



**OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF THE**

**STATES OF DELIBERATION**

**OF THE**

**ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

**HANSARD**

**Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 30th June 2017**

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

**Volume 6, No. 20**

**ISSN 2049-8284**

**Present:**

**Richard J. McMahon, Esq., Deputy Bailiff and Deputy Presiding Officer**

**Law Officers**

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

**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, 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

**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, 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**

S.M.D. Ross, Esq. (H.M. Senior Deputy Greffier)

**Absent at the Evocation**

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Procureur), Deputy L. C. Queripel, (*relevé à 9h 35*);  
Deputy J. P. Le Tocq (*absent de l'île*); Deputy H. L. de Sausmarez, (*relevé à 9h 33*)

## Business transacted

Evocation .....	1385
In memoriam – Former Deputy Francis John Roper .....	1385
<b>Billet d'État XII .....</b>	<b>1386</b>
I. Policy & Resource Plan – Phase Two – Debate continued .....	1386
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.35 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m. ....</i>	<i>1422</i>
I. Policy & Resource Plan – Phase Two – Motion carried as amended.....	1422
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.11 p.m. ....</i>	<i>1467</i>

*PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK*

# States of Deliberation

*The States met at 9.30 a.m.*

[THE DEPUTY BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

## PRAYERS

*The Senior Deputy Greffier*

## EVOCATION

**The Senior Deputy Greffier:** Billet d'État XII – Continuation of the debate.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Greffier, during the roll call, Deputy Lester Queripel and now Deputy de Sausmarez have arrived, slightly damp, this morning. Would you both wish to be relevé  
5 at this point?

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

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** Yes, please, sir.

## In memoriam – Former Deputy Francis John Roper

10 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, you will have been very sorry to learn of the death, on Wednesday of this week, of former Deputy Francis John Roper.

John was born in England in 1933. He attended Finchley Catholic Grammar School, following which he graduated in Philosophy, Politics and Economics (PPE) at Exeter College, Oxford.

15 In 1954, after a period of national service, John commenced employment as a regulator at the Bank of England. On 1st May 1986, the States resolved to set up the Guernsey Financial Services Commission, and later that year John came to Guernsey – initially as States' Commercial Relations Advisor at the Advisory & Finance Committee. In that role he was instrumental in setting up the Commission. The Commission came into being in 1988, and John was appointed as its first  
20 Director General, a position he held until 1997. He guided the Commission through its formative years, and the high reputation of the Commission, both in the Bailiwick and internationally, owes much to his vision, wide knowledge, and the enormous enthusiasm and drive he brought to the establishment of this respected institution. In many respects, he was the foundation stone on which the Commission has been built.

25 Shortly after retiring as Director General, John was elected as a People's Deputy for the electoral district of St Peter Port, and he continued in that office until April 2004. In the course of the seven years in which he was a Member of the States of Deliberation, he served on three major States' Committees, as President of the Board of Industry, and as a member of the Advisory & Finance Committee and the Education Council. He was also a member of the Arts Committee, the Ladies' College Board of Governors, the Guille-Allès Library Council and the Constitution of the  
30 States' Review Committee.

John was an ardent supporter of full executive Government, and he was most disappointed when the States decided to introduce the slimmed down Committee system, with effect from 2004.

35 John's dedication to public service did not end when he ceased to be a Member of the States. He was, for 20 years, a Douzenier of the Parish of St Peter Port, and served as Dean of the Douzaine for two years.

In 2005 he served on the Independent Working Group set up by the Treasury & Resources Department to examine the economic impact of changes to the Island's tax regime. His interest in the States also continued, and for a time he was regularly seen in the Public Gallery gathering  
40 material for his commentaries on States' meetings in *The Guernsey Press*.

Due to his professional background, he took a keen interest in the finance sector, in particular, and the Island's finances in general, and had a full understanding of technical issues relating to regulation. As President of the Board of Industry, John espoused diversification in the Island's economy. However, he did not limit his abilities to such matters and he cared genuinely for the  
45 welfare of the people of this Bailiwick.

He is survived by his wife, June, and daughters, Jane and Lizzie, to whom we extend our sincere condolences. Will you please now join me in rising to honour the memory of Francis John Roper.

*Members stood in silence.*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you all very much, Members of the States.

## Billet d'État XII

### POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

#### I. Policy & Resource Plan – Phase Two – Debate continued

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I hope, Members of the States, that you all have in front of you a new  
50 amendment, that I mentioned yesterday evening, which is marked as amendment 32, and is to be proposed by Deputy St Pier.

*Amendment 32.*

*To insert at the end of Proposition 10:*

*'but subject to deleting "Guernsey Runway Extension" from the list of bullet points and replacing it with "Strategic Air and Sea Links Infrastructure".'*

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, this amendment is to be seconded by Deputy Lyndon Trott:

*Deputy St Pier read the amendment*

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, this amendment is purely consequential following the amendments previously approved by the States, in order to ensure consistency, and it is nothing more than  
55 that, sir.

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

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

60

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Is there any debate on this amendment? No.

I will put it straight to the vote then, Members of the States. This is amendment number 32, proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Trott, to insert words at the end of Proposition 10. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

65

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I declare the amendment duly carried.

For the time being, Members of the States, that completes the amendments. I understand that there will be one composite whole replacement amendment to be proposed by the Committee, just so that you have got a clean set of Propositions for when voting takes place at the end of the debate.

70

Before we go into general debate, let me just try and summarise where I think we have got to.

If you have got your Propositions in front of you: Proposition 1 has been amended by the insertion of words at the end by amendment 19; there are then three Propositions that have been inserted between 1 and 2, by amendments 27, 26 and 21; Proposition 5A has been inserted by amendment 3; in Proposition 6 there have been two insertions at the end by amendments 28 and 29; Proposition 10 has just been amended by insertion of some words at the end by amendment 32; Proposition 11 has words inserted at the end by amendment 16; Proposition 11A has been inserted by amendment 17; Proposition 12 has been amended by wording introduced by amendment 15; Proposition 12A has been introduced by amendment 30; Proposition 15 has been added to by amendment 5; Proposition 15A, as it will now be numbered, has been inserted by amendment 24; Proposition 16 has been added to by amendment 14; and Propositions numbered 20A, 20B, and 20C have been inserted by amendments 8, 10 and 11; and Proposition 21 has been inserted by amendment 31.

75

I say that, just so that at the start of general debate, if anyone disagrees with me they will leap to their feet, but you should fairly soon get the text of an amendment that will explain all of that in black and white for your benefits.

85

Who wishes to speak in general debate?

Deputy Parkinson.

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

90

This will be a rather longer speech than I am accustomed to making, so I hope Members will bear with me.

In the first part of the speech I will be speaking in my capacity as President of the States' Trading Supervisory Board, and in the second part I will be giving my personal view as an individual Deputy, and I will try to draw a hard line between the two.

95

If we look at the big picture, in terms of the Medium Term Financial Plan, we see that P&R have identified a £70 million deficit over the Plan period, unless action is taken to improve matters. The cure that they propose for this deficit consists of £14 million of tax increases, which we spent a lot of the last three days discussing, and £26 million of expenditure reductions which we spent the rest of the time discussing. Those two elements total £40 million. But the biggest single component of the proposed cure is contributions totalling £30 million from the STSB, which we have spent no time at all discussing.

100

Now, STSB has been raided several times in the last year, so this is familiar territory to us. In 2016 Guernsey Post and Guernsey Electricity bought back some of their own shares from the States to a value of £6 million and £4 million, respectively. These one-off payments were made on top of dividends of £1 million from Guernsey Electricity and £200,000 from Guernsey Post.

105

Similarly, one-off payments totalling £2 million were made from the reserves of Guernsey Water and States' Works. So the trading assets contributed a total of £13.2 million to the surplus of £25 million reported in the States' accounts for 2016.

110 This pattern is continuing, because in the 2017 Budget, Members approved the return to the Capital Reserve of £18.6 million from Guernsey Water, to be achieved by refinancing the Belle Greve Outfall out of borrowings from the Bond funds. Again, this is a one-off payment.

115 We only learned that further contributions totalling £30 million were expected over the life of the Medium Term Financial Plan shortly before the Plan was published. So we had very little time to discuss this with P&R. However, we did feed back some comments at officer level, and as a result the Plan now says at 5.30:

The estimates of returns remain un-validated at this stage.

– and at 9.9 –

The Committee will work closely with the STSB to set a clear policy in respect of returns from trading entities ...

– which we welcome.

120 The Plan goes on to talk about our property assets and says at 9.12 a more disciplined approach to the use, management, purchase and disposal of property assets has the potential to provide sustainable income streams through rental income or one-off capital receipts through disposal of surplus properties.

125 This is undoubtedly true, but I would note that in respect of the proceeds of any disposals of properties, other than those on the balance sheets of the incorporated trading assets, these will go to the Capital Reserve and will not count towards the £30 million of contributions that STSB is expected to make to general revenue.

Incidentally, sir, I hope the STSB will be able to bring a policy letter to the Assembly, jointly with P&R, before the end of this year, setting out the steps that we believe need to be taken to give effect to the more disciplined approach referred to in the Plan.

130 Sir, basically the £30 million of contributions from STSB, on which the MTFP depends, have to come either from revenue dividends from the trading assets, or from the release of equity from capital assets, as in the case of the Belle Greve Outfall.

135 Now, sir, I want to unpack the issues of dividends from the trading entities, which you may recall remain un-validated at this stage. We have nine trading operations within the STSB portfolio, but some of these will never be able to pay a dividend. Among the four incorporated businesses, neither Aurigny nor James Co. will ever pay a dividend. We will be lucky if Aurigny ever returns to profit. So, only Guernsey Electricity and Guernsey Post can contribute.

140 Of the five unincorporated businesses, if we start with States' Works: 80% of States' Works business is with other States' Committees. So, if it makes a profit, it will do so at the expense of other Committees. The surpluses of the Harbours, are fully absorbed by the losses at the Airport, so it is unlikely the Ports will make a profit.

145 There are exciting opportunities at the Harbour, but these development opportunities cannot be realised until the Harbour Area Action Plan is produced, and it is vitally important that that element of the Policy & Resource Plan is actioned, but even if resources are found to develop that Plan, we are advised that it will involve a two-year public inquiry, and therefore it is very unlikely that any meaningful returns from the Harbours can be expected within the life of this Plan.

The Dairy makes small profits, and those are unlikely to increase. So we are left with Guernsey Water, and what is currently the solid waste account, but which will eventually become a new business, possibly called Guernsey Waste.

150 In effect, Guernsey Electricity, Guernsey Post, Guernsey Water and the new solid waste business, when it is established, will have to produce the major part of returns to P&R, totalling about £6 million a year. To put that in context, I remind you that Guernsey Electricity and Guernsey Post paid dividends last year of only £1.2 million.



Members will appreciate that increasing the profits of some of these businesses to pay dividends to P&R could be politically highly unpopular. Indeed, under the legislation establishing some of the trading entities, the charges made by them can only be used for the provision of the goods that they supply. For example, Guernsey Water can only charge for the cost of supplying water. It cannot increase its charges for the purposes of paying a dividend to general revenue.

More generally, it is legally doubtful that the trading assets can increase their charges, in effect, as a substitute form of taxation. In most cases the States is a monopoly supplier. So, for example, it may not be legally proper for the Dairy to increase the cost of milk in order to generate profits, because the States has a monopoly, a legal monopoly over the supply of milk, but by contrast, for example, it would be possible, theoretically, for the States to increase the price of butter because there is a free market in butter, but that is precisely why it would be very difficult to increase the price.

It might be argued that the required revenue surpluses could be generated by efficiency savings rather than price increases, reductions in operating costs etc. But as matters stand, it is probable that the trading assets would be obliged to pass on those savings to their customers, not to P&R. So, it amounts to the same thing.

Now, sir, I would be prepared to accept the economic argument that the cost of capital provided by the States is a proper cost to the business concerned, and that a reasonable rate of return on its investment should be paid to the States. But, I am not certain that this argument would stand up in Court, and we need further legal advice. If the argument that the States can demand a reasonable return on its capital is accepted, it will be necessary to formulate a dividend policy for each entity based on a reasonable charge for capital employed. None of this work has been started, and that is why the P&R Policy Plan says the estimates of returns remain unvalidated at this stage.

Now, sir, we come to the tricky part. It would, theoretically, be possible for P&R to bring a policy letter to the Assembly proposing changes in the relevant laws, to permit the generation of profits over and above what is legally defensible. But I have to say, speaking purely on my own behalf, that I would not be able to support such amendments, and I suspect that I would not be alone in the Assembly. We would, in effect, be imposing consumption taxes on some of the basic necessities of life – quite the opposite of the luxury goods tax that some Members have advocated.

So, in the absence of a regulator to protect the interests of the consumer –

I give way to Deputy Soulsby.

**Deputy Soulsby:** I thought at one time – I might be incorrect now, and things might have changed, but I thought – that the Dairy and the production of milk was exempt from the Monopolies Law.

**Deputy Parkinson:** Well, I do not know whether it is exempt; I am talking about the position where the States has a legal monopoly over the supply of milk, and the question is whether, if we increase the price of milk simply to generate returns to general revenue, that is an abuse of our monopoly position. But that is a matter for lawyers to advise us on.

So, in the absence of a regulator to protect the interests of the consumer, the STSB has to manage the trading assets in the wider interests of Guernsey as a whole, including the interests of the consumer. We can support sensible dividend policies that reflect the cost of the capital provided to these businesses, but the dividends must be legally permissible, obviously, sustainable for those businesses, and fair to the consumer.

It remains to be seen whether the resulting dividend policies produce the amount of money that P&R expects under the MTFP.

The MTFP has been described by another Member as a short-term plan, but I would prefer to characterise it as a plan driven by expedience. Numbers have been moved around to make them fit the objective of ostensible fiscal balance, without much regard to the legal, political and

205 economic realities. The MTFP assumes that tomorrow will be much like today, and that the only variables are the ones under our control. Well, it is most unlikely that the future, even the near future, will be like the recent past.

Members will not be surprised to hear that I continue to believe that the States needs to put reform of the corporate tax system at the heart of a proper fiscal strategy. Only, in my view, such a  
210 reform or the introduction of a consumption tax will fill the structural deficit.

Clearly, we cannot predict with any precision the impact of Brexit, to take one variable. But we can be certain of one consequence which is already visible, the almost total loss of influence of the UK government over developments in Brussels. This is of immediate consequence in the context of the current EU black listing process.

215 Sir, Guernsey is one of a number of jurisdictions that is required to submit to the EU by 7th July their responses to an EU questionnaire. This is a questionnaire that Bermuda's Minister of Finance has said is designed to lead to a pre-determined conclusion that the Island is a tax haven. The EU will evaluate the responses to the questionnaires with a view to producing a black list of tax havens by the end of 2017. We can only guess what the consequences would be if Guernsey  
220 appeared on that list, but they are not likely to be beneficial.

Sir, I made my case for Guernsey taking a different fiscal course when I stood for the presidency of P&R in May last year, and the States rejected the opportunity to pursue that option. There is little we can do now to alter the outcome of the EU process. The questionnaires have to be submitted by 7th July, which is whatever it is, Monday week. And so we will just have to await  
225 developments. There is certainly no point in moving an amendment to drive a change of course in our corporate tax strategy at this stage. But, I sincerely hope that when P&R consider the options for broadening and diversifying the Island's tax base, as they are committed to do, they will put the corporate tax regime front and centre. By the time we are debating the Budget in November of this year, there may be no alternative.

230 So, what to do about this Policy & Resource Plan? What is presented to us as a fiscal strategy is, in my view, complacent and barely credible. The savings targets will be hard to achieve. The revenue-raising targets will be painful, if the increases fall on the resident population, and the contributions expected from STSB are uncertain. They may not be deliverable.

235 Considering the Policy & Resource Plan as a whole, un-prioritised as it is, it is clearly not yet an effective plan for Government. We will have to wait until the Budget to discover what the priorities for this term of the States will be.

I am disappointed and I think the public will be disappointed, to see how little progress has been made in 14 months. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)** The States wasted the first eight of those 14 months deciding how blue the sky should be *(Laughter)* and have since embarked on a  
240 bottom-up approach to building a plan. My experience as a former Chairman of the States' Strategic Plan team tells me that a bottom-up approach does not work in Guernsey politics. The draft schedule of priorities, which P&R will now produce for the Budget, should have been put before the Assembly last November. By the time of the 2018 Budget at the end of this year more than a third of our term of office will have elapsed.

245 Sir, I am not yet sure how I will vote on the Propositions at the end of this debate. It can be argued that any plan is better than no plan at all, and of course the Plan will hopefully improve in future iterations. Furthermore, it can be said there would be little point in voting against the Propositions, but a vote in favour could be interpreted as approval of what I consider a disappointing piece of work, and could reinforce the possible complacency that we see in the  
250 current efforts.

On balance, therefore, it is likely I will abstain on the key votes, but I will, of course, listen to the rest of the debate with interest, and I may change my mind.

Thank you, sir.

255 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Paint.

**Deputy Paint:** Sir, I have some questions I want to make on the delegated authority of £2 million. Could Deputy St Pier explain how Members of this Assembly, who may object to a particular Committee's spend on a project, can approach this without calling a requête. A requête will no doubt cause huge delays in progress of any project a Committee may desire to do.

I am deeply concerned that some of the Committees have wasted thousands of pounds to date, and perhaps millions of pounds in the future, on projects that are not necessary, or may not be necessary.

The formal scrutiny of anything must be allowed to come to this Assembly before any project should be done, but if you have an objection it is going to be very difficult to do without calling a requête.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel.

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

Sir, my colleagues will recall I was the only Member of this Assembly who voted against Phase One of the P&R Plan, and when Deputy St Pier summed up on that debate he said he considered me beyond redemption. Surely, sir, the fact that I seconded an amendment by Deputy Tindall will prove to Deputy St Pier that he should never give up hope on me.

Now, sir, as I have said in this Chamber on more than one occasion, I consider myself to be an optimistic realist, ever hopeful, yet firmly rooted in reality. Which is exactly why I did second the amendment laid by Deputy Tindall, because I was hoping we could change Propositions from 'to approve' to 'approve in principle'. Now I was not allowed to speak in that debate, because I was the victim of the dreaded guillotine, but had I been allowed to speak I would have made the following points, which relate directly to the Propositions before us now.

The amendment Deputy Tindall and I laid was a simple one; it gave the Assembly the opportunity to vote in favour of another option regarding Propositions 13 to 19. Sadly, sir, as we know, the majority of the Assembly rejected that option. They were perfectly happy to stay with the choice they had which is to approve or to reject, or of course, to abstain.

Deputy Tindall and I, along with 11 of our colleagues, who voted in favour of the amendment, wanted to see the option 'to approve in principle' because that meant we agreed with the general direction of travel of every Committee but we did not agree, or approve, with every single word they said in their policy plan. There are some excellent initiatives laid out in those policy plans, but because the option to approve in principle is now not available to us I am going to have to vote against those Propositions, because I do not approve of every single word, or every intention, or initiative written in those policy plans.

I am not going to fall for the spiel that we approve now and when a department brings a Proposition before us that I do not approve, to have to then lay amendments to try to change things. I am not going to fall for that, because the department will then say, 'But you approved our policy plan in the debate on Phase Two. Why did you approve if you did not agree with it?' Surely, sir, it would be difficult for any Deputy to argue against that. But, the way I see it, all of that prolonged and protracted and tiresome and tedious debate could be avoided by voting against Propositions 13 to 19, and I urge my colleagues to do that when it comes to the time to vote.

I will also be voting against Propositions 8 and 9, not because I do not trust my colleagues on P&R and STSB to spend anything up to £2 million, wisely, but because I will not have any say in the matter, as Deputy Paint has just alluded to. There are already too many areas where Deputies do not have any say in the matter. Sir, we are, in reality, already restricted and I certainly cannot, and I will not, agree to placing even more restrictions on myself.

I am sure some of my colleagues will recall the reasons why I voted against Phase One of the P&R Plan, and those reasons may still apply to Phase Two – I am not sure yet, I will listen to the rest of the debate – but those reasons were because it seemed completely illogical to me to spend so much taxpayers' money, and commit so much staff time over a two-year period, to an

overarching master plan that has a shelf life of two years. Now, sir, I am not afraid to be a lone voice in the wilderness, like Winston Churchill in the 1930's, but I would prefer not to be.

My first question to the President, sir, is a two-part one: how much taxpayers' money has been spent, and how much staff time has it taken to produce this document before us today? In fact, to add to that, how much did it cost to produce Phase One? Now, I fully appreciate, sir, that the President may not have that information in front of him, and if that is the case my next question is why has he not got it in front of him? This is, after all, the plan that his Committee have been driving for a year now, so surely they know exactly how much it has cost, and how much staff time has been taken up compiling this document before us. If they cannot provide the Assembly with that information, sir, then I am perfectly happy to submit a Rule 14 Question, and relay the response to the media who will then relay it to the public, and, of course, I shall be doing that in the interest of openness, honesty and transparency, and for the –

I see Deputy Brehaut standing, sir, and it is going to make my speech even longer, but I will give way.

**Deputy Brehaut:** Thank you for giving way, Deputy Lester Queripel.

Staff are employed in specific roles which is to write policy, this is a policy document, which they are paid to write. How could writing policy increase the costs for people who are paid to do it in the first instance?

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** In response to that, sir, we will hear the answer from Deputy St Pier.

Sir, colleagues may be asking themselves why I am focussing so much on the overarching master plan. Well, the reason I am doing that is because it is totally unnecessary, in my view, and superfluous to requirements; why on earth do we need an overarching master plan to link a suite of plans? I do not think we do. All the good work that has already taken place within this document will continue regardless of them coming under the stewardship of an overarching master plan.

The amount of work that my colleagues and I are doing behind the scenes, as well as in the public eye is absolutely extraordinary. I get emails from colleagues at midnight, I get emails from colleagues at five o'clock in the morning when I am at my desk drinking my first coffee. We all attend numerous presentations and committee meetings. Many of us work on a one-to-one basis with fellow Islanders, helping them to resolve problems, some of which involve three or four departments. There is no mention of that in this Plan, and there is never any mention of it in the media. I have asked one of the authors of a regular column in *The Press* to write an article on that and he has considered, it and I just want to clarify it is not Deputy Roffey, sir.

What we are talking about there, we are talking about social policy, which is what this document is all about. Because we are talking about improving the quality of life of our fellow Islanders, and we are talking about at least trying to attain the aspirations as planned for us, which as we all know is to make Guernsey one of the happiest and healthiest jurisdictions in the world. But, of course, as we all know, happiness is subjective because it means different things to different people, but I will sign up to it, possibly. I will sign up to the aspiration anyway, I might not sign up to the complete document before us, but a lot of that one-to-one work does go on behind the scenes, and it goes on in confidence, but sometimes two Deputies work together to help to improve the quality of life for fellow Islanders, and in the past I have asked Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, I have asked Deputy Le Clerc, Deputy Gollop, Deputy Yerby, Deputy Leadbeater, Deputy Fallaize, Deputy Inder and my brother Deputy Laurie Queripel, to help me on case work, and I have really appreciated and valued their input, and I thank them for that. Did we need an overarching master plan, or any plan, in fact, to improve the quality of life of our fellow Islanders? Well, no we did not. We just rolled up our sleeves and got on with it. That is the part of the job I find really fulfilling and rewarding. That is what I signed up for: immediate action and immediate results.

360 Now, what have we really been doing these last three and a bit days? Well, the reality is that we have been navel gazing. We have been talking about what we have to do, and what we are going to do, but the reality is we are already doing it, so why do we need an overarching master plan to tell us how to do the job we have been elected to do? Why don't we spend that money on the issues themselves, rather than on the plan, that will apparently tell us what we have to do to resolve the issues?

365 Deputy Lowe, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, and several other speakers, have expressed their frustration in speeches this week, about the fact that we have been talking when we should be doing. I resonate with that, completely, because who knows how long we are going to be here today, but so far we have been here three and a bit days, when we could have been out in the community helping our fellow Islanders in that time – not debating a plan to do just that, when we already know how to do it.

There was a time yesterday during debate when I was reminded of a song that was a hit in the 1960's for Nillson entitled *Everybody's Talking*, the first line of which goes something like this, 'Everybody's talking at me but I can't hear a word they say, only the echoes of my mind'

375 Now having said all that, sir, I think this has been an absolutely cracking debate, with some superb speeches. A lot of effort has gone into compiling and delivering amendments, even though I could not support some of them, I really appreciated the sincere intention of colleagues to do something, as Deputy Ferbrache said, when he was speaking on an amendment laid by Deputy Yerby, I think he said that yesterday.

380 I have to say, sir, that my initial response when I first saw this P&R Plan Phase Two, I wanted to throw the whole lot out. But, I have learnt there is value in being pragmatic, there is merit in being pragmatic, and there is a time when one has to be pragmatic. Now that some of the Propositions have been amended, I may even support some of them. But the original document, as far as I was concerned, was nothing but motherhood and apple pie, and good intentions, but that has changed somewhat now, because of the amendments that have succeeded.

385 So, I am going to listen to the rest of the debate and come the time to vote I will make my judgement call. As I have said, I am going to vote against Propositions 8 and 9, and 13 to 19, but I will reserve my judgement on the other Propositions. I am certainly not going to vote in favour of employing even more civil servants on high salaries, but I will vote against that, of course, and vote against Propositions 13 to 19.

390 On that note, sir, whether we support or reject certain Propositions, I ask colleagues to take no notice whatsoever of such grossly exaggerated claims as the sky will fall and the Island will come to a standstill if we do not approve these Propositions before us. We have all been elected into this Assembly to make our own judgement call. We have all been elected to make up our own minds, so I ask my colleagues to bear that in mind, and not allow someone else to make their decisions for them. Every Member of this Assembly has a responsibility, and I ask them not to shirk from that responsibility when the time comes to vote.

395 I say that because there is no reason whatsoever to support these Propositions, despite what anyone in the Assembly might say. Where is it stated in the document before us that the States *have to* approve every Proposition, or else the Island will come to a standstill and the sky will fall. It does not say it anywhere, and why doesn't it say it? It does not say it because it is not true. Anyway, if we have got to approve everything then why have we spent three-plus days debating this document, and voted to compile it for the last year? Why were we even asked to engage with this whole process in the first place? Why wasn't this whole Plan presented to us as a rule book, as a *fait accompli* – 'Here is the rule book and we expect you to follow the rules', type of approach?

400 Now, I do need to ask the President one more question, sir, before I close. It is regarding the amendment that was laid focussing on the CEO's annual report. I did ask the question in debate but I did not get an answer, sir. In that amendment it says that the report will include a report on customer engagement and satisfaction, and I did say there is no mention of Deputies' engagement and satisfaction. In response to that, Deputy Le Tocq said that there will be an appendix report – I believe that is what he said; we can then comment on the appendix report. But

I am not talking about commenting on what is in the report, I am wanting to know if Deputies can have an input, and when they object – or express concerns, rather – that is reported in the report, in detail, as presumably there will be a lot of detail in that report. I hope so, otherwise what is the point of compiling it?

In closing, sir, I appreciate this speech will probably end up being a soliloquy, but I felt the need to make it for the sake of my own conscience. I must emphasise, sir, that at no time in this speech have I criticised any of my colleagues; I would not do that, I respect them for all they do, and I respect their views. In closing, sir, I ask that they in turn respect mine.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

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

The broad and wide-ranging nature of this report would make it easy to make a marathon speech on all of one's hobby horses, but I am not going to do that. I think the mood in the Assembly today is, rightly, for one of brevity, and I intend to respect that. I think it is important to read those moods. So, I will limit myself to four points.

The first relates to Proposition 2 and capital spending. Our target is one of 3% of GDP, I sort of support that because I think it would be a step change up from the amount that we have been spending on our infrastructure in recent years, and we certainly have not been spending enough. However, I do question whether, in the Guernsey context, any targets relating to GDP make a great deal of sense, whether it is a UN target of 0.7% for overseas aid and development, or whether it is the 3% target for investing in our infrastructure. I know we have probably borrowed that figure from elsewhere, but it does make absolute sense, but the relationship between the funds at the disposal of this Government, or this parliament, and of the GDP of the Island is tenuous, to put it mildly.

So if GDP doubled and our revenue went up by only, say, 30% then the implication in this Proposition 2 is that we should double our spending on capital expenditure, and yet we would not be able to afford to do that. So, I do invite, for future, Policy & Resources to look at whether a percentage of our spending should be on capital projects, so that we do not get taken down the avenue, that we have done in the past sometimes, of spending everything or almost everything on revenue expenditure, because of the demands on services, and not putting enough aside for capital, so moving away from the GDP.

Whilst still on Proposition 2, I did ask a question during an amendment from Deputy Yerby, about how restrictive Proposition 2 is. It has clearly got flexibility just to put aside less than 3% of GDP into the Capital Reserve in a year, as I read it; in no one year does it give us the flexibility to put more. So, if we have two or three years when we cannot put anything in, because that is just the situation, we have not got the money to put in to it, and then we have a sudden upturn in our fortunes, we will not be able to make good any of that shortfall.

