



**OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF THE**

**STATES OF DELIBERATION**

**OF THE**

**ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

**HANSARD**

**Royal Court House, Guernsey, Wednesday, 16th November 2016**

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

**Volume 5, No. 33**

**ISSN 2049-8284**

*Published by Her Majesty's Greffier, The Royal Court House,  
St Peter Port, GY1 2NZ. © States of Guernsey, 2016*

**Present:**

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

**Law Officers**

R. M. Titterington, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller) (morning),  
Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Procureur) (afternoon)

**People's Deputies**

**St Peter Port South**

Deputies P. T. R. Ferbrache, J. Kuttelwascher, D. A. Tindall,  
B. L. Brehaut, R. H. Tooley

**St Peter Port North**

Deputies, J. A. B. Gollop, C. N. K. Parkinson, L. C. Queripel, M. K. Le Clerc,  
M. P. Leadbeater, J. I. Mooney

**St Sampson**

Deputies L. S. Trott, P. R. Le Pelley, J. S. Merrett, G. A. St Pier,  
T. J. Stephens, C. P. Meerveld

**The Vale**

Deputies M. J. Fallaize, N. R. Inder, M. M. Lowe, L. B. Queripel,  
J. C. S. F. Smithies, S. T. Hansmann Rouxel

**The Castel**

Deputies R. Graham L.V.O, M. B. E, C. J. Green, B. J. E. Paint,  
M. H. Dorey, J. P. Le Tocq

**The West**

Deputies A. H. Brouard, A. C. Dudley-Owen, E. A. Yerby,  
D. de G. De Lisle, S. L. Langlois

**The South-East**

Deputies H. J. R. Soulsby, H. L. de Sausmarez, P. J. Roffey,  
R. G. Prow, V. S. Oliver

**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**

Deputies C.N.K. Parkinson ; Deputy L. C. Queripel (*relevé 10h 56*); A.H. Brouard (*indisposé*);  
Alderney Representatives L. E. Jean; S.D.G. McKinley, O. B. E. (*absent de l'île*)

## **Business transacted**

Evocation .....	2309
<b>Billet d'État XXVIII.....</b>	<b>2309</b>
Policy and Resource Plan – Phase one – Debate continued.....	2309
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.05 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.10 p.m. ....</i>	<i>2346</i>
Policy and Resource Plan – Phase one – Debate continued – Propositions 1 to 4 carried...	2347
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.20 p.m. ....</i>	<i>2385</i>

*PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK*

# States of Deliberation

*The States met at 9.30 a.m. in the presence of  
His Excellency Vice-Admiral Sir Ian Corder, K.B.E., C.B.  
Lieutenant-Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Bailiwick of Guernsey*

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

## **PRAYERS**

*The Greffier*

## **EVOCATION**

# Billet d'État XXVIII

## **POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

### **Policy and Resource Plan – Phase one – Debate continued**

**The Greffier:** Billet d'État XXVIII, the Policy and Resources Plan – Phase one – continuation of debate on the amendments.

**The Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, there is a further amendment that has been  
5 circulated this morning, which follows on from what we were debating yesterday evening, to be  
laid on behalf of the Policy & Resources Committee. It is number 23.

I propose we start with that and then we will continue with amendments 13, 2 and 6; and that  
will complete the amendments that we have before us at the moment. There will then be general  
debate. I have asked the Law Officers, if they can, to produce a consolidated set of amended  
10 Propositions before we go to the vote, so that we all know exactly what we are voting on.

I understand there may have to be, perhaps, some further slight amendments in order to  
ensure that the consolidations make sense and I hope that somebody is actually checking the text  
of the Plan itself, to make sure that the Plan will make sense once all these amendments are  
incorporated into it.

15 So there may yet have to be some further, really, consolidations, so we may yet see another  
amendment, but I want to ensure that that is circulated so that we all know what we are voting on  
before we go to the vote. There may have to be an adjournment at that point. It will depend how  
much general debate there is.

As I say, we start with amendment 23, to be proposed by Deputy St Pier and seconded by  
20 Deputy Trott.

Deputy St Pier.

*Amendment 23.*

*To insert at the end of the words in Proposition 3:*

*’, and in respect of the following bullet point which was added under the part of Appendix 1 entitled ‘Strong, sustainable and growing economy’ on page 7*

*“Ensure conditions that encourage and foster enterprise and remove barriers to business, keeping regulation appropriate and proportionate, subject to environmental and social safeguards.”*

*‘To delete the words “subject to” and to substitute therefor the words “whilst respecting”.’*

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, as you have said in your introduction, amendment 23 merely serves to replace ‘subject to’ in the amendment which was approved yesterday by the Assembly with the words ‘whilst respecting’ when referencing environmental and social safeguards.

25

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott, do you formally second the amendment?

**Deputy Trott:** I do, sir, thank you.

30

**The Bailiff:** Is there any debate? Yes, Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Gollop:** I think it got very complicated yesterday, but as an old hand in the game I should follow it. I think that we actually, effectively, voted for amendment 7 and it went through the States and so, effectively, what this does if it is passed is to contradict an earlier States’ decision.

35

It is a form of yo-yo government in a way. I, personally, prefer the words ‘subject to’ rather than ‘whilst respecting’. You might expect that of me, bearing in mind I have been involved in planning and, before that, heritage and environment departments.

But, whilst we are arguing words, and we know there are many Deputies here who love that, who are lawyers – Deputy Ferbrache, Deputy Tindall, Deputy Green and many others – I think that in terms of the environment, ‘subject to’ is stronger because it implies duty: a presumption, a trump card, dare I say, a bump, a condition that ideally, if not completely, you should satisfy with any significant Proposition; whereas ‘whilst respecting’ is more like the classic Guernsey States’ line that Deputy Trott and others know from years back where you go out to consultation and, in reality, the consultation, whilst valid, most of the key decisions have already been made at senior level and the consultation is just there to support or just, like ... *[Inaudible]* we saw in education, they went out to consultation and did not like what they got back, to a certain extent.

40

45

I will not go off into that, but the point I am making, if I think that if we want to give the environmental protection that many Members yesterday – Deputy Brehaut, Deputy Dorey and others – said the new States is keen to see it re-integrated into the Plan in a new way, not just the old-fashioned way of a three-legged stool, economic, social, environmental, when environmental was really the short end of the stool that collapsed. But actually integrated into the mainstream of policy then I think the original amendment of the two is preferable.

50

I wonder if members from Economic Development and other Committees will have slightly different ideas from that, because, by innuendo, the earlier amendment would give a stronger presumption towards environmental protection, where you have a difficult judgement call between business, commercial and other factors that need to be considered.

55

**The Bailiff:** Yes, Deputy Tindall.

60

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

I would just like to repeat the reasons why I mentioned it yesterday, which was simply the fact that I felt that the words ‘subject to’ and then only the environmental and social safeguards was too limiting, which might prevent other such safeguards being considered; also because under amendment 11 we have virtually the same set of circumstances under a bullet point, and yet that

65

was 'whilst respecting'. Because of the concerns that had been raised by myself and Deputy Green, we felt that it was necessary to point out that the limitation might not be preferable and it would be better to have the 'whilst respecting' so that we could have all of the safeguards in place, but without problems ahead.

70 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** I see no one else. Deputy St Pier to reply.

**Deputy St Pier:** Deputy Tindall has said what I would have said in response to Deputy Gollop.

75

**The Bailiff:** Just before we go to the vote, Deputy Brouard wishes to be relevé.

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

80 **The Bailiff:** We vote, then, on amendment 23. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

**The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.

We move on to amendment 13, to be proposed by Deputy Dudley-Owen, seconded by Deputy Laurie Queripel.

Deputy Dudley-Owen.

*Amendment 13.*

*To insert at the end of the words in Proposition 3:*

*‘, but subject to the addition to the seven bullet points under the part of Appendix 1 entitled “Sustainable public finances” on page 8 of the following bullet point:*

*“Ensure competitive recruitment and retention of quality, skilled professionals, balanced with appropriate scrutiny including control and review of staffing costs, grading and pay awards, and effective performance management, within the public sector”.’*

85 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Do you wish it to be read, or will you read it?

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Yes, please.

90

**The Bailiff:** Greffier, can you read amendment 13?

*The Greffier read out the amendment.*

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dudley-Owen.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you, sir.

95

My amendment, number 13, is reasonably self-explanatory and, I feel, needs little embellishment, so I will keep this introduction brief.

Together with Deputy Laurie Queripel and with the support of Deputy Yerby, I have laid this amendment to the future Guernsey proposal to add further substance and weight to the sustainability of public finances section, but also to the Civil Service reform plan, which I do not think has been adequately addressed in the draft we have been presented with.

100

Like the other amendments we have seen during this meeting, I think this item covers a very important and substantial part of States' business and its omission must be remedied, such that it

is explicitly incorporated into this high-level planning document. Including this reference to the performance of Civil Service staff, by monitoring pay, is an endorsement and acknowledgement of the Civil Service reform which is a key component of the over-arching Service Guernsey plan agreed a year ago by the previous States.

Remuneration and, more generally, the incentives for performance which have remained high, I understand, on the reform on the agenda since that time. However, we have yet to be appraised of any progress towards these changes.

Our Civil Service forms an integral part of Government, employs 17% of the working age population in Guernsey, with some 5,000 employees, many of whom are represented by 14 unions, and comes with a remuneration bill of approximately £217 million. It accounts for over half our Government spend. The effective management and remuneration of our human resources should by no means, therefore, be underestimated in its impact on our public finances and their sustainability.

By ensuring that we have a competitive recruitment system, means that we can pick from a pool of strong candidates. We are, after all, we have been told, going to be losing a third of our staff over the next eight years due to natural recruitment wastage.

To ensure that we retain quality and skilled professionals means that we are offering staff appropriate terms of employment, excellent working conditions and making efforts through performance management to provide high levels of job satisfaction and a good work/life balance.

These benefits provide us with an employers' standard, which must be tested for their sustainability, ensuring that they are compliant and enhance service delivery and also be balanced with appropriate scrutiny with measures such as an appropriate method of running cost control for staff grading and pay awards.

It follows that if you treat people well they will perform well. As this Government becomes ever leaner and moves towards more efficient ways of working to achieve the Public Service Reform aims, we must ensure that we are investors in people and that those who are working for us are treated well, which can be achieved in the ways that I have mentioned.

Just a quote here from the Public Service Reform document:

We will put the emphasis on performance management and outcomes. The public service employs some of Guernsey's most talented people, but it is only with the active and committee support of the right staff working in the right way that we will successfully deliver true reform.

Now, I agree with the sentiments from our Chief Executive there and during my short time in Government have seen some fantastic and dedicated staff. It would be naive, however, to suggest that in an organisation as large as our Civil Service, we do not also have some staff who might not be cutting the grade.

For both of these reasons, we owe all employees a modern and effective method of managing their performance and identifying their success or otherwise in delivering value to the States. In this way, as an employer, we can stand out from the crowd and attract and retain the right people to deliver our public services.

I have not laboured the point, you might notice, about the cost of our wages bill. This is a substantial part of our Government expenditure, at over 50%, and I am sure that I do not have to spell out to you all why it is so important to ensure that this spend is kept highly scrutinised, ensuring that our staff are awarded appropriately for the roles that they carry out and not gratuitously.

So, to conclude, I believe that by including this important point in the Plan, we are providing the hook on which to hang the hat of Civil Service reform. It shows that, at the highest level, this has political endorsement and is taken seriously and prioritised by this States.

I would like to thank Deputy Laurie Queripel for seconding this amendment today and for Deputy Emily Yerby in her support and ask that Members also lend their support to pass this item for inclusion in phase one of the Future Guernsey Plan.

Thank you.



**The Bailiff:** Deputy Laurie Queripel, do you formally second the amendment?

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** I do, sir, thank you.

155 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott will speak on behalf of the Committee.

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

The Policy & Resources Committee is neutral on this amendment but, at the same time, considers it unnecessary.

160 It is unnecessary for two reasons. The first reason is that work is underway in any event and, secondly, it is too detailed an amendment for this phase, for phase one, which is the high-level thinking. It is ideally suited, nonetheless, to phase two, which we will be debating in June of next year.

165 Where I do share Deputy Dudley-Owen's concerns is that our pay bill is very significant indeed. It is the most material aspect of the public sector expenditure and is just shy, these days, of a quarter of a billion pounds per annum, which is a very significant sum. As a consequence, it is a matter that gets constant attention and scrutiny by the Policy & Resources Committee, as you may think.

170 Having said that, sir, and for balance, it is important to understand that the 17% or thereabouts of the total employable workforce, or employed workforce in the Bailiwick, we have one of the lowest percentages of public sector employment anywhere in the Western world. That is not to say that there is not waste and inefficiency and some of the comments of Deputy Dudley-Owen has made are known to many of us and are considered regularly.

175 But we need to keep a sense of perspective, that we do not have a bloated Civil Service, as many in our community believe the case to be.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Oliver.

**Deputy Oliver:** Can I just say a point of correction to what Deputy Trott was saying?

180 In 2005, the employment of the States was 24.5% out of a static working population, which is much higher than that of the UK, who have 14% of the working population, whereas Jersey employ 13.8% of the working population.

185 **Deputy Trott:** Sir, I am sorry, I have to rise to say that Deputy Oliver's facts are wholly incorrect.

In fact, they bear no resemblance to the truth whatsoever. I have no idea where she got them from but they are not correct.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

190 **Deputy Gollop:** Well, I am very pleased to hear Deputy Trott give a strong endorsement for the vitality and credibility and relative leanness of our public service. The old joke we used to hear, the after-dinner speech, question time, asked how many people work in Sir Charles Frossard House, about half of them, is just a myth! (*Laughter*)

195 You could say the same about Deputies, I suppose.

200 Actually, we do have, as Deputy Fallaize and many others have pointed out, a lean public sector, even compared to the Isle of Man or Jersey. That does not mean to say that there are not efficiencies that have been made and could further be made. As a point of observation, over the years, I would say that, whilst the training and performance of civil servants is invariably very good, sometimes the productivity is not what it might be in some other branches of our society.

Deputy Oliver said a lot of statistics, which Deputy Trott immediately rebutted in the strongest terms. I would have to think about what Deputy Oliver said, but I say this as a general point,

205 defining especially the Guernsey context, like with capital investment yesterday when we got into the world of water and so on, is very difficult, because a civil servant here has a different meaning from a local government officer in the UK, or a Whitehall civil servant.

When people say, in the pub, in the café or in the taxi cab, there are too many civil servants and they immediately come up with a figure of somewhere around 5,000, that actually includes all the nurses, all the teachers, many public sector workers, school caretakers, air traffic controllers, water engineers, senior lawyers. I do not need to go on, but the point is the idea that there are 210 thousands of policy analysts and bean-counters sitting in an old-fashioned, Dickensian room is completely false.

The other point is that I do support this amendment. In fact, of all the amendments, I think it is the most exciting, because it is the one that is the most political of them. It covers the tracks. Deputy Trott appeared to be rebutting or stating he was neutral and then saying P&R were really 215 against it, depends how you look at it. It actually says 'ensure competitive recruitment and retention of quality skilled professionals'. So the point is covered. This is not a simplistic slash and burn mentality; it is actually about ensuring that there is a career out there for the most able Islanders and some people new to our shores.

It also says 'balance to appropriate scrutiny, including control and review of staffing costs, grading and pay awards and effective performance management with the public sector'. That is 220 appropriate in the week of the Young Enterprise Week when we have lots of workshops and all kinds of things, from motivation to skills.

What specific point do I want to add to this debate? It is this. Yesterday, the Bailiff movingly remembered the life and times of one of our most interesting and respected politicians, the late 225 Deputy and Conseiller Tony Bran, and it was mentioned, correctly, that he was, for a few years, President of the Civil Service Board.

When I first came into the Assembly, along with a few other people who are around today, there were many committees that did important things – education and health standing out, the Children Board, and so on – but the three most robust pillars of Government, and the three 230 strongest political committees, the ones new Members aspired to get on, were of course Advisory & Finance, the Board of Administration, which both in a way have modern descendants in different ways, and the Civil Service Board.

The Civil Service Board was where it happened, because senior politicians, usually from the centre-right and from a business or legal experience, would sit on that board and would have 235 day-to-day control about recruitment, retention, appointment, grading of positions, I believe, even, on occasions, part of the policy in those days was zero-growth, staff number limitation. Every position, whether it be catering manager at Castel Cornet or woodwork collector at education, would go up to that board and be adjudicated by a separate team of senior people.

That was real power. It came out of the former Wheadon Requête and so on. In fact, if you 240 look at a who's who of Guernsey politics, many of them were members and presidents of the Civil Service Board.

When we went launching headfirst into the Policy Council, we lost that and we have not really regained it. It seems to me that these days, with our slimmed down States and the greater focus 245 on policy and outreach, social media and all kinds of things, we are less effective at monitoring, controlling and, not micro-managing, but overseeing the Civil Service.

The one question mark I have about this amendment is what will happen to it? Who would run the review? Would it be an internal review, would it be part of the existing Transformation, would it be outsourced to management consultants, consultants from the UK? We have all got, where ... 250 *[Inaudible]* whether political or accountants. Or would it be really worked on by, perhaps, a mixed team of academics and successful local business professional and public sector people, and political involvement too. We actually need leadership here, whereby people who are accountable to the public run the review, rather than just an exercise that starts, costs a lot and goes nowhere.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

255 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Thank you, sir.

I rise just to support my colleague *Le Vice-Premier* Deputy Trott and, as the one tasked by my other colleagues on Policy & Resources to deal with pay and conditions matters – there was a long queue of people waiting to do that job! – I just want to say that we certainly would support this amendment in terms of its spirit but, as Deputy Trott says, it does not sit well here.

260 I will say why it does not sit well here. If we put an amendment like this at this phase of our planning process, what are we going to put at the next phase? What are the things we are going to put? We will have to go into such detail that it would be quite inappropriate.

265 This is certainly something we seek to do, but as, again, Deputy Trott said, sir, this is something we are already doing and involved with. It is important that we not only get perspective here and we are not complacent. It has already been stated, sir, that in terms of our public sector in Guernsey, that includes established staff and all the plethora of other pay groups and other employees, which people often forget, as Deputy Gollop was saying, we are very efficient in comparison with elsewhere. The danger with that is that we could get complacent and we must not get complacent about it.

270 I welcome the spirit of this. I am sure that Deputy Oliver's colleague, Deputy Prow, can put her right on her statistics, but the fact is that people do often confuse the numbers of civil servants, if you want to call that established staff, what people might have called white collar workers in the past but that is an inappropriate term today –

275 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Prow.

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

I think my name was mentioned. I did not make any intervention.

280 **Deputy Le Tocq:** No, sir.

I was just suggesting that you might be able to help your colleague, Deputy Oliver, with her statistics – where she got them from.

**Deputy Prow:** I do not see that that is at all my role.

285

**Deputy Le Tocq:** Fine.

If Deputy Oliver would like to come and speak to me or one of my colleagues.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

290

**Deputy Trott:** Maybe I could help, sir?

The facts and figures book advises us at the end of the first quarter of 2016, the end of March, there were 32,291 people employed. At the same period, there were around, give or take a few, 5,100 people employed by the public sector. That works out at a percentage of a little under 16%.

295 By way of contrast, in Northern Ireland, a little over 50% of all those employed are public sector workers.

Thank you, sir.

**Deputy Le Tocq:** I thank Deputy Trott for his intervention and –

300

**Deputy Oliver:** Sir, I never mentioned Northern Ireland.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Oliver, Deputy Le Tocq is giving way to you.

305 **Deputy Oliver:** Sir, I never mentioned Northern Ireland.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

310 **Deputy Le Tocq:** But, as Deputy Gollop was saying before, in comparison, and it is difficult to make comparisons because different jurisdictions include different types of people in what you would call public administration. However, Deputy Gollop did say, and he is absolutely right, that in comparison with Jersey and other similar jurisdictions, the Isle of Man, smaller jurisdictions, we do very well and we are at the top of the list.

315 Having said that, as I was saying before, we should not be complacent and I often used to quote, years ago, that the most efficient public administration was India under the British Raj, where there was about the same number of civil servants running the whole of India as there are in Guernsey currently, which is a little over 1,000. But I do not think we want to go back to those sorts of days.

320 The fact is that people often forget, and I remember having a conversation with newly elected Deputy Inder, that some of the most well-paid public sector workers are not civil servants, they are others that work in consultancy and the legal profession, the judiciary, all those sorts of things. People do not automatically think of them as public sector workers, but they are paid from the public sector purse. So it is not as simple as some people may think.

325 Coming back to this amendment, sir, I do think it is important, and I note the import of it, to recruit and retain quality skilled professionals, balanced and appropriate scrutiny on that basis. It is true that we are having to recruit, increasingly, from outside of this Island. That is a concern because obviously we want the right skills but we should also encourage those based here in the Island, those students who go away, to come back and to work for our Government.

330 There is certainly much more that needs to be done there in conjunction with the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture in encouraging and providing support for those who would seek to come back and perhaps work in some of those areas of public administration currently, where we are largely dependent on those outside of the Island.

335 That would certainly help overall. Obviously, we are never going to recruit totally from within the Island but that is just one example of an area where we could improve on the ways in which we do recruit and retain.

I do not think this is an appropriate place for this amendment, but the spirit of it is certainly one that I would support and I would ask Members to, not vote to support it, but to recognise that when it comes to the second phase of the Policy and Resource Plan, that may be an appropriate time in which some wording like this should be included.

340

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Green.

**Deputy Green:** Sir, thank you very much.

345 Like others, I have got somewhat mixed feelings about this. Again, I would welcome the spirit of it. I have a certain sympathy with some of the aims that are articulated within it. I suppose my major concern is whether this is actually already covered in the section. Page eight of the document, this is a heading under 'Sustainable Public Finances'.

In the second paragraph on page eight, the final sentence is:

We will need to rethink the way we provide and pay for public services to ensure that we can deliver the services that the public needs.

Then, the bullet points, you have the fifth bullet point, which is in bold and I quote:

Provide leadership of the Transformation agenda and support the Public Service Reform agenda in order to manage both short and long-term spending pressures.

350 I think it is already covered, to some extent. The other bullet points in that section are heavily dwelling on fiscal policy and fiscal strategy. The first bullet point talks about the fiscal rules within the framework, the second one talks about having a credible fiscal strategy, the third about a

balanced budget, the fourth about expenditure restraints. I am not sure whether adding to the wording that we already have, sir, makes a great deal of difference at this stage, when we have the second phase of the Plan coming anyway.

355 That said, I think there are clearly big concerns in our community about the affordability of the public sector, notwithstanding the comments that Deputy Trott made about the relative small size of the number of people employed in the public sector in the Island.

360 Slightly puzzled, I put it no higher than that, but slightly puzzled by the fact that P&R are officially neutral on this because, from the speeches we have heard so far, it sounds like they are against it. If they are against it, they should really say they are against it.

365 So I think my main concern is that this is a matter that is already covered but, nonetheless, notwithstanding the fact that one could say it is a matter of detail for the second phase, I think there is an argument for saying that this wording would be useful in any event, because what harm does it do?

There are concerns about productivity in the public sector, there are concerns about the high wage bill, there are concerns about affordability in the long-term.

370 So I look forward to hearing the rest of the debate and perhaps Deputy Dudley-Owen, when she sums up, and maybe the seconder Deputy Queripel when he speaks, if he speaks, can address some of the more major concerns that have been made about this.

Is it already covered in the document and what will this actually add, notwithstanding the fact that this might be something to add in the second phase?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

375

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

I intend to vote for this amendment, particularly if P&R are neutral about it, therefore they clearly do not mind if we pass it. I think, to take the language of yesterday in a particular debate on an amendment, I think the message does need to be sent.

380 Obviously, in Deputy Gollop's view I am a bit of a right-wing business type, as I spent several years on the Civil Service Board and he has told us that that was the type of person that served on there. (*Laughter*) I do not recognise that view really, but nevertheless.

385 I really want to pursue Deputy Le Tocq's comment about not being complacent. There has been a lot of banter about what the latest figures are, about the comparisons between the UK and Guernsey on how many people are employed in the public sector. The Office of National Statistics released their latest figures for the UK about 35 minutes ago, at 9.30 a.m., and it showed the continuing plummet in the percentage of the UK workforce employed in the public sector – not as civil servants but in the whole of the public sector. As of today, actually it was a couple of weeks ago when they put the benchmark, it was 16.8%. Now, that has fallen from just under 21% five years ago and it has brought the situation from Guernsey, having a far smaller percentage of its workforce employed in the public sector, to one where we are still below, but not very far below, the percentage in the UK.

395 Now, I am not saying that in order not to be complacent we should mirror what is happening over there. I think there have been a lot of damaging decisions taken over there, *force majeure*, they have had to do it, they have had a huge deficit and they have had to slash and burn.

But a part of it has also been through – actually, they do not mention transformation quite as often as we do, but they have been – quietly getting on and doing it and delivering some of the same services in a more efficient way.

400 During the Budget debate two weeks ago, like Deputy Fallaize, I suggested that maybe in order to make sound public finances, we may have to raise extra taxes from those who can afford it most. I stick by that. It is not a popular message, but if it is one that is going to be delivered it has to be one side of a coin. The other side of the coin has to be the States looking at every single way it can reasonably control costs, while not damaging crucial public services – possibly even while damaging crucial public services; I really hope not. That would sadden me greatly.

405 The first thing is to try to do things more efficiently and I think that is the thrust of what this amendment is saying. How can we be most cost effective in the way that we deliver public services? When you look at our costs, we have not approved 3%, 5% reduction in expenditure; that has never come to this Assembly as far as I am aware. It is a bit weird. It is the elephant in the room, P&R keep talking about it, the Committees are told that is what is expected, but we have never debated it in this Assembly.

410 I presume that that is probably the glide path that we are going down. Now, if that is going to be achieved without really damaging our public services – I do not know if it can be – we have to look at cost-effectiveness. We certainly have to look, I think, at performance management; it is going to be absolutely vital over the next five to 10 years. I do not know if it can be brought in over the next year or so, but this is a long-term plan.

415 Whether I should be voting for it now or voting for it next summer, I do not know. But it is before me now. I feel strongly that it is the right direction to go in, so I will vote for it.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

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

I will vote against it. Deputy Green said, 'What harm will it do?' Well, on that basis we could pass any number of amendments. You could concede hundreds of amendments to this Plan and say, 'Well, what harm will it do?'

425 There is a material difference between some of the amendments we have been considering and this one. What I am saying is, this one in terms of what harm will it do, this one goes a step too far for me, in that this really has nothing to do with policy.

430 Deputy Roffey makes a good point, because where this debate is going – and I suspect that future speakers are going to take it there further – is this debate is going to turn into whether we think the Civil Service is too big or whether we think the Civil Service is about the right size, or whether we want to demonstrate that we are very assertive and aggressive on behalf of the public in reining in Civil Service costs, or whether we are very liberal and complacent about it.

435 That is where this debate is going, but this amendment has absolutely nothing to do with that whatsoever. It is quite clear that the public sector in Guernsey is comparatively smaller than in comparable jurisdictions. It is also clear that the size and cost of the public sector is going to have to be reduced if public finances are going to be sustainable in the future. I do not think there is any dispute about that, so let us not have the debate turn into that sort of unhelpful binary choice.

