matters because when we seek to engage with the UK, France and even Jersey to exchange information on invasive species, at-risk species or species in habitat action plans, the information Guernsey has and its ability to communicate from a solid platform of knowledge is seriously lacking. We have a Biological Records Centre run in partnership with La Société and staffed for just two days each week with the help of volunteers. This work has shown that we are losing habitat and species, but it neither has the means nor resources to do anything about it. Our sea fishery resources are insufficient to carry out stock counts, benefit studies, examination of the spread of species and possibly the spread of disease. If we have to sustain our biodiversity and the benefits it provides for future generations, then co-ordinated action is required.

1060

1065

1070

Alderney is already streets ahead of us. Not only do they embrace the management and conservation of their biodiversity, but they promote it as a means to support their visitor economy. In the two years since funding to promote their Living Islands initiative began in 2013, the percentage of visitors naming wildlife as one of the main reasons for their visit increased from 25% to 42%.

1075

1080 However, in asking for adoption of the Strategy, the Environment Department is acutely aware  
of the issue of funding in the context of our current financial policy. This is why our board  
1085 unanimously agreed to limit our request to the minimum needed to make a difference: £80,000  
per year. Were we to be asking for the sort of resources that are applied in Jersey and the Isle of  
Man, and which would undoubtedly have had a greater impact, the amount would have been in  
the order of £300,000 per year. We have made it quite clear that £80,000 is not going to fund  
habitat improvement projects or species reintroduction programmes, but before we can even  
1090 think about trying to source finance from private enterprise, education and research  
establishments and potentially EU or international funding to deliver such improvements on the  
ground, we need to pull together the information resources we have and to co-ordinate our  
actions.

By imposing a cap from the start on public funding, it has challenged us to think about how a  
1090 small fixed sum of money can be used in the most effective way. Using Alderney as an example,  
their direct funding of a co-ordinator enabled the recruitment, training and deployment of  
volunteer time to build capacity and yield extra resources at no extra cost to the taxpayer. The  
Alderney Wildlife Trust provides the States of Alderney with in excess of 1,600 hours per year,  
1095 which provides unpaid support for work in relation to biodiversity and international conventions,  
thanks to its post-graduate involvement through its placement programme. Their Living Islands  
initiative has generated a further 1,800 hours of extra volunteer time, based on records taken  
between 2013 and 2014.

Research institutions are out there and willing and able to undertake work for us, but generally  
1100 not as an *ad hoc* piece of work specific to Guernsey; rather as a co-ordinated field of interest  
across several jurisdictions. A properly equipped co-ordinator can generate the networks, identify  
the knowledge gaps, liaise with the providers and research institution and capture those  
additional resources. I ask Members simply to look at the Renewable Energy Team to see how  
extra resources provided as seed funding can deliver additional free inputs.

I am aware of the concern that the co-ordinator is yet another civil servant, but it need not be.  
1105 If the funding is available, the Department could, for example, extend the contract with  
Environment Guernsey in respect of the Biological Records Centre to appoint a biodiversity co-  
ordinator. Other options no doubt exist.

I am also aware of the widespread support for the adoption of this funded Strategy from the  
1110 public, as evidenced by the petition, which is now in excess of 1,000 signatures. They fully support  
the Strategy and they see, rightly, that delivery of the Strategy sits first and foremost with  
Government, who have the capacity to enable, educate and implement and, where necessary,  
enforce. The States needs to work in partnership with the third sector organisations, business, the  
general public and of course other States' departments. The States can do this and much more  
through the co-ordinator proposed.

1115 On the subject of support from the community, I have been astounded by the numerous  
emails and phone calls I have received in support. Many of those asking the States to agree to  
funding the Strategy are people who already give of their free time to benefit the Island's natural  
environment and biodiversity. One email I received was from the group co-ordinator of the  
Guernsey Conservation Volunteers. The GCV works every other Saturday morning and averages  
1120 700 hours of free labour each year. It works on land belonging to the States of Guernsey, as well  
as La Société and the National Trust. I was told that the GCV is regularly contacted by schools,  
Duke of Edinburgh Award groups and corporate groups wanting to work in the natural  
environment. There is a huge enthusiasm for these projects, but virtually all of these requests are  
for term-time or weekday projects and the volunteers are unable to tap into this enthusiasm and  
1125 run these projects. If funding is given to the Biodiversity Strategy, a full-time co-ordinator could  
tap into this resource and the free labour could be used effectively to benefit our natural  
environment. If the GCV alone provides an average of 700 hours of free labour just working on  
Saturday mornings, you can imagine the amount of free labour that these community groups  
could give. £80,000 is a very small investment that would reap huge rewards for our environment.

1130 Treasury & Resources has expressed its view that we should seek savings from within the  
current departmental cash limit to fund this workstream. I am not going to dwell on this now, as it  
is more pertinent to the amendment which I understand is being laid. However, I will state that we  
have been making those savings for the last seven years, from when the Department's cash limit  
was cut by 7% in 2008 and since, when it has effectively been frozen. This has resulted in what  
1135 now represents a real terms cut of around £3 million in the Department's 2016 budget: a  
significant amount in percentage terms. The awareness by the Department that money is  
constrained is why we have taken the path we have, as it has the best chance of co-ordinating  
action from outside of Government at the least cost to the taxpayer.

Biodiversity and its conservation and management are and must remain central planks of  
1140 Government policy and this places an obligation on the Environment Department to develop  
measures to meet those obligations. The Department began the process in 2012 as one of its four  
key objectives for this States' term pledged by Deputy Domaille and with the objective of  
developing a Biodiversity Strategy for Guernsey and of meeting our global obligations by  
extending the Convention on Biological Diversity to what is now the last remaining jurisdiction in  
1145 the British Isles and one of a small handful worldwide not to have signed up.

There are solid, sound, stand-alone intrinsic reasons to fund this Strategy, but in the early 21st  
century, where everything seems to be seen through the lens of the market, there are also  
overriding economic reasons to protect our biodiversity. The cold, stark fact is that we do not do  
anywhere near enough to protect it. A caller to the Sunday phone-in recently was taken to task by  
1150 Deputy Langlois when she suggested that the States do not take the environment seriously. He  
upbraided her, saying that her comments were unfair and that, quote:

'In Policy Council the whole of the inclusion of the environment is a major factor in decisions and is constantly on the  
table.'

Well, all I can say is that I must be attending a different set of Policy Council meetings  
1155 (*Laughter*) to those attended by Deputy Langlois.

But what has nature ever done for us, apart of course from supplying water, pollenating plants,  
generating oxygen, creating recycling miracles in the soil and much, much more?

Environmental ecology and economic prosperity are inextricably linked. Nature is essential for  
economic development. It promotes well-being. Scientists have estimated that the value of nature  
1160 to the global economy is nearly twice as big as the worldwide GDP in any given year. Our living  
environment is the same one we rely on to attract visitors to this Island and underlines the  
importance we should attach to the biodiversity which is a fundamental part of it. The findings of  
the most recent exit survey of visitors taken by Visit Guernsey clearly supports this point. Over  
80% of respondents stated that Guernsey's natural beauty had a big influence on their decision to  
1165 visit, and birdwatching was the second most popular activity after self-guided walks.

The Puffin is a symbol for what we know represents the best in our Island. It is a wonderful  
icon, which sells the natural heritage of Guernsey, as embodied on the tail fins of our airline  
planes and now on our bus passes. Sadly, in October this year, the International Union for Nature  
Conservation formally listed the Puffin as a species threatened with global extinction. Surely that is  
1170 our clarion call to action. How long will we have to wait before we decide that we want to make  
sure that the Puffin, along with the rest of our natural biological diversity, will continue to live and  
thrive here and not be allowed to become just images of what we used to have? It is biodiversity  
which is the fundamental cornerstone of our natural environment and it is biodiversity which  
underpins our £4 million fishing industry.

I do not want to finish without acknowledging the outstanding contribution made by  
1175 volunteers. This Government more than ever before has relied on the third sector. There have  
been some suggestions that these volunteers should go and raise funds for this £80,000. Well, let  
me be crystal clear, those members of our society who give of their time to sustain the  
biodiversity in our Island are not doing it, as I have heard said, because it is their niche interest or  
1180 part-time, they are doing it because they absolutely get just how vital it is to try and conserve the

natural world for all of us, for our economy and most importantly for our children. We should be thanking them not endeavouring to abrogate our responsibility entirely. We have enshrined that responsibility in our strategic plans; we have given the environment equal footing with social and economic policy. Now let us turn that rhetoric into reality.

1185 Sir, I ask Members to support all Propositions.  
Thank you.

**Several Members:** Hear, hear.

*Article IX*

*Carried – Pour 40, Contre 5, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 1*

**POUR**

Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Le Lièvre  
Deputy Spruce  
Deputy Collins  
Deputy Duquemin  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy James  
Deputy Adam  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Wilkie  
Deputy De Lisle  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Sillars  
Deputy Luxon  
Deputy O'Hara  
Deputy Hadley  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. McKinley  
Deputy Harwood  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Domaille  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Robert Jones  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Sherbourne  
Deputy Conder  
Deputy Bebb  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Stewart  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy Ogier  
Deputy Trott

**CONTRE**

Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Perrot  
Deputy Inglis  
Deputy Quin  
Deputy Gillson

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Deputy David Jones

1190 **The Bailiff:** Members, before we turn to the amendment I can announce the results of the voting on the last Article which was the Education Department and Treasury & Resources Department's policy letter on transforming early years education and the funding thereof: 40 votes in favour, five against and one abstention means that the Propositions, as amended were carried.

**The Bailiff:** Now, we come to an amendment to be laid by Deputy St Pier.

1195 **Deputy Bebb:** Sorry, sir, I do not have a copy of this amendment and I am unsure whether it was circulated.

**A Member:** Oh, yes it was.

1200 **Deputy Bebb:** Whilst Deputy St Pier is speaking is it possible for a paper copy to be circulated certain Members?

**The Bailiff:** Do other Members have a copy of it? (**Several Members:** No.) Well, I have got it. Does anybody have a copy of the amendment? (**Several Members:** Yes.) Yes, some people do.

1205 **A Member:** Those of us that are prepared do.

**The Bailiff:** Could I suggest that the amendment be read? (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Ah, the Greffier does not have a copy!

1210 **Deputy St Pier:** I will read it, sir. I am happy to read it.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

*Deputy St Pier read the amendment.*

*Amendment:*

*To delete Proposition 3 and substitute:*

*'3. To direct the Environment Department, and after 1st May 2016 the Committee for the Environment and Infrastructure, to allocate funding from within their 2016 revenue expenditure budget and Cash Limit for 2017 and subsequent years to fund the Biodiversity Strategy, should that Department and/or Committee consider this to be a priority.'*

1215 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, I think it is probably an understatement to say that I have sensed that Deputy Burford is personally quite upset with me for bringing this amendment and has asked me why we do not just oppose the Strategy if we do not want to support it? Well, we do support the Strategy. We have said that in our letter of comment. Our issue, once again, is simply around one of funding. This amendment is simply brought because we do not believe that the use of the Budget Reserve, which is the Proposition in the policy letter before you, is the right source of  
1220 funding for a new ongoing, annual, recurring expenditure. Now, it is only £80,000. Some may say that is merely lost in the roundings, (*Laughter*) but of course it is a matter of principle. We have to keep reprioritising.

If this is a top priority, then something else must give and if in reprioritising Environment determine that they need to restructure their Department and they need funding to do so.  
1225 Perhaps, for example, to fund costs for redundancy for posts no longer needed as a result of their reprioritisation, then that would be an appropriate use of the Budget Reserve in year. But, to access the Budget Reserve before the year is even begun is, I suggest, not the correct use of the Budget Reserve.

And, sir, just to set it in context and remind people how constrained we are in 2016, the  
1230 Budget Reserve next year's £8.9 million. So, this £80,000 is you could say a mere 0.9% of the total Budget Reserve. However, £1.6 million of that is already taken care of for 2015 pay awards, already agreed; £1.4 million is set aside for 2016 pay awards, which have not yet been settled; £1.5 million is for capital; £1.15 million is earmarked potentially for HSSD – and we discussed it at length during the Budget debate – and £1 million is to cover the potential use, having regard to  
1235 the vacancy factor. So by the time we take all of those off, actually we have only got £2.25 million next year to meet any unexpected or emergency spending. So, that £80,000 now becomes 3.5% of

the Budget Reserve and of course we have potentially by the end of the week another suggestion that we use another £73,000 for domestic abuse. So, by the end of the week we could have spent 6.7% of the Budget Reserve before the year has even begun.

1240 On the other hand, this £80,000 is 0.6% of Environment's cash limit of £12.7 million. And, of course, coming together with PSD to form the Committee *for the* Environment and Infrastructure, they will have a total budget of £17.8 million, so this £80,000 is a mere 0.4% of that total budget. So, I really do not think that it is unrealistic to ask the Department to find those kind of percentages from their total budgets, if they believe that this is their priority.

1245 If this amendment is rejected, what is the impact going to be? Well, the obvious first point is there will be pressure on the Budget Reserve in 2016. For 2017, if we are to live once again within our fiscal rules of no real terms growth in expenditure, then that means once again this expenditure is effectively prioritised over and above other Committees' expenditure – and we have had that debate a moment ago in relation to preschool education. I cannot tell you whether  
1250 this £80,000 is above or below the £184,000, I think it was, for Education in 2017, but it is certainly above everything else. Now, there is nothing wrong in that, but Members need to be very well aware and under no illusions that that is what they are seeking to do.

So, I think that, sir, the proper way to prioritise this expenditure is for the Department to do so within its currently £13 million budget, or £18 million after the 1st May, and that is in essence the  
1255 choice before us today, sir: do we spend 3½% of the Budget Reserve or do we spend 0.4% of the combined Committee budgets? Accordingly, sir, I do urge Members to support this amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher, are you seconding the amendment?

1260 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** I do, sir, and I would be happy to speak on it at some time.

**The Bailiff:** Right. Does the Minister wish to speak at this point?

**Deputy Burford:** Not at this stage, sir, thank you.

1265 **The Bailiff:** I think Deputy Stewart has indicated to me that he wishes to do so, then I will call Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Stewart:** Mr Bailiff, fellow States' Members, we have actually heard this morning not  
1270 only from our Treasury Minister, but two former Treasury Ministers: Deputy Trott and Deputy Parkinson. This Assembly is going to have to become a lot more fiscally mature and a lot more fiscally aware. Unfortunately, I am absolutely with Deputy St Pier, in that this is good, but it will have to be prioritised within the Department and I think if it is a recurring theme from Environment ... And Deputy Fallaize referred to... It was not a flip flopping, and I make the point  
1275 again, I wrote to the Environment Minister at the time of the Transport Strategy saying there was a huge amount that I agreed with in that Transport Strategy, but I could not support a lot of the funding mechanisms and that was... (*Laughter and interjections*) Well, you laugh, but that is a fact. We can have as many good ideas as you like, but if we cannot pay for them and if we do not want to prioritise for them, then we are going to be fiscally in a mess.

1280 States' Members, it is in a very small parliament and jurisdiction like this, very much the economics of Angela Merkel: the '*hausfrau* economics', or if you want to go back to Dickens, it is Micawber. We cannot continue to spend or bring projects to this Assembly that we cannot afford, even if they are the best ideas. It is Steve Jobs at Apple. 'Here is 10 great ideas, but guess what? We can only do three of them.' I think these are the decisions that every board has to make, sir.

1285 Members will have just received an update on our Economic Development Framework. It is a lot of work to produce a document like that with a Gantt chart for every single project that we, as the Commerce & Employment board see as important. It is a huge amount of work to prioritise

those and make that then dovetail into your cash limit and your budget. But this is the work that we all have to do.

1290 The Minister, sir, for Environment said that this was – and rightly so – brought by Deputy Domaille when he was then Minister, and yes we approved it in the round. But, now we are being asked to approve extra expenditure. If it was such an important, such a vital, project, why, oh, why was it not, over the last few years, worked into their budget, worked into their cash flow and prioritised?

1295 I will give way.

**Deputy Bebb:** I am thankful to Deputy Stewart for giving way.

1300 Could I ask him to explain, therefore, his role in scuppering a large part of the Department's budget for this year (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) in his objection to the exact policies of the Department that was agreed by the States in introducing funding streams?

1305 **Deputy Stewart:** Everything that my Department has done (*Laughter*) has been within its budget and within its cash limit! And that is the responsible way for a Department to behave. We are given a cash limit. We have to budget for it and, if we all, constantly, bust our budgets and, given we have Budget Reserve for unforeseen circumstances, it is like having your money on one side because there will always be contingencies that we have to fund. There will always be things that will be unforeseen, and that is what it should be for.

1310 This is something that has been on Environment's agenda and priority list for a long time and they have failed to prioritise. They are now coming to us and saying, 'Awfully sorry we failed to prioritise ...' Sir, Deputy Bebb can sit there and make faces, but these are the facts of the matter. If we fail to prioritise, if we fail to plan, then we cannot keep coming back to the States and asking for more money.

1315 It is something that I think is very, very worthwhile and I would ask Environment to go back, look at how they prioritise their expenditure and deal with it accordingly, as this amendment suggests.

So I will support the amendment from the Treasury Minister, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize and then Deputy Luxon.

1320 **Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.

Deputy Stewart says, 'If these sorts of proposals are approved then we will be in a mess, fiscally.' We are already in a mess, fiscally. We are already spending more than we are bringing in and we have done it in every year that Deputy Stewart has been a Member of the States. In fact, the last two States have done it consistently, because we have unsustainable fiscal policies.

1325 This business about deficit funding, we are doing it now. We have a projected deficit of several millions pounds. Some of Commerce & Employment's revenue budget is currently being funded by drawing on where we are drawing from to fund our deficit. So this 'live within our means', we are not getting within our means now. No States' department is living within their means.

1330 Also, I think, in response to what Deputy Stewart has said, he has to acknowledge that the Commerce & Employment Department has something of an advantage because of the Economic Development Fund. (**Two Members:** Hear, hear.) Now, it would have been possible for the States to say, 'Well if you have economic development initiatives which are important enough, find the money out of your existing revenue budget.' Actually the States set up an Economic Development Fund which Deputy Stewart went around calling, 'Kev's Fund' (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) (*Laughter*) and that has –

**Deputy Stewart:** Point of correction. That was coined by other Members (**Several Members:** No.) (*Interjections*) and that Economic Development Fund (*Interjection*) ... Well, happy to take the credit for it if you like, but it was not. (*Laughter and Interjections*)



1340 However, sir, that Economic Development Fund is funded in separate ways. It was brought to this Assembly and agreed. If what Deputy Fallaize is saying, 'It is okay if we are slightly fiscally imbalanced, but it does not matter if we make it worse' then I cannot agree, sir.

**Deputy Fallaize:** I do not think that was at all helpful, but anyway it was good cabaret.  
1345 *(Laughter)*

I think this amendment is outrageous, not particularly because I object to Members opposing the Biodiversity Strategy, although I personally support it. The reason I think it is outrageous is because it allows Treasury ... I do not object to Treasury appealing to the States not to increase expenditure. Treasuries everywhere do that sort of thing. I do not object to them trying to defend the Budget Reserve. I think that is to be expected. What I object to is them being able to, or trying to pretend that they support the Biodiversity Strategy (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and then trying to strangle it at birth by denying it all funding. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

1350 What they want to do, T&R, is insert a new Proposition 3, which allows Proposition 1 to be retained, which is to endorse the Biodiversity Strategy set out in the policy letter and then to strangle the funding that everyone knows is necessary to provide for the Biodiversity Strategy. It is no use them saying, 'Well, we are fully supportive of it' and then 'the Environment Department can reprioritise its budget accordingly.' Well, the Environment Department would not have needed to have laid a Biodiversity Strategy before the States if they were able to reprioritise their existing budget. So, I think it is exceedingly disingenuous of T&R to say, 'We support the Biodiversity Strategy, but we do not want to provide any additional funding.' If that is their position, then they ought to advise where they think the Environment Department should cut its existing expenditure. It is not use saying, 'Well, that is a decision for the Environment Department.' The Environment Department have made their case. They are saying, 'If the States want a Biodiversity Strategy, they will need to allocate an additional £80,000 of expenditure per year.' If  
1355 Treasury believe that that additional expenditure ought not to be prioritised, they should advise the States to reject the proposals, and it would be a far more honest position than this amendment which pretends to support the Biodiversity Strategy, but clearly cuts it off at the knees.