Now, I did ask that during the Yerby amendment debate, and I do not think I got an answer. I would really, specifically, ask Deputy St Pier to give me an answer to that today, because if that is correct I would be voting against Proposition 2 because I think it would be an unnecessary strait jacket. He may say – I do not know, it is always hard to predict what people will say, he may – notwithstanding this, clearly we can recommend whatever we want in a budget debate to put aside, but if that is the case we do not need Proposition 2 anyway. But, the implication in voting for Proposition 2 is that not in any one year we will only put aside 3% of Guernsey GDP or less, whichever sum will allow us to balance the books. So I would like an answer on that.

The second of my four points relates really to where Deputy Charles Parkinson was coming from, in effect of returns from the trading entities, both incorporated and unincorporated.

Back on Tuesday morning Deputy St Pier urged us not to talk about stealth taxes, and to refer to money coming from our trading entities as any sort of tax because they are not. Of course, technically he is absolutely right, but this does look very much like a duck, and it is walking like a

465 duck – sorry, I am a Guernsey man, I pronounce my ‘u’s as ‘o’s – and it is quacking like a duck, so  
to me it is very much the same sort of thing. These entities, should they be a proper return to the  
owner? Maybe. But the owner is not the States of Guernsey, the owner is the people of Guernsey.  
At the moment they have only been charged for these commodities sufficient to reinvest in the  
business and to run it in an efficient way. They have not been expected to generate significant  
470 profits to return to this Assembly. It is another way of taking money out of the Guernsey man and  
woman’s pocket. But it is a way which is less progressive than most taxation would be. So, when  
Deputy St Pier says it is not a tax, maybe he is right; it is less fair than we would make a tax.

So, I really worry. We have ruled out a GST and I think that is probably right, although with  
*force majeure* I would go for a GST rather than let our services crumble. If I did that I would set it  
at a very high rate to make sure that the costs of administering it was proportionately low and  
475 then bring in lots of other benefits to ameliorate the impact, but I really do not want to go down  
that route. If I did I would go for it, but instead of the GST it seems that this sort of stealth  
approach is almost bringing in a BCT; we are bringing in a basic commodities tax on the people of  
Guernsey on things like water, possibly milk, although he told us it is not possible, electricity. They  
do not get much more basic than that.

480 Yet, we are expecting ever increasing returns to the General Revenue in order to balance the  
books, I think it does feel to me, I am sorry if Deputy St Pier thinks I am wrong, in practical terms, I  
think that is exactly what we are doing. It may be unavoidable. We were not willing to raise taxes  
more than £13.3 million, and I understand that, that was a very clear decision. We have to balance  
the books, so it may be unavoidable, but I deprecate it, and I hope it is not going to be a long-  
485 term systemic approach to the way we go about our business.

Before leaving that totally, I also actually want the trading entities to be able to retain some of  
their surpluses in order to invest in their own capital programmes in future. I do not want it all  
hoovered up by the Centre, and then expecting them to borrow. Just as I do not really want us as  
an Assembly to do that. I do not believe in national debt. I know I might be a bit old fashioned in  
490 that respect, but I do not see myself as Churchill, like one of my colleagues; maybe more like  
Gandhi, and he said – (*Laughter*) not in the sort of saint like way at all, but he once said – even if  
you are in a minority of one the truth is the truth, and to me the truth is that national debt is not a  
good thing. Everybody else is doing it, yes, but as my mum said, ‘If everybody else jumped off a  
cliff would you do it too, Peter?’ I said ‘probably’, but then I was always argumentative.

495 The third of my four points, I suppose, is this is all about setting priorities for the future, about  
what is our first priority, and yet to me, my first priority is not really addressed in this. I want this  
Assembly, if it does anything over the next three years, to address what I regard as the national  
disgrace of the inability for many people in this Island to afford timely primary care treatments in  
Guernsey. Now, I understand that Health & Social Care share that. I do understand, I have heard it  
500 from them. They know that this is something that has to be addressed, and yet I see no clear  
pathway, through this report, through this policy plan, to actually address that. Years ago we were  
trying to address it, we brought in a grant that at that time was 50% of a consultation.

The long-term prospect was to try and move towards something far higher than that. Never  
100% like the National Health Service, because things that are taken free tend to be abused, so  
505 there needs to be a co-payment to make people think. I do not think we can afford to do that  
now. We clearly cannot afford to do that now. Times have changed. But I think at the moment we  
really are seeing the health issues in the Island aggravated by people putting off visiting their GPs  
because of the cost – either because they just cannot afford it, or they probably could afford it,  
but it is so much of a sickener that they actually hope that things are just going to go away and  
510 they are going to get better, and by the time they do actually decide, ‘Yes, I have got to afford  
this,’ it is worse. If we cannot do that over the next years, then I am sorry, there are a lot of  
priorities in this document that I would put behind that.

My very final point, I suppose, relates to, I do not want to be as cynical as Deputy Lester  
Queripel, but paragraph 6 –

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, point of correction.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Lester Queripel.

520 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, Deputy Roffey is misleading the Assembly. I am not cynical. I said I am willing to vote for some of these Propositions, if I can receive the information that I am looking for. How is that cynical?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey to continue.

525 **Deputy Roffey:** I think the Deputy does protest too much. I was not saying cynicism was a bad thing, but I am afraid my personal interpretation of his speech was one of a degree of cynicism over the policy planning process. If not, if he is not at all cynical about it, then I took entirely the wrong impression from his speech, and I think, probably, I am not alone in that in this Assembly.  
530 But, I must admit I do become a bit cynical myself when I see paragraph 6.5. I started reading this report – it was a bit intimidating when you got it through the post – got as far as page 13 and it says the:

Policy & Resources Committee does not consider it necessary to include a detailed appraisal of Committees policy proposals here.

Well, actually, I thought they would. Sir, I thought this was the whole point of this exercise. *(Interjections)* I wanted some guidance from the top on whether what Health & Social Care wanted to do part of their plan was more or less important than what Environment & Infrastructure wanted to do, part of their plan which was, maybe in turn, more important than something economical, or less important than something economical, because I thought we were trying to get, not just capital prioritisation, but also revenue spending prioritisation. So, I did rather lose the will to plan when I got to that, and it has made the last four days probably slightly  
540 less meaningful than I would have liked.

So, I do want, really, an answer about when are we actually going to be determining, as an Assembly, what is the most important stuff to spend our dosh on, to actually use our human resources for. Not within each department, but cross departments and saying, actually, maybe their budget should come down 10% and they should go up 5% because what they want to do is far more important for the people of Guernsey than what they want to do. I thought that is what  
545 today, or the last four days, was going to be about. I am disappointed that it was not.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Alderney Representative Jean.

550 **Alderney Representative Jean:** Thank you, sir.

On page 52 I am interested to see mention of the adopting of International Accounting Standards. That interests me because we are doing it in Alderney.

On page 79, it talks of structural loss on the Alderney routes, and the Alderney population, and visitors, and businesses are innocent victims of circumstance. You are all aware that last week, continuing into this week, the Aurigny Air Services have been bad.  
555

Maybe now the only hope is having hit a daily all time low, things will change. There is a new plane that has arrived in Alderney. After years now, of erratic and poor service, people are very cautious with visitors booking to go back two days early because they just do not trust Aurigny to stick to its flight pattern. Pilots are leaving, as it is said by Andrew Ecclestone Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce, because there are not enough planes, and not enough hours. Alderney needs the support of the Guernsey States, but not just silent support – active support, and some action, and we need it now.  
560

While the economy and all aspects of Alderney are forced to suffer this kind of service, which the public has had to endure for years. I ask you if this was going on here in Guernsey would you



all want the same something done to sort it out, this continuing state of affairs. I believe you all would jump up and down and you would all be involved in putting it right. Is it because Alderney is the most northerly Isle and in the distance, or is it because we are just not Guernsey. I do not believe that. We are close to you and I know it.

I know there is understanding here. You all know over the months and years what is still going on as the service continually breaks down. In Guernsey, slowly, gently your economy shows signs of recovery, with higher Income Tax receipts and more economic activity. It is good. In Alderney there is no sign of recovery, and we are caught in a situation having little control over those regular events with our air travel, and Aurigny, and sea links which are just not strong enough.

Alderney is unable to get over this. The Government in Alderney tries hard. My only criticism is they move more towards the Airport than towards sea travel. I do not agree with that, and my belief is Alderney should sort out its second gateway and get a ferry service sorted. When I talk about this I am told – and this is interesting for all of you – Guernsey would not support us, or allow us to buy a ferry. My reply to this is that have I asked Guernsey for permission to buy or lease a ferry. I go on to say Guernsey are not our enemies, and I am not asking Guernsey to contribute to a ferry. Alderney must do something for itself, while working in the years ahead, on what is a crisis in terms of travel. For us, we face the rising deficit with dismay on Aurigny, and I have talked of the future, and I only see air fares rising by £11 a go for every two or three years, which will render our airfield obsolete. The air taxis Waves and Alderney Air may make some difference – I hope so.

My final word on this subject is I have been part of the Alderney States for nearly five years now, since re-election at the end of 2012. At this election my vote dropped by 20% at my second election for four years, at the end of 2016. Do I blame the public? No, I do not. I have achieved nothing in regard to our main problems. Transport. Being in Government is frustrating, and that has been expressed here in this Assembly today, and yesterday, and the day before.

Transport – it is not for the want of trying, despite the undeniable fact that Alderney is part of the shareholder base of Aurigny. Just nothing changes. Both Governments seem unable to restore stability. The Alderney Government reminds me of a hamster in a wheel, unable to get out and trapped by the enormity of this impossible task. I am heading for my last three years in Government; three and a half years I have got. I shall be glad to stand away at the next election, it will be a relief.

In the Policy Plan, Phase Two, mention is made of looking at extending Guernsey's airfield. As you know, now altered by the last amendment this morning to air and sea links. Mention was made of the now nine-year-old York Aviation Report. My view is that that report stopped the extension to Guernsey's airfield and runway. Changing circumstances, nine years have passed. My goodness, are you right to look at this again. You must look at it again. You should look at extending this runway again.

As I said, York Aviation put a stop on a longer runway in Alderney and any idea of a 21st century airfield. Ours is still in its original 1934 format, and is the oldest airfield in the Channel Islands. We were on the capital list for this project. Like Guernsey, Alderney could not mount a defence to the report from York Aviation. Over the coming months I look with interest to see what develops here in Guernsey. Perhaps, as our circumstances in Alderney change, in a few years' time we might be able to mount a defence against the York Aviation Report, and we should look again.

In the next two years, Alderney will assume more responsibility for its own finances, under the Financial Transformation. These will be interesting years.

Alderney's Government must work more towards securing good travel links. It is clear that this is the key to economics in both Islands, and we both have problems. Secure and affordable travel is so important to any economy, and every effort must be made to achieve that.

I know this, as I walk around Alderney and see empty buildings which are for sale at half their original price. My sincere belief is that when Alderney's Government gets a grip on its transport problems, slowly Alderney's economy will recover.

Here in Guernsey, this Policy Plan is good, but I do not see here ... I would like Deputy St Pier to tell me where the benefits are for Alderney in this Plan. I know I have not had a lot of time with the Plan, I could have done with more. Two meetings back to back, meetings with the Alderney States as well. I probably have not done the Plan justice. But if he can give me some pointers as to where the advantages are for Alderney, I would be grateful.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy de Lisle.

**Deputy de Lisle:** Sir, my concern with the Plan is the revenue-raising measures totalling £14 million a year, much of which, I feel, will fall on the individual, rather than taking action to reform the Zero-10 corporate policy, and provide further cuts in spending across the board.

I feel that the tax grab on the individual over the next number of years and, of course, this is a precursor to the budgets that we are going to see in the next four years, will add hardship rather than providing relief in difficult circumstances to individuals in this Island. It will take more disposable income from households. It will reduce consumer spending in the economy generally. And it will shed more pain on the High Street, and hit out negatively at the competitive advantage of Guernsey, making the Island less attractive to outside investment and high net worth individuals to locate here. All at the worst of times, when the Island is struggling with problems of connectivity, the high cost of living, and difficulty in attracting and keeping workers and families on Island. Individuals already pay Income Tax to the tune of £254 million and five times the company Income Tax of £46 million. I just feel that all must pay their fair share, including company entities not currently liable to any income tax. Targeting expansion of the 10% intermediate Income Tax band will help to fill the gap, but corporate tax policy needs to be reviewed to avoid the calls that we have even heard just recently for the introduction of GST, and further regressive hikes in TRP.

The corporate tax policy Zero-10 continues to increase taxes and charges on the individual and I think it erodes the benefits to pensioners and those on fixed incomes and young struggling families.

So, this Medium Term Financial Plan, the cornerstone of the Budget increases over the next four years, is all about taking more from hard pressed households and it all would add to the struggle rather than provide relief for local families at this time. So, I ask for consideration when the Budget arrives, and with respect to the impact that these tax increases are going to have on the individual in this Island and on consumer spending.

The other point that I would like to make – that all of course encompasses Proposition 1. I would like a free vote on Proposition 1, so that we can take heed of some of these issues at that time.

I would also like, with respect to Proposition 12, to ask for a recorded vote there also, and I call upon Members not to support the amended Proposition. That was the Proposition with regard to adding to Proposition 12 which reads:

To reaffirm that staff resources will be deployed across the organisation as necessary in accordance with the priorities of the States.

But that has been added to, which I feel has unduly affected the Civil Service. It will, effectively, strait jacket the public servants and limit their opportunity to advancement, and it could limit the competitive ability, really, for public servants within the system to compete with applicants from outside the system. So, there are a number of factors. It will be used by the bureaucracy actually, in sort of strait jacketing public servant within their departments, and will severely limit, I think, the possibility of advancement within the Civil Service. So, I think that is something that we should guard against, as politicians, influencing and giving another handle, if you like, within the bureaucracy to stem the movement and the advancement of public servants.

Thank you, sir.

665       **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

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

          I was amused and entertained in listening to Deputy Lester Queripel referring to the musical work of Harry Nilsson, because he had many songs, not just *Everybody's Talking*, but he wrote the  
670       score for Popeye, but also *I Can't Live Without You*, and I sometimes feel that we cannot live without plans in this Assembly, (*Laughter*) although when he got on to not getting enough satisfaction that made me think of the Rolling Stones a bit more.

          I think, Deputy Fallaize mentioned earlier, the prospect of maybe we did not really need a medium term financial plan. I think that we started this policy planning framework in the 1990's  
675       and it changed its view in the era when Mr Falla was Deputy Chief Minister and introduced a first draft of the Government Business Plan, and each time the plans have got bigger and broader and more baseless in a sense. Deputy Parkinson referred to his era, I sat for a while on his States' Strategic Plan team, and clearly, the planning process is a challenge for the States. It has already taken too long, effectively, we have already had virtually a third of our time, and one could also  
680       mention that we perhaps struggle with a plan with our new system of Government because, of course, we lost a Policy Council, and we combined them in the Policy & Resources hub, effectively, we combined a foreign ministry, an overall policy co-ordinating body and a treasury, and I think there is a tension between those three aspects because the treasury side of Deputy St Pier and Deputy Trott, and perhaps the other Members is rather fiscally conservative, whereas the policy  
685       shaping side is much more about making us a more expansive, fairer, more equal society and so on. That adds to some of the issues.

          I feel very much that one can only agree with what most of what Mr Louis Jean the Alderney Representative says. Of course, he was still remarkably successful in the election. He regarded a disappointing result when he had something like 60% of the poll, but I am afraid his three  
690       colleagues who were leading Members in the previous States of Alderney were not so lucky with the electorate. Clearly, the Island there sees challenges awaiting them. I would say the challenges in Alderney are an exaggerated version of Guernsey's, so they really come in two categories.

          The first category is the need for improving and sustained public services within a demographic that is not going in the right direction.

695       The second is transportation. Now, I am pleased we supported the amendment today, about putting in a strategic air and sea links infrastructure, because although I am not, at this stage, going to recommend, partly because some of the Committees I am on, a runway extension. I think it is just the sort of project that would kick-start our economy. It would be a message of us being open for business. It would, at least, facilitate mass tourism, albeit that might not necessarily be  
700       the best route for Guernsey to go down. Deputy Parkinson, for example, mentioned that as a possible economic scenario. This particular report is quite light on economics, and economic planning, that said the only part of it that really relates to it particularly is the Economic Development Committee policy plan, and they divide their policy priorities into critical, key and important. It was interesting to note under key that one of the keys on page 140 is to:

          Encourage high value individuals and new high added value and sustainable businesses to become established on  
          [Guernsey]

          Support the development of skills, talent and entrepreneurialism through identifying skills gaps.

705       Well, not only do I agree with them, but I think, arguably, they should be in the critical category, because clearly that is very necessary.

          But there is also more of a reservation perhaps within the economic development side of our bundle, because they talk about dis-benefits and the need to overcome barriers to success. Opportunities, which include a can't-do attitude, unnecessary red tape, and those kind of issues,  
710       and they do identify a shortage of policy staff, and say that they could actually put resources for the whole term just into overcoming the negatives. Well, we need to do more than that.

One of the advantages we had in the Zero-10 phase and afterwards was, of course, the leadership of Deputy Trott, who steered us on course, and for a while we were going ahead of Jersey, not just on the medals table, but as a dynamic economy attracting the right kind of business. But there has been a sense that we have fallen behind our sister Island in the last few years, and that is despite their rocketing population and the fact that they take out 5% of the economy into a sales tax, which has affected the retail sector.

Now, I would argue there the reason why we are falling behind is fundamentally we are focused all the time on internal policy processing and financial austerity management. Whereas Jersey has the cash cushion and to a certain extent the style of government to facilitate more investment in the infrastructure, and more of a 'come and do business with us'. We do not really have the mechanism to provide enough housing, enough social housing, and enough construction projects to keep everything on the move. It is disappointing to note that we are now significantly behind Jersey in terms of bed stock and perhaps connectivity.

We really do need to prioritise on the economy first, perhaps environmental matters second and then the social framework. I am not advocating this for an instant, but I just want to speculate in view of what Deputy Roffey said. Supposing we decided for next year, or the year after, to transfer £10 million away from Health & Social Care, we would oblige that Committee to manage within a very tight budget and we transferred that £10 million to Economic Development. That sounds like a horrific thought, but we would be better off in five or 10 years' time as a society. Would we actually have a larger cake or pie to share? Would we have more sense of satisfaction for most of our Members? Would new solutions arise? Maybe, for example, the cost of the GP – which is an issue – is due to the lack of supply of doctors, the lack of competition. These are the kinds of questions we need to look in to.

So, we have many questions to resolve and to consider, and we need to be quite robust in tackling these social problems with, I think, some very challenging policies.

What I think is important is that we do make progress on the Disability and Inclusion Strategy, on SWBIC, and those areas, and it would be pointless to vote against much of this Plan, because I am sure we will have an opportunity to amend it at the next stage, and also in the budgetary process, and in dialogue with various Committees. But, I do agree with Deputy Roffey that we do need to look at prioritisation more. I mean I did not speak yesterday in the justice amendment, I found that quite a hard one with arguments on both sides, but one observation I would make is that our system of justice and law and order has been very effective in maintaining the Island as a safe and happy community, with excellent legal facilities and everything else. But it is quite an expensive system. It is expensive for the user, it is expensive for the State. I am sure if we did a detailed *per capita* exercise of every element of it – prison, probation and so on – we would find it rather expensive *per capita* with salaries even above their English equivalents, or American equivalents in some cases. So I think we perhaps have rather a Rolls Royce model there, and if we are to reprioritise we should look very much at that kind of a framework.

I also endorsed much of what Deputy Parkinson and Deputy Roffey have said. Deputy Parkinson is quite right, if we demand, if Policy & Resources demand, more and more money from the trading boards, it will create a commercial atmosphere there that will lead to regressive charges elsewhere.

Deputy Roffey came very close to saying that he might support a GST sales tax if it was (a) relatively high, therefore not disproportionately expensive to collect, and (b) safeguarded and maintained and improved public services, including the gaps in the system, such as the overly high cost of medical and dentistry services. That has always been my position. I think we have not seen, really, an argument for socially progressive from expenditure-based on a rebalancing of taxation, and although Deputy St Pier chided me for not speaking up in the early stages of the PTBR when a few models were made of different rates of Income Tax.

The reality is that if we looked seriously at a meaningful consumption tax we could significantly reduce Income Tax for low and medium earners, and significantly increase benefits of one kind or another far above the SWBIC model and still have enough money for capital investment. The fact

that we have decided not to do that means that you get a paradox of many Members who sit on spending Committees voting against all the more generous amendments that Deputy Yerby and others put forward, and then complaining the following day they are really short of money for essential services. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Well, you cannot have the penny and the bun, and if there are any buns for sale I will have them! (*Laughter*)

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, before I call the next speaker, I have spotted that the amendment numbered 33, which will be the composite set of amendments, is available for circulation. It has already gone on the website. So people can be looking at it and seeing which Propositions you are speaking to. Can I suggest that we take that amendment next, and then return to general debate, so that you have got the document in front of you? Particularly following Deputy de Lisle's request for a recorded vote. If there are other requests for recorded votes I am keeping a running list of them.

So, could that be circulated to Members please.

Whilst you are receiving that, I understand if you are wondering why people on the bench of the Presidents of the Principal Committees are sitting on their hands at the moment; the broad intention, although some people might change their mind, depending on how debate is going, will be to speak towards the end of the debate to try and draw together any issues that have been raised by Members, rather than constantly popping up and down throughout.

So, therefore when we get towards the end of debate it is likely that the Presidents of the Principal Committees whose plans have been dealt with during the course of this debate will take the opportunity to speak at that time, possibly in some sort of formal order, possibly not, depending on how we are feeling at the time, before Deputy St Pier replies to the entirety of the debate before we close.

Does any Member not yet have a copy of amendment 33 in front of them?

I invite Deputy St Pier, as the proposer of amendment number 33, to introduce it.

*Amendment 33.*

*To delete propositions 1 to 21 and replace with the following:*

*'1. To approve the approach detailed in the Medium Term Financial Plan (appendix 1) for achieving a return to an underlying financial surplus by 2019 through a combination of savings targets and income measures totalling approximately £40 million and to direct the Policy & Resources Committee to take account of the Medium Term Financial Plan when formulating proposals for inclusion in annual Budget Reports, subject to the substitution of paragraph 6.15 of the Medium Term Financial Plan with the following paragraph –*

*"6.15 This total is similar to the levels set out in the 2017 Budget Report which included savings applied to non formula-led General Revenue budgets (excluding Health & Social Care) for 2018 and 2019 of 5% per annum. In regard to Health & Social Care, the "Costings, Benchmarking & Prioritisation Project at the Health & Social Services Department" report prepared by BDO Limited (and contained as Appendix II to the Annual Budget for the States for 2016 (Billet d'État No. XIX of 2015)) set out that BDO had "made an assessment of the costs to deliver a 3 to 5 year programme targeted at £7.3 million of efficiency within HSSD budgets alone. One-off costs relating to project implementation and potential double running are estimated at £3.3 million. Ongoing costs associated with operating new service models are estimated at £2.2 million. Therefore the net ongoing saving, once change has been embedded, is likely to be £5.2 million."*

*1A. To acknowledge the Committee for Health & Social Care's commitment to endeavour to return £2 million of its 2017 Authorised Budget to General Revenue and to direct the Policy & Resources Committee to take account of these expected recurring savings when recommending Cash Limits and any target expenditure reductions for the Committee for Health & Social Care for future years.*

*1B. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee, in developing its proposals for income measures from 2018 onwards, to consider the merits and disadvantages of any new forms of taxation, with*

*the exception of taxes on capital; this recognises that there will be a clear presumption that over this period (in light of the island's changing demographics) the tax base will broaden and diversify consistent with the principles of seeking a greater contribution from those individuals and entities most able to bear the burden.*

*1C. To agree that the Policy & Resource Plan annual review of 2019, which the Policy & Resources Committee must submit to the States in June of that year in accordance with Rule 23(5)(d) of the Rules of Procedure, shall include a Proposition which allows the States, in light of two years' experience of the Medium Term Financial Plan, to determine whether to maintain or amend the anticipated value and timing of the savings targets set out in appendix 1 and the contribution which reductions in expenditure should be expected to make to returning public finances to surplus.*

*2. To approve that the General Revenue Appropriation to the Capital Reserve should be the lower of that which achieves an overall annual investment of 3% of GDP or an amount that results in a balanced budget position.*

*3. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee, when the General Revenue Appropriation to the Capital Reserve achieves an overall annual investment of 3% of GDP, to include proposals in the annual Budget Report for use of any surpluses, to replenish other States' Reserves (having regard to the policies set out in propositions 4 and 5) such as the General Revenue Account Reserve or the Core Investment Reserve, or to invest in service developments, the Future Guernsey Economic Fund, the Transformation and Transition Fund or new services.*

*4. To approve a policy for the target balance of the General Revenue Account Reserve of 5% of annual General Revenue Income.*

*5. To approve a policy for the target balance of the Core Investment Reserve of 100% of General Revenue Income.*

*5A. a) To instruct the Policy & Resources Committee, in consultation with the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure, to consider and review the best way of raising revenues from motoring in future, taking into account the ongoing reduction in fuel sales.*

*b) To agree that the focus of the review shall be on how to achieve the maximum sustainability of this source of States' revenue rather than on increasing the total amount of taxation levied on motoring in Guernsey.*

*c) To instruct the Policy & Resources Committee to report back with its conclusions in sufficient time for any proposals flowing from the review to be included in the budget for 2019.*

*6. To approve the Capital Portfolio as per the projects listed in tables 26, 27 and 28 of appendix 1, classified as small; medium; and large projects, but subject to:*

*a) the replacement of table 26 of appendix 1 with the following table:*

*"Table 26: Portfolio Projects in the Maintain Category*

MAINTAIN CATEGORY		
Small	1	Coastal Flood Defences (Phase 1)
	2	Longue Hougue Breakwater
	3	CCTV Replacement
	4	Footes Lane Refurbishment
	5	St Sampson Fire Main
Medium	6	Town Fire Appliances
	7	Coastal Repair Schemes
	8	Cremation Services
Large	9	Affordable Housing Programme (Phase 1)
	10	Affordable Housing Programme (Phase 2) (Pipeline)
	11	Hydrocarbon Supply (Pipeline)
	12	Inert Waste Solution (Pipeline)
	13	Coastal Flood Defences (Phase 2) (Pipeline)"

and

b) deleting the "Guernsey Runway Extension (Pipeline)" project from table 27 and replacing it with "Strategic Air and Sea Links Infrastructure (Pipeline)".

7. To approve that the process contained within paragraphs 8.6 to 8.15 of appendix 1 is adopted as the approval process for capital projects.

8. To delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve opening capital votes for any project with a value not exceeding £2 million, funded from the Capital Reserve.

9. To delegate authority to the States' Trading Supervisory Board to approve opening capital votes for any project with a value not exceeding £2 million, funded from the Ports Holding Account.

10. To approve the projects listed in paragraph 8.23 of appendix 1 as pipeline projects, but subject to deleting "Guernsey Runway Extension" from the list of bullet points and replacing it with "Strategic Air and Sea Links Infrastructure".

11. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to work with Principal Committees to refine their policy plans to the extent needed to enable the prioritisation of resources to take place and report back to the States of Deliberation as part of the 2017 Budget Report; having used, as a basis for prioritisation, the eight strategic objectives of the Policy and Resource Plan; and having given no lesser status to policies and initiatives identified by Committees as currently unfunded or underfunded, in terms of evaluating their potential contribution to the strategic objectives, and thus their relative priority and need for resources.

11A. To direct all Committees when formulating policy to take account of long-term impacts on the wellbeing of current and future generations.

12. To reaffirm that staff resources will be deployed across the organisation as necessary in consultation with the respective Committee or Committees in accordance with the priorities of the States, but respecting the specific requirements of each Committee.

12A. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to lay before the States, on an annual basis, commencing in June 2018, an Appendix Report, which shall be the Annual Report of the Chief Executive of the States of Guernsey, and which shall include details of progress being made in connection with the delivery of public service reform, including:

a) A report on the structure and demographics of the public service;

b) A report on customer engagement and satisfaction;

c) A report on staff engagement and satisfaction;

d) A report on organisational performance management; and

e) Any other information which the Chief Executive considers important for the States to consider in respect of the delivery of public service reform and the performance of the civil service, for which the Chief Executive is accountable.

13. To approve the policy plan of the Policy & Resources Committee as set out in appendix 2.

14. To approve the policy plan of the Committee for Economic Development as set out in appendix 3.

15. To approve the policy plan of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture as set out in appendix 4, including the development of a comprehensive Sports Strategy by July 2019 and, noting proposition 11 of this report, reporting to the States on the funding requirements necessary to achieve the objectives set out in that strategy as part of the annual Budget Report.