440 I think Deputy Roffey made some interesting points about the UK, but I do not think the UK is reducing the size of its Civil Service and that is what this amendment is really about. I do not think it is particularly about health workers or teachers or other public sectors, it is about the established staff. What the UK is doing is busily subcontracting out or selling off large tranches of its public sector.

445 If you bring in dubious security companies to run your prisons and you shove all of the staff off the public sector pay bill, the figures look very impressive. Whether that is what we want to do, I doubt that Deputy Lowe wants to bring in a security company to run our prisons, I doubt that very many States' Members would. I doubt we want to go on selling off hospitals and other services. There are large parts of the education system in the UK where the staff are now completely unrelated to anything that happens in the public sector, so I think if that is the kind of image we have, then I do not support that.

450 The point is that the whole focus of this amendment is covered already, because we have words in this Plan, partly as a result of amendments passed yesterday. We have inserted, under the commentary about balancing the budget 'restraining public expenditure will require the prudent management of financial resources, people and physical infrastructure'.

455 That clearly covers many of the points that are being made about the need for prudent management of the public sector. It goes on:

The States also need to rethink the provision of some public services to ensure they can be delivered efficiently to a high standard but in ways that are financially sustainable as well,

– which must cover some of the points that Deputy Roffey was making. Deputy Green has already read out this bullet point which is in the Plan as drafted:

To achieve this we will provide leadership of the Transformation agenda and support the Public Service Reform agenda, in order to manage both short and long-term spending pressures.

460 Now, Deputy Dudley-Owen, when she laid her amendment, said that the need to manage the Civil Service prudently was not covered sufficiently in the Plan. Well, surely, the words that I have just read out, that we have already agreed, or are at least in the Plan as we are debating it at the moment, do cover the concerns which have been expressed in the laying of this amendment. I would like to know from Deputy Queripel when he speaks, and from Deputy Dudley-Owen when she replies, what do these words add which is missing from the Plan as drafted?

465 I want to repeat that I do not think this debate should turn into a sort of pro- or anti-Civil Service debate and I fear that it may degenerate in that way. I think all of us are of the opinion that the Civil Service, notwithstanding the statistics that Deputy Trott, accurately, has been able to convey to the States, needs to be managed in a very prudent way and, as far as possible, the size of the public sector needs to be restrained if public finances are going to be sustainable in the long-term. I cannot see that this bullet point adds anything to that task and ...

470 I will give way to Deputy Yerby.

**Deputy Yerby:** Sir.

475 Deputy Fallaize began by saying this objective had no place in the Plan and went on to say that it was okay because his words had just inserted this objective into the Plan. Which one is it? *(Laughter)*

**Deputy Fallaize:** My words have not inserted this objective into the Plan, because the original Plan on page eight says, 'as a priority, we want to balance the Budget during this political term, which will require the prudent management of our financial resources, people and physical infrastructure'. So all of the stuff which I read out is not the result of anything I have inserted, it is in the original Plan.

480 The point that Deputy Green made, which is the last point I want to make, I think is key. He made a very good speech against the amendment and then said he might vote for it, which was odd. A bit like Policy & Resources being neutrally opposed.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Green. Oh, he has sat down again. *(Laughter)*.

**Deputy Fallaize:** The bullet points as they read at the moment, under 'Sustainable Public Finances', are all about fiscal policy. They are not about the way in which we manage services.

490 I want to ensure there is prudent, efficient management of all public services, but we are not going to insert that in these bullet points. These bullet points are about fiscal policy. In phase two, the Policy & Resources Committee will have to come to the States and explain how they intend to provide leadership of the Transformation agenda and support Public Service Reform to manage short- and long-term spending pressures.

495 But I cannot see that this bullet point has any place in phase one of this Plan. I am not in any way saying that I oppose the spirit of the amendment, or the thinking behind it, but I just cannot see that it is appropriate.

Thank you, sir.

500

**The Bailiff:** Deputy de Lisle, and I know Deputy Kuttelwascher has been waiting a while. Actually, you have both been waiting a while.

**Deputy de Lisle:** Sir, I would like to just say that some may see an undertone here, particularly by staff, and somewhat demeaning, really of the Civil Service.

505 I would like the assurance that this is no way aimed in a derogatory way at the Civil Service. I have to, of course, raise the fact that I am a former civil servant and also a teacher and to say 'ensure competitive recruitment', are we saying that, in fact, recruitment is not competitive at the moment? Are we saying that it needs improvement?

510 Well, we have competitive recruitment currently. We go to great extent in interviews, just for example in education, to bring people over to make sure we have the best teachers in our schools. We do our best to retain quality and skilled professionals within our Civil Service and within our schools and so on, our nurses.

515 'Effective performance management' – are we saying we have not got effective performance management? We have annual reviews of staff. Each individual is reviewed annually. I just feel that we need some assurance here that we are not actually turning around and stating that we do not have competitive recruitment, we do not have means of retaining our best, the quality skilled professionals and that we do not have effective performance management.

In a way, this is demeaning, or can be seen that way by civil servants, and I think we need assurance that this is not aimed in that particular way.

520 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher, who has been very patient, then Deputy Laurie Queripel.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Sir, I have no plans to go anywhere yet! *(Laughter)*

525 What a start. The first thing that I do not like about this amendment is this word 'ensure'. To me, it is one of those hated words which, actually, means to direct that something happens. If you are going to ensure something is going to happen, you are going to make it happen.

530 My view is that you cannot make anything that is suggested in this amendment actually happen by any sort of direction. I would have much preferred if the word 'ensure' had been replaced by 'promote and facilitate', because that is all we can do.

535 You cannot ensure competitive recruitment. Deputy de Lisle mentioned one aspect of competitive recruitment. I think the bigger picture is competitive recruitment with relation to other jurisdictions. We pay substantially less for nurses here than they do in Jersey, so to be competitive you would have to pay substantially the pay for nurses. Maybe the same for teachers. But how do you ensure that? Well, you need an open cheque book, because you would increase costs substantially, sir. So, do you ensure this competitive recruitment at whatever cost? I do not think that would work.

540 How do you retain? You cannot ensure retention of skilled professionals. If they want to go, they will go. We do not have burning falls around Guernsey. You can have attractive work packages, but you cannot ensure people stay. They come and go all the time. Almost a pointless statement.

545 The other word that I find a problem is 'effective' performance management. We already have performance management all over the place, but when you use a word like 'effective', what is effective to one is ineffective to another, so it is such a contentious word, because it means different things to different people.

The other thing I do not like about this amendment, and it has been basically highlighted by Deputy Trott and Deputy Le Tocq, is this is putting more meat on the so-called bones, which is not meant to be happening at the present time. It was first highlighted yesterday by, it was Deputy Gollop, and I brought it up. It is the wrong time to bring this amendment.

550 I am sympathetic with what it is about, but this is not the way to do it. I have got a real problem; I am agreeing with Deputy Fallaize on this one. I will not support it, because I think, effectively, most of this work is already in train. This is far too prescriptive and it is not deliverable anyway, I do not think.



555 Northern Ireland, I have got to mention that. Deputy Trott loves mentioning Northern Ireland, it is not the first time, but he realises that Northern Ireland is part of the UK and the reason there are all these jobs in Northern Ireland is because of the very high rates of unemployment that were there and lots of Civil Service functions were migrated to Northern Ireland, and indeed to Wales. So it is not a fair description. Northern Ireland is part of the UK, so you look at the UK figures.

560 Although we are getting close to the UK figures, in spite of outsourcing various things, remember we do not have an army, we do not have an air force, we do not have a navy, we do not have an international array of embassies and everything else, so we would expect to be having a lower figure, by some substantial margin.

At the end of the day, I will not be supporting this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

565

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Laurie Queripel.

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

570 I think Deputy Fallaize read my notes when he was speaking, but he construed them slightly differently to me. I will come back to Deputy Fallaize a little bit later on.

In response to Deputy de Lisle, I have already got this in my notes, before I explain what I think this amendment is about, I want to explain what it is not about.

575 It is not an attack on the Civil Service, or those that work within that service, or public sector employees. The States is, by any measure, a large organisation. It offers a multitude of services, numerous operational tasks, carried out on a daily basis, and these need to be delivered, administered, managed, run by responsible people across the organisation. A great variety of skills and knowledge is required to do that.

580 I think we can all happily accept and acknowledge that, whenever inside this Chamber or outside the Chamber or in the media room. Speaking of the media, this is an important amendment. Despite a recent Nick Mann column in the *Press*, *Inside Politics*, questioning its value, it is important. The subjects that the amendment relates to, issues that it raises, are so fundamental that there needs to be an explicit reference to them in the Policy & Resource Plan and clear guidance given.

585 This amendment, aside from the direct reference to Proposition 3 and the bullet points that it refers to, strongly links in to so many of the statements and aims dotted throughout the policy letter and the green-coloured Future Guernsey document. Deputy Fallaize referred to those as well and I am going to do the same thing.

590 I do not expect Members to turn to the quotes I am going to raise, but in the green document, the Future Guernsey document, phase one, in the remarks made by Deputy St Pier, the President of the Policy & Resources Committee, on the second page of those remarks, he says:

The Programme for Government is complemented by Service Guernsey – the improvement in the quality and value of our public services through reform ...

On the page after that, it is actually numbered page four, it is the introduction page, in the second paragraph on that page, underneath, 'Why do we need a Policy and Resource Plan?', it tells us about the need to make sure that resources are put in the right place at the right time, to ensure maximum benefit.

595 Moving on a bit further in this document, I actually go to page eight, which is headed 'Sustainable Public Finances' and this of course is the bullet points that the amendment directly refers to.

At the top of that page, sir, the first paragraph says:

Sustainable finances are critical to both our economic success and our ability to provide public services in the long-term.

600 Then, sir, dropping down to the bullet points that are in bold print, and we are looking in particular at bullet points four and five. Bullet point four starts by saying, 'continue expenditure restraint', that is a clarion call. 'Continue expenditure restraint.' In bullet point five, 'Provide leadership of the Transformation agenda and support the Public Service Reform agenda in order to manage both short and long-term spending pressures.'

605 Pushing along to page 15, the last page of this document. The page is headed, 'What is the Link to Public Service Reform?' It is the last sentence of the top paragraph, the first paragraph, it says:

We cannot afford to stay the same. We need to change to meet these future challenges.

And in the second paragraph, last sentence again:

The States' Assembly has an important role in supporting and enabling the successful implementation of Public Service Reform.

610 Exactly. This Assembly needs to take responsibility. This Assembly needs to give direction and, along with the Policy & Resources Committee, provide political oversight and scrutiny. We need to ensure that particular things happen. This amendment is important; it needs to be approved.

Quickly moving to the actual policy letter, Policy and Resources Plan – Phase One, looking at paragraph 3.1. The start of that paragraph:

Sustainable public finances are critical to both Guernsey's economic success and the States' ability to provide public services in the long-term.

Over the page, sir. Paragraph 3.6.

Overcoming these challenges will require prudent management of our financial, human and physical resources. It will be necessary to rethink the way the States provide and pay for public services and to ensure that we can deliver the services the public need in an efficient and cost-effective way.

Then, in paragraph 3.8, this is the fifth bullet point:

Provide leadership of the Transformation agenda and support Public Service Reform in order to manage both short and long-term spending pressures.

615 There are a number of key words and phrases contained within those quotes. Many are repeated several times over: 'reform', 'sustainable', 'restraint', 'leadership', 'cost-effective', 'prudent management', 'value', 'quality and value' – the very things this amendment is seeking to make real in the context of public finances; quality, combined with affordability.

620 I spoke at the start, of the States being a big organisation and of the skills we need across the organisation. Of course, staff need to be remunerated accordingly and paid appropriately, but we cannot ignore the fact that the pay bill is the biggest single item of States' expenditure. Deputy Dudley-Owen said it is over 50% and she also relayed to us the figures, because the pay bill is currently approximately £217 million per annum.

625 I would just like to add some background to that, sir, just going back a little bit. I asked a number of questions during the last political term and the figures showed that between 2008 and 2013, pay costs had risen by £42 million, from £162 million to £204 million. In addition, there had been a 26% rise in the number of senior staff between 2012 and 2013; so, from 347 to 437. In addition to that, one in 10 staff received a salary of at least £70,000.

When I wrote to the Chief Minister in early 2016, my letter included this paragraph:

Ideally the situation would exist or be brought into being whereby competitive salaries are paid to ensure that suitably qualified and skilled staff are in place across the organisation, to make sure that the many functions of Government are carried out appropriately, while also exerting better control on pay costs. It will be imperative to achieve this without visiting hardship upon employees on low and modest incomes and in the best circumstances actually close the gap, to

some extent, between lower and higher paid staff. Reform in this area may result in positive and desirable outcomes. For example, the ability of the States to direct more funds towards frontline services such as health and education.

630 This is why I come back to Deputy Fallaize, sir, because interestingly, when I told him I was going to write that letter, he asked me to include his name in the letter because he shared the concerns that I did.

Sir, if we are going to have –

I will give way to Deputy Fallaize. I was looking for the delay factor! (*Laughter*)

635

**Deputy Fallaize:** I do share the same concerns as Deputy Queripel, but was he yesterday not criticising the laying off of 40 staff at Guernsey Electricity and saying if the public sector lays off staff, the greatest danger is they will be added to Supplementary Benefit costs?

640 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** I was saying that, sir, and Deputy St Pier assured me that that is the kind of thing that might have to happen if we are going to have a leading public sector.

I have not said anything about job losses at all. I am looking at restraint of salaries and what can be done in order to get public sector expenditure under control.

645 Deputy Fallaize, sir, I was not trying to catch him out. I know he remembers that he asked me to include his name in that letter and I know that he genuinely shares my concern. Indeed, I think he wrote part of it.

If we are going to have meaningful reform, where costs are constrained but services hopefully do not suffer, all the things contained within this amendment must be embraced and I am thinking back to a debate we had a few months ago and Deputy St Pier spoke about the modernising of terms and conditions of employment, and that is the kind of thing that has to be progressed and implemented, and hopefully this amendment will help to encourage that and speed that kind of thing along, sir.

650 So, I repeat, this is an important amendment. It can play its part in bringing about genuine, positive change, in helping to modernise the organisation and providing the taxpayer and the service user with greater value.

655 It can help to improve accountability, bring attention to detail and improve oversight and scrutiny. This is not a lightweight amendment; it is calling for some significant actions and I am very pleased that Deputy Dudley-Owen asked me to second it and I was very happy to do so.

660 Just thinking back to many of those quotes that I read from the green document, the Policy and Resource Plan, Future Guernsey, if everything was hunky dory, why are there so many key phrases, why are there so many key words that I highlighted in that document? Clearly, Policy & Resources feel that there is a need for reform, that there is a need to strive for greater efficiency, for greater effectiveness. That there is a need to strive for restraint in public expenditure.

665 Otherwise, all those quotes, all those words, would not be in that document. They would be empty words. All this amendment is doing is seeking to bring attention to those words and to bring them to life to ensure that those things are carried through.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Tindall, then Deputy Dorey.

670

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

675 Listening through the various speeches so far, I have had problems to understand quite where this fits. To start with, Deputy Fallaize refers to this amendment as nothing to do with policy, so I have looked up 'policy' and it is strategy and approach, an objective, aim, intention, purpose, and I think that fits.

Deputy Le Tocq then said if this was passed, what could we say in phase two? I think there is plenty to say in phase two: the actions of the Principal Committees, what they could do in this regard.

However, I note that phase two is described:

Phase one will then drive the States' principal Committees in phase two, their development of their own priorities and plans, 2017-2021.

680 Yet the mandate for P&R is the one that includes the role of the States as an employer. So if phase two is dealing with the Principal Committees, how can this affect what will be done as a States' employer?

Lastly, the Public Service Reform, I note, covers the years 2015-25, which clearly would cover that point and that period of time.

685 I am just trying to understand, sir, quite how phase one affects P&R's role in phase two.  
Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

690 **Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I will be supporting this amendment. Part of the debate seems to be focusing on the level of detail in the Plan. Well, the level of detail seems to vary quite a lot across the Plan. I could read from page 11, which is:

Facilitate the development of a thriving and vibrant harbour and Town seafront that people will want to use, visit and invest in by ensuring that local planning briefs are prepared for the harbour action areas.

695 That, to me, is extremely detailed and I think the argument which is being made that this is too detailed is not consistent with the Plan, because there is that and more detail within the Plan.

Staff costs are such a large percentage of expenditure, I think that we can actually make the case to have slightly more detail in the Plan, although there are areas which are in far more detail in this amendment.

700 The point was made that this is covered in the commentary, but then it is what is the role of the commentary and what is the role of the bullet points? I look, the bullet points are all preceded with the words, 'To achieve this we will ...' So, yes, it can be covered in the commentary, but I think it needs to be covered in the bullet points, because those are the action areas that are going to be taken forward.

705 I think it is important that, although it might be covered in the commentary, there is a bullet point which covers it.

710 The point Deputy Tindall has already mentioned about and which has been referred to is what do we say in phase two? Well, Deputy Dudley-Owen mentioned about Investors in People. That is something that could be in phase two, because that is certainly something that we, as a Government, should aim to get accreditation under. I do not know if it still is, but the Social Security Department definitely had accreditation and, seeing that Deputy Le Clerc is nodding that it still has that accreditation, that is what we should be aiming for, for the whole of the States.

I think there is plenty of detail to put at phase two, but I think it is not out of sync with the Plan, in terms of the level of detail and, as it is such a large piece of expenditure, I urge Members to support it.

715 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Yerby.

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

720 Deputy Dudley-Owen credited me a couple of times in her opening speech as giving my support to this amendment, so I thought perhaps I should just explain a little.

725 In the Budget debate a fortnight ago, a number of important strategic themes were raised by various Members of this Assembly, not all of which were then reflected in the Resolutions which were approved. Naturally, some of them went wider than the Budget, but I made a point of speaking to the various people who were leading the charge for different strategic things out of

the Budget debate and say, 'If this is something that the States ought to be serious about and committed to for the long-term, is it not perhaps something that we ought to reflect in our Policy and Resource Plan?'

730 That is how come I ended up laying a couple of amendments yesterday, to the fiscal framework. Those were not the battles that I came into this States to fight, but they were areas where the States had an obvious appetite to do more and where that needed to be swept up and captured in the next step of what we were doing. I believe that is what Deputy Dudley-Owen is doing here and Deputy Laurie Queripel is of the same nature.

735 But the conversation that we had at Budget time focused mostly on the cost of the Civil Service, and rightly so because, as has been pointed out, it is a significant part of our Budget. But there are more questions than just that. We do also need to talk about quality and the competitiveness of our recruitment.

I know from my time on the Committee for Health & Social Care what a challenge recruitment and retention is for us and that is something that the Government needs to focus attention to.

740 For Members who have said that this objective is more detailed than those others that are included under the 'Sustainable Public Finances' section, I would also point out that there is an objective in there to ensure that the States' commercial and semi-commercial entities and other States' assets, are maximised, making an appropriate return to the States and protecting their income consumers.

745 If we are able to talk at this level about getting the most out of our commercial assets, why are we not able to talk about getting the best out of our human resources? They are the most valuable thing we have got.

I will be supporting this amendment and I would ask other Members to do so.

750 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** I will not be supporting, because it is totally unnecessary. We should not be voting for things that are totally unnecessary.

755 If the States, as an employer, without any wording in any of these documents, cannot have due regard to normal employer/employee principles then it is a poor employer. This actually could be seen, if you read it in its normal sense, which is the way that you would have to do it if it was ever construed, could actually mean you pay more for people. Because it says 'ensure competitive recruitment'.

760 Now, that might mean, as Deputy Kuttelwascher says, paying another 50% for your nurses. It might mean that you need a chief executive of a certain department and you pay him or her another £50,000 than the pay scales would otherwise authorise, because that is competitive and you would have to do it, because it says you 'ensure' and that word is meant to have significance.

765 I am not sure why we need it because if, for example, looking at these documents, under appendix 2 Fiscal Policy Framework Update, there is a heading on page six which says, 'A Clearly Defined Public Sector and Commitment to Limiting Public Sector Growth,' well, £240 million, £250 million of the £400 million the States spends every year is on employment. You cannot just limit the cost of buying the Anadin that you need, or the biro that you need, or the computers that need. Your biggest control is going to have to be in relation to pay and employees.

770 Should we really be, as a States ... and lots of people said, 'You can find the wording here, you can find the wording there, you can find the wording everywhere', that is not really true, but why are we wasting an hour of time now debating something that is completely unnecessary, but we are obliged to do it anyway?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

775

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you sir, I will be brief, in the spirit of Deputy Ferbrache's latest comments.

780 I will be supporting this amendment, because I think it highlights a number of things that we should be doing, but we are probably not. In terms of competitiveness, I appreciate there are concerns about: does this mean we are going to have to pay people far more money? I would like to remind the Assembly that competitiveness is not always about money. One of the most valuable things when we are talking about recruitment is the conditions of work, for example. I do not think this amendment needs to be read in those restrained terms.

785 My final comment: I think most of the things that I would have raised have already been said, but there is one final comment in that if this amendment leads to greater confidence in things such as effective performance management and pay, I will be delighted. I think that is a really critical thing, because I have noticed, something that I find personally very distasteful, which is an appetite, sometimes, from political Members to pound or pursue named civil servants who do not have the right of reply; and I think if we can put more faith in our processes that we do not need to do this any more, I will be delighted because I do not think that that is acceptable.

**Several Members:** Hear, hear.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

795

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

I, too, will be brief. Deputy Green said that there are concerns in the community, there are concerns about the pay bill. There always will be concerns. If I took a referendum to the community – and I am not going to, for the record – to reduce the public sector by 30%, for example, I think that would have quite some public support out there. After all, the diet that has been fed to our constituents via the *Press*, is that we have a number of people on gold-plated pensions. They tend to refer to civil servants, actually, rather than public sector, but there is a context to discussions on civil servants that is unfortunately, as Deputy de Sausmarez has alluded to, quite biased.

805 When I first joined the Roffey board of HSSD, one of the first things that happened was a review of the senior management team and that senior management team was reduced significantly which, actually, created problems very quickly with regard to the joined, collective roles that people had. They had one oversight role; they then had oversight of a number of different areas.

810 Thereon in, that management team was reduced and reduced, and I remember the Budget debates in this Assembly, which is how many corridors of bean counters do you need within HSSD to deliver the services you have got? There was absolute, excruciating pressure to reduce the numbers further. HSSD reduced the numbers further and then we know what happened: governance issues arose and then the report on governance said, 'How on earth do you manage this service with such a small management team?'

815 Now, there are other ways, creative ways, to reduce Government expenditure that relates to the public sector. If you call a *pompier* or a *sapeur* in France, it is a fireman who is a paramedic. If all our firemen became paramedics, we could then, with the help of St John, scale back on what we pay St John to say, actually, firemen are paramedics, so if you make that 999 call, you may not get an ambulance or a paramedic, you will get a fireman who has more than one role.

820 The question to be asked right here and now is - do Health & Social Care have the depth of senior management that they would like, or rather the tier below that? Do they have that now? They probably do not. I do not know. I could ask the same of the Home Affairs Department. Are they happy with the level of management they have got? Could they recruit, necessarily, from the next tier below? I do not know. I suspect they would be unable to do that for a number of different reasons.

The context for public sector pay is generally, with a public perception, as Deputy Trott said, that we are almost over-burdened and that we are bloated by the number of public sector employees that we have and, clearly, we do not have. The best example, before I sit down, is

830 probably nursing, where we are looking to, arguably, performance manage vacancy factors. We pay £4 million to cover posts that we cannot recruit to.

So I just want other Members to be aware when we discuss this that, while there is a public mood for restraint and managing pay, which is absolutely right, we should not forget the number of vacancy factors we have and the costs that we are paying now and, for anyone employed in those services at this time, they really are doing all they can, at times, to keep their head above the water, and discussions on their pay and performance may be misinterpreted and not particularly well-received.

Thank you, sir.

840 **The Bailiff:** Does anyone else want to speak on this debate? No, Deputy St Pier, then, will speak, to be followed by Deputy Dudley-Owen.

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

845 The position of the Policy & Resources Committee was described by Deputy Trott as being neutral and Deputy Le Tocq spoke to that as well, and I think it was Deputy Fallaize who described it as neutral opposition, so perhaps I should seek to explain in different words what our position is.

That is, in essence, that we are ambivalent. We can see both sides of this argument and, I think, actually, Deputy Roffey captured it quite well when he described what P&R's position is.

850 Just in relation to Deputy Roffey's comments, I would say, of course, the States have considered the three of the 3-5-5 of the Budget debate a couple of weeks ago, but not the five and the five, that is quite correct.

855 Deputy Fallaize was going to oppose this because of the level of detail, and Deputy Ferbrache because he believes we do not need it. That exactly was our consideration when we were looking at this. We saw both of those arguments for that reason. In other words, we feel that this is a level of detail which is not necessarily appropriate here. However, Deputy Dorey has quite rightly identified that there is some inconsistency in the document in terms of the level of detail. We acknowledge that, so that is a reason why actually this may be a reasonable amendment.

860 Just to address Deputy Tindall's point about the reference to the Principal Committees, of course that reference in the sentence she picked up was from my introduction, in essence, to the document. To be clear, what will come back will be presented by Policy & Resources, as indeed is this document and, of course, it will be Policy & Resources co-ordinating and collating the input from Principal Committees; but also, of course, Policy & Resources will need to input itself in relation to areas of its own mandate, including as employer, as Deputy Tindall referred to. So hopefully that addresses her concern in relation to that particular point.

So I think, in summary, when I say Policy & Resources is ambivalent, we are neutral, that is what we mean. Therefore, we will not be voting on this.

870 As far as we are concerned, this is a matter for the Assembly to decide. As Deputy de Sausmarez said, if passing this amendment gives the Assembly increased confidence in the work which is already going on in this area, which is part of Public Service Reform, which is why it is difficult to object strongly to it, if they agree with Deputy Laurie Queripel that this amendment helps provide political support to the Transformation agenda, then they will support the amendment. If they agree with Deputies Ferbrache and Fallaize, they will oppose it.

875 It is a matter for the Assembly; it is not something that we felt was worth dying in the ditches over. That is the reason for our neutrality or ambivalence. It is a matter for the Assembly and we will leave you to decide.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dudley-Owen.

880 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you, sir.

It is rather difficult to do a summing up, really. Deputy St Pier has said very well either side you are going to take on this amendment. I hope more people side with myself and Deputy Queripel.

885 I would suggest that maybe those that think there is no need for it are at a level where they have not experienced direct line management for quite some time and that those people who are line-managed, which is the most people within the Civil Service –

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

890 I am opposed to it and I experience, as an employer of over 100 people, direct line management, whatever that means, every single day.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** You experience it by being the line manager. Excuse me, Deputy Ferbrache experiences by being the line manager, not being line-managed. As part of a large workforce and to retain and attract that large workforce, it is not only the financial benefits that you are looking for in being attracted into that workforce, and this is a lot of the thrust of this amendment, this should not be seen in any way, shape or form as a negative or criticism of the Civil Service.

895 This is a hook on which to hang the Civil Service Reform Bill, reform agenda, and it is in support of the civil servants who really, in the main, dedicate a huge amount of time, energy and creativity to their jobs, for which I really commend them.

