



**OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF THE**

**STATES OF DELIBERATION**

**OF THE**

**ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

**HANSARD**

**Royal Court House, Guernsey, Tuesday, 25th June 2019**

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

**Volume 8, No. 15**

**ISSN 2049-8284**

*Published by Her Majesty's Greffier, The Royal Court House,  
St Peter Port, GY1 2NZ. © States of Guernsey, 2019*

**Present:**

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

**Law Officers**

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Procureur)

**People's Deputies**

**St Peter Port South**

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

**St Peter Port North**

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

**St Sampson**

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

**The Vale**

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

**The Castel**

Deputies C. J. Green, B. J. E. Paint, M. H. Dorey

**The West**

Deputies E. A. Yerby, D. de G. de Lisle, S. L. Langlois

**The South-East**

Deputies H. J. R. Soulsby, H. L. de Sausmarez, R. G. Prow

**Representatives of the Island of Alderney**

**The Clerk to the States of Deliberation**

C. Foster (H.M. Deputy Greffier)

**Absent at the Evocation**

R. M. Titterington, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller); Deputy P. J. Roffey (absent); Deputies V. S. Oliver, J. I. Mooney, R. H. Graham L.V.O, M. B. E (indisposé); Deputy A. H. Brouard (relevé à 9.33 a.m.), Deputy M. J. Fallaize (relevé à 9.46. a.m.), Alderney Representatives A. Snowdon and S. Roberts (relevé à 9.59 a.m.), Deputies L. S. Trott and J P. Le Tocq (absent d'Ile) (relevé à 10.12 a.m.), A. C. Dudley-Owen (relevé à 10.17 a.m.)

## Business transacted

Evocation .....	1117
Convocation .....	1117
<b>Billet d'État IX .....</b>	<b>1117</b>
Policy & Resources Committee .....	1117
I. The Policy & Resource Plan – 2018 Review and 2019 Update – Debate commenced.....	1117
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.37 p.m. and resumed at 2.31 p.m. ....</i>	<i>1162</i>
The Policy & Resource Plan – 2018 Review and 2019 Update – Debate continued .....	1162
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.31 p.m. ....</i>	<i>1206</i>

*PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK*

# States of Deliberation

*The States met at 9.30 a.m.*

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

## **PRAYERS**

*The Greffier*

## **EVOCATION**

## **CONVOCATION**

**The Deputy Greffier:** Billet d'État IX and XI. To the Members of the States of the Island of Guernsey, I hereby give notice that a Meeting of the States of Deliberation will be held in the Royal Courthouse on Tuesday, 25th June 2019 at 9.30 a.m. to consider the items listed in this Billet d'État, which have been submitted for debate.

# Billet d'État IX

## **POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

### **I. The Policy & Resource Plan – 2018 Review and 2019 Update – Debate commenced**

*Article I.*

*The States are asked to decide:*

*Whether, after consideration of the Policy & Resource Plan (2018 Review and 2019 Update) Policy Letter dated 20th May 2019 they are of the opinion:*

*1. To direct:*

*a) the Policy & Resources Committee to redraft the Policy & Resource Plan to reflect the revised policy objectives as set out in Appendix 1 to the Policy Letter:*

*a. 'Access to Secondary Pensions' in place of 'Social Welfare';*

*b. 'Housing Strategy' in place of 'Housing Supply Policy';*

*c. 'Meeting Guernsey's Energy Needs' in place of 'Energy Policy';*

*d. 'The Future Model of Care' to include 'Partnership of Purpose', 'Health and Wellbeing' and 'Regulation and Support Policy'; and*

*e. to introduce the priority policy area 'Mitigate climate change';*

b) the Policy & Resources Committee to design, in discussion with Committees, political 'policy supervisory boards' with political Members who are authorised to discharge relevant functions of those Committees under Section 2 of the States (Reform) (Guernsey) Law, 2015, within the context of specific policy objectives resolved by the States;

c) the Committee for Health & Social Care to undertake expeditiously all work associated with revisions and amendments to the Children (Guernsey & Alderney) Law, 2008;

d) the Policy & Resources Committee and the Committee for Home Affairs working in partnership to deliver the Justice Policy and, together with the Committee for Health & Social Care and the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, to expedite work that removes delay from systems and processes relating to the delivery of services to children and young people in need, and to ensure that such systems and processes are centred on the best interests of the child or young person concerned;

e) the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure to develop a climate change policy and a 'Climate Change Action Plan' in a policy letter no later than May 2020;

f) that all Committees of the States of Deliberation ensure that, when delivering or overseeing the delivery of their operational functions, they reasonably assess, and where practicable address, the consequential impact on climate change of their actions;

g) that all Committees of the States of Deliberation when laying policy letters before the Assembly should assess therein any consequential impact on climate change of their proposals together with, where appropriate, their adaptation and mitigation actions;

h) the Policy & Resources Committee to review and assess the impact of current initiatives contributing to States of Guernsey's response to in-work poverty, bringing an update in the Policy & Resources (Future Guernsey) policy letter in May 2020;

i) the Policy & Resources Committee, working with the third sector, to undertake preparatory investigations of policies successful in breaking poverty, with a specific focus on generational focus.

2. To amend the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees as follows:

(a) by substituting paragraph (1) of Rule 23 with the following paragraph:

'1) Committees of the States must contribute to the formulation and, once agreed by the States, the application of the States' Policy & Resource Plan to be known as 'The Future Guernsey Plan.';

(b) by substituting throughout Rule 23 'The Policy & Resource Plan' with 'The Future Guernsey Plan';

(c) by substituting paragraph (3) of Rule 23 with the following paragraph:

'3) The Future Guernsey Plan shall be formulated according to the following timetable and in conformity with the following actions from 2020 and in every year thereafter in which a term of the States comes to an end:

'(a) March / April – all Committees shall produce a handover report to apprise their successors of what are considered to be the main policy and operational challenges facing the Committee in the next term outside the priority areas of the current Plan.

'Committees may also use this report to identify important policy issues and extant resolutions that Committees either did not complete or could not prioritise during the term, but which they believe should be considered in the forthcoming term by their successor Committees. Reports will be transmitted to the Policy & Resources Committee and published as an appendix to its policy letter;

'(b) At the last meeting of the States of Deliberation before a General Election of People's Deputies, the Policy & Resources Committee shall lay a policy letter setting out or including:

'a. High level commentary on the Future Guernsey Plan;

'b. Progress against extant States' Resolutions which remain outstanding;

'c. An order of priority for the drafting of significant items of legislation for the year ahead; and

*'d. The handover reports transmitted to it under the preceding sub-paragraph.'*

*(d) by substituting paragraph (4) of Rule 23 with the following paragraph:*

*'(4) Future Guernsey Plan Phase 1*

*'(a) July-October – the new Policy & Resources Committee develops a statement of policy objectives for the medium term (four years) in connection with issues of strategic importance to the Island and the overall policy objectives for the long term established in the Future Guernsey Plan (2018-38), with recommendations for the areas of focus e.g. fiscal and economic affairs, social affairs, the environment, population and external relations;*

*'(b) November – the States debate and resolve their overall policy objectives and areas of focus for the political term.'*

*(e) by substituting paragraph (5) of Rule 23 with the following paragraph:*

*'(5) Future Guernsey Plan Phase 2*

*'(a) Each Principal Committee develops its own four year Medium Term Committee Policy Plan setting out its contribution to the development and implementation of the priorities of the States as established by the Assembly through the Future Guernsey Plan; its other policy priorities for the political term to fulfil its purpose as set out in its mandate; and action required to discharge extant resolutions;*

*'(b) The Policy & Resources Committee develops a Medium Term Financial Plan for the States which sets out a fiscal plan covering the medium term designed to ensure the finances of the States can support the delivery of the outcomes set out in the Future Guernsey Plan and provide a framework for budget setting over the period;*

*'(c) Alongside the work described in the preceding sub-paragraph, the Policy & Resources Committee works with Principal Committees to embed governance arrangements for political supervisory boards, with political members who are authorised to discharge relevant Committee functions under section 2 of the States (Reform) (Guernsey) Law, 2015, providing political oversight to 'areas of focus' identified in the Future Guernsey Plan;*

*'(d) The States debate and make resolutions on work streams in their 'areas of focus' (sub-paragraph (4b) refers) to meet and prioritise their strategic objectives and ultimately finalise the content of the Future Guernsey Plan Phase 1 and Phase 2 which will inform the Budget debate;*

*'(e) Every 12 months the Policy & Resources Committee submits to the States a commentary on overall progress on delivery of the Future Guernsey Plan including annual performance reports from the political supervisory boards referred to in sub-paragraph (c) and any proposals to amend the Future Guernsey Plan which are considered necessary; and*

*'(f) The Policy & Resources Committee:*

*'(i) advises the States in its annual update on the Future Guernsey Plan on progress against extant States' Resolutions which remain outstanding; an*

*'(ii) lays before the States an order of priority for the drafting of significant items of legislation for the year ahead."*

*(f) by inserting paragraph (6) in Rule 23:*

*'(6) Notwithstanding the foregoing, a special Meeting of the States shall be convened on Tuesday 5th May 2020 to consider the [Policy & Resource Plan]/[Future Guernsey Plan].'*

*3. To rescind or transfer accountability for the resolutions of the States of Deliberation as set out in Appendix 5 of the 'Policy & Resource Plan (2018 Review and 2019 Update) Policy Letter dated 20th May 2019'.*

5 **The Deputy Greffier:** Article I, Policy & Resource Plan – 2018 Review and 2019 update.

**The Bailiff:** Good morning to you all, Members of the States.  
Deputy Brouard, do you wish to be relevé?

**Deputy Brouard:** Yes, sir, thank you very much.

**The Bailiff:** Before anyone asks, should the temperature in here rise today those who wish to do so may remove their jackets.

Because this is a special meeting of the States, of course, there will be no statements or questions. We will go straight into the first item and I call Deputy St Pier.

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

I should perhaps just start by explaining that this Policy & Resource Plan obviously is an important policy letter for the Policy & Resources Committee. The absence of two Committee Members, Deputies Trott and Le Tocq is simply because they are returning from London from States' business last night, so hopefully they will join us later this morning, weather permitting.

The Assembly of course established the Policy & Resource Plan to be ambitious in its objectives and with long-term horizons and much of the policy work required to achieve the Plan's objectives will need time to implement and deliver. The Policy & Resources Committee is mandated to oversee a policy planning process that ensures its success. It is investing time, energy and, I would suggest, political capital, in doing just that, aiming to achieve a situation where there is greater alignment between extant Resolutions in the Plan and ensuring that Propositions are laid only when they can be reasonably delivered, should the States resolve to support them. So focus, this is important.

Ambition is healthy but we must ensure we tackle policy development that we can complete in one political term to maximise our impact as an Assembly. For all Committees, balancing the resourcing of Policy & Resource Plan work, the discharging of extant Resolutions and supporting operational policy development in a consistent and timely fashion is, I would suggest, challenging and we must be cognisant that the same human resource, in many cases, is working to support policy development, discharge Resolutions of the Assembly, and secure public service reform.

The expenditure pressures being experienced in 2019 are expected to continue in 2020. The Policy & Resources Committee has already completed a round of meetings with all Committees as part of the 2020 Budget preparation process and it is clear these pressures are likely to increase as Committees seek additional funding in order to deliver on the Policy & Resource Plan priorities.

There is also a risk around delivery of the savings as firm and detailed plans are not yet in place for each of the initiatives. The role of the Policy & Resources Committee is to try and find a reasonable balance between revenue-raising at a level which the community and the economy can bear and providing funding for delivery of an appropriate level of public services.

This is a difficult balance but the funding necessary to invest in development of services can only be provided in one of three ways: from reducing the cost of existing services, or by ceasing to provide services which are no longer required or considered not to be priorities, or by raising additional income through increased taxation, which takes money from Islanders and out of the economy. There are no easy choices.

Priority setting and resourcing. This is important. Rightly, the Assembly has also invested heavily in its Plan, directly through debate such as today and indirectly through Committee and officer time. The policy letter before us today transparently provides our community with enhanced annual reporting on this investment of time and energy, providing greater clarity in the progress the States is making on our priorities, identifying where progress has been more cautious, that the building blocks have been put in place and where progress has been limited. This information has been available, it must be accessible, it must be able to readily inform debate and assist us with prioritising pipeline work for the next iteration of the Plan.

The Committee has taken every opportunity over this political term to stress that the Policy & Resource Plan belongs to the States of Deliberation. It was created by the whole Assembly. It is



not our Committee's Plan. But there is often confusion. The subtlety of no 's' on 'Resource' just does not do the job.

60 So on the gov.gg websites we set out the Future Guernsey Plan; that is an accessible title for our community, not to be easily confused with either a policy letter or a Committee of the States. Here, with limited keystrokes, tiles swiftly direct the user to a single source of accurate information on our priorities, maintained by those working in these areas. Accessibility, transparency and accountability will be further enhanced by the end of the year with regular updates on the progress in drafting legislation and discharging Resolutions, increasing the Assembly's  
65 accountability to the community even further. Accessibility, transparency and accountability: this is important.

Our community will understand in real time how we are completing policy development and moving to implementation. In the last 12 months this has included Brexit planning and legislation,  
70 the extension of Guernsey's territorial seas, progressing the extension of the UK's membership of the World Trade Organisation to Guernsey, the States of Guernsey Economic Development Strategy, the proposals to modernise Princess Elizabeth Hospital, transport connectivity and contingency planning, the submission of the UK for the extension of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Carers' Action Plan and the review of the Marriage Law.

75 A considerable number of pieces of legislation have also been passed by the States in this term and, with the most recent Brexit-related work now achieved, greater progress can, we hope, be made on other areas of legislation. Progress reporting and monitoring impact: this too is important.

Last year's update advised that more cross-committee work was being undertaken and that  
80 approach has continued. The Policy & Resources Committee's view is that this is an important and positive development but that it needs to be supported through appropriate governance and administrative structures. If the States' strategic direction is truly the priority of the Assembly then the Future Guernsey Plan is sovereign. A consistent and formalised approach is critical in delivering the States' agreed priorities apace and will facilitate the sharing of resources and  
85 expertise. The Assembly is asked to reflect on that during this debate.

The Committee has also taken this opportunity to set out its proposed approach in relation to the transition of the Plan into the next States' term, following the 2020 General Election. The transition requires the new political body to accept that it will achieve a four-year span of influence, driving the priorities and direction of policy development towards the overall 20-year  
90 objective. A process in governance: that too is important.