15A. To note that, as set out on page 191 of Billet d'État No. XII of 2017, the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture intends to review the policies of the States in relation to the provision and funding arrangements of, and entitlement to, pre-school education; and to agree that during the present States' term, i.e. up to June, 2020, there shall be no further restrictions made to entitlement to pre-school education beyond what was agreed by the States on Billet d'État No. XX of 2015 unless such further restrictions have been agreed by the States not less than nine months before they are implemented.

16. To approve the policy plan of the Committee for Employment & Social Security as set out in appendix 5, subject to deleting "£73.3million" where it appears on the fourth page of the plan

(see page 209, paragraph 3, line 6 of Billet d'État No. XII of 2017) and replacing it with "£56.1million".

17. To approve the policy plan of the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure as set out in appendix 6.

18. To approve the policy plan of the Committee for Health & Social Care as set out in appendix 7.

19. To approve the policy plan of the Committee for Home Affairs as set out in appendix 8.

20. To rescind the extant States' resolutions set out in appendix 9.

20A. To rescind States' Resolution 4 of Article 3 of Billet d'État No. IX of 2016, "Declaration of Unspent Convictions".

20B. To rescind States' Resolution 8 of Article 23 of Billet d'État No. XVI of 2015, "Distribution of Deputies' Seats Among the Electoral Districts".

20C. To rescind States' Resolution 10 of Article 10 of Billet d'État No. XI of 2015, "General Election 2016".

21. To amend States' Resolution 3 of Article 15 of Billet d'État No. I of 2016, "Proposal to Achieve Greater Autonomy in the Legislative Process and International Affairs for Guernsey" by replacing the words "States Assembly and Constitution Committee" with "Policy & Resources Committee".

790 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, this amendment will be seconded by Deputy Trott.

Sir, as you have said, this is the composite amendment. I am sure Members will be pleased to know that I am not going to either read it, or ask for it to be read.

795 All I can do is give Members reassurance that there is nothing different in this. Nothing extra has been added or slipped in, because I do appreciate Members will not have had an opportunity to read it word for word. However, I am sure H.M. Comptroller will be able to confirm that he has spent some time with us both last night and this morning in ensuring the accuracy of what has been transcribed across from the amendments which have been previously approved in the prior debates, and with that, sir, I obviously encourage Members to support it.

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

**Deputy Trott:** I do, sir, and I echo those sentiments. An awful lot goes on behind the scenes. We finished here at 7 o'clock last night, which saw many of our officers working late to ensure the accuracy of this document; and, like Deputy St Pier, I thank them for so doing.

805 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Mr Comptroller, do you want to give the confirmation that Deputy St Pier has invited you to give to Members? I can say that I satisfied myself that everything has been put in to, what I regard as, a logical order.

810 **The Comptroller:** Sir, I can confirm that and just echo Deputy Trott's comments about the officers at P&R who assisted as well.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.

Any debate on this amendment?

815 Deputy Yerby.

**Deputy Yerby:** Sir, nevertheless in the interest of good governance, I would like five minutes' grace to read it properly before we vote.

820 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes, well, maybe what we will do is we will –  
Are you requesting five minutes now before you vote on the amendment?



**Deputy Roffey:** Sir, can we not park the amendment for a while and carry on with a couple of speeches in general debate and read it during that? I am just aware we do not want to carry on too late tonight.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** What I am going to propose is to do exactly what was going through my mind that Deputy Roffey has articulated. That we will take another speaker in general debate, so that those who can do two things at once – and I am told that some can, and *(Laughter)* I am sure Deputy Yerby falls into that category – can listen to the next speaker in general debate, then we will return to this amendment, unless there is anyone else who wants to speak on it at this stage.

Deputy Lester Queripel.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, being a purist, I can only do one thing at a time. I find it very difficult to multi-task, so I support Deputy Yerby's request that at some stage, sir, we have a break and we consider these ... *(Interjections)*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, we will call for the vote on this as and when I think it is appropriate, Deputy Lester Queripel.

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

**The Deputy Bailiff:** So, we will park the vote on this, but at least Members now have the text of all the Propositions as they are expected to be when it comes to the vote.

I will return now to the general debate, and invite the next speaker to stand, and I am going to call Deputy Green, who has been trying to stand, and then I will follow it with Deputy Dudley-Owen.

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

First of all, I declare an interest in that in the Employment & Social Security Committee plan there is an intention to have a review of legal aid and I declare an interest in that regard.

Sir, Members, the first point worth making is how incomplete the Plan really is, even now at the second phase of the P&R Plan process and some 14 months into this political term, as others have said already. The prioritisation element is still missing. I thought the whole point of this P&R process, P&R Plan process, was to set out a clear statement of Government policies as costed priorities in a programme for the next four or five years. The prioritisation process clearly has not taken place to date, and it is a fair question, I think, to ask why that is, and when exactly we can expect the fully costed priorities to emerge?

Without that prioritisation process, without that prioritisation part, I cannot believe that we are any further forward in reality. Now, I know that the President of P&R acknowledged when he introduced the Plan – many, many days ago now, on Tuesday, I think it was, it seems like an eternity ago – there was too much detail in this, and there was no clear resourcing at this stage, and he was right to make that acknowledgement. But, can I press Deputy St Pier when he closes, or sums up the debate at the end, just to explain and to elaborate a bit further about why it is that this has happened, and why his Committee have not been able to make further progress than what we have achieved hitherto. I would be grateful for that.

Ideally, in this process I would like to have seen an overlay from P&R saying, in very simple terms, what should and what should not be resourced. I think that should have been in this.

Deputy Roffey already made the point quoting paragraph 6.5 so I will not quote that again, but paragraph 6.5 made me think, made me wonder how exactly what we have before us is consistent with the affected co-ordination of diverse plans from the Principal Committees, and I wonder whether sufficient has been done to date, sir, to nip in the bud the perception, if not the reality, that the Committees have developed their plans in silos rather than working generally across the

board. But, also paragraph 6.8, I think, is quite interesting, I will quote this. Paragraph 6.8 is on  
875 page 39, and I quote:

The Committee has some concerns that there may not be sufficient staff resources available to deliver all of the identified priorities within the anticipated time scales. However, given that the responsibility for taking forward the initiatives set out in the policy plans sits with the respective Committees, the Policy & Resources Committee has decided that the best approach in all the circumstances is to allow Committees the opportunity to deliver all their aspirations. When progress is measured and reported on there will be an opportunity to readjust the plans if necessary.

I thought, sir, we were trying to get away from the very worst aspects of the Committee system of Government. But, that paragraph 6.8 seemingly reinforces the perception that has existed in the past that Committees will be allowed to draft up aspirational things and in effect that they will not be checked or brought to reconsideration by the lead Committee of the States. So, again, I would  
880 be grateful if Deputy St Pier could deal with that when he responds.

So, at the end of the day, at the end of this debate, whenever we will finish, we are not going to have a complete, or polished, or costed programme for Government. We will have a work in progress document, as far as I can see, sir, and I think many people in this Assembly, and in the community will not be without frustration in light of that.

885 On the substance of the Plan itself, what we have, sir, is really quite a bloated behemoth. I think it needs to be slimmed down substantially into a real plan of action, with the difficult decisions that need to be made, i.e. what are we going to do, and by when, and perhaps more substantially, what are we not going to do, as a Government in the next four or five years. That is what the people of this Island want to know, and they will not know from this particular iteration  
890 of this Plan.

Now, looking at the plans themselves, of the Principal Committees, it does rather appear that they have come up with sizeable shopping lists of things, many of them aspirational in tone, but perhaps what we have not seen from the Principal Committees, so far – one or two exceptions I do grant you – perhaps, is the really hard choices and the really rigorous need for those difficult  
895 decisions, which must be essential in this process. The problem with the shopping list approach, sir, is it raises expectations in the community. I think I have said many times before, I think the States needs to be better at managing those expectations. Not artificially raising them only for them to be dashed later down the road. So, we do need to see the current plans, I think, whittled down to the clear and true priorities of this Government that simply must be done.

900 I grant the fact that that is not a straight forward or easy process. It is fundamentally a very difficult process. and that perhaps explains why we have not got any further than we have. But, nonetheless, it does need to be done.

In relation, sir, to the Medium Term Financial Plan, which I think in many ways is the best element of this policy letter, the question has to be: is this really a credible fiscal strategy? Deputy  
905 Parkinson this morning said, in effect, in terms, that he thought it was not. That is one of the fundamental questions. Is this really a credible fiscal strategy?

One of the other key issues, I think, is whether the savings that all of us want to make, whether the savings to general revenue that are going to have to be made, will actually lead to service reductions or whether they can be done by some other way.

910 I have already spoken about how Members can question the whole concept of having a savings to taxes ratio, and I stand by the remarks I made earlier on in the week, because plans very often become very out of date very quickly. We do not know what economic growth will look like over the next three, four, five years. We do not yet know how effective the savings programme will be, and we can never predict with any real degree of accuracy what revenues we shall end up collecting. Especially if we adjust taxes or even introduce new ones. So, I do express  
915 doubt again, sir, about that, although clearly P&R's approach of seeking to make the public sector more cost effective, whilst also raising additional sums from those who are in the best position to afford to do so, generally speaking, I do think that is an approach which is not an unreasonable one, in principle, even if we can quibble about the details.

920 Now, I know Deputy St Pier will probably say – I think he already has said it in debate – that perhaps P&R need to give themselves rather more room for manoeuvre. I appreciate the 65:35 ratio can be flexed. I think that is the phrase he used earlier on in the week, of course, if that is the case, why have that split in the first place. Proposition 1 proves a bit of a challenge for me at the moment, therefore. I accept entirely the need to find the £40 million or so in line with the Medium  
925 Term Financial Plan; I do not resile from that at all, but I certainly agree with the need for ambitious savings, and for additional revenues, but I do not necessarily want to sign up to a plan which is very constricting, which has certain constraint on what is basically an arbitrary ratio, in what is, essentially, an age of uncertainty.

Now, that brings me, sir, to the question of the savings issue, generally. I have already  
930 expressed some scepticism about the deliverability of the full extent of those savings targets. It does go without saying, sir, that the Scrutiny Management Committee will be carefully monitoring the progress to be made by all of the Principal Committees, but perhaps significantly by the three main spending Principal Committees – Health & Social Care, Education, Sport & Culture and the Home Affairs Committee – in their efforts to transform public services, and if such  
935 transformational change can be achieved without cuts to frontline services we will applaud them for doing so.

But, I think the concern really is that there is still very little evidence in the public domain that those three Committees, in particular, have proper, clear practical plans to transform the public services in the way that is often spoken about. We hear a lot of talk, a lot of rhetoric, about this,  
940 but what we need to see is action and action plans, and we encourage those Committees to come forward with those action plans as soon as they are ready to do so. Again, we do not underestimate the difficulty of doing this, but we do want to see the actual plans.

What we have perhaps had in sharper focus this week is an emphasis that the cross cutting initiatives across Government will also play an important, vital part of the savings including in IT,  
945 procurement, property rationalisation, and other matters, and again, from the scrutiny point of view we do look forward to fully understanding precisely how such savings will be achieved, over what particular period, and the expected quantum of those potential cross-cutting initiatives.

There is an overriding sense, sir, however, that the Principal Committees are perhaps not yet clear in their own minds about how all of the ambitious savings targets can be delivered. We  
950 would expect any savings to be genuinely transformational and not generated from simply putting up fees and charges, as was often done under the Financial Transformation Programme. So, I, and my colleagues on the Scrutiny Management Committee will be holding Committees of the States to account as best we can on this.

But let's not kid ourselves, sir, these savings plans will not be easy to deliver, neither will it be  
955 entirely painless to impose a further tax burden of £14 million on the people of this Island, and it will not be straightforward to get that money in.

So, all in all, sir, what we can expect, I think, over the next four or five years under this Plan is four or five years of hard slog, and that, sir, seems to me at odds with the key, often repeated, high level message of the first phase of this Policy & Resource Plan, which was – I forget the exact  
960 phrase now, been a while since I read it, but Deputy Lester Queripel talked about it this morning – a sense of creating the happiest, healthiest place in 2020 or whatever it is. There is a fundamental inconsistency, thank you, sir. There is a fundamental inconsistency between the nature of this second phase and that high level point delivered in the first phase.

In terms of the policy plans themselves, there are, I would say, many good policies that are set  
965 out in the policy plans themselves, from the six Principal Committees. My own view would be that the real priority areas ought to be given to three areas. The first is about realistically growing the economy in a sustainable way, and I think we need to go further on that. We do need to have very clear, very credible, long-term economic plans. Secondly, I do think we need to support any policies that will credibly lead to a more socially just society, and greater equality of opportunity,  
970 there are more policies in these plans that will do that, and I will be supporting those. Disability & Inclusion Strategy, Social Welfare Benefits Investigation Committee proposals, all of that stuff, and

anything that will protect, preserve and enhance our shared environment as well, I will support those measures.

I agree with Deputy Graham when he spoke, was it yesterday, or was it the day before, about the, perhaps, lack of emphasis on wealth creation, because I do think that is something that we have not seen sufficiently addressed so far. I do believe that wealth creation and wealth redistribution are two sides of the same coin. But you certainly have to have the wealth creation in the first place, if you want to be able to deliver the services in the social policies that we want to see.

But, the central point remains, sir, we cannot do everything as a States, and to pretend that everything is a priority means that nothing is a priority, as it has been said many times before, and there is that danger, I think, there is that danger if we go on as we are. At some point the realism has to kick in and hopefully that will be between now and the Budget.

I think it is probably fair to say there are gaps in the policy plans. I immediately open myself up to criticism for not laying certain amendments now, but I still think it is worth saying. Deputy Roffey made a point about the lack of emphasis on policies to improve primary health care. I think he is right about that. There is also a major political issue that does not get – well we talk about it as a problem but we very often fail to talk about solutions, or do anything to deal with it. It is the issue of the cost of living in the Island, and Deputy Gollop, when he spoke before, talked about perhaps we need to look at encouraging competition in the primary health care market, and that goes across the board, I think. But, you will look in vain for anything on that.

I think that is probably all I propose to say about the policy plans themselves.

Just a couple of other points. I think Deputy Lester Queripel spoke about Propositions 8 and 9, before. I do sound a note of caution about Propositions 8 and 9. I am not necessarily saying, sir, that I will vote against those Propositions at this stage, but again I would ask Deputy St Pier to possibly elaborate a bit more on the specific *raison d'être* really, for those Propositions and the quantum involved in the delegated authority, both in relation to P&R and the STSB. I think it would be helpful if we could have a bit more of a clear steer in debate on that.

But, in conclusion, sir, I urge P&R, and the Principal Committees, to urgently get on with the business of proper and effective prioritisation of General Revenue spending, as well as capital spending, so that we can have a meaningful Government programme as soon as possible. Unfortunately, what we have today is more work in progress.

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

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

Sir, I will make some general comments about the Plan and highlight some concerns in respect of the still standing Proposition 1.

Unlike many Members this week, I have not been particularly vocal as I have been keen to listen to the many views given over the days and days of debate that we have had.

The most obvious theme has been expenditure, and what the States are doing to curb excesses, or reduce duplication, or spend on unnecessary costs, e-gov initiatives etc. and whether these measures will achieve the aims outlined in the Medium Term Financial Plans. In this context therefore I would like to echo Deputy Queripel's question. Deputy Queripel he is not here at the moment. I know from Deputy St Pier, through you, sir, please, how much this Plan has cost from inception to date. Just an estimate, and that is taking into account the assistance of the consultants and all that staff time.

It is hard not to notice in that first meeting Deputies had last year to design Phase One of the P&R future Guernsey Plan, that we had the attendance of two consultants and all the principal senior civil servants of each Committee. Those consultants were in the second meeting as well. I did not understand the role of the consultants at the time, and in hindsight I cannot see that they made any material difference to our deliberations, or indeed, added any value. In fact, the

assistance of a handful of senior officers at the second meeting was the only helpful aspect, so I wonder why we had the consultants at all.

1025 Since then there have been hours and hours of officer time spent over the months pulling together this Plan, outside of their usual business as usual policy writing work.

I was surprised to learn during the process that Education, Sport & Culture are the only Committee to run a digital business management tool, which allows staff to look at strategic planning, project management, resourcing, as well as headline aims, and relevant actions of the  
1030 Committee, all in one place, accessible by all staff. I had assumed, naively, now I realise, that this was a given, and that all States' Committees would be running some sort of universal management system to aid the delivery of public services.

This is different from the SAP system which we use to run our budget and HR processes. It may be that there are plans in play to extend SAP to their business management tools or to roll out the software being used by Education. But, the point I am trying to make here is that if all Committees  
1035 used a management tool to record their vision, and mandate, their underlying policies, their action plans which underlie these, and the human and financial resources taken to execute these, I think that this Plan would have been delivered in a completely different and more beneficial way, with proper alignment against both financial and human resources, as well as the Phase One  
1040 strategic aims.

If we are serious about moving towards working differently, towards e-gov, towards Smart Guernsey, then why didn't we start with this Plan? A substantial amount of staff time over the last year spent instead introducing and populating a new management system, especially within the policy areas of each Committee, would have been entirely achievable, and time, in my opinion,  
1045 much better spent, as it would have been an investment for future management of the business as usual and also our policy work. A universal system used by each Committee would have meant that this Plan would be more coherent, uniform, shorter, focussed, simpler to understand and a realistic testament to the dynamic nature of the work that we do. This is a living document, and will change, as Deputy Green has just alluded to.

1050 That brings me, sir, to talk briefly about Propositions 13 to 19. I agree with many of the things that Deputy Queripel said this morning, and also the comments made yesterday by Deputy Tindall in her speech when she introduced her amendment; to the extent that I plan, at this stage, to abstain in voting to approve the individual Committee plans, other than for the two Committees where I sit, being Economic Development and Education, Sport & Culture, whose plans I am  
1055 obviously involved with and have already approved at Committee level.

I would like to reassure Members, through you, sir, that my abstention is not because I disagree with the plans of the other Committees. Not at all. In fact they all have merit, they are very interesting, all in line with their respective mandates, and I think that the Committees themselves are all pursuing with vigour much of the work stated within their plans. I look forward  
1060 to seeing policy papers, where relevant, coming from those Committees to the States, when I will be in a better position to evaluate them in detail and approve or disapprove on an arising basis, rather than on the basis of high level policy plans.

We also have mechanisms in the Rules to remedy, if policies do not come to the States for debate, as we have seen in play this week with Deputy Inder's requête.

1065 Finally, just to revisit Proposition 1. I do have real concerns about the Medium Term Financial Plan, and that the return to surplus is based upon the premise that we will achieve £25 million worth of savings over the period. I am not keen to raise taxes, but in the scope of our current tax structure I am not averse, as I said earlier this week, to exploring if there are ways of asking those businesses and individuals who can afford to if they can contribute more. My fear is the  
1070 continuing pressure on the Committees to cut costs, and accordingly their respective budgets. There will undoubtedly be different ways to do things, and savings will be made as a result of this, but until we have the courage to move more quickly and more decisively to a cultural and systemic change which emanates from central Government, I fear that we will not achieve the targets set. I fear that currently the cultured States is like a slow moving articulated road train, like

1075 you get in Australia, and I do not think that you can turn one of those things around quickly. So, I think that we really need to embrace, with gusto, change in organisational culture and operations in order to stand any real chance of making those ambitious savings targets.  
Thank you, sir.

1080 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Prow.

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

I would like to introduce our system of Government into this debate, as I think it is highly relevant. The very cumbersome 347-page report has, in my view, highlighted the tension between  
1085 the completely independent roles and mandates of all the Committees that we have inherited from the previous States, and not debated by this one, and as far as I am aware, there is no plan to do so.

Sir, there is no Machinery of Government in place to co-ordinate and prioritise what our Government will deliver – unlike the old Policy Council process in the past States. This, in turn, has led to the mismatch between the aspirations and needs articulated by the Committees in the Plan, and the 2017-21 financial plan, and the lack of prioritisation, which has been mentioned by many  
1090 Deputies. This has been most unfortunate. I believe that the public have not been properly engaged, and are justifiably very cynical. Some media have been unhelpful in this regard, they have not distinguished between the proper forecasting exercise by Policy & Resources.

1095 It is honest and right for Deputies, especially the Principal Committees, that income levels will cause massive challenges and this was quite right to be mentioned in debate.

Again to make it clear, in my view, we have to try to grow the economy, and to increase revenue, and to avoid over taxation. I actually believe Policy & Resources agree with this.

I am also disappointed that very little has been said in debate about transformation. I have mentioned this several times. Whatever happens, we must deliver things differently. We need to invest our savings into initiatives which will reduce costs.  
1100

Having said that, sir, I think there has been some excellent debate, only spoilt by attempts to micro manage and try to enforce green paper debates, and specific issues, which have been unhelpful to some Committees.

1105 Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Langlois.

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

1110 During the debate on the amendment which has led to what is now Proposition 1B, I did mention that we were using a very generic term, C A P I T A L taxes – to avoid apoplexy on the upper benches! (*Laughter*) I did ask whether we could distinguish between that very wise phrase and what might be called capital gains. That was not really answered by P&R, but I do not really want to go back there at the moment. I took it, I think, that it would probably be used fairly  
1115 loosely, and as we already had property taxes we would not preclude the possibility of further taxes on property, property values, should that prove necessary. Our next four years – it is going to be three and a half years – is going to be very dominated by how are we going to raise this money from revenues or – as Deputy Yerby warned yesterday and, I think, Deputy Parkinson confirmed today – from charges. I was relatively relaxed, but I noticed in the report in yesterday's  
1120 *Press* about the debate, they said, 'e.g. property taxes', when they were talking about capital taxes, and that did concern me, because I think somebody did mention Document Duty as an example of the way we tax property capital, and that was dismissed as, 'No, that is a transaction tax'. Obviously, it is a transaction tax based on the asset value. You could use that argument to say we could introduce a 5% transaction tax on the purchase of goods and services: 'Well, we do want to  
1125 avoid GST of course, but we will call it a transaction tax.' We can use terminology in confusing ways to suit ourselves.

It does worry me if the term 'capital taxes' is going to be too prescriptive, because I think we are going to need quite a lot of levers to raise this £14 million per annum. I would not want to exclude the possibility, I am not saying we need some additional property taxes, but I would not want to preclude the possibility of introducing them. Not the capital taxes that so worried Deputy Trott, but I cannot see any argument against the possibility of some additional form of property tax, particularly if it is related to gains in the asset value. So, I suppose I am looking for some sort of reassurance from P&R that they are not going to be too prescriptive in interpreting the phrase 'excluding capital taxes'.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Tindall.

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

I have found these last few days more valuable than I expected. I have had the opportunity to read the views of Committees on their mandate – their manifestos, if you will – and how they want to proceed.

The cut and paste from existing strategies, explanations and history has been helpful. I agree with Deputy Green, they need to be whittled down to the priorities. I think the tables summarising the plans are the best part and I hope the majority of the plans are reduced and presented in this manner as part of the refinement process. I will watch avidly for the publication of these refined plans as part of the Budget process, which I presume would happen, but I would appreciate confirmation of the same.

I also am counting down the days, sir, to 10th October, or earlier hopefully, when they are published. I have many discussions on the outcome of this debate – not with Principal Committees but one-to-one, so that I am prepared for the deadline for amendments at 3 p.m. on 26th October.

But, sir, I think of what the people of Guernsey will think of this debate, which has lasted a long time. What have we achieved? Despite my concerns, I think we have sufficient to steer the preparation of the Budget, not just through amendments but by showing strength and depth of views. Even if the wording of amendments has often been the downfall of such good ideas. I certainly am learning those lessons and listening to those views.

The debate on the Medium Term Financial Plan has been particularly enlightening, but I was most concerned about Deputy Parkinson's comments, in particular, about what appears to be a fundamental flaw in the approach of the Medium Term Financial Plan – the return of the proceeds of sale of properties which cannot be paid by way of a capital dividend into general revenue, but has to be paid to Capital Reserve; but again, as I am no accountant, I hope to hear how this obstacle was overcome, when considering the MTFP before it was published – or is that also to be refined?

I have to agree with Deputy Gollop's priority of the economy. By bringing more money into the coffers, by having a buoyant economy when, not if, the issues with sea and air links are resolved. There must be a positive strong message that Guernsey is open for business. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I am concerned voices in this Assembly are not as positive as I think we should be, as it is vital to achieve this.

I would also reiterate the need to maintain Proposition 12 as amended to ensure, in particular, recruitment is optimised and communication a priority.

Sir, I have noted the concerns of Members, which I articulated in respect of my amendment. I think it is of concern that there has not been an acknowledgment of this prior to this debate, and a more realistic attempt to cater for these concerns over the contents of the plans, to avoid the need to lay my amendment, or to have this discussion, which I think is unfortunate. There were many opportunities right up until laying the amendment yesterday; it did not cease at 3 p.m. on Thursday 15th June.

Sir, I have read the documents over and over, trying to find a way to approve these unrefined Committee plans, I have gone through noting on nearly every page something I disagree with, whether a statement of fact or a statement of opinion, or inconsistencies. I have found on balance I cannot approve the Committee plans. I do not accept that work on the excellent previously approved strategies and plans will be put on hold if these particular plans are not approved.

Members will also be pleased to hear that I do not intend to go through each point, as I do not intend to beat the record on the longest speech in this term, or indeed ever. I too acknowledge I did not lay amendments and, sir, I remain of the opinion that I cannot support the seven Committee plans. I await the answers to questions regarding MTFP and the plans, before finally deciding.

Sir, if not already requested by Deputy Dudley-Owen, I would appreciate a separate vote on the Propositions 13 to 19, 15A is not necessary as far as I am concerned.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Graham.

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

Members of the States, when I first saw the list of amendments that ???11:38:57 over the past three days, I probably, along with many of you, sort of sighed, but I have to say in retrospect, I think the Plan, and the understanding of the Plan, is all the better for having seen it and listened to it being tested against those amendments over the last three days.

On the positive side, I was very pleased to note that I do not think the word 'borrowing' appeared in any of the amendments, but on the other side, neither was there mention of measures in any of them to promote the growth in our economy. To that end, perhaps, in retrospect, I regret not having placed an amendment of my own of the generic nature of that placed, I think it was amendment 17 by Deputy de Sausmarez, really to remind Committees that when assessing their policies they should really bear in mind the wellbeing of the current and future generations, because I think had I done so, there would have been a very neat synergy between the two, because I can think of scarcely one thing that would better address the wellbeing of the current and future generations than if this Government were to grow the economy. **(Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

Whilst on growth – I am glad that Deputy Green, and also Deputy Prow, have alluded to the importance of it – I have no gripe at all with the plan for Economic Development Committee, all the right stuff is in there, including the cry of 'Guernsey is open for business'. I think we have to do a little bit more than cry it, I think we have to make sure that the door is really truly widely open.

I would like to give you a quote here from one member of a group of experienced young entrepreneurs in Guernsey, on trying to get an innovative business off the ground, and I quote from one of them:

Trying to loosen the bureaucratic shackles of the GFSC and Government here is like trying to thaw the Siberian permafrost with a blow torch.11:41:04

Now, I do not know how unfair that is, but other similar anecdotal evidence that I have seen really –

I give way to Deputy Dudley-Owen.

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Sir, thank you very much to Deputy Graham for giving way, I really appreciate that.

Myself and other members of Economic Development are constantly meeting business individuals from the community in Guernsey – entrepreneurs and the like – and the information, the feedback that we are getting from them is completely the opposite. We are there to help, we are there to break down all the barriers to them getting their businesses off the ground. So if



Deputy Graham does have any information where that is not happening, please can he give it to us so that we can help in that instance? But that is not a common theme that we are hearing.

Thank you.

1230 **Deputy Graham:** I do thank Deputy Dudley-Owen for the intervention. I am very pleased to give way to her, and I will take her up on her offer of consulting with her on this particular matter.

I repeat that I have got no problems really with either the philosophy or the determination of those who are on Economic Development. I am really happy with that. I do happen to say, quite frankly, that I think when it comes to direction from the centre, from P&R, I think more could have  
1235 been **11:42:25** of the Plan to really urge all sectors of the Government to buy into the whole business of growing the economy, as one way out of some of the dilemmas that are facing us. I hope that is not an unfair comment but, for example, if you look at the Medium Term Capital Plan there is a sort of slogan there, of maintain, transform and grow, and that is fine and I understand that. The allocation of percentages of the capital investment available is, in my view, questionable  
1240 and I will be grateful for a response to this when he sort of replies to the debate.

At the moment there is 30% of the capital available intended for maintaining, there is 50% for transforming, and only 20% for growth. My question really is, is that the right balance?

I mention the whole of the States having to buy into this growth ethic. Certainly speaking as an individual Deputy who happens to sit on Home Affairs, I am very well aware, personally, and I  
1245 think the Committee is also, of our responsibilities, for example, in regular engagement with the panel that has been appointed to advise on the population management and its impact on the economy, I think is it one of our first duties, really, to see that is going and to respond accordingly. I am sure we will.