I do note, though, that just above the Propositions we are advised that the Policy Council supports the proposals in this policy letter. We know, obviously, that the Environment Minister does. We know the Treasury Minister does not, because he is laying this amendment and we now know the Commerce & Employment Minister does not. I look forward to the speeches from the other Members of the Policy Council who do support this policy letter, which has led to the letter of comment from the Policy Council endorsing proposals 1 to 6 in this policy letter.

1370  
1375 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

**Deputy Luxon:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

1380 Sir, Deputy Fallaize, once again, tries to trip the Policy Council up. Well, we do not need his help, we can do it ourselves. *(Laughter)* We just do not need...

I have got to say, merry Christmas to everybody. *(Laughter)* I hope we have a very good debate. I can feel the Treasury & Resources' Minister's left thigh throbbing as this debate is started. I always know how difficult the debate is going to be.

1385 Sir, I was worried I was going to risk being a hypocrite when I penned this very brief speech – and I will speak on the amendment in general debate briefly, sir, if I may – but, Deputy Perrot made me more comfortable, because earlier when he explained to the Assembly he was changing his mind about the pre-school funding, he explained that he had a view and he was supporting the joint boards, but he listened to the debate and he realised that he had to change his mind  
1390 because of other principles. So, I did not regard him as being a hypocrite and I hope Members will not regard me as being a hypocrite, but I do feel I am going to be.

1395 Sir, I fully support all six Propositions and especially Proposition 3 and I hope that would  
surprise some Members bearing in mind what I would hope would be my usual fiscal, conservative  
approach. Yes, I do understand the irony of that statement, having recently had the States of  
Guernsey Budget named the 'Budget for Health' only in October. However, on the basis of the  
virtually zero allocation of resources to developing the environmental policy area of the States'  
Strategic Plan – the other two being fiscal, economic and social – both in the Government  
Business Plan and the States' Strategic Plan we have emphasised why the environmental policy  
area is important and yet, I believe, we have given it virtually no resources or support over the last  
1400 three and a half years. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

1405 So, I support the Biodiversity Strategy and the reason I support it and I support the funding  
requirement is because we all know this is a beautiful Island; it is a fantastic place to live in and,  
for me, it is not about the birds and some of the other things that Deputy Burford was explaining.  
It is just about the beautiful Island, this rock upon which we live, and the Biodiversity Strategy for  
me is a bit of packaging, Christmas packaging, around that beautiful Island. It deserves to be  
supported.

1410 Deputy Stewart mentioned that Environment Department should have prioritised this earlier.  
Well, they could not have done that, because they had not written the Strategy earlier. They have  
written the Strategy now and now they need to work out the prioritisation. Yes, if this report had  
come prior to October, it should have been captured in the Budget submission that they made to  
T&R and either it would have been approved or not, But the Strategy is before us now and they  
have explained how they need to fund it.

1415 Commerce & Employment, responsible for tourism of our Island, may well want to go 50/50  
with Environment Department if this amendment is successful, because, of course, tourism  
absolutely benefits from this beautiful Island (**Two Members:** Hear, hear.) and the Biodiversity  
Strategy absolutely at the heart of it wants to protect what the Island is today, future and for the  
long-term future. But, I do not agree in pinching budgets from other departments, like certain  
Requêtes suggest.

1420 Sir, so as painful as it is to find the money and bearing in mind every other Department's  
genuine need for resources, I will repeat ...

I will give way to Deputy Stewart, sir.

1425 **Deputy Stewart:** The only point I would make is that Kev's Fund is not Kev's Fund and if there  
was a real benefit to tourism and you can show the economic advantages and return on  
investment, then that money is available to every department, including Environment.

1430 **Deputy Luxon:** Point of correction, sir. I did not mention anything about Kev's Fund. I just said  
that I recognise that Commerce & Employment's mandate covers tourism and the Island's natural  
beauty is an important part of tourism.

So, sir, I repeat that if we were serious in setting out the States' Strategic Plan, the three pillars  
of fiscal/economic, social and environmental policy areas, then it is time to at least demonstrate  
some small measure of recognition of that by approving this funding request.

1435 Sir, Deputy Parkinson said earlier today that the States has not prioritised policy development  
this term and, of course, he is right, we have not, or should I say we did not. We chose not to. This  
Assembly chose not to when we binned the idea behind the Government Service Plan the Policy  
Council presented to Members at Les Cotils in 2012. We did not like the sound of GSP or a multi-  
criteria analysis, the sausage machine, or prioritising by a formula.

1440 Sir, Deputy Parkinson also said in a recent interview, 'This States did not have a chat. We did  
not decide on any direction and have wandered around in the dark for the last three and half  
years.'

**Deputy Parkinson:** Sir, can I just correct him?

I said, 'This States did not have a chart.' The Guernsey Press chose to misprint that.

1445 **Deputy Luxon:** Mr Bailiff, I am afraid that the Guernsey Press is the font of all wisdom in this Island and if it said it was a 'chat' rather than a 'chart' –

**A Member:** Oh, no they are not!

1450 **A Member:** Oh, yes they are! *(Laughter)*

**Deputy Luxon:** Oh, yes they think they are, sir.

1455 Anyway, 'chart' will do. Chart, chat, whatever! But what we have done, we have complied with that critique that Deputy Parkinson made, when it comes to the environmental policy area incumbent within the States' Strategic Plan. We have not given it any focus, any priority and we have not given it any resources.

Sir, I do not support this amendment and as I said I worried I might be hypocritical because I do believe that fiscal prudence is important. I note, out of the corner of my eye, that the Minister of Treasury & Resources is making a note. No doubt he is going to make comment on that in his summing up.

1460 Sir, I know that you cannot be a bit principled; you cannot be a bit disciplined or a bit fiscally prudent, but in this case, I am prepared to be a bit *not* fiscally prudent. This Biodiversity Strategy benefits from public funding and volunteer time and third sector contributions. What the Strategy needs from us is only 80,000 of these: £80,000. (**A Member:** Ditto.) Now, the only problem is that cost me £2.70, sir, so I do not suggest that I am welcome on the T&R board, but what I would ask, it is only £80,000 – and we will be talking about another small amount in a policy letter later – but the environmental policy area is important to this Island. We have not given it the priority it deserves. We do have fiscal challenges ahead of us, but I am prepared to be a bit not fiscally prudent, to allow us to recognise the third-party work and effort in making sure that the Island stays as we all like it: the beautiful Island we know.

1470 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** I said I would call Deputy Spruce next.

Deputy Spruce and then also Deputy Paint and I know there are quite a lot of other people waiting to speak. Let's see how we go before lunch.

1475

**Deputy Spruce:** Thank you, sir.

1480 Members, it is with regret that I speak against the funding proposals in this policy letter. I am a Vice President of the National Trust of Guernsey and past Chairman of Floral Guernsey, which as you know are both organisations that are committed to improving and protecting our environment. So, I really do get what this is all about, having spent nine of the last 10 years advancing the aims of biodiversity. I speak as someone who supports the need for protection of the Island's biodiversity and the aims of this policy letter. So, I take exception, actually, to Deputy Fallaize suggesting that this board does not support this policy, because we do sincerely support the policy. However, we are unable to support clause 3 of the recommendations regarding funding. It is a real fact that funding is just not available at this time.

1485 It is also a fact that we need to prioritise what we believe to be the most essential strategy or strategies in need of funding. I believe that much can be achieved by the Department working more closely with organisations such as Société, Floral Guernsey, the National Trust of Guernsey and all the other organisations working in the field, working very hard to improve our Island's biodiversity. Working together, the aims of this Strategy could take huge steps forward. My genuine problem is the fact that this is yet another strategy in the long list of strategies which have inadequate funding. Just think about social policy generally. Much of it is moving forward at a snail's pace due to inadequate funding, and here we are again suggesting 'only another £80,000'.

1490

1495 This policy letter is undoubtedly long overdue, but it really does demonstrate that it is possible  
to propose strategic policy making from within the Department's existing resources. This is a well-  
written and structured report and, as I say, it has been prepared with existing resources, so why  
not continue the fine work? Why seek extra funding from an already empty pot? Given that the  
1500 Department will be part of an annual budget of £18 million, if they cannot find £80,000 from their  
existing resources, it is just plain criminal. (*Interjection*) To suggest that our Island's biodiversity  
will be improved just by funding yet more manpower, to write yet more quality proposals will  
result in yet more disappointment within the community unless significant funding is made  
available. £80,000 will do nothing more than produce a few more policies. It will not change  
things on the ground.

1505 As I have already said, it really is time to decide what are the essential priorities and fund them  
correctly. I would ask you all, therefore, to support this amendment, but also support the aims of  
this Strategy by sending a clear message to the Environment Department that they should  
reprioritise their existing budget and progress the Strategy from within their existing resources  
and by working more closely with all the volunteer organisations who currently do such a fantastic  
1510 job.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Paint has still got comments.

1515 **Deputy Paint:** Thank you, sir.

I have to declare an interest here being President of the Fisherman's Association and President  
of the Fisherman's Liaison Group which will come into this later.

1520 This request for funds is like the misuse of credit cards where some would buy everything they  
think they need at the moment and without consideration to where the funds are going to come  
from or for the service proposed or the damage it is going to do for more pressing and needed  
projects. To live today hoping to pay tomorrow or for somebody else to pay for you in the future  
is not acceptable to me. It also appears to me that there is no self-control in what several  
departments could make do with for the time being until more funds become available, if they  
ever do.

1525 I do not want to hear what is reputed to have been said by a UK prime minister in the past:  
'The pound in your pocket will soon be mine.' It appears to me that we are being driven and  
heading that way in this parliament. I do not understand why so many Members cannot see it.

1530 Not so many years ago, Deputy Ron Le Moignan – who sat in the very seat I occupy today –  
made a speech concerning the creation of a new post for HSSD which the Chairman of Health,  
Deputy Sue Plant, requested the States to consider. You might ask what this has got to do with  
the topic we are discussing. I will explain. Deputy Plant wanted £14,000 for a Health Promotion  
Officer. Many supported her in this post. One that did not was Deputy Ron Le Moignan who argued  
on the day that, if the States granted Health's request for a single post of a Health Promotion  
Officer, the single post would soon become a department in its own right. History shows that he  
1535 was absolutely right. The Health Promotion Unit now employs several staff and that started off  
from just one request. There was plenty of money at that time in the States' funds, where there is  
not today.

1540 That is how I feel about the request for these funds for the new Biodiversity Strategy with  
£80,000 of taxpayers' money. I also think after listening for a week or more, several Deputies in  
this States are sick to death of hearing of new strategies. Well I warn you now: if this grant is  
requested it will turn out to be another department in its own right, as I said before.

We cannot afford to say yes to every funding for everything that is raised without increasing  
direct or indirect taxation to pay for all these wants.

1545 The Environment Department have very good staff who have looked after the environment for  
many years. I believe they could now continue to manage without further financing or extra staff  
for quite some time in the future until all aspects of biodiversity have been properly looked into.

1550 There always seems to be a bunfight each time a department wants to fund something or other. In my view this Assembly is unable or unwilling to understand that the funds are not available on demand any more. The ordinary person in the street, the ordinary family, even companies cannot operate outside the ability to live within their means. This Government must do the same. We have a proposal which no doubt will cost much more than £80,000 per annum in the long run and cannot be considered as an immediate priority at the moment.

1555 I am also concerned at the accuracy that has been claimed on page 3059 in Appendix 6 of the marine part of the Biodiversity and other pages also. Commerce & Employment Sea Fisheries Section has worked very hard and continues to work hard to ensure that there is sustainable fishing in the waters we control. This is much more than countries and Bailiwicks around us have done. To quote a fisherman who spoke to me a few years ago: 'Guernsey waters are a massive reserve of fish. We want to keep it that way.' To quote a Jersey fisherman recently, 'Your Government protects your fishermen's interests much more than ours does.'

1560 Going to page 3059 of the dangers there is for fishing. Pair-trawling – which is one item mentioned – was banned within our six-mile limit in 2013. Scallop dredging up to the three-mile limit is regulated, the vessels only towing four dredgers. From the three to 12-mile limit, a maximum of eight dredgers and from the six to 12-mile limit, a maximum of 12 dredgers. Super scallopers can tow up to 60 dredgers per boat and thankfully have to stay outside our 12-mile limit. All these things have been sorted.

1565 There is at the moment a consultation process being put together as we speak by Commerce & Employment Sea Fisheries Section regarding ormering, netting and many other sources of fishing within our coast and further out to sea. This has taken a much longer time than expected due to the other pressing priorities which cannot be spoken about at this time.

1570 Our well-loved Puffins: they are migratory birds and they only come to these islands to breed and nest about three to four months a year. They spend the rest of their lives perhaps 1,000 miles away or more to the north of the British Isles. How can we be blamed for the apparent decline of this bird when most of its life is spent in waters that may be more polluted with oil rigs and heavily fished than ours? The point I am trying to make is that not much research has been done on these aspects of marine biodiversity from the writer of the proposal and the Environment board and why they did not know what I have just told you must be a travesty.

1575 If you look now at page 2991 under Table 1, you will find a list of 30 species of birds many of which are migratory birds. Again, how can we be blamed for the decline in these birds when they only stay on our shores or our land for a very short time?

1580 Now let us look at just one of these birds: the Cuckoo. (**A Member:** Cuckoo!) (*Laughter*) It comes from Africa. It stays here for a period of six weeks or possibly ten weeks. It lays its eggs in another bird's nest, then vanishes back to Africa. The Cuckoo chick hatches first before any other eggs in the nest and then evicts the chicks from the original bird. The parent birds then feed it and they feed the sole Cuckoo chick until it can fly the nest. Then it abandons its parents. This seems to ring a bell with me. (*Laughter*) Someone has to ask what is the accuracy of the other parts of these appendices and the main proposals? Or is this yet again a dream without any proper research? And we talk about the eradication of silo government!

1585 Hopefully the amendment placed by Deputy St Pier will be accepted by this Assembly and the proposers will be able to fund and improve parts of the proposals until the funds become available in the future and accurately laid down.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

1595 **Deputy Brehaut:** Thank you, sir.

Just in addressing Deputy Stewart. He made a number of references in opposing the Strategy. I need to say that I think the first advertisement that he ran or had responsibility for as a Minister was a coasteering YouTube promotion of Guernsey's natural environment. So C&E realised the

1600 benefit of Guernsey's natural environment and heavily promoted coasteering. It is worth saying  
that actually coasteering presents risks to nesting seabirds and the growth of coasteering is  
something that we have to watch and monitor and obviously the Strategy and the funding would  
give us the ability to do that.

1605 The next time the Minister referred to the real value and the importance of biodiversity was  
when he came to this Assembly with the Milk Report. He made clear the value of the manner in  
which the farm was managed by the size of the farms and the importance of biodiversity in  
relation to milk. Again biodiversity underpinned aspects of the Commerce & Employment  
Department's work. The third occasion, from memory, is the last ad we have seen to promote  
Guernsey which is green lanes, the coast, the natural environment.

1610 I know that within this Assembly there are people, for example, who do not believe in climate  
change and people who still refer to 'global warming' rather than climate change. I know the  
science is out there, but I appreciate that not everybody is there yet. What we must accept in the  
context of this amendment is we are eroding Guernsey's natural environment and each and every  
one of us should be alarmed by that.

1615 Now, the Vale Commons Council are concerned about. *(Interjections)* Sorry, the People's  
Republic of the Vale and the Vale Commons Council have concern about a number of vergées  
that need protection. And how much do they want? How much do the Vale Commons Committee  
want?

1620 **A Member:** You tell us. *(Laughter)*

**Deputy Brehaut:** That is right. Yes. Let's buy a lottery ticket. They are saying they have £30,000  
from the Environment for a few hundred vergées. That is not enough. They want a minimum of a  
third of £30,000. They are being offered – it is out there in the ether – something like £100,000 to  
manage the common. Not the Island and its rich diversity; just to manage the common!

1625 I suppose I have to refer to remarks made by Deputy Paint. I know he is going to argue or  
perhaps intervene and say, 'But the widows paid in' or 'The spouses did not' rather. But he bought  
a requête to this Assembly that wanted to see widows' pensions fully funded. Now how much  
would that have cost? What legacy would there have been for this Assembly? *(Interjections)*

1630 **Deputy Paint:** Point of order, sir.

**Deputy Brehaut:** I will give way, bearing in mind –

1635 **The Bailiff:** He is saying, 'point of order'.

**Deputy Paint:** The widows' husbands had already paid and had died so the money that was  
taken from their husbands would never be paid out other than to other people. This is what I was  
arguing about. And it has absolutely nothing to do with biodiversity.

1640 **Deputy Brehaut:** Yes, well on the subject of Cuckoos! Deputy Paint says of course they are  
migratory birds, but of course it is both ends isn't it? Birds go to a habitat where the habitat exists.  
It could be that that habitat does not exist on Guernsey any more, rather than implying that it is  
somewhere else.

1645 But I just wanted to talk very generally on what I would refer to as this choreography. I resent  
taking part in this because I realise like all of us we are drawn into this vortex of deliberate chaos.  
And T&R I am afraid they are doing this to this Assembly far too frequently. We could have  
agreed funding for this with a meeting at T&R. We could have agreed it between the two  
Departments in some way, but what T&R do: they want to have a debate in this Assembly over  
any sum of money to show to the taxpayer their due diligence. They will go to great lengths to  
1650 have this Assembly falling over itself over relatively – I stress, relatively – small sums of money.

Clichés aside, but I am going to use it. This is the case where we are going to debate – I am sure even before lunch and after with this amendment – the price of everything and the value of nothing and we should not do that.

1655 Just before I sit down, the Minister of the Commerce & Employment Department, in his well-funded, in his well-staffed Department, they have the number of officers with the time and the ability and the grade to write reports. Not every department has this. Ideally, Environment would have been to this Assembly before today with this report, but resources do not allow.

1660 Deputy Domaille has not spoken yet, but yes when he stood for Minister he made it clear he would deliver a Biodiversity Strategy. If there would not have been resignations then Deputy Spruce would be in here today; Deputy Paint would be in here today, probably endorsing this Strategy put forward – and the funding possibly – by the board they were members of.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson.

1665

**Deputy Parkinson:** Yes, sir.

1670 Of course this is a worthwhile project, a worthwhile expansion of public service, but the question is, is it more worthwhile than a disability strategy or a domestic abuse strategy or any of the other claims on the public purse in the context of a situation where the Island is running a structural deficit and has no credible fiscal plan to restore the public finances to surplus?

1675 I spoke earlier this morning about the three tests I will apply to each and every one of these proposals for further public expenditure which will come before the Assembly in the next three or four months. I ask myself, firstly: 'Is the sum of money involved trivial?' Well, I do not think we can say £80,000 a year is trivial. I do not want to put a number on where I would cut off the concept of trivial but £80,000 a year times several other projects which are of that sort of value which are coming to the Assembly would add up to quite a large amount of money if we simply gave the green light to everything under that level.

1680 Secondly, I ask: 'Is the States already committed to doing this?' And the answer to that appears to be no. We have not yet committed to a Biodiversity Strategy, never mind the funding mechanism.

1685 Thirdly I ask: 'Will serious harm result from delaying the introduction of such a new service until the summer of 2016 when I believe there will have to be a prioritisation debate in the next Assembly?' And I answer that question in the negative. I do not believe that between now and the summer of 2016 that the absence of a Biodiversity Strategy will have catastrophic ill-effects.