The first iteration of the Plan is drawing to its close. This Assembly has one last chance to influence the allocation of policy resources. Drawing from extant Resolutions and Committee policy plans, the Committee is recommending that pipeline work begin for future high-level priorities of the States. The Assembly resolved that in the absence of a dedicated programme  
95 focusing on in-work poverty, the Policy & Resources Committee would review and report on work streams and measures in the Policy & Resource Plan and would bring forward any recommendations that it determined may be required.

It is also recommending that policy development to break the generational pattern, to lift people out of relative poverty, is the next phase for this Assembly to consider. This could be  
100 achieved for this area of policy by working with the third sector. The Guernsey Community Foundation intends to commission research on poverty in Guernsey; focusing this research on policies which have proven to be successful in breaking generational poverty will assist with identifying any actions that may usefully be undertaken by the third sector, taking into consideration the impact of existing policies and strategies of the States of Guernsey.

105 The Assembly will also have an opportunity later this year to contribute positively to the global response to climate change and shift to decarbonisation, when considering the Committee *for the* Environment & Infrastructure's Energy policy letter. Not only does Guernsey contribute to global

110 climate change but, as an Island state, it is already feeling the impacts of climate change. We are  
seeing rising sea levels in the Channel Islands and experiencing more volatile and violent weather  
patterns, stronger storms, greater frequency of storm damage, flooding, hotter summers and  
milder winters.

The need for urgent and meaningful action on climate change is widely recognised. As a  
mature and responsible jurisdiction, we are alive to the pressing need to minimise our carbon  
emissions and reduce our environmental impact. Government must continue to reduce Guernsey's  
115 contribution to global climate change through the policies it develops and the services it delivers.

It has made a good start with many factors relating to climate change included in existing work  
streams, such as energy policy, the Hydrocarbon Supply Programme, renewables, the Integrated  
Transport Strategy, the Waste Strategy, the Biodiversity Strategy and the long-term Infrastructure  
Investment Plan.

120 In addition, Guernsey Finance and the Guernsey Financial Services Commission are developing  
a Green Finance Offer that combines Guernsey's finance sector experience with our desire to be  
part of the global fight against climate change. This has led Guernsey to registering the world's  
first regulated Green Fund and to joining the International Network of Financial Centres for  
Sustainability.

125 However, there is a need to ensure the different strands are co-ordinated, the cumulative  
impact is effective and to include any relevant factors that fall outside that existing work. Indeed  
there are other areas of work that should not be overlooked in this area of policy, such as  
Guernsey's commitment to the blue economy, in its Economic Development Strategy, and the  
potential of the Overseas Aid and Development Commission to support global sustainability  
130 goals.

The Committee *for the Environment & Infrastructure* has already undertaken preparatory work  
in developing a more unified climate change policy and commencing a Climate Change Action  
Plan. The Assembly can then decide how to prioritise further activity when presented with a  
suitable programme of work, with resources identified and objectives defined.

135 This is how the Future Guernsey Plan should be developed, giving visibility to the work within  
an area of focus, like in-work poverty and mitigating climate change, so that they can be  
prioritised against each other when competing for the same limited resource. The Assembly will  
want to recognise the severity of climate change now and to continue to shift the culture and  
expectations of the community. The Policy & Resources Committee therefore recommends, as an  
140 immediate action, that all policy matters brought to the Assembly should address their  
consequential impact on the environment. This reinstates previous practice lost under the  
cessation of the States' Strategic Plan, established in 2009, and changes to the Rules of Procedure  
in 2016.

145 It will serve no one's interest for there to be virtue-signalling declarations of intent alone to  
salve consciences as a substitute for action. Whilst recognising that the Assembly continues to be  
busy, some of its current priorities are moving nearer conclusion and it is appropriate to  
recommend that it formally acknowledge the requirement for climate change planning in the  
Future Guernsey Plan.

150 If the Island is to respond responsibly to the existential crisis that is climate change, it must  
plan to do so and prioritise the allocation of its resources accordingly. The Future Guernsey Plan  
gives the Assembly that opportunity. Continuous improvement and ambition for Guernsey, sir,  
that is important too.

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

155 **Deputy Fallaize:** Yes please, thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** We have a number of amendments. We will start with amendment number 1, to be proposed by Deputy Merrett and seconded by Deputy Green.

Deputy Merrett.

160

**Deputy Merrett:** Could I have the amendment read please, sir?

*The Deputy Greffier read out the amendment.*

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Merrett.

*Amendment 1:*

*1. At the end of Proposition 1(h), to add:*

*‘ in consultation with the Committee for Employment & Social Security, the Committee for Health & Social Care, and other stakeholders, and focusing especially on the work being done to address: (i) benefit rates and tax levels; (ii) affordability of housing; and (iii) affordability of primary health care and emergency health care;’.*

*2. In Proposition 1(i): a. after ‘Policy & Resources Committee’, to add ‘guided by existing States’ Resolutions on in-work poverty and’; b. after ‘working with’, to add ‘the Committee for Employment and Social Security, other States Committees and’.*

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

I hope that the explanatory note assisted Members and I am grateful that Policy & Resources Committee will not be opposing this amendment. Very simply, sir, what this amendment does in 1(h) is retain the focus on the areas already agreed by the States as being of high priority, namely the affordability of primary and emergency health care, affordability of housing and the way in which taxation and benefits can address in-work poverty.

It is important that the States retains focus on these pre-identified, prioritised areas for action until meaningful progress has been made in addressing them. When we deliberated, debated and decided the Scrutiny Management Committee In-work Poverty Review Report in January of this year, the successful amendment, as submitted by Policy & Resources, explicitly stated that the future reporting should focus on these areas. Amendment 1(h) reiterates that Resolution.

For the avoidance of doubt that P&R needs to work with the Committee for Employment & Social Security and other States’ Committees when it engages with the third sector, the Committee for Employment & Social Security is clearly mandated to substantially consider in-work poverty, and this amendment makes explicit that that Committee must be engaged and must be working with P&R and the third sector in undertaking a preparatory investigation into policies with the aim to successfully break any poverty circle or poverty trap that families may find themselves in. P&R have turned it into a specific focus on generational focus. I am not sure how this has been determined and why that would be the focus, so I am hopeful that a further explanation will be forthcoming in due course, meaning how it has been concluded this area needs specific focus in more detail.

I appreciate in appendix 2 it states that P&R believes focusing on generational patterns will lift people out of relative poverty, but I am unsure as to how they have determined this without doing the preparatory work. After all, we would hope and wish that they would be as objective as possible and as open-minded as possible when undertaking initial investigations.

I am grateful to Deputy Green for seconding this amendment and for the support of Deputy Laurie Queripel, two of the three political musketeers on the Scrutiny Management Committee. Members may recall, sir, that I took Deputy Roffey’s seat on the Scrutiny Management Committee after he resigned and therefore I came in towards the end of this important work that the Scrutiny Management Committee Panel was doing in this area.

195 I have previously thanked Deputy Tooley for being on the panel and I thank her again today.  
But my fellow musketeers and I are determined that the valuable time and resource that the  
Scrutiny Management Committee used in investigating, deliberating and determining the Scrutiny  
Management Committee In-work Poverty Report and the subsequent policy paper should not be  
simply put on a shelf, parked or left until we are confident that meaningful progress has indeed  
been made. Only when we see that these areas are pre-identified and the States' agreed direction  
of travel has been achieved, will we rest and lay down our foils; although maybe I am more suited  
200 to a sabre, rather than a foil or an *épée*.

The update before us today in appendix 2 clearly states that the work streams are ongoing,  
sir – they are *ongoing*. On page 15, in 3.15, P&R advise us that they will bring a final update to the  
Assembly in the P&R Plan policy paper in May 2020. That is hopeful or, rather, I am hopeful that  
205 may be the final update as by that date meaningful progress has actually been achieved.

In my opinion for the Assembly to deliberate, determine and decide. I thank the Committees  
for Health & Social Care and Employment & Social Security for their continued hard work in this  
important area and I am looking forward to seeing the labours of their hard work in due course. I  
urge all Members to support this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

210

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

**Deputy Green:** Yes, sir.

215 **The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier, do you wish to speak at this point?

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, very briefly just to advise Deputy Merrett and indeed the Assembly not  
only will the Policy & Resources not oppose this amendment but they will support it.

220 **The Bailiff:** Is there any debate? Deputy Le Clerc.

**Deputy Le Clerc:** Sir, I would just like to say that I will be supporting this amendment.  
However, I do have some concerns about the resourcing concerns over the volume of work that is  
here. There is nothing in this amendment that says where the resources are going to come from  
225 and, as I have said previously in this Assembly, the resources of Employment & Social Security are  
already stretched to the limit for the remainder of this term.

However, I can advise that some of the work streams are already being undertaken so, for  
example, on the affordability of housing Employment & Social Security and Environment &  
Infrastructure have already got a housing review that they are undertaking so that work is already  
230 in train. Benefit rates and tax levels: I think that is going to be a considerable piece of work. We  
will be coming back with our annual Uprating Report but I think there is some wider work that  
needs to be looked at on that and also I would say the insurance contribution levels as well.  
Primary Health Care and Emergency Health Care: again we are looking at some of that work under  
our Family Allowance.

235 My concern is where the resources will actually come from to undertake this work in the  
timeframe. It is interesting in the Plan, up to 3.16 it talks about the In-work Poverty Review and  
then it says in 3.17:

The new Assembly should only consider prioritising any further activity when presented with a suitable programme of  
work with resources identified and objectives defined.

I think we have got objectives defined here for this old Assembly but without potentially the  
resources. So I would like some reassurances from P&R, before I commit, that the resources will

240 be put in place to assist ourselves and Health & Social Care and Environment & Infrastructure are impacted on affordable housing to get this work progressed.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Langlois, you were standing earlier, do you wish to reply?

245

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

I will not be supporting this amendment. I have never liked the term 'in-work poverty', for me it is reminiscent of the deserving poor and those kinds of concepts. Our whole income support system has evolved into an in-work benefits system; there is a work requirement. So making this distinction between in-work poverty and out-of-work poverty I think is redundant and takes us down the wrong path.

250

Poverty arises when income is insufficient to meet basic needs. That is true wherever that income happens to come from. The only difference between being in work and poor and being out of work and poor is that the Government has a couple of extra levers – basically, the tax system and the ability to legislate to ensure there is a reasonable minimum wage. Other than that there is no real difference.

255

Some of the items included in the amendment – benefit rates, affordability of housing, affordability of primary care, health care and emergency health care – they apply whether you are in work or you are out of work. I am suspicious of the concept of applying this just to in-work poverty. We should be talking about poverty, which is one of the things the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security is involved in. I do not see the necessity for dividing poverty into in-work poverty and out-of-work poverty, unless we are going to contemplate fairly radical ideas, which I am quite keen on, such as tax credits. But there does not seem to be much appetite in the States for that.

260

The amendment has got the same flaws the Scrutiny Review had, in that it somehow skips around the real problem and it is both too prescriptive and yet not focused enough. It is as if it does not really want to see the picture of poverty in Guernsey clearly. I think this amendment is going to be a distraction from the real work which is necessary in addressing inequality in the Island.

265

Thank you.

270

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Stephens.

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

275

This is a good opportunity, I think, to inform Members that proposals are being developed with the Guernsey Community Foundation for the review. Work is going on jointly drafting the terms of reference which, once agreed by P&R, would give us an opportunity to discuss with the proposers of the amendment and with the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security to get their views on those terms of reference and the way forward. I do agree with Deputy Langlois that it is really necessary to consider the causes of poverty alongside with the symptoms of poverty and I will just repeat that P&R supports this amendment.

280

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Laurie Queripel.

285

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

I just wanted to address the point raised by Deputy Le Clerc in regard to resources. It is a valid point. We know that there is not a bottomless pit of money and we know that resources are limited. But I am just getting a bit fed up of that argument because we always seem to have

290 millions of pounds to spend – many millions of pounds – on so-called transformation, reform and  
endless reviews, whether they are governance reviews or anything else, so all the money is  
slushing about it seems at the top end but hardly anything seems to come down to where we can  
do something very meaningful and very effective. I am just getting a bit fed up of that.

295 This is a P&R Plan debate, this is our chance actually to direct the resources where they are  
really needed and so this is why this amendment has come before the Assembly, Things like  
transformation, reviews and all those things, that is an abstract theme to most people out in our  
community, particularly those who are doing what we are asking them to do. They are taking  
responsibility for themselves. They are going out to work, they are contributing to our community  
economically and in many other ways, and yet they are suffering hardship. They are not getting by  
300 properly, they are going without things. That cannot be a good and acceptable thing within our  
society and within our community.

Our economy is structured – and it has been done deliberately over the years – in such a way  
that we have a high-value business sector here, we attract high-net-worth individuals to the Island  
and the idea of that, at least in part, was so that the trickledown effect could kick in and we could  
305 all share in the benefits of that kind of economy. That is clearly not happening. So that is  
something that needs to be addressed and this amendment will be a way to help us to address it,  
hopefully, in a fairly timely manner.

Thank you, sir.

310 **The Bailiff:** Sorry, just before I call the next speaker, the two Alderney Representatives have  
entered the Chamber so do you wish to be relevé?

**Alderney Representative Snowdon:** Yes, sir, thank you.

315 **Alderney Representative Roberts:** Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you.

Who wishes to go next? Somebody was standing on my left.

Deputy Soulsby.

320 **Deputy Soulsby:** I have got no problems with this amendment. I find it quite meaningless,  
really. Deputy Laurie Queripel just stood up and said 'This is an opportunity to set priority areas  
and that is where you can put your resources', but we have already got that. At Health and Social  
Care in our Policy Plan Update, we talk about exactly that: what we are doing to look at Primary  
325 Health Care and Emergency Health Care funding. We are already doing this work. So I really do  
not understand what this adds.

Fine, I am happy to accept it. I am not quite sure about the Community Foundation Review, to  
be honest, because I thought it was only a few years ago that the Community Foundation did a  
review in this area. So I do not know what the next review is going to add.

330 This is where I agree with Deputy Laurie Queripel that this is another review into something we  
already know. (**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Exactly.) We have identified these as issues at HSC. ESS  
are doing the work and, throughout this term, have been doing the work to support those on low  
incomes. We had the whole changes earlier in this term. It is not as if we are all ignoring the fact  
that there is an issue, which is why it is already in the P&R Plan. I have got no problems accepting  
335 this amendment but I do not understand quite what it adds on top of what we are already doing.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Yerby.