Enough about growth. I do want to return to one factor that I mentioned very briefly back on  
1250 day one, and that was this business of progressive taxation and progressive measures as a whole, and the talk of broad **11:44:17** shoulders and those who are most able to bear the burden. Now, of course, philosophically it is an easy thing to buy in, and certainly in terms of social responsibility. I am not going to take any lectures away from the fact that my social conscience might be any smaller than anybody else's, but I really do think there is a need to understand what  
1255 we mean when we say these things. I think we now know quite clearly what progressive taxation is. Now, Deputy Ferbrache tried to seduce us with his rather benign interpretation of what it meant; we do know, don't we, that it actually means the rate that taxation is levelled increases as the amount of taxable income or taxable assets increases too. So effectively, when we talk about, for example, progressive taxation measures, we are talking about some people paying 20%, some  
1260 people paying 21%, 22% or whatever figure we come up with. Now that may or may not be a good or bad thing, but I think it is important that we understand what we are talking about when we talk about progressive taxation measures.

I now turn to these broad shoulders and those who are best able to cough up. Now, in my  
1265 view, if there are, out there, individuals and entities who are not paying their fair share, then it is the responsibility of Government to get it out of them. So I am fully behind this, I really am, but when you analyse the facts, one wonders how many of those are out there, and are there sufficient of them to make a difference.

Now, already we have had Deputy Trott and also Deputy St Pier, draw to our attention, or  
1270 remind us, that the top 10% of those who contribute by way of direct taxation account for 40% of our income in that field. Further, the top 40% of those who contribute, contribute and account for 90% of our total tax. That suggests to me that out there there are insufficient individuals or entities to really make a fundamental difference that is actually going to affect our fiscal policy in a substantial way. I just wonder where these people are with the broadest shoulders.

Now, yesterday Deputy Tooley described in graphic detail, and very effectively, that very  
1275 definitely amongst that lot is not the sort of squeeze the middle who are already squeezed very tightly indeed, and she was referring really to a couple on median earnings. Well, my question is, I am not quite sure how wide the belt is that goes round the squeezed middle. I suspect that those

on median earnings are towards the bottom edge of the belt (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and I wonder how far up the belt you have to go, up above the waist, before you get clear of that.

1280 Deputy Tooley mentioned the couple on median earnings. What about those, for example, and I am talking here, perhaps, of a couple, one of whom might be a teacher with special responsibility payments, another might be a senior staff nurse, a health visitor or a middle manager in the private sector; they will probably be on a family income of around about £80,000 a year. Now, to people of my generation £80,000 a year as a family income is riches indeed. But when it is put  
1285 against the cost of living, and the essentials here in Guernsey, it is quite illuminating. That couple for example, would lose just about a quarter of its income through direct taxation, Income Tax, through Social Security contributions, through TRP, through water rates and things like that, so even before they have gone beyond the basic essentials of life, even before they go into the arena of buying their clothes and feeding themselves, they have already had half of their income  
1290 accounted for, if they are also renting in the private sector. Any couple who are renting, for example, in a pretty basic three down, three up, semi-detached house down in **Grandes Roque**11:48:45 or at Mare de Carteret or the **Villeq**, or places like that, they are almost certainly paying a minimum of £20,000 a year in rent. So half of that couple's income has gone, and they have reached this time of the year before actually they have earned anything to do more than lay  
1295 their head on the pillow at night and have a cup of water. They are left with under £800 a week basically to fend for themselves. So, I mention that merely because I think we really do, as a States, have to know what we are talking about when we talk about those who have the best ability to pay. I think there is a middle out there, and I think that middle is squeezed, and I think we should be very careful before we squeeze it any tighter.

1300 I hope Members of the States will forgive me if I finish on two hobbyhorses. One is this business about working age. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) It is in the Plan, and I have to say Deputy St Pier actually included it in his introductory speech. Now, look, if this was just a matter of making me grumpy every time it is mentioned, (*Laughter*) it would not matter one bit, but actually there is a serious thing at issue here. I do acknowledge all the work that is being done by Deputy Le Clerc  
1305 and her Committee members in this area, but I really do feel we, as a States, need to buy in also to try to change the culture of how we regard the demographic headwind into which we are heading. Clearly, there are problems ahead, but the ageing population is not just a problem, it is an opportunity, if we actually look at it with fresh eyes and work out how we can, to our own profit, and their individual profit, recycle those who traditionally have finished being productive  
1310 citizens in the economy. (*Laughter*) I have to say – yes, I am aware that Deputy de Lisle is sitting just below me, and I am doing my best too. I do not think our declining workforce, or the threat of it, is just a matter of ageing; I think it came out very clearly yesterday in the field of health, when Deputy Soulsby was able to point to the downside of an affluent society – the effects, for example, of obesity-related diseases, not only in terms of the pain that is inflicted on the individuals, but  
1315 also on the costs to her Committee and to the States, indirectly.

But, my worry is that just as we may run out of people young enough to work, we may run out of people who by the age of 50 are unfit to work, if the current trend continues. I am worried that those in their 20's and 30's and 40's now, for various reasons, may not be able to be productive  
1320 citizens when they are 50 and 60, and to that end, I do really appreciate, and I give my best wishes to all the work that I know Deputy Soulsby and her team are doing. I am fully behind that; I am fully behind the sports strategy. I hope there will be increased synergy there. I look forward to when that sports strategy is brought back to the States – that it will be full of very clear precise objective and KPIs, so that we can judge it, and judge its contribution to the health problem.

1325 My second and final hobby horse is that of making a clear distinction between objectives and plans. When we, back in May last year, all gathered at Beau Séjour, I did make it plain – and I think I was tagged with being the cynic of the new class, which is a little bit unfair, but I think it was meant fairly kindly – I did make it clear that I, personally, do not think governments really should pay too much regard to visions and things. I am not criticising the fact that we have, but it is not really for me. I really believe in setting clear objectives. Now, I think objectives are set when you

1330 conduct a very clear objective analysis at any one time, and you come up with a very clear idea of  
 where you are heading, and what that objective is going to look like at the end. You then find  
 plans. Now plans get you there. Plans are means to an end; they should never become an end in  
 themselves. The reason is plans hardly ever survive their first contact with reality. We saw that  
 classically, and to our advantage, when we had adjustments, powered by P&R, to the balance of  
 1335 our fiscal approach. Do you remember an analysis in 2015 predicted, I think, it was about a deficit  
 of about £25 million toward the end of 2016? In fact it turned out to be a hell of a lot better.  
 Sensibly, P&R adjusted the plan, or adjusted the 3%-5%-5% plan merely this time by extending it  
 over a different period, and slightly changing the percentages. That, in my view, is good  
 government.

1340 That, I think, reinforces the view uttered by Deputy Fallaize at some stage when we were  
 debating the amendments, that we should not necessarily be fixated on the plans, and we should  
 not be too reserved about contemplating changes to them as and when the facts change. The  
 important thing is to keep the objectives in very clear mind, the way to get to them may change  
 from day to day.

1345 In that regard, I think the P&R Plan Phase Two is a potentially confusing mixture of objectives  
 and plans. I am very clear, Members of the States, what the objectives are in that Plan, and I am  
 very clear about what the plans in it are. Over the next year or so I, personally, am going to  
 monitor very clearly the distinction that is preserved between the two.

1350 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Smithies.

**Deputy Smithies:** Thank you, Deputy Bailiff.

As an aside from my speech, I completely concur with what Deputy Graham said. I will just add  
 one thing: time spent in reconnaissance is rarely wasted.

1355 Deputy Roffey has introduced the term 'stealth tax' into the debate, and I thank him for that,  
 and I intend to respond. Allusions have been made to a reluctance to introduce any form of  
 opportunistic stealth tax to be levied on consumers as States' asset provided services. I am quite  
 clear that I would not support either tariff increases, or the reallocation of efficiency savings, other  
 than to the benefit of customers (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) through reduced tariffs or inward  
 1360 investment into the asset. Service tariffs are protected under the law from being used for any  
 other purpose than the provision of those services.

I can assure Deputies Roffey and Gollop that I would resist any move to increase tariffs other  
 than for the purpose of maintaining and running services and reinvesting in the infrastructure  
 necessary for providing those services.

1365 Contributions to general revenue can be achieved through other means. New revenue sources  
 can be developed from within the assets. We do have huge assets for which we are responsible  
 and which we believe can be managed for the benefit of the people of the Bailiwick. Sweating the  
 assets is not the same as skimming the tariff revenue, or skinning the consumer.

I remain very optimistic that the STSB will achieve significant repositioning of the States'  
 1370 trading assets, and much work has already been accomplished.

Turning now to the MTFP, I am generally supportive of the policies presented by P&R, and am  
 informed by many of the arguments presented to this Assembly over the past three days, and  
 before.

1375 There is a need to broaden the tax base and to effect further savings in expenditure. Now is  
 not the time to let up on pursuing savings. But, we really do need to revisit corporation tax.

With Wimbledon fortnight imminent, I am resisting the urge to ask anyone for tennis, rather I  
 will ask anyone for territorial taxes. I know there is at least one other player here, can we get  
 enough for a doubles match, or even a tournament?

Thank you, sir.

1380 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

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

During the last States' term we embarked on many significant policy developments, but due to lack of financial and staff resources the States failed to make acceptable progress on many of those, and that is the backdrop for the Rules that we have in Rule 23, which I will come back to.

Also, as Deputy Parkinson has referred to in earlier amendment debates, we have made little progress on capital projects. When you look at the capital projects that we have started and completed during the last four years: 2013-16 the Mental Health & Wellbeing Centre and the Cabernet recapitalisation are the two ones which stand out, apart from the Long Sea Outfall, which, as Deputy Parkinson said, has been subsequently funded from the Bond.

As I said, due to these problems and the previous attempts by the States to do policy planning, the States Review Committee spent some time thinking about how we were going to organise policy planning in this term, and in particular we came up with some Rules, which then SACC put into Rule 23. I actually think that this Plan is outside those Rules, because if you look at those Rules there are words which like 5B identification of any conflicts and where prioritisation is necessary. To say that they are coming back to refine it, I do not think, as many speakers have said, they have not done that prioritisation. So, actually, I do not think they fulfil those rules.

I go on to Rule 5C which says, '... and ultimately finalise the content of the Policy Resource Phase One and Phase Two, that starts off with June 2017'. It has not been finalised, they are going to come back and refine it. I know many other speakers have spoken about it, but I think this is outside the Rules, and I can only add my disappointment, that I think this was such a key focus for P&R during this first year, and they have failed to deliver what was envisaged. But, we have failed in policy planning many times before, but I just hoped we had actually turned over a new leaf, and it does not seem as if we have.

Just going through some of the Propositions. Proposition 1 – I think Deputy Yerby actually referred to this – talks about the Medium Term Financial Plan, but actually we should use common terms in our fiscal policy framework. It actually refers to short term being up to five years, and medium term between five and 15 years. So, in fact, it would be good if we used common terminology throughout our documents where we specifically define what they mean.

I have equal concerns as others about our ability to deliver those savings. Particularly, we did try in the past with the Financial Transformation Programme, and I am particularly concerned about procurement, because I could look at the *I always keep plenty of old documents* this is a *12:01:40* document which dates back to July 2009 and there were plenty of words about a number of cross-cutting projects on procurement; and interestingly, the sums that would be saved were very similar to what we have got in this document, but we failed to deliver them.

I do accept that there are words particularly that they are going to approach it differently, and I do hope, I really do hope, that they succeed. I will be very pleased if they do succeed, but I am slightly sceptical, because of our previous attempts and our failures to deliver them.

I would just like perhaps Deputy St Pier, through you, sir, when he sums up, if he could actually explain how they are going to allocate it to Committee budgets. Are they going to be allocated before the year in expectation that those savings will be made during that year, or are they going to be allocated subsequent to that? Because, obviously, if they are cross-cutting they are not directly related to one Committee.

We talked about raising more money through taxes. I think that I mentioned in the Budget that the Guernsey Alcohol Advisory Service, particularly, identified the amount of money that alcohol costs this Island, and we failed to collect anything like the amount it costs, and I think that is one area we should particularly look at in terms of collecting money which is similar to the cost of alcohol in two public services in this Island.

When we did Phase One I proposed an amendment, I think it was Deputy Fallaize who seconded, about in terms of the charges that we made through utilities about a disproportionate burden on those who can least afford it. I am very concerned, particularly, having listened to Deputy Parkinson's excellent speech about what the effect of the returns that are expected in this Plan will have on those who can least afford it, because in the end it is going to be a form of tax

on those people, and we do not charge electricity, water or any other utilities by those who can afford it; it is purely by usage. Those who can least afford it, I am concerned that the proportion of their income they have to spend on utilities will increase if we embark on that policy.

I am also concerned about the returns from the – we talked about that we should look at the net return which we cannot just look at the dividends without looking at the losses that Aurigny make and therefore, effectively, we sweep it under the carpet, and then every 10 years or so we do a capital recapitalisation. I think we should be looking at accepting the cost of the losses on a yearly basis, and if the electricity produces £2 million but all Aurigny needs is £2 million, we should not accept that £2 million to go into our accounts and just keep those £2 million losses at Aurigny on their books, which we have, effectively, to pay off at a later date. We should say, well, basically there is no money coming from the States' Trading Supervisory Board.

On Proposition 2, if in the fiscal framework we are committed to spending 3% of GDP, so I cannot see any point in having a Proposition which allocates less than 3% to capital projects just to balance the Budget. I think that would be wrong. That would mean that ultimately we will not be able to fulfil that fiscal framework commitment to spend 3%. So I cannot support that.

I was pleased to see Proposition 5, which talked about the core investment fund getting back up to 100%. But, I think, actions speak louder than words, and all we have done in the last four years is raid that, what used to be the contingency fund, by (a) moving money out of that into other reserves and then spending them, and also by taking the investment return above maintaining the real value of that and use it elsewhere.

So, if P&R are really committed to doing that, I ask them in the next Budget to stop, change that Proposition where they take the investment return above maintaining the real value of the capital in there, stop taking it away from that fund and leave it in that fund as showing some commitment to actually growing that fund. Because all we are doing is just maintaining its value in real terms by our current actions.

A number of Members have mentioned growth. I am concerned about the lack of capital projects in relation to growth, but one of the ones which we had identified which would be able to bring future growth – it is under the growth category on page 102 – is the St Peter Port Action Area Development, which was one of the very few of those projects of growth, but by deciding to do the strategic air and sea links infrastructure pipeline project, I think that we have to put that on hold, because there is no point starting that project if we are looking at the sea links infrastructure in another project.

So, by voting for that amendment, I think Members are delaying one of our few growth capital projects, which I think is not a sensible decision. But due to the way the Propositions have been amended, I cannot do anything about that from my final voting.

So, thank you. Those are my comments.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Merrett.

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

I would like to talk to Proposition 7 initially, please, sir. It refers to 8.6 and 8.15 of the Medium Term Financial Plan, which I wish to bring to the attention of Members, because 8.12 on page 99 refers to delegating the authority to P&R for a maximum of £2 million:

... once a prioritised list has been approved and proportionate business cases developed, capital votes up to a maximum of £2million can be approved.

Can Deputy St Pier confirm that the prioritised list is indeed the list of portfolio projects on page 101? If so, how are Deputies meant to know which of these projects will be within £2 million if indeed this Assembly approved the delegated authority to P&R. There is a distinct lack of detail on page 101, or is it just the small projects?

Number 8.13 refers to giving STSB delegated authority also for up to £2 million. My concern, sir, is that there are only two democratically elected Members on that board, and two non-elected

members who have the same voting rights. So my concern, sir, my understanding, is that if the Assembly vote Pour to Proposition 7 and 9, they will be giving the delegated authority for up to £2 million of taxpayers' money with, perhaps, only one democratically elected Member in agreement.

Proposition 8 will give P&R delegated authority, again, for £2 million – so again just a handful of Deputies. My concern, sir, is just how open and transparent it will be to other Deputies and, indeed, our community as to how we are spending our community's money; £2 million is a lot of money to me, and it is a lot of money to a lot of people.

Therefore, I would ask Members to be wary of Propositions 7, 8 and 9 and look forward to Deputy St Pier's responses to my questions.

I also have sympathy with the amendment that tried to alter 'approve' to 'approve in principle' Committees' plans. Maybe it is semantics, but I am concerned that if we do indeed approve the Committee's policy plans, exactly what elements of their plans will fall into this £2 million of delegated authority, to either, if approved to either P&R or STSB; because in theory, if Committee plans required funding to approve capital votes for any project with a value exceeding £2 million funded from Capital Reserve, then P&R, if Proposition 8 passes, could spend up to £2 million per project without coming back to this Assembly.

Sir, I therefore request a separate vote on Propositions 7, 8 and 9.

Proposition 10 asks the Assembly to approve projects listed in paragraph 8.23 appendix I. For Members' convenience, that is on page 103. This included the Harbour Action Area Plan that Deputy Parkinson referred to earlier. How the Harbour Action Plan Area could add to economic growth is an unknown, but I sincerely hope this Assembly would wish to proceed with it in the near future. Environment & Infrastructure in their policy plan state that they consider it would be best placed to oversee, co-ordinate and promote this policy area. However, on page 264, it states this work would take in order of two, two and half years to produce as a master plan. I would like to suggest, sir, maybe to bring this forward, not put it back. But, some of the capital reserve that has not been allocated, maybe to this area would be beneficial. We need to look at and investigate growth more pro-actively.

Other Members have voiced their concern regarding the financial costs involved in this Phase Two Plan; I echo these concerns, but I must also emphasise the cost in time. My biggest concern, sir, is that we are looking at the Medium Term Financial Plan as a calculator rather than at our economy as a whole. Additionally, the Committee's plans have been submitted in silo. I do know, for example, that Environment & Infrastructure policy plan regarding the Harbour Action Area Plan was changed between draft and the final submission. I am only highlighting this because after reading the hundreds of pages in draft, I then had to play spot the difference when reading the final submissions – a few more 100 pages. This is indeed time consuming for myself, and therefore, I assume for others. This process clearly needs streamlining, unity and does require Policy & Resources act as an overarching Committee, and sadly, on this occasion, I do not think this has been the case.

I have engaged with this process pro-actively: I have attended many, many meetings, I have lost many days of my life to this process, but I fear that we still have much to do, without a lot of money, and now without a lot of time.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

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

First of all, on Proposition 1, I am going to find it very difficult to vote in favour of Proposition 1 – this is one related to the Medium Term Financial Plan – because in paragraph 1.4 there is an interesting phrase used by the Policy & Resources Committee. They say they do not think there should be any change to the underlying fiscal approach as there is no evidenced need to do so. Then two paragraphs later they say:

... if no actions are taken, an underlying deficit will persist throughout the period, cumulating to £70 million.

1535 Well, I am not quite sure how you get from the first claim to the second claim. If the objective is as it is – and I think it should be – to return to a balanced budget, how you can say the underlying fiscal policies that we have in place will lead to a cumulative deficit of £70 million, therefore there needs to be no change in our fiscal approach, seems to me slightly inconsistent.

1540 I fear that the Medium Term Financial Plan as set out, essentially unamended now, will result in, first of all, reductions in expenditure which I believe will cause cuts in the quality and scope of public services. I know that that is not what the Policy & Resources Committee has in mind, but I think that is what will happen if the reductions they envisage are carried into effect.

1545 Secondly, increases in fees, charges and taxation on some of those households who are unable to bear that burden. Because I think that we are entering an era where, according to the Policy & Resources Committee's own proposals, there will be increases in the revenue raised by the States, but I think our tax structure means that a great deal of the burden will fall on people who will not be able to bear the burden. That is related to what Deputy Parkinson was saying this morning, about the incorporated and unincorporated businesses under the control of the States' Trading Supervisory Board.

1550 Now, I agree with Deputy Graham's comments about trying to understand more clearly who are those with the broadest shoulders. It is a very easy phrase to talk about. The problem that we have, and we do not like to admit it, or we certainly do not like to talk about it very much, is that we have this commitment, and it is a sincere commitment, to raise revenue from those who are most able to bear that burden. But we turn away from all of, or most of, the measures which other jurisdictions would employ to ensure that tax falls mainly on those with the broadest shoulders. So we do not have meaningful taxes on capital, we have already had that debate, but that is just a fact. We have comparatively low rates of tax on property. We have very low rates of corporation tax by international standards. Now, if a jurisdiction starts excluding those possibilities, it is very difficult to meet the objective that tax will be raised by taking it from those with the broadest shoulders. Zero-10, whatever its rights and wrongs – and a strong case can be made either way – did, as a matter of fact, transfer a significant portion of the tax burden from the non-resident corporate sector on to the resident population. That was an effect of Zero-10, and I think that trend is going to continue based on the policies set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan.

1565 We tax consumption very peripherally in a targeted way, with measures like duty on fuel, but obviously we do not have some kind of general consumption tax. Now, I voted in the last States against what was, in effect, the introduction of GST, but also against the amendment to try and take the whole thing off the table, because the way that the old Treasury & Resources Department set it out did not provide for general consumption tax to be levied in a way that was fair and reasonable, but it is not inconceivable that a general consumption tax could be conceived in that way, or could be designed in that way. If we had quite high rates of general consumption tax then sufficient revenue would be generated to reduce Income Tax. Deputy Gollop has already referred to this, to reduce Income Tax, possibly quite significantly for those on low and middle incomes.

1575 Now, the fact is that some of those who do have the broadest shoulders are not contributing the same or anywhere near the levels of tax they would be, even on a proportionate basis in other jurisdictions.

I will give way to Deputy Roffey.

**Deputy Roffey:** Thank you.

1580 I am interested in the argument that Deputy Fallaize is developing, but I wonder if he has ideas how you would compensate people who currently pay no Income Tax and are not on benefits, for the introduction of a consumption tax.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Well, the answer to that question – and I suspect it is not palatable in this Assembly, or in the wider community ... but if one wanted to design a more coherent fiscal

1585 strategy the answer to the question is the benefits system. But they are the kind of challenges that  
we need to face, if we are going to raise more revenue from those with the broadest shoulders.  
Because some of them, and do not misunderstand me, there are very many, poor, relatively poor  
pensioners – *many* – but there are also, if we are trying to get a picture of who are those with the  
broadest shoulders, many of them are people who are not in work – the retired population. If you  
1590 looked at the distribution of wealth in Guernsey, a reasonable proportion of them are people who  
are not in work, and yet we are collecting vast quantities of tax based on income. Now, that was  
the argument for GST; it was never made by the old Treasury & Resources Department because,  
frankly, they did not quite have the courage to make it, and it is a very, very hard argument to sell,  
but there are very many people who are not in work, whose expenditure is quite high, who would  
1595 have contributed more to the exchequer if we had a general consumption tax. But we cannot have  
a general consumption tax if we just try to superimpose it on our current tax system. Because the  
effect of it is that we would take very much more tax from those who clearly are unable to bear  
the burden. So, the point I am making is we have a problem: if we want to talk about generating  
more tax from those with the broadest shoulders, we have to change the whole structure of our  
1600 tax system. It is no good looking at tweaks here or there – I am not sure there is any appetite to  
do that – but I am concerned that raising more revenue within our existing tax system will just  
lead to an even less fair distribution of tax on those who are unable to bear the burden. So, I am  
going to find it hard to vote in favour of Proposition 1.

Just speaking briefly about the policy plan, for which I was partly responsible, as a member of  
1605 the Committee for Employment & Social Security, the Committee agrees with Deputy Roffey's  
comments about primary care, and they are covered in the policy plan. It is set out by the  
Committee that the underlying policy objective for the £12 per visit grant is now very dubious. It is  
not clear what it is achieving, other than allowing the GPs to charge £12 more than they would  
otherwise. There is the potential for that expenditure to be reallocated to assist those who are –  
1610 and there are many of them – unable to visit the doctor, or who very much limit their visits to GPs,  
because of the cost. I would say our failure as a Government to invest meaningful sums in primary  
care is probably our single greatest failure of social policy.

A very major step forward was made with the introduction of the secondary health care system  
some years ago, but it was meant to be the first step of two steps. It was meant to be allied with  
1615 the introduction of a universal primary care system. It never was, and there are, in my judgement,  
many thousands of people who are unable to visit GPs when they should, simply because they  
cannot afford it, and in what should be a modern and compassionate society that really cannot be  
acceptable. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Secondly, on employment and Social Security matters, I think it is worth drawing to Members'  
1620 attention that the pensions uprating policy has been made less generous, and at the moment the  
States have a policy in place to make it less generous still, from the year 2020. If that policy is  
maintained there is no question that as a whole demographic in society, pensioners will become  
poorer relative to the rest of the society. So that is going to be a challenge the States are going to  
have to confront. Which, of course, means if that policy is maintained it becomes even more  
1625 important that our means tested welfare system is adequate to provide what poorer members of  
our society require.

It is a major part of the Committee for Employment & Social Security policy plan that the  
Committee will propose the introduction of the social welfare reforms which were agreed in  
principle by the last States, to be introduced from 1st July 2018. Now, if any Members are  
1630 uncomfortable with that, and bearing in mind this is a significant item of expenditure, if any  
Members do not want that, I would say speak now, because the Committee has a great deal of  
work to do over the next year before those measures can be introduced. But they are absolutely  
essential, because at the moment by the States' own standards – not just by the Committee's  
standards or measurement, but by the States' own measurement – there are thousands of people  
1635 in Guernsey whose income is below that which the States have agreed is required to live a



tolerable life. Now, we cannot allow that to continue. If States' Members do not agree with that, then they should set out their objections in this debate.

On the Policy & Resource Plan, generally, I think one of the major advantages of it is that Principal Committees, for the first time, have been forced to think about their own policy programme for the four-year term. Now, believe it or not, that has not happened, not in a structured, coherent way, previously. If that has been the only advantage of this process, then I think it is quite a significant advantage, and I know that the Committee on which I sit has benefited greatly; and I think other Committees, some of them at least, have benefited greatly from going through the discipline of trying to put together a policy programme. There is a great deal of work which still needs to be done in that area, but it has had an advantage.

Where I think the Policy & Resources Committee has underperformed a bit is that I think much earlier in the process they should have set out exactly what was expected. They did not. It was well into 2017 before they gave Principal Committees any kind of indication of what was expected in these policy plans, and in the future there needs to be more commonality between them. One of these plans is 44 pages long. That is not a policy programme. I think we, as Members and Committee Presidents and members of P&R, allowing us lot down here, to coin a phrase, to debate all of this first, which is quite helpful in a way, but Member after Member has got up to criticise this document, but the last 200 pages of it were produced by the Principal Committees. They had nothing to do with the Policy & Resources Committee. The Policy & Resources Committee's bit of the thing stops about, I don't know, it stops about there – this bit, is all produced by Principal Committees. Well, it is no good those of us who sit on Principal Committees standing up and saying this document has taken too long to produce, and it is too long and it is not focussed enough, because the work has been produced by us. So we have to take some ownership of it.

I will give way to Deputy Dudley-Owen.

**Deputy Dudley Owen:** Thank you very much.

Sir, through you, just to address the comment by Deputy Fallaize, the work was co-ordinated by P&R and there was every opportunity for P&R Committee to be able to streamline the information that they wanted from each of the Committees. So the Committees only responded to what P&R asked for.

**Deputy Fallaize:** I do not think that is quite right, because some Committees ... the Committee for Home Affairs, for example, submitted a 14-page policy plan – (*Interjection*) 12 pages, Deputy Lowe says. The Committee for Employment & Social Security submitted one of 16 pages. But the Committee for Economic Development submitted one that is 44 pages. So there is a complete disparity.

Now, I agree with Deputy Dudley-Owen, some of that was a misunderstanding. The instructions from the Policy & Resources Committee were not adequate right at the beginning of the process. I do not think they invested enough time and effort and thought into the process during the first six or nine months of their term. But nonetheless, those of us on Principal Committees cannot entirely blame them, because these were the policy plans which we submitted, and we have to take some ownership, both for the form they take and for the length they take, and for what is in them.

I think the structure of this Plan is right. I think it is just that the length of it is too great. I do not think that the Policy & Resources Committee's instructions were strong enough at the beginning, and I think that in two or three cases, certainly, the policy plans submitted by the Committees are not really policy plans, they are just a sort of commentary on the challenges which exist. They need to turn them into a Programme for Government. In the UK, parties which want to be in government do not say, 'Oh, we have Brexit challenges to face, we have tax challenges to face, we have social care challenges to face,' they say, 'This is what we are going to do in an effort to meet those challenges,' (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and that is the way in

which these plans in the future need to be refined. But they need to be refined by the Principal Committees working in collaboration with the Policy & Resources Committee.

1690 I think this is a better platform than previous States have reached a year into their terms of office. I think all Committees, including P&R and the six Principal Committees, deserve credit for that. The next stage is not going to be what previous States did in wrecking their policy planning processes, which is to sort of tear it all down, but is to say this is a reasonable platform from which to start, it now needs to become more focused, and more coherent, and in future iterations it  
1695 needs to be turned into a genuine Programme for Government. But I think it is quite a good start.