I also mentioned this morning I take into account my own personal views of whether such a strategy would be likely to be favoured in any prioritisation debate. I think it quite possibly would, but I do not think it is absolutely clear cut that that will be a priority at the next Assembly and I am reluctant to spend the money of the next Assembly on projects which they have not yet had a chance to opine on.

1690 So taking all that into account, I have to support the Minister of Treasury & Resources' amendment. I think this can wait.

**Deputy Fallaize:** I am grateful to Deputy Parkinson for giving way. He is making some very interesting points, but where is all this new money coming from in the summer of 2016?

1695

1700 **Deputy Parkinson:** Well, that, sir, will be decided by the next Assembly but in my view it will come from a reform of our corporate tax system (*Interjections*) and certainly not from a GST. But that is a debate yet to be had. The point that we need to take on board here is that the next Assembly will have to have a credible fiscal plan to restore the public finances to surplus and it may be that I am overruled and that it decides to introduce GST, but frankly, I will not be supporting that decision and this is not the time and place to have that debate.

1705 So I had almost reached my conclusion. I will support the amendment, somewhat reluctantly, but I think turning down any project in the next three or four months will be a painful decision. I think it is the responsible thing to do. Until the States has a credible fiscal plan in place we should not be writing cheques unless we have to.

1710 **Deputy Luxon:** Sir, point of correction. I just thought I would wait until Deputy Parkinson finished. Sir, through you, would Deputy Parkinson agree that in 2016 there may well not be additional money, because a corporate tax review may well end up in net lower income because of the negative impact that review would have on our international finance sector.

**A Member:** Hear, hear.

1715 **A Member:** Well said.

**Deputy Parkinson:** I think it extremely unlikely that that effect would ensue from a corporate tax review, but as I said this is not the time and place for that debate.

1720 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Domaille.

**Deputy Domaille:** Thank you, sir.

1725 I will be brief. Can I just say that, as Deputy Burford has said and I think Deputy Brehaut has said, the introduction of a Biodiversity Strategy was one of the main aims that I had as Environment Minister. It was one of the things that I put forward; one of the things that Members actually elected me to the post of Environment to perform and bring to this House. I commend the Department for the report. I commend Deputy Burford for her opening speech.

1730 I am more than disappointed I think that we are actually having this debate over – and I heard what you said before, but in the scheme of things, given the importance of Biodiversity Strategy, I really find it *very* disappointing that we are having this argument or disagreement today. I think the points have been well made and we cannot commit a future States to its priorities and so on, but we can certainly put down some important markers. I would also add, for this Assembly, they already made it clear that biodiversity is a *very* important (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) strand of Government.

1735 For my part I do understand why Treasury & Resources are putting forward the point of principle but, given the amounts that we spend just on consultants alone, let alone further reports that go nowhere I really do not see how we cannot support the Environment Department in this matter.

Thank you, sir.

1740 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb and then ...

**Deputy Bebb:** Thank you, Monsieur le Bailli.

1745 I feel that there is something about Deputy Parkinson's speech that needs to be corrected. He pointed to the fact that until 2016 in a new Assembly that we would need to say no because of funding, but of course funding for 2016 is set by the Budget of this Assembly. Therefore, is it also a point that when we look at initiatives, if we are to say no to everything, think very carefully about what else will actually appear.

1750 I am surprised also as to the stance that I have heard so far from the Commerce & Employment Department – because Deputy Brehaut makes certain points but I think that it goes further. When we look at the mandate of the Commerce & Employment Department not only do they have responsibility in relation to biodiversity when it comes to farming; not only do they use biodiversity extensively when it comes to tourism – and we know that tourism biodiversity is an integral part of our tourism attraction. It is one of the biggest pull factors. When I first came to



1755 Guernsey, one of my first jobs was working at the Ambassador Hotel. Every week the hotel would be full with buses of people from Sweden who had specifically come here to look at the flora and fauna. I personally did not quite understand what they were interested in, but let us not imagine that those people did not arrive here to spend hard cash in our tourist economy because they were interested in our biodiversity. And that continues. It is an exceptionally important part.

1760 But further, biodiversity within Commerce & Employment's mandate also looks at sea fisheries. We all know that the desire to actually protect the sea fisheries was further expended by the Department recently in their bid in order to actually replace the Leopardess – which I supported fully.

1765 I have to say that I am surprised to hear that when it comes to what is in relative terms not a significant amount of money, that there is not wholehearted support from the Commerce & Employment Department on this issue.

1770 I also have to say that when we look at the funding, we ask the question about £80,000 and we ask the question as to why the Department has not been able to prioritise it? So far the speeches against it, apart from Deputy Parkinson, have been from those people who have created havoc with a budget of a Department of the past year. We agreed to paid parking, but of course it did not pass, the legislation. We agreed to omissions and then that was pulled. We agreed to one form of funding after another in order to actually find the very same people who have spoken against it, scupper the funding.

1775 I have sat on HSSD and I know what a difficult budget looks like when you have a got a very difficult budget in terms of funding, but the Environment budget, though much smaller has been a true exercise in trying to understand what the budget was to start with. Repeatedly, we have been told, 'Well you have some funding coming' but then of course the Treasury & Resources Department, quite rightly, have said, 'Do not imagine you can spend that until you have passed the legislation.' So even knowing where our budget lies in 2015 has been a real exercise in mental agility. Those people who objected to those funding streams cannot now stand and say that they believe we should reprioritise our existing budgets. It is hypocrisy to say so.

1780 Members, I would actually ask you to please wholeheartedly reject this amendment. The benefits that we will reap ... Further, Deputy Paint I think it was who said or Deputy Stewart ... No it was Deputy Spruce – I beg your pardon – who said that we should be working more closely with other societies and quoted a number of them. But who? With what resources? How are we to see this coordinated work happen if we do not fund it?

1790 Deputy Paint made reference to the Cuckoo. Well it is interesting that actually the Cuckoo at the moment is not considered to be native in Guernsey because it has gone. The only time that we have actually heard it – which I did actually about two years ago – apparently it was just passing by. You cannot imagine that you talk about the idyllic parts of Guernsey and then say that you do not want to fund in order to actually see some of those return, because they are gone.

1795 Members, I would honestly ask you sincerely, the Department's budget has been in turmoil. I believe that it is only appropriate for us to fund what is intrinsic to the Environment Department's mandate appropriately. That we do place the priority that we state we place on an environmental strategy in the same way that we already place that priority when it comes to social and when it comes to fiscal issues.

1800 And when it comes to the comments from the Minister for Treasury & Resources, about breaking our fiscal rules, I did not hear an awful lot of complaints from Members during the Budget debate about those fiscal rules. Those fiscal rules – I am sorry but I am not really interested in those people who think their roundings are so large. *(Laughter)* I do believe that when it comes to our fiscal rules, if we do not place real barriers to breaking them, they remain as fluid as any piece of water that we can come across. If we have no punitive actions from breaking them, it will be just like the last Budget debate: something that we all think it is nice to have a fiscal rule until it comes to breaking it at which point nobody really wants to mention it. Let us be honest.

1805 It is time we actually showed that we do place an equal priority on environmental issues,  
something that we have been lacking for a long time. We are willing to actually give a substantial  
sum of money to the Commerce & Employment Department to increase our fiscal issues; to  
improve our commons relationship and that is right, but it is also right that just put £80,000 ... I do  
not even want to know what that is in comparison to the funding that has been given in order to  
1810 improve the economy of this Island. £80,000 would see a substantial return of investment based  
on tourism alone never mind our fishing industry and our agricultural industry.

Members, for me £80,000 seems small in comparison to the benefits that would be reaped. I  
ask you to please reject this amendment.

Thank you.

1815

**The Bailiff:** Members, it is 12.30 p.m. We will rise and resume at 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.30 p.m.  
and resumed its sitting at 2.29 p.m.*

## ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

### **XI Biodiversity Strategy – Debate continued – Propositions carried**

**The Bailiff:** We continue the debate on the Environment Department's policy letter on  
Biodiversity Strategy.

Deputy Green.

1820

**Deputy Green:** Sir, thank you. I will be very brief.

Coming into this debate I certainly thought that I would probably be supporting the Deputy St  
Pier/Deputy Kuttelwascher amendment, but I must say I am not sure whether I can support it at  
this stage now, mainly because I think the speech that the Minister for the Environment  
1825 Department made this morning was exceptional. I think the phrase she used was, 'We *must* turn  
rhetoric into reality' and I think that is actually the core of this issue.

I absolutely agree with many of the comments that have been made about the need for fiscal  
prudence and for appropriate prioritisation. I take all of those on board, although I do think to  
some extent this debate has been slightly hijacked by some of those comments, because there is  
1830 no doubt in my mind that we in the States have not afforded the significance to environmental  
policy in the last few years.

The States' Strategic Plan is supposedly one that sets economic, social and environmental  
policy on a par. We can spout off, we can talk up the importance of environmental policy and  
biodiversity all we want, but unless we actually put our money where our mouth is then it is all  
1835 rhetoric.

I take the point that the amendment is in support of the Strategy and is simply trying to fund  
the Biodiversity Strategy in a different way by asking the Department to resource it from its own  
budget. I do understand that. But I do think I am beginning to be persuaded by the arguments  
that the Minister made in her speech this morning. She talked about Alderney as a good exemplar  
1840 in this regard. I did sympathise a lot with what she said on that, because I think the Living Islands  
initiative that Alderney has pioneered has been successful; is being successful in terms of driving  
tourist numbers to that island, in terms of its wildlife and its green spaces.

1845 The bottom line is Guernsey's greatest asset is its wildlife, its green spaces, its marine environment, its cliffs, its sea. They are a major draw for tourists coming to this Island and we can build on that so much if we really want to.

I will listen to the rest of the debate. I had initially thought that I would probably support the amendment but now I am not so sure. I will certainly listen to the debate, but I am minded to probably vote against the amendment.

1850 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Laurie Queripel.

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Thank you, sir.

1855 Sir, there is a 'however' in my remarks, so I do not want the Members of the Environment Department to get too perturbed or worked up by what I am about to say. The fact is I am drawn to this amendment and the reasons for that are as follows. I am not convinced that Environment have used their budget very wisely during this term, sir, because spend during times of financial constraint really does need to be based on what is necessary and with good supporting evidence. We have heard many times during the course of this term, and in fact yesterday and today, that it is absolutely vital to prioritise, because you cannot have everything at once when we are going through difficult financial times.

1860 I think with some better judgement, Environment could have found at least half of what they require here to support or to fund this Strategy from their budget. They knew this matter was coming up and they perhaps should have allocated their spend with this Strategy in mind. Actually that was given away slightly this morning by Deputy Domaille and Deputy Bebb who spoke very well, sir, and they spoke in support of the Strategy. But actually Deputy Domaille told us that he had this in mind for a *long* time and it was one of the first things that he brought to the Environment Department when he was Minister. And Deputy Bebb of course who spoke well too in support of the Strategy, but he said that this was an 'intrinsic part of Environment's mandate'. Now, if it is an intrinsic part of their mandate, then they should have perhaps borne it in mind when they were allocating their funding. However, that does not mean that I am going to vote against the Strategy. I am minded to vote for it because it seems to me that this is not simply a nice to have. It sits in a much higher category than that.

1870 Going back to where I think Environment have perhaps been unwise in their spending, because I am loath to mention it, but there of course is the situation of the seafront, sir. I think there has been some very misleading information given about that seafront situation: talk of half a million pounds being spent and actually as far as I understand it that is not what Environment spent. I think they spent about £30,000 or –

1880 **Deputy Burford:** Less than that.

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** – a bit less than that sir. About £30,000 was actually Environment's share of the expenditure on the seafront changes.

1885 The other thing I am concerned about is the replacing – I know it is not a great deal of money but all these things add up – of things like bicycle hoops at L'Ancrese sir. I can understand why the Department would look to or seek to improve the provision for cyclists in the town area, because if we have traffic congestion and traffic problems that is where we have them and trying to encourage people to look for other transport alternatives in the town areas in St Peter Port I can understand. But I could not see the evidence or the need for placing things like bicycle hoops at places at L'Ancrese.

1890 If you add all that lot together there is probably at least half of what the Department are looking for in regard to this Strategy. But I am still minded to vote for the Strategy.

It seems to me, sir, the report is full of compelling reasons why this is not merely a nice to have, but is in fact something close to a necessity and not just for conservations reasons. The reasons being put forward in the report are worthy enough: to preserve habitats and species and

1895 biodiversity, but actually for reasons of self-preservation. We have a vested interest in maintaining a healthy environment, sir, because of the services that it provides to us. Deputy Burford did a much better job than I could of describing all of the services that the environment provides to us.

1900 Aside from all those things, it is good for our wellbeing and good for our balance as human beings. Whichever way you look at it the environment is our life support system, economically, socially, in so many ways, sir. In fact without us, without human activity, it can survive very happily, but we could not survive without it. Humankind has got to a point, a mixture really of taking things for granted and being a little bit arrogant. We seem to acknowledge or value everything in monetary or materialistic terms and we find it far harder to appreciate things when they are measured in perhaps slightly less tangible terms, sir.

1905 So, we owe it not only to the environment. We owe it not only in the name of biodiversity and species and habitat preservation, but we actually owe it to ourselves, sir, to look after our environment. We do not own it. We need to live with it, not just live off it.

1910 If ever there was a spend to save initiative and invest in the future, to pay a dividend in the future to the benefit of ourselves and our environment, biodiversity, species and habitat preservation, this is probably it, sir.

1915 Now, I was a little bit concerned ... This is another reason why I have hesitated to say I am absolutely going to support this Strategy, sir. I was a bit concerned when I read in the report that there was going to be a need for a new staff member. I was hoping that the Department could find somebody from within their existing staff. I have dealt with some of the members of the Environment staff and they seem to be very capable and very knowledgeable in this area. I cannot quite understand why – okay, you are going to need some funding and some resource to help the work along – the Department cannot find somebody from within their staff who can take this work forward. That did concern me a little bit, but on balance, although I was tempted to support the amendment, for the reasons that Deputy Green gave, because – I have said this before, sir, many times during this term ... I have voted conservatively. I have voted because I thought that was a fiscally responsible thing to do and I have actually gone against my natural inclinations. I would love to see social and environmental policy advance much more quickly, but we have to balance that against our fiscal responsibility. So on many occasions I have voted conservatively, but I think what we are talking about here is *very* important and not only in the name of biodiversity, but in the name of human health and the fact that we benefit greatly from the environment.

I think on balance I will be supporting the Strategy.

Thank you, sir.

1930 **The Bailiff:** Deputies Quin and Soulsby have been waiting a long time.  
Deputy Quin.

**Deputy Quin:** Thank you, sir.

1935 I rise to speak on the amendment. I have nothing against the Biodiversity Strategy, nothing at all, except who is going to pay for it? All the time we hear talk of fiscal prudence and cutting cloth. When does it ever happen? Every month we come here and something new comes up and everyone wants something extra. Well this pot must be pretty empty, if it is not empty.

1940 I had an uncomfortable meeting – as did the rest of the Home Department – on Monday with service chiefs to explain why there had to be more cuts to vital services. I am not saying that the biodiversity is not vital. What I am saying is that we just cannot keep taking.

The last matter on pre-school: I am not against the pre-school. I am against these additional monies as were four other Members of this Assembly. We do not have this money to continually take. We can all make it a good reason, but we just do not have it.

1945 'We must live within our means' is something that I read once and we are not living within our means. I cannot believe that the Environment Department has not been able to find this amount of money in their huge budget.

I am not going to follow the last Deputy who spoke about money supposedly wasted on the sea front. That has gone and dusted and buried.

1950 The importance of this is great. You do not need me to tell you what my hobbies are. I spend more time on the cliffs and on the foreshore than probably all of you put together and I am fully in favour of it, but I do not believe we can keep taking. We talk all the time about fiscal prudence and cutting cloth. When do we do it?

I am going to support the amendment.

Thank you.

1955

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

**Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, yes.

1960 I have to say I did struggle with the funding request for this Strategy for quite some time. I have been in e-mail correspondence with the Minister quite a lot on it, but at the end of the day my feelings about the policy letter and why I cannot support the amendment are very much aligned to what Deputy Luxon said before lunch.

1965 I do believe the States should be fulfilling its commitment to the environmental strand of the States' Strategic Plan. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Members will not need reminding that the SSP says:

'the Government of the Guernsey aims to:'

– and I quote –

'...to protect and improve:

... The Island's environment, unique cultural identity and rich heritage.'

– and it says that –

'... this requires:

... Polices which protect the natural environment and its biodiversity by accounting for the wider impacts that human activity has on it.'

Clearly the Strategy meets the SSP's aims. So how can we not support it?

1970 My main concern about the cost was less a quantum – and as we know for Deputy Trott it would be lost in the roundings – but more about the potential creation of another civil service post. All up front, bearing in mind what was said ironically by the Treasury & Resources Minister, that his Department automatically sets aside money for the annual pay rises. I would like to know what Treasury & Resources are doing to minimise that increase in pay rises which have a far bigger impact on States' expenditure. Certainly far more than just the £80,000 that is required here.

1975

I would rather not see another civil service post. My preference would be a two-year contract in order that the action plans can be put in place and then for the role to be revisited. However, I appreciate this may not be practical, but I do thank the Minister for clarifying that this may well not result in an increase in staff numbers.

1980

1985 So why can't I support this amendment? Why can't we just tell Environment Department to take the money from elsewhere? Well funding for the environment – I am not just talking about the Environment Department – already falls woefully short. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I have before now expressed my concerns over such lack of funding, principally in respect of coastal defences. I have a qualification on coastal erosion, geomorphology. I can see the likely impact that is going to happen to this Island particularly through climate change. I am convinced that we will live to regret the decades of underinvestment in that area and the result will mean very difficult decisions are going to have to be made.

Money is often not spent until it is too late. A case of out of sight, out of mind. The result is a false economy. The same goes for biodiversity. The cost of reintroducing species is far higher than

1990 protecting what we have. Or are we happy to see the end of the unique and rich natural heritage of this Island?

I was surprised to hear Deputy Paint, as a representative of the fishing industry, not supporting this policy letter. I do not understand that at all. The fishing industry will benefit from this Strategy. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

1995 We hear so much about how, from an economic and social point of view, Guernsey is losing its identity. Are we happy for this to be true from an environmental perspective too? I am not and that is why I cannot support this amendment but will support the policy letter.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Adam.

2000

**Deputy Adam:** Thank you, sir.

First, I would like to make a comment about some of the things that Deputy Soulsby has just said. She talked about pay rises and how T&R have to keep money aside for pay rises. The pay rises are nothing to do with T&R. They just have to pay for them. It is the Policy Council that negotiates pay rises with the public sector. So we have to just pay for them.

2005

The other thing she quoted: SSP quotes and stated what they quoted. I would like to mention SSP was actually prioritised methodology for assessing what was important and what we should be funding.

Next she mentioned coastal defences. Deputy Spruce, sir, would be much more suitable to reply to this, because he keeps a very close eye. The Environment Department has had money and we are waiting and putting forward various bids for the major jobs and they have had to prioritise in what order they are doing that work, depending on how serious it is. So they do get funding for that. That comes out of Budget Reserve because that is there for one-off processes.

2010

The other thing is Deputy Bebb. He gave a very good speech as usual and emphasised the importance of biodiversity and the Biodiversity Strategy. As he said, he used to work in a hotel and all these people would come across, not spend money but go round the Island appreciating the beauty and the variety of wildlife, etc. in Guernsey and it was a tourist attraction. Sir, I would like to ask the Minister of Environment, why is the Environment Department not working with Commerce & Employment and getting some funding from the money that is given to tourism and stop thinking in silo mentality? But unfortunately as some of you may be aware there is the Requête that is also looking for money to come out of the tourism budget in the near future and that is for medical services.

2015

2020

On the whole, sir, I tend to agree with what Deputy Laurie Queripel said: £80,000 does not sound a lot, but £80,000, plus another £70,000, plus another £80,000, plus ... It starts mounting up. I think it is time we actually look after the pennies and the pounds will look after themselves: a very old saying. We should look after the pence and the pounds will look after themselves, but that is always a good thing. And live within your own budget.