340 **Deputy Yerby:** Sir, before too many more of my colleagues stand up and say that they do not like this amendment or they do not see what it adds, can I just do the technical talk-through? The reason why this amendment exists is because of Propositions in the Policy & Resource Plan relating to in-work poverty. Members will remember that we debated the Scrutiny Management Committee's Report on In-work Poverty not that long ago, in January of this year. We agreed that the best way of keeping track of it was, rather than creating a new work stream we would, as  
345 Deputy Soulsby has just said, ask P&R to monitor and report on the work that different Committees are doing through the Policy & Resource Plan.

We have then seen, despite Deputy St Pier's opening speech saying we must keep focus on the things that we have already agreed to prioritise, some new Propositions from Policy & Resources saying they are going to focus on things other than the things the States has already agreed are  
350 the most important actions in relation to in-work poverty.

I agree with Deputy Langlois that a distinction between in-work poverty and poverty and inequality as a whole is unhelpful and potentially regressive. But this amendment is not creating that distinction. That was a distinction that was created as a consequence of our debate on the In-work Poverty Report. P&R's own Propositions refer to the States of Guernsey's response to in-work poverty. So that is already the ongoing focus of their reporting back.  
355

The aim of this amendment is simply to ensure that the Committees, whose mandate it touches on most closely who are delivering the work, as Deputy Soulsby and Deputy Le Clerc said, that will allow us to tackle those areas that we have already decided are of primary concern to us, are involved and consulted in that reporting back process, rather than haring off to focus on new areas which this Assembly has not agreed to be our priority.  
360

So it is about continuing to remain focused on our priorities, continuing to ensure that resources are, for example, directed towards the work that we are doing at ESS on the basket of goods, or the work that we are doing around reallocating the Family Allowance, rather than having to put them into new bits of research of policy development, because this States has suddenly said something else is a priority. I am just making sure that tracks through.  
365

If I can make one final plea to Deputy Langlois it would be to accept the amendment on the basis that it brings us back to what the States has already said it is going to do rather than adding anything into the mix; and then, if he really does not like to focus on in-work poverty as distinct from all other forms of poverty, to vote out the Proposition at the end of this debate. This amendment puts us in a better place than the original Propositions, but if he wants to get rid of those then by all means do so.  
370

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache.

375 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, I hear what Deputy Yerby says and I very much respect both generally and in particular the proposer of this amendment and her comments, and I am going to vote for it, but I am very much in the Deputies Le Clerc and Soulsby camp. I cannot see what it usefully adds.

380 Also, they are not really having regard to resources and that can be said to apply to many of these 19 amendments. The cumulative effect, 'Can we just have a bit of this, a bit of that, and a bit of that' – and I very much disagree with Deputy Laurie Queripel, 'Well, you can find resources'. Where? There is no magic level of resources. (*Interjections*)

385 I think that the Policy & Resource Plan, and I say this now, is a very good document. It talks about the need for education; it talks about the need for good health care. It talks about all the other things that we should be talking about and considering. The only way you are going to be able to provide better health care, more affordable housing, etc. is if you have a vibrant economy.

If you have a vibrant economy that creates wealth, wealth trickles down, there are more resources. But resources, as I say, and I just repeat what I said 30 seconds or so ago, you cannot magic them.

390 I would like people when they bring these proposals to the States to say what the resource requirement would be, how it is going to be managed, what the cost is, what the time factor is and how it is consistent with a Proposition that I think finds most support both in this Assembly and outside of this Assembly, which is to reduce the numbers in the Civil Service. If we are going to ask the civil servants to do more, when overwhelmingly most of them are hard-working, decent  
395 individuals, then how are we going to reduce resources?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy de Lisle.

**Deputy de Lisle:** Sir, my concern is with the taxpayer and I would like assurances that this is  
400 not going to mean the taxpayer being further burdened with more cost as already the taxpayer is being over-burdened. Already, earlier this term, £4 million a year has been added by putting together Supplementary Benefit and the Housing Benefit, putting another 800 or 900 families on Income Support. Surely enough is enough? I would need assurance on the cost factor before accepting this amendment.

405 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

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

410 Of course Deputy Ferbrache implies that we actually want fewer civil servants. Well I think Policy & Resources have told us that they plan to get rid of 200 posts – whether that means they will be outsourced to consultants or whatever we do not know. Of course, we also have needs that we want the public servants to work more effectively.

I met, as I do sometimes, I was the only one as it turned out, various members of the St Peter  
415 Port Douzaine last night and they seemed to be very much of the view, perhaps more left than they usually are, perhaps, along the lines of you work out what you want and then you raise the money to spend it, rather than the other way round, which is to have what you have and then you cut your cloth according to it.

They also very much had the view that to a certain extent Scrutiny had been under-resourced  
420 in this term and they regretted the loss of the Audit Commission and the old-style Public Accounts Committee. In a way this amendment is a Scrutiny amendment. We have heard strong support for it from Vice-Chairman, Deputy Laurie Queripel and we see Deputy Green seconding it and Scrutiny Member Deputy Merrett proposing it.

Actually Deputy Yerby is of course right. We did have an in-work poverty debate at the  
425 beginning of the year and that debate was a disappointment to Scrutiny, when the States kind of said, 'We do not want to have a specific work stream on that, we want it to be embraced and entangled and embedded within the Policy & Resource Plan'. Now, that is exactly what Policy & Resources has done and this kind of fine-tunes that a bit.

I think that the three messages I want to get across in this amendment, and probably other  
430 amendments as well, is that we need to do more groundwork for the next Assembly. We also need to do more gestures to the public and we also need to do, in a way, more grandstanding. I do not particularly agree with Deputy Shane Langlois' perspective here, in-work poverty, whether you like the term or not, is widely used elsewhere and has been widely used in this Assembly. It was designed originally as actually a gesture against those who were implying that people who  
435 were relying on welfare were in some sense unemployed or unemployable or permanently sick. In reality, we have a lot of people in Guernsey who struggle to meet minimum lifestyle expectations but they are partially or fully in work.



440 What this amendment does, I agree, being a Member of Employment & Social Security I am well aware that we have discussed on occasions, more frequently of late, affordability of primary health care. That is not our mandate but we have given great consideration to the future funding of health care, which we have already done of course. Emergency health care is very much in our mind and the whole wider picture of supporting living and ageing well and targeting benefits appropriately.

445 But also there is this key phrase, 'affordability of housing'. Now, that means different things to different people. I suspect Deputy Merrett and Scrutiny mean it in terms of maximising social housing and realistic rents and rent support. Now actually, of course, to other people listening in it means affordability of first-time, or lifetime, or second-time housing. The first-time buyers' market, which this States has completely shown a policy void on, frankly. We have gone round and round in circles and gone nowhere.

450 Actually, I am sure most of the public are very keen that we do support everyone in this community and that we eliminate inequality; or you could say you can eliminate inequality by making sure billionaires are millionaires, I do not think we mean that. What we really mean is to maximise the standard of living and gross domestic product of our entire society. (**A Member:** Ooh.)

455 Although most people are sympathetic, yes they are, to helping everybody across society, I think the squeezed middle on the Island are very much saying, 'What about the affordability of housing for us?' Affordability of people perhaps having what might be considered good wages in the north of England, but they are struggling. They are struggling on many levels with everything from taxation to the rubbish bills, to housing costs, whatever. We do need more work streams on that and we do need to completely reassess our benefit rates and tax levels so that we are fairer across the board.

460 I would go further and say that one idea I picked up at the Green Party conference, a little bit left-field for us at the moment, would be a minimum income. Move away from tax credits and actually consider a minimum citizens' income. That is being looked at in some countries. It is a bit radical for us but I think we need to widen our horizons.

465 This amendment is a gesture but it is more than a gesture because it is saying that we are going to prioritise our resources on real issues, tax and benefit rates, rather than just reorganising administration systems and internal processes and our property estate. That is what we need to do. Deputy Ferbrache may be right, we need to use our Civil Service resource wisely and carefully but we need to target it on what the public want rather than perhaps what we want at times.

**The Bailiff:** Deputies Le Tocq and Trott, do you wish to be relevé?

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

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

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Green.

480 **Deputy Green:** Sir, yes, very briefly.

I think we are in danger of making mountains out of molehills for this amendment. (*Interjection*) The first thing that Deputy St Pier said this morning is that the Policy & Resources Committee accepts this amendment. Quite what more comfort and assurance Members need, I do not know. (*Interjection*)

485 The reason why Deputy Merrett and I are moving this amendment was because we were concerned, to be honest, that P&R had not fully discharged the amendment that they brought and the subsequent Resolution that they got in January, following the debate. We were concerned

490 that there was the loss of the specific focus on the key areas that the review had talked about and that is the very simple purpose of this amendment, to restore that explicit focus on the areas concerned and to make it absolutely clear that is not just the third sector that P&R are going to be working with, it is the relevant Committees.

We know that the Committees are already doing this work. We debated that *ad nauseam* in January. So this is just a simple instrument to restore that focus.

495 I think Deputy Yerby summed up the argument for this amendment best and she took issue with what Deputy Langlois was saying. Much of what Deputy Langlois said I sympathise with, I absolutely agree with him about the real issue being inequality but of course there is nothing explicit in the P&R Plan that is going to tackle the inequality in our society.

500 So I think this is a very straightforward amendment. It does have a purpose. It does have a meaning, which is to restore that key focus in the way that the original Resolution in January maintained, that the actual Proposition that was in the original P&R update policy letter before us did not. That is simply what this is about restoring. So I would encourage everybody to support it, bearing in mind the fact that P&R do not oppose it.

**The Bailiff:** No one else? Deputy Merrett will reply.

505

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

I am a little bit concerned that resources have been called into this when this was a direction of travel determined back in January and in the appendices it says 'ongoing work', sir. This is not new work; this should be ongoing work. What this amendment does is it retains the focus and it means that P&R need to come back to the Assembly, need to stay on track, and need to give an update.

510 The queries we have had about in-work poverty, again, I have sympathy with. But people that are not working may have or indeed do have access to services in health care that members of our community that are working would need to dig into any savings, if they have any, would actually be making a decision. I have met these families, they are making a decision between going to the doctor or having baked beans on toast that evening. It is as simple as that.

515 They do not have a large, disposable income. They are doing what we have asked them to do, sir, they are going to work, they are paying their taxes. But they cannot afford to access certain parts that most of the other members of our community, really, some take for granted and some also struggle to access. This is about keeping focus.

520 I will refer to Deputy de Lisle's, 'Is the taxpayer paying enough?' I think it was another Deputy that said, earlier in the term, that arguably we have sacrificed equity and fairness on the altar of simplicity when it comes to our tax. I am not, sir, but if you are earning £200,000 a year, or more than that, are you indeed paying enough? We are, after all, a low-tax jurisdiction but does that mean that all of our taxes are fair and equitable? But those, if on low wages, pay their tax then they have to queue to ask for Income Support because they no longer retain enough salary to actually feed their families, go to the doctors. I could go on, I am trying desperately not to get too passionate, sir, but I think we need to have a reality check sometimes.

525 Deputy Yerby has very helpfully said that this is actually a technical amendment, which retains focus. It asks P&R to stay on track; it asks them to give updates to the Assembly. It is about recognising the progress that Committees have made and it is the opportunity to see and recognise that meaningful progress. That is what this amendment does. So I urge all Members to support this.

Thank you, sir.

535 **A Member:** Hear, hear.

**The Bailiff:** I just pause to give Deputy Dudley Owen a chance to return to her seat and to be relevée. Do you wish to be relevée?

**Deputy Dudley Owen:** Yes, please, sir. Thank you.

540

**The Bailiff:** We vote, then, on amendment 1, proposed by Deputy Merrett, seconded by Deputy Green. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

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

545

So the next amendment we are going to debate is amendment 8, to be proposed again by Deputy Merrett.

**Deputy Merrett:** Could I have it read, please sir?

*The Deputy Greffier read out the amendment.*

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Merrett.

*Amendment 8:*

*To insert the following Proposition:*

*'4. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to bring to the States, either in its Fiscal Rules policy letter or otherwise before or within the debate on the 2020 States Budget, a proposition that will allow the States to decide whether to maintain or amend the anticipated value and timing of the savings targets set out in the Medium-Term Financial Plan and the contribution which reductions in expenditure should be expected to make to returning public finances to surplus, in accordance with the States Resolution cited in paragraph 3.93 of this policy letter.'*

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

550

Again, I am pleased that the Policy & Resources Committee will not be opposing this amendment. Maybe it was assumed that the outstanding States' Resolutions determined in June 2017 in regard to including a proposition in the Policy & Resource Plan you are debating today, sir, maybe Policy & Resources assumed that as they have not succeeded in determining within the two-year window whether they should advise the States to maintain or amend the Medium-Term Financial Plan; whether we should be maintaining or amending the anticipated value and the timing of savings targets and the contribution which reductions in expenditure should be expected to make, or maybe P&R simply assumed that Members would know that they intend to do this in the anticipated Fiscal Rules policy letter. Or maybe they needed more time – another year before they could adhere to the outstanding States' Resolution.

555

560

Maybe they meant, sir, to simply apologise for that, or maybe felt that they had resolved most of the States' Resolution in the 2019 Budget Report in section 7. Maybe, as in 3.101, it is the intention to submit an update in the 2020 Budget Report with the future details of the Medium-Term Financial Plan, what has been delivered or what we should be planning to deliver together, potentially – a revised forecast that includes values and times of delivery. Maybe.

565

However, that is an awful lot of maybes. As Members may recall, the Medium-Term Financial Plan was decided early in this political term. A States' Resolution was in place to review in light of two years' experience. Members may or may not be content that this was addressed in the Budget Report in 2019, sir, but with the changing economic climate, with existing Committees now having

570 three years' experience, we simply must ensure that the Medium-Term Financial Plan is updated in this political term. This is clear, unambiguous and achievable.

If my memory serves me correctly the Medium-Term Financial Plan initially appeared as sacrament. In 2019, it was looked at being a bit more of a guideline. But, sir, it does appear to be getting increasingly divorced from reality.

575 We strongly believe that this Assembly should have an opportunity to influence, deliberate, debate and determine the shape of the Medium-Term Financial Plan and by doing so help support transition for the next Assembly. So this amendment directs Policy & Resources to bring the States, either in its Fiscal Rules policy letter or before then, or within the 2020 States' Budget, but please bring to the States a proposition in this political term that allows us to decide whether to maintain or amend the Medium-Term Financial Plan.

580 As Policy & Resources are supporting this amendment, sir, maybe it is not a 'maybe' at all. But I do urge all Members to support this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** And Deputy Yerby, you are formally seconding the amendment?

585

**Deputy Yerby:** Yes, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

590 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, yes, very briefly, as Deputy Merrett has said, as we have indicated to Members before this sitting, we will not oppose this amendment.