900 Deputy Trott considers it too detailed, as do other people. I do not agree; there is a level of inconsistency throughout the Plan. There is detail in some areas, there is not in others, so I just cannot agree with it, I am afraid. P&R have placed a real emphasis on reform, so I cannot understand why P&R would not support this amendment.

905 Deputy Gollop has talked about a possible lack of productivity within certain areas of the Civil Service. This matter could only be addressed by a proper performance management system being put in place.

910 Deputy Le Tocq supports the spirit of the amendments, but not in phase one. Again, I think that we have looked at that and there is no talk of methods or mechanisms within the amendment, so I cannot quite see why this is not a high-level statement and it should not be included.

915 He also was looking at recruitment back into the Island and ensuring that people locally were attracted to the Civil Service. Myself and Deputy Merrett are running the refreshed Skills Guernsey and, obviously, our remit there is to look at strategy and look at the skills gap in Guernsey and provide courses and training for people locally to ensure that they have the requisite experience and skills to offer local employers.

Deputy Green, well, I think I have covered that to a degree. It is rather confusing to pull all these different comments together!

Thank you, Deputy Roffey, for your support; and Deputy Fallaize, well, I think quite a few other people have addressed your concerns, in terms of the level of detail.

920 Deputy de Lisle, I think I have covered your point. This should not be seen as a derogatory amendment at all. As I said, Deputy Queripel has backed me up there in stating emphatically that this is not so. It should be seen as a positive thing.

925 Also, one thing that you were talking about was annual reviews and performance management. I think that maybe these days, looking at modern appraisal systems are quite different. Annual reviews are not enough, I am afraid. You need to be constantly looking at what staff are doing. You need to reassure; you need to be supporting them. Certainly, modern appraisal systems look at outcomes and the value that staff feel that they are providing to their roles. You just cannot look at that and address that at the end of one year.

930 Deputy Tindall, thank you for your support, as well as Deputy Dorey and Deputy Yerby, of course, and Deputy de Sausmarez.

I am sorry that Deputy Ferbrache feels that this is a complete waste of time and it should not be explicitly stated, because actually this is what we should be doing already. Well, there are a



935 whole load of things that we are talking about in the future plan that we are actually doing already and we are just affirming them, I feel, within this Plan. The fact that we should be doing it and we have to state that we are doing it actually means we are really committed to it.

I want as much support for this, because it sends a message out to the public that we are really committed to Civil Service reform.

Thank you very much.

940 **The Bailiff:** Before we go to the vote, Deputy Lester Queripel, do you wish to be relevé?

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, please.

945 **The Bailiff:** Right, you are relevé. We vote, then, on amendment 13.

**Deputy Inder:** Sir, can we have a recorded vote, please?

**The Bailiff:** We will have a recorded vote.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 20, Contre 14, Ne vote pas 3, Absent 3*

**POUR**

Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Tindall  
Deputy Tooley  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy Merrett  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Hansmann  
Rouxel  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Yerby

**CONTRE**

Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Mooney  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Smithies  
Deputy Graham  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy De Lisle  
Deputy Langlois

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Trott  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Stephens

**ABSENT**

Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. McKinley  
Deputy Parkinson

950 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, Members, the voting on amendment 13 was 20 in favour, with 14 against and three abstentions. I declare it carried.

We move on now to amendment 2, to be proposed by Deputy Yerby and seconded by Deputy Soulsby.

*Amendment 2.*

*The States are asked:*

*To insert at the end of the words in Proposition 3:*

*‘, but subject to the addition to the eight bullet points under the part of Appendix 1 entitled “Inclusive and equal community” on page 12 of the following two bullet points:*

*“Recognise the value of the early years, partnering with families and communities to ensure every child has a nurturing and supportive start in life.*

*'Deliver on our responsibilities as Corporate Parent for all children in statutory care, including young care leavers'.*

955 **Deputy Yerby:** Sir, the amendment, is:

*Deputy Yerby read out the amendment.*

Sir, the aim of this amendment is simple. No plan for the future of Guernsey is complete without referring to our most important asset and investment for the future – our children.

960 The whole spirit of the Plan reflects a commitment to the children of this Island and a desire to build them a future worth aspiring to. This amendment simply puts it there in black and white, so that we never overlook our children in policy making, so that we do not leave any of our children behind.

965 I am grateful for the support of the whole Committee for Health & Social Care in laying this amendment and for the endorsement from Deputy Jane Stephens, who chairs our Children's Executive, leaving the States in and holding us accountable for the delivery of the Children & Young People's Plan.

970 I will not tire Members with a long discussion of this amendment. I just wanted to add a couple of points which I think are important. The first bullet point talks about the early years of a child's life. This is commonly understood as the period from before birth until about five years old. The stage is set, at this age, for the rest of the person's life.

975 That does not mean it is too late to reduce disadvantage, or to improve wellbeing or confidence, or to build a love of learning after this time and the healthy communities amendment laid by Deputy Soulsby yesterday underlines the importance of acting early to prevent or mitigate problems, whatever age they appear. But a good start is important.

980 If we work to give all our children a good start in life, we are laying the foundation for a community of competent, ambitious, resilient and generous citizens. The kind who will make Guernsey great today and better tomorrow. But is this Government's responsibility? Well, yes and no. The wording of this amendment is carefully chosen. It is not about what, just, the States will do for children and young people, but what the States will do, in partnership with families and communities, for the next generation.

985 The family is the natural and fundamental unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the States. It says so in every international convention we accept or aspire to. We do not talk enough about the family and its role, when we are making policy, we tend to focus more either on individuals or on society as a whole. That, I think, is something we would benefit from changing.

990 Families matter. We build our future on the strength of them. It is families who have the primary responsibility for raising children into phenomenal young adults, as so many of our young people are. The States could help to create the conditions to do it well but families and the whole non-formal unofficial network of friends, neighbours, faith and community groups, voluntary and professional providers of activities and services and learning and care are right at the heart of this and Government is often, rightly, a distant second. We make it possible; we do not get in the way.

995 However, there are times when families just cannot provide the nurturing, supportive environment that every child and teenager needs. Sometimes, the best possible option for a child is to be brought into statutory care. When that happens, we as a Government have a very specific responsibility to that child. We become what is known as a corporate parent.

1000 We cannot escape that responsibility; it is legally ours under the 2008 Children Law. That Law enshrines the principle that any child in the care of the States is entitled to similar levels of care, protection, guidance and control as would be expected from any reasonable parents. The Children & Young People's Plan briefly reminded us of our duty in this respect. At the same time, it outlined the difficulties that many young people in our care have lived through. Family backgrounds often marked by some combination of domestic abuse, mental ill-health and

substance misuse, personal brushes with the youth justice system, a profound disengagement with education and a struggle to achieve the basic qualifications they will need to access opportunities later in life.

1005 It is our parental responsibility to try to turn the tide on all of that. It is also our responsibility not to drop our children as soon as they turn 18 – just as any parent would continue to be there for their children as young adults who are still finding their way in the world. That is why the second bullet point highlights our special duty, not only to children in care, but also to care-leavers.

1010 This responsibility belongs to all States' Committees and especially, perhaps, the Committees for Health & Social Care, for Education, Sport & Culture, for Home Affairs and, as our children become young adults and need the keys to decent housing, financial security and employment opportunities, the Committee for Employment & Social Security.

1015 It is a responsibility which we all need to understand better and prioritise more. Deputy Tooley and I have both been pushing for an introduction to corporate parenting for States' Members since we were first elected and we understand that will be soon coming. The Children's Executive, set up by P&R, which brings together all the Committees with a major role in this area, except, I believe, DESS, which may need to change, will help to ensure more co-ordinated working between public services to the benefit of all children and especially those in our care.

1020 An unambiguous commitment to the next generation has already been made through the States' endorsement of the Children & Young People's Plan earlier this year. That Plan reminded us that it takes an Island to raise a child. This amendment hardwires that commitment to all our Island children, into the heart of the Policy and Resource Plan.

I ask all Members to support it.

1025

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby, do you second the amendment?

**Deputy Soulsby:** I do, sir.

1030 **The Bailiff:** Does anybody wish to speak on behalf of the Committee at this stage? Deputy Le Tocq.

1035 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Sir, the Committee is supportive of this, but I was going to speak quite personally as well in terms of as a personal experience. The state was responsible for looking after me for the first 11 days of my life back in 1964, for which I am very grateful. Also for finding a family to eventually become my adoptive parents.

1040 However, sadly, today, I think I would have had to fight against the state to actually see the light of day. Putting that to one side, I think our focus upon early years and early intervention is vitally important if we are to improve at all upon some of the situations that we talk about much later in life.

So this responsibility that we have largely worked out, obviously through the mandate of the Committee for Health & Social Care, is of vital importance for us as a community, as Deputy Yerby said, in ensuring that everyone in Guernsey takes responsibility for our children in giving them the best start in life.

1045 This is the right place for this sort of amendment and I, certainly for one, welcome it.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Clerc.

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

1050 I will support this amendment. I think it is really important for us to remind ourselves what a corporate parent is, to enable us to deliver on our responsibilities and what is meant by children in statutory care.

1055 The States as a whole, as Deputy Yerby has already advised, are corporate parents. Therefore, all States' Members have a level of responsibility for the children in our care. This requires there to be mechanisms for all Deputies to receive accurate information and be able to find out about the issues faced by such children on our Island.

1060 That includes not just the children taken into our care, but also just as important, those who remain with their families who are under a care order. We will need to receive regular feedback from the CYPP but, in addition, our role and responsibility needs to be clear from the start of any new States' term and corporate parenting and the principle of what is good enough parenting must be understood by us all and therefore must be part of a future induction programme.

I am pleased to hear from Deputy Yerby that training sessions are going to be forthcoming in the near future for us and I will support this amendment.

1065 **The Bailiff:** No one else? Deputy Dudley-Owen.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Sir, this to me is probably one of the most important of the amendments that we have seen in the States in the last day or so and, if it is successfully supported, it will become one of the most important statements of the Plan.

1070 The value of early years partnering with families and community to ensure that every child has a nurturing and supportive start in life creates the bedrock on which our Island is built. The far-reaching and positive consequences of a stable and caring family life into which a baby is born are well-researched and documented, and to provide such a life to their children is for many a natural response to parenthood.

1075 The impact of placing value on ensuring that every child in Guernsey is nurtured and supported touches all aspects of our community. Increased levels of social wellbeing and happiness, better educational outcomes, leading to an increased level in skills and innovation in our workforce and, therefore, potentially more vibrant workforce. Strident moves are already being made in early years support and are being supported and delivered by States' Committees such as ESC, HSC and ESS. Apologies for the acronyms.

1080 A few weeks ago, I was at a meeting with the commissioners from the Guernsey Financial Services Commission and I was asked – I was rather put on the spot – what I felt was an important factor for the future of our economy. Without hesitation, I spoke about the long-term impact and positive impacts of the 1001 Days agenda, which is being led by Rachel Copeland of ECOF and Dr Adrian Datta.

In addition to this, the complex matrix of work being undertaken by our health visitors to support all parents and families with young children.

1090 Ten years ago, if I had said this sort of thing at a finance meeting I might have been quietly ushered out and not invited back. However, everyone around that table understood the importance of the support programme I was describing and the value of the hard work being undertaken and its impact on society and, in turn, the economy of the future.

1095 I mentioned earlier that many provide a stable and caring environment for their children as a natural response. However, not every parent is the same and there are many reasons why stability in care are not given or cannot be given to offspring. We are not here to judge, we are here to help and give support by programmes, such as at early years, which offer targeted support at various levels, depending on need. You never know who might need the support and when they might need it.

1100 So it is with this in mind that the value of early years in partnering with parents can be so effective to help reduce the risk of problems in later life. If we can make available vital programmes, such as an Australian model called MECSH, which is Maternal Early Childhood Sustained Home-visiting programme, we can go further in delivering discernible outcomes. Any investment in this that we make can help create happy lives and also public savings in the long-term. This amendment will add weight to the requirement for such programmes.

1105 By including this amendment in the Future Guernsey plan, we will display our enthusiasm and sincerity to support these important interventions. By putting money into these programmes, we will be following through and doing something positive about the many problems which families and young children face in our community, so I hope Members will join me in supporting this amendment.

1110 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

**Deputy Inder:** Sir, just very briefly.

1115 I had a similar early life experience to Deputy Le Tocq, just slightly perturbed that he was grabbed in 11 days and it took me three months, but I was not entered for a bonny baby competition thereafter either, so it may explain something!

Early years support of the innocent should be central to this Plan and I will be supporting this amendment, sir, thank you.

1120 **The Bailiff:** Anyone else?  
Deputy de Lisle.

**Deputy de Lisle:** I will be supporting the amendment, sir.

1125 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

**Deputy Brehaut:** Just very quickly, just an opportunity to raise the issue of fostering, whether it is short-term or long-term foster care and ultimately adoption.

1130 I will say this. The 'corporate parent' does feel a bit Orwellian, sometimes, when you think about it. I was on the Fostering and Adoption Panel. The States, quite rightly, have the corporate responsibility for the child, the child may be fostered short-term, long-term and it is the, for want of a better word, interface with foster parents and the state, sometimes, that actually can be a barrier for different reasons.

1135 I will say something that may be controversial, I am afraid. I think sometimes parents do such things that they no longer should have any parental oversight. I know that is contentious within social services, but the more we can do to encourage fostering, long-term, short-term and ultimately adoption – the more we can do with that, the better.

Thank you.

1140 **The Bailiff:** I see no one else. Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** Very little to add, sir, other than to note, in particular, Deputy Yerby's comments when she laid this. The emphasis on the partnering, the focus not entirely being on the States. I think that, in particular, was an issue which Policy & Resources discussed when considering this amendment, particularly with Deputy Brouard's concerns around the importance of strengthening and partnering with families.

The Committee will be supporting this amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Yerby.

1150 **Deputy Yerby:** Thank you, sir, I will be very brief.

Thanks to everyone who has spoken in support of this. I just wanted to respond to a point that Deputy Le Clerc made, because she is so right. Parenting children who have had difficult lives is no easy task. This is not meant as a feel-good amendment. We must take it seriously, keep it on our agenda and really follow it through.

1155 Let us all work together to do that.

**The Bailiff:** We vote then on the amendment proposed by Deputy Yerby, seconded by Deputy Soulsby. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

**The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.

Now, amendment 6, proposed by Deputy Yerby, seconded by Deputy de Sausmarez.

1160 Deputy Yerby.

*Amendment 6.*

*The States are asked:*

*To insert at the end of the words in Proposition 3:*

*’, but subject to the addition to the six bullet points under the part of Appendix 1 entitled “Centre of excellence and innovation” on page 13 of the following two bullet points:*

*“Promote innovation within the public sector and its partners, and in pursuit of the realisation of government policies and strategies.*

*Promote the pursuit of skills in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, providing opportunities for young men and women to gain the strong technical skills that underpin a creative, innovative society”.’*

**Deputy Yerby:** Sir, the amendment is:

*Deputy Yerby read out the amendment.*

Sorry to bore you all with my voice again. I hope the first part of this amendment is not contentious. Through the Public Service Reform agenda and the commitment to transform the services across most of our Principal Committees, we have already embraced the need to think differently, to be creative and innovative in the way we deliver public services and the way we work with partners outside the States. This just codifies that in the Plan.

1165

The second part needs a little bit more explanation. I think it is brilliant that one of the top aims in the Plan is to be a centre of excellence and innovation but, my word, is it a tough aim? Yesterday, Deputy Tindall quite rightly talked about times when Guernsey has been at the cutting edge of new developments, I believe she cited intellectual property, as an example.

1170

We are good at finding niches and developing great products and services within them, but this section of the Plan does not talk about being on the cutting edge of new developments. One can stay on the cutting edge for a long time by riding the crest of someone else’s wave. No, this section of the Plan talks about us being a centre of excellence and innovation. That means we are going to have to make our own waves.

1175

Almost every major economy around the world has a strategic commitment to innovation. The UK’s 2014 innovation strategy was simply titled Our Plan for Growth. That said it all. At the heart of each innovation strategy is a recognition of the vital importance of skills in science and technology.

1180

The OECD’s research on innovation found that, and I quote:

There is a strong circular and cumulative interaction between knowledge, skills and innovation. Reflecting that, an increase in the supply of skills can generate change, with more technologies being invented and faster upgrading of the productivity of skilled workers. We are reminded that human capital is the essence of innovation and, while innovation goes beyond science and technology, those disciplines have a fundamental role in enabling radical innovation.

So how do we become a centre of excellence and innovation? Well, if we can learn anything from other jurisdictions, it is that a real commitment to core skills in the circle STEM subjects, that is science, technology, engineering and maths, is an essential part of the solution. The joy of

1185 innovation and the trouble with it, too, is that it is about doing things that people have not thought about before. About creative new ways of working, about imagination and invention.

The whole point is that we do not know where it is going to take us. So if we want to build a society that is truly innovative what we need are some building blocks and valuing and promoting interest in science, technology, maths and engineering will certainly give us some pretty strong building blocks. They will help us create the platform for the next new thing. The thing we cannot see coming at us yet.

1190 Every aspect of education is important. I am not in any way attempting to under-value other areas of learning by shining a spotlight on science, technology, engineering and maths. I am just doing exactly that, shining a spotlight.

1195 Every government which aspires to dynamic growth, to enterprise, to innovation, has some kind of policy objective which targets STEM, which focuses on building interest and skills and knowledge in those subject areas. We do not and I am not sure that we ever have done. But if we are now going to make innovation one of the centre pieces of our strategies for the next 20 years, we must.

1200 I would also say, as an aside, the governments which are ambitious for STEM tend to be governments which are ambitious for the quality of their education system as a whole.

1205 Whatever the outcome of the selection debate, in three weeks' time we are going to have to put all of that behind us and all of us, on both sides of the debate, will have to pull together with a common purpose of delivering an education system, whether inclusive or selective, which offers the quality and opportunity which all our children deserve. Being ambitious with STEM within that system seems like a good place to start.

1210 From what I have heard before the debate, States' Members generally agree that this is an area in which we should do more. However, the area I seemed to have messed up is in drafting an objective which targets 'young men and women' – to address men and women first. Most countries report a considerable gender imbalance in pursuit of science, technology, engineering, mathematics and related subjects. Especially at higher levels and on into employment. There is no reason to believe Guernsey is any different.

1215 The amendment could just have said 'people', I suppose, and that would have been fine, but I did want to spell it out in a way that gives equal weight to the participation of both men and women to make it clear that both girls and boys can become great scientists, mathematicians, technicians, engineers, inventors and teachers and makers of all kinds. I do not think anyone here would disagree.

1220 But why 'young men and women'? In all honesty, because I was thinking about it through an educational frame. Valuing the STEM subjects starts in school, in further education, in university. It starts young. That does not mean it stops later on. That does not mean that people should not seek second careers in science, technology, engineering or maths, or that they should not have the opportunity to provide it to do so.

1225 But it starts young. I do not know what her views on this amendment are and I do not presume to guess at them, but I hope that Deputy Dudley-Owen might take this opportunity to introduce some insight from the recent convention event she attended and the awesome contribution which young adults made to it.

To put this in some context. Before the debate, a friend outside the States said to me, 'Why does your children amendment just focus on the early years? Why doesn't it focus on providing assistance to children and teenagers and their families at any age?'

1230 My answer to that was, amongst other things, the early years are important. They are a particularly important policy objective, A pretty powerful place to focus if you want to achieve positive change.

But, in saying that the early years are important, I am not saying that every other year is not important. I am just focusing attention.

1235 The Plan also now contains Deputy Soulsby's amendment on healthy communities, which recognises the importance of prevention or early intervention whenever problems emerge, for people of all ages and in all walks of life.

The two amendments are complementary and, combined, reflect a general need for early help and a special focus on the early years. Similarly, one of the primary themes of this Plan is lifelong learning. The whole spirit of this Plan is about learning and opportunity at all ages and for people of all genders.

1240 This amendment nestles within that spirit. I hope, through this, to shine a spotlight on STEM and on the importance of engaging young people especially, but it is just that: a specific highlight in the broader context of a commitment to lifelong learning. Given that, as Deputy Dorey pointed out earlier, in this Plan we also have an objective to facilitate a vibrant and thriving Town through planning briefs to the harbour action areas, an ambition which is certainly valid but very specific, it does make it rather hard to critique other amendments on the grounds of being overly precise.

1245 Nevertheless, if the reference to young men and women is the only objection which Members have to this amendment, I would invite them to make that known during debate. After all, if the Assembly considers it wise, if it is permitted and if the Committee are willing to do so, perhaps a P&R-led amendment, in the same way as that placed to Deputy Brehaut's amendment 7, might be able to resolve the issue of wording.

Certainly, I would prefer that to losing the commitment to STEM altogether. But I also sincerely do not believe that a reference to 'young men and women' is exclusionary. It is simply focused.

1255 The final question, of course, is what does this amendment mean for the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, or for the Committee for Economic Development, which seem like the Committees which might have the closest interest in it? What does it mean for the Guernsey University Working Party and whichever Committee oversees that – P&R, I think?

1260 Well, it simply means the same as any other effect in this Plan. That it is an area which the States will expect to be considered when the phase two plans are being developed. It is not prescriptive. That would be rather ironic, given what I have just said about innovation, imagination and unpredictability.

It does not demand a certain course of action. The time for working that out is in phase two. It simply focuses the mind.

1265 I hope that Members will recognise and support this amendment for what it is. A good base to start from. A commitment to the building blocks of innovation, skills, learning and knowledge. We want to be competitive, globally. We want to be a centre of excellence and innovation. We want a diversified economy with a focus on high value, low footprint businesses. A strong foundation in science, technology, engineering and maths will help us to achieve this.

I would encourage Members to support the amendment.

1270 **The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez, do you second the amendment?

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** I do, sir, and reserve my remarks.

Thank you.

1275 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott, to speak on behalf of the Committee.

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

1280 I think Deputy Yerby covered the concerns that P&R have had. Complete support for the first bullet point, a somewhat neutral position with regard to the second. Primarily because we felt that it was unnecessary to be in any way sexist or to suggest that this Assembly would be, in any way, sexist or, for that matter, ageist.

In any event, 'young' is a relative term. By way of example, Deputy Ferbrache might consider Deputy Graham as a young man, relatively speaking.

1285 Thank you, sir.



**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

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

1290 Deputy Yerby made a good speech, another very good speech, in proposing her amendment, but I do have slight concern about the second bullet point and I suppose I speak on behalf of all those people who were more interested in what the Americans call liberal arts subjects or the humanities and who were, and still are, absolutely useless at the things that Deputy Yerby calls STEM subjects.

1295 It does concern me a little bit that the Plan, if this amendment is approved, will emphasise skills in certain areas of education, certain areas of the curriculum, and not in other areas. Deputy Yerby pre-empted my concern about this, which may have been because we had a conversation about it last week. I accept the point that she makes that there needs to be focus and investment in STEM subjects, but I really am concerned that, by being so explicit in the Policy and Resource Plan, and mentioning science, technology, engineering and mathematics in this way, that by  
1300 implication we are placing less emphasis on all the other areas of education and I do not want to do that.

I do not want to place more emphasis on one area than on the other areas. Not to labour this point about detail, because that is not really quite the right word, but I do wonder quite how the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, in particular, will report to the States next summer and with action plans to explain how they are going to promote the pursuit of skills in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. I am not saying it is a zero-sum game between those  
1305 subjects and other subjects, but I am uncomfortable about the idea of the Plan emphasising some areas of the curriculum and not other areas, because I think by implication it does mean the other areas are of a slightly lower priority.

1310 Deputy Yerby is going to have to convince me about that if I am going to support this amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Smithies.

1315 **Deputy Smithies:** Thank you, sir.

The first question I ever asked in this Chamber was prefaced by an observation, for which I am grateful for your indulgence, sir. I should not have done it.

1320 The observation was that, after a lifetime career in industry, my experience has shown me that true wealth creation, as opposed to wealth management, is based on making things. The three-legged stool of classical economics, which is founded on land, labour and capital, is further strengthened by enterprise or entrepreneurship.

1325 The entrepreneurs of the future, in manufacturing, will be largely drawn from those individuals who have had their skills in STEM subjects nurtured. I will support this amendment, as it is forward-looking, positive and, above all, sensible.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dudley-Owen.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you.

1330 It does fall to me, I think, to respond to Deputy Yerby, because sitting on the Committee for Economic Development and the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, as well as being the political lead for digital, it seems I am an appropriate person to very much be behind this amendment and support it.

1335 The recent Convention 2016 event, which Deputy Yerby mentioned earlier, was a great success and real proof that there is more than a little appetite for the technological skills within the Island. We have got people moving over to the Island to set up digitally based businesses. We have got entrepreneurs and innovators locally based, who are setting up new digitally based businesses as well.

1340 Encouraging our young people to look to technology specifically, which covers every single sector; technology is useful in creative arts, technology is useful in accounting, in legal practices, in finance. It crosses every single sector, so we cannot under-estimate its impact going forward. Certainly, as I mentioned before, myself and Deputy Merrett, with our remit for Skills Guernsey, will be looking at where the skills gap is for those particular areas.

1345 I can just lend my support to this and say that it is something that is desperately needed. Actually, as an addition, Digital Guernsey, which is going to hopefully replace our FDOG Committee, once we have got it all in front of the Committee for Economic Development, is going to be looking at education as one of its first areas to deliver on in the next two years.

So thank you very much for bringing this amendment.

1350 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Graham, then Deputy Kuttelwascher.

**Deputy Graham:** I am going to support this amendment. I only rise really to make two points, which have arisen in the course of response to Deputy Yerby's excellent introduction.

1355 One has been made by Deputy Fallaize, in relation to the possible inference that we might draw in terms of the relative importance of STEM subjects and the softer humanities, if I can call them that. I do not draw quite the negative inference that he does. The implication that I think Deputy Yerby is making, certainly the inference that I draw from it, is more that perhaps we are doing better in the humanities and softer subjects than we are in the STEM subjects. That is certainly my view and certainly, from my experience of regular visits to the College of Further Education, my experience has been to come across a lot of our youngsters who, at the age of 17, are just starting some STEM disciplines, which it would be reasonable to ask why hadn't they started them earlier?

1360 Very often, when you ask them, the answer they give you is that they were not available and instead, 'We were being dragged through another core curriculum, for much of which we did not feel we had particular talents and, therefore, not an awful lot of enthusiasm'. I am beginning to draw the lesson that perhaps the time is rapidly coming when we might re-examine the validity of the gold standard by which we judge our secondary schools of five GCSEs, A-C. We can debate that in closer detail later on.

I draw a more positive inference, I think, in terms of the relative importance of STEM and humanities.

1370 The other point I would like to pick up on is I am very pleased that Deputy Yerby made a very clear indication really that you are never too old to get stuck into this game and certainly part of my philosophy – and I hope it is going to be embraced by more and more people – is that if we are going to recycle those who have gone beyond what has conventionally been described as the working age, then part of that recycling is really to adopt a less condescending view to that age group and embrace even the thought that they might be capable of being recycled.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher.

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

1380 I am very happy to support this amendment, for lots of reasons. The first one is Deputy Yerby has used the word 'promote' and not 'ensure'. 'Promote', or 'facilitate', is always the more appropriate word, because that is all you can ever do. You can never ensure anything.

1385 The other thing that struck me was, in order to be a centre of excellence ... that is interesting, because the issue of a university of the Channel Islands or Guernsey has come up recently. Life has changed since then, because the original proposal would have required absolutely no investment from the States; it was to be funded from outside. That has gone.