2025

But £80,000 has to be found from somewhere, because it is essential to have this Biodiversity Strategy up and running, organised and progressed. We saw what happened to the Disability Strategy when it was not pushed forward and progressed forward actively and it did have the funding for many of the areas of work, but it needs someone to lead and push and push. You do require someone.

2030

I feel £80,000 is an amount that, if they work with Commerce & Employment because it is to do with tourism as well, it should be able to be found, if necessary, jointly from their budgets. Remembering: I think it was an FTP saving, to reduce the monies going to the farmers for looking after their farms and keeping the countryside in good state. Now as you are saying the price of your milk is going to go up by roughly speaking 6p to replace that money that the Department took from the farmers.

2035

Everything goes round in circles so at some point we have to try and stand back and say 'Hold on! What is the responsibility of T&R?' T&R's responsibility is to try and get a balanced budget. If we do not ask the question every time an amount comes up, then we are not doing our job

2040

properly. You can criticise us, you can slate us, but that is a job and mandate that has been given to Treasury & Resources Department. So it is very easy for you to sit back and criticise, but we carry the can if we do not try and achieve a balanced budget.

2045 Thus Members of the Assembly, I hope you will be considerate enough to accept this amendment.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy De Lisle and Deputy Brouard.

2050

**Deputy De Lisle:** Thank you, sir.

I will not be supporting this amendment, because I want to see the Biodiversity Strategy progressed. (**A Member:** Microphone on!)

2055 Sir, I said that I will not be supporting this amendment because I want to see the Biodiversity Strategy progressed and funded now. (**Two Members:** Hear, hear.) And it has been a long time coming, sir, because a start on the Biodiversity Strategy was made during my tenure as Minister – and that was a few years ago – as one of my priorities in becoming Minister of Environment in 2007: to liaise with the UK in order to extend the UK's signatory to the Biodiversity Convention to Guernsey.

2060 Sir, I feel that it is very unfortunate that the Environment Department has not integrated this area of work within its budget priorities. That is shame, because it has had eight years to do it, which would be about £10,000 a year, wouldn't it?

**A Member:** Eight years of £10,000.

2065

**Deputy Burford:** Sorry, sir. Point of correction.

**Deputy De Lisle:** So that ... Oh, I see.

2070

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

**Deputy Burford:** It would not be £10,000 a year, sir. It is £80,000 each year that is required as I am sure most people understand. (*Laughter and interjections*)

2075

**Deputy De Lisle:** Yes, it is indeed a more substantial sum but well worth it, sir, because biodiversity is central to the primary industry sector of agriculture, renewable resources, fisheries and the tourist, retail, hospitality sector. They are all very dependent on effective management of biodiversity in these islands.

2080 I call on people to think again. It is an important area that we should be supporting. It is late in coming to the extent that it is in front of Members now. We should be fully supportive of moving it forward and progressing right now and not leaving it to sometime later.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

2085

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

I rise at my usual time, just from the graveyard and fourth time lucky. I will try not to go down in flames again or I will try and find a different slot.

2090 I just want to pick up on a couple of points. The gentleman from T&R – you can use those words together (*Laughter*) – Deputy Hunter Adam. He was mentioning about the money that we used to give to the farmers to help them with the biodiversity strategy round the edges of fields, etc. and things like that. Well that money of course was handed back to Treasury and is available in the coffers for use. It went back to the General Revenue so we did not keep it. It is there.

I think Deputy Queripel was absolutely right about having a vested interest in the environment. I think it is more than that. I think it is an essential interest we have in the environment. We are a  
2095 on a ship as such and its integrity is fundamental to us, if not the rest of the planet.

But the issue that needs to be addressed is the funding. It seems to be a bit of a trophy match between T&R and the Environment because for the amount of money: £80,000 when just the other week we were passing a thing about the capitalisation of Aurigny and Cabernet. I cannot even remember the figure. Was it £19.2 million? We passed some pretty big figures across for ...  
2100 In fact I think Deputy Dorey made the point during the ... Some of the money we are putting across is for future losses that they have not yet made. And here we are on £80,000 on the Environment Strategy. It just seems all a little bit of a staged issue. I think we just put this in proportion: £80,000 for the environment and the multiplier effect of having someone looking at it and taking forward some of the strands with all the third sector is absolutely vital.

2105 I am going to dismiss the T&R's Proposition. If they cannot find £80,000 I do not know who else can.

To be honest, I know Deputy Adam was mentioning about 'It is their job to give a balanced budget.' Yes, but it is also their job to find the money that we as States' Members direct them to find. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) (**A Member:** Oh right!) And our Island and what it looks like is very  
2110 important to tourists and us and everybody who uses it and one of the reasons why Guernsey is such a nice place.

Please support the Strategy and dismiss the amendment.

Thank you, sir.

2115 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Hadley and then Deputies Duquemin and Ogier.

**Deputy Hadley:** Mr Bailiff, some years ago – 30 years ago about – I was a member of UK government quango tasked with developing health promotion. So it was music to my ears to hear  
2120 Deputy Paint say that appointing a Health Promotion Officer has led to the creation of a whole department, because you see the health Promotion Department at the Princess Elizabeth Hospital does a marvellous job in promoting strategies to improve the health of Islanders and reduce expenditure in the future. So if the allocation of £80,000 to the Environment Department to promote a Biodiversity Strategy leads to the creation of a whole new department, then all I can say is, 'Bring it on!' A Biodiversity Strategy is exactly what we need to keep us abreast of  
2125 international standards and concerns about environment in general.

Deputy Parkinson spoke of the use of post-dated cheques to fund initiatives. Well I think that we do need to issue one for this project. It will be for the next Assembly to develop a sensible tax strategy to increase the necessary spending of the States which the current T&R Department, I am afraid, in my view, has not done. I do not necessarily agree that GST is inevitable. What is  
2130 inevitable is that the Treasury Department does need to increase the revenue of the States and if GST is the only option then so be it perhaps.

Deputy Parkinson also said that he did not know how to define 'trivial'. Well I will perhaps help him a little because this Strategy will cost just over 1p a week per person. Now 1p a week, per person to fund something as important to the Island as a proper Biodiversity Strategy does seem  
2135 to me a trivial amount to spend on an essential service.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Duquemin.

2140 **Deputy Duquemin:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I do not know how many people have already spoken in this debate, maybe a dozen. I am surprised that the issue that I am wrestling with has not been mentioned by any speaker to date. That is that I fully endorse what Deputy Adam said before about T&R's brief. We have a policy of real terms freeze on General Revenue expenditure and T&R are right and proper to do all they can



2145 to ensure that wherever possible that promise is kept to. My query – and I hope the T&R Minister  
will be able to explain it when he sums up on the amendment – is that a very similar problem – I  
think both Deputy Luxon and Deputy Parkinson alluded to the issue when they spoke – we have a  
budget shortfall on the Biodiversity Strategy for the Environment Department, but later during  
2150 this meeting we will also talk about something very similar and a very similar quantum for the  
Home Department on the Domestic Abuse Strategy. Clearly the T&R Department through the  
Minister and Deputy Minister are attempting to amend the Propositions and find a solution, but  
the solutions are very different.

We have one which is the amendment we are discussing now which is for the Environment  
Department to find it purely out of their own current cash limit. Whereas the solution that is  
2155 offered when and if it is laid on the Home Department Domestic Abuse Strategy is that that  
funding will be created: £73,000 through a pro-rata reduction on other department's budget.

When I first saw the second amendment, if I am allowed to talk about that, I thought it was a  
relatively ingenious solution to a problem that we will often wrestle with in this Assembly, in that  
departments will often try and do all that they can to find savings in other areas. I think the  
2160 Government, the States is relatively poor at turning services off and prioritising, and it would be  
very easy to come to this Assembly and seek additional finance. But if, in seeking additional  
finance, almost the default position was an amendment of this sort, which actually said that we  
are going to stay within our spending limits, but we will have to find it from other departments,  
then people around the boardroom tables of departments would think very carefully before they  
2165 wanted to take money from other departments. But as a fall back I thought it was relatively  
ingenious.

So the question that I ask the T&R Minister when he is summing up on the amendment is to  
explain the nuances that obviously do exist between the two problems, which for me, obviously  
seem relatively similar and yet the solutions are obviously very different. Having said that, I will  
2170 listen to the rest of the debate. I am presently minded to support the amendment, because I think  
it is important to stay true to your principles.

But what I would like to say is this: that I think a vote for the amendment is not a vote against  
the environment. I think it is important and that is why I will be very intrigued and look forward to  
the summing up that Deputy St Pier will give and also look forward to Deputy Burford summing  
2175 up as well. In the sense that there obviously is a budget, it is not an insubstantial budget. If it is  
genuinely a priority then the money can be found. I know it may sound like a hollow gesture, but I  
honestly believe that a vote for the amendment is certainly not a vote against the environment.

Thank you, sir.

2180 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier.

**Deputy Ogier:** Thank you, sir.

This report made for some sobering and saddening reading. Not for rainforests at the other  
side of the world, nor for the Australian coral reef die-offs, nor for depleted fish stocks in the  
2185 North Sea or off Canada, but for our own environment here on the Island.

A number of habitats which underpin our diversity have been lost, are in the process of  
shrinking or have been degraded. Threats to biodiversity are increasing in number and intensity  
such as the changes to the way land is managed, levels of disturbance from human activity and  
changes in the climate. It is fair to say that I was shocked by this report.

2190 Guernsey has lost 80 species of animal and plant in the last 100 years, mainly as a result of  
habitat destruction. The true figure is likely to be higher. To answer Deputy Paint, breeding pairs  
on the Island have reduced, partially due to habitat and partially because the overall numbers are  
reduced, which may be in turn be due to poor environmental management elsewhere, which is  
why we should ensure that it does not happen here. It may be that proper biodiversity strategies  
2195 are not in place elsewhere, which has led to fewer breeding pairs on Guernsey, something we  
should take steps not to replicate. Puffins' breeding success is absolutely dependent on the

numbers of sand eels in the Bailiwick waters, for example, and they migrate south from here. Our local strategies are essential to their continued well-being, yet their numbers are falling, falling noticeably and falling significantly. So what we are doing here is not currently working.

2200 We can read in the mail just sent to all Deputies that sea birds are monitored annually in the Bailiwick and breeding success has been measured by La Société. Cuckoo decline in the south of England has been linked to decline in large moth caterpillars, which is the mainstay of their diet. This is the result of pesticide use and intensification of farmland. Some very large declines in the production of chicks of the species has been recently seen, and this is the result of things  
2205 happening in the Island's environment, not thousands of miles away.

We cannot continue to starve these kinds of initiatives of funding and hope that things are going to be okay, because they are not okay. It is imperative we understand why *now* and take action *now*.

2210 We should have taken action before we saw certain species disappear from our shores and others half in number, but today we can start to put that right. There are many things we can do to support biodiversity locally, for example, the control of rat populations which predate on eggs and chicks.

2215 Among birds alone, 15 species no longer breed on the Island or are locally extinct. As Deputy Burford lists, 14 other species of bird are seeing dramatic declines in their populations. The following breeding populations have decreased by at least 50% in the last 25 years, which is the House Sparrow, the Herring Gull, Starling, Puffin, the European Shag, the Swallow and the Song Thrush. A 50% reduction in 25 years; that is since 1990! I find that pretty shocking.

2220 I am convinced that we would be remiss in our duties if we fail to understand what is happening and fail to take steps to address it. We often have proposals before us in this Assembly asking for land to be set aside for housing; for marshes to be drained for new schools; for former  
2225 vineries to be set aside for light industrial use, and here we are today with the opposite side of that coin. What is being asked for is a very small sum of money to help make sure that our development on this Island, amongst other things, does not have a disproportionately negative effect on this Island.

2230 If you need to monetarise your environmental contribution, a healthy and sustainable ecosystem is essential to support a viable fishing industry – worth around £4 million annually – and provides the foundation for agriculture and supplies of clean, raw water. It entices visitors, receives resounding support and mention – particular mention by our cruise passengers. A clean and healthy environment means good sources of income and revenue from our natural resources.  
2235 It more than pays for itself, if you keep it fit and healthy and productive.

Like Deputy Queripel, I have supported many fiscal initiatives brought before this Assembly and have been very conservative in order to make the difficult decisions which were required. I think T&R have performed their work well by bringing this amendment, but sometimes you have to say something just needs to be funded, particularly something which has been consistently  
2240 under-funded and which is having such an obvious and lasting injurious effect.

Our habitat on this Island is disappearing. We can see it, we can measure it and we are not fulfilling our commitment to the environment as laid down in our own plans, as Deputy Soulsby outlined.

2245 If this Assembly is quite content to vote for Belgrave to be a housing target area; for La Ramée to be designated a site for a possible golf course; for other large areas of St Sampson to be housing target areas; for the Saltpans to be light industrial; to set annual housing targets; redevelop Admiral Park; develop social housing areas further; develop rural centres and a myriad of other developments which come before us, but will not spend £80,000, understanding what is happening on this Island in the way of biodiversity and to take steps to mitigate it, we would be unbalanced. We would be unheedful of the impacts of our actions. In the face of this onslaught of development, which this Assembly and previous Assemblies have brought and are bringing forward, we may as well tell this Island that we are not particularly heedful of the impact we are having, if we do not support measures to mitigate the impact on our environment.

2250 We all know how underfunded the environmental side of policy development has been over this term. Some Members are content to support the environment it seems, as long as we do not have to spend too much money on it. I do not believe that is where the majority are. I believe we do care deeply about the affect we are having on this Island and I believe we want our actions to be balanced between meeting our desires for fiscal and social initiatives and the environmental impact of those initiatives and I am happy to support this Biodiversity Strategy unamended.

2255

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Paint, you have a point of order?

**Deputy Paint:** Yes, I do, sir.

2260 Deputy Ogier was saying that Puffins go south from here. They do not. They go north. This is the maximum of their range, south, so I would just like to bring that to his order.

And what has not been mentioned are the birds that have come in recent years like Egrets and wild geese.

Thank you, sir.

2265

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Perrot and then Deputy Lester Queripel.

**Deputy Perrot:** It is Christmas and I am possessed of my usual sunny disposition and therefore I am not going to be unkind to my colleague, Deputy Brouard, but there are times when he comes up with some weapons grade nonsense. *(Laughter)*

2270

He says that T&R has engaged in a 'trophy' match with the Environment Department. He has still got the cheek to keep shaking his head. It is such an absurd idea. Of course we are not doing that. The point is, you, the States, through you sir of course, set up a body called Treasury & Resources and then also invented the rules under which Treasury & Resources has to comport itself. Then because some Members of the Assembly want a particular thing they would like us not to abide by those rules and the point is, if we have rules which are imposed upon us, we have got to stick by those rules.

2275

So, of course is not a trophy match. We are not trying to be deliberately awkward with the Environment Department. What we *are* trying to do is to support the policy, but find some way of funding it. So it is not the case, as Deputy Fallaize said, that we go through some sort of theatrical process of supporting a policy and then strangle it at birth. Again, that is utterly absurd. We are not doing that at all. What we are doing is trying to do what the Members of the Assembly have tried to make us do, which is to act as a treasury department and abide by the rules which apply to that treasury department.

2280

Anyway, going back to the budget debate in October, Deputy Trott gloated, in that sort of way of his when he gloats, and he gloated about the fact that HSSD was getting an extra £8.2 million. What he was saying then was, 'You will rue the day', and he was absolutely dead right. I had difficulty in supporting that £8.2 million – actually I think it was £1.05 million. It was split up between a fixed sum and something coming out of Budget Reserve. I cannot remember what the exact figures were, but it was not exactly £8.2 million. It added up to £8.2 million. But the trouble is, of course, having broken the rules once, now everybody wants to break the rules again. That is if that is consonant with pushing through a policy which they wish to see put through. I happened to support that £8.2 million, somewhat reluctantly, because I thought that that was the opening up of a pathway to bringing HSSD into the black again, in accordance with the findings of the BDO report, which was bought in at a simultaneously time to produce savings of £24 million a year.

2290

2295

But the trouble with that is, of course, the big but, is that the thought is there in the minds of some of us now that we can break the rules. Some Members of the Assembly are saying, 'We can break the rules because it is a relatively small amount', and as Deputy Luxon himself was, 'I just want to be sort of fiscally incorrect because it is not too much on this occasion. In fact, in respect of the State's budget of £382,000 this is only 0.02%'. **(Several Members:** Million) Sorry,

2300

£382 million. I am grateful for that correction, of course it was not obvious from what I was saying that I meant £382 million, but 'It is a drop in the bucket' – it is *not*. The fact is the money is not there and whether it is £8, £800, £8,000, £800,000, or whatever it might be, it is actually breaking the rules and we have got to stick with those rules.

2305 I know it is difficult for us because there has been a sustained campaign. We have all received the emails. They are all saying very much the same thing, in favour of this Biodiversity Strategy. The point is I think *everybody* is in favour of this Strategy. The trick is to find the money to pay for it, and that is what Treasury & Resources have been trying to do. And the fact is that departments are going to have to prioritise. It is no good if a department wants something else in the future, it is going to have to dump something else until we find that we are in that great position again when money is not in short supply.

2310 Deputy Parkinson has three filters which he applies to himself. One is something trivial: have the State's already committed to it? And if we do not adopt this, will we do serious harm? A very good filtering system. When he answered his own question in relation to have the State's already committed to this? He actually said, no. Well, the States of course, actually, I have got to disagree with him about that, they have committed to it in the sense that it is in the States' Strategic – oh, that word again! – that plan, but the trouble is the States' Strategic Plan is a rather like the Bible or some parts of the Bible. It is written in such fluffy terms, some of it, that you can divine anything you want from that overall plan. So, if you are a departmental Minister, you can point to the Plan and say, 'Yes! That is what we have signed up to when we approved the States Strategic Plan.' I say, no, the States' Strategic Plan is written in such vague, fluffy, meaningless terms that actually you can say anything you like and say that it is Genesis within the States' Strategic Plan.

Hunter Adam, I think, from what I understood, that I agree (*Laughter*) with all that he said.

2325 As far as Deputy De Lisle was concerned, Deputy De Lisle is one of those who of course says he wants this Biodiversity Strategy and he wants it *now!* Great. Let's have it now, but let's find the funding now in a way which is consonant with the rules which the States have laid down. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

2330 Oh, and one thing which I really did not understand from my friend, Deputy Al Brouard, which was he says that Treasury & Resources have to find the money for something when we direct them to do so. No we do not. What we do have to do is, when a policy is approved by the States, we have got to find a way of finding the money if we possibly can from the money at our disposal within the rules which apply to us. So, I do not go along with all of those who say, 'Yes, this is just a teensy weensy bit ...' (*Interjection*) No, I do not give way, (*Laughter*) unless this is a point of correction or point of order, sir. No, I thought it was not. (*Laughter*) Sir, I do not go along with those who say we can drop our principles just occasionally when we really want something which other people are trying to stop us having. I think that we have got no alternative within the rules to go along with this amendment.

2340 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel, I was going to call next and then the Chief Minister and Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Thank you, sir.

I suspect this amendment will succeed, but I want to go on record as saying that I cannot support it.

2345 Although I fully understand why Deputy St Pier and Deputy Kuttelwascher laid it, they are doing their job – which is what Deputy Perrot has just told us – that we elected them to control the spending and take care of the taxpayers' money. In general, sir, I think that Deputy St Pier and his board are doing an excellent job under very difficult circumstances.

2350 What they are saying to the Environment Department is we have already given you the money for your budget, it is up to you to prioritise it. We are not giving you any additional funding from the taxpayers' purse. But it is this whole issue of prioritising that concerns me greatly, because it seems to me, unless a department do get the money for the Strategy from another different

source, then they will have to cut some service or other. And where do we think they are going to make those cuts?

2355 I am one of the Deputies who took funding from the Environment Department during the whole Transport Strategy debate, but I did not agree to putting even more pressure on the Department by asking them to cut even more services in the future. That was not a deal I signed up to.