The very last thing I want to say is a question to the President of the Committee for Health & Social Care, because I have become, over the last few months, quite confused about what the formal position is of this Committee on its capacity to generate expenditure savings. Now, I say quite openly, I doubt very much that they can generate any expenditure savings. Perhaps, there  
1700 are some marginal savings which can be generated. So, I am not in any way criticising them for their financial performance, but at page 288 they say in their own policy plan in bold:

However, while transformation of services may allow some of the costs of health and social care to be contained, and managed more sustainably, the pressures of rising population demand and increasing medical inflation mean it is not possible for [the Committee] to commit firmly to achieving no real-terms growth in its budget in the medium term.

Now we are not talking here about expenditure savings. We are not even talking about holding their budget at real terms increases. We are talking about them saying that they cannot commit to no real terms growth in their budget. So, it is possible that their general revenue  
1705 budget will have to be increased in real terms.

Now this Government appears to be expecting from this Committee expenditure savings of several million pounds a year, annually recurring savings, in order to deliver on the Medium Term Financial Plan. I would like to understand more clearly from Deputy Soulsby when she sums up, does she believe that the cash limit of her Committee's budget in future years can be cut in real  
1710 terms, or does she believe that it will need to be increased in real terms? I think some clarity about that would assist the States as they continue to debate the Medium Term Financial Plan.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, it is just past 12.30 p.m.

1715 Would it be feasible to put amendment 33 to the vote now, or would you prefer to have it just after lunch?

We will adjourn now until 2.30 p.m. unless there is a wish amongst Members to come back earlier than that.

We will adjourn to 2.30 p.m. then.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.35 p.m.  
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

## **POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

### **I. Policy & Resource Plan – Phase Two – Motion carried as amended**

1720 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, are we now in a position to resume amendment 33, so that we can get the vote in on that before resuming general debate?

Does anyone else want any clarification about amendment 33?

1725 This is the composite amendment replacing all the Propositions with a complete set taking into account all the amendments that have been carried during the course of the last three and a bit days. It is proposed by Deputy St Pier, seconded by Deputy Trott. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I declare that amendment duly carried.

Who wishes to speak in debate?

Deputy Oliver.

1730 **Deputy Oliver:** Thank you, sir.

I would just like to speak about Propositions 7, 8 and 9, if I may. Yes, 7, 8 and 9. What worries me about these Propositions is that the States do not always have a brilliant track record of staying within budget on projects. There could be quite a few I could choose, and I am just choosing one, but with Salerie Corner, this was quite a large overspend of 42%, because things change on the project.

1735

**Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** Point of correction.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

1740

**Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** It was not an overspend of 42%; the original survey was for £82,000 and there was a marginal overspend where they re-went over work. The extras that were created, that does not account for 42%. Incorrect.

1745 **Deputy Oliver:** There were extras though. It does not matter which way you look at it, there are extras. It is just an illustration to try to show what I am talking about. But what concerns me is if we give delegated authority to up to the cost of £2 million, if we have these kinds of overspends we could be actually looking at more like £2½ million, that we are giving the delegated authority to, because by the time a project has spent up to £1 million, it is very unlikely that if it has to come back to the States that we can actually say no, because it is a huge waste of money, and that is one thing that we need to protect, to do. So, I think delegated authority up to £2 million is too much and we need to keep more of a tight control on what we are doing.

1750

Now, as Deputy Merrett also pointed out in regard to STSB, there could potentially be two unelected members voting for a project at the final say when there are not the two Members of the States in there.

1755

My other thing is that I think Deputy Roffey actually made a very good point that we have kind of, to a large extent, just glossed over where the £26 million in savings is going to come from. We need to start looking very differently at how we do things, we need to be open to change and we have to start working much more closely with other Committees. I think that the Home Affairs Committee is very good at doing this, but I think other Committees, where there is cross over, we need to start meeting more regularly. We just need to become a lot more savvy on how we spend the people's money.

1760

I know that it has been said that the report is too short, and Deputy Matt Fallaize pointed out that, well, we wrote the report. Well, Home Affairs wrote 14 pages of the report. Now, I think it is a very good sort of initiative that P&R want to do regarding independent taxation, but there is a whole page explaining it, when actually we could have only just had a paragraph saying that we need to bring tax into the 21st century and move on from that. So, it is a very wordy document, when I think it could be cut down, which would save officers time.

1765

I support Deputy Green saying there are some very large holes in the report, and also, I think it is a shame that yesterday's amendment from Deputy Tindall did not actually go through, because (A Member: Hear, hear.) there are lots of things within individual Committees that I just cannot

1770

sign up to. I sign up to the majority of it, but there are definite points where I think actually I cannot do that. 'In principle' would have actually changed that, so I will be voting for the Home Affairs and I will be abstaining from the rest of the Committees. *(Laughter)* Well, I have gone through the Home Affairs, we have scrutinised it, debated it for, I think it was, about four days, within, to make sure it was where we as a Committee wanted it to be. So I can truly say, hand on heart, that that is what I think should be okay with Home Affairs, but there are things within the other Committees that I do not necessarily agree with.

The other thing is I know this is a medium-term report, but many medium-term priorities also have a very long-term effect on the Island. I think what we need to start doing more as a States, is taking these longer-term initiatives that will have a big impact on the Island – and it could potentially be a very positive impact – and start thinking it might not benefit us in this term of the States, but it will reap the reward further down the line. I think we do tend to look a little bit too short term sometimes in a lot of initiatives. So, if we could just sort of try and urge people to start looking at longer term.

As I have said, it was quite a long report, and I could speak a lot longer, but I think that is all I actually need to say, because I do not want this debate to go on any longer than it needs to.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Leadbeater.

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

I have got to echo this sentiment that my colleague on Home Affairs, Deputy Victoria Oliver, has just said. I have got reservations about Propositions 7, 8 and 9 also.

Looking through appendix 8.15 on page 100, this also has an effect on the medium-term projects, £2 million to £10 million, where P&R will have delegated authority to approve funding for progressing the early stages of the projects. Now, I am really uncomfortable with that, because once you have progressed the early stages of a project, it is going to cost a lot of money. I think a medium-term project, certainly £2 million to £10 million, should be scrutinised before it gets off the ground.

Even the maintain and routine replacement projects, we have got property maintenance, minor works, the proposed categories, IT, medical equipment, vehicles, other equipment. This can cost a lot of money, and up to £2 million is a lot of money. I could only vote for Propositions such as this if I could have reassurance that any of these projects that are proposed get circulated amongst States' Members first, maybe even the media, so we can have proper scrutiny, so a requête can be brought before the States if there is an issue, if we find out there is an issue. I am totally uncomfortable with this going on behind closed doors with just the Committee responsible, and P&R. I think the whole of the States' Assembly needs to be aware of what this money is going on.

I will leave it at that.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

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

Very similar to Deputy Leadbeater, I have got concerns with Propositions 8 and 9, related to the delegated authority.

The job of us, as Deputies, I think, is certainly to scrutinise keepers of the public purse, scrutinise our own policies in this Assembly and to be scrutinised by our peers. That is ultimately what we are here to do and to be, possibly. Notwithstanding – I do not want to raise it again, but I guess I am about to – the recent interest in one particular project. I look with some irony at Proposition 9, the use of the term 'opening capital votes'. To my mind, sir, it is this place where votes should be opened, and sometimes closed. Like Deputy Paint and a few others in this

Assembly, there is a real concern over Proposition 8, particularly, and I look forward to Deputy St Pier addressing that in his final summing up.

1825 Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld.

1830 **Deputy Meerveld:** I, like a lot of people, I think, have some concerns over Propositions 8 and 9, but having thought about it, we do have a risk in the States generally of being too risk averse ... try to make everything perfect before proceeding with it. I have given this some thought and I will be supporting these Propositions, because I think we need to let it play out and see how it works. We are trying to be more efficient in what we do. Proposition 7 does lay out some very sensible procedures for how these applications will be processed. The only thing I would say, or request of  
1835 P&R is that they take into mind, when they are approving applications under these clauses, that they are mindful of public interest, and in certain cases in some projects – I would use the L'Ancrese Sea Wall as an example – they may withhold permission and encourage those Committees to bring certain items to the States, when it is thought to be in the public interest to do so.

1840 Thank you, sir.

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

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

1845 I was going to start by saying that my remarks are going to be somewhat hotchpotch, but I thought the cry might come back, 'Nothing different to normal then!' But I do have a few specific points, sir, and a couple of general comments.

I want to start with the Sports Strategy that was approved yesterday. I voted for the Sports Strategy, but I voted for it reluctantly, and I want to explain why: because I think Education, Sport  
1850 & Culture really did make a genuine attempt to buy into the spirit or the intent of this process, which is mainly prioritisation, which I think is a good thing. So they said they would defer a Sports Strategy; they did not say they were going to abandon it, but they took seriously the idea of prioritisation, so they said they would defer it and they put forward what they really felt was a priority. Of course, there was a backlash against that. There was an outcry, and that situation  
1855 changed. I know Deputy Le Pelley and other members of the Committee have apologised. I do not think they had to make an apology. I think they were trying to enter into the spirit of the prioritisation process. They suffered some backlash because of it.

This process, sir – and I am talking now about the Policy & Resource Plan, the prioritisation – was not meant to be an opportunity to display wares in the shop window; it was not meant to be  
1860 putting forward a list of coming attractions; because in the end you get this point others have made, 'These are our priorities,' but actually everything is a priority. It was meant to be a filtering process as far as I am concerned – a filtering exercise.

I was expecting Committees to exercise some self-control, some self-discipline, to self-regulate, and that has not really happened. This document, this Policy & Resource Plan should be  
1865 a fairly slim, easy-to-understand document, with a very clear and focussed approach to it, and it is anything but that. It should contain genuine priorities, and perhaps just a brief explanation in regard to what Committees might hope to do in the future, but not use it as this opportunity to cram all their wares into the shop window.

As somebody else has said, sir, it does not comply with the spirit of the process, and it raises  
1870 people's expectations. We already receive mixed messages from our community, and we already give out mixed messages, so it has not helped in that regard at all. So it should have been much more focussed and briefer, and a much slimmer and easier-to-understand document.

Sir, when I was a nipper, two inches ago, (*Laughter*) when I went out shopping with my mother, on the odd occasions when we were lucky enough to go into a toy shop or a sweet shop, I was

1875 told you can pick one thing, but no more than that. That is the approach – I am not saying one  
priority, sir, but I really feel that Policy & Resources at an earlier stage should have said to the  
Principal Committees there is, I suppose we can talk about gateways – we talk about gateways  
very often, but you have to narrow it down to your three or four genuine priorities (**A Member:**  
Hear, hear.) and everything else must be, okay you can talk about them, but must be held back,  
1880 you must not put them forward as priorities. That is where, I think, Policy & Resources Committee  
has failed to some extent. I do not think they laid down the rules clearly enough and early  
enough, and that is what should have happened, I think.

Then we are told by some of the members of Policy & Resources, and some of the members of  
this Committee, 'Oh yes, but that process can happen next time,' but it should have happened this  
1885 time, and I think we are already behind schedule because it has happened this time, that sifting,  
that filtering, has not happened this time. I am concerned about that. Hopefully, when we get to  
the next stage we will be back on track, but it should have happened this time, sir.

This is why I worry about the Sports Strategy. I think the approach I have just spoken about,  
getting down to essentials, to necessary things, that is the approach that needs to be taken in  
1890 regard to the Sports Strategy. I do not think the Sports Strategy should be a ground up piece of  
work. I think it should firstly look at what we have available now. Guernsey, for a small Island, is  
extremely well facilitated in regard to sports infrastructure, sports facilities; we have all sorts of  
sports clubs, football clubs, cricket clubs, table tennis, all sorts of things, tennis, bowls clubs. There  
are all sorts of sports clubs in the Island, that are quite easy to join, that are quite accessible. So, I  
1895 think the first thing any strategy should do is not try and reinvent the wheel, we should look at  
what we have already, what is available, where it is, how accessible it is. That would be a good  
start, rather than trying to start with a blank sheet of paper and to reinvent the wheel.

Now, I am not saying, sir, I know some Members of the Assembly have offered to write the  
Sports Strategy, I am not putting myself forward as an author of the Sports Strategy, but I am  
1900 quite happy to be an unpaid consultant (*Laughter*) for a change.

I give way to Deputy Le Pelley, sir.

**Deputy Le Pelley:** I would just like to thank Deputy Laurie Queripel for that very kind offer, we  
1905 accept.

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Thank you.

Because I do think we need to take a pragmatic approach, and also we need to take an  
approach that is appropriate and proportionate to Guernsey.

I give way to Deputy Leadbeater, sir.

1910 **Deputy Leadbeater:** I thank Deputy Laurie Queripel for that.

I would just like to point out that work has already been undertaken on the Strategy, so we are  
not starting from a blank sheet; and personally, I think with the input of Deputy Fallaize and  
myself and now Deputy Laure Queripel, we should be able to turn this around quite quickly,  
1915 without too many resources being drained.

Thanks.

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** I appreciate those interjections from Deputy Le Pelley and Deputy  
Leadbeater, sir. I am just hoping you get my point. I have heard what you said, it has not got to be  
1920 a ground up ... there are lots of things we know already. Lots of thing we know already. We know  
that Guernsey, for a tiny Island, is extremely well facilitated in regard to sporting facilities and  
clubs and things, so it is not a big stretch there. So, I think we need to take that as our starting  
point.

The other thing about the Sports Strategy, what I have noticed with States' strategies and  
vision documents – it is a horrible phrase, vision documents – is the amount of platitudes within  
1925 them, high level phrases; and they get repeated over and over again throughout the document,

and this is why we have got a 350-page document here. The repetition is incredible. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) It really, really is. I actually thought I was going through a reoccurring nightmare when I was reading through it, (*Laughter*) because the amount of times I read the same thing, I thought I am sure I have read that before, or did I just dream it.

So, really, if the Sports Strategy is going to contain some of these high level statements and platitudes, please just do it once; you do not need to tell us over and over again about the ... I mean we all understand very clearly – and Deputy Inder and Deputy Le Pelley and Deputy Leadbeater said, as did others – the benefits of sport are quite clear, in regard to wellbeing – physical and mental wellbeing – they are quite clear in regard to creating a team spirit and all working together. We all understand that, so the document has not got to keep repeating those phrases over and over again. So let's have a meaningful document, a practical one, a realistic one, but a slimmed down one that only contains what it needs, and only does what it has to do. I am not just saying that about the Sports Strategy, that is the approach we should take across the States for everything, as far as I am concerned. But, since this is a document that has not been fully written yet, let's put that approach in place now.

Sir, I want to come on to the other amendment that was passed yesterday, the original amendment was going to be proposed by Deputy Tooley in regard to the report from the Chief Executive Office, I prefer the wording of the original amendment, actually, but the second one was good, and I agreed to it, but what struck me about that was when Deputy Le Tocq spoke to it, what he said was true, but it was only half the story. He was talking about that report, and I know Deputy Gollop has spoken about how he is disappointed it is only an appendix report; and I agree with him, it should be a report the States can debate, but luckily enough, through the Rules, we can find a way to make that happen.

But Deputy Le Tocq was saying, 'Oh, it is good because it will give the States information.' It is about way more than giving the States information. What is going on in regard to transformation and public sector reform is enormously complicated; there are several programmes going on. It is a multi-layered piece of work and it is a very costly piece of work. It is no good States' Members just having a vague understanding of what is going on, and occasionally we get a look behind the curtain and we see what is happening there.

Sir, first and foremost, as democratically elected Deputies, our first duty, as Deputy Inder has said, is to scrutineer; we are the people's representatives, we are here to hold to account. So it is not just a case of having the information, or to some extent understanding the work that is going on there – and this is another thing that Deputy Le Tocq said; he was putting forward again this idea that we had this division between the operational and the political. I accept that to some extent, but, as I say, this is a massive piece of work. It is a long-term, 10-year plan and there is a heavy investment in it. We cannot be divorced from that, and we cannot be vague in regard to what is going on. We need to understand very clearly what is going on, and we need to very clearly be able to measure the benefits of that programme, those programmes are producing. It is our duty as politicians to keep an eye on that and to be well aware of what is going on and to apply appropriate scrutiny.

I cannot emphasise that enough, sir. I say it not only as a member of the Scrutiny Management Committee, so you would expect me to say that, but I say it as an individual Deputy, because it is our job to hold to account, to provide oversight, because, ultimately, we represent the people of Guernsey, and we are accountable to them, and so any work that takes place within the States, operational or not, it needs to be accountable to us. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

The third point I want to make, sir, and it has already been made to some extent by Deputy Oliver, is I think it is a great shame that the amendment put forward by Deputy Tindall was not accepted by the States yesterday. As I say, a constant theme through most things I say – I apologise for that, but as I say – in good conscience, as a scrutineer, how can I vote for something, how can I vote for something when I do not really understand it?

Now, I want to give an example of that, sir, because recently the Scrutiny Management Committee had a presentation in regard to one aspect of the transformation programme, the

1980 public sector reform, and it was called the People's Plan. Now, it was beautifully presented, very  
1985 smartly put together, it was well spoken, wonderful visual aids, but as I say, I did not understand  
half of it. I am not very familiar with corporate speak, and most of it was corporate speak. It has  
plenty of meaning, I am sure, I am hoping it is going to be an effective plan, but as I said earlier, it  
was a multi-layered, very complicated plan, programme, and it is not without a price tag, and we  
need to ensure that these kind of things are going to produce, are going to produce added value,  
are going to be value for money.

It is the same with all the Committee plans in this Policy & Resource Plan. Yes, they are well  
written and there are some very interesting things in them, but when you put it all together I find  
it hard to come to grips with the whole complete document. Now, why I would have preferred a  
vote 'in principle', sir, is how can I vote for something when I do not truly understand perhaps all  
1990 the implications of what is written in here, I do not truly understand what some of the  
consequences might be? It is very hard when you vote for something unconditionally, and then  
things come back later and you are told, 'Well, hang on a minute, you approved it,' or 'you voted  
for it all and now you have got problems with it, now you are raising concerns about it.'

So I really think States' Members missed an opportunity there, when they did not vote for that  
1995 amendment, because there would have been nothing wrong with that, and the next stage when  
we are, apparently, going to get this slimmed down, more focussed document, a much more  
coherent, pulled together plan, that would have been the time to say, 'Yes, I believe now I have  
scrutinised it properly. I believe I understand it as best I can. I believe I can vote for this with  
confidence.'

2000 But that is not the case at the moment, so unfortunately, I think I am going to have to vote  
against. Although there are many good things in them, I think I am going to have to vote against  
the plans from the Committees because, as I say, even though I have been through it as best I can,  
we have not had a great deal of time, but as best I can, if people look at my ... Deputy Fallaize and  
others in the last term used to laugh at my Billets, sir, because they were full of highlights as this  
2005 one is, and full of notes and all sorts of things, but to go back and look at all that again and  
collect it all together, and to come up with a conclusion that is sound, is very, very difficult – *very,*  
*very* difficult – and I just do not think that this document lends itself to that kind of scrutiny and to  
me, having that kind of confidence that I can actually go along with everything with reservation  
and without thinking there might be some implications or some consequences.

2010 So I will be voting against those plans.

Sir, thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Yerby.

2015 **Deputy Yerby:** Briefly, sir, I too voted for the wording to be changed to 'in principle' yesterday,  
and I have some sympathy with Deputy Dudley-Owen and Deputy Oliver when they said that the  
plans with which they were less familiar were plans that they could not feel confident voting in  
favour of. Having read them myself and recognising that there is a subsequent stage of  
clarification, I think the question that I am asking myself is: are these are reasonable base to  
2020 prioritise from? Do they reflect the intention of the Committees which we have elected to do the  
work? I know that those Committees will not always reach the decisions I would have liked them  
to, but are they fair within their mandate and in answer to those questions I think the answer is  
yes, and as a reasonable base, they are plans that I am happy to approve, knowing that we are  
going to do another stage of work on them.

2025 I will not be voting for Propositions 1 to 3. I know that my attempts to amend them have  
failed, but that does not mean that they have become any more reasonable to me overnight, so I  
will not be able to support those Propositions.

2030 But, unlike many of those who have just spoken, I am quite comfortable with Proposition 8,  
and I think it is worth setting out why, briefly. Capital expenditure is not so radically different from  
revenue expenditure that we have to be thinking about setting very different scope of delegated



authority for the two. If we think about what we delegate to groups of five States' Members in the form of Committees, in the shape of their annual revenue budgets, tens of millions of pounds which we trust them to spend wisely, then I genuinely have no problem delegating decisions of up to £2 million, in terms of capital expenditure, to Committees with the oversight of Policy & Resources Committee.

So that is my position, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

**Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** Thank you, sir.

I would just like to say about the Plan itself, it is not what I expected. I did expect to see a more cohesive plan that showed the cross workings between Committees. Now, when we did get the prioritisation process within our own Committee, it was a very good exercise, and I think Deputy Fallaize pointed out that was a benefit, we can definitely see it. If this is the first time that has happened, obviously, being a newbie to parliamentary processes, that makes infinitely more sense than not doing that, it is quite scary to think we have not done any prioritisation of our work in the past.

I think also having ideas of priority within the full scale of that year, or of the four-year period was also quite useful. So, if you could not prioritise it for this quarter, you could prioritise it for third quarter 2018. That was a useful exercise. I did not see in some of the other plans ... there are not as many timescales as I would have liked, to see how they would fit together.

But, I do think what we could have done is a pre-process to this policy letter being ... there is a step missing, the step is when we got sight of the other Committees' priority letters, and had a look at where the similarities were, there was an opportunity there for those Committees then to speak to each other and say, 'These are the cross overs. We believe this is quite a high priority in our workings.' A classic example of that would have been the Harbour Action Area Plan, because both the Economic Development Committee, having spoken to my colleague, Deputy Merrett, and the Environment & Infrastructure Committee felt that the Harbour Action Area was a high priority, but there was a concern over resources, and there was a misunderstanding when I saw the plan come out from Economic Development; it looked like it was not a high priority for them, and therefore we could not put extra resources in it.

It is still in our plan. That kind of conversation should have happened. That kind of working should have happened before – and not official letters backwards and forwards. I think a joint Committee meeting and talking about your priorities and your cross over priorities (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) should happen before you then take it to the next stage, and it is not just up to P&R, as this high level body, to sit co-ordinating between the Committees. We need to get away from that. Committees work within your own Committee, you have got five members, you work and you discuss it there, you do not always agree with them and we should be able to do that Committee to Committee without it coming in this Assembly and then there is far more chance of the message, or the priorities, being diluted.

The other thing that struck me is when you have a high level plan, which we did with Phase One, the idea behind it is to have that framework, and I have said that during the policy one debate: you have the high level framework, and it shows the direction of travel. So you have to for the next step where you are prioritising, you are having a cohesive direction of travel; and I do not think that we have a cohesive direction of travel, because there has not been enough cross party prioritisation.

We went through the process of the IDP. It is a classic example. We had the SLUP; the Strategic Land Use Plan is a big high level plan and it filters down to the IDP, and the IDP was looking at different strategies and trying to pull them together. It does end up with quite a restrictive result, in some cases, but it is that process; and we have not, I do not believe, been disciplined enough. The danger, I think, that was trying to be avoided – and some Committee members, or other Members, might have mentioned as, 'Oh it is going to be a bun fight,' – there is going to be

Committees fighting for this, and it should not be about fighting, it should be finding the commonalities and finding where we collectively want to go. That is missing from this. There is a lot of collective thought that is not happening.

Now, the last thing I thought, or the second last thing, was the idea of delegated authority. I do think my colleague, Deputy Yerby, pointed out that there is not such a large difference ... In asking for the delegated authority for some projects, it really came out of an inefficiency in how we were getting to do projects. There is – I mentioned it yesterday – a mountain of bureaucracy and at the moment if you want to say we have got to scrutinise how people spend money, yes, we do, but we are now spending more money on deciding to spend the money. So the process is not working.

I would like to know from P&R what their process is for scrutinising. So if the Committee comes to you do they just go, 'I want a million pounds for doing something,' or do they give a proper capital bid? Now, in the case which was mentioned earlier of Salerie Corner, it was a very small amount, and the officers had asked for an amount and were told, 'You either ask for £50,000 or £100,000, you cannot ask for in between,' because it was deemed a small amount. Now that is a procedural problem, because it has led to what is a mountain out of a molehill.

I do understand the scrutiny and I, personally, would not want to have gone in and as a result of my actions, and my decision making, have caused money to be wasted, and that is why when the report came back I looked at it and there was £3,000 that was created by the decision that we made where they had to go in and redo some work. That is the problem. That was the problem for me: to be constantly told that we are not doing our job properly. I want people to imagine if you were in a Committee meeting and you were making the decision, would you make the decision differently? Not, 'It is easy to make decisions and you made the wrong decisions or you just overspent, we have shown the information, not overspent.'

Lastly, the Medium Term Financial Plan, I mentioned it early on in my speeches, that I did not believe that we should be cutting to get to surplus. We do need to get the economy going, we need to see that plan from Economic Development, and I know from conversations that they are working on it. I cannot see a plan, a cohesive plan, in their workings, and again it does mention that that is not there, but it will be, and we will see it in the States, I am sure, by the end of the year.

I will vote for the Medium Term Financial Plan, even though I do not believe in its principles, because at this stage I do not think that we can go forward if we choose to actually ... I do want us to move forward. We need to be more radical in our thinking, but to vote against the Medium Term Financial Plan, if that is going to mean ... and I would like confirmation from Deputy St Pier or a member of P&R whether if that Proposition did fall – I forget which Proposition it is – about the Medium Term Financial Plan, whether that would mean that you would not be able to put a budget together at this stage.

That is all, thanks.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

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

I will not recap all the things that I agree with or disagree with, with what has been mentioned already, but I would echo in summary the people that have said this debate has actually been very useful, particularly the debates on the amendments.

Some of the stats highlighted by Deputy Graham and Deputy de Lisle, in particular, have underscored something to me and I think I can identify a little bit of a theme growing. Deputy Graham talked about the proportion of revenue that is raised from a relatively small section of our community, our society; and Deputy de Lisle talked about the ratio of individual taxation to corporate. For me, these stats underline two things. They underline the narrowness of our tax base, and our overdependence on taxing individuals. So, I urge P&R to please redress those balances.

2135 Deputy Dorey mentioned one particular example, and for me, that also feeds into a broader beam. Deputy Dorey talked about the cost to the Island of a particular area, and for me, I really think we need to be mature enough to start accounting for our externalities more. I know Deputy St Pier knows all about that, but I would urge him to really look at the external costs and start accounting for them in our tax policies and other areas of policy.

2140 I cautiously echo ... I mean, obviously, everyone wants growth; I mean you cannot really challenge that, except I will slightly. Of course growth is a good thing; that is what capitalism is predicated on, and we hear a lot about the need to grow our economy and everything else will follow. Well, I will slightly challenge that orthodoxy, in fact, because I do not think it is that simplistic and linear. At the very least, it is very chicken and egg.

2145 I think Deputy Ferbrache would probably agree with me to an extent, that we need to have the right environment for growth, don't we – sorry, sir, through you. We need to create the right environment, and in order to attract people to live here, we need to have a good quality of life, we need to have adequate services etc. So, for me, we should not be aiming for growth for growth's sake, and I think we need to think carefully about what kind of growth we want, and I would urge P&R and all Committees, in fact, when looking to grow that we look to grow sustainably and inclusively. So those are the two key things as far as growth is concerned, for me.

2150 Finally, I will pick up a little bit from where Deputy Hansmann Rouxel left off. I think this process has been helpful, but I think it has also actually been unhelpful in some ways, and I think there has been an element of divisiveness that I would prefer to have not seen. I do not think it was all inevitable. I do not think this did need to be a bunfight. I completely agree with her, and Deputy Merrett's endorsement of it, that we did need to work better beforehand, but I stress that I think we need to work better as a result of it.

2155 I was disappointed by some of the more divisive messages being sent out by this Assembly, and my plea to everyone in this Assembly is, please, we have a lot of work to do, please let's work together in a constructive way to get it done.

2160 Thank you.

**Several Members:** Hear, hear.

2165 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

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

You did ask us to speak, I think you said, speak late in the debate, and I sense that we are late in the debate now, so I got to my feet.

2170 This general debate was opened – or the first speech, or one of the first speeches – was from Deputy Parkinson, and I have to say I thought it was a quite brilliant speech (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) delivered in his usual understated way. I will be fascinated at Deputy St Pier's response to his speech. But I did think to myself that somebody would come here in 15 years' time and say, 'You have got a fantastic Health Service, you have got fantastic infrastructure, just how do you do it?' and the response from Deputy Parkinson is, 'Yes, well, milk is £20 a litre.' (Laughter) That is the way we are going. We are all looking at rich pickings from STSB and how they were going to deliver, and I think the speech, through you, sir, from Deputy Parkinson really put things in perspective.

2180 He also spoke of the Harbour Action Area. I referred to that yesterday, the potential for delay, when there is obviously a need to be getting on with things, and the tension between the review of airports, harbours and infrastructure at the same time when the staff at E&I and the DPA also have roles in trying to deliver the very same thing, with limited resources. So, it will be interesting.