A couple of years ago, as a member of the Information and Communications Technology Subcommittee of T&R, I said, 'Why don't we start on a small scale? Call it an institute of e-government.'

1390 The driver for that was the fact that we had developed our rolling electronic census, which has won a major prize and is a massive enabler to provide consultancy services and income for the States.

This whole process of the electronic census will, in time, be taken on by others, and we will get no benefit from it. We should be selling it, now. Even at the time, I had some commitments from  
1395 certain industries to provide grants to start such an institution and all it needed was a name on the door, to begin with.

Now, the reason this has become more of an issue for me today is that on Monday I went to a presentation by Digimap and there is another area where we have been, as an Island, extremely innovative. Although I could only attend for half of it, it inspired me to look at this whole issue of  
1400 where we go with a centre of excellence-cum-university of Guernsey. I think we have got to start small, we *can* start small. In fact, I will bring it up on Thursday at the next Committee meeting for Economic Development. I will suggest we commandeer a room in the Digital Greenhouse, put one of our civil servants, maybe, who is involved in this particular issue of the rolling electronic census, and start. Let us start small.

Also, not so long ago, Hewlett Packard were interested, and I went to a meeting with them, in promoting Guernsey as an island or a jurisdiction of excellence in the digital world. So there are outsiders who seem to think that Guernsey has potential – something on a par with Singapore and others. But that will also include massive, as it were, investment in the digital framework that we have. The digital basic issues that concern us, like: in Jersey they have fibre to most homes, if  
1405 you want it; we do not here.

There are all sorts of issues that need to be addressed, but I think we could start small and I am very interested in promoting these particular subjects because, unlike Deputy Fallaize, I know that the sciences, if you like, have been the poor relation of education for at least half a century. They certainly were when I went through and read physics at university. I think on a course in the engineering section of that particular university, there was one woman and she dropped out after  
1415 a year. It was a man thing, but not only that, half the people who started courses dropped out. Only in the science section. So I think it needs extra focus and promotion and the only way you will ever succeed in that with youngsters is to make it interesting.

Now, what has made life interesting for many youngsters is iPads and iPhones. They know how to use the technology; the next step is to try to get them to understand why it works and to innovate and develop the technology. I think we are closer to that possibility now.

So let us support this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

1425 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

**Deputy Inder:** Sir, I have come out of the creative industries from an early career in advertising and marketing.

In the last 15 years, I was in what is now known as the digital space. It was a manifesto  
1430 commitment of mine to support the tech and creative industries and this amendment will save me a fair amount of work. Thank you, Deputy Yerby and Deputy de Sausmarez, for that.

It is a good amendment for a fairly disparate and unstructured industry, but has contributed hugely to our diverse economy.

So well done and thank you both for that.

1435

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Tindall and then Deputy de Sausmarez.

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

I also wish to support this amendment, for many reasons. I have been told about the work  
1440 available on-Island for those in information technology, particularly in coding, but with insufficient suitable local applicants.

1445 We will also need skilled people to assist with cyber security. I do not think that there is sufficient emphasis being placed, at an early stage of the STEM subjects. In particular, Deputy Graham has mentioned this. Nor, indeed, have the students been informed of the opportunities that are actually available now on-Island.

I am hoping that I will be reassured by Deputy Yerby that other areas will not suffer. But also Deputy Dudley-Owen has mentioned that.

1450 However, I do refer specifically to what Deputy Yerby mentioned with regard to my reference to intellectual property in the area of innovation and in that, whilst that is good, we should be the creators. I wish to point out that, as far as intellectual property is concerned here on Guernsey, we have been a creator. We have created the world's first register of image rights.

1455 I also reiterate Deputy Kuttelwascher's points about our other innovations, including Digimap. I was actually able to attend the whole of the seminar, the only Deputy that did, and I would like to point out there was an enormous amount of opportunities there, which covered how we could do many things better, in particular in the Development & Planning Authority. A colleague was there and we were discussing how we could use the opportunities.

There were also opportunities for health provision and many others, and I would very strongly urge people to contact Digimap to consider what we could use and benefit from that.

Thank you.

1460

**The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you, sir.

1465 In a way, I am a very unlikely seconder for this amendment. I think STEM is probably the acronym that most accurately sums up the subjects I hated most during my education. I was very much in the Deputy Fallaize school of, what were they, soft, touchy-feely subjects or something like that. Nonetheless I think this is important. Deputy Fallaize assures me it is the dark arts! I could not disagree.

1470 Nonetheless, I do think STEM subjects are very much worthy of promotion and I would like to reassure Deputy Fallaize that the way I see this amendment, I absolutely do not think that we will be promoting STEM subjects at the expense of other subjects. Absolutely, categorically not. If I saw it that way, I absolutely would not be seconding it. I agree with Deputy Kuttelwascher and Deputy Graham that they are not actually offered the promotion that they deserve at the moment.

1475 A STEM education creates critical thinkers. It increases science literacy and it does enable the next generation of innovators. These are very important things, the aims that Deputy Yerby outlined. In general, STEM subjects promote a better understanding of the world we live in and I think this is never more important now.

1480 I would just like to touch on one slightly more specific point, which is the gender balance. P&R assure us that we do not need to make it explicit because it is already implicit, it is a given that we already address these things in equal measure. Men and women are afforded equal weight in this thing. We have heard this 'implicit' argument before. We heard it yesterday about environmental issues and I am afraid I just do not see it that way. I think there are some things that we need to make explicit because we might like to think that we are full of gender balance, but we do not. Women are under-represented in STEM subjects. That is a fact. I agree with Deputy Yerby. I think we do need to make it explicit, so that we can actually achieve that aim and not just pay it lip service.

1485 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Merrett.

1490

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

I, of all people, do not wish to focus on one word. I think we have been doing that quite a lot in this Assembly over the last two days. However, the word 'young' does ring alarm bells, as it does imply youth.

1495 Yes, it can be relative, but why should someone at the age of 30 who wishes to retrain or participate in educating in STEM, or in fact any other subjects, feel they cannot? Age 30, you are not even halfway through your working life. **(A Member:** Hear, hear.) *(Laughter)*

Thirty years old can be seen as relatively young by some, but this amendment does imply youth. It does imply school age. It does imply compulsory education.

1500 I believe in lifelong learning for all, although I do have some comfort from Deputy Yerby's opening statement. I would like to support this amendment but, as I said, sir, the word 'young' does ring alarm bells.

Thank you.

1505 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Green.

**Deputy Green:** Sir, thank you.

1510 I have reservations about this amendment and I identify entirely with what Deputy Fallaize said a moment ago. It might come from me on the basis that I was certainly not somebody who was ever particularly interested in science, technology, engineering and mathematics when I was at school, although I am, in fact, now.

1515 But I think the problem with this is it has very strong undertones of what Harold Wilson once said in the 1960's about the 'white heat' of technology, about the new Britain that was going to be forged from the 'white heat' of this revolution, in a famous speech in 1963. His government then got into massive problems by trying to pick economic and industrial winners.

1520 I remember Professor Wood, not in his independent fiscal review of 2016, but his review of last year, in 2015, saying the Government of Guernsey should not in any way be in the business of picking winners and actually he quoted in his joint report with his colleague how there was a strong correlation between investment in the right sort of education, which included focusing on developing thinking skills and developing high-level cognitive skills, and economic growth.

1525 I think this is where the amendment in question falls down, because it is giving a specific direction in relation to the STEM subjects, but not other skills and it is the broad range of skills that we need to be investing in, in schools, beyond statutory education. Because that is where the evidence says that you will be able to drive economic growth in the future, by investment in the right sort of skills.

I am concerned that we are kind of picking a winner, if you like. We are picking out these particular subjects, giving a specific direction in a high-level document. I guess the concern, really, is about how this will be interpreted and what kind of implications this will have.

1530 It is probably not stretching it too far to say what implication may this have for the future of higher education funding, when we know that the budget in that area is already under strain? Will this actually mean that there will be a preference for students going off to study certain subjects, but not others.

1535 I do not think we want to exaggerate that concern but, nonetheless, you are putting in a high-level document something which is a direction, very specifically, in one area, but not in others, when we should be focusing on skills across the board. We already have an awful lot of dedication in the school curriculum to the science subjects, to maths and to technology already.

1540 I agree with what Deputy Merrett said about the use of the descriptive term 'young men and women'. I think we should be trying to govern for everybody in our society, not just for younger members, and if lifelong learning means anything then people at the age of 20, 25, 30, 35, 45, whatever, should have the confidence and the support of their Government to retrain if they wanted, if they have the ability to.

The other concern I would make is, it has been mentioned in this debate about the lack of women doing these particular subjects. That is actually a cultural problem. You are not going to

1545 solve a cultural problem by having some words in a document. You are going to do it over many years through cultural change. It is often said that culture will eat strategy for breakfast. This is a strategic document. It is going to be eaten for breakfast by the culture and, until we actually tackle that culture, this amendment is not going to do what some people think it is going to do.

So I think I will probably vote against it on that basis, because Government should not be in the position of trying to pick winners in industry or indeed a skills base of the future.

1550

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

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

1555 Again, brief. What I do not like about this is the Charlie and the Chocolate Factory type of golden ticket that comes your way, perhaps, that may lift you to somewhere greater and better, through hard work and application, whatever, and there is nothing wrong with that, perhaps.

1560 I know from my family experience that some children are much more emotionally tuned in, much more socially tuned in and actually the education system we have now thrives; the 11-plus itself thrived on that difference at that age that some children were perceived to be more capable than others and under-valued the children that had a different type of disposition.

Where are the young men that are primary school teachers? Where are the role models for young boys who want to be teachers? They are not there. Why is it that most young girls want to be teachers? It is the first thing they want to do, because they are surrounded by the role model of the primary teacher.

1565 When you go into a nursing environment, where are the male nurses? Where are they? It is a profession that is still dominated by women. Actually, it is getting around to issues like that and giving the male care roles the same type of footing that we do in the academic type of environments that we think people would better themselves by gravitating towards.

1570 It is the child in the round that I think we have to watch here. The academic, social and emotional.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

1575 **Deputy Lowe:** Thank you, sir.

1580 I have sympathy for this amendment. In fact, I am probably going to support it. Very much has been said about the word 'young' in there and I can understand why you put it in there and why people are actually criticising it. But there is not any reason why that could not be amended, as the amendment that was placed yesterday. It could be for 'men and women' regardless of age. You could put some wording in there that gets rid of the word 'young' and you have still got the spirit of it all.

1585 The reason I say that is that the States themselves have been out there promoting, by raising the retirement age to 70. We have had a huge outcry from many in the construction industry and other industries which are very manual, saying, 'We cannot be expected to be working to 70, lifting bricks and standing on roofs' – all those sort of things that they do very well.

We have actually been saying, 'You are going to probably need to look at a career change. You are going to have to start some training.' This fits the bill. This is exactly the type of thing that we should be offering those in our community to be able to have a career change.

1590 From the wording in it, if you take out the word 'young', I think there is great merit in this amendment.

Also, I have forgotten what they call themselves in short, GFI, I think, that is Guernsey Federation Industry or something like that, they have been very active in the schools and they have put on courses in the lunchtime and, indeed, after schools and they did a pilot at La Mare de Carteret School, programming 'Raspberries' or whatever they call it. It was extremely successful

1595 and they have spread that across the other schools and I believe they are now starting it in primary schools.

Again, that is a perfect private and public partnership, where businesses are coming into schools and helping, because they very much want the youngsters at the schools to get trained, so they are helping by saying, 'We have got your curriculum. We understand the curriculum is full. We will put on courses after school.'

1600 They have encouraged the youngsters, as well, to go to the businesses themselves, so the GFI have done a cracking job in that and that is the type of thing that we should see and that, again, supports this type of amendment, where we are trying to get people to get involved.

1605 So I will support it, even if it has got the word 'young' in and that does not apply to me. But I will support it, because I do think it is important. Lifelong learning, we are saying about that all the time because you can always learn. Every day there is something to learn.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Oliver.

1610 **Deputy Oliver:** Sir, Deputy Green said that we need to change the culture, but what better way than to promote this at school level? When I was starting out and went to uni, I nearly did not get my place at uni. Not because I did not get the grade, but because there were no other women on the course.

1615 By promoting this, young or old, I can only see this as a big positive and I urge you all to vote for this.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy de Lisle.

1620 **Deputy de Lisle:** Sir, I just want to make the point that we are having difficulty in recruiting teachers in areas of science and mathematics, in particular. This is a situation in the UK and England as well, and there are drives there to try to encourage more into the sciences and also into mathematics, physics and so on.

1625 In terms of Deputy Fallaize's point, I think there might be some justification for a little more emphasis, perhaps, or some emphasis, on the sciences and engineering, mathematics, in order to perhaps get more of our young people training in that particular area to come back and provide their skills to this community in those areas.

1630 The other point that I would like to make is that, in the whole diversification thrust, in terms of economic development, I think we need to push the engineering side more and one of the areas we can do this is in developing our renewable resources. I think in that area we can provide more opportunity in the future for people to take up jobs in engineering to push the renewable sector – a sector, of course, that we have opportunity in and a sector that we should be looking at in the future for economic diversification and job creation.

Thank you, sir.

1635 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

1640 **Deputy Gollop:** Yes, Deputy de Lisle has just mentioned the work that has been done in renewable energy. But I think it is interesting that that renewable energy is all about tidal power, wind power, wave power and Deputy Yerby mentioned about the need for us to, not just swim with the tide but to make waves. Well, she has certainly been making waves with these amendments and I think we should support her in that respect.

1645 Unlike Deputy Green, I very much support the, not necessarily Harold Wilson's 'white heat' of technology, which ended up in the nationalisation of steel and cars, which perhaps did not go very well, although I could give Guernsey counter-parallels. I am actually quite supportive of the big government, the interventionist state, and I woke up this morning depressed and

disappointed that the bank idea, the savings and loan idea, has gone for a Burton, at least for the moment.

1650 Certainly in the last States, and I am sure Deputy St Pier would agree with me, some of the Members, especially Kevin Stewart when he was Minister for Commerce & Employment, were really committed to making Guernsey a centre of innovation, of starting examples like the Digital Greenhouse.

1655 We are in danger of losing that impetus. I went to a seminar. I did not go to the Digimap at Desonnier's, but to a seminar at the Digital Greenhouse and, to my surprise, they were saying that something like 13% of businesses trade in e-commerce, but Guernsey is only about 7% which had been behind.

I have been to business seminars where people who have been involved in both politics and commerce have said that Guernsey finds it really hard to find computer coders and people in that sector. We know of big businesses on the Island that have had to recruit outside the Island and even outsourced to different places, precisely because they reached a recruitment drain here.

1660 The Island actually, as Deputy Brehaut and others have implied, has been very good at turning out lots of potential actors and musicians and creative people. There is not necessarily a living for everybody in that field, although I would argue that there are certainly many hundreds of people more employed in that field than you might imagine.

1665 But we have fallen behind a bit with the sciences, even in the old days. I believe the history of a school like Elizabeth College, it was very good at turning out vicars and soldiers, but perhaps less so with scientists, although there were a few doctors that were employed. We very much need to promote sites. There are already women breaking the glass ceiling in Guernsey, not just in chartered surveying and architecture, but also in engineering. The current leader of the Channel Islands Group of Professional Engineers is a very high profile woman engineer and I think we need to support the equality.

1670 'Young men and women', admittedly, is not a phrase I might have chosen, because does it imply twentysomethings, teenagers; when are you too old? Although, as we unfortunately know, if you are a very successful lawyer and you decide at the age of 45 you really want to be a doctor, the chances are you will not find it easy to transfer and even less easy to get any form of subsidy for that kind of endeavour.

1675 There is a certain realism in some of these fields, but you can of course have lifelong learning and I think it is an ambition we should promote.

1680 The point is, we are committing ourselves here to be a centre of excellence in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. We have let some of those areas go over the years. We have not made a commitment really to the digital economy that is sufficient at every level and I think this goes a long way further.

1685 Yes, we could quibble about why those four subjects and you do not go slightly further and embrace, say, communications or psychology, but as far as it goes, the commitment to STEM is important.

1690 The one area nobody has talked about is to promote innovation within the public sector and its partners. Does that mean supporting, as Deputy Kuttelwascher implied, new electronic technologies, or does it mean going back to the idea that the States should, where appropriate, give funding to new ideas that are potential winners or losers? I personally do not think Government should be afraid of occasionally backing a loser in order to, in the long-term, get winners. If we do not try to pick winners and just take an apathetic view that the market will provide, we may all end up being losers in the long-term.

**The Bailiff:** No one else? Deputy St Pier and then Deputy Yerby.

1695 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, very briefly.

Not a great deal to add or respond to in the debate. I think the one issue which has clearly been identified is, as Deputy Yerby identified in her opening speech, this question of the use of



the term 'young'. As it happens, Policy & Resources are going to have to work on a consequential amendment from some of the other things that have gone on in the last day and a half.

1700 That will happen; Deputies Trott and Le Tocq will work on that with the Comptroller as general debate proceeds, so I suggest that perhaps if Deputy Yerby would like P&R to consider that question, in view of the debate, then that is perhaps something that should be picked up. She can make that judgement, in view of the strength of the debate so far.

Aside from that, I have nothing to add.

1705

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Yerby to reply.

**Deputy Yerby:** Thank you, sir, and thanks for the general level of support from the Assembly.

1710 I just wanted to pick out a few points that were raised. First, in response to the points which Deputy Green made, I am glad that yesterday Deputy Ferbrache said he did not believe in economics, because it makes it a little easier for me to say something similar. Most macro-economic factors are entirely outside our control. When we say we have done so well with the economy, it is often as much a matter of good luck as it is of judgement.

1715 But that does not mean that when there are factors that are within our control we should do nothing about them. Skills development is one of the economic factors which a government can control, invest in, use to its benefit, and we should make efforts to do that, to do it strategically, think about it carefully, and to do it well.

1720 I was not overwhelmed by the suggestion that, if we could not do everything, we should do nothing – that by focusing on STEM alone, we devalue everything else. This amendment has been in the public domain for some time; there have been opportunities to raise the profile of other areas of skills development, should Members have wished to do that. But just to throw the baby out with the bath water seems a shame.

1725 In response to what Deputy Merrett and Deputy Lowe and Deputy St Pier have just said about the term 'young', I am grateful for Deputy Trott's comment that age is relative. The teenagers in the Youth Forum were certainly stunned to hear that some people voted for me because they wanted some younger faces in the States and I am not even 30 yet! (*Laughter*)

I hope Members will support this amendment in its current form, but I leave it in the hands of P&R whether they will remove the term 'young' in their consequential amendment. I would not oppose it if they did so.

1730 Finally, in response to Deputy Fallaize, Deputy Graham and I are both foreign languages graduates. You do not get more fluffy than that. Nevertheless, Deputy Graham is right: STEM, I believe, is underplayed.

1735 The Plan already talks about culture, heritage, language, arts, sports. We have hooks for the flourishing of the humanities. I think it is the case that we have never given science a real policy focus, and so it falls off our agenda.

But if we really want to be a centre of excellence, it is time to give it a try.

**The Bailiff:** We vote, then, on amendment 6. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

**The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.

1740 That concludes the debate on amendments. Some people may be wondering if we might finish by lunch time. I think the fact is we will have to come back this afternoon, because there is some work to be done on consolidating all these amendments and making sure that they all hang together and it will not be possible to complete that before lunch.

1745 So if people are thinking they will keep the speeches short to rise for lunch, I do not discourage from keeping your speeches short, but I am afraid you will still have to be back this afternoon.

Deputy Roffey.

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

1750 I have got a confession to make. My confession is I cannot help myself, I am slightly cynical over the whole Policy & Resource planning process. I am trying to fight that cynicism very hard.

**The Bailiff:** Sorry, it is just H.M. Comptroller wants to speak. I do not know whether he wants to interject in your speech.

1755

**Deputy Roffey:** Oh, I give way to the Comptroller, sir.

**The Comptroller:** I am grateful for that.

1760 Sir, I was wondering whether it would be actually prudent to take an adjournment now. We have – well my colleague mostly, H.M. Procureur, has – prepared a composite set of amendments to the Propositions. We now need to go away and feed in the amendments that have been carried this morning.

From what I can see, things are fairly consistent, but there is one matter where I have noticed there is an inconsistency between two matters that were agreed yesterday.

1765 Now, I do not know whether they can be agreed in terms of the composite or whether it might be necessary to move one final amendment, and therefore what I would request is whether perhaps we might adjourn.

I realise it will make it a long lunch hour, but it will enable the composite to be prepared. It might be possible to agree a composite. If it is not possible, then perhaps there would be need for one further amendment for the States to consider, before then moving on to general debate.

1770

**The Bailiff:** I agree it does make sense to try to get all the amendments out of the way before people speak in general debate and I will allow Deputy Roffey to speak again. I will not say, 'Well, he has now had his speech, that is it!' Although it would be a very short speech!

1775 So what I will put to Members is that we rise and then we may come back early, but I will put to you first of all that we adjourn now. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

**The Bailiff:** We will rise now and I will put to you the suggestion that has been made to me that we return at 2 o'clock rather than 2.30 p.m. Those in favour of coming back at 2 p.m.; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

1780 **The Bailiff:** We will come back at 2 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.05 p.m.  
and resumed its sitting at 2.10 p.m.*

**Policy and Resource Plan –  
Phase one –  
Debate continued –  
Propositions 1 to 4 carried**

**The Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, I apologise for the delay, but we now have amendment 24, to be laid by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Trott.  
Deputy St Pier.

*Amendment 24.*

*To insert at the appropriate place in Proposition 3:*

*‘; and subject to the deletion of the word “young” where it appears on page 13 of that Plan in the following bullet point, which was added to the six bullet points under the part of Appendix 1 entitled “Centre of excellence and innovation” –*

*“Promote the pursuit of skills in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, providing opportunities for young men and women to gain the strong technical skills that underpin a creative, innovative society”.’*

1785 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, this amendment is very straight forward. It simply provides the States with the opportunity, should they wish to do so, to remove the word ‘young’ from the amendment previously approved, just before the lunch recess, from Deputy Yerby.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott, do you second the amendment?

1790 **Deputy Trott:** I do, sir, and in rising, make the point that Deputy Yerby had encouraged the laying of this amendment and we took our direction from her, sir.

1795 **The Bailiff:** Those who wish to may remove their jackets. I gave that request yesterday, so those that wish to do so may do so.  
Deputy Lester Queripel, then Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** I am just confused. It has still got the word ‘young’ in it and I thought the idea was to take the word ‘young’ out.

1800 **The Bailiff:** I think that is quoting what was inserted this morning but then the word ‘young’ would be removed from what is there. That is the intention.

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

1805 **A Member:** I think we call it the English language. *(Laughter)*

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

1810 **Deputy Fallaize:** This amendment is one-fifth right. If we could add the words ‘science’, ‘technology’, ‘engineering’ and ‘mathematics’ to the words being deleted then I would happily support it. *(Laughter)*

1815 **The Bailiff:** Any further debate? No?  
Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** No, sir.

**The Bailiff:** No need?

We will go to the vote, then, on amendment 24. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

1820 **The Bailiff:** I declare it carried. Despite the volume of noise, there were not that many voices, I do not think. But if anybody disagrees with me, we can have a recorded vote. But I declare it carried.

1825 I think that is it. There are yet to be some consolidated Propositions now, which will have to incorporate that. We had said it makes sense this morning to see those before people make their final speeches and they are not ready yet because, of course, this amendment now needs to be incorporated into those.

1830 **Deputy Roffey:** Would it not be equally practical for us to all have our general debate on the Plan? It is not an issue of policy, is it, a consolidated amendment at the end. It is only tidying up the wording. It is not going to re-open debate in anyway.

**The Bailiff:** It should not do. So, if you are happy to start the general debate, Deputy Roffey, I was going to call you first anyway, as you started it this morning.

So, Deputy Roffey.

1835

**Deputy Roffey:** Okay, *déjà vu* all over again.

1840 I think I got as far as saying that I was rather cynical about the Policy and Resource planning process, but I was going to go on to say that I am trying my best to fight that cynicism, for at least two reasons. Having been kicking around politics since 1982, in and out, I really do not want to be seen as the grumpy old cynic in the corner over by the door. I am a rather more positive person than that. Not as positive as Deputy Trott, obviously, who is becoming Guernsey's very own version of Dr Pangloss, I think, from Voltaire's *Candide*. If he has not read it, I suggest he does! *(Laughter)*

1845 I do try to be positive wherever I can and the other reason for trying to subdue my cynicism is I do accept, in principle, that this Assembly ought to have some kind of overall document which shows our direction of travel that we want to go in, in order to try to be cohesive and coherent in our policy making.

1850 My cynicism is I have heard those lines so many times, what happens when any individual items come back to this Assembly, even if they are contrary to the Plan, if people like them they will vote for them and, even if they support the Plan, if people do not like them, they will throw them out.

1855 Cynicism does come, in a degree, from experience. If I could sum up my cynicism in one word, or perhaps maybe one acronym, it would be CEDAW, the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women. It was first pointed out to this Assembly that we had been incredibly tardy in getting it extended to Guernsey in 1985, in the report of the Equal Pay Investigation Committee, led by a very thrusting and dynamic young Deputy at the time. Nothing was done about it, but I think, I am guessing, about 12 or 13 years ago, a requête came to this Assembly and it was successful, which decided that Guernsey would sign up to CEDAW as rapidly as it possibly could. It had, first, to put a couple of things right, like maternity rights and equal pay for work of equal value. Nothing happened, again, for a few years, and then we had the great Government Business Plan, co-ordinated by the former Deputy Chief Minister, Deputy Stuart Falla.

1860 Knowing the cynicism about Government plans in the past, he said, 'Okay, there are a lot of things in here, a lot of words, not everything will be done at once.' In order to make it really meaningful for the States, what the Policy Council wanted the States to do at that time was pick one thing out of the social policy agenda to fast-track, to really get done quickly, so that we

would know that the three days we had spent on the Government Business Plan was not wasted. It was not a document to go on a shelf. We could see it happening and happening quickly. And what the States decided was they wanted to fast-track Guernsey signing up to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

1870

I am not sure whether it was nine years ago or 10 years ago, but 'fast-tracking', like 'medium-term', obviously is a subjective term! (*Laughter*) I was surprised to see absolutely no reference to it in this document – in fact, no reference to any of our international obligations under any of the conventions that we aspire to. Maybe that is all going to come in phase two and I do ask for an assurance that these sorts of issues will be picked up in phase two next summer because, if they are not, I will be disappointed.

1875

The other thing I cannot help myself but be slightly cynical about is this whole happiness malarkey. (*Laughter*) Not because I want the people of Guernsey to be unhappy, of course I do not. I do want them, generally, to be happy and I accept there are certain things the States can do that would make happiness more likely and there are certainly plenty of things the States can do to make happiness less likely.

1880

Yes, we should try to do more of the former and less of the latter, but having it as the big thing in this document, happiness, to me, makes it seem a little bit like one of those bonkers, away with the fairies mission statements you get out of Silicon Valley-based high-tech companies, rather than a really serious document which can steer our Government's work and inform its priorities.