2360 Just how important is biodiversity? I think it is summed up in bullet point three at the top of page 2988. Biodiversity:

'Is essential for own survival.'

– because:

'Living things interact in a myriad of complex and inter-related ways to provide a range of conditions that favour life;'

2365

In response to what my good friend, Deputy Paint, said this morning about Cuckoos – it is a shame he is not in the Chamber, he must have known I was going to say something.

**A Member:** He has flown the nest!

2370

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** He has flown the nest, indeed.

In an attempt to remind us how important it is for us to support our natural habitat an Islander recently emailed my colleagues and I, sir, the George Meredith poem entitled *The Lark Ascending*, and I would like to just recite six lines of that poem, sir, because these six lines relay an extremely profound message:

2375

'For singing till his heaven fills,  
'T is love of earth that he instils,  
And ever winging up and up,  
Our valley is his golden cup,  
And he the wine which overflows  
To lift us with him as he goes'

Sir, that relays to us the gift of the song that the Lark brings to our ears, or should I say used to bring to our ears, because the Lark is now almost extinct, and there are many more birds that are all but extinct. There is a whole list of them on page 2991.

2380 Many of the birds that face extinction, like the Lark, have a sweet melodious song that lifts us up whenever we hear it. (*Laughter*) It obviously makes some people laugh as well, sir, but bird song makes us feel good. It is not the bird's fault, sir, that man chops down whole forests and woodlands and destroys their natural habitat.

2385 I remember talking to a fellow Islander a couple of weeks ago now about the Strategy and he said he was absolutely fascinated by bats and he was worried that numerous types of bat were on the verge of extinction. In the next breath he told me he absolutely loathed spiders, flies and mosquitoes. I was tempted to ask him, sir, what type of world did he want to live in, but I refrained from that because he would have said a world without spiders, flies and mosquitoes. But when I explained to him that mosquitoes and flies were a vital source of food for bats and that they can eat hundreds a day, he changed his mind. He had not realised the importance of the food chain.

2390 Sir, I have been critical of the Environment Department in the past on occasion, but I am with them all the way on this one. The money must not come out of their own budget, unless of course their budget is increased, because if it does come out of their budget, services will have to be cut, which would be detrimental to our community. It would be tragic, bearing in mind that this Strategy will benefit the whole community.

2395 My great fear is if the money does not come from the Budget Reserve, we may not be able to have a Biodiversity Strategy at all, because we cannot have a partial Biodiversity Strategy. These

proposals really do present us with an opportunity to sow a seed, stand back and watch it grow. They provide us with an opportunity to contribute to the cycle of support that nature needs and by nurturing nature now we ensure we are able to pass on a healthy, natural habitat to our children, who in turn can then pass it on to their children to nurture. What better legacy can we pass on to future generations for everyone to enjoy than that?

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** The Chief Minister.

**The Chief Minister:** Thank you, sir.

It is always interesting to follow Deputy Lester Queripel. I do love poetry and, whilst he was mentioning *The Lark Ascending*, I was mindful of the Vaughan Williams' piece of the same name. Had there been a piano and violinist in the Assembly, (*Laughter*) I would have gladly performed it. (*Laughter*) But we will leave that for another occasion. (**A Member:** More!)

Trying to get back to the amendment, sir, sometimes when Members of Policy Council speak in this Assembly, I wonder whether I attend the same Policy Council as they do. (*Laughter and Interjections*) I do know that I am sometimes absent, so I looked back at the minutes when the Biodiversity Strategy was considered, to see if I was present because unfortunately, unlike others, if I am not present I have not got someone to deputise for me so I cannot even give my opinion in that.

**A Member:** Excuse me? (*Laughter*)

**Deputy Luxon:** Point of Correction, the Deputy Chief Minister deputises for the Chief Minister. (*Laughter*)

**The Chief Minister:** That is true, but he does not get two votes or two opinions, as far as know. (*Laughter*) Yes. But anyway, I was there on this particular occasion. I think only Deputy O'Hara and Deputy Jones were not present. I note that, particularly at the time – and this is I think very much the nub of the issue before us – that the comments made by the Treasury & Resources Minister were along the lines of the fact that the funding that was at that time being proposed, there was an issue over that because the Budget was being finalised at that time, and as a result of that it was not certain how it could be funded from the 2016 Budget proposals. So it was totally a matter of timing.

What I am hearing from my Policy Council colleagues and from the majority of us I think here is that this is a matter of timing in the main. The question is should we spend money now that we do not have and therefore have to go to the Budget Reserve to get that money – because that is what it is for; that is what the Budget Reserve is for – when the Budget Reserve is already looking like it is going to be very stretched indeed? Or do we say that, 'Rules do not matter and we will ...' Sorry, do we say, 'We have to find that money in some other way and that some other way, certainly for next year, should be by looking at existing resources and looking for reallocation?' Now that is difficult, because of the issues that were mentioned, particularly by Deputy Perrot.

Members will see, on page 40 of the policy letter, there is a diagram of the States' Strategic Plan and, as Deputy Perrot mentioned, there are three equal – or at least it seems like they are equal – high-level policy plans: the Fiscal and Economic, the Social Policy Plan and the Environmental Policy Plan. As Deputy Perrot, whose Bible studies I will look forward to coming to... Because, he is partly right. It is all down to interpretation, but I do not think that the States' Strategic Plan was meant to be taken by itself. There is meant to be a mechanism alongside that, the Government Service Plan, that helps us to prioritise amongst the various policy actions that are outworked from that plan, particularly within a States' term. If we had that type of agenda of Government actions it would be easier to make this decision, but we are not in that position. Personally, I do not think those three plans are equal. I think there will be, at different times, a

2450 focus on different ones and it will be down to this Assembly, as new Assemblies are formed, to make their decisions, according to the needs of the hour and the day, as to what should be the main priority.

2455 Should social policy, which I have felt very strongly about in this term because it seemed to me that very little had been done in the past term and we have not achieved as much as I would have liked this term... But to focus on that particularly, and I have argued strongly for that and will continue to do so. Maybe sometimes that needs to be the focus and therefore the others need to serve that to some degree, and other times maybe it will be fiscal and economic policy. It is true to say, probably – I am sure environmentalists amongst us would say this – that the Environmental Policy Plan has always been the Cinderella of the three. I am not suggesting that should always be the case, but the point is the States needs to decide based on proposals that are brought against that high-level Strategic Plan and those three high-level plans that speak into it. The States needs to have a mechanism where we decide what the service priorities and actions will be in any given term, and we have not got that sort of matrix to look at. So I do believe that – bearing in the mind the sort of moneys we are talking about here and bearing in mind that we are going through, in 2460 2016, a change in the structures of our Government – there could be potential to find these moneys from some of the rearranged structures in the short to medium-term.

2465 Sir, some of the comments that have been made today made me concerned. They gave me concern, because when we came to the end of the FTP a number of us made, I thought, very clear noises that transformation and particular focus on changing the way in which we deliver services, so they become better value for money needed to continue beyond the FTP. Now, that is 2470 happening to some degree with regard to the transformation in the public service that is being led by the Chief Executive. There may well be next year some savings that can be made that could be carried forward in that, which can cover some of these sorts of things, and particularly possibly in the Committee *for the* Environment & Infrastructure when it is formed. That, amongst the coming together of the various parts of that new Committee in the office that is formed by it, they could find the staffing resources needed to take this forward. Obviously there are going to be further costs down the line, but again, in terms of looking at alternatives to service delivery – and I know this is being considered by other Governments similar to ours. Actually, the Isle of Man at the moment. There needs to be greater working with the third sector, many of whom have lobbied us on the Biodiversity Strategy. I do believe it is possible for us to see different ways of 2475 commissioning some of the outworkings that would not cost us as much as it would otherwise, if we were thinking of achieving all those things through employing people in the States.

I believe, sir, that the choice before us today is to have an expectation therefore that next year, through some of the reforms that happen, moneys could be found through the Committee *for the* Environment & Infrastructure as it comes into being, to fund some of this Strategy. At the same time, the other side of the coin is that if we do not feel that is within the realms of possibility, then 2485 the other option is to break the rules, as Deputy Perrot was suggesting. I am never one to suggest breaking the rules, but I cannot at the moment give myself to do that, bearing in mind the comments that have been made by Treasury & Resources.

When we considered this at Policy Council, we did not have the comments of Treasury & Resources before us at the time, but I have deep concern that if we start doing this here, bearing in mind that some of us seem to have forgotten that we still need to apply the culture that was embedded, I had hoped through the FTP, that we cannot continue to do this sort of thing and say it is just a one-off. If there are too many of these, in the end what will happen is we will lose the ability to control our finances. And it is all very well people standing up and saying, 'Well, it is T&R doing their job and we expect them to do that, but we are going to basically ignore them.' To my 2495 mind, that does not bode well at all for the Policy & Resources Committee in the next Assembly. The last thing I want to see is that sort of them-and-us attitude. We need to work together and own the problem that we see.

It is a timing issue, I believe, because most of us here want to see this Strategy put in place. 2500 The question is, really, can we do it now? And, if so, how are we going to do it?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, may I, through you, compliment the Chief Minister on a very balanced speech.

2505 Those of us who have served on the Treasury & Resources Department will know that we are entering the 'frightening phase': the phase between now and the Election, where the cheque books come out and often the sense of perspective that has occasionally been obvious within the Assembly is lost.

2510 I am going to lay down the gauntlet now, sir, to our friends in the media, to our local newspaper and radio station – who report the most comprehensively on the activities in this Assembly – to run a table of expenditure between now and the Election. Of course, they can start with the £192,000 and the £187,000 that we spent this morning and add to that the £80,000 we are likely to spend this afternoon. I will give them help with the maths, sir – that is £459,000; and let's see how we go over the next few days.

2515 The Environment Department clearly consider all their other services as a higher priority than this, because if they did not they would be funding this ahead of all other initiatives. I accept their budget is tight, but that is the logical conclusion that anyone who has had to undergo a prioritisation process would come to.

2520 I am all in favour of biodiversity. We are just a few weeks away from a time when the Greffier and I will be up to our chest in water, hunting out the elusive ormer, and I am just a few weeks away from going on a shoot, where my aim will ensure that I miss most, but in any event the cost of that shoot will enable many, many more birds to be released than could ever be taken. We all do our bit for biodiversity. *(Laughter)*

2525 **Deputy Brehaut:** He is not shooting ormers, sir! It would concern me if he was! *(Laughter)*

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, Deputy Brehaut should know that that is illegal, sir!

I did receive a short poem from a Mrs Le Page, *(Interjections)* who is listening to this debate, and I think she captures the sentiments perfectly, sir. She writes:

'We need to fund this Biodiversity,  
If we don't, it will be a pity,  
But if it isn't top of the Department's priority list,  
Is it really such an opportunity missed?'

2530 That is good old Guernsey logic, sir.

I will give you another bit of good old Guernsey logic: it seems to me that we possibly have a solution here, and it is in number plates. We are all aware, aren't we, of the incredible success that the Environment Department had at auctioning the number 007. In fact, my understanding is that the sum that they received for that was so enormous that it exceeded the average advocate's annual salary. *(Laughter)* I do not know whether that is true or not, **(A Member: It's not!)** *(Laughter and interjection)* but it certainly gives us... *(Interjection)* There are a couple of number plates that we have yet to auction off. Some of them I suspect would attract a premium even to that achieved for 007 – number 1, for instance. *(Interjection and laughter)* We are all in this together, sir! *(Laughter)* It does seem to me that that is one solution, and as you know, I am a problem solver and offer that one for consideration.

2540

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gillson. Deputy Harwood is waiting as well.

**Deputy Gillson:** Thank you, sir.

2545 Clearly this is a good report. It makes a good case for the Strategy, for the need for the Strategy, and there is support both in this Assembly and outside the Assembly for the Strategy. I think the case for the Strategy and the case for the cost of the Strategy is well made.



2550 But again we have a problem with funding it. The report is asking for new money for a new service, asking for a budget increase in the 2016 Budget; a budget increase for 2016, only a few weeks after we agreed the 2016 Budget.

2555 Deputy Luxon mentioned that this amount could not have been included in the Budget because of timing. I question that statement because I think I am right that the report had to be submitted to Policy Council before the date the Budget was finalised, so it could have been factored in. We seem to sometimes do things in a roundabout way: we agree a Budget for a year, then before the year starts we start tinkering with it. To me, once we agree the Budget, that should be it and it changes only for matters of exception or urgent important matters, not things which are known and Environment have been working on for months and months before the Budget was set. This should have been included in the Budget.

2560 I will not repeat a lot of the speech I made about pre-school, but the same points are relevant here. I will just summarise: 2016, Budget deficit, 2017, Budget deficit, 2018, Budget deficit. We must show financial restraint. We do not have the spare money to fund this. The Budget Reserve is small and we have not even started yet and we are taking away from the Budget Reserve. Goodness knows what is going to happen if we need anything during the year, but that is what it should be kept for: in-year emergencies.

2565 Most Members, in debates here and elsewhere, have expressed the opinion that we should not borrow for general revenue. Okay, we have borrowed for capital – that is one thing; I agree with that – but we should not borrow for general revenue and we should not borrow for day-to-day expenses. Well, the shocking truth is that running a budget deficit is like running an overdraft: it is borrowing on general revenue; it is borrowing for day-to-day expenses. The bottom line is our expenditure is greater than our income.

2570 A number of Members have expressed, quite rightly, the opinion that this is an important Strategy, and I accept that. The amendment says I accept its importance, but as Deputy Trott alluded, it cannot be more important than everything else the Department has.

2575 Members have suggested that this would be good value for money. It probably would be. I am sure it would be good value for money, but that is not the point. The point is we do not have the money. We are running an overdraft. The Strategy is good but Environment need to prioritise it within the budget that was agreed only five or six weeks ago.

2580 I will say it again: we need to make difficult decisions. We talk about it, but at some point we are going to have to actually make a difficult decision and not just talk about it. We can only show fiscal restraint by voting for it. Standing up and saying, 'I agree with fiscal restraint but I am going to spend money,' is not showing fiscal restraint.

2585 So I will support this amendment because it does demonstrate fiscal restraint. I think Environment, like the Home Department has to do, will have to make difficult decisions and will have to prioritise within the Budget that was agreed a matter of weeks ago.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Harwood.

**Deputy Harwood:** Thank you, sir.

2590 I resonate with Deputies Luxon and Domaille in the problems that we faced in 2012 when shortly after the Election we tried to set up the working group for the Environmental Strategy, which, as other Members have already pointed out, is an equal part of a three-pillar policy behind the States' Strategic Plan. It was very quickly clear to us that we had no funding for the Environmental Strategy, notwithstanding the importance of that pillar. It was also quite clear that  
2595 one of the problems we faced was that it was something that was outside the particular normal budgetary restraint of the Environment Department. It was one of those slightly odd situations where, in retrospect, half of the States' Strategic Plan should not have been headed 'Environmental', because everybody assumed that automatically meant it fell into the Environment Department.

2600 So the States have regularly endorsed and paid lip service to the importance of environmental  
policy under the States' Strategic Plan, but there has never been any financial commitment given  
by States' Members, certainly within this term, to support those platitudes, and as Deputy Green  
and Deputy Soulsby have already identified, that is the case. The time now is actually... People  
2605 need to put their money where their mouth is, because if they believe in the Environmental  
Strategy they need to support this biodiversity, which is part of that Strategy.

Sir, the Chief Minister has talked about timing. Other Members of this Assembly have said,  
'Well, why wasn't it prioritised in the 2016 Budget?' The simple fact is that, of course, until today  
we do not know whether this Strategy meets the approval of the States, so it would have been  
very difficult for the Department to have put it into the 2016 Budget or to have tackled  
2610 prioritisation in advance of that debate.

Certainly from my recollection of the 2016 Environment Department budget I do not believe  
there is any slack. Deputy Trott – sadly, he has left now – obviously in his usual knockabout  
manner has suggested that of course we could have a few more auctions of number plates, but I  
think, from memory, and I am sure the Minister will correct me if I am wrong, some of the benefit  
2615 of the recent auction will actually go back to Treasury & Resources, oddly enough, and will not be  
retained within the Department. (**Several Members:** Ah!) So the situation is, of course, that even  
had we known that we would have had the support of this Strategy, almost certainly we would not  
have been able to find any surplus within the 2016 Budget.

Of course, the Treasury & Resources Minister has reminded us that in 2016 things will be  
2620 different because we will no longer just be the Department of Environment, but we will be the  
Committee *for the* Environment & Infrastructure. I think he intimated that, presumably by adding  
together PSD and Environment, then there should a budget of... I think he said about £18 million. I  
do not believe anybody, on the Environment board certainly, has sat down and gone through the  
element of that budget that is coming from PSD to know whether or not there is any surplus that  
2625 would be available to be prioritised for this particular service. The Treasury & Resources Minister,  
in his summing up, I think needs to address one further thought and interestingly I see that the  
Minister for Commerce & Employment was totally opposed any funding for this coming from  
general reserve. I assume he also would resist any suggestion that we should raid the tourism  
budget for this, (*Interjection*) notwithstanding the significant contribution biodiversity clearly  
2630 makes to tourism. But perhaps the Treasury & Resources Minister could remind us, because last  
month – gosh, it was a long time ago – we debated the States' Review Committee Organisation of  
States' Affairs Third Policy Letter, and the Treasury & Resources Minister will no doubt recall that  
on page 3219, in the description of the mandate and functions of the Committee *for the*  
Environment & Infrastructure operational functions:

'The Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure shall deliver or oversee the delivery of those operational  
functions which immediately before the 1st of May, 2016 were delivered by:

(a) the Environment Department;

(b) the Public Services Department;

(c) the Commerce and Employment Department, in relation to the following operational functions only:

Agriculture, the rural environment, biodiversity and countryside management advisory services'

2635 Perhaps the Treasury & Resources Minister would advise what surplus he believes may be in the  
Commerce & Employment Department budget is coming across to the Department of Commerce  
from the Committee *for the* Environment and Infrastructure. And, Deputy Stewart, yes, we would  
like to have some of your budget for that purpose.

I will give way.

2640

**Deputy Stewart:** Thank you for giving way.

Through the Dairy Review that we brought to this Assembly... You all voted in favour of that  
Review, and because of that, so far £600,000 has been returned to general revenue – not ring-  
fenced by Commerce & Employment but returned to general revenue (*Interjection*) and to  
2645 suggest... And what I will say, furthermore, around funds for that and back to the Economic

Development Fund, if there is – and it is open to every Department... If there is a case where you can prove return on investment, whether it be diversity for the economy, then that fund is available to all.

2650 **Deputy Harwood:** I am very grateful for the clarification provided by Deputy Stewart, because he has pointed out that, actually, through his ingenuity, he has been able to return to Treasury & Resources £600,000 which is now sitting in general revenue. So, presumably, part of that, being part of the biodiversity functions of Commerce & Employment, could be made available for the new Department, which indeed could address that funding. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Therefore, I  
2655 I would suggest, sir, that the amendment put forward by Treasury & Resources is inappropriate, because actually there is £600,000 sitting there which actually is the proceeds of biodiversity, and therefore that should be made available to the new Committee for the funding of the Biodiversity Strategy. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

2660 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe, and then Alderney Representative Jean and Deputy Le Clerc.

**Deputy Lowe:** Thank you, sir.

There is plenty of point-scoring, trying to see whose budget is going to be taken for the Biodiversity Strategy.

2665 I fully support the Biodiversity Strategy in the same way I supported Education this morning. It is the funding issue and I still struggle with this funding issue. I just find this States – and it probably will happen again in the next couple of months as well... We have not got the money, and we are handling the management of public funds poorly. In fact, I could put stronger words than that, but I cannot. I am trying to think of a better word to put, so I will leave it as 'poorly' for  
2670 that, because we are custodians of the public purse and we are failing to look after that public purse. We are running in deficit and it seems to me that some do not understand the word 'deficit'. We have already spent, Deputy Trott explained this morning, over £400,000 today that we have not got, and we are going to be passing this on to the next States.