2185 He also reminded States' Members of how much of the income to STSB comes from other States' Departments, and we are a good client of STSB, with States' Works and the money we spend with them, and if we are looking for future savings at E&I then we would have to be looking at our contract with STSB which is counterproductive, and I think already I have seen a

letter in *The Press* today that people this time of year will be frustrated about hedge cutting and the fact that we have not got enough staff to keep up with cutting cliff paths, and hedges, and if we look to, no pun intended, clip back on that a little further, then that is the visible element of what we do, and is represented disproportionately sometimes in the letters page.

Deputy Paint posed an interesting question, which was – my reading of it, by the way, my interpretation in the light of a requête, or more to the point, in the light of a requête not succeeding: how then do you remove or get your hands on the money that the Committee still want to spend? This is fundamental stuff, and I think all Chairs of Committees need to prick up their ears here with regard to this. We could have a situation whereby we go out to tender, and by the way these are large sums of money, £400,000 on a sea wall, £500,000, £600,000 is usual. It is all local tradesmen, it is all local materials, but those are the sums that we spend. So if, for example, a wall was, the same piece of work was £450,000 but the Committee decided that under the procurement prices that we have, the best person to give it to was £550,000, you get the sense that if that came to this Assembly we would end up employing the person for £450,000 to find that they did not appreciate when the spring tides were, that the work took them into winter, and they had to stop. The processes that we have in regard to procurement are extremely thorough and have evolved over time. If you want to bring back every project to this Assembly then your clients diminish because they then get nervous that though they have tendered, they have got over all the obstacles, it then goes through this washing machine process of appointment and they do not come out the other end. I think we should bear that in mind.

I agree with the general observation that other people have made, that this is not an easy document to read. It is not. The reason for that is, perhaps, a mistake that was corrected probably by the Home Affairs Department late in the day in delivering a shorter plan, whereas the first P&R submission that we got together was immense, but it was what was wanted, it was what was asked for. So many hours, and so much time was put into paring a document down to an accepted ... into a process when actually even that process has left you with so many individual documents; and it is something of a difficult read, for that reason.

The Alderney Representatives have left to go back, for perfectly understandable reasons with regard to an event in Alderney. I just wanted to place on record, it is worth remembering this, because these numbers are big, and again, if you want to bring every capital vote, or open every vote in this Assembly, when the Home Office, as it was back in 1985 or 1986, said, 'We are no longer looking after the Alderney Breakwater,' they anticipated spending £600,000 on it, that is 1985-1986 – £600,000. We will be spending about £300,000 on it over the next 12 months. So if you want to bring those type of things to the Assembly, then what are you looking for in doing that? Because the numbers are big, they are scary. Do we go for the cheapest tender and do we compromise the integrity of the infrastructure around us?

Deputy Gollop, sir, he said that he compared us to Jersey, he wanted to see levels of growth comparable to Jersey – I think that was implicit in what he said, through you, sir. I, personally, do not want to see that. Jersey have 103,000 people, a little bit more space than us. But he did say economy first, environment second. Well, obviously, as I think I have said in many speeches, and other members of E&I, it is the natural environment, the product that you have, that gives you the economy, and we should not be too willing to switch those two things round so readily.

Deputy Green also said that the Committees submissions are long winded, it is a shopping list. I would remind him, perhaps, through you, sir, that it is a mandate we have, not an agenda, we have a mandate to deliver on these things, and the natural environment and hydrocarbons sit very neatly into our mandate, and it is not an aspirational shopping list. It is the business of the Environment & Infrastructure that we are mandated to carry out.

Now, although our revenue spend it relatively small, it is just over £12 million, obviously capital is a bigger element to that, and creates a little bit more public attention, and political attention, but I remind Members we did underspend by £611,000 this year. Again if we had another visit from P&R colleagues then we will, I suppose, be looking at the figure of £300,000 or £400,000 to shave off our budget. There is only so far we can go with that, until we then start looking at things

2240 such as the bus contract, and we start looking at the bus contract, bearing in mind the investment to get it up, we know that the minute you start taking money out of the bus service, it is just such a struggle to get it back up again, and I think that was the one, the disaster from the FTP process, which was to take a hard stance around the negotiating table, having somebody walk out of a process, and then finding somebody who can just about literally, in the first contract, just about afford to provide a bus service for you. Now, again, sir, if we do trim back on our revenue expenditure then the results are more than visible.

2245 In light of the questions, this is a broad question now, over delegated authority on capital expenditure. As I have just said, our revenue is low, the capital is high and if we do have to come to this Assembly, that would create problems for us and other departments. So we need to be aware of that, because what I did not say in my earlier note, was that coastal defences, by definition, get damaged and they have to be repaired very, very quickly and you do not want to stall that process unduly.

2250 Deputy Dudley-Owen also remarked on the process of the document, the finished document, and how clunky it was, and the plans were not uniform – a very different, very difficult document to read. But also I would urge both her and Deputy Oliver actually said not to please vote for their own Committees proposals. I think it would be quite bizarre today if we debated this document just to approve their own P&R plans and did not support the work of our colleagues in other places because we have concerns in some areas with regard to expenditure, I think that would be, then I think members of the public could say, I told you they work in silos, they debate a plan for four days but then only approve the bits that they like.

2260 Personally speaking, I have not been immersed in the P&R planning process; maybe that is a criticism of both me and the process, because this is Phase One and Phase Two, the engagement is not constant, but even – not even but as – Members will be aware, the business as usual element of Environment & Infrastructure just keeps ... I am sure that, other Presidents, the business as usual just keeps you busy, and it is very difficult to take time out to fully immerse yourself in a process that, at times, can be a little bit opaque, but I commend Deputy St Pier for the work he has done, I have to say, in his usual mild mannered moderate way. I mean he is trying to herd cats through the gates of Battersea Dogs Home, and he is doing it, (*Laughter*) he is doing it incredibly well! (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) It is a bit of a noisy process at times, but for understandable reasons.

2270 Deputy Merrett, again, was a Member who raised this issue of delegated authority on the sums of money involved. Repetition, I am sorry, but just the need to act in the now, a sea defence fails, a flood defence fails, infrastructure fails, you need to do it. If we open up the tender process, invite bids then you are losing time and it could cost you more money. Specifically, she spoke – as I think Deputy Parkinson raised it too – with regard to the Harbour Action Area, and I think on page 2275 – I have written down page 70 in the hope that it is page 70, it is page 70, I have dog eared it to the size of 15:23:11:

The [St Peter Port Harbour Action Area] has only relatively recently been identified, and the policy provision for its delivery put into place, in the Island Development Plan process which was approved by the States in November 2016.

So it was only approved – I know in business terms that is a lifetime in; political terms that is yesterday, but it was only approved – in November 2016. It goes on to say:

However, because of its recent emergence the Committee does not have any existing resources in terms of budget or human resources available to co-ordinate and promote and help deliver the strategy.

2280 It cannot be any more stark than that. We do not have the resources to deliver on the Harbour Action Area today.

I think the Deputy Gollop amendment was more significant and will be proved to be more significant over time than it perhaps has done today, because what we do not have is ... I am the President of the Committee for Environment & Infrastructure, we do not have an infrastructure office, we do not have an infrastructure plan, we do not have staff dedicated to infrastructure –

2285 which is a serious fault within our system; we do not have that. So the staff that are involved in that, if we wish to have so many people giving 30% of their time here, 20% elsewhere, then the delivery of infrastructure projects will not be so great.

I want to say, an emotional speech from Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, and I work with Sarah Hansmann Rouxel very, very closely, and I want to put this on the record, Members: when a Committee, when individuals, are constantly negatively referred to in the media it takes its toll, and I think for people who stood this first time, they stepped up to the plate to deliver on the big ticket numbers for you, and it can be hard. So, I identify with the emotion that came through in Deputy Hansmann Rouxel's speech.

I would go on to say – because I need to say this, because Deputy Oliver did not say it – the JESCC overspend will buy you three cycle paths, will buy you three cycle paths. Now, we made a mistake, perhaps, at E&I; we dealt with it politically, we dealt with it constantly, we responded politically to every letter every note, every phone call. But I just want to place that on the record.

Just in closing and going back to, essentially, what we do then, which is what this is about: energy policy, on the positive side of the energy policy we have hydrocarbons, and I thank everyone who has participated in the presentations and the process, because hydrocarbons is an expensive but significant piece of work, and I will add, actually, if the body of work that is hydrocarbons came to this Assembly, I just wonder whether we would have a hydrocarbons project today – I would ask you that.

We have the obligation for environmental policy, and we know aspects of the biodiversity strategy have been delivered on that, we have infrastructure policy and we know that the coastal flood and flood and coastal defences are going well, actually, and we have the sustainable and integrated transport strategy, that will deal with issues such as pedestrianisation, and other such matters, and we have waste policy, not to forget inert waste, because we produce 100,000 tonnes of stone from different developments, and as yet, we are trying to work out exactly what we can do with it, and where we can put it.

That is the positive side, but then as President of Environment & Infrastructure I have to deliver for you all through the filter of the media, through the filter of politics, which actually puts a different flavour, and a different colour to the work we do. So, when I talk about energy policy, we engage consultants and our staff at the renewal energy team have told us that offshore wind for Guernsey is absolutely the best thing to do, and within the reports it would tell you why offshore wind is the thing to do. However, Guernsey people, and a number of them say 'No, no. Offshore wind is a non-starter. You are wasting time. Tidal energy is the way forward' ... So we have done the work, we have looked at every aspect, we are promoting the idea of offshore wind, however, the community has a different view and argue that we should go to tidal.

If I talk about bio-diversity, which I think is a success, the community say, 'No, no. Your bio-diversity is not a success, we do not want you going near Ecart. We like Ecart. When have you ever seen a herd of cows on Ecart grazing on meadow grass? It has never happened. We do not want you going to Ecart.' So, in trying to deliver aspects of our mandate, we get knocked back, sometimes in interesting ways.

The infrastructure policy and – sorry, the sustainable integrated transport policy: I promote the bus service. I have to say, against the grain, it would be nice sometimes to have a bit more buy-in on that. So, although our budget is small, the projects we do are high profile and sometimes meet a little more resistance, in my view, than they should. I have made this comparison before, but our work is like an impressionist painting when you stand back from it you can see exactly what it is, when you start to get a bit closer, and you see every little brush stroke, more people want to make their own mark and then they fundamentally change the look of what you are trying to do.

Now, I remind Members, because it is interesting, when you look back in the 1980's there was a 9,000-signature opposed to seatbelts – 9,000 and seatbelts were introduced. If you look at concerns with regard to what would happen at Fort George if it did become used for the Open Market, 10,000 signatures – 10,000 and States' Members came into this Assembly and still voted.

We have had about a dozen emails, a dozen emails on a piece of work we would like to undertake, and that has been enough to trigger a community reaction and a campaign.

Now, all I am saying is we must not lose perspective. We have mandates, we have budgets, we have authorised limits, and I think sometimes we should all have a bit more comfort in our colleagues around us. These things sound trite at times, but I particularly like this line, it says, 'It is easier to throw bricks than build houses,' and, Members, I think that is quite true and we will need your continued support to lay the foundations for E&I through the mechanism, clonky as it is, of the P&R Plan.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

**Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, I cannot say that the thought of having to develop the Committee for Health & Social Care's P&R Plan gave me a warm feeling inside. Creating a plan for HSC within a year of the election and whilst we are still developing the business case even to begin at a new model of care, while at the same time we are trying to arrest the spiralling overspend, did make me slightly nervous.

Now, Deputy Parkinson said nothing had been done but create a plan. However, I would turn it around and say we have managed to produce a plan whilst commencing one of the biggest transformation programmes the States will have ever undertaken, to put Health & Social Care back into surplus, and progress various areas of social policy including the autism and dementia framework, amongst many other things. We have not been just sitting back undertaking an academic exercise.

In fact, I would say much of what appears in the Committee's plan has actually commenced, and in answer to Deputy Lester Queripel, who is not in the room, 'Why do we have a plan if we are already doing it?' – well, it is all about setting priorities; that is the whole point of it. The plan sets out our priorities because we do not have infinite resources to absolutely everything, and neither should we. Of course, these are the things we are doing, as they are our priority. The hardest thing is not doing things which others think should be our priority. This is precisely the value of the P&R Plan. It enables focus and a clear direction; and, frankly, I have found the process incredibly valuable, certainly at Committee level.

Now, Deputy Lester Queripel asked how much staff time has been spent on this plan. Does he think that Members of this Assembly have had nothing to do with them? From HSC's point of view, we had no dedicated resource to support us on developing the plan until earlier this year, and we are very grateful for the work that officer has done in helping the Committee put this plan together. I say it like that, as I would like Deputy Queripel to be very clear that my Committee's plan is a result of the time and effort put in by the Committee itself, and our hourly rates are very reasonable indeed. *(Laughter)*

The next four years are critical for Health & Social Care and, as we set out in our plan, the most significant priority is the responsibility for the implementation of the future operating model. The primary purpose of this model is to ensure services meet the community's changing needs and in the most sustainable and equitable way. This is not just about how the States of Guernsey organises itself, but the structure of health and social care across Guernsey and Alderney. HSC needs to redesign the existing model to achieve best value for money, and to be aligned with the principles of the 2020 Vision. Integration between the core elements of the existing system are essential: primary care, secondary care, community services, third sector and various private and commercial businesses. We talk about the health and social care system, but do not really have a cohesive system at all. The focus is on putting the patient at the centre of truly co-ordinated and integrated care between the many organisations and services concerned with meeting the needs of Islanders.

The work being undertaken will place greater emphasis on key principles of future services, including: patient centric care; partnership and engagement; treating mental health with equal

consideration as physical health; better use of technology; and prevention and early intervention. Again, these are all dealt with in the plan. Key outcomes will be a system that is appropriate, flexible and sustainable.

The Health & Social Care submission for the P&R Plan sets out the policy priorities for the Committee, demonstrates how we will tackle these priorities, and links in with the emerging guiding principles for the future operating model.

I will focus on a few. Looking after yourself to prevent illness in the future – I know I got a bit passionate about this yesterday, but really, truly, the impact of today's lifestyles are having a material impact on the cost of health and social care, and I would like to thank Deputy Graham for his support.

Another principle is ensuring fair access to care, and not allowing the poor to be priced out of good health and, on that front, I am not sure where Deputy Green was coming from in relation to primary care; there is no restriction on primary care providers setting up on Guernsey, and in relation to access to primary care, that is addressed both in our plan and that of Employment & Social Security, and I am sure my colleague Deputy Le Clerc will mention that when she speaks about her plan.

Other principles include: commissioning services to enable equal access and proportionate governance and regulation; improving access and reducing duplication; providing care closest to home; and, last but not least, inspirational leadership and empowered staff. These principles run through our plan and are at the heart of our new model of care.

Deputy Roffey speaks of priorities of individual Committees, and there is not a cohesive plan that sets up priorities at States-wide level. He is correct, there just has not been the time to get that far, quite frankly, and I think if Members have managed to get through the end of all the plans they will see areas of common priorities, from Health & Social Care's point of view these are particularly strong with Education, Sport & Culture and Employment & Social Security, as would be expected, I hope.

I would also like to pick up on what Deputy Roffey said about moving funding to match priorities. Whilst I would question whether we do that at the highest level, I am not sure it is easy to decide whether being safe and secure should be a higher priority than a healthy community, just as an example. But, I think we should look to do that within the various categories, such as strong sustainable economy. Yes, Committees should not defend their budgets if that means key priorities, of which they are a part, cannot be progressed by another, and I think there is opportunity for Committees to support each other in social policy in particular.

So the Health & Social Care plan is about thinking differently, working differently. That does mean change, and change can be a difficult thing, but we know our health and social care system needs to change, or we will end up breaking the fiscal rules we have been debating all this week quite spectacularly.

That is the reality, and on that note I will pick up the query from Deputy Fallaize.

Indeed, I think it is important that I do clarify exactly where the Committee stands. This year we do expect to be able to return £2 million of recurring savings back to the Treasury. We also hope to begin reinvestment as part of the £2 million BDO said we would need to make the £7.4 million savings in three to five years. It was important that we got acknowledgement from the States that this £2 million was counted against our expected savings, which as the States have also acknowledged are a net £5.2 million, in accordance with BDO's report. These are savings in the short term, of course, and the savings we will endeavour to make. However, as I said earlier this week, if we are pushed too hard our ability to make truly transformational savings for the new model of care will be compromised. So the medium term, that which is more properly understood to be the medium term.

Now, the figure of £24 million has been used and, as I have said before, represents a non-risk adjusted saving of both HSC and the ESS, that BDO said could be made in the next seven to 10 years. However, if anyone believes those savings mean the same as a cut in the bottom line, they are sadly deluded; that is not what BDO said. They identified savings on how the service operated



2440 in 2015. No modelling was done to consider the impact of the ageing population, medical  
inflation or growing expectations. Those pressures are real and now. The States' own analysis  
shows that if we do nothing, costs will rise exponentially. We saw last year how the number of  
2445 ambulance call-outs rose 8.5% directly due to the ageing population, primarily from greater falls  
in the home. It is against that background, and the fact that we have yet to have our proposals for  
a new model of care approved, let alone implemented, that of course we cannot commit firmly to  
achieving a no-real-terms growth in expenditure in the medium term, and that is the medium  
term, as it is generally understood.

Now, whilst we have debated what the States are doing, and can do, all week, there has been  
hardly any mention of – I mean I cannot recall a single one, where we have spoken about – how  
2450 we need to work with others to make our plans work. Yes, we speak about Committees working  
together, but I have not heard anyone in debate talk about working with the people out there.

Deputy Green spoke about the need to see action plans when it came to transformation; well,  
that is precisely what our Committee is developing now, or rather we are working collaboratively  
to do so. That is because the transformation of health and social care will only happen, and will  
2455 only be a success, by the whole community working together to design and deliver it. That  
process has already begun. We have been working with fellow health and social care professionals  
in the primary care and secondary care, third sector and wider public. The engagement to date  
has exceeded my expectations, as has the positivity. There is a desire to think differently, work  
differently, beyond the confines of the States of Guernsey.

2460 Now, we set ourselves a very tight deadline that was still on course to produce a policy letter  
that is based on working collaboratively with our partners and wider community. The coming  
months will be ones where we continue that engagement before bringing that policy letter to the  
States in November. What we need to do is take people with us, and we do that by working  
together, listening to each other, challenging each other, and developing a new model of care  
2465 together. The Committee for Health & Social Care is committed to doing just that, and that is  
central to our Policy & Resource Plan.

**Deputy Parkinson:** Point of Correction, sir.

2470 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Parkinson.

**Deputy Parkinson:** I did not say that nothing had been done in the first 14 months, what I  
said was, considering the Policy & Resource Plan as a whole, unprioritised as it is, it is clearly not  
yet an effective plan for Government. I am disappointed, and I think the public will be  
2475 disappointed, to see how little progress has been made in 14 months.

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

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

2480 I have no intention of speaking for any length of time on the Committee for Employment &  
Social Security Policy & Resource Plan. I believe it was well written and clear on our direction of  
travel this term, and does not require a great deal of further explanation.

Sir, I would like to thank the Committee, at both political and officer level, for the time and  
effort they have put into the plan. We found it useful in getting to understand in greater depth all  
2485 areas of our mandate following the changes in May 2016.

I believe we have endeavoured to be realistic in what we feel we can deliver with the resources  
available, rather than producing a wish list, we feel we have been honest with ourselves and have  
prioritised our work accordingly.

2490 There is one item where we have asked for additional funding, and I am very pleased to see  
that the Medium Term Financial Plan anticipates additional expenditure of £1.9 million on SWBIC  
for the second half of 2018, and then £3½ million in 2019, transitioning down to £3.2 million from

2021. This recognition in the Medium Term Plan is taken as a very positive indication for inclusion in the 2018 Budget later this year. This is a positive step that will help us in our ambitions to reduce poverty on the Island. However, we must remember that it is just the foundation of reform.  
2495 For example, some of our proposals for short-term benefits offer only a very basic assistance, so there will be more that will need to be done in the future to review and refine our welfare system.

Sir, Deputy Roffey raised concerns regarding the £12, £6 grant for primary care visits. As Deputy Fallaize has explained, we acknowledge in our plan that the grants need to be reviewed. We understand the financial difficulties faced by many Islanders when they visit their GPs. I am  
2500 approached by many constituents struggling with primary care costs and, where possible, Employment & Social Security help through the Supplementary Benefit or the medical expenses assistance scheme. Unfortunately, there are still some that do not qualify for either benefit.

Only last week, I met with KPMG, who are currently undertaking a review of the health and social care target operating model and the transformation of services. So primary care services  
2505 were discussed, and I hope that the two Committees working together will be able to find a way forward to review primary care services to assist those most in need, as well as work at preventative measures.

Sir, I do not think that there is anything more that I can add, and I will be supporting the proposals in the Plan on an individual basis.

2510 Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, I picked up on the last sentence of Deputy Le Clerc. I also will be  
2515 supporting all of these proposals. It does not mean I necessarily agree with every word of them, but we have got to have a cohesive plan. Now, where I agree with the previous speaker – I cannot remember who said it – is that we possibly should have been, probably should have been, at this stage several months ago.

Deputy Graham said in his speech that he went to an event at Beau Séjour shortly after he was  
2520 elected a Deputy, and let me say my own experience of that was that it was hocus pocus, it was a complete waste of time; people were spending time talking about this vision thing for 25 years, when it is very difficult to predict the future 25 days hence. When I voiced the opinion that I thought it was a complete waste of time, I was told I was not aspirational. I have been a person who is aspirational all my life, so just because I did not want to talk hocus pocus and corporate  
2525 jargon and *socle* worker type stuff, that does not mean I am *not* an aspirational person.

Anyway that is not the important point. The important point is I agree with Deputy de Sausmarez when she says we need the right kind of growth. Absolutely. The last thing I want to see in Guernsey is Las Vegas type growth; I want to see growth but not Las Vegas type growth, and it is a theme that came through in the very ably delivered speech by Deputy Brehaut just a few minutes ago. Because five members of the Education Committee and four members of the Committee of which I am the President went to a presentation just at lunchtime. Now, five and four make nine, but in fact it meant eight, because obviously Deputy Dudley-Owen is a member of both Committees; and this person has been a resident of Guernsey for two years, and he says the things that attracted him to this Island and still attracts him to this Island are beauty and  
2535 integrity.

Now, sir, nobody wants to do anything to affect the beauty of this wonderful Island, and nobody wants to do anything that is going to affect the integrity of this Island and all of its institutions, because one thing that is apparent is that every States' Member I have dealt with, both in this term and in the terms that I served from 1994 to 2000, every single civil servant, every  
2540 Law Officer, every judge, everybody in public office is a person of integrity. Now, you may think, 'Well, so what?' This is so rare in the world that it is worth saying. We have got that, and we continue to get it, and it will be a value that we must always protect. I am not actually too bothered about that, because I think it is the nature of the people that are in this Assembly, and

will succeed in this Assembly, and the other people holding the offices that they do, that is established. But that is something we should hold proud, because, as I say, it is a rarity.

The Plan itself, whether it should be 347, whether it should be 247 pages, whether somebody has written 44 pages – we have written a lot but then I am the President of that Committee so you would expect it to be verbose – (*Laughter*) or whether we have written 14 pages, it is irrelevant, it is irrelevant; it is a plan, it is not a first edition, this is not the work of Shakespeare, I am not going to ask either Deputy St Pier or Deputy Trott to sign it so I have got a first edition which I can sell in the future. I may give them a cheque which I would ask them to sign, which would be something of value, (*Laughter*) but I doubt that they would actually do that! (*Laughter*)

But, moving forward in connection with it, we have had some excellent contributions, not only today but previously. I would like to commend the speech delivered earlier today by Deputy Gollop, because he was one of the few that actually spoke at any length about economic development and the growth of our finances.

Now, we know this strain. I look out the window; do you remember in a previous speech on a previous occasion I was looking for money trees, I could not see any of those out of these five elegant windows. But what I can see is the day is picking up, I can actually see more blue sky than I can see cloud, and that is the point with our economy, there is more blue sky than there is cloud, but there will always be dark clouds. There have been in the past, and there will be in the future. I partly agree with the comment made by Deputy Green, when he said we have got four or five years of hard slog; where I disagree with him is when he says it is four or five years. We are permanently into a situation now of hard slog. There are no easy answers, there will be no easy answers; there is no taking your foot off the accelerator.

In connection with Deputy Tindall saying we have got to show we are open for business, of course, I agree with her. Deputy Dudley-Owen, quite properly, had an interposition during one of the speakers to say – I think Deputy Graham was explaining difficulties and she interrupted him and said – look we are open for business, we explain it. When we sit down either the four able colleagues that I am fortunate to have in the Committee of which I am President, they sit down collectively, individually, and they tell people and they explain when people have got difficulties and they try and sort out their difficulties, and by and large they manage to achieve it.

But, of course, I want to work collectively. But I am a bit like a dad – well, I am a dad, I am a granddad, might be a great grandad in a few years' time, you never know, but – therefore, I have got to speak to you truthfully, I have got to tell you the truth, sir, I have got to tell the Members of the States, via you, the truth as I see it.

The reason that there is a lack of confidence out there is that there is a lack of confidence that this States has a business interest and a business appetite. It is thought to be too greedy, it is thought to be too inexperienced, it is thought not to appreciate that there is a real world out there. I do not like telling Members of the States that, but that is the truth, so it is not enough just to say we are open for business, because we are open for business, we are better than our competitor just a few miles away. We are better than most other places, I think we are better than anywhere else in the world, but we have got to project that, we have got to do things, because we have got so many demands upon our economy.

Alderney Representative Jean, this morning, talked about the difficulties that Alderney faces, those are our difficulties because they are part of the Bailiwick of Guernsey, and we have got to pick that up. A good point made by Deputy Gollop. He said, 'Look, effectively,' I do not think he used the word precursor, but 'really it was a precursor for what Guernsey could be like, transport and demographics,' and he is absolutely right. We have got those here, we are just a more buoyant economy. If we do not tell the world at large that we are open for business, if we do not only tell them we do not show them that we are open for business, they will go elsewhere. They think Jersey is open for business and we are not.

Jersey is overheating its economy, Jersey has got a problem, they have got 4% unemployment, they are going to rack up great debt, they are going to spend £500 million on a hospital that will not be fit for purpose in 10 years' time because they will need to build on top of it. They are going

to do all of those things; but cranes are in the air in Jersey and there are not many cranes in the air here; once the development at [Havelot???15:51:24](#) is finished, where else is there, of substance, that is being developed? I know, I still call them the IDC because I made so much money over the years through arguing with the IDC, it is etched in my ... *(Laughter)* and I had many battles with very many able Law Officers, and thankfully they lost most of them, and it was ... but anyway that is by the by.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Is this relevant, Deputy Ferbrache? *(Laughter)*

**Deputy Ferbrache:** I do not want to embarrass anybody, sir. *(Laughter)*

The relevance of it is this, sir – that is a fair point: in connection with it, I said years ago, and I say it now, if I was President – and this is not a slight on anybody – if I was President at any time of the Planning Authority, whatever it may be called, I would be saying to my officers, ‘You do not need to tell me about the ones you granted permission for. I do not want to know about those, because those will get on and get developed; I only want you to tell me about the ones you have refused. I want you to explain to me why you have refused them,’ and I would test those because –

I give way to Deputy Tindall, sir.

**Deputy Tindall:** Thank you, Deputy Ferbrache, for giving way.

I would just like to point out that if the Development & Planning Authority concentrated on the ones that were not given permission we would have little to do.

**A Member:** Hear, hear.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Isn’t that interesting. I would be saying, and it is the same with everything, we get rid of regulation unless we absolutely need it. We only bring regulation in if we have to, and sometimes we have to. For example, we are in the process of bringing in regulation in relation to the pension industry, because the sector came to us and said if you bring in these regulations it will make us competitive, it will give us a competitive edge. We saw the value of that, and therefore we are in very close consultation, with the able assistance of Policy & Resources, doing something about it. That is a positive thing for us to do.

Deputy Graham – and, of course, I always accept what he says, but – I accept what he says in relation to that he had heard from people that had difficulties with GFSC. Let me just say that I do not think that that is right. I accept that Deputy Graham says he has heard it; he said twice he said he had heard it, but generally, the regulator here is seen to be pro-active compared with almost any other regulator and do a wonderful job. For example – Deputy Dudley-Owen will be able to bear testimony to this, Deputy St Pier will be able to bear testimony to this – we went down to see Northern Trust a few months ago, where they talked about their blocked chain, which I do not understand a word of what it meant, and Deputy St Pier was also honest enough to say he did not understand about 80% of it either, but we were told what it was, and they came here because this was a good place to do business, and because the regulator was so co-operative and so open to discussions, and that is why – bear in mind they are a Chicago-based entity, they could have gone anywhere – they came and did their business here. We are open for business and we should proclaim that loudly and from the hilltops. **(A Member:** Hear, hear.)