1885

Secondly, I am not actually sure it is that easy to measure. For example, my experience of Guernsey people is that they are never happier than when they are being really quite miserable and moaning about everything! So, if you are trying to measure how we are doing on the happiness stakes, and everybody is being miserable and moaning, do you put them down on the bad side, because they are miserable and moaning, or on the good side, because they are really enjoying being miserable and moaning? I really do not know how we do that.

1890

Having said that, if we are going to have it as a high-level priority, surely, we must try to measure it? With that in mind, I have been working my way through this UN document, the *World Happiness Report 2006*, volumes one and two. The methodology I am still struggling to understand but I would ask, on a serious point, if we are going to adopt happiness as a key indicator and sit amongst the happiest places in the world, do we want to be above the United Kingdom, in 23, do we want to be above Luxembourg, in 20, do we want above Sweden in 10, or do we want to aspire to Denmark at number one? It would be interesting know where amongst the happiest means. We certainly do not want to be down with Syria and Afghanistan who, understandably and sadly, are right down at the bottom of the table.

1895

Probably half the problem I have with happiness is that so many things that really make people happy or unhappy, we have got no influence over whatsoever. I think the things that make most happy is their personal relationships; how they are getting on with their significant other, how they are getting on with the rest of their family; what the weather is like. Deputies, although we think we can have control over everything, actually have very little control over these things.

1905

I think, actually, the whole happiness agenda, certainly with the UN, started because Bhutan were very keen on happiness. I have to say, I have spent time in Bhutan. I really enjoyed Bhutan, it is a beautiful country and it was their former king that said he was more interested in the gross national happiness of his people than the gross national product of his country. Now, that is an easy thing to say when you are married to four women, all of them sisters, but nevertheless! (*Laughter*)

1910

Okay, I think I have been as cynical as I need to be. I do want Guernsey to be happy. I am not sure it should have been the leading indicator and I certainly do not want a P&R fact-finding trip to the Himalayan kingdom of Bhutan, but other than that I will now shut up about it and move on to the Policy Letter itself.

1915

Can I say I find it slightly more awkward coming on, being a short Policy Letter, cross-referencing to two glossy appendices? There is not much in it, I would have preferred one simple document, but that is a side issue.

1920 I am going to steal Deputy Graham's prose, I am afraid, if he does not mind, metaphorically  
speaking anyway. Going to point 3.5 in the Policy Letter itself. What on earth does it mean, when  
it refers to Guernsey's working age population? I really do not mean to belittle Guernsey's  
demographic challenges, because I think they are massive, but we keep hearing this outdated  
term, 'working age population'. It really is one we have to get away from. If we mean 16-65, say  
16-65. But, if you think that that is a definition of working age population, you are sadly out of  
1925 date.

My second point is to report the claim in paragraph 3.7 that we have to restore our reserves. I  
think that is absolutely vital. Even more so when I hear the news that we might actually turn,  
possibly, indicatively, at the moment, a small surplus at the end of this year. Please, let us not go  
on a spending splurge. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) I am not saying no investment is  
1930 necessary, but let us look at restoring our reserves.

I would go further, I would like to reinstate the previous target, which was never achieved,  
which was that our reserves, what was then our contingency reserve, I know it has all changed  
now, should be equal to at least one year's revenue spending. Mr Bailiff, micro-states like  
Guernsey are particularly vulnerable to sudden changes in the world that can affect their income,  
1935 affect how much they need to spend on welfare, far more so than larger countries. Having  
adequate reserves against a rainy day are absolutely crucial.

I remember when we first set up the contingency reserve and there were a lot of cynical  
Deputies here, just as cynical as I am today over happiness, and they wanted to spend money on  
the immediate priorities and they could flag up lots of them. They asked the then President of  
A&F, Conseiller Roydon Falla, what on earth did he mean by an emergency he wanted to put  
1940 money aside for. His answer was masterful. 'What is an emergency?' he said. 'I find it almost  
impossible to describe, but I say to those people asking me, what is an elephant? Really difficult to  
describe. But, I tell you what, you will know it when it is charging towards you.'

Mr Bailiff, there are a lot of elephants in this world and Guernsey needs to be prepared.

1945 Moving on to the glossy appendices. In the foreword to appendix one, it refers to using  
technology to transform the public sector. Even someone who I have to admit is totally inept, I am  
absolutely inept when it comes to technology, I can see the sense of that. It is obviously crucial.  
But, if it is so important, can we please take a fresh look at our own Government website? The old  
one was a bit clunky, but even a total technophobe like me could use it after a fashion. The new  
1950 one seems to be totally impenetrable and unusable. You search for something, you put something  
into the search facility and you get lots of results, but none of them seems to bear any relation to  
what you want to actually find.

I know we have considered it already in the amendments, but I want to move on to the bullet  
points on page seven. We have talked about regulation and Deputy Ferbrache wanted minimum,  
1955 we said no, not minimum, it has to be appropriate. The trouble is, I do not think you would find  
one person in Guernsey or anywhere else who advocated inappropriate regulation.

I have problems with over-use of subjective language throughout this report, because it does  
not really mean anything. Okay, I suppose if it is a regulation you can sort of deduce it means not  
really at the top and strangling everything and not at the bottom and cutting corners and being  
1960 somewhere in the middle.

But then we move on to another bullet point just below, bullet point three, which says  
'maintain an appropriately sized working population'. Again, you would not find anybody that  
wants an inappropriately sized working population, but am I to guess, my definition of what is an  
appropriate size working population and P&R's may well be poles apart. So, we will both happily  
1965 vote for this in the Policy Plan and mean something different. If it is meant to be a guide, I do not  
think that really moves us very far forward.

I will pause here and say through you, sir, to P&R, that if this speech comes across as one from  
a miserable and unhappy individual, do not worry about it. Delivering it is making me happy and  
that is supporting your over-arching aim, so you should be pleased. (*Laughter*)

1970 I am just going to show that I can be positive. I am deliriously happy to see the penultimate  
bullet point on page seven, which refers to removing barriers to work. I think we have to remove  
1975 that, whether those barriers may be age, as Deputy Graham keeps talking about, disability, family  
commitments, whatever is stopping people who want to work from working, we have to make a  
priority of removing those barriers. I hope this aim is pursued vigorously, because the only  
view would ruin the Island.

Briefly, onto the last bullet point on page 10, which says that our built environment should  
reflect our local distinctive style. I have to pose the question, what does that actually mean?  
1980 Architecture in Guernsey has undergone so many different changes in style through the ages. I  
suppose we have got a lot of distinctive styles, from the old granite farmhouses, through to  
Victorian cottages, but I do not think we have one distinctive style and I am not sure, given that  
aesthetics are so inherently subjective, that this is the right place to put it, in an over-arching Plan.

For example, I absolutely hate the current prevailing style of new houses being like wooden  
sheds, with a whole wall being glass that you can see out of and everybody can see in and see  
1985 what you are doing in your life. I suppose it is openness and transparency, and people want to see  
that, I keep being told. I think those buildings are hideously ugly but, obviously, a lot of people  
really love them, otherwise they would not be shelling out £750,000 to buy one. I worry that we  
embed these sorts of aesthetic judgements in our Policy Plan. Obviously, our planners, at Deputy  
Gollop's department, have to do it to some degree, but to put it in the Plan seems a bit OTT.

1990 I want to move on to page 12 and bullet point five on relative poverty. Here, I have to say three  
cheers for Policy & Resources, if they really mean it this time. I only hope they do and we are not,  
as an Assembly, raising false expectations yet again.

The States have paid lip service to this issue for so long. If it is passed and passed as part of the  
short, compact Policy and Resource Plan today, I see it as a top priority and I expect to see real  
1995 and meaningful action to back it up.

Briefly onto the fiscal framework. Personally, I would have liked to have seen it far more averse  
to borrowing. I know, I may be out of kilter, I have said that before, but I accept that in some rare  
circumstances it is justified to borrow, to invest in projects with a good income stream. But, by  
and large, Government borrowing, I think, is a bad thing. I know, it is pointed out we borrow a lot  
2000 less than everybody else, but that is simply because they borrow far, far too much. I do not think  
that we are being fair on the next generation. I really do not buy this argument we keep hearing  
these days, that as future generations will benefit from the infrastructure projects that we are  
invested in, they should help pay for them. That is just lazy shorthand, for we want it but we  
cannot afford it.

2005 After all, our predecessors by and large, with the odd exception, paid for the infrastructure that  
we use today. If we are not willing to do the same for our children, then this generation will go  
down as the one which, to use Deputy Gollop's oft-used phrase, wanted their penny and their  
bun. It is a trick that can only be played once.

2010 Again, I know I am swimming against the tide there, but I really am worried about the direction  
we are going on borrowing.

In closing, I want to go back to where Deputy St Pier started. He started, I think, with a sort of  
plea to hang on to liberalism in Guernsey, in an increasingly illiberal and divided and divisive  
world. I would agree with that and while I may be cynical about this Plan, one thing I do take  
comfort from, is I think the last two days and the debate on the amendments, in particular, have  
2015 shown that, by and large, our direction of travel, is a liberal one, with a small l. You can be a liberal  
on the right wing, you can be a liberal on the left wing. It has got nothing to do with socialism or  
capitalism. It is to do with a state of mind that is to do with inclusiveness, a state of mind that is to  
do with tolerance and a state of mind that says, actually we do not want to be illiberal.

2020 We hear about 'liberal elites', as if that is a sneering, insulting term. I have never been a part of  
an elite, but why people want me to illiberal – I will be illiberal to them if they want me to – it  
seems to me absolutely perverse.

2025 I want to live in a world where, as long as people are not harming other people, they are more or less free to be themselves and get on with being themselves and I take comfort, having been a fairly negative speaker, I will come back and say I do agree very much with the opening remarks from Deputy St Pier.

So, to sum up, there are some good bits in this document, there are some bits about which I am profoundly unhappy. I am sorry if that is letting my Island down when it comes to the world happiness league, I promise to try and pull my socks up.

2030 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Graham, I think, was wanting to speak, and then I will come to Deputy Lester Queripel.

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

2035 I remained quiet through all the various amendments, yesterday and the first part of today, partly because I did not really feel I had too much wisdom to contribute to it, but also, frankly, because they did not particularly energise me. Not in a negative sense. Many of them were fairly benign. The implication of that, really, was that P&R were very happy to support all but a few of them.

2040 I think the point I am making is that if we, for example, take the environmentally inspired amendments, I benefited as a boy with a rural upbringing and that has stayed with me for the rest of my life and I reckon I am probably as environmentally oriented here as anybody. I do not make a song and dance about it, but it is in there.

2045 To be honest, none of the amendments has really energised me, or informed me too much about my responsibilities towards the environment when, in the future I come to make decisions, either in the Assembly or as a member of one of the principal Committees. For me, it was not necessary and, I suspect, for many of the Assembly who are not of the philistine tendency, the same would apply, really.

2050 Of course, there were some amendments which seemed to go to the core of the Plan and they were identified. For example, Deputy Yerby's amendment, which had a narrow-squeak failure, was one of those.

2055 One of them was the amendment that never happened. I am reading between the lines but I think, if Deputy Roffey had not run out of his self-imposed limit of amendments for November, he might well have placed one, and again I must not put words in his mouth, but I inferred from what he was saying that probably it would have been along the lines to delete all mention of raising revenue for the general revenue from the States' trading assets. Something along those lines.

2060 In a way that would have been, I am trying to avoid the word honest, it would have been more upfront than the amendment that most of us voted for, which really almost wanted it both ways. We are going to get revenue from the States' trading assets, but without harming those who can least afford it. I am not quite sure it was explained how that is going to be achieved. Deputy St Pier, I think, hinted that it might come from the corporate sector, in other words through enhanced charges, perhaps, to the corporate sector, almost to balance the privilege of paying fairly low levels of corporation tax if they pay any at all. I may have inferred the wrong message from that and if I did I apologise.

2065 That amendment never came and we had the one which I was very pleased to support.

Having reviewed the amendments, can we just for a moment raise our eyes above the particulars to the general theme of the vision and how outcomes and themes float from that. And, from that, how objectives, although I am not totally sure of the distinction between desired outcomes and objectives, but let us say there is one, how the objectives then lead to the plans.

2070 It seems quite a long time ago since we gathered in Beau Sejour with our felt tip pens and our easels and our flip-over bits of paper and we sort of scribbled our way and then erased our way and then re-scribbled our way to a vision by 40 committee members. Something along those lines. Of course, that was an inherently difficult thing to do.



I do congratulate Deputy St Pier and his team on managing something coherent out of all that. We could have argued over some of the wordings, over some of the priorities. It has already been  
2075 alluded to by Deputy Roffey, but it goes without saying we all want to be amongst the happiest of communities.

If I am being pedantic and personally, looking at it from my perspective, I might have asked that safety would have been up there, right at the top. In other words, perhaps we might have aspired  
2080 to be one of the safest of territories in the world, I know what Members of the States are thinking, here is the vice-president of Home Affairs speaking, but it is not, actually, because quite a few of us in here share the privilege of having served in parts of the world where, actually, the day-to-day waking certainty was that the population feared for their life and would never take it for granted that they were protected.

In a way, it is a back-handed compliment to Guernsey that we do take it for granted. We did  
2085 not even need to put it in there, which is why I am relaxed about it. I do not think anybody is going to infer from its absence, or its absence as a top priority, that, in future, we are going to somehow undermine the forces that actually keep us safe, whether it is the police the Border Agency or the progressive regime that we have at the prison and that sort of thing. All those elements of our security.

I am not going to waste too much time on the presence or absence of words and in what  
2090 order they came. One of the best images, if I may put it that way, that came out of those brainstorming sessions, was in my view Deputy St Pier's vision of a walled garden. Guernsey as a walled garden. I know Deputy Lester Queripel was a little bit unhappy that it was a sort of walled-in thing that you could not get into and therefore nobody was welcome. But, of course, this  
2095 walled garden would have a gate in and a gate out. The idea that it was full of fertile soil, with various crops growing to their best effect, if they chose the appropriate wall, was a very good one for us.

A slightly negative comment on that, if I may, the whole business of a fertile place open for  
2100 business, I think we should not take for granted that we are of that mentality just yet. I have evidence, both actual and also anecdotal, that actually the whole business of setting up a new business here can be glacial in its progress. Almost to the point of un-cooperativeness and obstructiveness. Okay, we have got to locate Guernsey, and I know lots of people are out there doing their best, but I think Guernsey has got a long way to go before it really embraces what it is in the Plan here, about being open for business and encouraging people to come here and  
2105 contribute to our economy.

The walled garden we had and, as I say, I do congratulate Deputy St Pier and his team on making the best of that.

Can I now just share a few thoughts with you over this whole business of objectives and plans? It may be stating the obvious but, sometimes, the obvious needs to be stated and I think there is  
2110 a certain amount of lack of clarity on this, because in the exchange that we had between Deputy Kuttelwascher and Deputy Fallaize, there seems to have been a lack of consensus as to exactly where we are in the process. How much flesh is on the bones, how much flesh needs to be on the bones at this stage.

For me, it is quite a simple world. You have objectives which need to be spelled out with  
2115 absolute icy clarity. Deputy Fallaize, I think, remarked that a lot of the clarity would come when the principal Committees come back next year with their plans, but I think it has to start before then and Deputy Roffey has mentioned some of these subjective descriptions of what we are trying to achieve, which makes clarity, I think, a little bit more difficult than it needs to be.

The objectives or the desired outcomes really need to be framed in a pretty precise way, if the  
2120 plans are to reflect the same degree of clarity, in my view.

We come to an inherent difficulty, really, with a 20-year vision and plan because plans are inherently fragile and scarcely ever survive. But they are a means to an end and I think the important thing is always to keep the end in mind and your end or your objectives should only

2125 change in the most cataclysmic circumstances, really. Whereas we all know that the plans have to change.

I am not going to treat you to a military anecdote but when I first joined my regiment, my commanding officer new a thing or two about plans. At 18, he had won his DSO fighting the Japanese in Burma, 10 years later he had won the Military Cross fighting the North Koreans in the Korean War. He knew something about plans and he took me aside and he said, 'Look. You have to make plans in life, but never kid yourself that any plan made by any military man survived its first contact with the enemy. Fog of war.'

2130 Okay, that is a military metaphor but it translates, in my view, into life in general and particularly into the business of government. I do not think any plan can be expected to survive much beyond its first contact of reality that and I think we need to recognise that. We have already got a great example for us to contemplate now. When we first joined the Assembly, I think it was Deputy St Pier who explained to us that we inherited a Budget deficit from last year of around about £24 million, about 1% of our GDP. Within a few weeks, we were encouraged to think actually it might not be that bad, might only be about half of that. In other words, half of 1% of our GDP. Then, a few weeks later, we heard it might be down around about £6-£10 million, or I may have got the figures wrong, and then the other day, from Deputy Trott, 'Actually we think we may have eliminated the Budget deficit for the end of this year.' If I understood what was said.

2140 Admittedly, that may be a freak year and it may be that, structurally, we have not cracked it. But the point I am making is this whole business of trying to, at the end of this States' Assembly, have reached a position of a balanced Budget, or even the first signs of a Budget in surplus, that was the feeling, wasn't it? The Plan that went into implementing that was that we would save 3% in our expenditure next year, by two thirds making savings and by one third in raising other means of revenue.

2145 My question now is, we have eradicated, we think, the Budget deficit. Do we stick, rigidly, to the plan? We may do, for other reasons. As I hinted, it may be that structurally nothing has changed. But, at least, I would be disappointed if we were not saying to ourselves now, at the top, does this change the ball game? Plans, very fragile.

That is all I have to say, sir, thank you.

2155 **The Bailiff:** I said I would call Deputy Lester Queripel next.

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

I will start by saying I am not going to give way in this speech, so if any of my colleagues want to stop me they will have to call a point of order or a point of correction.

2160 I cannot possibly support this Plan, even though I appreciate it has been laid with the best of intentions. There are several reasons why I cannot support it. Number one, such a document, it makes no difference if it is adopted or rejected, is testament to its inconsequence and such documents do nothing but bring us into disrepute as a talking shop.

2165 Number two, the States have debated nine similar plans over the last 20 years and we have got more to come. And that is after we promised the people of Guernsey we would look for efficiencies and use of staff time more efficiently.

Number three, plans can actually stifle innovation and business, especially if they are constrained by performance indicators.

Number four, this Plan seems to be nothing more than a metaphorical sticking plaster trying to cover over the inherent weaknesses of our system of Government.

2170 Number five, this Plan offers social salvation at bargain basement prices. Preventative measures are the invention of the accountant who seeks to eradicate social shortcomings with a stroke of the fiscal pen.

Therefore, I cannot vote for this false offer of hope, because to do so would be to betray everything I believe in, because in my world social policy is at least the equal to fiscal policy.

2175 So, it follows that the whole of this document is fatally flawed and I will not sign up to any of it.

2180 Finally, for the moment, sir, number six. If any of us down here on the floor of the Chamber had produced this Plan, we would be accused of wasting States' time. I ask my colleagues to consider the abundance of attempts at a policy planning process and in each case their swift rise and fall, always with the same failings. To consider whether this Plan will have any chance of succeeding where its predecessors have failed. Also, to consider that it is already binding on the States, within current States' Resolutions, statements of aims and objectives very similar and, in some cases, identical to those which are presented before us in this Plan today.

2185 We all know full well what the major challenges are in this term and work in all of those areas is already underway.

2190 Not a single course of action that any States' department is taking, or a single Government policy of any significance will change as a result of us supporting this Plan today. My colleagues should also ask themselves why, for more than two decades, members of staff and members of Government have seen their attempts repeatedly flounder and collapse and then, before the reasons for the failure have even been considered, there comes a replacement which proves to be equally short-lived and unsuccessful.

2195 Just in case some of my colleagues are thinking the last reason sounds like the sort of thing Deputy Fallaize would say in his speech, it was. He said all of that. He said it when he was speaking in opposition to the States' Strategic Plan, in this Chamber on March 26th, 2013. If my colleagues want to verify that on Hansard, sir, it is on page 242. I quoted him because everything he said in opposition to the SSP applies to the P&R Plan, because the SSP morphed into the P&R Plan. It is the same plan, with a different name.

2200 Both plans contain lists of promises, wishes and, in general, unattainable aspirations. Every one of the other five reasons I mentioned came from speeches that were also made in the SSP debate. Fifteen Members of the previous Assembly voted against the SSP and eight of them are still in this current Assembly. Everything they said in opposition to the SSP applies to the Plan before us today. It has to, bearing in mind that both Plans are one and the same.

2205 I can only hope, sir, that those eight Members speak against and vote against the Plan. Just for the record, it was Deputy Lowe who said the States had debated nine similar plans over the last 20 years, all to no avail. It was Deputy Green who said the plan seems to be nothing more than a 'metaphorical sticking plaster'.

2210 The other Members who voted against the SSP, just for the record, were Deputy Le Pelley, Deputy Gollop, Deputy De Lisle, Deputy Brehaut and my brother Deputy Laurie Queripel. It was former Deputy Andrew Le Lièvre who said in an excellent speech he could not vote for a false offer of hope, because to do so would betray all he believed in. His view was social policy is at least equal to fiscal policy. That was why the plan was fatally flawed and he was not going to sign up to any of it.

2215 I resonate with that, sir, I am not signing up to any of it, because that is exactly what happens when governments sign up to lists of promises, wishes and aspirations. The people are given false hope, just as they were given by us signing up to the SSP. That is exactly what will happen if we sign up to the P&R Plan.

2220 During that same debate, sir, Deputy Trott said that either supporting or rejecting the plan would have absolutely no effect whatsoever on what we do as a Government and that will be the plan's 'Achilles heel'. He was wrong to say it would have no effect whatsoever on what we do as a Government and if he thinks the same about the Plan before us today, he is still wrong. He is wrong because, if the Plan is supported, it will result in more and more staff time committed to progress the Plan and more and more taxpayers' money being spent on a completely unnecessary Plan that seeks to bind a suite of Plans together when there is no need, due to our having States' Resolutions already in place with statements of aims very similar and, in some cases, identical to those which are presented in this Plan.

2225 So, not a single course of action that any States' department is taking or a single Government policy of any significance will change as a result of supporting this Plan, as Deputy Fallaize told us in his speech on the SSP.

2230 So, let us get this straight. Let us be clear on this. What will happen is even more time will be spent by civil servants progressing this Plan and even more taxpayers' money will be spent and that will have a direct result on what we can and cannot do as a Government, because staff resource is already scarce and money is already tight.

I would remind my colleagues, sir, through the chair, the reason that the Disability and Inclusion Strategy sat on the shelf for two years was because of lack of staff resource. It was not due to lack of funding. The funding was in place. It was because the staff could not be spared to progress it. That is why it sat on the shelf, despite the hard work of several people in the Assembly at that time and outside of Government. It sat on the shelf due to lack of staff.

2235 Just to further that point, to remind colleagues on 28th October, we all received an email reporting on the current progress of the Strategy. We were told in that email, and I quote:

Lack of staff resource remains an issue across many of the project's work streams.

2240 So, it is because staff resource is still scarce that current strategies are progressing at snails' pace and here we are being asked to commit staff time from now until next June. Eight months of staff time spent progressing this superfluous Plan, the contents of which will add nothing to States' Resolutions that are already in place.

If that is not proof that this Plan is totally unnecessary then I do not know what is. Before I move on, I do have a question for the President. There is nowhere in this document that says that this States will fail to uphold and carry out its duties and responsibilities if we do not sign up to this Plan, so why do we need it? Where is the proof that we need it?

2245 I say that having read the relevant section in the Plan that tells us why we need the Policy and Resource Plan, but it does not provide proof and it does not provide evidence and we always say we need to be fully informed, as much evidence as possible to make decisions. Where is the evidence?

I am doing my absolute utmost here to encourage colleagues to reject this Plan. In the words of Jimmy Cricket, there's more.

2255 I want to reel off some of the work that we need our civil servants to progress over the next few months, instead of spending time progressing this unnecessary Plan. We need to spend the same time progressing the same sex partnership policy, the Biodiversity Strategy, the Disability and Inclusion Strategy, the Supported Living and Ageing Well Strategy, the Obesity Strategy, the Drug and Alcohol Strategy, the Domestic Abuse Strategy, the Skills Strategy, the Mental Health and Wellbeing Strategy. (**A Member:** Stop.) Our own Health Department's 20/20 vision, the Children and Young People's Plan, as well as the work our civil servants will have to do in the not-too-distant future to introduce a Carers' Strategy and address the lack of adequate respite care and also, we need to bear in mind hundreds of hours of staff time that will be needed to progress SWBIC.

2260 There is a lot more that I could add to that list. We do not need an over-arching Plan to enable us to do it, especially if that Plan means more and more staff time will be needed to progress this Plan, to the detriment of all the other plans and strategies that we have in place.

2265 On the day of the debate on the SSP, I was in such a dilemma, I had written two speeches. I had written one speech in favour and one speech against. On the day, I chose to speak and vote in favour of the Plan and I want to apologise to my fellow Islanders, through the chair, for doing so.

2270 I apologise because I am one of the ones to blame for wasting civil servants' time and taxpayers' money to produce the Plan we have before us today. That mean that strategies such as the Disability and Inclusion Strategy sat on a shelf for almost two years and I am sincerely sorry about that. My conscience has not given me a minute's peace, since the day I supported the SSP. I certainly will not make the same mistake again, by voting in favour of this Plan.

2275 I call this Plan unnecessary for several reasons, some of which I have already highlighted. Another one being that every committee and department already has a plan. They have got a

mandate. We all know what we have to do to comply with the mandates. We already know our duties and responsibilities as Deputies.

Just as a point of information, sir, Deputy Trott, once again, said in the SSP debate, and I quote:

You will not hear a better speech in this Assembly than the one made by Deputy Fallaize. It was in my view absolutely faultless in getting to the rub of the problems.

2280 It will be interesting to see which way those two Deputies vote, because they both focused on problems in their speeches on the SSP. This Plan harbours the same problems, so what has changed?

Perhaps they have been lulled into a false sense of security by all the amendments that have been passed. I hope they have not. Time will tell.

2285 Speaking of time, even though I realise there is no time limit on speeches made in this Chamber and maybe there should be.

**Several Members:** Hear, hear.

2290 **The Bailiff:** There should be no tedious repetition. There is that in the Rules. *(Laughter)*

**Several Members:** Hear, hear!

2295 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** I do want to focus on a couple more points, sir. New points. Not tedious repetition.

Although I may use the same phrase occasionally, just to highlight the point I am making. *(Laughter)*.

2300 The next point is this: This Plan tells us we need to prioritise and it is asking us to sign up to that intention. In relation to that, I think my colleagues need to ask themselves this question, which is a two-part question.

It goes like this: how will you decide which issues you are going to disregard and how will you explain your decision to your fellow Islanders who are disregarded as a result of the decision you make?

2305 Anyone who signs up to this Plan will be signing up to prioritisation. You will need to know your answers to those two questions.

Why would we confine ourselves, anyway, to a Plan, when every single issue needs to be addressed and can be addressed as long as we all work smarter and play our part to save time and money focusing on areas that are of little consequence?

2310 I will give colleagues an example of one of those issues, through the chair. Not long after being elected in 2012, I realised that the States were presented with documents in full colour. They were glossy and they were extremely expensive. They were read once and they were put on the shelf to gather dust. What a complete waste of money.