It is worth just clarifying that the amendment does suggest that P&R return in either the Fiscal Rules policy letter or the Budget. It will not be in the former because that was signed off yesterday by Policy & Resources and it has been lodged we hope, sir, for a September debate. In any event  
595 we would not regard the Fiscal Rules policy letter as being an appropriate place. The Fiscal Rules policy letter is intended to provide the framework fiscal rules, which will outlive the Medium-Term Financial Plan in any event.

I think the Budget is the appropriate place. This was discussed at some length during the last Budget debate and Members' concerns at that time were acknowledged by me in responding to  
600 that debate and that is the reason why we have no objection to this amendment and we will be happy to return in the 2020 States' Budget Report.

**The Bailiff:** Any debate? Deputy Soulsby.

605 **Deputy Soulsby:** This is a really important amendment, actually. I think Members need to see at page 28 that P&R had no intention of reviewing the Medium-Term Financial Plan against what was in the Resolution or in Rule 23(5)(d). That is a concern, particularly as we see it from where we are sitting, from a Health and Care point of view, where the pressures on costs are growing all the time.

610 We have highlighted in the P&R Plan the number of budgetary challenges that we have got and it is proving increasingly difficult to contain General Revenue expenditure. The ageing demographic is hitting us daily and we have seen the rise as a result. I think that pressure runs to about an extra £1 million a year. That is the calculation we have done.

We have got the orthopaedic backlog which has needed additional funding, but the trend is  
615 towards a greater requirement for orthopaedic procedures, so this issue will need careful management and resources on an ongoing basis. During 2019, a pilot to trial additional reablement services is being funded from the Transformation Transition Fund. These services are integral to the Partnership of Purpose and trying to keep people out of the hospital and keeping

620 them independent in their homes. But that is at a cost and what are we going to do after the Transformation Transition Fund disappears at the end of the year?

It has already been difficult getting staff on the basis that we do not know whether we will have funding for the coming year, so that makes it really difficult to actually start the service in the first place. We have got inflationary pressures with the rising cost of drugs and an increasing NHS tariff for off-Island services. They are all hitting the bottom line.

625 Members might not know that in 2017 and 2018, HSC adopted a self-imposed vacancy pact in respect of Agenda for Change staff, to reflect what were believed to be false vacancies in the established structure. The value of that was £2 million. But following an extensive review of vacancies across HSC, this should now be removed as we are confident that there are no such false vacancies within HSC's Agenda for Change posts.

630 The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for people over 50, which has now been approved by the Committee, is an absolutely fantastic piece of work led by the Director of Public Health and provides a wealth of information about the specific needs of the cohort within the Bailiwick and identifies a number of urgent and needed projects in Guernsey and Alderney to improve the wellbeing of the community. Addressing issues highlighted by the needs assessment will require a  
635 cross-committee approach.

So in a nutshell what I am saying we are facing increasing pressures; we are seeing funds being used from different pots, which are hiding the fact that the Medium-Term Financial Plan is really under pressure. We are not keeping within the Medium-Term Financial Plan as it is and we are kidding ourselves if we think we are. That is why I believe this is a really important amendment so  
640 we can really get to the heart of what we need. And if people still think we need to keep within the Medium-Term Financial Plan, fine; but then we should not be kidding ourselves when we start debating for something of 300 pages saying, 'How are we going to prioritise everything for the people of Guernsey?' Because we cannot, if we are going to stick to the Medium-Term Financial Plan.

645 So that is why I support this amendment and I urge others to as well.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

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

650 I agree with everything Deputy Soulsby has just said, except perhaps in one respect, which is to do with the status of the Medium-Term Financial Plan. I want to make a request of the Policy & Resources Committee, which I know they are going to take no notice of, but I am going to make it anyway. When they proposed the Medium-Term Financial Plan, I think possibly alone maybe there  
655 were one or two people who agreed with me, I said I thought it was a waste of time and my request of the Policy & Resources Committee is that when they are carrying out their review, as directed by this amendment, which clearly is going to be approved, that they consider scrapping the Medium-Term Financial Plan.

The reason I say that is it is an attempt, or it creates an impression, of setting a budget several years in advance. It identifies in quite specific detail savings which will be made years in advance,  
660 expenditure which will occur years in advance, and no sensible Government tries to set budgets years in advance.

The Policy & Resources Committee – and Deputy St Pier referred to this in his opening speech on the Policy & Resource Plan – I think that their performance in managing the annual Budget of the States is actually quite impressive. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I do not think that they get it all  
665 right but I think that, year on year, they are able to in most cases, provide Committees with what Committees need to meet their reasonable demands; they try to chart a reasonably balanced course between tax-raising measure and demands for new services. I do not agree with all the proposals they have put in the Budgets that they have been responsible for and I have supported

670 amendments against some off them, but generally speaking I think their stewardship of the States' financial affairs is quite good. But I think that is best done on an annual basis.

The only certainty when the States approved the Medium-Term Financial Plan was that the actual numbers were not going to turn out anything like those set out in the Plan. And so it has proved. The expenditure is nothing like set out in the Plan; the tax-raising measures are nothing like set out in the Plan. All that happens is that we then say – and others will hold us to account  
675 for failing against the Medium-Term Financial Plan. But it is not a failure of performance it is because, in a very dynamic situation, it is just not possible to plan financially to the level of detail set out in the Medium-Term Financial Plan over a series of years.

What it ends up amounting to is rather like, I think it was Gordon Brown who was the Chancellor who had fiscal rules and confidently asserted that he had eliminated boom and bust,  
680 and of course as soon as economic circumstances changed they just ripped up the fiscal rules. That is exactly what the States do. The States say, 'We will set Fiscal Rules, for example we will invest 3% of GDP in capital expenditure every year' – and the States made that Rule when the States were not investing 3% in capital every year and have not in any year since, even though that Rule has been in place for 10 years.

685 The savings targets in the Medium-Term Financial Plan were breached within a few months of the Plan being in place, as I say as were the expenditure parts of the Plan and yet, actually, the fiscal position of the States is quite secure. We must not be complacent about it but actually the Budget is in balance, tax receipts are increasing, there has been quite considerable expenditure restraint, certainly more expenditure restraint than almost any other jurisdiction has managed.

690 So there is some kind of disconnect here because the financial stewardship is quite good and yet the Medium-Term Financial Plan is breached within a few months of being established. It is because the Medium-Term Financial Plan is not a good concept and if it is going to exist it should exist in a much looser form, as a guide or a framework, more than in the quite definitive way in which it was presented first time around.

695 As I say, I do expect the Policy & Resources Committee to ignore what I have said and I do not say that particularly critically, it is just that when I made these points the first time around they were challenged by Deputy St Pier and Deputy Trott, and I do not expect that they are going to have become convinced. But I wanted to put on record my view of the Medium-Term Financial Plan.

700

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

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

I agree with Deputy Fallaize, although I imagine that we are in the minority. However, if we do  
705 need to keep this type of plan I think it is worthy of acknowledging that things like missing the savings target, so in 3.87 it says £4.6 million savings target is behind schedule, but there is no analysis of why that is. And that goes back to Deputy Soulsby's point about the challenges faced within the Committee. If you are going to have a set of rigid rules that are above the annual budgeting process, which does constrain the transformation and the tensions within the annual  
710 budgets of each of the Committees, then you do need to have some analysis of when and how that is working and whether those rules are having perverse effects on the delivery of those transformations and policies within the Committees.

That is the kind of married-up thinking between resources and how we allocate them and  
715 *when* we allocate them, in order to deliver effective policy outcomes that I would have expected of a Committee called Policy & Resources. But I find the Treasury is still very much siloed away from the policy. Now, I know that there has been work and a gradual acknowledgement of this and work done to try to marry these two, but I still feel that we are not able to see clearly how these fiscal rules are affecting policy.

720 And it is not just about looking at priorities, it is actually getting to the detail and looking at the policies and how they are being delivered and whether they are given the resources to deliver the outcomes that we expected when we designed the policies. That is how you look at policy. Policy is iterative, you have to go back and look at it as it goes; whereas a fiscal rule does not necessarily marry itself up with that unless there is a mechanism for us to see those together,

725 That is what the Policy & Resource Plan is supposed to be – that mechanism to see these two elements together. I still feel they are too far apart and with the Medium-Term Financial Plan you can see that highlighted, and the reason why it keeps coming back is because of this deficit. We cannot just simply stick to the savings targets just because we set them. Setting and delivering policy is iterative and it does not stop at implementation. We should always be going back to challenge the assumptions and whether the policies and the direction that we have chosen is meeting the objective, achieving what we designed the policy to achieve. Is it solving the problem?

730 We cannot test that if we are not giving it the resources to solve the problem, so we will continue to have the problem and the problem will create more problems and we will create more policy to solve those other problems, although we cannot demonstrate that the original policy is actually working unless we give it the resources. And, yes, we do not have infinite resources, but I think there is not an acknowledgement and we are not capable of acknowledging the transformative shift that we are experiencing, not only in our own States but globally, the shift that is happening. And a mechanism like the Medium-Term Financial Plan is dampening our ability to actually take advantage of that transformative shift and actually really redesign our system.

740 So I agree with this amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Merrett will reply.

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

I will be quite brief. I thank Deputy St Pier for giving us clarity that we like, certainly expect and I believe the Assembly needs, as to when the Medium-Term Financial Plan will be coming back to this Assembly.

750 I also think Deputy Soulsby made some very valid points, which I absolutely completely agree with. And also I concur with many of the points made by Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

But I would urge P&R, through you sir, can you please listen to this Assembly? Please. We could avoid many of these amendments and many of these things if P&R could listen to this Assembly.

755 Please listen to what Deputy Fallaize has said today. Please listen to what Deputy Soulsby has said today. Please listen and if you need to, sir, if Policy & Resources need to, they could obviously use *Hansard* if they were distracted whilst Members were speaking. But I would urge, once more, for Policy & Resources to listen to this Assembly and I urge all Members to support this amendment.

760 Thank you, sir.

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

*Members voted Pour.*

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

Next we have amendment 13, to be proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez.

765 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you, sir.  
Can the amendment please be read?

*The Deputy Greffier read out the amendment.*

**The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

*Amendment 13:*

*In Proposition 1(e) to add immediately after the words 'May 2020':*

*‘recognising that climate change has reached a critical point and that Guernsey must urgently address the climate and ecological crisis at both local and international levels, and recognising that, as well as addressing environmental issues, social and economic factors will be integral to this priority policy area, which may include:*

- local action to mitigate climate change and environmental degradation,*
- local policies to stimulate the 'green' and 'blue' economy and promote environmentally sustainable economic development,*
- international action through overseas aid focused on climate resilience, and*
- international action through our role as a Green and Sustainable Finance Centre;’*

770 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** You will be relieved to hear, sir, that I do not intend to talk for more than a minute or two about climate change *per se* because actually I do not think I need to. I think the majority of my colleagues, like the majority of the community, recognise that climate change is real, that it is happening right now and that we need to do something about it while we still have a meaningful chance to do so.

775 Sir I was born in 1977, the year of the Silver Jubilee and the Sex Pistols' rendition of *God Save the Queen*. Every single year since has been hotter than the global average. The past five years have been the hottest since records began in the late 1800s, which was coincidentally around the time that the burning of fossil fuels really took off and greenhouse gas emissions started to soar.

780 Some have pointed out that carbon dioxide, which is the main culprit in terms of greenhouse gas emissions, is a natural gas, essential to life on earth. That is quite right. But what is wrong about the current situation is the balance of greenhouse gases, like carbon dioxide, in the atmosphere. It is this disproportionate concentration that is causing the problems. Before the industrial revolution, atmospheric carbon levels were around 280 parts per million. Today our atmospheric carbon levels are nearly 415 parts per million. That is a 48% increase on that pre-industrial baseline.

785 To put that into context, these levels are the highest they have been in about three million years and they are still rising, along with that global average temperature. It is now about 1 C hotter than it was in the pre-industrial era. Now 1° may not sound like much but it has a very big effect. The oceans are warming. The Polar ice caps and glaciers are melting. Sea levels are rising and extreme weather events such as hurricanes, floods, droughts and heatwaves are becoming more frequent and more intense.

790 These problems are not just environmental. They disrupt energy and food production, destroy critical infrastructure, disseminate disease and displace entire communities. Make no mistake, the social and economic impacts of climate change are very real and very significant indeed and, while the effects are felt most acutely in developing countries, Guernsey will be increasingly affected.

795 So is the problem too big and intractable to tackle? Have we left it too late? Nearly, but not quite. Until October last year international efforts were mostly focused on limiting global warming to 2°C, bearing in mind that we are 1° hotter already and we are currently on track for warming of between 3° and 4° later this century if we do not start implementing more effective measures soon.



800 The possible consequences of a 4° rise in global temperatures are generally described in terms like 'catastrophic' and 'devastating' and not just for coastal communities. The disruption to food security and water resources and the damage to human health and wealth, to name just a few, are frankly too depressing to discuss.

805 A 2° rise would be no bed of roses, especially for coastal communities and islands, but it would be better than a 4° rise by an order of magnitude. Limiting it to 1.5° would lead to a far better outcome, again, for people and ecosystems around the world. That half a degree could mean 10 cm less sea level rise, 10 times the probability of retaining some Arctic sea ice through the summer and the difference between losing just 70% of coral reefs, as compared with losing more than 99%.

810 Every extra bit of warming matters and by the same token every bit of mitigation matters. That is why the international focus has now shifted to limiting warming to 1.5°, which the latest IPCC report makes clear is possible to achieve with decisive and swift action. The quicker we take action the more effective it is likely to be and the next 10 years are particularly crucial.

815 As the explanatory note to this amendment explains, the decisions that we make and the actions that we take within this next decade will fundamentally affect all that follow so it can be described as a crisis – the stage in a sequence of events at which the trend of all future events is determined. We are at a delicate tipping point.

820 Sir, it is a fact universally acknowledged that I love cake but, sadly, it is also quite well known that large amounts of cake are incompatible with a balanced diet. If I were to eat a whole cake a day, any cake, I am really not fussy, my waistline would expand and expand, my organs would come under increasing pressure and my health would deteriorate more and more to the point that I would find it difficult to move. This is clearly not a good situation to be in. If I could halve my daily cake consumption, limit my habit to a mere six slices, perhaps, rather than the round dozen, I would still not be a paragon of healthiness exactly, but I would be relatively healthier and more mobile than I would have been had I continued on my original trajectory.