I say to all of you, it is no different to running your own accounts at home. We have people  
2675 outside in our community every week... Probably just about everybody out there would like more money to be able to spend each week, or each month or each year. You have to budget. If you have not got that money, you have not got that money, and it is not any different with looking after the States' money either: if we have not got it, we have not got it. It is a very easy word to say, 'no'. It is just that some struggle with that very simple little word. There are two letters in it:  
2680 'No, you cannot have that because we have not got the money.'

I do not think it is right and proper that we just go around and endorse everything and rubberstamp something because it is something nice to have. It is certainly nice to have. I fully support a Biodiversity Strategy. However, if you have not got the funds you have got to prioritise, and it is as simple as that. It is priority that people seem to struggle with. They just want more and  
2685 more. Well, the more and more is not available. The terminology which has been said several times in this Assembly today is 'It is *only* £80,000'. Well, if it is *only* £80,000 I look forward to those Members getting out their cheque books and writing it out – because if it was coming out of their own bank accounts it suddenly would not be *only* £80,000, but £80,000 would be a huge amount of money. I think we lose the scale of things of how we are going to have to pick up these pieces.

2690 Then, this morning as well, and it was in the Members' Room afterwards, after the Education debate, where there were some grumblings because GST had been thrown into the arena and was seen as a threat as to the costs and the possibility of being able to save the States from all these overspends. Well, wake up and smell the coffee, because somebody is going to have to pay for this. The continual cry you hear from the public is, 'Cut your cloth. We are not prepared to be  
2695 paying more and more taxes.' As I say, £400,000 today and still more to come. Who is paying for it? The only way it will happen will be through more taxes: through Income Tax or through GST – the famous GST. Somebody is going to have to come up with a solution because this States

currently is not prepared to face that. All they are doing today, and will be in the next few weeks... We know what is coming down the line from the train is an awful lot of expenditure which is beyond the approved Budget that all of you approved not that long ago.

2700

I will support the amendment. I do support the Strategy, but it is up to Environment Department to find that money and prioritise, like the whole rest of the other Departments have to do. Even if the report had said that... Because I think it was Deputy Harwood who said just now, 'Oh, we need to know who will support the Strategy.' Well, yes, we do, but one of your resolutions or recommendations at the end could have been, 'If you support the Strategy, the funding will be in the Budget for 2017 or 2018,' so you would know exactly where you were going and you would know that that money would be part of your budget process in a year or 15 months' time. To me, that is proper balancing of the books and being responsible with public funds.

2705

2710 **The Bailiff:** Alderney Rep. Jean. (*Interjection and laughter*)

**Alderney Representative Jean:** Like everyone else, I want so much to support this Biodiversity Strategy.

Deputy Burford said some kind words about the Alderney situation, the Wildlife Trust and Living Islands. I was there when the Wildlife Trust set off in Alderney; I was actually in Government at the time. There was a lot of support for it and it has proved to be very good indeed. A one-off grant was given for cliff path maintenance in Alderney. These were ways that it was done, which might be helpful, because I am going to support the amendment, so I think I should explain this.

2715

Members of the public are members of the Wildlife Trust and they, of course, pay yearly subscriptions. There are souvenirs sold in the shop, round-the-Island boat trips, there is a fundraising fair at the end of the season and lots of other things that the Wildlife Trust do, and it is very successful in Alderney. It is just about to move its HQ into new quarters in a shop up by the newsagents, so it is going to have its own dedicated HQ which will open on Thursday night, tomorrow night.

2720

During each year they undertake a great deal of work. They look after the Ramsar site. They are in charge of the protection of the little island off the side of Alderney, called Burhou, and its Puffin colony. They have installed on its Puffin colony, 'Puffin cams'. There is another lovely little organisation attached to the Wildlife Trust, which is Watch, for the young children, and they go and do moth traps and a garden that they do. That is really good.

2725

What I want to come to is why I want a biodiversity strategy. I was very interested in some of the speeches. I enjoyed Deputy Trott's bang-bang with his gun for what I would call a diverse strategy. I am not sure if it was a diversity strategy, but never mind. The thing about this, where I am concerned, is that it seems to me that a clear route has been demarked to where funds are available through Deputy Stewart and the fund that he has with his committee, which has to prove a case to T&R. I think that is one clear route and I do not think it would make a great deal of difference. It would take into 2016 probably to prove that case and make that case and get the money from there. But Alderney's is a very different model and it works very differently. Living Islands, whilst a success, is not the success we thought it would be. Two of the directors did resign off the Living Islands board, which shows that there were some pretty major disagreements there. However, it was successful. It could I believe have been more successful.

2730

2735

2740

I am going to support the Treasury amendment. I think it is right. I think some of the speeches have been good. I really enjoyed them. I think we have got to be prudent and do that but my goodness I am saying, 'Prove your case.' Let's get this Diversity Strategy. Let's go the route where there is the funding that we know is available for you. It is important. Nobody is saying no, but what I am saying is I think it may be a way to take a shortcut to bring it to the States in this way, when perhaps it should have gone the way of the development fund spoken of.

2745

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Clerc then Deputy Kuttelwascher.

2750 **Deputy Le Clerc:** Thank you, sir.

I have got a declaration to make: I am a bird watcher! (*Interjections*) I am actually a bat detector as well, because my partner last year bought me for Christmas a bat detector (*Laughter and interjections*) so I actually go out and listen to bats after dark.

2755 **A Member:** You are bats!

2760 **Deputy Le Clerc:** It was interesting because I started watching birds April 2009 and that is because my partner and I we log every single bird that we see wherever we are: Guernsey, the world. Before this report came out ... We go out on a Sunday when we get a chance, when there is not a huge pile of Billets or board reports to read. We go to La Claire Mare and we go to Rue des Bergers. We always go past Richmond Corner and stop to see if there are any waders there. It was really interesting because I said, 'You know I have really noticed over the last year or two that the number of birds have really declined over on that Richmond Corner.' Then low and behold about a week later we get the report through which backs up exactly what I had established myself as an independent bird watcher.

2765 We do need to have a strategy because in Richmond Corner there is some self-regulation. It is asking people who have dogs and if you walk to not go round that area at times when the birds are out feeding. Unfortunately if you go and watch there are people that abuse that. So we do need some form of regulation. We do need some form of strategy because I have first-hand seen the birds decline in that area.

2770 I, like Deputy Soulsby, wondered why we perhaps needed this to be a civil service post. Actually I wrote to Deputy Burford and said, 'Is there any possibility that this could be a post through a third sector?' Actually if you look at 5.13 on page 3004, it does not actually specify that this post would be a civil service post. It is just saying it is a 'coordinator'. So there is a possibility that this would be funded, a coordinator, through a third sector rather than it being a civil service post. So I think if you have got concerns about another department – I know Deputy Paint has said earlier on in his speech about growing departments – well perhaps that is a way around it.

2780 One of the other things I did wonder – and I was on the phone-in a couple of weeks ago and there was a caller – if there was an opportunity for the actual third sector to raise some of the funds themselves towards this. I am a member of the National Trust of Guernsey. I am a member of La Société and RSBP and I do wonder if some of this could be funded from an increase in subscriptions towards this. I would just like to ask Deputy Burford if that has been looked at because that is another potential. Or maybe that is a way that we could seed fund it to get it off the ground but that is the way to fund this for the future.

2785 It is very difficult. I want to support the Biodiversity Strategy. I hear what everybody is saying about the increased costs but I just think this is such an important part of our life; of our infrastructure and it is enjoyment that is given to a lot of people. People do not actually contribute much money towards this. It is something that is for free when you walk round and see the wildlife, enjoy the cliffs, enjoy the orchid fields and all of that.

2790 I will not be supporting the amendment but I will be supporting the Strategy.  
Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher.

2795 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Thank you, sir.

2800 Just a few words on the Budget Reserve: I think what is being proposed in the policy letter is an inappropriate use of the Budget Reserve. I think the boat has been missed regarding 2016. This report should have been brought before the budget was discussed. At a recent T&R board meeting in one of my lighter moments I suggested we rename the Budget Reserve as 'the Trough'. Now that had certain implications but one of my colleagues who is a lot kinder said, 'No. Let's call it the "Sweetie Jar"'. I think there is a trend at the moment to think of the Budget Reserve

as being a source of funding for new service developments which are going to appear at the last minute. I think that is most unwelcome. No more about that.

2805 The second issue I had: I was so disappointed with Deputy Fallaize's input – and he is not here, but never mind – because two weeks ago he gave quite a heated speech about his dislike of strategies.

**A Member:** He is back.

2810 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** You remember it well. In fact he said words to the effect that he would 'like it expunged from any States' business at all'.

**A Member:** He wanted actions.

2815 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Yes, he wanted actions. Oh yes. And today, quite vociferously, he is supporting the Strategy. Well! We are all allowed to change our minds. We will let that one go.

2820 Then he made another mistake in what he implied about Treasury & Resources members' attitude towards biodiversity. He was saying our support for biodiversity basically was hollow. Nothing could be further from the truth and I am going to tell you a little story. (*Interjections*) Yes. It tends to get people's attention when you say that.

2825 I have been a member of the Airport Project Board now for five years. It is a flipping long time. It was 14 months as a member of PSD and now I am the T&R representative. In that budget for the airport we had a budget for biodiversity if you like. Because we were extending the runway and safety area to the west and basically destroying a bit of wetland, there were planning conditions put on us to recover land elsewhere. One thing that was not part of that which was also 'biodiversity positive' was if you remember just to the west of the airport we dug up a road, filled it in and covered it with grass. Well that in itself is a biodiverse positive result but beside that. (*Laughter*) It is! Aren't green fields better than tarmac? Why are you laughing? (*Interjection*) Never mind. This is what happens and people do not like the truth.

2830 The first amount of the money from our biodiversity budget was spent on doing a lot of work at the Colin Best Nature Reserve. I have discussed this with the project board and they are happy for me to talk about it. The only thing I cannot tell you is how big our budget is for biodiverse projects, but that was substantial. I am happy to say it was tens of thousands of pounds were spent on that. Now I suppose it was rather fortuitous but just a couple of weeks ago I received the agenda papers for our last project board meeting and there was a request for three amounts of funding for biodiversity projects from Environment. And it was for a lot more money than the £80,000 that we are talking about today. There was one for recovery of scrubland very close to Deputy Hadley's house at La Bouvee and there were a couple of fields that were asked to be recovered at Icart. There were three budgets for this and the interesting thing is I was aware of this just prior to a T&R board meeting and before we had our Airport Project Board meeting and I mentioned to the members of the board that a rather large amount of expenditure was being requested – again in the interests of biodiversity. I stated I was in support of this. We had a budget for it. It was approved a long time ago. The whole board supported it and it was supported at the Airport Project Board meeting. We are talking about now we have spent in excess of six figure sums on biodiversity projects.

2845 What interests me about this is one of the things Deputy Fallaize said, 'We do not want any more strategies. We want action plans.' Well there are four there or possibly five, but if you do not believe covering a road with grass is an action, well fair enough. But biodiversity is something that is being progressed.

2850 Now that brings me on to planning conditions because it was planning conditions which require this budget for recovering land elsewhere for whatever is destroyed because of the airport development. The Environment Department have the Planning Department under themselves.

They have great power with planning conditions and this is an amazing tool or lever for insisting on biodiversity.

2855 I am not giving way just yet, thank you.

**Deputy Harwood:** Point of clarification.

2860 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** That does not exist. It is a correction or point of order.

**Deputy Harwood:** Point of correction, sir.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Ah!

2865 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Harwood.

**Deputy Harwood:** I would point out to Deputy Kuttelwascher that actually as from May next year the administration of planning will not be part of the Committee *for the Environment & Infrastructure*.

2870

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** That is fine, but it still is at the moment and it has been up to now which is what I am discussing. Anybody can say anything they like about the future. Nobody knows what is going to happen tomorrow.

2875 But one could if one wanted to – and maybe the Housing Department will not like this. When Housing Department want to build on a green field site in St Martin or wherever else, you could apply the same sort of strict rules that were applied to the airport project and say 'All right, you are using 50 vergées of land. We want you to pay for the recovery of 50 vergées of scrubland on the cliffs which can be used for grazing.' There are tools there now. My whole issue is biodiverse projects are in train and are being delivered.

2880 If you look in the past, our whole dairy industry is driven by biodiversity. We pay twice as much for our milk because we like to preserve our herd; we preserve the fields and all the rest. Biodiversity or attention to biodiversity is not something that is not happening. It is.

2885 If we go back to strategies, I remember it was Deputy Le Lièvre right at the beginning of this term said something like, 'We have got a bucket full of strategies and not a cup full of common sense.' I think those were his words or something similar.

**Deputy Le Lièvre:** I would never say anything so clever as that, sir.

2890 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Oh dear. I will have to look this one up. It was. Yes. And that is my whole point.

2895 The last point I want to make is you remember that the scope of the Integrated Transport Strategy was somewhat diminished. But nonetheless before that happened there were three new employees taken on by the Environment Department to implement a lot of things which actually were later on taken away from the Strategy. I would have thought that maybe there would have been some resource available there to draft a strategy.

2900 As far as £80,000 a year that is a drop in the ocean with what would have to be spent to actually implement biodiversity strategy projects in the future. What has happened with the airport shows the amount of money that has already been spent now. So please do not think that the T&R Department are not interested in biodiverse strategy. We have approved expenditure way over six figures on projects which actually resulted from the airport project.

To me one more point that needs to be referred to is again in relation to biodiversity. We have a got Director of Pollution now and until recently the Director was only responsible for pollution of the land but we recently or not so long ago extended the law to include the sea and the air. So we have a Director of Pollution now that can direct all sorts of activities within our territorial

2905 waters and the air. So there are all sorts of things happening relating to biodiversity strategy. So  
my view is that, fine build a framework, build a strategy but we all know that to deliver  
workstreams in that will require a lot more money and I feel that at this stage with this  
amendment that Strategy could be drafted from the existing resources of the Department. In fact  
if you look at the policy letter it is half a strategy already. Is there much more that needs to be  
2910 added? I do not know.

So I would hope Members support the amendment.  
Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

2915

**Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, sir.

Deputy Gillson earlier said about 'We were borrowing to fund general revenue'. Well I do not  
consider we borrow to fund general revenue because if we were borrowing we would be  
expecting to pay it back. What we are doing is spending our savings from previous years. That is  
2920 different to borrowing in my view.

Deputy Trott talked about accumulating the amount of money that we have committed to.  
Well if you are looking at the November Billet, we committed to £25.2 million on Aurigny. This  
was essentially losses which we are capitalising. It is also predicted losses in the future, which I  
think is very doubtful as was said then that they are actually capital. They are more revenue  
2925 expenditure. So if he is talking about 'We have committed a lot of money already'...

This morning the T&R Minister said that because the States had agreed to fund the pre-school  
education then we effectively had to find a method to fund it. If you look at the Statement of Aims  
that we all agreed in the States' Strategic Plan in March 2013, it says – I will just pick out the bits  
which apply to this particular policy letter.

'The government of Guernsey aims to provide and improve:  
... The Island's environment, unique cultural identity and rich heritage.'

2930 And it goes on:

'It recognises that this requires:  
... Policies which protect the natural environment and its biodiversity by accounting for the wider impacts that human  
activity has on it.'

And turning over the page there is the diagram of the three plans and under 'Objectives' on the  
Environmental Policy Plan it says:

'Land and marine spatial planning and management ensuring countryside, marine and wildlife protection.'

So I think that we have actually agreed to effectively a biodiversity strategy. So I just want some  
consistency because this morning he accepted that because we had resolved the pre-school that  
2935 we had to find funding for it. So why don't they find funding for this? Because I think the States  
has resolved to support it. In that he accepted that some of the money would come from  
prioritisation within the Education budget but some of it needed to be externally funded either  
through Family Allowance or from additional prioritisation. So can he explain why he does not  
accept that Environment can find this money by prioritisation? Because they have obviously  
2940 looked at Education and said they cannot find the money so where does he expect Environment  
to find the money by prioritisation which is effectively what he is saying by proposing this  
amendment?

So I urge the States' Members to not support this amendment.  
Thank you.

2945

**The Bailiff:** Would anyone else like to speak on the amendment?  
Deputy Wilkie, then Deputy Sherbourne.



**Deputy Wilkie:** Just very briefly, sir.

2950 I am just brought to my feet by Deputy Kuttelwascher. His example of biodiversity and the fact that they have covered in a lane, taken away the hedgerows and the trees and put in a piece of grass that is constantly being fired at by explosives to stop any wildlife settling there (*Laughter*) as an example of biodiversity is quite wrong. (*Laughter*) (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) If that is his idea of biodiversity, I think we definitely need this Strategy.

2955 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Sherbourne.

**Deputy Sherbourne:** Thank you, sir.

2960 I think most things have actually been said this afternoon, but there are one or two comments that I would like to personally respond to. My jaw dropped somewhat this afternoon when I think I heard Deputy Gillson talking against this amendment. Am I imagining things but didn't last month he –

**Deputy Gillson:** I was supporting the amendment.

2965 **Deputy Sherbourne:** Sorry, supporting the amendment.

Last month, if I remember correctly, Deputy Gillson was asking us to forego quite a substantial FTP saving for the Home Department. It is amazing how times change.

Deputy Trott mentioned ...

I give way.

2970

**Deputy Gillson:** Thank you for giving way. There is a significant difference: the amendment we placed on Home Department was about the ability to protect existing services not bring in new services. This report from Environment is about bringing a new service and that is a significant difference.

2975

**Deputy Sherbourne:** I thank Deputy Gillson but I do not really see it as a new service. It is part of the Environment mandate. It is a new strategy maybe but I do not see it as a new service. Anyway I accept his explanation.

2980 Deputy Trott – pity he not in here – invited the media ... One of his occasional forays into media nurturing, massaging. I hope he is in the Members' Room and actually can hear this now. He suggested they kept a running total of all these additional funds and mentioned the two figures that were actually included in the amendment for the pre-school provision. I would remind everyone in this room that there were no funding commitments for 2016. There was one figure for 2017 and another for 2018. So I hope the media actually redelve into these figures and get a true picture of what those requirements are. Maybe £400,000 but over a three year period. I think that was misleading and mischievous. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

2985

I mentioned yesterday that I consider that a lot of our Departments are picking up a lot of legacy issues that we inherited in 2012. Of course we inherited a hiatus with regard to FTP response: a two year period where very little was actually done, where major departments had to find substantial amounts in three years and I mentioned yesterday that Education had found £6.5 million. In fact, in total if I am correct – and I am sure the Treasury Minister will correct me if I am wrong – the FTP savings from revenue was over £28 million. We did not meet the target but £28 million that we removed from revenue expenditure.

2990

2995 I fully understand that there is the issue of the salary which has been mentioned today and I accept that is something that does need to be addressed but nonetheless departments made great efforts for those savings. Education have got £650,000 to find in the future. It has not gone away. We are saving constantly. That money has been taken out of revenue. Now when we look at the accounts we see that in fact contrary to the media presentation of accounts, this term that we are 'running a deficit' constantly is partially correct but is also partially wrong. Our revenue

3000 expenditure last year was £372 million. Our income was £400 million. So in fact in terms of our  
revenue income and expenditure we were in surplus. The reason that we have a deficit is that our  
mechanisms for funding capital investment mean that we transfer substantial amounts to the  
3005 capital funds. Now that is the rule. That is the way it is. I have argued against that. I think we have  
missed opportunities in the past for more imaginative ways of investing in our capital  
infrastructure. I do not think that that will go away. I think we will still have to look again next  
term. Whoever is in the Treasury Minister's chair will have to look at ways of funding the capital  
infrastructure. That will raise a spectre of where we get that money from: whether it is taxes,  
whether we go back to that big debate on borrowing which I do not think will ever totally go  
3010 away. I think we are living in cloud cuckoo land to believe that that is the case because the  
inability to take that sort of concept on board and think it through properly has led us to where  
we are today.