2315 I submitted a set of questions to all 10 departments which focused on their annual printing costs. Some time later, Deputy St Pier made a statement to the Assembly, in this Chamber, informing us all that approximately £80,000 of taxpayers' money had been saved by printing some documents in black and white. The documents that did not need to be printed in colour. Well, sir, that was two and a third years of my salary taken care of in one fell swoop. I saved taxpayers £80,000. Did I have to sign up to a plan to do that? Of course, I did not. I looked around and used my own initiative. The irony is, I submitted those questions using the Financial Transformation Programme as a vehicle, because governments, especially the States of Guernsey, always need something to hang an issue on.

2320 They devise all sorts of plans and programmes in an attempt to get politicians to focus which I think is an insult to an individual's integrity and their desire to have a beneficial influence on their community.

2325 I did not say that because I am seeking any personal glory, I said that as an example of the things we can do to save taxpayers' money and to save civil servants' time. We can just do these things by looking around and using our own initiative. You do not need a Plan to do these kinds of things.

I mentioned desire, well that brings me on to another reason why I think my colleagues should reject this Plan. I have said in this Chamber on more than one occasion I sense a tremendous desire within this Assembly to be proactive. We are told in the last paragraph on page seven of this Plan that to achieve a safe and secure place to live, we will be proactive.

I do not think we need to be told we need to be proactive, or that we will be proactive, when we already harbour a tremendous desire to pursue proactive policies that will be beneficial to our fellow Islanders. I think that is another question my colleagues need to ask themselves when they come to vote. Do they really want to be told what to do and led by the hand every single step of the way for the rest of this term, or do they want to be allowed to use their own initiative, or even learn from their mistakes as I did when I voted in favour of the SSP?

2340 One of the many flaws in this Plan before us today, sir – there are flaws on every page, I am not going to highlight every single one – it is presented as a panacea for all our ills and woe betide if we do not sign up to it.

In fact, it is presented in such a motherhood and apple pie kind of style, I am sure some of my colleagues are thinking, 'How can I not vote in favour of these well-intended aspirations?'

2345 What reasons will I relay to my fellow Islanders for not signing up to a Plan that seeks to improve their quality of life?

Well, for a start, any colleagues thinking that way could always say, 'Actually I voted against the Plan, because I want staff to progress all the other plans we already have in place and I do not want any more taxpayers' money to be spent pursuing and progressing a completely unnecessary Plan.'

2350 Now, sir, I am sure the majority of our fellow Islanders would accept that as a justifiable reason for rejecting this Plan. Especially those Islanders who are fed up to the back teeth of their Government insisting on debating endless streams of plans, visions, and strategies.

2355 Which brings me onto my next point, sir. The previous Assembly was not in office very long before we found ourselves swimming in a sea of plans, visions and strategies and, in my opinion, the previous Assembly eventually drowned in that sea of plans, visions and strategies, which was absolutely tragic, actually, because I also sensed the same desire to be proactive in the previous Assembly as I do in this one.

2360 The previous Assembly drowned in a sea of plans, visions and strategies and became known as the worst States ever, which was totally unjustified. But, now, this States is being asked to sign up to yet another Plan that will, as Deputy Kuttelwascher said in his speech on the SSP, stifle innovation.

If this Plan succeeds today, it will not only stifle innovation and creativity, but it will force Members to prioritise when there is no need, because we can do it all. If you sign up ...

2365 I will wait for the mirth to subside. Sir, I am doing my utmost here. I will try and get the message across to colleagues.

If you sign up to this Plan, it will bind your hands and tie us to a list of promises, wishes and unattainable aspirations which will give false hope to our fellow Islanders, just as the last States did, by signing up to the SSP and failing to progress the Disability and Inclusion Strategy.

2370 As I said, sir, sorry to repeat, I am truly sorry that I was one of the ones to blame for that, because what our fellow Islanders do not need any more of, is false hope. What they need is action, the right action.

2375 My manifesto slogan in the last election was 'it is time for action'. When I went out knocking on doors, I did not meet one person (*laughter*) who said – I should have been quicker in my delivery of that sentence, sir! I met hundreds of people, but I did not meet one person who said, 'Hey, I will vote for you if you support and vote for a high-level plan.' Not one.

Hundreds said to me, 'I will vote for you if you just get on and do the job I elect you to do and not waste time and taxpayers' money pursuing any more plans, visions and strategies because we have had enough of them.'

2380 So, what they want and what they need is for us to pursue the issues that affect their day-to-day lives. The members of the public I have spoken to over the last few years do not want us to carry on debating time and time again unnecessary plans. They want us to get on and do things that benefit them in their daily lives.

Things like, getting on and off the Island, via transport links that can be trusted and are reliable. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

2385 Things like roads being closed for weeks and there is not a workman in sight. Things like stopping the creation of new roles in the civil service at the top of the pay scale. Things like pavements being so full of wet leaves they are dangerous to walk on. Things like they cannot afford to go to the doctor when they are ill. Or they cannot afford to go to a dentist, so they pull their own teeth out with a pair of pliers. Just in case any of my colleagues think I am exaggerating, 2390 Deputy Le Lièvre, in his speech, said he knew of an Islander who had pulled their own teeth with a pair of pliers because they could not afford to go to the dentist.

Things like people who have mobility problems and they have been on the States' housing list for two years, because there is no suitable accommodation to put them in.

2395 Those are the sorts of things they need us to spend time resolving. Not pursuing yet another superfluous plan for eight months that will have little more than a two-year lifespan, due to the fact that we cannot bind the next States to anything.

You can fall for the 20-year Plan, you can fall for the five-year, you can fall for what you like, but the reality is we cannot bind the next States to anything. Once this Plan, if it ever gets – and I hope it is not – implemented, it will have less than a two-year lifespan. All that money, all that 2400 time would have been spent for two years and then, of course, the question one has to ask is, say the Plan succeeds and it is implemented on June 2017, well it will not be it will be implemented much later in that year, will this Government then be considered to have been a failure up until that point, because we do not have that Plan?

2405 I would like to just repeat, if I may, with your permission, to say to colleagues they do not need to sign up to the document for the good intentions. A document that Deputy Le Clerc once described as being 'akin to a Mills & Boon novel' and that is on Hansard. They do not need to try and make themselves look good in the eyes of the public by signing up to it. They do not need to feel guilty for not signing up to it.

2410 They can have a direct beneficial influence on the lives of fellow Islanders right now, by working with your fellow Islanders on a one-to-one basis, to help them resolve their problems. None of us needs a plan for that.

2415 I know, sir, that many of my colleagues do that already and all credit to them for doing so, but it can be an extremely rewarding role to play when you help your fellow Islanders get some much-needed health care, perhaps help them find a job, help them to get a benefit payment they did not realise they were entitled to. Help them to resolve a dispute with their neighbours or help them to sort their finances, all sorts of things.

You can improve the quality of life of your fellow Islanders right now. You do not need a plan to do that.

2420 As I said, sir, many of my colleagues already do that, but I am trying to reach the colleagues who do not. I am trying to reach the colleagues who prefer to pursue a high-level plan and I know colleagues are looking at iPads, sir, and perhaps not even listening to what I am saying, but I hope they will at least take some of what I am saying on board.

2425 Ultimately, what I am saying is this: What I think we all need to do is believe in ourselves and believe in our ability to do the job we have been elected to do. Also, believe and have faith in our collective desire to be proactive.

Because, if we have that belief, and that faith, there is no need to tie our own hands and confine ourselves to the restrictions of this unnecessary Plan. A Plan that will not only stifle

innovation and give false hope to fellow Islanders, but will also, inevitably, result in needing to employ more staff, which will mean even more taxpayers' money will need to be spent.

2430 Either that, or by signing up to priorities, it means that some issues will be left behind, such as the Disability and Inclusion Strategy was left behind.

I am proud to be a Member of this proactive Assembly, just as I was proud to be a Member of the previous Assembly, because despite what the media sometimes say, and some members of the community sometimes say, I know how hard my colleagues work, I know how committed they are and I know they are all driven by a tremendous desire to be proactive and have a beneficial influence on our community.

2435 That desire and that passion is sometimes so strong, especially in this Chamber, you can almost touch it. If you could put it in a bottle or a box and sell it, you would make a small fortune. It is that strong.

2440 I ask colleagues to have faith in their ability. I will end with that plea, to colleagues.

Please, please, please reject this Plan. Have faith in your ability to do the job you have been elected to do and give yourselves the freedom to be able to do it.

Thank you, sir.

2445 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize, I think, was first up. Deputy Fallaize.

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

I was mentioned a few times in Deputy Lester Queripel's speech, which is the main reason I speak now. While I accept, albeit four years too late, his apology for voting in the way he did in respect of the States' Strategic Plan, he is right that he was wrong to vote for it. But he is just as wrong today, unfortunately, to implore the States to throw out the Propositions before them.

I am probably somewhere, in terms of this Plan and my enthusiasm for it, between Deputy Lester Queripel and Deputy St Pier. I do not share Deputy Queripel's cynicism. I do not share Deputy St Pier's evangelism. I would not have chosen Guernsey being the happiest and healthiest place in the world if the wording had been left entirely up to me. I do not think that one should exaggerate the importance of the Plan.

2455 But, why I think Deputy Lester Queripel is wrong to implore the States to chuck it out is I think he has misunderstood, certainly my opposition, and I think many other Members' opposition to the States' Strategic Plan and other plans which came before. It is no secret that I took the view that the States' Strategic Plan became, it did not start out as but it became useless, in exactly the same way the Government Business Plan did.

2460 That is why it is very important how this Policy and Resource Plan develops in phase two. The Government Business Plan is so long ago, there is hardly any point revisiting it. The problem with the States' Strategic Plan was, first of all, it was much, much too large. It was dozens and dozens of pages. Secondly, the proposal that came before the States four years ago, was for money, I think it was £250,000 off the top of my head. I cannot remember exactly what it was.

2465 Deputy Lester Queripel is wrong when he says the States voted to spend that money and that the money was wasted, because I laid an amendment, I think it might have been seconded by Deputy Soulsby – she is nodding, sir – effectively to deny that expenditure until the Policy Council returned to the States and explained how they would develop the States' Strategic Plan in a way that would make it more useful than its predecessors, which had had failed.

2470 Now, they told us, the old Policy Council, that they knew exactly how it was going to develop, but they needed the money to unlock the rest of the Plan. But, for three-and-a-half years after we denied them the money and just said, 'look, come back to the States and tell us how it is all going to operate in practice', they could not, which I think vindicated stopping the expenditure of the money. The problem is, the States' Strategic Plan had become an end in itself. Even its proponents did not really have any idea what it was doing any more, what purpose it was serving. There was money being spent on it, there was time being expended on it, simply to perpetuate the existence of this Plan.



2480 It was also, and this I think was its most egregious flaw, incompatible with our system of  
Government. The Policy Council, which was a dysfunctional body at the best of times, nominally  
took ownership of it, although, in practice the members of it scarcely ever did, and the whole  
thing was meant to be managed through what were called Policy Council sub-groups, which was  
2485 another tier of Government, which had sort of been inserted by the Policy Council, somewhat  
surreptitiously, I think, some years ago.

The point is that the majority of the Assembly were sitting on committees and departments  
and felt no ownership of this States' Strategic Plan, because the whole thing was being developed  
somewhere else, well away from them.

2490 Now, and I am not talking necessarily about its content, although it is worth noting that it is  
dramatically shorter than its predecessors, the reason I think this Plan is different is because it is  
compatible with our system of Government. What will emerge, and I accept all the criticism that  
some of the language is vague and it could mean one thing to somebody and another thing to  
somebody else. Manifestos, if one wants to see it as a sort of manifesto, all of them tend to have  
that quality in any event.

2495 The difference, I think, is that this Plan does not seek in phase one to usurp the responsibilities  
of principal Committees. We are all, or the vast majority of us, sitting on principal Committees. The  
driving force for the development of this Plan will be through principal Committees. The six  
principal Committees will need to develop between now and next summer, effectively, their action  
plans.

2500 There is a lot of significance that needs to be attached to that. If they become, simply, bids for  
additional expenditure, or available money, which may or may not exist, then the whole thing will  
fail in exactly the same way the States' Strategic Plan did. I hope the Policy & Resources  
Committee is going to stop that.

2505 If Committees believe that all they need to do is go away, draw up a list of things they would  
like to bid for and then send it in to the Policy & Resources Committee, please bear in mind that,  
if that is the approach taken, the whole thing will fail.

2510 Stage two needs to involve the six principal Committees coming to the States to set out action  
plans. In other words, what they will do, when they will do it, how much it will cost, how it will be  
measured, when we will be able to know whether it has been successful or not. It needs to look  
like a programme for Government, not something that is vague and aspirational. Phase one,  
aspiration is reasonable enough, but phase two, it is not. They need to be action plans.

2515 I have already said that I would not necessarily have chosen this happiest and healthiest  
objective, but there is not very much in it to dislike. All organisations need to plan. Surely, we  
accept that Government needs to plan? There is no organisation in Guernsey which is larger than  
the States, we employ, as we have heard this morning, thousands of people. We are spending  
hundreds of millions of pounds a year. The idea that you can do all of that and not make any  
plans for the future is, patently, nonsensical.

2520 That is what Deputy Lester Queripel is suggesting. What he should remember is the Policy &  
Resources Committee has not dreamt up this process. Yes, this document, regrettably as far as he  
is concerned, in gloss, is their document, but the States directed them to produce this. Not the  
exact words, but the process, the framework in which this is being done was established by the  
States. There would be a phase one which set out the objectives of the States over the medium  
term and then a phase two to be debated next summer, which would involve the six principal  
Committees, proposing, effectively, action plans. They are called policy plans, but action plans are  
2525 what they are.

2530 Deputy Lester Queripel voted, I am quite sure, for that, and now he is criticising the process. If  
he does not like the words, he should have laid amendments. I am not defending the words. There  
were 20 amendments, initially, and I was responsible for six of them. So, I am not standing here  
trying to say I think the Policy & Resources Committee have got all the content right, but in terms  
of the framework this has been produced under the direction of the States.

I think this is as good as it gets. We do not want to have a document that is dozens and dozens of pages long. That is what the States' Strategic Plan became. It becomes not just vague, but completely useless. It becomes impractical.

2535 I do not think this document is impractical. I think the principal Committees, I mean I am member of a principal Committee, I think will be able to pick up this document – not this one, because it has been amended, but the amended version – and see what the aspirations and contribute to the formation of an action plan, a policy plan of proposals to fulfil the aspirations and objectives set in this Plan.

2540 For those reasons, I hope the States will not follow Deputy Lester Queripel's advice. I am not an evangelist for this, I realise the limitations. Deputy Graham, who I thought made an exceptionally good speech, probably now lost in the mist of time. It felt like several days ago, I think it was actually only at about half past two! He was right in what he said about plans. Clearly, plans are there almost to be broken, in the sense that we will have to deviate from the Plan.

2545 But, every government needs a framework in which to operate. Not least of all because we do not have a party system. There is no manifesto. We have all been elected on manifestos, but effectively it is 40 separate political parties. There is no connection between what the public have voted for at the ballot box and the policies that then end up with in Government.

2550 There are advantages and disadvantages in our non-party system. The point is we do not have any parties and so the policy development which, under a party system, takes place before an election, in our system has to happen after an election.

We are currently embarking on this process, which a political party would do several months or even years before a general election. It is the production, in effect, of a manifesto, or a programme for Government.

2555 I implore Members to stick with this process. It is far, far better than what has come before and, if it is thrown out, it will not be the end of strategic planning, because the vast majority of the States will believe that strategic planning is necessary. Where we will end up if we do not accept this sort of model, is we will end up back in the days of the Government Business Plan and the States' Strategic Plan, where the whole thing is done top-down, by the Policy & Resources Committee, in the way that the Policy Council tried. It will disengage the vast majority of States' Members and it will, inevitably, fail.

2560 This is not perfect, but it is far better than what has gone before and I implore Members to support it.

2565 **The Bailiff:** Deputies Soulsby and Prow have both been waiting a long time. Deputy Soulsby, then Deputy Prow.

**Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, I am so glad that Deputy Fallaize just spoke.

2570 I feel so much happier now than I did about 10 minutes ago. I endorse everything he just said about the States' Strategic Plan, as well. It was very much, we, those of us on department boards as they were at the time, I am trying to remember the terminology, felt very much done to, rather than being part of a process.

This, I think, is much more inclusive and I think the next phase, particularly, we will see that happen. What will make it really good is the Committees talking together about how we can develop the whole Plan.

2575 I will not take Deputy Lester Queripel's comments about accountants personally. We are used to it. But I do wonder how he thinks we can have social and environmental policies if we do not have fiscal policies. They all go hand in hand –

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, point of order, if I may?

2580 They were not my criticisms, they were the comments that Deputy Le Lièvre made in his speech. I was the messenger.

**Deputy Soulsby:** I cannot speak to former Deputy Le Lièvre. It was Deputy Queripel who just reiterated them.

2585 You could not have social, environmental policies without a fiscal policy.

I think it is funny that this is the same Deputy Lester Queripel that wanted us to support an amendment against the Budget, that it was only to investigate and produce a report. I do wonder who he thinks would be expected to do that work. Would that be civil servants' time?

2590 I hear the cynicism and, perhaps, part of me, to misuse a reference to *Candide*, which Deputy Roffey referenced earlier, I think all is probably not for the best and the best of all possible worlds. But, surely, the key to this Plan and how concerns can be assuaged, just through paragraphs 5.1 and 5.1, that talk of the importance of monitoring trends and how we will need to assess outcomes?

2595 We need indicators that demonstrate whether we are actually making a difference and that measure progress. Such indicators may change, to remain relevant and up to date. That will happen as the Plan progresses, to address what Deputy Graham and Deputy Fallaize just said. We need something to show we are going in the right direction. There should not be hundreds of them but, say, one for each bullet point within the Plan.

2600 I did a bit of a search on this and it has actually been done elsewhere. In Wales, they have what is called the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act. It sets 46 national indicators, which range from percentage of children at fewer than two healthy lifestyle behaviours, such as not smoking, eating fruit and veg, never or rarely drinking and meeting physical activity guidelines, through to levels of nitrogen dioxide in the air, gross disposal household income per head, gender pay difference, percentage of people satisfied with their ability to get or access the facilities and services they need and the percentage of people who volunteer.

2605 Even more interesting, on that front, they also have an indicator about how many people speak the Welsh language. It might be something we might need to consider here. Not Welsh! *(Laughter)*

2610 It is monitoring outcomes that holds us all of us to account and it will make a difference. Deputy Graham mentioned the walled garden analogy. I do not know about that, it sounds a bit like Trumpton to me.

However, what I can say, is I am very happy to support this Plan and hope it remains in rude health throughout its life.

2615 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Prow.

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

I shall be reasonably brief, which, when you follow Deputy Lester Queripel, that is reasonably easy to do.

2620 Unlike Deputy Queripel, I can possibly vote for this Plan. I am sorry to say that I have struggled a bit with this Plan. I have absolutely no problem with the basic idea of a Plan, as outlined in section 1.1 of the Report, and quoting from it, to co-ordinate work and for it to become the 'vehicle for guiding the planning and co-ordination of the work of the States in the future'.

2625 Sir, in section 2.1 it goes on to say that this Plan should be straight-forward, clear, concise, flexible and unbureaucratic. It is a framework of overall policy assumptions, in order to assist principal Committees.

2630 One other positive, is that there has been engagement from the public and I and other Deputies received considerable feedback and comment on the Plan. That has got to be a good thing. As Deputy Inder quickly reminded us in his excellent maiden speech, fresh from canvassing, that the electorate, rightly, have high expectations, and refreshed some of the views from the doorsteps, which should still be ringing in our ears.

I think that, to some extent, the 20 amendments to the debate, also reflects this and evidenced engagement from Deputies. One example is the focus on our precious value of Guernsey's

national environment and the greater clarity asserted in the vision of putting health and wellbeing of the population as a first priority.

2635

So far, so good. What is there not to like?

The States needs a framework to co-ordinate policy and the principal Committees need all the assistance they can get from Policy & Resources. I want a better tomorrow and to live in the happiest place in the world and I agree with all the headings in the appendix.

2640

So, why am I struggling a little with this? In the Budget debate, we were inspired by some literary references which, at the time, caused me some difficulty but, happily, Deputy Kuttelwascher provided the guidance I sought. I will refer to that later. When it comes to literary references and when it comes to plans, we must, of course, take similar inspiration from Captain Blackadder, who had the benefit of many of Baldrick's cunning plans, which often involved turnips. But, in the end, upon closer analysis, they only had one flaw. They were not so cunning.

2645

I am not suggesting that the P&R Plan falls into the same category. It contains a lot of good stuff and I applaud the initiatives and hard work, which has clearly gone into it. But I simply have some difficulties with it.

In my view, why the Plan worries me a bit, is that it varies from being quite aspirational to being quite prescriptive. In considering all the many amendments, I cannot help thinking that we have a long way to go. This is just phase one, understandably, it barely butters the bread and we do not know what the policy filling is. We seem to have adopted a piecemeal approach. We are not debating a finished thing.

2650

We saw the 20 amendments which we debated and we are subject to last-minute negotiations and further change, which does not say an awful lot, in my view, about the process. As I have said, this is only phase one. Are we creating some rods for our own backs in this early stage? Section six describes phase two, but we have no idea at this stage what the work streams are that Committees intend to pursue.

2655

Will the plans we agree to today be the correct vehicle, described in the executive summary? Section 7.6 sets out very stringent criteria, which I quote, 'will be applied across both stages'. This includes criterion of strategic fit. This is a 20-year plan and, by my reckoning, that will span five States and five general elections. This is a challenge in itself, let alone the immediate challenges that Deputy Kuttelwascher well-articulated in his warning in the Budget debate, concerning the impact of Brexit, which only gets scant mention in the Plan. That is a concern to me.

2660

We live in a changing environment where we need to be fleet of foot, to seize Brexit opportunities or indeed survive, mitigate the negotiated impacts upon which we have no real control over, such as the movement of people and trade. We might require extensive new policy initiatives and legislation. To quote Donald Rumsfeld, 'These challenges are only known unknowns at this stage.' What about the unknown unknowns?

2665

There is, in today's wider global political environment, a great risk of unintended consequences and the Plan becoming a strait jacket. In this regard, I see a real danger in the prioritisation criteria as outlined in section seven, as the Plan requires a strategic fit clause.

2670

I quote:

To what extent do the proposals fit with the States of Guernsey's strategic direction and supporting objectives?

In other words, if it is not in the Plan, forget it. Is this a possible flaw in the cunning Plan?

2675

I also worry about achieving outcomes, which I would like to see more in the Plan about growing the economy, which is frankly the only way to underpin our aspirations for our happiness and health and the continued security of our citizens and protecting our beautiful, natural environment.

Having a Plan is one thing. Delivery is another. Section 6.4 outlines a legacy of agreed but not delivered fully costed strategies. I will not go into the detail because Deputy Lester Queripel has outlined those in detail.

2680

In particular, I support the fantastic contribution made by the third sector, with regard the ability to deliver and this must not be forgotten when we talk about those particular strategies.

2685 However, I completely agree with all the points eloquently made by Deputy Ferbrache in a number of speeches that the electorate now expects delivery.

We know what the fiscal challenges are. We have debated them at length at the last Meeting. We have ample strategic steer, so we know what we need to do. We know we cannot do everything and have to prioritise. Clearly, we need to transform and radically change the way we do things. I support the Plan in that regard and I completely endorse everything, all the comments  
2690 that were made just before by Deputy Soulsby.

I very much want to vote for the Plan, because, as the Plan says, we need strategic direction. Not just for the States, but for the whole community and we need to prioritise and to transform how we do things.

2695 However, I need some assurance that the Plan really is straight-forward, clear, concise, flexible and non-bureaucratic. I will repeat those key words, flexible and unbureaucratic. It is absolutely vital and we need to respond quickly to change. We do not want Captain Blackadder to say, 'For once, Baldrick, it was a brilliant idea, but it is sadly not in the Plan.'

Thank you, sir.

2700 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Tindall.

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

I support the need for a Policy and Resource Plan. It is essential for any government or  
2705 business to know where they are going, so that everyone can support the aims coherently and consistently. I also consider this debate extremely thought-provoking, covering a multitude of issues which has been most beneficial.

I also congratulate all of those who took part, which of course includes all of us. Even if, like others, I would not have drafted it in this form.

2710 But, I have one question. Will there be the right level of buy-in from the six principal Committees? Have we also been taking proper account of our friends in Alderney? An Island which, unfortunately, has hardly been mentioned these last few days, which highlights, I think, the good work of our Alderney Reps, by their mere absence.

I seek encouragement this has been happening and will continue to happen as it is so  
2715 important that we start off on the right foot. This Plan is not just for the States, but for the community as a whole, so our endorsement is essential.

I therefore ask Members of the States to lead by example. By approving this Plan, we can show that there is a strategic direction, it is supported by the P&R Committee and all the principal Committees and that, throughout phase two and beyond, we are committed to working together for the benefit of all of our community.

2720 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Green.

**Deputy Green:** Sir, thank you.

2725 I agree with the last Speaker, in the sense that an organisation as big as the States, especially given the system of Government that we have, does require a Plan and I think the point that Deputy Lester Queripel was driving at, cannot really survive any kind of proper logical scrutiny.

2730 It reminds me of the Christopher Columbus situation. Christopher Columbus was a man who, when he set out on his journey, he did not know where he was going and when he got to where he got to, he did not know where he was. He did all of that at the expense of somebody else.

I think that is the basic reason why the States of Guernsey, States of Deliberation, needs to have some kind of Plan, because we need to know where we are going. We need to know when we get there, whether we get there, and, bearing in mind that somebody else is funding all of this, it is important to take that all on board.

2735 I do not actually dislike this Plan. I think what Deputy Gollop said yesterday at some point in relation to one of the amendments, before the amendments were adopted I think the Plan did have a certain fiscally conservative, right-wing flavour to it. I think it has now been dragged, not so much kicking and screaming, but dragged back towards the centre ground, with the enhanced sections on the social policy and environmental policy. I think that is fundamentally a good thing.

2740 I do think there are still elements that are missing from it. I think there is very little discussion, I do not think there is any discussion of justice. There is some mention of social justice. There is nothing about procedural justice. There is nothing about human rights. There is nothing about international obligations, as Deputy Roffey said, and there are elements in there which are somewhat inconsistent with the policies that we are already pursuing.

2745 Deputy Roffey talked about the reference to relative poverty but we know that, even if the SWBIC proposals are implemented and funded, the test that we are going to apply for alleviating poverty, for want of a better phrase, is to alleviate intolerable poverty, not relative poverty.

So, there are problems with it, but I think overall my main point would be I am not sure how helpful the Plan will actually be to the six principal Committees, because there is virtually nothing in there to disagree with.

2750 I suspect that any Deputy, regardless of where they appear on the political spectrum, will probably end up endorsing it, and any document that would seemingly make happy both Margaret Thatcher and Clement Attlee is probably not, necessarily, a document that says an awful lot of worth.

2755 Given that, I am not really sure what strategic direction it is really giving to anybody. It is certainly not giving a particularly clear strategic direction of any real substance and that is probably where our system of Government tends to fall down.

This document could be interpreted as giving support for keeping the 11-plus and also for getting rid of it, simultaneously. It could mean greater public investment in health care, or it could mean greater personal responsibility or private sector involvement in health care.