825 If, after a stern word from Deputy Soulsby about the health budget implications of my eating habits, I managed to limit my cake intake to a single slice a day, filled up with fruit and veg instead, and threw in a daily jog on the cliffs for good measure, I might still end up carrying a few extra pounds but clearly I would be in a much better state and travelling along a much healthier trajectory than either of those previous scenarios.

830 One of the ripostes I hear most often is that we are too small to make a difference. Leaving aside any arguments about moral responsibility or comparative carbon emissions *per capita* and also leaving aside the fact that countries like China are actually pretty well on track to meet their emissions reduction targets, Guernsey can in any case punch well above our weight.

835 First of all, I know we are often quick to moan and talk ourselves down, but this is one area we can and should recognise the progress that we have made to date. The latest data show that we have reduced our carbon emissions by nearly 36% against 1990 levels. That is less than the UK's impressive reduction of 43% but better than the EU as a whole on around 22%.

840 But mitigating the effects of climate change does not begin and end with reducing the emissions we generate on Island. We can go further; potentially a lot further. This is where we can make a disproportionately positive impact relative to our size. One way we can do this is through our positioning as a green and sustainable finance centre. Deputy St Pier will confirm that I first started nagging him about this back in 2016 and, perhaps just to keep me quiet, he followed up those leads and concluded, as did the Committee for Economic Development, that green finance did indeed present a promising economic opportunity for Guernsey.

845 As Deputy St Pier mentioned, we are now members of a prestigious international network of finance centres focussed on sustainability and as its Chair, Stephen Nolan, confirmed when he was in the Island a few days ago Guernsey is doing really very well in this area. For those not familiar with what green and sustainable finance is all about, the very basic premise is this: in order to

850 transition from the brown economy, that is the current paradigm underpinned by fossil fuels, to the green economy, based on renewable energy, a lot of capital will need to be mobilised.

That is where green and sustainable finance centres come in. By making a good name for ourselves in this space and getting ahead of the curve, which we are, Guernsey can not only play a vital role in that global transition, but we will of course benefit our own economy in the process. When I talk to people on the front line of our green finance sector, they are excited about those  
855 commercial opportunities, but they are also candid about the reputational risk. They stress that Government needs to support them at quite a fundamental level. We as a jurisdiction need to be able to demonstrate that we are walking the talk. That is one of the reasons Deputy Dudley Owen and I are keen to incorporate green and sustainable finance into the action plan.

860 Deputy St Pier touched on the green and blue economies in his opening, the economic benefits of which I hope are self-evident, but we included these elements in the outline scope partly because they underscore that when environmental objectives and economic objectives are sustainable they are mutually beneficial and supportive.

Another area that offers Guernsey the opportunity to extend positive effects well beyond our shores is through our Overseas Aid and Development Commission work. Developing countries are  
865 often disproportionately affected by climate change and that is only set to become more exaggerated as climate change becomes more pronounced. So climate mitigation and climate resilience is particularly important in many of the regions and territories where the OECD already works.

Anyone who has read the forthcoming overseas aid policy letter will have noticed that climate  
870 resilience is already a theme running throughout. But tying that work into our Climate Change Action Plan will ensure that we are taking the most holistic and effective approach possible. The Climate Change Action Plan will pull all these strands together into one cohesive package. It will, I hope, explore the practical options and implications of climate change mitigation and set out the areas where we, as a community, can possibly benefit and how we can benefit others.

875 People often talk in terms of sacrifice when it comes to climate change mitigation, what we stand to lose. But what is given less air time is what we might possibly gain. Better standards of energy efficiency for householders, for example, better public transport, a better range of high quality, locally grown and produced food perhaps. Just as the problems are not confined to the environmental category, neither are the potential benefits of mitigating climate change. There are  
880 clear opportunities for social and economic wins, too.

Climate change is the biggest inter-generational challenge of our time, arguably even of all time. When Deputy Hansmann Rouxel and I brought the future generations amendment to phase two of the P&R Plan, there were a few sniggers in the wings about being pointless or a bit fluffy. But taking into account the impacts of the policy decisions we make today on young people when  
885 they are our age and the generations that follow them, is serious stuff. Political decisions are often shaped by short-term thinking but if ever an issue needed long-term thinking, it is this one.

Greta Thunberg's now famous call to action to governments around the world is to act like the house is on fire. She was in Paris shortly after the Notre Dame went up in flames and one of the facts I learned then about the iconic cathedral was that it was built over the course of about  
890 200 years. The people who conceived of the plans and started construction knew that they would never see it completed in their own lifetimes. But how many generations since then have been thankful that they nonetheless got on with the job in hand, way back in 1163?

We need some 21st century cathedral thinking now. We might have to start without a clear idea of what the roof will look like but now is the opportunity to lay some strong foundations.  
895 Supporting this amendment will send a clear message to the local community, to the business community, to the international community and, perhaps most of all, to young people everywhere – Generation Greta – that we are looking well beyond the horizon of the next election and are prepared to build a more secure future for the generations to come. *(Applause)*

**A Member:** Hear, hear.

900

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

**Deputy Dudley Owen:** I do, sir, and reserve my right to speak.

905

**The Bailiff:** Thank you.  
Deputy St Pier.

910

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, I hope Deputy de Sausmarez was only using a turn of phrase when she was suggesting that she was nagging me, because it certainly did not feel like that and certainly I would hope that my support was not merely to keep her quiet. I am an enthusiastic supporter of her enthusiasm in this area. She introduced me to her brother, which has been one of the sources for the development of our relationships in relation to our role as a jurisdiction for green finance and indeed I was able to introduce Sir Roger Gifford, the former Lord Mayor of London who I had met at an event in London and he has subsequently been to the Island and has engaged with a number of people.

915

Of course, Deputy Dudley-Owen also has been very active in this area. This has been one area where there has been – and rightly so – a good cross-committee working relationship. I say that by way of introduction and of course it is working also outside Government with Guernsey Finance; and Guernsey Finance has taken an active and high-profile role in this area too.

920

Sir, I rise primarily to make it very clear that the Policy & Resources Committee are very happy to support this amendment. We do regard it as being a valuable addition to the Propositions, for clarity, for all the very many reasons which Deputy de Sausmarez set out when she spoke. Indeed we thank the sponsors of this amendment, Deputies de Sausmarez and Dudley-Owen, for bringing it forward.

925

**The Bailiff:** Deputy de Lisle.

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

930

You will recall that I brought the issue of climate change, Extension to the Paris Agreement and the IPCC Report to the States in October of last year, with questions to the Committee *for the Environment & Infrastructure* in relation to mitigation measures and our responsibilities to future generations.

935

The IPCC Report had just been published at that time. The response from the Committee was that our track record was poor and as an Island state we should be at the forefront of those seeking to mitigate climate change, basically because in fact it would impact directly on this Island of ours. However, it was reported that discussions with the UK authorities had been ongoing for the last year, and that was back in October last year.

940

So in terms of assessing the Paris Agreement's relevance and potential application and extension to Guernsey, the aim of the Paris Agreement to strengthen the global threat of climate change by keeping the global rise of temperature well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels, with efforts to limit the rise in temperature to 1.5°C. Now, the Environment & Infrastructure Committee is currently preparing a revised energy policy with participation by the Committee *for Economic Development* that will play a very important role in addressing the trilemma, really, of security of supply, affordability and sustainability with the emphasis on decarbonisation and further reducing emissions.

945

The revised Energy Policy, as I understand it, is scheduled to be placed before the States in the September Meeting. But I am also pleased to note that the Policy & Resource Plan that we have in

front of us today has taken the opportunity to address fighting climate change with a good summary, actually, which is provided on pages 21 and 22 of the document in front of us.

950 That is on the issue of climate change directly, which has been brought to the fore by the Committee and integrated into this Plan now. So that gives a lot of comfort, I think, that P&R have got this very strongly at the fore and that work will be incorporated also, as stated, in a work stream by the Environment & Infrastructure Department on a climate action plan for the future, which I think we must all support and contribute to.

955 So in regard to the amendment, sir, and I am not sure that this really is an amendment as such it is more adding, as they say in the explanatory note, more detail to the Proposition 1e) and of course we also have 1f) and 1g) Propositions also on climate change. So I think the Policy & Resource Plan has done much to integrate this particular issue into its domain and also to recognise the very important element that this obviously has for future debate and also policy direction by this States.

960 I am very pleased also that climate change as an issue today has brought environmental policy to the fore and I think this is extremely important, because I have always argued in the States that we need a good balance. A balance between economic development as such and environmental integrity and I think we have to maintain that; and I think through this emphasis on climate change we have that opportunity now to bring forward environmental policy again and make sure that we consider it within the dimension of economic growth and of course the social aspect also of community care.

Thank you, sir.

970 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Stephens.

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

975 This topic challenges personal commitment in so many ways. Unlike Deputy de Sausmarez, I am not going to tell the Assembly when I was born but I can confirm that it was some time after the first Industrial Revolution! (*Laughter*) Neither can I apologise for the actions of the post-World War II generation when, admittedly, coal was king, fossil fuels were the origins of much of the freedom of travel and the range of commodities that we then enjoyed. I will not apologise because the past is a different country, although I do agree in this context it is certainly within the same environment.

980 But we now know what the post-World War II consumer optimism caused, in effect, on the environment. We are all the sum total of our experience, our education and how we accept emerging information and therefore I am, on a personal level, very pleased to support this amendment for my sake for the sake of my grandchildren.

Thank you, sir.

985 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Leadbeater.

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

990 We have heard from Deputy de Sausmarez that temperatures have been rising on an annual basis for quite some time but climate change right the way across the board has been happening for decades. If you look back to the terrible famine in Ethiopia in the 1980s, which was apparently caused by the industrialisation and development in Europe, because the particulates that were in the atmosphere caused a phenomenon called 'global dimming'. That global dimming and the climatic changes that caused, prevented the monsoon belt from returning to Africa on an annual basis, which caused that horrific famine that defined Africa during that period of time.

995 I am really keen on climate change. I think we can see it. I remember long, hot summers when I was a kid in the 1970s and we are lucky if we get three weeks strung together now, our climate is

1000 all over the place, I do not really know what is going on. But one thing, there is a bit of a hypocrisy here because we have cruise ships coming and we welcome them in every summer, and one cruise ship can put about as much particulates in the air as one million cars. So there is a hypocrisy here. Deputy de Lisle mentioned the balance between protecting our climate and benefits to the economy and that balance is going to be difficult to achieve but that is the important thing we need to focus on.

Thank you.

1005

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

**Deputy Inder:** I just want to pick up on something Deputy Leadbeater said. I am not entirely sure there is a hypocrisy there because my understanding is the carbon effects of the cruise ship is usually related to the port or the country where it actually fuels from and we just happen to be part of the process.

1010

But I just wondered, it is a bit of an odd amendment because if you actually read e):

the Committee *for the Environment & Infrastructure* to develop a climate change policy and a 'Climate Change Action Plan' in a policy letter no later than May 2020;

1015

I always expected E&I to come back with some kind of action plan and all this appears to do is almost add some terms of reference for 1e) which, to be perfectly frank with you, I expected them to come back to the States with anyway. I cannot disagree with it because it is what I expected E&I to come back with in terms of 1e).

So I am not entirely sure what this amendment is about, really, because it asks for:

- local action to mitigate climate change and environmental degradation,

Well, I expected that in May 2020.

- local policies to stimulate the 'green' and 'blue' economy and promote the environmentally ...

We have seen that on Economic Development and I expected that in 1e) anyway.

- international action through overseas aid focused on climate [*change*] ...

1020

Well, okay.

- international action through our role as a Green and Sustainable Finance Centre;

We were heading down that route anyway.

So when, possibly, Deputy Dudley-Owen speaks, or possibly Deputy Lindsay de Sausmarez speaks ... I am probably going to vote for this, almost pointlessly, because it is what I expected 1e) to turn up with anyway. I am in a very odd situation.

1025

I wish I had not stood up, actually, to be perfectly frank with you! I will sit down now. (*Laughter*)

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

1030

**Deputy Soulsby:** After that ... I am really pleased there is a growing desire to tackle climate change. I do kind of feel it is sad that it has taken a TV presenter, the divine being that is David Attenborough, of course, notwithstanding, and a TV programme for people to actually get inspired by all this. We have had scientists that have been talking about all this, having publications for years and years, but it has taken TV programmes and schoolchildren to make people wake up.

1035

1040 But so be it. I am really glad that it has actually happened now because it has been something that I have taken a keen interest in since I was at school. It started off when I studied glaciology and understood the impact it was having on glaciers at the time. Then I studied it at university as part of my geography degree. In fact, I think it was probably one of the first courses at university set up that looked explicitly at environmental change, and that is because we had one of the leading academics in this area, Rita Gardner, who became head of the Royal Geographical Society later on.

1045 Now I have actually – because I say quite frequently, ‘once a geographer, always a geographer’, and that is what I still think of myself as, not an accountant as people always think, I am a geographer and I have still got my little book on environmental change and I was just flicking through it. Deputy de Sausmarez said when she was born and this book was actually first published in 1977 and I thought, well, that is a bit of a coincidence, isn’t it? This is a second edition by the way and I was at university more recently than that!

1050 But, anyway, I have still got the book here and it is fascinating. I was really interested in hearing Deputy de Sausmarez talk about the CO<sub>2</sub> and the parts per million when she said we were currently around 415 parts per million. From this book it says current concentrations – this was in 1980 – the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration was 335-340 parts per million. Now that is an increase of 80 parts per million in about 40 years. Interestingly, at the time it said: ‘The present rate of CO<sub>2</sub> build-up is about seven parts per million per decade.

1055 That would say, when using basic maths, a 28 parts per million increase we should have seen. We have actually seen 80 parts per million. So things are getting worse, whether we want to call it a climate crisis or a climate emergency, things are changing rapidly and we need to do something about it.

1060 The evidence is reinforced by ... The information is there, but we cannot afford to ignore it now. The number of technical reports that are coming out, even in the explanatory note it talks about 6,000 scientific references. I mean, I know there seems to be a desire in various popular circles to ignore the evidence of experts but I think really we are putting our heads in the sand if that is what we think we should be doing here.

1065 So it is no surprise that I totally support this amendment and particularly, I like it because it is not saying we need to declare a climate emergency or climate crisis. It actually says what we need to do. It actually says, and it counters those arguments, ‘Oh, Guernsey is so small, what difference are we going to make?’ If everybody in the whole world thought that then nothing would happen. We all have our part to play and it is really important that we do. That is why I really like this amendment and would urge other Members to support it too.

1070 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Gollop:** Thank you.