Some people sitting in this room who I have a great personal regard for were the main  
proponents against the possibility of borrowing to invest in infrastructure. I suggest that that is  
one of the biggest issues for us. A substantial amount of our income was taken out of our revenue  
3015 income through fiscal strategies and has not been replaced. So we are where we are today:  
squabbling over £80,000 a year for a most important strategy. I think it is very sad that we have  
spent so much time on that sort of issue.

Somebody mentioned earlier about the deficit write-off for Aurigny: £24 million. Now actually I  
agree with it as a recapitalisation. I understood the reasons for it. But £24 million of taxpayers'  
3020 money! And here we are arguing over £80,000 to do something which will leave the right legacy,  
not for other States along the way to have to pick up the pieces of the damage that is done  
through the neglect of this Assembly. Obviously I feel strongly about it. It is very rare that I do not  
about issues that we speak about in the Assembly because it impinges on everyone. Guernsey has  
been great to me. It has been great to me since I came here in 1968 and I hope that during the  
3025 time I have been here I have been able to contribute something to it. I am in the privileged  
position, as you are all here, of doing something very special for this Island and the sort of  
proposals that we are looking at now will do something special for the Island and it is £80,000.

Any rate, I do not support the amendment. I support the Strategy and will vote accordingly  
and I hope that you do the same.

3030 Thank you. (*Applause*)

**The Bailiff:** Deputy James.

**Deputy James:** Thank you, sir.

3035 I would very much like to echo and applaud Deputy Sherbourne's speech.

Yesterday, sir, we heard in the Sunday Trading debate *many* speeches identifying what a  
wonderful, healthy, safe environment that we live in. I am pleased that I live here and I am sure  
that everyone in this room is *very* proud to live in this fantastic Island. I plead with you not to  
support this amendment and my reason being is whilst we have heard many people in their  
3040 speeches thus far support the Biodiversity Strategy, if we do not get the appropriate funding for  
support, it will stall and we will still be talking about it years hence.

Aside from our intrinsic obligation to protect the natural environment for future generations,  
there are many other reasons for us to do so which directly impact on our way of life and our  
economy not least of which is because of the benefits to human health of a health-diverse natural  
3045 environment. The causes of loss of wildlife in our Island are due to our actions: ill-planned  
developments, poor management and continued exploitation and pollution have caused the  
degradation of our environment. So we *all* have a duty and a responsibility to repair it.

We all know that worryingly obesity rates are rising especially amongst children and to tackle  
this we need to encourage children to get out from their game consoles and outside. The best  
3050 way to do this is to get them interested and excited about our environment and our natural world.  
They need to go outside exploring to find minibeasts and frogs. They need to get excited about

3055 seeing Buzzards and Kestrels flying overhead, but for this we need two things: we need the wildlife to be here and we cannot take for granted that it will be unless we invest in its protection. We need to educate children, parents, teachers about the natural environment as for a lot people that connection has sadly been lost. This Biodiversity Strategy aims to achieve both of these things.

The appointment of a coordinator would encourage collaborative and strategic working between the organisations which should in turn reduce costs and increase efficiency. This is particularly important for charitable organisations in a field with limited resources.

3060 Like Deputy Sherbourne, I too would like to highlight the irony of the £25 million to recapitalise an airline whose logo is indeed the Puffin. Yet we are debating spending 0.03% of that sum on protecting the Puffin itself, which has just this week be reclassified as a Red List Species which is at real threat of global extinction.

3065 What would happen without the funding of the Biodiversity Strategy? We have already seen the loss of biodiversity in the Island so current conservations measures are not working. If this Strategy is not implemented and funded adequately it is fair to assume that we will continue to see the loss of wildlife. This is indeed a great opportunity to reverse the decline in wildlife. The States need to lead the way in environmental protection as outlined in the 2013 Strategic Plan.

3070 The Island cannot be considered sustainable if all three components of this triple bottom line are being invested in: social, economic and environmental. So I would actually go further to suggest that given that Mr Puffin, Mr Oystercatcher, Mr Song Thrush, Mrs Swallow, Mrs Swift, Mrs Sand Martin, Mrs House Martin, Mr House Sparrow, Mrs Meadow Pipit, Mr Linnet, Mr European Shag, if they were all on the electoral role perhaps this would get voted through.

3075 A certain irony, sir, in relation to Deputy Paint's comments about the Cuckoo: it rather surprised me, the fact that he highlighted the irresponsible and transient behaviour of the Cuckoo. As a member of the Housing board, Deputy Paint knows how difficult it is to get a Housing Licence. So it is probably not so surprising that you would not get a chance of one if your name was Mr Cuckoo.

3080 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop and then Deputy Inglis.

**Deputy Gollop:** I think we have probably heard enough from the Cuckoos.

3085 But it is very hard in fact to follow both Deputy James and Deputy Sherbourne who puts his usual passion and intensity of thought into this. Of course much has been said but what I would say is one has to consider the Biodiversity Strategy as not just a new initiative but as the next stage of an initiative that has in a way failed to materialise.

3090 The remark was made earlier by Deputy Kuttelwascher that Deputy Fallaize had said, 'We have too many strategies. Let's go for actions instead.' He did say that but this report makes clear that the Strategy itself is a prequel to actions that are needed: urgent actions to protect the very birds that are not necessarily human but are just as important nevertheless, that Deputy James has just referred to.

3095 I think perhaps a point that has not been bought into the debate so far has been that we have spent a lot of time discussing the intricacies of budgetary management. Deputy Lowe has given us a lesson from her experience of how perhaps we should have thought about the budget both as a board and as a States and as a budgetary process. But of course budgets can be very complicated and they are getting more complicated because as has been pointed out by several Members we are in a transition phase from one ministerial/departmental structure to another and as has been pointed out Planning will not be part of the Infrastructure & Environment agenda. We are also changing perhaps the roles of officers, staff pyramids, all kinds of things. So it is even harder than usual to prioritise the expenditure.

3100 I think we have already heard today that maybe there is an additional £600,000 of money that could be used ecologically from Deputy Stewart's improvements of the agricultural and dairy sector, which could and should be transferred for environmental purposes. We also know that it

3105 was a six figures sum gained for recent number plate sales that Deputy Trott approved of including quite a high sum for a number that some people see as particularly significant. So in that context, there we have it. We have maybe 15 years' funding if you will not do the sums for the £80,000 a year. I think we have got to realise that we are behind the times in not supporting this.

3110 I think the two original points that I would wish to make apart from pointing out on page 2991 – I know we have mentioned the Cuckoo's lot – but there are a number of other important species that are referred to: the Puffin, the Oystercatcher in serious population decline in Guernsey; the Skylark, the Reed Bunting lost as a breeding species; Mistle Thrush, Dartford Warbler, Turtle Doves, Yellowhammers, Ringed Plovers, Kentish Plovers, Wryneck, Yellow Wagtails, Common Tern, Golden Oriole, Storm Petrel and a Partridge in a pear tree. *(Laughter)* No not a Partridge in a pear tree but all the others are at serious risk or have already disappeared. We have to bear that in mind.

3120 I think the two other significant points that we need to consider are we have had a lot of items this month that have engaged the public more so than usual: the marriage debate that we have yet to come to; population; pre-school education and indeed the Sunday trading arguments on both sides. But I believe that all of us Members through our e-mails and letters and communications have received even more correspondence on the biodiversity issue. We have seen a community campaign that clearly resonates with the public. We have seen a unification of approach from many of the ecological organisations. We have even seen one of the parishes joining in that is not renowned for spending lots of money. I think we should bear that in mind.

3125 The other point I would raise is amongst the length of the report, there is reference to our sister islands and we see that both Jersey and the Isle of Man, despite budgetary cutbacks, put in significantly more proportionate resource into this including the recruitment of professional graduate ecologists. Although I have a certain sympathy with the argument that you can employ people on a short-term contractual basis, you have got to bear in mind that many naturalists and ecologists are in demand across the British Isles and elsewhere and they are as professional in their own way as accountants, lawyers or engineers and therefore cannot necessarily achieve the best results with lack of certainty of recruitment.

3130 The other point that is particularly useful to emphasise is if one returns to the era that we were in in the last Assembly, when we were moving towards the FTP as Deputy Parkinson has alluded to earlier, the Government's Strategic Plan took over a commitment to biodiversity that Deputy De Lisle put as an amendment to the original Government business plan and was endorsed as one of the 15 key elements of that and there was a lot of ... If I turn to page 3049 and 3050, States' Strategic Plan was a family of related plans. Here we see the pictograms, the icons: 'Environmental Policy Plan', 'Strategic Land Planning', 'Executive Summary':

'... actions over a 20 to 25 year ...'

3140 – plan.

'The States of Guernsey will provide clear leadership through education, information and action on environmental issues and challenges. The States will demonstrate delivery of its environmental priorities.

'Biodiversity, Countryside, Marine and Coastal Protection' actually received its own paragraphs.

'Guernsey's natural biodiversity ...'

– the report said –

'... is perhaps more evident and prevalent in the marine environment.'

We have a 'rich biodiversity'.

'However, man's intervention in terms of land take and especially in respect of climate change impacts has been so severe that we have a duty to correct the pace of change and to support species and habitats giving them the time needed to adapt and evolve.'

3145 That was in general terms a clear commitment by the overall States to biodiversity but the funding and the next stage: a more detailed strategy, never –

**Deputy Parkinson:** Can I?

Thank you for giving way, Deputy Gollop.

3150 As the text you read out made clear, those elements of the Strategy in the States' Strategic Plan were a 25-year view. There has been some confusion in this debate from Deputy Perrot and others that seem to think that because the States endorsed those three high-level basic plans that that somehow endorsed the programme of specific action in any one term of the States and that is not the case. The piece that is missing from the States' Strategic Plan is that box in the centre which says what we are going to do. That is the box that the States has never filled and which  
3155 needs to be filled. You cannot rely on the high-level 25-year view to justify tactical decisions, if you like, taken today.

**Deputy Gollop:** Well except in many ways Deputy Parkinson's view point.

3160 But in a way he gives force to the argument Deputy Perrot raised earlier, that too much of what we have done with strategic plans is meaningless and not implementable in a meaningful way and is fluffy. Because we have got to start delivering on the *many* years we have seen policy analysts and their successors putting the advisor in finance era onwards, emphasising the importance of our environment, the three tiers of our society, the Environmental Plan, with no boxes to deliver, no action, no funding, no mechanism for funding. As it says at the top here:

'They will adopt green procurement policies and environmentally supportive practices and procedures.'

3165 Well we have not been doing that and we need to start delivery now and that is why when I come back to this debate I think probably most Members will support the Strategy as a whole. Well the biodiversity policy report is for funding and the amendment that is the issue. And on the amendment I think we have got to realise in the scheme of things that £80,000 compared to the sums of money we have been spending in other areas is not a fortune and we need to give that  
3170 funding now and make sure that if it has not been at the centre of the Policy Council and the soon to go Environment Department, it must be at the centre of Policy & Resources and the Environment & Infrastructure Committee.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Inglis.

3175

**Deputy Inglis:** Thank you, sir.

I will be in the words of Deputy Domaille 'As quick as I can' because there is a point to what I want to say at the end.

3180 I support this amendment. I support it because there has been some good guidance from Deputy Lowe, from Deputy Gillson, from Deputy Laurie Queripel. Why was this not built into the budget in the first place? I really am lost for words to do with that.

£80,000: yes, as Deputy Gollop says is not very much but when you add it to all the other things we are looking to achieve then it becomes a huge figure.

3185 I support the Strategy or the plan, whatever we want to call it. I really do support it. Naturally, as you know, I come from out west and out west we have the very great privilege, certainly in Torteval, of looking after the National Park and (*Laughter*) and we want to make sure that that is well-maintained but I am embarrassed about what is going on in the west. We have probably the highest concentration of highly manicured fields you have ever seen in your life. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) That is not to say that people cannot do that but they do it at the risk of damaging all

3190 the hedgerows. The hedgerows are the feeding grounds for a lot of animals, etc. We are well aware of that. So from that point of view, education needs to be put to everyone so they understand the implications of their actions.

I take a for instance because it is costing me a fortune at the moment. Very close to where I live there was a pond which had all the benefits of feeding loads and loads of ducks and ducks like muddy water. That pond has been cleaned and now I get 25 ducks a morning coming up and looking for feed because someone in our family is stupid enough to throw food out for them. Not me. No. My point is we are changing our ecology and our biodiversity needs to be dealt with in the right manner.

This report is very good. There is one particular area in here that in a previous life I had a lot of problems with and it talks about 4x4s and motorbikes on beaches. They are not breaking the law. They can do it. But the law is 60 years old and in this day and age it is very dangerous to carry on with that. So from that point of view we need to address this problem.

I am, as I said, disappointed with Environment in not being able to ascertain this £80,000. I think they have got to look outside of the box. Private sponsorship is a very clear message that could be approached. Certainly at Culture & Leisure we introduced commissions. Commissions work really well in particular areas that you know and want to employ experts. There seems to be plenty of experts out there. We can tell that from the number of e-mails we are getting. So, sir, it is important that Environment look outside of the box for what Deputy Gollop says is £80,000. There are plenty of commercial sponsors out there who would jump at the chance of getting involved.

To finish: we have now spent four hours talking about this amendment. We have not even got onto the main part. There are 50 people involved in this room. If we took a mean average, sir, of £50 an hour – I am not including my good friend, Deputy Trott, because obviously his is a lot greater – but we have now spent £10,000. Environment only want £80,000. We really have got to get our act together in what we do and how proficiently we do it. So, please Members, let's move on and move on quickly.

I would recommend that you do support this and ask Environment to go away and think about this in a better way.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** No. Nobody else wishes to speak so Deputy Burford.

**Deputy Burford:** Thank you, sir.

I will start if I may with just a few responses to some of the points that have been raised in debate before going on to my short speech.

Deputy Spruce clearly had his speech prepared in advance because I am sure that some of the points he raised had in fact been addressed in my opening speech. First of all the National Trust of Guernsey are wholly behind this Strategy and the funding of it. I think that was the only one on that. Oh! I also spelled out in detail in the speech why a coordinator is actually needed.

Thank you to Deputy Domaille for his support. He started off this process.

Deputy Parkinson: I am rather concerned actually that in the very short time that Deputy Parkinson has been back in this Assembly – he is not here just at the moment – that he has been sitting too close to Deputy Lester Queripel and some of his calculator skills may have rubbed off on him because according to Deputy Parkinson's three-legged test £160,000 is not a trivial sum for Education but £80,000 is an important sum when it comes to biodiversity. Sorry, it is a trivial sum for Education. He also says that it is not time-critical but of course even in the last few weeks two more species have been added to Red List. I think we are too late in doing this and we need to get on with it rather than just kick it down the road further.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: I am actually pleased he mentioned these points because I am sure they are points that are in some people's minds where Environment is concerned. I fully acknowledge that. But if we look at the sea front, where Environment were concerned it was a cost

of £15,000 in total and it has actually left a safer crossing there as well. So we have a £15,000 which was a one-off. This is a recurring thing for the Biodiversity Strategy. So a one-off fee of £15,000 does not go to funding an £80,000 a year strategy. And you mentioned the provision of parking for bicycles. Obviously, we provide a lot of parking for cars but we are now providing some places where people can secure their bicycles. The reason that we have also looked at putting some in rural areas is because we also want to encourage tourism and it is something: tourists come to Guernsey, see it as a tranquil place, want to cycle around and they are used to having provision where they come from, quite often from the Continent. So that is the reason behind that.

You also mentioned about whether we have someone within the Department who could do this work. We have staff in the Department, not many but they are fully employed. This is why it has taken three years to get to the point with this Strategy because it has been fitted in together with their daily work which involves things to do with coastal defences, with the parks that we manage: Saumarez Park, Candie Gardens, all of the other parks that fall under our mandate. We only have four staff altogether in the entire Environment Services section of the Environment Department and we need somebody for this post who is ... Things succeed when you have the right person in the job. We all know that and we need someone for this post who is trained in the particular skills that this post needs. Now whether that is funded through Environment Guernsey – which is nothing to do with the Environment Department; that is a separate outfit – or whether it is done through the Department is something that we will need to look into if this approved.

Deputy Adam: I did take the opportunity to ask Deputy Stewart if we could have £80,000 from his Tourism Budget. He was not very amenable to the idea, (*Laughter*) I think is a polite way of answering that question.

Deputy Brouard is absolutely right. We have to have a sense of perspective on the amount of money that we are asking for. We have spent nearly the entire day it feels debating it for a small sum relatively.

Deputy Duquemin says a vote for the amendment is not a vote against the environment. Well I am afraid it is. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) We need this funded. It is very easy for people – and Deputy Duquemin is certainly not the only one – to actually try and say, 'Well, I am all for this but I am not going to fund it.' Well in that case, I am sorry, you are not all for it. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear).

Deputy Perrot: when species go extinct, when fewer visitors come, we can at least console ourselves that we stuck by the rules. (*Laughter*) It is not going to make me feel very good I do not think.

Deputy Trott thinks we should be funding –

**Deputy Perrot:** Point of correction, sir.

I think I was saying that Treasury & Resources need to abide by the rules. What Environment Department wants to do is up to the Environment Department.

**Deputy Burford:** Deputy Trott wants us to fund this from number plate sales. (**Deputy Stewart:** Good idea!) Seriously, is that what Government is reduced to: trying to protect our natural environment by flogging the occasional number plate? It is just not a great strategy is it? But the unfortunate part about it actually is that our budget –

**Deputy Trott:** May I, sir?

**Deputy Burford:** Is this is give way, sorry, Deputy Trott?

**Deputy Trott:** A point of correction.

It was not any old number plate, sir. It was your number plate. (*Laughter*)

3295 **Deputy Burford:** But the unfortunate truth of it is that actually number plates are what prop up the gaps in Environment's budget already. That money is accounted for.

Deputy Gillson: our budget has already been reduced by 1% and Deputy Gillson talks about fiscal restraint as do many others. But I want to come back to this point and I am going to labour this point. It is a point that Deputy Dorey has made. But last month, only nine other people apart from Deputy Dorey supported his amendment that would have allowed for airfares to go up by the cost of a cup of coffee to raise half a million pounds –

3300

**A Member:** It is so simple.

**Deputy Burford:** – but instead we decided that we would rather that they stayed lower and therefore that half a million pounds is money essentially foregone. There is no two ways about it. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) The main argument that seemed to come out in that debate which I found was absolutely astounding was that we must not micromanage and yet you looked at the Billet from Treasury & Resources, you wanted Aurigny to charge £67.22 for 63% of the fares to London Gatwick. If that is not micromanaging, well please tell me what is.

3305

To answer the Chief Minister, the Committee *for the* Environment & Infrastructure, when it is all merged together, I understand that we get La Vallette pools. No budget, no capital allocation. Grateful thanks to all the volunteers who have worked so fantastically on that project. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) We get roads. Well the budgets, I am sure the Minister for Commerce & Employment ... Where are you, Paul? (**Deputy Luxon:** PSD.) PSD, that is the one. (*Laughter*) It has been a long day! (*Interjection*) You can tell that the budgets have been cut back significantly on the roads – they were when I was there two years ago – and I notice that the pot holes on my way home each evening are still there.

3310

3315

**A Member:** Sort it out!

3320

**Deputy Burford:** We also get the Alderney breakwater. Well that is going to be a money spinner isn't it? (*Laughter*)

Deputy Lowe talks about GST. It may be in the next Assembly that other ways are looked at for raising funds. I hope that they are in some ways. I am did not vote for GST this time. The one thing we have to remember about the GST debate was it was not designed to raise any extra money.

3325

**Several Members:** Yes.

**Deputy Lowe:** That was then.

3330

**Deputy Burford:** But I find it a bit difficult. It was the same as on the radio phone-in I referred to earlier where the caller was asked, 'Do you want to put money on petrol?' 'Do you want to put GST?' 'Do you want to have all these things?' Let's keep this in perspective. This is 2p per week, per person: £80,000. This is not having 5% GST to pay for this. We need to keep this in perspective.