2760 It could mean the adoption of a radical, integrated, green transport strategy. Or it could equally mean the status quo.

So, what is it really saying? How helpful will this actually be to the six principal Committees? I suspect, it might be a bit of a cynical thing to say, it will not be that helpful and that is the realistic answer.

2765 Clearly, the next stage is going to be all important, whereby the principal Committees will shake their policies around the Plan. But wouldn't they come up with the same policy agenda, anyway, if we did not have this over-arching Policy and Resource Plan? I guess the proof of the pudding will be in the eating. The next stage of the planning process will, undoubtedly, require some very hard choices to be made and, surely, that is what prioritisation must mean in practice?

2770 But how does this Plan actually aid the making of those difficult decisions and hard choices? I am not sure that it does.

Other speakers have spoken about how this particular Plan, this particular planning process, is different from previous plans that we have had and, I think, I do accept that this is different. I think Deputy Fallaize said this is a process that is more, this is not what he said, but in terms of what he said, this is a process that is more simpatico with our system of Government. I think that is right and we should end up, in the summer of next year, with a programme for Government and that is exactly what we should be aiming for and that will actually, hopefully, come from the principal Committees themselves, and it will be endorsed by this Assembly, rather than being foisted upon us from sub-groups or subcommittees of the Policy Council, which is certainly what was previously suggested. I think that has to be a step forward.

2780 I do think this is materially different from other plans and I do think, for that reason, it is probably worth supporting. But it does not mean it is going to be an easy process to go through, at all.

2785 I suppose my concern is that we will eventually end up with some kind of programme for Government in June of next year. We will end up with those policy priorities of the six principal Committees.

2790 Deputy St Pier, in fact, said, when he opened this debate, he talked about this being an opportunity for the committee system of Government to show that it can work. Again, I am not sure that is what he said verbatim, but in terms of what he said. I do think that is the key issue, because certainly when we debated the States' Review Committee's proposals, last term, there were a few speakers, former Deputy Perrot, for example, said that the committee system of Government was effectively going to be in the last chance saloon.

2795 I think that is still true and I think this planning process is key to whether the committee system of Government will continue or whether it will be superseded by something else.

The point I am trying to get at. The thrust of what I am trying to say is, it will not be until the summer of next year that we will have a programme for Government, which will be at least over 14 months since the general election. I am not sure that is a terribly satisfactory way to practise democracy. I am not sure that is a terribly satisfactory way to govern, ultimately.

2800 Deputy Fallaize talked about the difference between our system of Government and any other system where you have parties and, of course, that is true. I just do not think it is good enough, I do not think it is anywhere near effective enough, to wait basically 14 months, or more, to come up with a proper programme for Government. I just think that is too leisurely when you bear in mind some of the key problems that our community is facing at this particular time.

2805 Turning now to the financial matters concerned with the updated fiscal policy framework. I fully support the reaffirmation of a credible fiscal framework, alongside the environmental and social policies that will be in our strategic planning. However, over the last few years, I think it is unclear how the existing fiscal framework has informed any real fiscal discipline in our Government, particularly with the continuation of a deficit for some eight consecutive years, and the systematic under-investment in capital projects.

2810 The question can be posed, how would things look differently in 2016 or, indeed, 2017, if we had not adopted the fiscal framework in 2009? Would it really be so different if we did not have a fiscal framework, at all? There is and there will continue to be no sanction or any particular consequence for any breach of the fiscal rules in the new framework, if and perhaps when this is endorsed.

2815 So, where is the real or actual incentive for our Government to even attempt to meet its self-imposed rules within the framework itself? Is there any point in having rules that we consistently break in any event?

2820 I have to confess that, given the rules about not exceeding 28% of GDP, or indeed the 3% of GDP target for capital, I find it a little strange that our budgets are set long before we know real GDP figures anyway. But, that aside, we know that the States does, in effect, pick and choose which rules to comply with at the moment, depending on the fiscal circumstances and, of course, that can be entirely pragmatic and can be entirely practical to do so.

2825 Whilst I totally approve of the concept of a strong and credible set of fiscal parameters, maybe from time to time we should think more about what actual value this framework adds to our management of public finances in reality.

2830 We will always need to retain a certain fleetness of foot, so to speak, to allow us to react quickly to unforeseen international events. Following the fiscal rules should never be slavish or robotic, given potential economic uncertainty, but maybe we do need to give some real focus to what is more important, following the rules or doing the right thing?

If we end up not adhering to the rules for a very good reason, sir, are the rules really achieving much if anything?

2835 Finally, I think we should regard the fiscal framework and, indeed, regard the P&R Plan as a means to an end, not the end in itself. A necessary but not sufficient tool in the governmental bag for building the Island that we all wish to see.

I close by just reiterating the point that I made during the course of my speech. We operate a unique system of Government in Guernsey. We operate this post-hoc approach to democracy whereby people are elected on individual manifestos. We then come together and we then take a certain amount of time to come up with our programme for Government. I think if that system is going to endure, we really need to be a lot more efficient and a lot quicker at getting to where we want to be and I think that, by the time we actually end up with the programme for Government, it will be the summer of next year. I think memories will already be fading from the general election.

There is a clear disconnect, I think, between what people actually vote for and what they will end up with as a programme for Government next year and I do think we need to think more seriously about whether that system can really endure in the long term.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

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

If we could travel back in time, the decisions we could take again, the things we would look at again, there are several things you could do, I suppose. For example, you might want to hide Deputy Lester Queripel's speech, or you might want to revisit the decision we took with regard to Deputy Yerby on her amendment, was it two weeks ago, on the Social Security Uprating Report, when she was making the case that people living in actually quite squalid accommodation would be barred from benefit for five years.

Would you make that decision today, if we took these things out of sequence? Do you think that decision, for example, focused on the prevention and early intervention and protection from negative health outcomes, bearing in mind people in some of the poorer open market accommodation do have health-related issues, consequently? I know I am stretching the point a bit, but could you improve housing options to ensure appropriate and availability for all? Could you improve availability of supported accommodation to assist with living? People presumably who are in not particularly good open market property have needs just like the rest of the community.

Would it resonate, to use a popular word, for Deputy Lester Queripel to implement the improvements required to monitor and understand and reduce poverty and income inequality in Guernsey?

Perhaps the most pertinent one, does it foster integration in our community? Clearly not.

If we have this document before us today. This document today, it has to be meaningful and we have to take the principles in here on board and begin to live by them.

Now, Deputy Queripel did refer to a previous debate. This is on Hansard. You will not find me saying so, but he does tend to use blackmail by Hansard, which is, 'I am telling the people of the community how you voted the last time you discussed a document and when you come to vote they now know how you voted.'

I can tell Deputy Lester Queripel why I voted against the Plan last time. How could I, as a member of HSSD, onto its third board, support a Plan that spoke of the best health care facilities on the Island, the best independent living we could provide, community services, an Obesity Strategy, a Domestic Abuse Strategy, when we were denied funding to do all of those? How could I make the case and sign up to a Plan to deliver those while our budget was capped at an artificial level?

If we think that this Plan is bad, let us go back again in time and sit in on a strategic bid debate where, dreadfully, we had to choose between bowel cancer screening, a Domestic Abuse Strategy and a museum storage facility. We do not ever want to go back there, Members.

I would ask Members to buy into this Plan, to believe in this Plan and to move forward with it. Speaking on behalf of the President of one of the six Committees, we are already working on the phase two element of this, appreciating the impact of phase one and looking at the next stage. I know that, members certainly of Environment & Infrastructure, do embrace this Plan, the spirit of



this Plan, and will deliver the aspirations of the community and the ideas and context contained within.

2890 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Yerby.

**Deputy Yerby:** Sir.

2895 I entered the Policy and Resource Plan workshops full of energy and enthusiasm to make it work. I left dejected and dismayed. I know I was more than a little petulant in the closing of the second workshop and I do apologise for that. But it had become very apparent in the course of that afternoon that we were so keen on trying to build consensus to find a solution broad enough to accommodate all of our views all of the time that we were at risk of smudging out some  
2900 legitimate policy differences between us. That has troubled me.

Deputy Roffey and Deputy Graham have both touched on this. Subjective language feels good, because everyone can sign up to it, but if we want to take action in any area, we have to choose a direction and pursue it and not all of us may agree to that course of action all of the time.

2905 Disagreement is healthy, even necessary in a democracy. So, I am glad of the debate. I am glad that we had an imperfect plan which led to amendments being made. I think the dialogue between us all is vital.

I do not think we have thrashed out all the differences. I suspect the drafting process for phase two will be more contentious and the amendments will be more tightly fought, because we will be that much closer to the concrete things we are going to do or not do.

2910 I am also glad of the debate because of the community reaction it has provoked. I would never have guessed the strength of positive feeling among Islanders for environmental matters. Especially not, given the kicking that environmental policy usually gets in this Assembly, in the media and in public forums. That has been an eye-opener for me and perhaps for other new Members and I am glad to have been made aware of it.

2915 The last two days have felt to me like a useful policy debate. Actually, this is the sort of stuff that governments ought to talk about from time to time.

Deputy Lester Queripel and I have spoken about this outside the States and we agreed to disagree with the utmost respect for each other.

2920 When I stood for election, it was with a desire to roll up my sleeves and get stuck into serving our community, making practical changes which would benefit the daily lives of ordinary Islanders. I love that character of Government in a small society, but we are still a national Government in almost every respect and it is good for governments to think and talk about the long-term and the strategic side of policy making.

2925 We do have to keep it moving, though. Some important things have been raised in this debate and we will have to track them through to phase two, to the fiscal strategy, to the 2018 Budget, to the Policy Letters brought forward by principal Committees in pursuit of the aims of this Plan. If we care about what we have said in here, we have got to keep it alive.

2930 Sir, like Deputy Graham, there were some omissions in this Plan that grieve me, but that were probably a good sign. I too was alarmed, as Deputy Green has said, that there was no mention of preserving a fair and independent justice system, of protecting civil liberties and enabling access to justice, but I was glad to be assured by the Committee for Home Affairs that their phase two submission would make this more explicit.

2935 I take a similarly optimistic view to Deputy Graham's. I believe we are lucky enough to live in a place where justice is not, in general, under threat, and so we are able to take it almost for granted.

One thing, sir, which I think we should make more of as we progress towards phase two, is this question. Can we see it. If we picture Guernsey 2036 in our mind's eye, what does it look like? This Plan gives us a few, broad brush strokes. We know there will be lively bustling harbours in Town and the Bridge. If I were being wicked, I might suggest that there will be similarly shabby public

2940 infrastructure inland, by the way my amendment yesterday was narrowly lost, I do have hopes that P&R will have heard the message that we cannot continue with the lacklustre approach to capital investment we have had. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I am optimistic that we will start to see a change in this area now.

2945 I do not find Deputy Roffey's claim that it was meaningless to talk about the local aesthetic, the way that places and buildings look here. Future Guernsey is first and foremost a place. We have got to know it and recognise it and love it, now and 20 years from now. Although Deputy Roffey has quite rightly vetoed a trip to the Himalayan kingdom of Bhutan, I think it is right that we should look around the world at real places that are really healthy, or really safe, or even really happy and to understand what it is that they do that we might seek to emulate.

2950 Equally, what they do that we might not consider as right for Guernsey.

I like this Plan. Not because I agree with all of it, because I am not sure that I do, and not because I am confident that I know what Guernsey will look like in 20 years' time. Because, even now, I am not sure that I am.

2955 We are still figuring it out together. But I like it, because it is so clearly a blend of ambition for the future of our Island and a real care not to leave anyone behind.

2960 Deputy Roffey and Deputy St Pier may not think that they have agreed in the course of this debate, but Deputy Roffey said that our personal relationships were the most important thing in most people's lives, the thing that makes us happiest. Deputy St Pier, yesterday, opened with a reminder of how devastating it is when those relationships are violated. For most of us, when we boil it down to the essentials, the most important thing is to have a chance to live a simple, ordinary life, filled with people we care about, doing work we find fulfilling and unthreatened by violence or insecurity.

2965 I might say, in the spirit of this Plan, that we have the best chance of doing so in a peaceful, thriving society. A community that is healthy and safe and contented. But that is by the by. I am not supporting the Plan because it is perfect, or because I am going to be happy to sign up to everything this Assembly wants to do. Believe me, we have got a few more scraps coming. But I am supporting it because it is genuinely motivated by respect and value for our community and because the amendments, which were laid, were laid in that same spirit. A respect for Islanders and a commitment to their future.

2970 That has got to be a good thing and I am certainly going to vote for it and I will work with others to get the very best out of it from hereon in.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

2975 **Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I will also vote for the Plan. When Deputy St Pier, Deputy Fallaize and others, we sat around the States' Review Committee table, probably in early 2015, perhaps late in 2014, discussing the Policy and Resource Plan and what it would look like, I think this does meet my expectations and I congratulate them. I think the approach and layout is right and it is what we envisaged.

2980 Deputy Green spoke about coming sooner. Well, perhaps we have found, hopefully, the way forward and in future Assemblies we have got a model that we can then use because what has happened in the past, and others have spoken about the history, is that we have had 20-year plans, but every time as a new Assembly, we have thrown them away and come up with something completely different.

2985 Hopefully, we have learned from our mistakes and that is part of what we did when we sat around the Review Committee table. I think Policy & Resources have taken it forward. They have learned from what we have done in the past, learned what we have done wrong and tried to come up with a model that we can take forward. So, I thank you and congratulate them.

2990 I hope Deputy Green that, yes, it has taken longer and I was pushing for the dates to be sooner when we sat around the Review Committee table, but my colleagues persuaded us that, in order

to get it right, they needed a little bit more time. But, if we have got it right this time, we will do it sooner in future.

2995 I do not necessarily agree with every word in the Plan and I particularly shared Deputy Roffey's concerns on population, which I know I particularly feel strongly about and I think the focus on maintaining appropriately sized working population is fairly meaningless. But, probably, at this stage, it was what was necessary to get support, but I think it gives an indication to us that the next stage will be more controversial.

We have had 20 amendments, which was good and showed Members have engaged in it. But, perhaps, we will have even more than 20 next time, because it will be more controversial.

3000 Deputy Fallaize mentioned about his amendment. It was actually to the Government Service Plan, which was the next stage after the States' Strategic Plan and that was what was controversial, as you were seconded by Deputy Green. I looked it up while you were speaking.

3005 That level of detail will be more controversial, but hopefully, if it is driven by the principal Committees, and that is the whole idea. One of the failings, again, of the previous plans, or the previous attempts at plans, is that it will be better and it will have greater support. They are closest to the policy development that is needed to deliver, improve and develop the services that they are responsible for in their Committee.

3010 So, I think they are the right ones to lead it and I urge everyone who is on principal Committees to go away and really engage in this next stage. I accept that not everybody is, but I think it is important that you engage and you really lead this. Yes, it has got to go through Policy & Resources Committee, but unless we work at it we have got a direction that we are travelling in, but what vehicles we use to travel in that direction will be determined by the principal Committees.

3015 It is a 20-year Plan, so we are not going to achieve everything but I think it is vital that we do engage and, I think, if you do engage, we will get it right.

3020 My final point is in relation to the deficit and I cannot let go the comments that have been made in this debate. It is interesting that we have spoken about capital and I refer again to the Budget Report where it said that the transfer in the end was going to be £12.9 million, instead of the £36.8 million which would have been transferred in line with agreed policy. It particularly says that excludes with capital income, so we are £24 million short of what we should have been transferring. So, yes, we might be in surplus, but if we are in surplus, that is very good, it is still, whatever the surplus is, you should put minus £24 million against it and that is the number that you should be thinking about, because that is the number that we should be delivering. We should be delivering a surplus and pay the correct amount in to the capital reserve.

3025 Please do not be fooled by the comments that we are in surplus. We are not. Whatever that number is, subtract £24 million from it and that is the number for which we are in deficit. We have got a long way to go. So, do not think that the necessity for what there is, necessity in terms of getting more income, will go away because we are supposedly in surplus, they are still needed. Whatever measures we do, they are needed in order to make our capital requirements.

3030 As Deputy Yerby has said, unless we have that capital, we will not be able to look after our infrastructure.

With that, I will sit down.

Thank you.

3035 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop and then Deputy Lowe.

**Deputy Gollop:** Sir, although it has been a long afternoon in a way, we have been on flights of fantasy today.

3040 I would love to go on one of the Dorniers we never bought to Deputy Roffey's Himalayan paradise, to see the happiness. We heard, too, about how Deputy Lester Queripel, amongst others, wanted, although he dislikes strategies, he does support very much the Disabled People and Inclusion Strategy and also the Older People's Strategy and the Loneliness Strategy. Well,

3045 Deputy Roffey said personal relationships can make you happier than politicians can, but maybe if we had some form of speed dating organised by the States, that might work and solve two problems at the same time. I do not know.

I agreed with a lot of what Deputy Green said, I think. Earlier in this process, Deputy Lester Queripel, in fact, had a chat with me and, at one point, we perhaps considered a sursis to the Plan on the grounds that the Plan would be much more useful if it was more fleshed out, going back to the issue of Deputy Kuttelwascher. Because, at this stage, it is like, I will not say motherhood, but it is like apple pie, really. You are voting for something that is very generic and there is not much to criticise.

3055 It is interesting, we all have different views on what has happened across the mid-Atlantic, but a personality partly won an election there by talking about building a wall. Whether you agree with that or not, and we have seen walls in other places from China to Berlin to Cyprus, that was a specific policy.

Now, we go into this process saying we want to make Guernsey great again, or the happiest place on Earth. That is almost what we are doing. I am a bit of a dandelion Deputy. I do not think I necessarily fit the demographic profile because they tend to be younger, slicker, and more professional, perhaps, than me. But, nevertheless, it is a movement. A religious movement without any religion, in any sense.

3060 It is very much about hundreds of people who gather together to really want a better Island and I have to disagree with something Deputy Gollop said yesterday, especially when it was re-broadcast on the BBC Radio this morning. (*Laughter*) In which I was saying that maybe there was a bit of a right-wing flavour to this. Well, there is. But I may have suggested that it was all about attracting relatively affluent, highly trained professionals back to the Island and I think that probably did influence them with Locate Guernsey, but actually, they are a very important group to our society. We need to stop the brain drain. Deputy Laurie Queripel has mentioned that. There are so many singletons, couples, families, who do leave the Island, undergraduates or whatever, and never come back. That is one of the reasons we have a demographic problem.

3070 Therefore, we do have to have a society that is attractive for all.

Now, listening the last couple of days, I am going to be a bit controversial here, but I am sensing a little bit of a generation gap between the politicians who have been around and are in the States for a long time, or in and out of the States for a while, and the newer generation. They think differently. I think some of the more senior political figures must have had a shock the last few months. The traditional rhetoric and the traditional policies are not necessarily finding such a great audience.

3080 As the late and great Deputy Dave Jones used to say, he said it was useful talking to the younger generation – I have a feeling we have heard from quite a few Members who went to the Youth Forum – precisely because he said we all assume we know what the Islanders want, but it tends to be our generation of Islanders and the upcoming generation actually want to focus on different areas.

Maybe, generally speaking, they want a more inclusive and egalitarian society. Maybe the obsession with really low tax rates is a 50-plus issue. I could go on about the property market, but I will not any more.

3085 So, we do have a lot of policy issues here. I will support the Plan but I, too, have reservations about it. Like Deputy Green, I think the fact that we do not have even a quasi-executive system and we do not have parties and we do not have supremoes standing means we all have a rather mushy set of policies and people forget that a lot of politicians, myself included on occasions, we do not know what our policies are. We still do not. We sit on boards and information that we get or new circumstances means that we have to re-assess.

3090 Deputy Roffey alluded to some points about architecture and design that are in the Plan and in other plans. Actually, dare I say it, the many, many plans that we have had since, I will not say 2004 but it goes back before then, because we had policy advisers and policy planning officers, and in those days, we had an annual debate every July, which was a lovely midsummer treat. Perhaps we

3095 should go back to that, because the one advantage of that tedium was at least it made a plan relevant and you were refreshing it all, according to current events, rather than just putting it on the shelf, which is ridiculous, because society changes and the Plan stays still.

The Plan, really, despite the workshops which always seem to happen and people all trying to reach the consensus Deputy Yerby referred to, is a creature of the civil service. The amendments we passed today are definitely not. They come from the politicians, they have come from the community. Some of them fit in easily to the Plan, some of them less so. But it is a corporate process and that is why you see certain things. They are a nod to the department and the framework and the decision-making and the influence that has gone into that.

3105 States' Members who get elected often do not realise that, regardless of the mandate they have been given, quite properly, they are walking into a departmental or a committee structure where the policies and procedures are already there and are pretty much hard to challenge.

I know some Members of the States, especially those christened Peter, would say it is the politicians' job to challenge and not accept what they are given. Nevertheless, it is a hard struggle, especially with some of the newer States' Members.

3110 So, actually, there is a lot of work to do with this and I support the Plan insofar as it goes. If I have a central and fundamental reservation which makes me sceptical and cynical it is I still think the fiscal framework is the albatross around its neck, because we effectively promised all this additional resource for children's plans, for health, for many other endeavours and, unless we are clear about having the right level of income as a States, we can guarantee that, then however many efficiencies we make, and I am the first to demand greater efficiencies in the civil service, we will end up, as Deputy Lester Queripel said, raising hopes and expectations that we cannot deliver.

3115 So, a Plan that works has to unfortunately have the hard part of costing measures and implementing those at the same time. It should really be a budgetary Plan.

With that, I think I pass on.

3120

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

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

3125 I will support the Plan. I have seen many plans during my time in the States and many are gathering dust somewhere at Frossard House. They do concern me, because the amount of staff time, and it is always senior staff time, that is taken up to do these plans, has been astronomical over the years. Sadly, a lot of them have been left up there and we now, though, have a Plan before us today.

3130 For this Plan, I have to say I am a little bit more optimistic. When Policy Reports come before us, there is no doubt that there will be opposition to some of the ideas that we put before you when they come in the future. That is true democracy. This Plan, I will doubt if there will be in this Assembly today who will sign up to every single word in it, but it is a base and you have to have a base.

3135 Whether in business or in your private life, you can say, 'Tomorrow, I plan to go into town.' Actually, when you wake in the morning and it is pouring with rain, you do not go to town because you do not particularly want to get wet. Life is about plans and we have got one before us today and I am hopeful that this will be a good Plan, working amongst the six principal Committees, and you will have some work before you in the foreseeable future.

3140 It is not unusual in States' Meetings for Members to quote statements previously made in this Chamber. But, in line with the 20-year vision in front of us today, I wish to quote a comment, sir, made from this top bench earlier this year. Not by a President, nor by a Minister. Not even by yourself, sir. But by one of the young people, Pierre de Garis, who participated in the Youth Forum event held here in February.

He said, I quote:

As the world changes, we must change with it, in order to compete and grasp new opportunities.

3145 This simple sentence sums up entirely the task in front of us today. The need to develop a Plan to achieve an Island which is safe and inclusive, successful and happy, and able to respond flexibly on a global stage.

The Policy and Resource Plan lays the framework for this vision to be achieved but, as with all frameworks, it is, as the detail is developed, at committee level that the true impact of the Plan will be best seen and its success can then be judged.

3150 The Committee for Home Affairs' primary purpose is to support a high standard of living and quality of life, by maintaining and promoting a safe, stable and equitable society, which values public protection and justice and respects the rights, responsibilities and potential of every person.

3155 This work is vital in achieving the aims of the Policy and Resource Plan. with the Committee's successful delivery making a vital contribution to safeguarding our quality of life, our community, our place in the world and our economy. Also, the development of Committee plans will commence with phase two. Home Affairs has, in considering this first phase, sought to consider how the Committee will seek to develop its own plan, in line with the guiding principles being set out today.

3160 In so doing, the Committee has, firstly, been mindful of the context and backdrop against which the Plan will need to be delivered. As I highlighted within the Budget debate, the Home Affairs is committed to an ongoing Home Operational Services Transformation, known as HOST, which seeks to achieve a new operating model that will ensure sustainable and affordable future service provision. HOST will offer a real opportunity for both a sustainable financial savings and operational change, which enables the continuation and development of high quality service delivery.

3165 Undoubtedly, HOST is a programme with deliberate outcomes, be it the co-location of services, the evolution of service delivery to maximise technological advances for the greater use of resources, which complement the P&R Plan in terms of ensuring sustainable public finances and our quality of life.

Most specifically, that Guernsey remains a safe and secure place to live.

3170 In acknowledging our place in the world, both as a centre of excellence and of innovation, it is vital to recognise that the world is changing and nowhere is this more apparent than in the growth of digital and information business.

3175 Home Affairs is committed to ensuring that there is an appropriate framework locally, which gives confidence to both the industry and to global counterparts. To this end, efforts are ongoing in relation to the steps necessary to comply with the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation, a standard which must be complied with in order to retain the Bailiwick's adequacy status and enable access to EU markets and to develop policies surrounding cyber protection and data security.

Both projects are fundamental in maintaining and developing our international reputation and developing an environment which encourages and supports businesses.

3185 Home Affairs has mandated responsibility for justice policy. The delivery of justice for all, the conviction and punishment of the guilty, coupled with help to stop offending and protection of the innocent, is the core function of not just the Committee for Home Affairs and its operational service areas, but for other key stakeholders and the Committee is committed to working with these partners to best build upon the success of the Criminal Justice Strategy in the previous term.

3190 The implementation of both new Police Law and new sexual offences legislation will represent major milestones in this term of office, in ensuring that we have a justice system fit for the 21st Century and beyond and this will be a key priority for the Committee.

Additional significant work streams for 2017 and 2018 are the introduction of a new Population Management Scheme, due to come into force in April 2017, and the introduction of a regulatory framework to better protect consumers.

3195 So, finally, to return to the Youth Forum's event held in February, with these young people as our future leaders, it is safe to say that Guernsey will be in safe hands. However, it is our duty, as

States' Members and as custodians of this Island, to ensure that we continue to protect what makes Guernsey special and ensure that it remains special into the future.

3200 I can confirm, on behalf of my Committee, that Home Affairs will be doing everything it can to ensure that Guernsey really is great today, better tomorrow.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

**Deputy Inder:** Sir, as a new boy in the Assembly, I was not involved in the original workshops.

3205 I am just kind of taking what looks like a back view, every government, every organisation, needs a plan and I accept they are amended a bit on the fly. That is probably a bit too hard a word. I accept that in every plan, when you start looking at the final deployment of it, you know there are things that are not quite right and I accept that we have been through an amendment process and it seems that has been a fairly fair and reasonable debate.

3210 I cannot let this happiness thing go uncommented on. I really do not think it is helping. If we look back at the mid-80s, I think Guernsey, I think the *Daily Telegraph* said that we were one of the happiest places in the world. Then, in the 90s, it was probably *The Times* said we were the wealthiest. Now, I do not know what happened in the year 2000, but, apparently, we are the most suicidal.

3215 Centralised happiness is an odd concept to me, it really is very strange. I do not like Government telling me how to be happy. I just do not like it.

3220 I am not sure I'm thinking the Moonies and mass weddings in Cambridge Park, or maybe the Branch Davidian cult in Waco in Texas. It just does not seem right to me. My personal happiness is my happiness and, for me, as a fairly, I am going to use the word Libertarian, I do not like labels, but I think that is where I probably fit in, it is quite simple. I want Government to leave me alone. I want it to stop telling me what to do, I want it to stop telling me what to think, I want it to stop telling me what to say. I just want you out of my face on a personal level.