I do have concerns – it is not meant as a criticism, and I am pleased to see we passed it by 33 votes to 6 so we cannot complain about it – about what is now Proposition 1B, which directs:

... the Policy & Resources Committee, in developing its proposals for income measures from 2018 onwards, to consider the merits and disadvantages of any new forms of taxation, with the exception of taxes on capital;

Now, they have said they are going to do it, and therefore I believe them, but as to the Medium Term Financial Strategy as it is, it is clear, for the reasons very clearly and ably expressed

2645 early on this morning by Deputy Parkinson, that it will not work. He gave an example of the body that he is President of, the States' Trading Supervisory Board, whereby they are looking for a £6 million, if I have understood the figures correctly, income, from certain entities, and he has made it very clear that there are very few lemons to be squeezed from his Board that is going to give that £6 million income. I think he said the figure was £1.2 million. He explained it; I am not  
2650 going to go over all the arithmetic again. Let's even say we get from £1.2 million to £2 million, that is still £4 million short on one item.

Deputy Soulsby very clearly expressed the commendable efforts that her Committee has done and will continue to do, but the point made yesterday by Deputy Fallaize, he thought the arithmetic was £18 million; I thought it was £20 million.

2655 Let me give way to Deputy Fallaize – figuratively, not literally – in connection with the figures. Let's say he is right and it is £18 million. I honestly, honestly, honestly, do not see in the medium term the three spending Committees – and there is no criticism of them at all – coming up with £18 million of recurring savings, because, as Deputy Soulsby said, people are living longer, we want to promote good health, we have got all kinds of considerations in relation to that, we are  
2660 going to have an education debate which no doubt will involve spending, with considerable respect to them, I do not know what it is going to say, a fair few shillings, later in the year. We have got the commitment to Deputy Le Clerc's Committee, whereby they are always going to have significant claims upon their funds and their assets.

So, we have got to have a look at where we really are, but that does not mean that it is a bad  
2665 strategy. It will need tweaking, perhaps significantly. But, as somebody said, I have got confidence in all the members of Policy & Resources; they may not think it all the time from some of the things I say, but I do – and the Treasury guys, if I can call it that. Deputy Trott and Deputy St Pier are experienced people, they are balanced people, they are business people, they are sensible people. So, what they have come up with is not perfect, but it is not bad. Lots of communities  
2670 would say, 'My goodness me, aren't we lucky to have increased our reserves by £64.8 million last year? Aren't we lucky to have balanced our books?' – albeit I don't know if it was an illusion but it was ... if we had actually put the capital reserves in etc. we would not have done. But it is still pretty good. I do not think many other communities would have done that.

Where I am disappointed is when I heard Deputy Dorey say earlier, I think just before lunch,  
2675 when he made his speech about, 'Well we really should not be' – I am précising it, so if we wants to jump up and say I am quoting him incorrectly, well I apologise in advance. He was saying, 'Well we really should – the runway and the sea links, the air links and the sea links we should put back a bit really because we should speak about the Harbour Action Area.' No, no, no, no! It is always a recipe for, let's do that tomorrow, and tomorrow is not 365 days' time, it is 3,650 days' time, it is  
2680 pushing things off not just into the foreground, it is the horizon over there that you can barely see. We have to do something.

What I have said to this Assembly and I am going to say it because my four colleagues on Economic Development agree with me, is that before the end of this year we will come up with more meat on the bone, because this is a high level document, it is still a bit apple pie. I do have  
2685 my reservations about such plans and I think in two years' time we will probably hardly remember what it says. It is a talking document which should be changed, and will be changed very quickly as circumstances change very quickly. I have not discussed it with them so they will probably moan at me when they next see me, when they get the opportunity to talk to me, so I will say it now, because they have got the opportunity to interrupt me, to my four colleagues that I would  
2690 actually like to see a runway extension, whenever that may be, I would like to see the Harbour Action Area advanced.

I fully appreciate Deputy Brehaut saying resource implications; I fully accept that, if he says that that is true. Maybe we have got to bring in resources, we have got to pay for it. It may be we have got to do something. I would like to see our sea links sorted out. I have got ideas which I cannot  
2695 say publicly, because they are still confidential and we are discussing it at Committee level. I would like to see all of those things done, but they are going to cost a lot of money. They are

going to cost a lot of money. The £6 million for, I am calling it, new capital projects, rather than whatever – I cannot remember all the classifications, I cannot remember these words nowadays – is not enough, and we have got to tell you now, it is not enough, and therefore whatever we sign up to – and I am going to vote for this because I said for all however many thousands of these Propositions there are, there might be another late amendment with the leave of the Deputy Bailiff brought in, I hope not – I am going to vote for them all because we have got to move forward.

Where Deputy Lester Queripel said why do we need ... he said it three times – I thought my name is Peter and he was denounced, St Peter was denounced or denounced Jesus three times didn't he, well never mind, three times – overarching, we do not need an overarching plan; yes we do need an overarching plan; because Deputy Lester Queripel is a very conscientious States' Member, he helps lots of people to try and resolve their problems, but he can only help them resolve their problems if there is a structure, if there are rules, if there are procedures; because if they do not exist he cannot, despite his ability and his undoubted effort and his undoubted integrity, he will not achieve anything. So, therefore you do need cohesive joined up Government, and one of the criticisms that was made of this States and previous States is that we do not have cohesive joined up Government.

I conclude by echoing the words of Deputy de Sausmarez. I know she is going to vote for the runway in due course, so I have got that in the bag now, (*Laughter*) but I echo the words of her, we have got to work together. That does not mean to say we are not going to have some really strong arguments and disagreements, because that is democracy, we are all people who are wanting to do the best for the Bailiwick, we may want to do it in certain different ways, we may have certain different emphasis, but what we have got here, I do not like calling Guernsey a product, and Alderney a product, and Sark a product, but we have got a great product, we have got a great community, and we have got to shout it from the hilltops. But you have got to give us, Economic Development, sir, Members of the States have got to give us, Economic Development ... when we come back we do not want to be like Geoffrey Howe and be expected to face the West Indian bowlers with broken cricket bats, we want you to support us, because if you do not support us we will get nowhere, and therefore this community, if we are not given the opportunity lay the seeds for growth, we will get nowhere.

Deputy Meerveld made the point to me in several conversations recently, about economic growth is a long-term thing, there are going to be no quick fixes, the procedures and the policies and, hopefully, the practicalities that we will bring into play, if supported by this Assembly, in due course, will take some years to develop and to give seed, as it were. That does not matter, if the community out there see we are doing something, and we are doing it practically, they will stick with us, and we will attract business, and we will attract people, and we will continue with this wonderful environment that we all live in.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

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

Mine will be brief, because it is all in the Plan, so I have nothing further to add. I have not got any questions that need answering, that have been posed about Home Affairs.

I have sat through numerous types of plans; whether they have been Government business plans, you name it, they have had various titles over the various terms that I have been in the States. Is it good to have plans? Yes, it is. Will they change? Of course they will, life changes all the time, and we do not actually know what is going to happen. But we have to have a base to work on. I think you have got a base here, you have got a good plan set before you, with all the Committees of their priorities.

We worked extremely hard, and I would like to publicly thank my Committee and indeed the staff; we dedicated meetings solely for this, so we put on extra meetings beyond our normal

meetings and went through our plan to put before you, which was taking bits from our business plans, because we have business meetings regularly with all the services.

2750 So it was reasonably easy for us, but we did actually make sure that we put the priorities in the order that we think is appropriate for the States to be able to see where we are going with that. Because, as Members will know in this Assembly, apart from our normal everyday work we are heavily involved with Brexit, so we have had to park a lot of our everyday work. We are heavily involved with the GDPR. Both of these things are extremely important. They will affect the whole  
2755 of the Island, and it falls very much on the Committee for Home Affairs, and indeed with P&R, of which we thank their staff for supporting us during that period, and during this period, and continues to do so, and of course, the cyber security is, again, right at the very top of the list.

So, I am aware about the pressures within Home Affairs at staff level, and indeed, of our Committee members as well, who have had extra meetings as well to go through many of the  
2760 items that we have got that are the fallout from Brexit, GDPR, cyber security, and indeed putting on extra meetings, again, as I said, regarding this Plan. So, I cannot thank them enough for their time and dedication to bring it before you today.

This is a high level Plan – quite rightly so. The detail will be coming back in policies, which the States will see. This Plan will be back in itself in a year's time, which I am sure will not actually take  
2765 four days, because you have now got a base, so you will have an update of that.

So, all I would like to finish by saying is Guernsey is a good place to live; talk it up. It is not perfect, but it is an awful lot better than other places around the world.

**Several Members:** Hear, hear.

2770

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Le Pelley.

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

I will be very brief. It is just about five past four, I have to say, sadly, Jersey has overtaken us in  
2775 the medal table. *(Interjections)*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Blame the gymnastics.

**Deputy Le Pelley:** As the Deputy Bailiff just pointed out, of course, we do not have a  
2780 gymnastics team and, of course, there are something like about 12 medals or so in that section that Jersey can lap up that we cannot compete with. Having said that, we might be behind them in the medal table but we do have a lot more medals than them overall.

Anyway, I will be brief. I have not anything much to say. I could list the 13 items, or the 12 priority items that we had in our policy plan. They are there for you to see on pages 187 to 200. I  
2785 do thank the States very much indeed for allowing us to put our 13th one back in, which is the Sports Strategy.

I have got a little note to say thank you very much to my fellow Deputies in Education, Sport & Culture: thank you very much indeed. I have also got to say thank you very much to the staff, because we are in the first throes of moving offices. We are understaffed, we have no Chief  
2790 Secretary at the present time; we have an acting one. We have all sorts of people doubling up. I do appreciate the fantastic effort that they have put in, so thank you to all the staff.

I think, sir, I just want to say that we have had a useful debate. I think it is very, very useful that we have a debate, most people here have sat through four days of it; luckily for me, I have only had to sit through three days, having had one elsewhere. But I think that having a plan is very,  
2795 very important; it gives you a structure and a framework to work to, and it can hold you to account if you stray from where you said you were going. I think we do need to work together now to get things done. I think Education, Sport & Culture has got a lot to do, and I am going to sit down very, very shortly, sir, because I think people are going to hear rather too much of my

voice in the next two weeks, because we are going to be delivering all our plans to Deputies and stakeholders in education.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Tooley.

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

I apologise for breaking what was a carefully constructed flow; I did not intend to do it. I had not intended to speak, but I have been inspired to do so. I will make what I think people will probably regard as a short and fluffy speech, but I make no apology for that, as you will probably realise when I begin.

I was inspired during Deputy Gollop's speech this morning. As he sat down I realised who it is that he has been reminding me of for the last couple of years, and I have told him this, and I am fairly confident he will not mind me sharing it. I realised that I was reminded of Paddington Bear, (*Laughter*) who is described in the books as a hopeful bear at heart, and that inspired me to think again about some of those fantastic stories, which are stories about a bear who is different, but welcomed. Something Guernsey does very well, is welcoming those who are different. I remember this quote, and I have looked it up to make sure that I am getting it right, Paddington said:

*I think the merry-go-round is a very good way of travelling if you do not want to go anywhere, especially if you have plenty of marmalade sandwiches to keep you going.*

Now, Guernsey, obviously, built its prosperity to a large degree on marmalade. But there has come a time, and we are right slap bang in the middle of it, where we do not necessarily have enough marmalade sandwiches to keep us going round and round. We can, we must and we will do this, Deputy St Pier.

So, as I say this is short and fluffy, but I want to join Deputy Gollop in being a hopeful bear at heart. I am going to sit down with one last quote:

*Bears like Paddington are very rare, and a good thing too if you ask me or it would cost us a small fortune in marmalade.*16:09:26

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, I do not see the only two people who could otherwise speak at this stage, and the three other members of the Committee, so I will turn to the President of the Policy & Resources Committee, Deputy St Pier, to reply to debate on this Article.

**Deputy St Pier:** Thank you, sir, and thank you, Members, for speaking.

Sir, Members, this has been a fairly long week starting on Tuesday. Those who will have seen me sum up in debates on matters of substance before after long debate will know that particularly late on a Friday afternoon my style may be to seek to canter through and respond as swiftly as I can to the points raised. I think, however, this is going to take a little bit longer, and I am going to go a little slower, because I think the debate and the substance truly warrant it.

But before I start, I think, if I may, I would just like to take the opportunity to thank you, sir, because we do not often have the opportunity to have your presence here, and I am sure we have all appreciated your guidance through (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) the last four days, which has greatly assisted us.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, very much.

**Deputy St Pier:** I think the quote of the debate has to go to Deputy Brehaut, that it is like trying to 'herd cats through Battersea Dogs Home'. I do not know whether it is through the gates of Battersea Dogs Home or just through the middle of them but I can assure you that that is very much the feeling that the members of Policy & Resources have had.



2845 It has also been a debate of regrets. Many Members have stood up to say, 'I regret not laying an amendment'. Well, after 33, I am sure many of the rest of us do not regret (*Laughter*) you choosing not to do so.

Sir, many of those who spoke did actually criticise the Plan, that it was not as expected and I think, to be fair to the Policy & Resources Committee, we have acknowledged the weaknesses of what is before you in the policy letter and, indeed, in my opening speech, and I do not think there is probably much merit in seeking to respond further on that point.

2850 Deputy Parkinson began and I think, in particular, I would like to echo his, and Deputy Merrett's and I think Deputy Parkinson's, comments that I certainly regard the Harbour Action Area Plan as being vitally important that it is expedited, and I certainly see that as being one of the areas that we are going to need to look at over the next few months, in this next stage, to see how that can be achieved.

I think the concerns which Deputy Parkinson, very ably and eloquently, set out identifying that yes, indeed, under this Plan there is an expectation of around about an average of £6 million a year, does present some challenges, and he identified those. Some of those are legislative, for example, and I certainly do not see us moving towards £20 litre for milk, as Deputy Brehaut suggested. But, I think, certainly the expectation in the Plan is not all of that would necessarily be revenue related, and I think the point I wish to just emphasise here is that there is reference in the plan to an expectation about the opportunity to look at the equity structure of some of the businesses that Deputy Parkinson referred to, and this really is all around the proper allocation of capital. Because, clearly, if capital is misallocated and mispriced, then it is used inefficiently, and I think you see that quite a lot, perhaps, with our property portfolio, and the equity in the businesses is no different. So that is certainly an area that I think needs to be looked at.

2860 Deputy Parkinson and Deputy de Lisle and a number of others, of course, referred to the corporate tax regime, which has come up once or twice during this debate and, again, all I would say in response is that, of course, in light of international developments, which Deputy Parkinson did refer to, that is an issue that we need to keep, and are indeed keeping, a very close eye on.

Sir, Deputy Paint was the first to raise the question of delegated authority, and a number of Members referred to that, and I am going to spend a little bit of time talking about that and explaining the position, because it is a critical one, and I think people do need to be making some informed decisions when we get to the vote.

2875 So, certainly Deputy Paint said, obviously, if a requête was brought – and I think perhaps referring to one recently filed, in respect of L'Ancrese – then clearly it will cause a delay, and he is, of course, absolutely right. But the point I would make, sir, is the absence of delegated authority will delay *all* projects, and that is what needs to be considered.

I think, certainly, in relation to, let's focus specifically on the L'Ancrese East Wall, it clearly has had some political controversy around it and I think, clearly, now that a requête has been filed then if we were presented with a request for funding next week it would be inappropriate to use the delegated authority, and certainly, I think, my advice, and I am sure the Policy & Resources Committee's advice, to Environment & Infrastructure is clearly to pre-empt that with their own policy letter, and I am sure that will be something they are giving very active consideration to, and no doubt will respond in due course, when we as Policy & Resources seek their comment on that requête.

2880 Deputy Merrett made some questions around the small projects, sir. Now, we of course already have delegated authority to fund development of projects up until the point of opening a vote for a substantive project, and clearly, what these proposals are seeking to do is to ensure that we can progress projects as quickly as possible, seeking to respond to the criticism about the pace of development. I would also point out to Deputy Merrett that, of course, we already have authority for urgent projects, for up to £2 million anyway.

2895 Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, again, in relation to the capital bid process, it is clearly necessary for a business case, or a business justification case, to be prepared and depending, again, on the size of projects, project assurance reviews are required, but I think anybody who – and there are many

in the Assembly who have brought project and business cases before Policy & Resources – will not have found them a soft touch. I think, even the Committee for Home Affairs, when they were bringing the project for the Prison perimeter fence, which was saving money, indeed found that that was challenged, because we were seeking to understand the nature of the business case they were presenting. So I do not think that Deputy Hansmann Rouxel should have any concerns about the robustness of the approach which Policy & Resources will take.

I think Deputy Brehaut has made a very good point that Members and Presidents need to consider very carefully that if every project comes back to this Assembly, then you also need to think about the impact on staff resources as well. The need for our staff across the States to be preparing the additional policy letters that would need to be required, will present significant pressure on the States.

Sir, in relation to Deputies Leadbeater and Oliver, I would urge Members to look at pages 101 and 102 of the Medium Term Financial Plan. There are projects on there which would be impacted if Proposition 8 fell, projects that are within the Committee for Home Affairs, of CCTV, the Town fire appliances and so on. So, again, we do need to think about the consequences of rejecting Proposition 8.

But I want to draw particular attention to Proposition 7, and Proposition 7 was really the one that scoped out the different capital process, and again, draw Members' attention to page 100 of the Medium Term Financial Plan, and in particular in relation to large projects, – and I will read the relevant section to Members that do not have page 100 in front of them, but in relation to large projects – that is those estimated with a value greater than £10 million, it suggests:

... that States are given the opportunity to understand, influence and shape the scope of large significant projects at an early stage.

This comes back to the point – I think it might have been Deputy Leadbeater who made it – that actually, often work can be done, the whole thing goes too far down the road and we end up feeling committed or pressurised into it because of time, or because the work has been done. We have recognised that criticism as well and said, 'Look, for large projects we need to have this Assembly more involved earlier,' therefore once a strategic outline case has been completed, which sets out the strategic case, then it should come to this States, and:

This should avoid committing substantial resources to projects before getting wide agreement to the proposed direction of travel.

So, if we vote out Proposition 7, then we are throwing that out as well, and I think that would be most unwise, and not in the best interest of the States, and those looking to have better control of those projects. In essence, what we are trying to do is to have a proportionate system of oversight responding to the criticisms that people have had.

Deputy Green questioned particularly Propositions 8 and 9, what it was we were seeking to do there, particularly for giving States' Trading Supervisory Board the same approvals. Well, really it is to ensure consistency. I think Deputy Merrett described that as being undemocratic, but of course the composition of that board was democratically decided by this Assembly, and the members of that board were democratically decided by this Assembly, so Deputy Merrett may not like the democratic decisions that were taken, but that is the construct which this States has chosen to adopt.

Sir, I hope that has dealt with most of the issues arising on the issue of capital.

Deputy Lester Queripel said never give up hope and I can absolutely assure him that I definitely would never give up hope with Deputy Lester Queripel, or indeed anyone else. He also questioned how much this whole process had cost, as did Deputy Dudley-Owen. As was pointed out, I think, of course, clearly most of the work was undertaken by staff, principally at Committee or officer level, not all of it by Policy & Resources, of course. Of course, I am sure Deputy Lester Queripel will know staff are not required to complete timesheets, they are not required to allocate their time to particular projects, so I cannot tell him exactly how much staff time has been spent

on preparing this. What I can tell him is that the external costs for this amounted to about £5,000, which has all been spent on Island in respect of on-Island services and facilities, so that is hiring of rooms, printing, facilitators and so on. So I think it is a relatively modest cost in the context of what it is we are seeking to achieve.

He questioned why we should plan rather than just do. He said, 'Why can we not just do' – well I would say –

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, point of correction.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Lester Queripel

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, I did not question why we should plan; I questioned the need for an overarching master plan. It is totally different, sir, to what Deputy St Pier says, because there are a suite of plans under the umbrella, under the stewardship of the overarching master plan, which will carry on doing what they do now; departments will carry on doing what they are doing. It was the document itself and the need to have an overarching master plan to link, to be the golden thread. I just did not see the need for that, sir.

Thank you.

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, Deputy Queripel said, 'Why should we have a *master plan* (*Laughter*) rather than just do?' My answer to that is, well, because we have too much *to do*, so we need to plan *to do* what it is we are going *to do*, and that is why we have the master plan.

He also questioned the level of Deputies' engagement, and I think we need to absolutely consider Deputies' ... Sorry, he questioned their engagement and satisfaction and that was one of the things that needed to be considered. Absolutely, Deputies, of course, are customers in that sense, and of course there have been surveys already undertaken by the Civil Service as to the level of support they are receiving from us. But, I think, we need to maintain some sense of perspective, there are only 40 of us, there are another 62,960, roughly, customers, other customers out there, and clearly that is primarily where I would expect the focus to be in the kind of work to which Deputy Lester Queripel was referring.

Deputy Roffey made an interesting point about perhaps moving away from GDP in relation to Proposition 2. It is an interesting point. I think it has worked its way into the fiscal framework simply because of international norms as being a way to sort of provide some international comparative about the level of capital expenditure that we have, but it was a valid observation.

He also questioned what would happen if Proposition 1, I think it was, was to be voted down. Was it 1 or 2? Yes, okay, I think it is Proposition 2, I will come back to Proposition 1 later and Deputy Fallaize. Clearly, the appropriations for the Capital Reserve will be a matter for annual Budget Resolutions, and in that sense, Proposition 2 is clearly just a guide, it is a starting point, if you like, that will help us when preparing the ... **16:25:22** Thank you, Deputy Green, for that accompaniment. It is a starting point for when Policy & Resources prepare the annual Budget, that we are working to what we believe the States have endorsed as being an appropriate point to start. But, absolutely, I accept that actually the appropriations will have been determined by annual Budget Resolution.

That really reflects Deputy Graham's point that of course plans do not survive the first engagement. He always used to say, perhaps tracing his military background, 'Do not survive first engagement with the enemy.' I notice he has changed that to, 'Do not survive first engagement with reality' – (*Laughter*) a subtle shift which being here in the States has rendered upon him. So, I certainly think it is better for us to have States' endorsement, that we do have that reasonable starting point, than just working with a policy vacuum, which would be the implication if Proposition 2 were voted down.

He then said, 'When are we going to have all of this?' He referred to paragraph 6.5 and he kind of said well he gave up at that. He did not quite say 'gave up'; he did use the phrase 'gave up', but

I do not think he meant literally. But actually, had he gone on a couple of paragraphs and maybe he did skip over, at paragraph 6.10 we did give an indication that Policy & Resources Committee will work with the Principal Committees later this year and in tandem with the Budget Report. That is the time frame that we are working to, and we will make recommendations to the Committees on the prioritisation of policies and resources taking into account cross-Committee working, and will seek to find resources through agreeing with Committees where current priorities might be reassessed for reallocation of funding or through allocating funding, as appropriate, through resources such as the Future Guernsey Economic Fund and the Capital Reserve where those proposals meet the States' agreed criteria.

But I can perhaps just expand a little bit further on that, because this is a matter which Policy & Resources discussed at its meeting only this Monday, and we have developed an outline prioritisation process and framework really – picking up on Deputy Yerby's point, at some point this week, I cannot quite remember at which point – that we need to ensure that this process does align to our priorities as set out. So, we are looking akin to the capital portfolio process, what is a strategic fit with our overall objectives? What are the benefits? The Committees will be asked to quantify the benefits of the policy initiative. How many people will be affected by it, and to what extent? What is the financial impact, and how achievable is it going to be? How achievable is it with our current capacity and capability? What are the risks associated with its delivery? So all of those things will go on in the next few weeks.

We hope to have an update on 5th September at our Committee meeting with a view to, at the end of the process, a short update document on the revised reprioritised Policy & Resource Plan can be published and put before the States for endorsement. Then a real hostage to fortune here, at that stage the four to six page version of the overall Plan will also be published. Now, Members who know me well will know that I am normally very reluctant to make those kinds of statements publicly, but I think it is probably a healthy one to make in order to help ensure that we do actually deliver against that objective.

Deputy Green really challenged why we had not been able to achieve what we needed to achieve by now, and I think a number of others picked up on that. I think it has been a challenge, undoubtedly, for us to receive all the information from the Principal Committees on the timeframes that were set, to enable us to undertake the prioritisation process, and the overlay process which he described. But, I think the important point is that in paragraph 6.8 in relation to the Committee plans, the Committees have said that they can, largely, complete the priorities with the resources that they have. Yes, we do have concerns about whether they are right about that, but generally speaking, that has been the message which has come down from the Committees.

I think in terms of the different product and styles, I think the Committee for Home Affairs at 12 pages I think they have produced something which is succinct and clearly sets out their priorities in a short and easy-to-read document. I think that has been welcomed. It is interesting when we suggested producing a one-page summary of each plan – which, of course, we did put in the policy letter – we received significant pushback from Committees that they could not possibly condense down everything they wanted to do just to one page, so it is a real challenge in terms of the political – it comes back to the 'herding cats' comment again.

Alderney Representative Jean – unfortunately he has disappeared – asked specifically what is in this for Alderney. Well, of course, it is really about the benefit from the priorities set by the Committees that provide the transferred services.

Deputy Langlois was really questioning this question of the review of taxation. Now, the States have unequivocally excluded the taxation of capital from scope. And that was a very clear message of the series of debates and votes we have had this week. Now consumption tax has similarly been ... a number of Members referred to it; it is all very interesting but the States have very clearly taken that off the table during the last term, by a substantial majority. So the levers that we have available to us are limited, but property of course is currently in scope, as of course are income and excise duties. So we are going to have to look at all of those to see how those can

3045 be broadened and then that takes us back into the question also of diversification, i.e. new sources of revenue outside those which we currently have.

Deputy Gollop said the whole process has taken too long, but again, I reiterate that of course – and I think Deputy Ferbrache essentially made the same point, because really reiterating – we are working to the timetable which is in the Rules.

3050 I absolutely agree with Deputy Graham that this has probably been all the better for being tested by amendments, and that I would agree with.

He also questioned the balance between transform, maintain and grow, and whether we have got the proportions right. I think, of course, he referred to some percentages but, of course, what has actually come through in the bids is somewhat lower than those initial percentages. So 3055 actually the amount allocated for 'grow' is considerably less than was anticipated. But, again, what I would say to him and, of course, to Deputy Ferbrache is again repetition, with your permission, sir, of what was said earlier in the week, that there remains an anticipated £64 million of unallocated capital in the Capital Reserve which, hopefully, might be available to progress some of these growth projects, whether it is the Harbour Action Area or others, and that is the kind of 3060 development that I would hope to see may be possible.

Deputy Graham also referred to progressive taxation, sir, and he said 21% or 22%, to which I would say, no; I would refer him back to my comments around effective taxation rates, rather than headline rates, so what we are really talking about is taking up the effective rates of taxation for higher earners, whether that is 16%, 17% or 18%, bearing in mind that at the moment nobody, of 3065 course, is currently paying a straight 20%.

So the question of broadest shoulders, I think, absolutely, is right, and I reiterate that we do not have a bottomless pit. I think he made that point very well: that very quickly we get to the point where middle Guernsey, the jams – all these terms have been used during this debate – will be affected. He gave an interesting example of a couple with a certain earnings and so on who 3070 would, he said, be contributing around 25%, which was interesting because of course he was actually describing the size of Government as a proportion of the economy. I do not know whether it was accidental or by design, but he absolutely hit on the burden which Government is on the shoulders of the population.

Deputy Dorey also was sceptical and I think rightly so, given experience about procurement. 3075 But we absolutely have to succeed this time and I think the efforts that have been made have demonstrated some progress in that area. He questioned the allocation and, of course, whether it would be at Committee level or cross-Committee, and I think it is going to depend very much on, of course, where the procurement opportunities lie.

An interesting challenge also around the transfers from the Core Investment Reserve to the 3080 Capital Reserve where we have periods of out performance on the Core Investment Reserve, and I think I would say to him that if the Capital Reserve can be properly funded in the way that this Plan envisages – and, of course, this Plan does not envisage out performance on the investment returns because it would not be prudent to do so – then I agree it would be perhaps appropriate to review whether that policy of transferring excess returns to the Capital Reserve is appropriate, 3085 or whether we should, in fact, be recommending to the States that we concentrate those returns on rebuilding the Core Investment Reserve, as he suggested. I think it was a very worthy and valid point.

Deputy Fallaize referred to ... in talking about Proposition 1, and in particular, in relation to paragraph 1.4. I think, to be clear, what it says in 1.4 is:

The plan does not seek to ... materially change the fiscal approach ...

3090 And I place the emphasis on the term 'materially', and also the reference there is in relation to our tax architecture. I think we stand by that comment that there is not an expectation that we need to substantially change our tax architecture in order to deliver this Plan. So I do not think it is inconsistent with paragraph 1.7, that we need to make some changes, but not necessarily material ones.

3095 I also want to make a point of correction, sir. He said he did not wish to interrupt the flow, but  
he said that with Zero-10 there had been a transfer from the non-resident corporate sector to the  
resident population. Of course, the whole point was the non-resident corporate sector was  
exempt before and we needed to create a structure by which they remained outside the scope of  
3100 tax, and that is what Zero-10 was all about. The transfer has actually been from the resident  
corporate sector to the resident population. But of course that also is only focussed on direct  
taxes and, as Members will have heard me say, of course, the other steps that were taken in  
relation to Social Security, corporate TRP, the extension of the base for Zero-10, all of those other  
measures have replenished the tax that was lost from the resident corporate sector at the time.