3335

Deputy Kuttelwascher: the airport project, the biodiversity off-set was part of the planning condition as part of the environmental impact assessment as I am sure you are aware. There was no net gain. It is quite possible, if anything, it was a net loss. It was purely an off-set, so we cannot claim that as a victory for biodiversity. What we were doing is we were trying to claw back something including at cliffs at Icart to compensate for essentially what was the trashing of the western end of the runway and those untouched fields in order to have the runway end safety area.

3340

Somebody mentioned about the Active Travel Unit. It has already been cut back due to the reduced funding and of course we have not received a penny of the funding yet due to the slightly tortuous process on the Transport Strategy.

3345



3350 In my opening speech I expressed my disappointment that Treasury & Resources find themselves unwilling to support this request for funding especially as we kept the sums required as low as we possibly can and far lower than any comparable jurisdiction. I am disappointed that Treasury & Resources should assume that the Environment Department has simply come to the States cap in hand without first thinking how it could fund the services itself. Of course, if it was simply a case of cutting a no longer needed, no longer important service, we would have already done that. Of course, if we had any gold-plated services that we could downgrade to more work of those services we would have done that. Many of the services that Environment delivers are statutory services which we are legally obliged to provide. As a small example of our services one  
3355 only needs to look at some of the road markings to see how long we make the paint last in order to manage the costs within our budget. Every week we face requests, including from our colleagues in this Assembly, for new filters, yellow lines, speed humps, parking bays and so forth, many of which we simply cannot deliver because we already prioritise the spend on those contracts.

3360 Driver and Vehicle Licensing is another statutory service. It is one that regularly suffers with backlogs due to understaffing and it is one that has gone through process re-engineering to deliver a better customer experience whilst administering more transactions with fewer staff.

Public service vehicle regulation and the driving test service costs £480,000. It is worth noting that the staffing demand ratio is so finely balanced that any sickness is managed by bringing  
3365 visiting examiners over from the UK.

The Planning and Development service: this is another statutory service and has faced cuts in staffing. Over the last 30 years there has been a review every decade. All three independent reviews of the planning service found the service to be under-resourced. The land management and environment service area, the area we are seeking to support and enhance with the Biodiversity Strategy, has just four staff and has recently advertised for volunteer wardens to assist  
3370 in the inspection of some of its land areas. The vast majority of the land management budget is spent in contracts with States' Works and others to deliver the service.

A quarter of a million is set aside for, but is insufficient for the coastal defence maintenance budget: a sum only recently voted by this Assembly in recognition of the state of the coastal defences that has resulted from insufficient annual maintenance budgets for decades.  
3375

Maintenance of the cliff path essentially revolves around the twice annual cut back of growth. If every year there are calls for earlier or more frequent cuts, simply keeping the coastal areas clean and paying to dispose of all the waste costs over £200,000 a year.

The walled garden and the playground at Saumarez Park and the clean-up at La Vallette have  
3380 been done by volunteers and that demonstrates that this area of the Department's work is underfunded and under-resourced. We face constant requests and frequent criticism because the service delivered is continually being cut back to manage a frozen budget against escalating contract costs. Even T&R Members, who are telling us to reprioritise our services, call the Department asking for repairs and improvements in greater expenditure to our coastal paths, car  
3385 parks, beaches and defences. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) To reprioritise the land management budget, to find money to improve the way that land is managed for biodiversity would simply be perverse.

We recognise the need to work smarter and rely more on IT, and we recognise that doing so will ultimately free up resources. Those projects however, intrinsically link to States-wide projects  
3390 in the area of document management, online payment and a one-stop shop. Not only are we reliant on the bigger States' picture, but also to deliver those smart working advances, we need money and people to drive the projects forward. To do that we need teams of people to fully scope and define projects, write the complex business cases required by T&R and project manage the delivery. The Department does not have those resources. Unlike some larger departments, we  
3395 do not have the ability to release people from their primary front-line function or the money to back-fill during the life of a project.

At Policy Council from time to time there are requests for sums well in excess of what we are asking for: projects or people that cost far more than this £80,000. When I query it, I am told that these are all 'economic enablers' and that, if I want the kind of social and environmental improvements that I press for, then I need to support these economic enablers because they are what pay for them. Well I have done, and now it is time for the other half of the bargain to be upheld. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

So, please let us keep this figure we are asking for in perspective. HSSD's recent budget uplift of £8 million would fund this Strategy for over a century.

Sir, I ask Members to swiftly reject this amendment. Thank you. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) (*Applause*)

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

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

Sir, this is a long debate on a short amendment. Deputy Fallaize said that he understood why Treasury & Recourses had brought this amendment, but he described it as 'outrageous'. Well if being outrageous is being fiscally responsible then so be it. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) I am very happy to wear that badge with pride and I hope there will be others here who will join me in doing so. He said that in fact what we should do is 'invite the States to reject the proposals'. Sir, if this amendment is rejected that is precisely what we will do, we will ask the States to reject the proposals in their entirety because we do believe that is the only responsible thing to do. And that is why we feel that the only way to support this is by finding it from within the Department

Deputy Luxon, sir, worries that he might be being hypocritical. Well he is right to worry, because he is being hypocritical. (*Laughter*) He says, 'You cannot be a little bit fiscally prudent', and he is right, you cannot be a little bit fiscally prudent.

Sir, he and a number of others, Deputies Gillson and I think also Inglis, also questioned why this was not part of the budget process. Well it was part of the budget process. We did receive a request for this funding from the Department. And I wrote on 15th September to advise the Department that:

'Having taken into account the current position of the State's finances, the competing demands for additional funding for existing and new services and the absence of an agreed method for prioritising services and spending across the public sector to ensure the direction of the resources towards political priorities, I regret to advise you that my board is unable to agree this request.'

So this report was written in the knowledge that that decision had been made and it was –

**Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, point of correction. The policy letter is dated 17th August.

**Deputy St Pier:** Yes, we also noted that the Environment Department will be submitting a policy letter for consideration to the November States' meeting with a recommendation that the requested funding is made available. It was well known by the Department that the funding would not be made available through the budget process.

Had an amendment been laid at the time of the Budget, as indeed of course, Deputy Gillson attempted to do for the Home Department, and asked the States to support to provide additional funding in the knowledge that this was heading down the tracks, I have no doubt whatsoever that the States at that stage would have done what it did with the Home Department amendment and rejected it. So this is, sir, an approach which has avoided the necessity for that.

Deputy Brehaut suggested that Treasury & Resources had a desire to have these kind of fights on the floor of the Assembly and that is just simply not correct. I know it may suit the narrative of this particular debate, but, sir, I think anybody who has dealt with the Department over the last few years knows that it is our preference to try and avoid that if at all possible.

3445 Deputy Parkinson: Sir, I sent Deputy Parkinson an email, I think over the weekend just before he was sworn in, to congratulate him on his re-election and to say that I felt sure that we would find ourselves on common ground. I had no idea that it would be only a little over 24 hours before we would find ourselves on common ground, because he is absolutely right in two respects. I agree with him entirely that this is not a trivial sum and it is not the responsible thing to do, and I agree with him also that now is not the time to have the discussion and debate around corporate tax reform, so on those two things I find myself on common ground.

3450 And, sir, as it is Christmas, as I was listening to Deputy Lester Queripel, and he was talking about sweet and melodious song, I thought for a moment he was talking about me, (*Laughter*) but it became apparent that he was not. In fact the mystery calculator which came in my cracker at lunch time, which I was going to keep for Deputy Lester Queripel, I think I will give to Deputy Parkinson as a welcome gift to the Assembly (*Laughter*) and to thank him for finding yourself on common ground.

**Deputy Parkinson:** Thank you, sir, I have one or two already.

**Deputy St Pier:** Of that I have no doubt, sir. (*Interjection and Laughter*)

3460 Deputy Green said he wanted to turn the Strategy into reality. Sir, he can do that and he can be fiscally responsible by supporting this amendment and then making it up to the Environment Department to deliver which I think that they can reasonably do by using 0.4% of their budget to do so.

3465 Deputy Lester Queripel, I think, or maybe it was Laurie. Deputy Laurie Queripel – forgive me, sir – suggested that perhaps better judgement was required in some of this. Perhaps half should have been found by the Department and that, sir, of course is exactly what Education did in relation to pre-school when they sat down with us to try and work out the priorities and to try and work out how their proposals for pre-school funding could be responsibly funded and so they have had to make those decisions about their priorities from within their own budgets. So I agree entirely with Deputy Laurie Queripel's assessment on that.

I thank Deputy Quin for his support.

3475 Deputy Soulsby questioned why were we not doing any more to minimise pay rises when I think others have made it clear that Treasury & Resources are not the employer. It is Policy Council that is the employer. Treasury & Resources simply has to meet the settlements that are agreed by others. And as I pointed out in my opening speech, sir, £1.6 million of the Budget Reserve of £8.9 million has already been taken up for settlements that have been agreed in advance for 2015 and are therefore already accounted for or taken care of.

3480 Deputy De Lisle said that the Environment Department had had eight years to integrate this into their budget and I agree with the Minister for the Environment that that is perhaps not the case because it is £80,000 a year, but I do agree with Deputy De Lisle: they have had eight years certainly to plan for this, absolutely.

3485 Deputy Duquemin asked me to explain the nuances between the two approaches which the Department had taken on this amendment and on the domestic abuse amendment and why we had chosen to treat them differently. It is simple, because in the case of the Home Department, if the Assembly is minded to support the amendment likely to be laid to provide funding for that, then we will lay an amendment that says that all other departments and committees should bear the burden of that. We simply took the view that Home had already had to experience considerable restraint through the budget process and it would be unreasonable to adopt the same approach as was the case for Environment, in this case.

3490 Deputy Ogier: I would suggest, sir, that this has not been underfunded by the States. I think it has been perhaps under-prioritised (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) by the Environment Department in bringing this to the States.

Deputy Perrot: I agree absolutely that if departments do want something then they have to prioritise and I think that in essence is the same point that Deputy Laurie Queripel made as well.

3495 Of course, the Chief Minister made the point that this was really about timing and how we ensure that we can responsibly fund a policy that many people would wish to do so.

Deputy Harwood asked Treasury & Resources to explain the surplus that was potentially sitting within Commerce & Employment. With respect, sir, that really is not for me to do. I am perhaps disappointed that Environment have not already engaged and had that conversation, knowing that it will be moving across to them and having explored that. Then we could have perhaps had a three-way dialogue that would have allowed us to really explore whether that could have been part of the solution and that could have been dealt with in that way.

In relation to the question of number plates, there was a suggestion that the funding comes back to Treasury & Resources. There was, in particular, in relation to the sale of 007 an agreement, an arrangement which we put in place to say that in essence this was an arrangement that had been ... We consented if you like to the sale of that number plate that was likely to generate super proceeds, provided it was only sufficient to fulfil the likely over-spend of the Department in the year, so that anything that was in excess of that would return. So, of course we have to see the financial outcome for the year to know if or whether anything will indeed return to general revenue.

I thank Alderney Representative Jean, sir, for his support. I did note with alarm the matter of the moth traps up there and I do hope that the Mother of the House will bear that in mind (*Laughter*) when she next heads to Alderney.

Sir, Deputy Dorey: I think the point there is we do expect Education to contribute to the pre-school funding. That was precisely the point and I have to say that was something which was recognised very early by the Minister and his board in that process.

I think I have already addressed Deputy Inglis' point about why it had not been built into the budget.

Sir, the Minister for the Environment says, 'Let's keep this in perspective', and I agree this is only 0.5% of the Environment Department's budget. I think it is instructive to look at the recent financial experience of the Department. In each of the last four years the Department has had a substantial underspend. In 2011 the underspend was £618,000; in 2012 it was £604,000; in 2013 it was £573,000 and in 2014 it was £523,000. At the time of the Budget debate there was a forecast that the Department would overspend by £46,000 this year. As at today the forecast underspend for the Department is £100,000.

So, sir, if this amendment passes then let me make a prediction. Just as Deputy Fallaize predicted that Education would find a way to deliver universal pre-school within the restricted budget that had been approved, sir, I think Environment will find a way to fund this if it is necessary and if that is what is they wish to do.

Thank you, sir, and I ask Members to support this amendment, sir.

**Deputy Burford:** A recorded vote please, sir.

**The Bailiff:** We have a recorded vote on the amendment proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Kuttelwascher.

*There was a recorded vote.*

**The Bailiff:** Members, while those votes are formally counted, is there anyone who has not already spoken generally who would wish to speak in general debate? No.

In that case we will wait for the formal result and then I will invite Deputy Burford to reply to general debate as there has been substantial general debate, although you may consider it has already been replied to. It is a matter for you.

*Amendment by Deputies St Pier and Kuttelwascher*  
*Not carried – Pour 19, Contre 27, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1*

<b>POUR</b>	<b>CONTRE</b>	<b>NE VOTE PAS</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Deputy Lowe	Deputy Fallaize	None	Deputy Jones
Deputy Spruce	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
Deputy Collins	Deputy Le Lièvre		
Deputy Duquemin	Deputy Green		
Deputy Paint	Deputy Dorey		
Deputy Le Tocq	Deputy James		
Deputy Adam	Deputy Brouard		
Deputy Perrot	Deputy Wilkie		
Deputy Inglis	Deputy De Lisle		
Deputy Quin	Deputy Burford		
Alderney Rep. Jean	Deputy Soulsby		
Deputy Kuttelwascher	Deputy Sillars		
Deputy Langlois	Deputy Luxon		
Deputy Parkinson	Deputy O'Hara		
Deputy St Pier	Deputy Hadley		
Deputy Stewart	Alderney Rep. McKinley		
Deputy Gillson	Deputy Harwood		
Deputy Le Pelley	Deputy Brehaut		
Deputy Trott	Deputy Domaille		
	Deputy Robert Jones		
	Deputy Le Clerc		
	Deputy Gollop		
	Deputy Sherbourne		
	Deputy Conder		
	Deputy Bebb		
	Deputy Lester Queripel		
	Deputy Ogier		

3545 **The Bailiff:** Members, the result of the voting on the amendment proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Kuttelwascher was 19 in favour with 27 against. I declare the amendment lost.

I invite the Minister, if she wishes to do so, to reply to any general debate.

3550 **Deputy Burford:** Thank you, sir.  
 I just want to thank everybody who is in support of funding the Strategy.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you.  
 In that case we vote on the Propositions which are to be found on page 3072 of the Billet.

3555 **Deputy Burford:** Could I have a recorded vote please, sir? Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Right. I was going to put all six Propositions to you together, unless anybody requests otherwise.  
 We will have a recorded vote then on the six Propositions on page 3072 of the Billet.

3560 **Deputy St Pier:** I would like to take 3 separately, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier would like 3 to be taken separately.  
 Deputy Burford, if we have 3 taken separately, do you require a separate vote on 1,2,4,5 and 6 or just – *(Interjection by Deputy Burford)* So, shall we take 3 first and have a recorded vote and then take the others together *aux voix* unless anybody requests otherwise.

3565 So Members, what you are voting on now is Proposition 3 on page 3072, which for the benefit of anyone listening at home is:

*The Bailiff read the Proposition.*

*There was a recorded vote.*

3570 **The Bailiff:** Members, while those votes are counted I wonder if we can move on and deal with, what I hope may be fairly swiftly, with the next Article.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, we need to vote on Propositions 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6.

3575 **The Bailiff:** Oh, sorry. Propositions ... All right.

**A Member:** Far too swiftly!

3580 **The Bailiff:** I was trying to move us swiftly, yes. *(Laughter)*  
Thank you for correcting me. I must remember where I am.

**Deputy Paint:** Could we have a recorded vote on this one as well please, sir, so we can see who is different. I would like to record that I will be voting in a different way.

3585 **The Bailiff:** Well, if there is a request for a recorded vote then we will have a recorded vote on Propositions 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6. All five of which will be taken together: Propositions 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6.

*Article XI: Proposition 3.*

*Carried – Pour 28, Contre 18, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1*

<b>POUR</b>	<b>CONTRE</b>	<b>NE VOTE PAS</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Deputy Fallaize	Deputy Lowe	None	Deputy Jones
Deputy Laurie Queripel	Deputy Spruce		
Deputy Le Lièvre	Deputy Collins		
Deputy Green	Deputy Duquemin		
Deputy Dorey	Deputy Paint		
Deputy Le Tocq	Deputy Adam		
Deputy James	Deputy Perrot		
Deputy Brouard	Deputy Inglis		
Deputy Wilkie	Deputy Quin		
Deputy De Lisle	Alderney Rep. Jean		
Deputy Burford	Deputy Kuttelwascher		
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Langlois		
Deputy Sillars	Deputy Parkinson		
Deputy Luxon	Deputy St Pier		
Deputy O'Hara	Deputy Stewart		
Deputy Hadley	Deputy Gillson		
Alderney Rep. McKinley	Deputy Le Pelley		
Deputy Harwood	Deputy Trott		
Deputy Brehaut			
Deputy Domaille			
Deputy Robert Jones			
Deputy Le Clerc			
Deputy Gollop			
Deputy Sherbourne			
Deputy Conder			
Deputy Bebb			
Deputy Lester Queripel			
Deputy Ogier			

**The Bailiff:** Members, the result of the vote on Proposition 3 was 28 in favour with 18 against. I declare Proposition 3 carried.

Now we have a recorded vote on propositions 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6.

*There was a recorded vote.*

**TREASURY AND RESOURCES DEPARTMENT**

**XIII Treasury & Resources Department –  
Amendments to the Compulsory Acquisition of Land  
(Guernsey) Law, 1949 –  
Propositions carried**

*Article XIII.*

*The States are asked to decide:*

*Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter dated 11th August, 2015, of the Treasury and Resources Department, they are of the opinion:*

*1. To agree to the proposals detailed in section 2 of that Policy Letter.*

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

3590 **The Bailiff:** I do not know if there is time to move on to the next item. Are you going to make a long opening speech?

**Deputy St Pier:** Very short.

3595 **The Bailiff:** Members, can I just have an indication of how many people would wish to speak in debate on the Treasury & Resources Department policy letter on the Amendments of Compulsory Acquisition of Land (Guernsey Law)? Is there going to be any debate? No.

In that case shall we try and deal with that this evening then? (**Members:** *Pour*)

If you could formally announce the Article please, Greffier, Article XIII.

3600 **The Greffier:** Article XIII, Treasury & Resources Department, Amendments to the Compulsory Acquisition of Land (Guernsey) Law 1949.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

3605 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, a short policy letter on page 3106 of the Billet and the proposed amendments do not introduce any new powers but simply clarify existing provisions and help to ensure that the law remains accessible and unambiguous. The Department would also like to prescribe the fees charged in respect of assessment of compensation proceedings in the event that a compulsory purchase order is made.

3610 I think the short policy letter is self-explanatory, sir, and I encourage Members to support it.

**The Bailiff:** Is there any debate? No.

Well, there are two Propositions on page 3109. I put both of them to you together. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

3615 **The Bailiff:** I declare those carried.

I suspect the next Article will take a bit longer as there are two amendments, so I suggest we leave that until the morning.

We will just wait until the votes have been counted on Propositions 1, 2, 4, 5, 6.

*Article XI: Propositions 1, 2, 4, 5, 6.*

*Carried – Pour 45, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1*

**POUR**

Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Le Lièvre  
Deputy Spruce  
Deputy Collins  
Deputy Duquemin  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy James  
Deputy Adam  
Deputy Perrot  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Wilkie  
Deputy De Lisle  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Inglis  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Sillars  
Deputy Luxon  
Deputy O'Hara  
Deputy Quin  
Deputy Hadley  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. McKinley  
Deputy Harwood  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Domaille  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Robert Jones  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Sherbourne  
Deputy Conder  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Bebb  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Stewart  
Deputy Gillson  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy Ogier  
Deputy Trott

**CONTRE**

Deputy Paint

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Deputy Jones

3620

**The Bailiff:** The voting is 45 in favour with one against. I declare those Propositions carried.  
We rise now and wish Deputy Lowe a very happy birthday evening, and resume tomorrow.

*The Assembly adjourned at 5.30 p.m.*