3225 But, in the main, sir, moving on the read the Policy and Resource Plan itself. It is a Plan and at least we have a Plan. It is better than not having one and I accept what P&R are trying to achieve it is not going to be perfect and I can imagine it has been like herding cats, as we have seen over the past couple of days and I do accept what they are trying to achieve and I am looking forward to phase two and the delivery of those and the tactical work that will be done through the phase two process.

Thank you, sir.

3230

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, I would like to say hear, hear to the remarks that Deputy Inder has just made about Government not being in everybody's face.

3235 Governments have tried to do that over the years. They tried to do it in 1994, they are trying to do it now and they should not do so. I am not saying it as any kind of criticism but, in relation to Deputy Lester Queripel's speech, my mind wondered on occasions. (*Laughter*)

3240 Three particular pieces of popular music came into my brain, for no particular logical reason. One was *Oh Happy Day*, another was *Happiness, (The Greatest Gift that we Possess)*, Ken Dodd from Liverpool, and the other one was *The Times They Are A-Changin'*. All of those are applicable.

Deputy Fallaize said, rightly, he is somewhere between the cynicism of Deputy Lester Queripel and the evangelism of Deputy St Pier. So am I. I fear cynics because they bring nothing to the world. I do not like evangelists because they bring misery to the world. I would rather be somewhere in between.

3245 Happiness, it is a point Deputy Inder and others have made, and I cannot remember who else said, happiness is really something you get from outside of Government, nothing to do with Government. Most of us who have families realise that they are the ones that give us the greatest

happiness, whether it is my eight-year-old son ... my eight-year-old grandson, I have not got an eight-year-old son! (*Laughter*)

3250 The safe thing is, I know my wife is not listening, she never does, either here or outside of this Chamber!

Whether it is one of my grandsons who is eight, asking me if I know about relegation or which is the best goalkeeper, is it Petr Cech or is it Hugo Lloris, or it is now my six-year-old granddaughter, because I am her granddad I think she is very talented at whatever she does, she has not got the best voice and when she sings Twinkle, Twinkle Little Star, which she does, even I realised that she was not going to win The X-Factor.

3255 All of that gives you happiness. It is much more important than listening to the wonderful speeches that I have been subjected to, we all have, over the last day and a half. There have been some very good speeches. Deputy Brehaut made an excellent speech in relation to the environment. Deputy Yerby made several good speeches on various topics. They are just to name but two. Other people made good speeches too.

3260 But what we have got to look at is reality. I am going to vote for this Plan. I am going to be lukewarm, tepid and a little unenthusiastic, but you have got to have a plan, you have got to have an outline in life. You have got to have a goal. You have to have some aspirations.

3265 Deputy Gollop said we tend to look at things generationally. I cannot help it that I am now of a certain age, but I have lived through other ages and I hope I am still receptive to people who are the leaders of tomorrow. But, we are, and do not want to sound over-grand, again it is a point from Deputy Lowe, we are the leaders of today, the 30-odd of us that are in this room and the other people that are not here today. The 40 of us that have been elected, either in Alderney or in here, we are the leaders of today. It is our responsibility.

3270 Aren't we very, very lucky? I am of a generation, again going back to Deputy Gollop's point, born after the war. Deputy Graham's commander, at 18, was winning a DSO. He was risking his life. At 28, he won his MC. He was risking his life again. People like him, men and women through the years, Guernsey people, elder people, wherever, have given Guernsey, because we are where we are in the world, geographically, politically, really in relation to our philosophy, we are a safe place.

3275 We are already a safe place. I want us to be a safe place in June of next year when we debate phase two. My goodness me, I am looking forward to that! A safe place for the future generations, for the present generations. We have got that. I think we will have that as long as others help us.

3280 Because we are not going to be able to resist the Russian tanks if they ever come to the shores of France again. Hopefully they never will. Hopefully, now President Trump is elected, they never will. We will see. We will find that out in due course.

3285 But, really, in connection with all of these things, we need to be, and there is no criticism, it was Tony Carey in the 1980s, who was a fine Guernseyman, who was an ex-serviceman. He was the one who promoted Happy Guernsey. I want to be happy. I am happy. I do not possess, nobody in the world possesses the ebullience of Deputy Trott, but I think I am just as happy as him.

If I could bottle his ebullience, I would sell it and I would then be a rich man! (*Laughter*)

3290 **Deputy Trott:** Maybe we could go into partnership?

**Deputy Ferbrache:** We could, but you would want to be the senior partner.

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

3295 I think Mr Ferbrache meant richer man! (*Laughter*)

**Deputy Ferbrache:** It is nice to know that Deputy Trott is not the only self-professed wit in Assembly! (*Laughter*)

In connection with all of that, we have got to approve it. There are weaknesses. We need to fashion it forward. It is not something I would have spent the best part of the last two day



3300 listening to. I said to Deputy St Pier earlier in the week, I am not going to speak at this debate, and I have spoken several times, because it has provoked me to speak, because that is what this parliamentary Assembly, whatever we call ourselves, should do.

So, we can credit ourselves with that, but we should move on, now. We should approve this, hopefully without further debate. Who am I to truncate anybody's debate? But I see Deputy Queripel has left temporarily! (*Laughter*)

3305 We should now say enough is enough. Let us approve this and then let us put a lot more meat on the bone between now and next June.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy De Lisle.

3310

**Deputy De Lisle:** Sir, just a couple of points.

I felt that the amendments have added breadth to the Plan, particularly in the environmental area and also in health.

3315 One thing, though, if we get back to the public and the way the public see the States and their deliberations. I think at some point you have to stop planning and get on with delivery and that should not wait until June next year.

The public have been subjected to a long debate on the Development Plan, a few weeks ago. Now they are subjected to two days of Policy and Resource Plan and, at the end of the last session, they were subjected to all of these strategy developments at the last term.

3320 It is time that we show that we can get on with things that are of major concern to the public. They want to see the stopping of haemorrhaging of money and the concentration on issues of current public concern, such as the worsening transport links and costs, the horrendous losses of Aurigny, the escalating taxes to the individual, just to name a few.

3325 I think it is extremely important that we address the frustrations, if you like, of the public and get on with delivering some results that ameliorate some of the problems that we face.

Just in the tourist industry, we want a tourist industry next year that actually shows some sign of development and growth and we want transport links that welcome people to these Islands, between the Islands and so forth. We need to look at our economy and see some development thrust and I think it is up to this Assembly to get on with those particular issues and deliver.

3330 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you, sir.

3335 I will be brief. I too embrace this Plan, with the same tepid and heavily caveated enthusiasm as has been expressed by the majority of the Assembly.

I would like to pick up on something that Deputy Gollop alluded to, which is assumptions. The process of this Plan has exposed something about assumptions.

3340 We started off with a very inclusive workshop process. Following from that, there was a degree of editorial decision-making that went on that resulted in this Plan. I think when we looked at this Plan, certainly the members of the community that got up in arms about it were quite clear about what had been edited out, in their eyes, and that was what was widely recognised as a lack of environmental representation.

3345 I know it has been said it is okay because these things are implicit and it is the thought that counts. 'It is alright it is already there.' I do not accept that and I know that Deputy St Pier is an enthusiast for behavioural economics and I would like to remind him of the status quo bias, which I think has been amply demonstrated in this.

3350 I think it is fair to say that we all assume that a successful economy would be implicit in this Plan and yet we think that it is worthwhile to set out how we see ourselves achieving that. I think the same is true of these other imbalances, environment and health, that should have been there.

So, I am glad that we have had the opportunity to rectify that and I am looking forward to phase two and getting on with it in the meantime as well and I remain faintly optimistic.

Thank you.

3355 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Sir, I have been inspired.

3360 A couple of weeks ago, when I first discussed this Plan, I coined a phrase, while I was discussing with some people, of happy-clappy politics. That was not to say that is what it was, that was what I was hoping it was not going to be. It is that word 'happy'. But that has been done to death, now. I think it is most unfortunate that was ever used.

As for dandelions, I consider them to be weeds. (**Several Members:** Ahh.) I do, it is a most unfortunate choice of plant if you want to promote happiness. I would have preferred a tulip, or a lilac or something.

3365 I empathise with Deputy Prow's concerns about bureaucracy and flexibility. We are told this Plan is not going to be bureaucratic and it will be flexible. Well, it had better be, because the last thing we want is some sort of bureaucratic framework lying in ambush, awaiting to stop any innovative policy that might come forward, especially to assist us in our fiscal situation.

3370 At the end of the day, I got a feeling that, even with this Plan in place, not much will actually change and I will tell you why. We are currently, now, under the constraint of saving shall I call it the 3% 5% 5% savings in current expenditure? There is not going to be a committee, I suspect, that is even thinking of a new service, because it would have to then go through the process and they will be more concerned about trying to maintain what they have got with a reducing budget.

3375 The only areas where some prioritisation might be required, in the short-term, between now and June, is if there is a requirement to maybe access what is now called the Future Guernsey Development Fund or the Transformation and Transition Fund. That is about all, because for the rest of us, it is business as usual. The hospital will carry on. The airport. Nothing much is going to change. This business of submitted our policies, this is what we are doing. We are not going to stop it.

3380 There is not actually going to be much change, I think, between now and June. I find that positive. It will all, at the end of the day, depend on, and Deputy Gollop was quite right, where we stand fiscally. As for a balanced Budget, Deputy Dorey is quite right. We are balanced because we have made in-year savings. Some of them are accounting procedures which just transferred the liability to next year. So, next year will be pretty critical and we will have to see how it pans out.

3385 Until we actually take a serious look at widening our tax base and I say getting away from income taxes, because whatever you do with them, even in a temporary sense, you could increase income tax from 20% to 21%, 22%, a 2% increase. It is actually a 10% increase in people's tax bills, but that is only going to make a difference for a short period of time, until the pay shrinks further. Then you are going to have to lift it again when you stop.

3390 There are great immediate issues to look at and you can rest assured the Committee for Economic Development will be looking at them. I suspect some real action between now and Christmas and I suspect we will be asking for some funding, possibly, in relation to air links and sea links and other things. These are areas which could be determined this week.

3395 So, there is hope. I will support it. I do not like all of it. I never like all of anything! (*Laughter*) It is an improvement, I think, on the past, but it is only as good as how it is implemented and that is up to you and me.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

3400 **Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** Thank you, sir.

I was not going to rise to speak but I, like Deputy Kuttelwascher, have been inspired to stand up and speak. It is just about that word, 'happy'. That seems to have gotten some of us confused as to why it would be in the Plan.

3405 It is not a prescriptive way of Government, interfering in our lives, but I think what is important is to understand why it is we need a Plan and what that Plan includes. Now, there is an evolution of how we see ourselves, how we see our health, how we see our person and we are looking more at the whole person.

3410 Mental health is something that you cannot just exclude. How do you include mental health in a Plan? Do we say we want to be grumpy individuals? Do we want to be bad? The only word that you can use, or one of the only words – 'joy' is another lovely word to use – but one of the only words you can use is 'happy'.

So, yes, putting that in the Plan means that you have that mental health in there. It means that when we are thinking about the Plan, when we are taking decisions and making steps forward, that we do include that in our thinking.

3415 I just wanted to put that in there. The other thing, and this is to Deputy Lester Queripel, sir, through you. In response, do we need a Plan? Well, I come from a part of the theatre world that does not use a script. I do improvised comedy. Some might say I still am! (*Laughter*)

3420 What we do is without a script, without a Plan. Yes, you can get up there and yes you can create an entire play, you can do an hour-long improvisation. There are theatre companies that do that, they create an entire musical, including the musicians improvising the music as they go along. But you cannot determine the result, so you get up there and every single person that is there, there is a framework and the framework is working together.

3425 This Plan is that framework. It is the framework of creating a place where we can all work together to move forward. There is one thing in improvisation and how we do it, how we get up on stage. You do not know what the other person is going to say, but you build on what they say and you move forward.

3430 I think that is the crux of what everybody is saying, Deputy Ferbrache as well. Let us get on with it now, okay? Let us move forward. I know that there is action happening. It is not just a standstill and let us wait until June. Already there is work and we are implementing the strategies. Let us stop complaining about and actually agree the Plan, moved forward. Yes, let us act.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** Do you know, I feel inspired by that, sir? That is very good.

3435 Deputy Hansmann Rouxel says that she does improvised comedy, sir. Well, can I ask the States if they have heard this one?

Did you hear about the German pessimist who hates sausage? They say he fears *ze wurst!* (*Laughter*)

Thank you.

3440 Now, sir, Deputy Roffey referred to someone earlier, an author earlier. I had not heard of them. I wonder if he has heard of someone called Alphonse Karr? Alphonse Karr once said that 'some people grumble that roses have thorns, I am grateful that thorns have roses'.

3445 I think that captures, in a sentence or two, my view on life. I am the eternal optimist. Some people, hearing Deputy Queripel speak earlier, may have considered that was the oddest speech they have ever heard him deliver. But it was not, sir. I have heard him deliver one even more odd than that. If you look deep enough, there is a virtue with everything.

3450 Who would not be happy? Deputy Graham and his comments about the Budget surplus, or the probable Budget surplus for fiscal 2016, and Deputy Dorey's comments earlier. Let me give you three reasons to be cheerful. Our discipline with regards public spending has been adequate. Not any more than that. Adequate. The housing market is moving and improving and our investment funds' performance has been outstanding.

3455 Unfortunately, unless we celebrate our successes, we are inclined in this place to get almost into a spiral of pessimism and I will always do my best to remind Deputy Ferbrache, who waxed lyrical about some of his favourite songs, that Monty Python had one that I always refer to. On odd occasions, I find Deputy Ferbrache quite Monty Python-esque. They said, Always Look on the Bright Side of Life. One should always look on the bright side of life.

3460 Let me end with a comment that Deputy Roffey made about Government borrowing. He said it is a bad thing. Well it is not a bad thing. Excessive Government borrowing is a bad thing, but Government borrowing in the way that we have undertaken it is likely to prove, during next year, to be one of the best decisions this Government has made during my time in this States. More on that in the future.

3465 It leads us to the fiscal rules and the fiscal rules are part of this debate. The fiscal rules are one of the reasons why we have a shot at remaining as happy as we are and going on to probably becoming one of the happiest places. We have, over a number of years, managed our public finances, most of the time, with great discipline and with distinction.

Particularly, I have to say, during the last term, when I was sat on the back benches and can claim little, if any, credit for our fiscal discipline. I think Deputy St Pier and his team did a fantastic job. We have much to be grateful for. We have much to celebrate. We have much to be happy about.

3470 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Paint.

3475 **Deputy Paint:** Sir, I have to say that I am really very happy in my misery.

In fact, my nickname in Vietnam is Happy Buddha! (*Laughter and applause*) I just cannot think why.

3480 Going to this Plan, as others have said, I am not completely sold on it. I think it will end up just as another plan, sat on the shelf, gathering mud or dust. I listened to a what of Deputy Lester Queripel said and a lot of it resonated well with me. But, I think, once again, it is time to try it again. So, I will, very reluctantly go with it.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy let Tocq.

3485 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Thank you, sir, I will be very brief.

I was going to say suddenly the Eeyores are coming out this afternoon, particularly, but I think those who feel perhaps more that disposition should take a leaf out of Deputy Barry Paint's book, sir, because he is willing to go with it, which is a good thing.

3490 I certainly, have been in this Assembly and seen a number of iterations of attempts of planning in this sort of format. I did say to somebody, recently, that I have been there and got the T-shirt, literally, because I have got a T-shirt that says 'The Government Business Plan – it is better than nothing.' (*Laughter*) We produced that for everybody that got involved in the Government Business Plan team.

3495 I suppose that is the one thing that you can say about it. It was better than nothing. We learned from it, at least, which enabled us to get to this stage.

I do think that the States' Strategic Plan was a step backwards from the Government Business Plan, but it does not really matter now, because this is an improvement. It is not perfect. It is not right, but in fact it was an evangelist, it was Billy Graham that said if you aim at nothing you are sure to hit it.

3500 Having a plan of some sort enables us, particularly if we are able to link it into the individual plans that put the meat and the bones on the details in due course, next June, which will come out of the various committees, and then that affects the way in which we priorities our resources, our finances, then it is a much-improved system for us.

3505 Like it or not, if we just muddle through and approach the difficulties that we have, and I sympathise with those that want minimal Government. I have always said I am for that. But, in order to get there, we need to have the right sort of environment for people to thrive. That brings us back to the whole thing about happiness, because maybe it isn't worded to everybody's liking, but the pursuit of happiness, the opportunities for everybody to pursue their own idea of happiness, should be the main focus of us as the people in Government. We should be creating the environment where everyone has equal opportunity to do that.

3510 I think this Plan goes a long way towards that, certainly far more than we have ever done in the past and so I do welcome it and I hope we can get to the vote soon, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Leadbeater.

3515 **Deputy Leadbeater:** Thank you sir, I will be very brief.

I would just like to echo what Deputy Hansmann Rouxel said. If you fail to plan, you plan to fail. So, let us just vote this through and get on with it.

Thank you.

3520

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier will reply to the debate.

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

3525 I think I must have been described as evangelical in this debate and perhaps I will share my scepticism at that description, or concern at that description that Deputy Ferbrache described. I think it probably is fair to say that I am evangelical, though, about the need for a Plan and the rigour and discipline that should come with a proper planning process.

I think I would probably describe myself as an enthusiast for the content of this Plan. I am not evangelical about the content of the Plan, but I am evangelical about the need for it.

3530 I think nobody has actually stood up and said they agree with every single word of the Plan and I do not, either. Deputy Yerby said it is not perfect and that was a theme which I think was repeated by a number of people. That encourages me. The problem with previous plans is actually nobody could really find anything to disagree with any of them. The fact there are bits of this that people do not like is, actually, counter-intuitively, a positive thing.

3535 Deputy Roffey asked about CEDAW and whether it would appear in phase two and I would say to him that I would expect it should. The third bullet point on page 14 talks about the commitment that we will progress work on signing up to appropriate and proportionate social, environmental and justice standards. Then, on page 12, we will prioritise resource and implement the strategy's plans related to inclusion and equality, approved by the previous States and that was subsequently also amended by the amendment introduced, originally, by Deputy Fallaize.

3540 Those are the two hooks which should allow that to be developed, if indeed the relevant committees bring that forward as one of their priorities. He also asked about how we were going to measure this and I think Deputy Soulsby very much addressed that in drawing attention to paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2 of the Policy Letter. It is very important that we develop the right measurements of performance and indicators of success in achieving this.

3545 He also drew attention to paragraph 3.5 of the working age population, something that Deputy Graham has referenced on a number of occasions. It is a valid point that I have acknowledged before. It should just read 'working population'. We will strive to do better in subsequent documents that refer to that particular challenging issue.

3550 I absolutely agree with him with the need to rebuild the reserves for the elephants that we will face.

Deputy Graham would have preferred greater emphasis on safety. Sir, I would draw his attention to the fact that the vision is only two sentences long and safety does appear in that two-sentence vision. He may have preferred it in the first sentence rather than the second sentence, but I suggest he is probably over-analysing its location in that vision. It is a clear commitment and

3555

recognition that safety is a key objective, here. I think that was something that has very much been pushed by Deputy Lowe, as well, through this process, and she referred to that when she spoke.

3560 He also referred to the problems in setting up a business. Again, I would draw his attention to the bullet point on page seven, with regard to our economy, the very first bullet point, in fact, in terms of our commitments. We will:

Ensure conditions that encourage and foster enterprise and remove barriers to business.

Deputy Ferbrache spoke about that during the last two days. I am absolutely certain that his Committee will be wanting to bring forward some measures to deliver that high-level objective in response to the comment that you have made.

3565 Sir, he and Deputy Prow, and also Deputy Dorey, referred to it as being a 20-year Plan and others may well have done so. I want to correct that. It is not a 20-year Plan, it is a 20-year vision, with a Plan for the next five years, up to 2021. There is a significant difference, recognising exactly the point he made that you cannot possibly plan for 20 years and that was never the intention.

3570 Deputy Lester Queripel, it was a long speech. I have written down two words. 'Beyond redemption.'

I think it was quite clear very early on that Deputy Lester Queripel does not recognise or accept the need for this Plan at all. He made that very clear and, really, there is nothing more I can say to persuade him to change his mind.

3575 Deputy Fallaize referred to this planning process as developing a manifesto and Deputy Green referred to that as being post-hoc, following the election. I think that absolutely describes this process. The use of the terminology in the Plan, the statements of 'we will' was very much picking up the references in a manifesto-style to the commitments at a high-level of what we should be doing.

I think that captures what we were seeking to do in this first phase.

3580 I think it was Deputy Prow who said we have a long way to go and this is merely phase one. That is absolutely right. We recognise this is only the beginning and there is a long way to go.

Deputy Tindall referred to concern about the absence of reference to Alderney. Of course, this is only a Plan for Guernsey, because of the nature of our Government and the fact that they have a separate Government other than in relation to transferred services and that is recognised and it will be an expectation that the committees that have responsibilities for transport services will have regard to the needs of Alderney in this Plan.

3590 Deputy Green also referred to Deputy Perrot's much used phrase of this being the last chance saloon to make the system of Government work and I agree. We have to make it work. He also noted it will be 14 months since the general election before phase two is adopted, in whatever form, amended or otherwise.

And, of course, the States Review Committee absolutely recognised that, as Deputy Dorey acknowledged when he spoke and that was the reason that we have this overlap to 2021, to provide a smoother system next time around.

3595 P&R are working to the timetable that was set by the States. A re-iteration of what I said in my opening speech yesterday, we are working with the rules which have been set for us by this Assembly.

I am delighted with the comments from Deputies Lowe and Brehaut, confirmation that their Committees are already moving onto phase two of the planning and I know others are as well, actually.

3600 That is entirely appropriate because time is, notwithstanding the comments of Deputy Green, time is actually relatively limited to pull this all together from here. Deputy Dorey, again, looking back to that same point about the length of time that will have elapsed, I agree. I would hope that next time around this process can be concertinaed, providing, of course, it has worked and it is a system that we wish to retain and we have not left the last chance saloon, or wherever you go  
3605 once you have failed in that sense.

Also, I think I would endorse Deputy Dorey's encouragement of the engagement. Deputy Inder, I think, referred to his concerns about centralised happiness and I absolutely agree. This was never about Government directing happiness of its people and I think that was perfectly captured by Deputy Hansmann Rouxel and, indeed, endorsed by Deputy Leadbeater, that if Government's job is not to, as Deputy Inder said, get out of the way, but to improve the lot of its people, to allow them in the pursuit of happiness, as Deputy Le Tocq said, then I do not know why we are bothering at all.

The reference to happiness, to be very clear, and maybe the pursuit of happiness as Deputy Le Tocq said, was recognising that the community's objective would be and should be no different from the objectives that we have for ourselves as individuals and for our families and there are perfectly sensible measures, going back to Deputy Soulsby's point, about how we can measure whether we have created the conditions that allow people to maximise their own personal pursuit of happiness and mental health, as Deputy Hansmann Rouxel is one of those.

I think that Deputy Hansmann Rouxel also, absolutely hit the nail on the head, when she recognised this Plan is a framework.

Deputy Ferbrache is absolutely right. He told me that he would not speak in this debate and I told him that he would! (*Laughter*)

Finally, Deputy Kuttelwascher expressed his enthusiasm that this must be a non-bureaucratic, more flexible system, as it says in the document. I think the fact that it is so much shorter than previous versions as a starter for 10 in phase one, is a very important indication of our commitment to ensure that is the case.

I have nothing further to add, sir, other than to encourage everybody, with the possible exception of Deputy Lester Queripel, to support all the amended Propositions with considerable enthusiasm.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** And those amended Propositions have now all been consolidated and prepared and they are ready to be handed out.

Hopefully you all have a copy of these amended Propositions. As I understand it, and perhaps Madam Procureur can just confirm, all you have done is just to, literally, consolidate all the amendments into a single document. Have there been any further consequential changes you need to draw to the Assembly's attention?

**The Procureur:** No, there are some minor tweaks to make the wording flow better, obviously, because a lot of the amendments were simply to come at the end of Proposition 3.

So, hopefully what this document does is take on board the consolidated amendment from P&R which was tabled yesterday and on that vein, show sequentially on each page where all the amendments are in relation to Proposition 3.

The amendment to Proposition 1 takes account of the only amendment which was passed by this Assembly yesterday in relation to Proposition 1.

So, all the amendments that have been tabled and carried are and should be incorporated in this amendment. I know that P&R officers have also double checked this, so it should be absolutely accurate.

Everything should be covered in there. There is nothing extra added.

**The Bailiff:** I hope nobody wishes them to be read, but if anybody does, I am sure the Greffier would be only too happy to read the document.

**Deputy Yerby:** May we have a minute to read them?

**The Bailiff:** You may have a minute, certainly, particularly people who want to ensure that their amendments have been properly incorporated. Please take the time to do so.

Deputy Fallaize.

3660 **Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, can I ask, it is a bit unusual, in that the Propositions, if approved, change text in a document which is being approved. Could the President of the Committee perhaps just advise the States what his Committee's plans are for getting the full document circulated and published?

3665 **The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** Yes, sir.

Staff have been working on that this afternoon, so I would hope that we would be in a position to circulate an amended version of the entire document imminently.

3670

**The Bailiff:** As I understand it, staff have made sure that these changes make sense once they are incorporated into that document. (**Deputy St Pier:** Correct.) So, they have been sent to check it in that way.

Has everyone had a chance to read the document? Does anybody have any questions of H.M. Procureur on it?

3675

No?

Do you have any questions, Deputy Yerby? You look as if you are not quite happy with it.

**Deputy Yerby:** I think we might have a consequential amendment.

3680

Paragraph J(ii)(a) substitutes the subheading 'one community inclusive and committed to social justice' for the 'inclusive and equal community' subheading and then later on, Paragraph N, tries to insert text under the subheading 'inclusive and equal community', which, at that point, will presumably no longer exist.

I am not sure how much that matters.

3685

**The Procureur:** I am aware of that. It also occurs in a couple of other places. We took the view that actually that was the amendment that was placed, it is obviously what was amended and in the P&R document, the tracked changes are on. They have picked up that change.

But, we were aware of that.

3690

**The Bailiff:** Thank you. I see no one else rising.

There are actually four Propositions. A number of sub-Propositions, but unless anybody wants any separate votes, I will put all four to you together.

Deputy Lester Queripel is rising.

3695

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** A recorded vote, sir, please on all of them.

**The Bailiff:** We will take all four Propositions together, with a recorded vote.

What you are voting on is the entire set of Propositions, just to make that clear. The entire document.

3700

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 35, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 4*

**POUR**

Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Prow

**CONTRE**

Deputy Lester Queripel

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. McKinley  
Deputy Stephens  
Deputy Parkinson



Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Tindall  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Tooley  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Mooney  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy Merrett  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Smithies  
Deputy Hansmann  
Rouxel  
Deputy Graham  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Dudley Owen  
Deputy Yerby  
Deputy De Lisle  
Deputy Langlois

**The Bailiff:** Clearly that has carried.

Members, I can declare the result of the voting was 35 votes in favour, with one against, I declare Propositions 1 to 4 on Article I of the Billet carried.

3705

We will now rise and resume here in two weeks' time.

*The Assembly adjourned at 5.20 p.m.*