3105 **Deputy Parkinson:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Parkinson.

**Deputy Parkinson:** In 2007 the tax paid by companies was, I believe, £156 million, and I think  
3110 you will find in these papers in front of us it is predicted to be £47 million. There is no way that  
increases in Social Security paid by the corporate sector, and other changes which have been  
imposed on them, have anything like compensated for the £110 million shortfall.

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

3115 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you.

Well, after Deputy Parkinson has made his, I thought this was a good opportunity.

3120 I did not mean the non-resident corporate sector in the sense of businesses not based here, I  
meant businesses based here, trading here, but owned by non-residents. That is where the  
transfer has come from, them to the resident population.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier to continue.

3125 **Deputy St Pier:** Thank you, sir.

In relation to Deputy Fallaize, I think he was suggesting that he might vote against the Medium  
Term Financial Plan. I think the Medium Term Financial Plan, sir, is a key plank of Policy &  
Resource Plan, for which of course he was a keen advocate to plan for the matching of resources,  
3130 including of course financial resources, to our policy priorities.

So with respect, I think it might risk looking a little bit like sour grapes that he was unable to  
get support for the amendments that he did support for the Medium Term Financial Plan because  
had they succeeded. I suspect he might have supported Proposition 1, so I think it would be  
disappointing, sir, if Deputy Fallaize, as a keen supporter of the planning process and the Medium  
3135 Term Financial Plan, felt unable to support the Medium Term Financial Plan. But, he did  
acknowledge, sir, that Committees had been forced to think about their priorities for the first time,  
and that is, again, a point that I have made and I think is to be much welcomed.

Yes, actually it is a good point to lead on from the Medium Term Financial Plan. Deputy  
Hansmann Rouxel questioned what would happen if it was voted out. Well, I think what would  
3140 happen is we would just have to deal with, as we have done for ages, the Budget one year at a  
time. I think it would be an unfortunate return to short termism. Some have described the  
Medium Term Financial Plan as short term; well, it is very short term if we are just looking at a year  
ahead.

I think, going back to my comments in relation to Deputy Roffey, sir, in relation to Proposition  
3145 2, the presence of a guide that helps Policy & Resources, gives us a policy framework in which to  
operate in preparing the Budgets over the next few years, would be most valuable.

I think the narrowness of the tax base, which Deputy de Sausmarez referred to, and our reliance on the taxation of personal incomes, of course, she is not the first person to point this out. I have been pointing this out for a considerable period of time, since I entered politics. Of course, that is precisely what the Personal Tax Pensions and Benefits Review was intended to look at, and of course the reality is that many of the alternatives presented, as I said in my opening comments, are constrained. They are politically constrained, constrained by the international regulatory environment we have, and the competitive environment we have; and that gives us the challenge which, again, drives us back to the reasons that we need to keep the tax burden as low as we possibly can, not only to address the couple that Deputy Graham was talking about, but because of the very real political regulatory and competition challenges we have in seeking to broaden that tax base.

I think, sir, it probably leaves me only to conclude with the rallying cry, and I think it is probably the second quote of the debate so far, which is from actually Deputy de Sausmarez, that we should go on from here to work together in a constructive way. It absolutely is the right spirit. I absolutely endorse that and I will leave that as the conclusion of my speech and encourage Members to support all the Propositions.

Thank you, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, the first thing I am going to do is remind you about the consequences of mobile phones sounding during the course of the States' sitting. The Bailiff has a convention, which I also endorse, that if a Member is obviously known to have a device that goes off and sounds, there is an encouragement to make a contribution to the Bailiff's Charitable Fund. Deputy Ferbrache knows this from another context.

So, Deputy Green, if you will repair yourself to the Deputy Greffier at the end of the sitting to make the *(Laughter)* necessary contribution, that would be appreciated.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Isn't it based on the ability to pay? *(Laughter and interjections)*

**Deputy Green:** Yes, sir, I will happily pay the standard fee *(Laughter)* and I can only apologise, sir. I am sorry.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Apology accepted, Deputy Green, it is a flat rate.

Members of the States, there are 31 Propositions. I have got, at the moment, if I have understood it correctly, requests for recorded votes on Proposition 1; Propositions 7, 8 and 9, but I do not know whether that is together or distinct; Propositions 13 to 15; and 16 to 19. Again they would have to be distinct. I remind Members that if somebody wants to record an abstention, the only way to do so is through a recorded vote.

So, requests at the moment, please?

**Deputy de Lisle:** There was also a request for 12, sir.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Did I not say 12? I had 12 down on my list, Deputy de Lisle. I did note that. Deputy Lester Queripel.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, running from the very beginning, you have already got one on the list, I would ask for 1A, 1B, 1C to be taken together please, recorded; 2 to be taken in isolation; 3, 4, 5 and 5A and 6 could be taken together; 7, 8, 9 you are already doing; but *(Interjection and laughter)* I would ask that we take 15A as well. I am quite happy to take those altogether but if not then we take 13, 14, 15, 15A, 16, 17, 18 and 19. *(Interjections)*

It is my right to ask for a recorded vote, sir, so ... **(The Deputy Bailiff: It is.)** Sir, I did ask originally for 13 to 19 altogether.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes. Because of 15A coming in the middle, that will be taken separately, but does it have to be a recorded vote?

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

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Okay.  
Deputy Yerby.

**Deputy Yerby:** Sir, I am not asking for a recorded vote, but in contrast to Deputy Queripel I wish to vote against some of the Propositions in the first five, and would be grateful if each of them could be taken individually down to Proposition 5.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Very well.

Now, Members of the States, it is inevitable that voting will take some time. I simply ask for your patience and good nature through it, and to remind you that you have to put your microphone on when you are voting and try and lean forward towards it, not necessarily as far forward as Deputy Trott, and as loudly, *(Laughter)* but close to it, and can we try and do voting reasonably clearly, for the benefit of the Deputy Greffier, so do not rush too quickly each time to vote.

But there are the 31 Propositions. We will work from them in the form of amendment 33, because that is where they all are, and we will have a recorded vote in respect of Proposition 1, first.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 31, Contre 4, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 3*

**POUR**

Deputy Graham  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Prow  
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 Stephens  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Smithies

**CONTRE**

Deputy Green  
Deputy Yerby  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Lester Queripel

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. McKinley



**The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, in respect of Proposition 1, there voted Pour 31, Contre 4; 2 abstentions, 3 absentees, and therefore the Proposition is declared carried.

Proposition 1A, there is a now a request for that to be taken separately and a recorded vote, if I have understood correctly, Deputy Lester Queripel.

*There was a recorded vote.*

3225 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Le Pelley.

**Deputy Le Pelley:** Sir, in the interests of brevity, could I point out that the Alderney Representatives are in Alderney, they sent us their best wishes for summer, and we could save time by not calling their names out.

3230

**The Deputy Bailiff:** They are being called very briefly, and it is necessary to do it, because they were here at roll call.

*Carried – Pour 37, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3*

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Graham	None	None	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Green			Alderney Rep. Jean
Deputy Paint			Alderney Rep. McKinley
Deputy Dorey			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Dudley-Owen			
Deputy Yerby			
Deputy de Lisle			
Deputy Langlois			
Deputy Soulsby			
Deputy de Sausmarez			
Deputy Roffey			
Deputy Prow			
Deputy Oliver			
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Kuttelwascher			
Deputy Tindall			
Deputy Brehaut			
Deputy Tooley			
Deputy Gollop			
Deputy Parkinson			
Deputy Lester Queripel			
Deputy Le Clerc			
Deputy Leadbeater			
Deputy Mooney			
Deputy Trott			
Deputy Le Pelley			
Deputy Merrett			
Deputy St Pier			
Deputy Stephens			
Deputy Meerveld			
Deputy Fallaize			
Deputy Inder			
Deputy Lowe			
Deputy Laurie Queripel			
Deputy Smithies			
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel			

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, in respect of Proposition 1A, there voted Pour 37 and three absences, and therefore I declare it carried.

3235 Deputy Lester Queripel, are you continuing your request that there be a recorded vote on Propositions 1B and 1C, or can we go *aux voix* now?

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** We can take both those two together, sir.

3240 **The Deputy Bailiff:** But we cannot because Deputy Yerby wants them taken separately, so the question is can we go *aux voix* rather than have a recorded vote?

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** No, I would rather recorded, please, sir.

3245 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Very well.  
1B then please, Deputy Greffier.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 36, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3*

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Graham	Deputy de Lisle	None	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Green			Alderney Rep. Jean
Deputy Paint			Alderney Rep. McKinley
Deputy Dorey			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Dudley-Owen			
Deputy Yerby			
Deputy Langlois			
Deputy Soulsby			
Deputy de Sausmarez			
Deputy Roffey			
Deputy Prow			
Deputy Oliver			
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Kuttelwascher			
Deputy Tindall			
Deputy Brehaut			
Deputy Tooley			
Deputy Gollop			
Deputy Parkinson			
Deputy Lester Queripel			
Deputy Le Clerc			
Deputy Leadbeater			
Deputy Mooney			
Deputy Trott			
Deputy Le Pelley			
Deputy Merrett			
Deputy St Pier			
Deputy Stephens			
Deputy Meerveld			
Deputy Fallaize			
Deputy Inder			
Deputy Lowe			
Deputy Laurie Queripel			
Deputy Smithies			
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel			

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, in respect of Proposition 1B, there voted Pour 36, Contre 1, the same three absentees, and therefore I declare that Proposition carried.

3250 Members of the States, before we move to the next recorded vote, which will be in respect of Proposition 1C, I have got a suggestion for you. Could we assume that everyone will vote Pour unless they stand in their place when I ask those who want to be recorded as voting against, and

then those who want to be recorded as abstaining. (**Several Members:** Pour.) Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

3255 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, I will declare that carried, and therefore in respect of Proposition 1C, first of all, who wishes to be recorded as voting against it? Deputy Tindall. Does anyone wish to be recorded as abstaining?

*Carried – Pour 36, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3*

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Graham	Deputy Tindall	None	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Green			Alderney Rep. Jean
Deputy Paint			Alderney Rep. McKinley
Deputy Dorey			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Dudley-Owen			
Deputy Yerby			
Deputy de Lisle			
Deputy Langlois			
Deputy Soulsby			
Deputy de Sausmarez			
Deputy Roffey			
Deputy Prow			
Deputy Oliver			
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Kuttelwascher			
Deputy Brehaut			
Deputy Tooley			
Deputy Gollop			
Deputy Parkinson			
Deputy Lester Queripel			
Deputy Le Clerc			
Deputy Leadbeater			
Deputy Mooney			
Deputy Trott			
Deputy Le Pelley			
Deputy Merrett			
Deputy St Pier			
Deputy Stephens			
Deputy Meerveld			
Deputy Fallaize			
Deputy Inder			
Deputy Lowe			
Deputy Laurie Queripel			
Deputy Smithies			
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel			

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I therefore declare Proposition 1C carried, by 36 votes to 1, with three absentees.

3260 Proposition 2, Members of the States, a distinct vote on that, again a recorded vote. Who wishes to be recorded as opposing it, Contre? Right. I cannot do this in order; I will go round the room. So that is Deputy Yerby, Deputy Laurie Queripel, Deputy Roffey, Deputy Lester Queripel, Deputy Dorey and Deputy Gollop. Who wishes to be recorded as abstaining on Proposition 2? No abstentions.

*Carried – Pour 31, Contre 6, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3*

**POUR**

Deputy Graham  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Tindall  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Tooley  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Mooney  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy Merrett  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Stephens  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Smithies  
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

**CONTRE**

Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Yerby  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Laurie Queripel

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. McKinley

3265 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Therefore we will record that as a vote of 31:6 in favour of Proposition 2, which is duly declared carried.

Are there any requests to take Propositions 3 to 5A separately?

**Deputy Yerby:** Might we take 5A separately please, sir?

3270

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Can we take 3 to 5 together, then? Is this to be a recorded vote, Deputy Lester Queripel, or *aux voix*?

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Recorded, sir, please.

3275

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Right. Well, once again, this is 3 to 5 together. Those who wish to be recorded as opposing all of 3 to 5? Deputy Yerby. Does anyone wish to abstain from 3 to 5?

*Carried – Pour 36, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3*

**POUR**

Deputy Graham  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Soulsby

**CONTRE**

Deputy Yerby

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. McKinley

Deputy de Sausmarez  
 Deputy Roffey  
 Deputy Prow  
 Deputy Oliver  
 Deputy Ferbrache  
 Deputy Kuttelwascher  
 Deputy Tindall  
 Deputy Brehaut  
 Deputy Tooley  
 Deputy Gollop  
 Deputy Parkinson  
 Deputy Lester Queripel  
 Deputy Le Clerc  
 Deputy Leadbeater  
 Deputy Mooney  
 Deputy Trott  
 Deputy Le Pelley  
 Deputy Merrett  
 Deputy St Pier  
 Deputy Stephens  
 Deputy Meerveld  
 Deputy Fallaize  
 Deputy Inder  
 Deputy Lowe  
 Deputy Laurie Queripel  
 Deputy Smithies  
 Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I declare Propositions 3 to 5 carried, by 36 votes to 1.

3280 Proposition 5A. Those Members of the States who wish to be recorded as voting Contre please stand in your places. We have got Deputy Smithies, Deputy Prow, Deputy Mooney and Deputy de Lisle. Do any Members wish to abstain on Proposition 5A?

*Carried – Pour 33, Contre 4, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3*

**POUR**

Deputy Graham  
 Deputy Green  
 Deputy Paint  
 Deputy Dorey  
 Deputy Brouard  
 Deputy Dudley-Owen  
 Deputy Yerby  
 Deputy Langlois  
 Deputy Soulsby  
 Deputy de Sausmarez  
 Deputy Roffey  
 Deputy Oliver  
 Deputy Ferbrache  
 Deputy Kuttelwascher  
 Deputy Tindall  
 Deputy Brehaut  
 Deputy Tooley  
 Deputy Gollop  
 Deputy Parkinson  
 Deputy Lester Queripel  
 Deputy Le Clerc  
 Deputy Leadbeater  
 Deputy Trott  
 Deputy Le Pelley  
 Deputy Merrett  
 Deputy St Pier  
 Deputy Stephens

**CONTRE**

Deputy de Lisle  
 Deputy Prow  
 Deputy Mooney  
 Deputy Smithies

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
 Alderney Rep. Jean  
 Alderney Rep. McKinley

Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I declare Proposition 5A carried, therefore, by 33 votes to 4.  
Proposition 6, *aux voix*? Those in –

3285 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Recorded vote, please, sir.

**A Member:** 5B to 5C?

3290 **The Deputy Bailiff:** There are no 5Bs and Cs. Members of the States, just to be clear, Proposition 6 is the next Proposition to be put to you. Once again I will adopt the same approach. Those who wish to be recorded as voting against, please stand in their places. Does anyone wish to be recorded as abstaining, as *Je ne vote pas*?

*Carried – Pour 37, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3*

**POUR**

Deputy Graham  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Yerby  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Tindall  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Tooley  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Mooney  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy Merrett  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Stephens  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Smithies  
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

**CONTRE**

None

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. McKinley

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, I will declare that carried unanimously, 37 to 0.

3295 Proposition 7, those, once again, who want to be recorded as voting against Proposition 7, please stand in your places. That is Deputy Paint, Deputy Lester Queripel, Deputy de Lisle, Deputy Leadbeater, Deputy Merrett and Deputy Gollop. Does anyone wish to be recorded as abstaining on Proposition 7?

*Carried – Pour 31, Contre 6, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3*

**POUR**

Deputy Graham  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Yerby  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Tindall  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Tooley  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Mooney  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Stephens  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Smithies  
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

**CONTRE**

Deputy Paint  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Merrett

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. McKinley

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I declare Proposition 7 duly carried. I think that was 31: 6.

3300 Turning over, Proposition 8, once again those who wish to be recorded as opposing it, please stand in your places. So on Proposition 8, we have got Deputy Paint, Deputy Inder, Deputy Laurie Queripel, Deputy Lester Queripel, Deputy Leadbeater, Deputy de Lisle, Deputy Merrett and Deputy Gollop. Does anyone want to be recorded as abstaining? Deputy Oliver.

*Carried – Pour 28, Contre 8, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3*

**POUR**

Deputy Graham  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Yerby  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Kuttelwascher

**CONTRE**

Deputy Paint  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Merrett  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Laurie Queripel

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Oliver

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. McKinley

Deputy Tindall  
 Deputy Brehaut  
 Deputy Tooley  
 Deputy Parkinson  
 Deputy Le Clerc  
 Deputy Mooney  
 Deputy Trott  
 Deputy Le Pelley  
 Deputy St Pier  
 Deputy Stephens  
 Deputy Meerveld  
 Deputy Fallaize  
 Deputy Lowe  
 Deputy Smithies  
 Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

**The Deputy Bailiff:** So I declare Proposition 8 carried by 28 votes to 8 against, with one abstention.

3305      Proposition 9. Who wishes to be recorded as voting Contre in respect of Proposition 9? Similar group, Deputy Paint, Deputy Oliver, Deputy Inder, Deputy Laurie Queripel, Deputy Lester Queripel, Deputy Leadbeater, Deputy de Lisle, Deputy Dudley-Owen, Deputy Merrett and Deputy Gollop. Does any Member wish to abstain in respect of Proposition 9?

*Carried – Pour 27, Contre 10, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3*

**POUR**

Deputy Graham  
 Deputy Green  
 Deputy Dorey  
 Deputy Brouard  
 Deputy Yerby  
 Deputy Langlois  
 Deputy Soulsby  
 Deputy de Sausmarez  
 Deputy Roffey  
 Deputy Prow  
 Deputy Ferbrache  
 Deputy Kuttelwascher  
 Deputy Tindall  
 Deputy Brehaut  
 Deputy Tooley  
 Deputy Parkinson  
 Deputy Le Clerc  
 Deputy Mooney  
 Deputy Trott  
 Deputy Le Pelley  
 Deputy St Pier  
 Deputy Stephens  
 Deputy Meerveld  
 Deputy Fallaize  
 Deputy Lowe  
 Deputy Smithies  
 Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

**CONTRE**

Deputy Paint  
 Deputy Dudley-Owen  
 Deputy de Lisle  
 Deputy Oliver  
 Deputy Gollop  
 Deputy Lester Queripel  
 Deputy Leadbeater  
 Deputy Merrett  
 Deputy Inder  
 Deputy Laurie Queripel

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
 Alderney Rep. Jean  
 Alderney Rep. McKinley

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I declare Proposition 9 carried by 27 votes, therefore, in favour to 10 against.

3310

Can we take Propositions 10, 11, 11A, 12 and 12A together? Aux voix. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*



**The Deputy Bailiff:** I therefore declare Propositions 10 to 12A duly carried.

3315

Proposition 13, the policy plan of the Policy & Resources Committee, does anyone wish to oppose Proposition 13? Deputy Laurie Queripel, Deputy Tindall, Deputy Lester Queripel and Deputy Merrett. Does anyone wish to be recorded as abstaining in respect of Proposition 13? Deputy Oliver, Deputy Leadbeater and Deputy Dudley-Owen.

*Carried – Pour 30, Contre 4, Ne vote pas 3, Absent 3*

**POUR**

Deputy Graham  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Yerby  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Tooley  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Mooney  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Stephens  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Smithies  
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

**CONTRE**

Deputy Tindall  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Merrett  
Deputy Laurie Queripel

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Leadbeater

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. McKinley

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Therefore, I will declare Proposition 13 carried by 30 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

3320

Proposition 14 is the policy plan of the Committee for Economic Development. Once again those who wish to be recorded as opposing it, please stand in your places. Deputy Laurie Queripel, Deputy Tindall, Deputy Lester Queripel. Does anyone wish to be recorded as abstaining on the Committee for Economic Development's policy plan? Deputy Leadbeater.

*Carried – Pour 33, Contre 3, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 3*

**POUR**

Deputy Graham  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Yerby  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy de Sausmarez

**CONTRE**

Deputy Tindall  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Laurie Queripel

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Leadbeater

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. McKinley

Deputy Roffey  
 Deputy Prow  
 Deputy Oliver  
 Deputy Ferbrache  
 Deputy Kuttelwascher  
 Deputy Brehaut  
 Deputy Tooley  
 Deputy Gollop  
 Deputy Parkinson  
 Deputy Le Clerc  
 Deputy Mooney  
 Deputy Trott  
 Deputy Le Pelley  
 Deputy Merrett  
 Deputy St Pier  
 Deputy Stephens  
 Deputy Meerveld  
 Deputy Fallaize  
 Deputy Inder  
 Deputy Lowe  
 Deputy Smithies  
 Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I therefore record that as carried by 33 votes to 3, with one abstention.

3325 Proposition 15, which has been amended, policy plan for the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture. Once again, please can those who wish to oppose it stand in their places. I have got Deputy Laurie Queripel, Deputy Tindall, Deputy Lester Queripel, Deputy Merrett. Does anyone wish to be recorded as abstaining? Deputy Leadbeater.

*Carried – Pour 31, Contre 4, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 4*

**POUR**

Deputy Graham  
 Deputy Green  
 Deputy Paint  
 Deputy Dorey  
 Deputy Brouard  
 Deputy Dudley-Owen  
 Deputy Yerby  
 Deputy de Lisle  
 Deputy Langlois  
 Deputy Soulsby  
 Deputy de Sausmarez  
 Deputy Roffey  
 Deputy Prow  
 Deputy Oliver  
 Deputy Ferbrache  
 Deputy Kuttelwascher  
 Deputy Brehaut  
 Deputy Tooley  
 Deputy Gollop  
 Deputy Parkinson  
 Deputy Le Clerc  
 Deputy Mooney  
 Deputy Trott  
 Deputy Le Pelley  
 Deputy St Pier  
 Deputy Stephens  
 Deputy Meerveld  
 Deputy Fallaize  
 Deputy Inder  
 Deputy Smithies  
 Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

**CONTRE**

Deputy Tindall  
 Deputy Lester Queripel  
 Deputy Merrett  
 Deputy Laurie Queripel

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Leadbeater

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
 Alderney Rep. Jean  
 Alderney Rep. McKinley  
 Deputy Lowe

3330 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I will record that as being a vote in favour of carrying Proposition 15 by 31 votes to 4, with one abstention. The reason for the change in numbers is that one Member has now had to leave.

Proposition 15A, Deputy Lester Queripel you asked for this to be a recorded vote, didn't you?

3335 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** I did, sir, yes, please.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Very well. We will follow the same process. Will those who wish to oppose Proposition 15A stand in their places please. Deputy Tindall. Does anyone wish to be recorded as abstaining on Proposition 15A? Deputy Gollop.

*Carried – Pour 34, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 4*

<b>POUR</b>	<b>CONTRE</b>	<b>NE VOTE PAS</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Deputy Graham	Deputy Tindall	Deputy Gollop	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Green			Alderney Rep. Jean
Deputy Paint			Alderney Rep. McKinley
Deputy Dorey			Deputy Lowe
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Dudley-Owen			
Deputy Yerby			
Deputy de Lisle			
Deputy Langlois			
Deputy Soulsby			
Deputy de Sausmarez			
Deputy Roffey			
Deputy Prow			
Deputy Oliver			
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Kuttelwascher			
Deputy Brehaut			
Deputy Tooley			
Deputy Parkinson			
Deputy Lester Queripel			
Deputy Le Clerc			
Deputy Leadbeater			
Deputy Mooney			
Deputy Trott			
Deputy Le Pelley			
Deputy Merrett			
Deputy St Pier			
Deputy Stephens			
Deputy Meerveld			
Deputy Fallaize			
Deputy Inder			
Deputy Laurie Queripel			
Deputy Smithies			
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel			

3340 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Therefore, I will record that as being carried by 34 votes to 1, with one abstention.

3345 Proposition 16 is the policy plan of the Committee for Employment & Social Security, with the amendment that has been made. Once again those who wish to vote against Proposition 16, please stand in your places. I have got Deputy Laurie Queripel, Deputy Tindall, Deputy Lester Queripel and Deputy Merrett. Does anyone wish to be recorded as abstaining? Deputy Green, Deputy Leadbeater, Deputy Dudley-Owen.

*Carried – Pour 29, Contre 4, Ne vote pas 4, Absent 4*

**POUR**

Deputy Graham  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Yerby  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Tooley  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Mooney  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Stephens  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Smithies  
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

**CONTRE**

Deputy Tindall  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Merrett  
Deputy Laurie Queripel

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Green  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Leadbeater

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. McKinley  
Deputy Lowe

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Proposition 16 is therefore carried by 29 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

Proposition 17 is the policy plan for the Committee for Environment & Infrastructure. Once again, will those Members who wish to oppose it please stand in their places. Deputy Paint, Deputy Laurie Queripel, Deputy Tindall, Deputy Lester Queripel, Deputy Merrett. Those who wish to be recorded as abstaining? Deputy Inder, Deputy Leadbeater and Deputy Dudley-Owen.

3350

*Carried – Pour 28, Contre 5, Ne vote pas 3, Absent 4*

**POUR**

Deputy Graham  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Yerby  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Tooley  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Mooney  
Deputy Trott

**CONTRE**

Deputy Paint  
Deputy Tindall  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Merrett  
Deputy Laurie Queripel

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Inder

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. McKinley  
Deputy Lowe

Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Stephens  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Smithies  
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Therefore, I will record the vote in respect of Proposition 17 as being 28 in favour, 5 against, with 3 abstentions.

3355 Proposition 18 is the policy plan for the Committee for Health & Social Care. Once again, will those who wish to be recorded as voting Contre stand in their places. Deputy Laurie Queripel, Deputy Tindall, Deputy Lester Queripel, Deputy Merrett. Thank you all very much, and those who wish to be recorded as abstaining? Deputy Leadbeater, Deputy Dudley-Owen.

*Carried – Pour 30, Contre 4, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 4*

**POUR**

Deputy Graham  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Yerby  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Tooley  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Mooney  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Stephens  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Smithies  
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

**CONTRE**

Deputy Tindall  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Merrett  
Deputy Laurie Queripel

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Leadbeater

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. McKinley  
Deputy Lowe

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Therefore that will be recorded as carried by 30 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

3360 Proposition 19, policy plan for the Committee for Home Affairs. Those who are wishing to be recorded as voting against, please stand in your places. Deputy Laurie Queripel, Deputy Tindall, Deputy Lester Queripel and Deputy Merrett. Those who wish to be recorded as abstaining? Of course, Deputy Dudley-Owen.

*Carried – Pour 31, Contre 4, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 4*

**POUR**

Deputy Graham  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Yerby  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Tooley  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Mooney  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Stephens  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Smithies  
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

**CONTRE**

Deputy Tindall  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Merrett  
Deputy Laurie Queripel

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Dudley-Owen

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. McKinley  
Deputy Lowe

3365 **The Deputy Bailiff:** So, that is Proposition 19 duly carried by 31 votes to 4, with 1 abstention. Propositions 20, 20A, 20B, 20C and 21, I propose to put to you aux voix. Those in favour, those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I declare all five Propositions duly carried.

3370 As far as I can work out, Members of the States, that means that all 31 Propositions have been carried, some with some opposition, some without.

Members of the States, that concludes the business for this meeting.

Can I beg your indulgence briefly, for a few words of my own, to thank you all for the way that you have conducted yourselves during the course of this debate. It has been a half marathon, rather than a sprint

3375 The reason for referring to that is to be able to announce that Louise Perrio and Lee Merrien have both won gold medals (**Members:** Hurray!) (*Applause*) in the half marathon at the Island Games. These are some of the last events where the medal winners are being recorded. It does mean that the gap to Jersey is closing, but it has not yet resulted in Guernsey coming in front of Jersey.

3380 I have had open in front of me for most of these last four days the Future Guernsey Policy & Resource Plan Phase One. At page 6 of that it has the strap line Great Today, Better tomorrow. It has been great each day, it will be better tomorrow (*Laughter and applause*) for a good number of people.

Deputy Gollop.

3385

**Deputy Gollop:** Sir, in thanking you, I am standing in for Deputy Lowe who has had to go maybe to watch the Island Games, I am not sure, but we very much, I think I speak on behalf of her and all of us, thank you, from us longer serving and even shorter serving Deputies. You have handled us extremely excellently, and in the words of Deputy Lowe, superbly.

3390 You have been a considerate referee, at times rye and sardonic, at times a coach and a mentor, seeing us through the epic pentathlon, if that is the right phrase, of the last few days. I wish you, sir, your family, indeed every Member, any chance of summer holidays, when we get round to the presentations and Committee meetings, but I am sure most of us will not be going to darkest Peru, unlike Paddington. *(Laughter and applause)*

3395

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you very much, Deputy Gollop.

Can I echo that by wishing you all a restful summer. Do try and get a break and come back refreshed for the next ordinary meeting on 6th September.

We will now close the meeting please, Deputy Greffier.

*The Assembly adjourned at 5.11 p.m.*