1075 Yes, I very much support the amendment. On our way in today, for the second time in a month we were greeted by enthusiastic and committed members of the Climate Change Emergency Network. Of course, I missed their march in Candie Gardens and that was because I was at the Green Party conference in Scarborough where I met people who were so radical that they would probably argue that even a speaker as committed as Deputy de Sausmarez was quite conservative, the way she put across the arguments. Some of the people there had actually, for example, been involved in arguably public order issues in London during the recent demonstrations there

1080 Although the Green Party perhaps came from, originally, the ecological fringe on the issue, they have got to the point now where not only did they beat the Conservative Party, the party of government, in the recent European elections, but they emerged number one party in various

1085 cities, or the number two party in places as diverse as Norwich, Bristol, Oxford and Cambridge, and Brighton, of course.

I think the links there are not necessarily that they have their support in farming areas but they have the support in cutting-edge intellectual areas, where people are very much interested in reviewing the issues and looking to the future. Even if you are a cynic and you say there have been – and there certainly have been – historical climate changes, we believe there was a little bit of a warm period in the early years of the Norman Conquest, the period when Guernsey was part of the Duchy of Normandy and maybe that is why wine has been grown in southern England and people were settling in Greenland. We suspect there was a cold period in the Tudor and Stuart era, when there was ice on the Thames, and so on.

1095 The point is climate changes have occurred naturally. Once upon a time Jersey and even Guernsey were connected to France and climate change has changed that. We have to realise, as Deputy Soulsby and others have explained, that human activity has certainly added significantly to the problem. So if you take a risk-based approach, you will realise that it is a crisis, maybe an emergency. I think even our sister Island Jersey has recognised that and we need to play our part in this.

1100 Although I take Deputy Inder's point that this only adds a little bit of substance to the Environment & Infrastructure proposed report, and some of the people supporting this, of course, are Members of Environment & Infrastructure, but it focuses the mind. It is about local action and Deputy Meerveld, Deputy Lester Queripel and many others at the last election had as a campaign 'Stop talking, more action'. Well, this is action to mitigate climate change and environmental degradation.

Although we may have improved, relative to some places, we do know even from recent news reports that sometimes traffic, for the sake of argument in Fountain Street, is potentially polluting. We have issues there. We need local policies to stimulate the green and the blue economy.

1110 Deputy de Lisle, who has been ahead of the game here in many ways, has often said the States should look to itself in many respects when it comes to environmental pollution, incineration and so on. Of course, he is involved like probably Deputy Dudley-Owen is, with the blue economy, which is all about using our marine and sea enhancement areas as well as we possibly can.

1115 But we really do need to ensure that we are not regarded as dirty in any way. We need to promote a sustainable economic development. Deputy de Sausmarez is quite right to point out the efforts she has made and other people close to her in strengthening our offer in terms of green funds. We know Guernsey Finance, Dr Andy Sloan and others have actually developed this as part of Guernsey's rebranding as a niche – something that not only is a gesture towards environmentalism but is much more solid than that, because it will not only bring money and attention to the Island but it is potentially an economic opportunity for us to give back to the world. We may only have a thousandth or so of the population of the British Isles but that does not mean to say we are not significant, because we are *extremely* significant in many areas, from sports right the way across the piece to our work in the hedge-fund industry and in looking after global capital.

1125 So I think this focuses very well on what Policy & Resources and Economic Development want to do: international action through our role as a green sustainable finance sector. And I know Deputy Yerby would support international ecological action with an overseas aid element. And I can only quote from the amendment:

... by positioning ourselves as a Green and Sustainable Finance Centre we can facilitate the global transition from the brown economy to the green economy,

1130 I saw today, coming in, members of the Climate Change Network in Guernsey which has grown very rapidly. There you have people who have distinguished themselves in other walks of life, from

wellness and health, from archaeology to stressing the importance of reclaiming our community and living streets. I think the next stage is for us to really put meat on the bone.

1135 Yes there will be, on occasion, difficult decisions, maybe decisions about regulation, about taxation, about importation, (*Interjection*) and about relative consumer merits. But even sceptics like Deputy Inder will have to make a decision as to whether they support those policies or not.

**Deputy Inder:** That will be easy.

1140 **Deputy Gollop:** But, with this, at least we will have a debate in hopefully a more full way next year.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld.

1145 **Deputy Meerveld:** Thank you, sir.

We find ourselves in an interesting situation. Basically the Industrial Revolution started in the mid-18th century and since then there have been approximately nine generations that have preceded us in creating the issue and the crisis we now face.

1150 The difference with our generation is that we are now fully aware of the damage that has been done and the potential consequences that are heading our way if we do not do something about it. I fully support this amendment. I fully support the initiative and the fact that we – and I agree with Deputy Soulsby – that everybody is obliged to do something about this; and I agree with Deputy de Sausmarez that Guernsey has an opportunity here to lead the pack and differentiate ourselves by doing as much as we possibly can.

1155 We are obliged, as custodians of our environment, our society, to implement changes to protect and preserve what we have got now and hopefully improve it for the future generations that come after us. But I also am cognisant of the point made by Deputy de Lisle that there has to be a balance between economic, social and environmental issues; that we have to maintain a practical, pragmatic and sustainable approach to this; and we also have to be aware of the potential radicals that Deputy Gollop has mentioned, about the fact there are some individuals who would want us to go potentially too far and undermine the other elements of our society.

1160 So the only caveat I would add to my support is that this Assembly, and future Assemblies, have to make sure that what they do is practical, pragmatic and sustainable. In some quarters there are pushes for moves that would be, in my opinion, too radical and would create a whole raft of problems in other areas.

1165 Thank you, sir.

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

1170 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you, sir.

This for me is one of the most important amendments to this debate, given the backdrop that we realise we are at a crossroads in the health of our planet. It signals our intent and the intention of each Member who supports it to react dynamically and with urgency to the crisis that we now recognise in our current situation with climate change and environmental degradation.

1175 Work has begun by the States, its related agencies and also via community groups, and is also ongoing in relation to areas such as, but not limited to the reduction of plastic, raising awareness regarding the importance of our natural environment through biodiversity, green finance and our related membership of the UN's Finance Centres for Sustainability, impact investment for our Overseas Aid budget and our future energy policy.

1180 What this amendment sets out is the detail behind the Climate Change Action Plan, the work that is being undertaken, and is pulled together in a coherent instructive vehicle for delivery. I



hope that helps Deputy Inder, but I am not sure. Maybe no-one can help Deputy Inder, but I have tried! (*Laughter*)

1185 It also steers us towards a goal which I think that we can feasibly and realistically aim for prior to 2020 and this is positioning ourselves with credibility as a green Island. An Island that critically does the right thing in regard to its treatment of its own environment, that aims to make an influence globally with the reach that we have via our financial services and the contribution we make to helping those much worse-off than ourselves in other countries, which are going to be affected very dramatically by climate change, via our Overseas Aid Commission. An Island that sends a message that taking care of our planet and influencing others to do the same via the policies and work streams that we have outlined in the amendment.

1190 If navigated well and considerately, with balance and pragmatism, this is an opportunity for us to grab with both hands; and that does not mean entering into an era of self-imposed austerity, wearing a hair shirt, self-denial or some sort of religious awakening. Deputy de Sausmarez has well illustrated today the need for balance in our lives and those of us in this Chamber will all remember, no matter what our age, a younger self and the world that we lived in then where less was more and the mass consumption which dominates our waking hours today, which I remember as sort of dystopian but it turns out accurate view of a less-promising future, which we are living in today. It is not a future that I want for our children.

1200 We have the opportunity now to restyle and re-evaluate the way that we are doing things. I talked about this during the debate on the runway extension proposal. It was one of my main reasons for voting against that Proposition. I said that the time for doing things differently, the time for using new tools to tackle the challenges of today and the future, has started. It is not just here in Guernsey and I note with irony the positioning of environmental concerns and impact mitigation focusing at the heart of the recent Heathrow expansion plans, these were presented almost as a salve to the fact that those behind the plans are still trying to fit the round peg into the square hole and still investing in the use of fossil fuels in order to power our Northern European economies.

1205 Well, times are changing and these types of plans and ways of thinking are no longer sustainable or fit for the future. This amendment embraces that principle and the support of Members today will endorse that and also, importantly, send the message that Deputy de Sausmarez so well outlined in her speech. It is not just for our community locally, but it is also further afield and it is about the commitment that we are serious to this hugely important matter.

Thank you.

1215 **The Bailiff:** Yes, Alderney Representative Snowdon.

**Alderney Representative Snowdon:** Thank you, sir.

1220 I just wanted to say I am completely supportive of this amendment and just to give some context with Alderney, we have set up a working group with the tidal energy and are looking to explore how we can move forward with tidal energy. I think it is worth taking into consideration that Alderney is a tiny little Island, the tidal resource around Alderney is substantial and it has been said the power it could generate could be the size of Hinckley Point C, which is a tremendous amount of power.

1225 So I think it is really important that, as a Bailiwick, and Alderney, we look at how we can get renewable energies and take that first step. The problem with tidal is that the cost of tidal is a little bit expensive compared with wind and solar, so hopefully in the future there will be a cost reduction. If that does happen there is a tremendous amount of power on our doorstep. So we are working very hard to try and see ways to take that opportunity.

1230 I would also like to touch on that Alderney is actually considering a solar farm as well on the Island, which would go into Alderney Electric if it happens, which would be very good. We have

also got the campaign group, Plastic Free Alderney, which is doing quite successfully over there as well. And my understanding is that Herm and Alderney will be part of a pilot scheme which is a cold water project with other islands to look at ways of reducing plastic on Island and in the seas.

1235 So I very much support this amendment and I really hope that Alderney and Guernsey and the Bailiwick can work together on delivering renewable energies for the greater good of everyone.  
Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

1240 **Deputy Brehaut:** Thank you very much and, needless to say, I am fully supportive of this amendment and thank the proposer and seconder.

1245 This amendment, as alluded to by others, must be seen in the context of the policy letter we are going to bring, *Action on Climate Change*, as informed by the Energy Policy and of course by the Hydrocarbon Policy, which is perhaps the twin of the Energy Policy – not identical but very similar in many regards.

Can I just say that the challenge with any environmental change is the ‘doing bit’ and the doing bit is the most contentious element, because it is very easy to feel very warm and cosy, and rightly so, about this amendment. But when you get down to the detail of delivering, to realise the benefits of climate change then that is when it gets very, very difficult.

1250 I am not a climate change sceptic, obviously, and 97% of climate change scientists acknowledge global warming. If you are in a high-rise building and 97% of lift engineers were saying ‘Take the stairs’, my advice would be take the stairs. We cannot ignore the overwhelming number of voices in that regard, but it is the delivering on that.

1255 The way that Guernsey will deliver, for example, with vehicle emissions, will mean that at times we will have to do things to make walking and cycling more conducive, more enjoyable, more amenable for the community. That might actually mean doing something in regard to car usage and we know on Guernsey that that presents a problem. Everything we try to do is seen as war on the motorist, ‘Leave the motorist alone. Why have you got such an issue with the motorist?’

1260 But if you are trying to deal with emissions you need to deal with emissions. That may mean saying that we will give subsidies on EVs to encourage the uptake of electric vehicles, and of course that leads to people saying, ‘Why are you helping the middle class?’ – which is a misconception, by the way, in regard to affordability these days of electric vehicles. But the delivery bit, as I was saying, is much more difficult.

1265 What do we do in regard to our CPA membership, if we are serious? Do we resolve, this Assembly, to stop flying if we are serious? What about our BIC involvement? At a time when we are going into this pre-post-Brexit era, do we seriously suggest that no politician from this Island should fly at a time like this because there is such a crisis, because there is an emergency? I suppose that is the balance and the pragmatism that people are asking for in some of the things that we are asked to consider.

1270 There is real evidence to say that soft sea defences are the way that low-lying areas of land are best protected. We are trying to ensure that a soft sea defence is left healthy and used just as that in the north of the Island. I know it is a contentious element, again, but it is the doing bit, isn’t it? People may still argue that we spend many millions of pounds over decades to repair a structure that is in the wrong place and actually does environmental damage.

1275 So measures, for example, with dark-smoke emissions, we need to address that urgently. As I have said before, that was not a bonfire debate it was about air quality and dark-smoke emissions. So there are things we will need to do. But the point is that you do all of these things and, like it or not, it has to be through taxation. There has to be incentives, there has to be subsidies and actually there has to be sanctions at times and that is what makes it more difficult than perhaps  
1280 this amendment encapsulates in the here and now.

But endorsing this amendment, I just ask Members to bear that in mind. You must assist Environment & Infrastructure and the other Committees in delivering on this because, at times, some of the decisions that we take will not be universally popular with the community.

Thank you.

1285

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** Thank you, sir, three comments from me.

I intend to support this amendment but I think there are number of issues that I wish to raise. The first is that actions speak louder than words and there is no doubt that, whilst other Members in this Assembly were enthusiastic and played an important role in getting the green finance initiative off the ground, the Board of Guernsey Finance put its money where its mouth is. *(Interjection)* And it is *its* money, because remember Guernsey Finance is part-funded by industry and part-funded by General Revenue. It recruited the right man for the job and it has deployed resources from elsewhere, in addition to creating the foundational framework for this Island to be an exemplar as a green finance provider.

1295

1300

That has already been recognised because a press release which went out from Deputy Dudley-Owen over the last few days, reminded us that Guernsey is fifth or sixth in the league table of 27, with London and Paris being first and second in that list. So we are in very good shape and long may it continue. That deals, I think, with the bullet point that covers 'international action through our role as a Green and Sustainable Finance Centre'.

1305

The second point, 'local action to mitigate climate change and environmental degradation'. Well, local action: we have a situation at the moment where we do not deal with our residual waste on Island, preferring to send it ultimately to Sweden. So the question has to come if we support this, and I intend to, does that mean that we need to change our local action in a manner that sees an on-Island solution rather than an increased carbon footprint as a consequence of that trans-shipment of waste?

1310

But the main reason I rose is for something that has troubled me for 30-odd years and continues to trouble me today. As greater emphasis is placed on the blue economy, much greater emphasis needs to be placed on the incredible waste of discarded fish. Thousands and thousands of tonnes (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) of protein are wasted every day, thrown back because of the absurd quota system that the international community has. So, if we are serious, particularly as an Island, about the blue economy that is a very good place to start. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Thank you, sir.

1315

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

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

1320

I am very happy to support the amendment. It adds some meat to the bone and I think Deputy de Sausmarez is well placed on the Environment Committee to bring this forward and to act the lead in our Plan that we have put together as the Future Guernsey Plan.

1325

There is a cartoon I really quite like, actually, which you may have seen. It is a picture at a climate change conference, it was done by cartoonist, Joel Pett, and there is a whole list of things on the big screen and one of the people in the audience stands up at the climate summit and says, 'What if it is a big hoax and we create a better world for nothing?' *(Laughter)*

We create a better world for nothing, but look at the better world: energy independence; reserves of rainforests; sustainability; green jobs; liveable cities; renewables; clean water and air; and healthy children. So, even if it is a hoax, it is well worth doing anyway because it is the right thing to do.

1330 I think Deputy Leadbeater did touch on an area which I do get very cross about and he is absolutely right, do watch the hypocrisy. Each person has a role to play. Some people will go on holiday to the Galapagos Islands and tell me all about climate change and then criticise me for a straw that I have just used, or something. So do be a bit careful what we wish for. I think one of the other Members made the interesting thing about the balance that we have to strike.

1335 But the balance also has to be slightly more in favour of the climate if we are ever going to get out of this particular problem. And it may not necessarily be that a brand new, shiny £20,000 electric car may not be the best thing for the planet for Mrs Le Page. It may be better for her – who is using her Ford Fiesta for a couple of hundred miles a year – to preserve that car and keep it and run it a bit longer than buy a new electric vehicle with the tonnes of carbon that it will create.

**A Member:** Hear, hear. Absolutely right.

1345 **Deputy Brouard:** Also, when we are looking at carbon, again, just watch the hypocrisy, because that new washing machine has probably been made in China and is added to *their* tally. And Deputy Trott made a very good comment just now about our waste and where our waste is processed, that carbon waste is happening in Sweden.

1350 We import the goods; the carbon tally is with someone else. So maybe we just have to pay a little bit more attention when we buy these goods about how they have been manufactured, where the lithium battery came from, where the cobalt came from, how much water was used in it, how much food that those people have. It just goes on. This whole issue is extremely big, extremely complicated and extremely entangled, both in our lives and in what we do, from all sorts of things.

1355 Even as Deputy Brehaut mentioned about the sea defences and things, I personally hate the idea of groyne on L'Ancrese Beach and I will be doing something about that later, but that is another day. But he does make a good point: how much we have to do here as an Island. We have got some very low-lying areas and we need to make sure they are protected as we go forward.

So we do need to up our game and I thank the two Members who have brought this amendment. It gives the chance to have this debate.

1360 Thank you very much, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Paint.

**Deputy Paint:** Sir, I have been very sceptical about all this and I still am.

1365 We have heard several things this morning about tidal rise. Well, I have been working in this harbour for 58 years and I have not seen an inch of rise. Not an inch.

1370 Many years ago there was a building called the Annexe, I think it was a States' building on the Albert Pier, and they all used to row around it on a flat-bottomed boat on high-water spring tides. But that is nothing to do with tidal rise, that is to do with barometric pressure: the tide comes up sometimes two feet more, on very high spring tides. So, be careful what you wish for with this tidal rise business. I do not actually believe it.

1375 It worries me a bit that people pushing climate change are perhaps overdoing it. If I can just say we do not know what is going to happen in the future, but I suppose it is safer to take the other way and try to do something about it. It is a no-lose situation for them. In 10 years' time, if the water has not come up, or there is no warming they will say, 'We have saved it; we have saved the planet.'

I think, for safety, it is better for my grandchildren's sake to actually do something about it, but we have been told things before and what do we believe? Right up to last week we were told that

1380 we had better regulations than the UK on fraud and money laundering. Then all of a sudden the States have changed to go with the other two Islands –

**Deputy Tindall:** Point of correction sir.

1385 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Tindall.

**Deputy Tindall:** We do have a superior legislation for both anti-money laundering and beneficial ownership register. It is the quality of the verification that is superior.

1390 **Deputy Paint:** So why change?

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

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you, sir, to Deputy Paint for giving way, I am very grateful. I had the privilege of accompanying Deputies Le Tocq and Trott on the All-Party Parliamentary Group meeting yesterday in Westminster and it was acknowledged by the Lords and the Parliamentarians that we met there that their system was inferior to what we have in Guernsey, in terms of the register that they hold.

So I think that might be useful for Deputy Paint to know.

1400 **Deputy Paint:** Thank you very much for that. I accept that, but the trouble is who do we believe? We are led one way to believe one thing and another way to believe another. This is the same with this.

When I first came in the States this same subject came up and it was given to me by a scientist that about every 100,000 years there is a global warming incident. My question was: what caused that? We were not here. Humans were not here. They were not burning fossil fuels. So over the last 500,000 years this has happened, so what caused that then?

1405 Regarding the blue economy, and Deputy Trott, and fish being thrown back into the sea: that was not us doing that, nor the UK, it was Europe. Europe really do not know what they are talking about at times (*Laughter*) because a lot of these flat fish – flat plaice and sole and things – if you throw them back they will live, it is only round fish that will not. But now we have got seagulls starving because they cannot get food from the tip as they used to before, and because fishermen will have had to save these round fish where they chuck them back into the sea. So it is not as simple as what you see.

1410 If you watched the news a couple of nights ago, they are now using CO<sub>2</sub> to make all sorts of things commercially, like building blocks and many other things, and that is going to develop so that is going to reduce the CO<sub>2</sub>. So we must be careful what we do. We just must be careful what we do.

1415 I will not go against what is being proposed but I am really worried about it that we go too far. Thank you, sir.

1420 **The Bailiff:** Alderney Representative Roberts.

**Alderney Representative Roberts:** Thank you, sir.

1425 I take on board Deputy Paint's comments and there is some truth in them. Climate change is nothing new. Climate change would occur even if man did not exist. But, and it is a big but, climate changes are starting to happen unnaturally and that is because man does exist on this planet.

1430 Mr Snowdon has highlighted just what Alderney is trying to achieve and it is Island wide, because we value what we have. Technology may well save the day and we are trying to encourage our tidal solutions on a daily basis. Man is too clever – or, are we the stupidest animal ever? Only time will judge us.

The changes are alarming and changes are evident to a degree as never before. The world has to wake up – and fast; for it may be at an accelerating pace far faster than we actually realise.

1435 I would like to see these Islands lead the world in climate change measures, for it is not only our standing in the rest of the world it is our duty to the rest of the world and its children.

And I support this amendment. Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Yerby.

1440 **Deputy Yerby:** Sir, it would be wrong of me to let this amendment pass without touching on the fact that it mentions the role of Overseas Aid in tackling climate change but I will not dwell on it substantially because we will have the opportunity to unpack that fully in the debate on the Overseas Aid policy letter in our next debate. But I am very pleased that it has been recognised as a core part of a Government-led holistic approach towards climate change, and of course I am  
1445 fully committed to working with the Committee *for the* Environment & Infrastructure and with others to make sure that the role of Overseas Aid in delivering the Climate Change Action Plan is fully realised.

On that, sir, we have started an exercise looking at trying to express the impact of our current funding in numbers, so going beyond just the amount of budget that we put into many different  
1450 developing countries, but looking at how we can quantify that. I know that development will be welcomed by some Members and, in the context of climate change, these figures are still in draft so I ask Members just to not take them as gospel for the moment but when we come to climate change last year alone the funding that the States of Guernsey put into overseas development has rehabilitated hundreds of football fields-worth of agricultural land, planted hundreds of  
1455 thousands of trees and trained over 4,000 farmers in sustainable techniques.

It has put in place solar power supplies for schools and health centres. It has provided rainwater catching systems as a sustainable source of clean water, again for schools and health systems and villages around the world. We have even funded a hospital waste bio-digester to provide a sustainable solution to getting rid of one's waste on site. So for the comparatively small  
1460 amount of money that the States puts into Overseas Aid, in contrast with how far that money would go invested locally, the impact that we are having around the world is impressive in relation to climate change and in relation to other things and it is something that we can all collectively be proud of.

Talking briefly about the impact at home, I was also delighted that Deputy de Sausmarez and  
1465 Deputy Dudley-Owen included reference to the green and blue economies and what we can be doing on Island to be more self-sustaining, more sustainable, to use Deputy Meerveld's word. I felt that this was an area that was close probably to Deputy Lester Queripel's heart and I am sure that he will tell us if that is the case, because he has regularly reminded this Assembly that, as an Island, we have had a history of being self-sustained. We have had a history of good agriculture and then horticulture and we have lost a great deal of that.  
1470

But there is a great deal of potential, through the Climate Change Action Plan, through our actions as stimulated by this debate, to create the policy space needed to restimulate some new approaches towards being self-sustaining, to provide and retain food sources on Island. So it is not just having a better impact on the climate but it also provides us with additional security. As  
1475 Deputy de Sausmarez said in her opening speech, there are benefits that go well beyond just making a ... *Just!*

1480 The benefits involved in making a better world for a future also have a very real impact on our lives here today. They have the potential to tackle fundamental inequalities in society, because we know that climate change will hit the poorest hardest. It will hit the poorest hardest in the developing world but also here.

We know that in natural disasters, even the 'small-scale' disasters we have experienced, things like localised flooding, it is harder to evacuate if you are older or disabled. That inequality is prevalent even on a small level and the more that we can do to tackle these issues at source, the better it will be for everybody.

1485 So what is good for the planet is good for people. Action to tackle climate change will also improve our health and wellbeing. It will give us opportunities, as others have identified, for economic development and to flourish as a society.

And, sir, I support this amendment wholeheartedly.

1490 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Tooley.

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

1495 Various of my colleagues will know that I have been, at times, hesitant to make pledges in regard to climate change – *not* because I am sceptic, I absolutely believe that climate change is real, that it is happening and it is something that we need to do something slow or halt the progress of – but because I am concerned at the effect this will have on the poorest in our society.

1500 If we were to aim to become a carbon-neutral Island, a carbon-neutral society, we need to contemplate the ending of the use of combustion engines, moving to all-electric vehicles on our roads and in agriculture, electric-powered fishing boats and ferries. We would need eventually to end the import of hydrocarbons, gas, petrol, oil, etc. and to convert our oil and gas heating systems to other forms. We would need to offset the impact of flights. We would need to offset the impact of goods imported into the Island. We would need to consider whether cruise ships should be allowed into our waters.

1505 We need to consider, therefore, what effect this has on our social policies. It might be relatively easy for the wealthy but for the just-about-managing that simply is not the case. Travel to and from Guernsey is already expensive. How much does the cost rise if Aurigny, Condor, *et al*, have to offset the carbon they are using getting here? How attractive are we to other travel companies if we go down that road?

1510 Can households afford to replace cars, heating systems, etc. and simultaneously cope with price hikes in food cause by the cost of importation rising? Even a penny per unit on the cost of electricity will leave some households wondering how to afford shoes for their children. And if we are to offset, we will need to generate renewable energy for export – solar energy or perhaps off or onshore wind – and presumably we would need significant storage capacity, and I am not sure I remember seeing that in the IDP. We would need to find suitable offsetting schemes, possibly reforestation in areas around the world because physically we are not big enough to provide the space for the number of trees we would need to plant.

1515 I realise that sounds quite negative, so I want to give some reassurance to the proposer and seconder of this amendment that I am supportive of the amendment, because I am *absolutely* supportive of its aims and I am really reassured by the commentary here and by the wording which says that we need to address the social and economic factors which are integral to this priority policy area.

1520 I will vote for this. I look around the room because I will be holding your feet to the fire, Members of the Assembly – (*Interjection*) obviously not the Bailiff's feet to the fire, (**A Member:** An electric fire?) because that would be a very unfair thing to do – a solar-powered fire, I think (*Interjections*) perhaps is the best way to go, because apparently solar flares might become an issue going forward. But I will be holding the feet to the fire of everybody who, alongside me

today, votes for this amendment, because we need to *absolutely* ensure that in doing what is right for our planet and what is right for the poorest in our society, we do not damage those who are the poorest in our society right now.

1530 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson.

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

1535 I think Guernsey has been making some reasonable progress towards mitigating its impact on the climate over recent years but there is obviously still a long way to go. As an example of something we have done really well, the new Waste Strategy, which is achieving nearly 70% recycling rates puts us in the world top decile of jurisdictions and demonstrates our commitment to not burning re-useable resources.

1540 The Energy Policy, which will be published by E&I later this year, will obviously be another milestone along the path to improvement. I have seen that in draft and I think that will be a really significant step forward. About one third of our energy usage is domestic heating, one third is road transport and the rest of our energy use is the other third.

1545 It is actually the first two thirds, the first two segments, which are the easiest for us to do anything about. As we move, as I am sure we will, towards electrifying our energy market, it will be possible to replace high carbon intensity fuels and unsustainable fuels with sustainable and low carbon fuels, via the electricity market.

1550 To address Deputy Tooley's comments before I spoke, clearly we have to ensure that we do not create energy poverty in doing this. But I believe that the new technologies for generating renewable energy actually will be economically viable. Today, generating electricity via solar power, for example, is cheaper than generating it via burning carbon fuels.

1555 So we must not fall into the trap of thinking this is all going to be done at the expense of the lower paid. We have to be careful to ensure, of course, that we move with the technological advances. Guernsey is too small to be a pioneer in this area but, as some of these renewable energy technologies become commercially viable, we must be ready to take advantage of them. So achieving electrification of the road transport fleet and the domestic heating market is clearly going to be where the lowest hanging fruit lies.

1560 The other one third of our energy usage is generally more intractable and Members have already referred to cruise ships, airliners and so on. It may eventually be the case that somebody will develop a commercially viable electric plane. I do not know. But for the foreseeable future, planes are going to be powered by hydrocarbons, cruise ships are going to be powered by hydrocarbons, and some of those areas are relatively difficult for us to deal with. We have very little influence over technology used in manufacturing aircraft.

1565 We could assist the cruise ship industry with reducing its environmental impact if, for example, we had –

I give way to Deputy Tindall.

**Deputy Tindall:** I thank Deputy Parkinson for giving way.

1570 I did actually investigate whether we could encourage cruise ships that have a green label to come to Guernsey in preference and there are cruise ships out there that are very much advertising themselves on that platform. So it is a possibility but obviously the market may well, at the moment, dictate.

1575 **Deputy Parkinson:** Indeed, there may be some cruise ship operators who claim, and may justifiably claim, to be operating more environmentally friendly cruise ships and the market may in the end prefer those operators because customers will want not to be seen to be engaged in



1580 heavily polluting activities. But we, as I was about to say, could assist them. As Members will be aware cruise ships at the moment have to anchor in the middle of the Little Russell, or in fact more frequently they do not anchor they simply switch on a sort of sky hook on the GPS and the ship remains stationary in the Little Russell by running its engines and its bow thrusters and stern thrusters. So, all the time the ship is sat there outside St Peter Port it is running its engines. It has to run its engines anyway, or it has to run some engines, to keep the lights on because all the electricity on the boat is provided by its generators.

1585 Now, we could assist them and reduce the carbon footprint of the cruise ship industry in Guernsey by providing an alongside berth where they would not therefore need to run their engines to remain in one place and indeed they could plug in to shore power to connect for their electrical systems on board. Whether or not we end up building a cruise ship berth is a big subject, a very complex one, and frankly I do not think as a project on its own it could stand up economically, but it might stand up economically as part of a wider scheme that was involved with new port facilities generally or, for example, tidal protections. I do not know. That all needs to be looked into and should be looked into by the Seafront Enhancement Area Group.

1590 So there may be things we can do to mitigate some of the activities in that final third of our energy economy, which is going to generally provide the most difficulties. But I do not want to stray too far into that. The point is we can relatively easily electrify two thirds of our energy consumption and that on its own would make a massive difference to Guernsey's carbon footprint. This is something we really need to try and make progress towards.

1595 So that I think is all I have to say. I am obviously going to support this amendment. I think we should look to the low-hanging fruit, as it were, not get too side-tracked on the carbon emissions of aircraft which we cannot do much about. In any case, in response to Deputy Dudley-Owen, I do not think it is clear that running lots of fleets of small aircraft is more carbon-intensive than running smaller fleets of larger aircraft. I suspect the truth would be the other way around. But let us by all means support this amendment and make a commitment, as an Assembly, to getting Guernsey towards a lower carbon, more sustainable economy.

1605 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Merrett.

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

1610 I will be quite brief. Nobody has picked up on what Deputy de Sausmarez said, which is that one of the real issues we have had in trying to get to grasp with this is the longevity of our Assembly – that we have a four-year Assembly. Obviously, and I appreciate the analogy of Notre Dame Cathedral that we have to start somewhere, but I am a person that actually wants, if we are going to do this, to bring it into the Government policies that we bring to the Assembly. But we do have to start somewhere and I think this is a relatively good foundation.

1615 Again, sir, what no other Deputy has yet mentioned is the first amendment we discussed this morning that is all about resource. I am not sure if Environment & Infrastructure are already on this, they already have the officers in place and they already have the resource in place to achieve this May 2020 deadline and I would like some reassurance on that.

1620 Just to clarify, it is not just the physical cost of doing this that I am interested in. I think we do sometimes know the cost of everything and we sometimes forget the value of things. Also, what is the cost of doing nothing compared to the cost of doing something? That is something else that I think we should take into consideration with this amendment.

But the other one to mention is this hypocrisy issue and I want to try and bang it on the head. I am usually an optimist, sir: I do not think I will succeed in doing that but I am going to try. This issue of hypocrisy compared to being holier than thou.

1625 I am very much in favour of educating and informing our community as individuals of what they can do in their daily lives, if they are interested, to try and mitigate some of the

environmental considerations, whether that is recycling or whether that is educating, and of having a choice, sir, of whether we walk, cycle or drive a vehicle.

1630 I do not believe I am a hypocrite by eating red meat. I eat less red meat. I do not believe, because I am not a vegan or a vegetarian, that I cannot make a difference towards our environment. I believe that I will try to do what I can do and I will try to implore to my family and friends and dependents that when we can we should. I think we should not have to penalise our community, we just educate our community and we do not shout, 'Hypocrisy! How dare you want this, but you are still eating red meat or you are wearing other shoes, or you are driving a diesel vehicle.'

1635 That is why I can agree to some extent with Deputy Brouard, sir, because I have a vehicle that I purchased when I was told it was better for the environment to buy a diesel vehicle, so I bought that vehicle, sir. In fact it cost me an extra £1,000 to buy that vehicle because I thought, 10 years ago, that was the best thing I could do. Now, do I scrap that vehicle at a greater cost to the environment, or do I use that vehicle as I do now probably once or twice a week? These are the balances that we need to consider as individuals. Actually, I cannot afford an electric vehicle, sir, and I would not be able to afford it probably with a subsidy either. So I do have some concerns in that area.

1640 But what we are going on – and I am really hopeful that Deputy de Sausmarez can sum this up, because we are looking at a lot of *micro* and a lot of *macro* in this debate today. We are a little bit all over the place. Hands up, sir, I certainly am myself. But the point is we are a bit confused, aren't we? We are a bit confused. What can we do on a micro-level; what can we do on the macro-level? That is why we do need this action plan.

1650 I go to hypocrisy again, because we are hypocritical aren't we? At one juncture we are throwing waste into the sea, that seems to be okay, but in theory it could be used as aggregate on certain things but we are okay to throw it into the sea and fill in the bay, potentially, and then we would have to import our aggregate, maybe. I mean, you know, that is hypocrisy.

Then the IDP was referred to earlier. It says on this first point, sir – and I will read it to Members again:

- local action to mitigate climate change and environmental degradation,

1655 To me, sir, environmental degradation is building on greenfield sites or brownfield sites. (*Laughter*) Because if we are not using sites that have already being built on we are looking at a greenfield site and building on that! Now, I think that is hypocritical. I think that is hypocritical indeed. So we have to be careful when we throw out this hypocritical, holier-than-thou card, because we can all play that card and I thought we played it quite well today, sir.

1660 The thing that I really did respond well to was Deputy Tooley, because Deputy Tooley made a very good point about the social inequalities and balances that our community faces. Now, I am passionate about these and I really do believe that we need to be balancing up our economy, our environment and our social policies on a far more level playing field; and we do need to start taking mitigation actions or, in the very least, acknowledging when we pass the policy – and I think the last debate was a prime example of this, sir, where we passed a policy on Reform of Public Health and we talked about Income and Social Security and we talked about Health and Social Security, all good stuff, but it was not until other Members brought an amendment to say, 'Look how about the social inequality of appliances for disabled Islanders?'

1670 We had to actually put in an amendment to that and then support it I think unanimously if I remember. But that is a really good example of where we just are not taking these in proportion, we are not being pragmatic. We are not balancing these three important areas of Government work, which is the economy, the environment and our social policies.

Do you want me to give way, Deputy Gollop? (*Interjections*)

**Deputy Gollop:** Yes, please.

1675

**Deputy Merrett:** I will give way, Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Gollop:** Yes, I agree with Deputy Merrett in a way, but it is not just writing policy and policy planning and getting it amended and push it upstairs in a way to Policy & Resources that does the trick. The reality is committees on the ground, like ESS and Health and Social Care, in some cases have not been doing as much as they could because of budgetary restrictions and staff resources.

1680

We need a radical debate on taxation and income and not just on social policy.

1685

**Several Members:** Hear, hear.

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

So I will be supporting this amendment. I believe it will probably vote unanimously. The only concern I have before I sit down is that we are getting a little bit – I do not know how to put this politely, I am going to try to be diplomatic but Members know it is not my strong point – are we jumping on a bit of a populist wagon? (*Interjections*)

1690

We have known about this ... We did not know how to deal with it and I am not convinced we know how to deal with it now, either. That is why I will support it because I think that we need something, a plan, in place so I will support this. But I will go back to my first opening comment, sir, that as an Assembly every four years we kick the can down the road on so many things, we kick so many things into the long grass that actually I welcome this, I will support it but we need to understand – and I go back to Deputy de Sausmarez, the Notre Dame analogy, which I thought was brilliant, we need to understand that we put the foundations in place but actually when we deliberate, discuss and decide on things in this Assembly that we actually take a balanced view on those three important areas of Government.

1695

1700

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Laurie Queripel.

1705

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

A bit like Deputy de Lisle, I was content with the section of the policy letter that deals with climate change and environmental matters. It spoke about a formulation of an action plan. I thought that all seemed fairly reasonable to me. Now, I think this amendment, in not so many words, and I am sure Deputy de Sausmarez will correct me if I am wrong, is asking for us to call for an emergency or a climate change emergency or crisis.

1710

I am somewhat reluctant to do that, sir, because normally speaking when a crisis or emergency is called, regardless of the subject area, what would normally happen is the rather swift imposition of very severe and stringent mandatory measures. Clearly, as Deputy Meerveld pointed out, we cannot do that. If we do that the damage to our community, economically and socially, would be severe. So Deputy Merrett is right, it is about balance and proportionality.

1715

I think that is what we need. We need a well-considered, proportionate action plan to be formulated and to be acted upon and that is the key word, I think. That is what I am for, sir. I am not ignoring the issue, I am acknowledging it, but I think there is a way to approach it. I am a bit concerned, as Deputy Merrett said again, if we jump on the bandwagon and declare an emergency we are not taking the measured and proportionate approach that we should take. I am not saying that I will not vote for this amendment – I will give way to Deputy Dudley-Owen, sir.

1720

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you, sir, to Deputy Queripel for giving way.

1725 This is not a declaration of emergency in response to requests that we have received recently. An emergency, in my view, is an administrative tool; it is covered by our civil contingencies law. Climate change of itself is actually excluded from that but the consequences of climate change events are not. This is not what this is about. This is exactly what Deputy Queripel has outlined, it is an action plan around the crisis that we are facing and this is not a declaration of an emergency in any way shape or form.

1730 Personally, my view is that we would have to do much of the actions that Deputy Tooley has outlined. We would be switching off the power station tomorrow if that was the case, we would be stopping people from using their cars if that was the case, and a whole raft of other measures. That is not what this is about. I hope that that is clear.

1735 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Thank you. Yes, so that helps me to some extent. But what I am saying, sir, is that to me it absolutely makes sense that we try to live as individuals, as a community, as a Government, as a business – we try to live as sustainably and environmentally friendly as possible. I am all for that and I am not speaking against that at all.

1740 But I was a bit concerned, sir, when Deputy Brehaut stood up and he spoke about difficult decisions ahead that we would have to take. What always concerns me is whatever subject you are debating or discussing, whatever subject is the focus of attention, there is always going to be an extreme element that will jump on the situation and say we should be doing this, we should be doing that; whatever the cost to the community, whatever the cost to the poorer people within our society. I have to say right now even if I vote for this amendment if something, in my opinion, 1745 lazy comes back and we are looking at a raft of additional green taxes, I will not be voting for that, sir. If it is just about additional green taxes I will not be voting for it.

So I am laying down that marker now. I think actually any action plan, aside from the macro things that we can do, and other Members have referred to that, so the Energy Policy – in other words how the Island is powered – and the push to become a centre of excellence, to promoting and encouraging and facilitating green finance and green investment, those are all good things. 1750 Those are things that can be done on a macro level.

As far as the individuals are concerned – and I have got to be careful here because I do not want Deputy Inder to spring up and say that I am virtue-signalling – for me there are some quite simple and not severe things that individuals can do in order to lighten their carbon footprint. I am just going to give some examples, things that I have thought about and done over the last 1755 two years, because we all have to act responsibly but proportionately.

So by way of an example, I have a van. It is only a low-powered van, a 600cc van. If I can use the bus, for example, for a straightforward journey, so from home to Town and back, I will use the bus and that is what I do. If something is within reasonable walking distance, let's say we have a 1760 supermarket that is I think about a quarter of a mile, or half a mile away from where I live, I will walk there and back. So I have immediately cut down, and I only use my van if I have got what I would call a multi-tasking day ahead, or perhaps for more essential journeys.

I am also conscious in regard to vehicle use, sir, there are many people locally who have a multi-tasking day in the sense of they will go to work, they might pick the children up after school 1765 to take them to their club or activity, then they will go and get the shopping and they will go and get the children again. I do not want to make life any more difficult than it has to be for people like that. That is the sort of thing we have got and, once again, it is all about being reasonable and proportionate. That is the sort of thing we should think about. But what I am saying is I use my van less than I used to because if I consider I can take the bus to get somewhere or I can walk 1770 somewhere, I will do.

Now, in regard to consumer choices, this is where I think the action plan should be more about education and awareness, and I think Deputy Merrett has already mentioned that. It should be about trying to educate and make people aware that they can make better lifestyle and consumer

1775 choices. So for me, when I go shopping, I try and buy as much local produce as possible because invariably it has got less packaging on it. That is something else one can do, make good choices in regard to the products that we purchase.

1780 Other simple little things, sir, like now I will buy containers, say, with washing-up liquid, for example, where you can go and refill that container – instead of going and buying another bottle of washing-up liquid I will take the container back and get it refilled. Occasionally I wash up, yes! (*Laughter*) I have not got a dishwashing machine because I do not believe that is a green thing to do. These are the kinds of things that we can do. You can purchase more and more containers of things, whether it is soap or washing-up liquid that can be refilled. In regard to soap, sir, I do not buy the pump-action soap any more, I buy a bar of soap that you can put in a soap dish. That is cutting down on plastic use as well.

1785 Now, this is a big one, sir, but it is quite a simple thing to do, in regard to electronic devices. And I just want to say, before I get too much into this, electronic activity and electronic devices are not the green solution that some people may think they are and I will explain why in just a moment. In regard to electronic activities and electronic devices, all the devices I can switch off – in other words not leave on standby, I can actually switch them off properly at the mains – I do so.  
1790 So that could be your stereo system, your laptop, it can be your televisions. All these things can be switched off at the mains rather than being left on standby, because leaving things on standby also produces a carbon footprint. It is about thinking about these types of things.

1795 As for travel, sir, I do not leave the Island very much, I must admit. I am a bit of a home boy. So if I do go somewhere it is normally a day trip or a long weekend to Jersey. So you could probably add up my travel miles during the course of a year very easily in regard to off-Island travel; but I am not saying people should not take a holiday, that is a perfectly reasonable thing for people to do. But these are all the things that people can think about. If they take three holidays a year, perhaps they can cut down to one or two. (**A Member:** Tax them.) No not tax them, just make them think more carefully about their consumer and lifestyle choices.

1800 So these are all the kinds of things that people can do and that is quite an easy message to get across, and when you think about the worlds of advertising and marketing, if advertising and marketing is done in a very clever way it is very effective. It makes people think about, 'Perhaps I should do this', or 'Perhaps I should go out and do that'. If the message is put across in a very good way, in a very clear way, in a very persuasive way it is possible to get people to think about  
1805 their lifestyle and consumer choices without taxing them to the hilt. These are the kinds of things that should be part of the action plan.

I think a sigh sometimes emits carbon emissions as well, I am not quite sure ...

1810 In regard to devices there was an article recently in the Guardian newspaper – not everybody's newspaper of choice, yes, you can read it online ironically enough (*Laughter*) – and part of that article said:

In response to vast increases in data storage and computational capacity in the last decade, the amount of energy used by data centres has doubled every four years, and is expected to triple in the next 10 years."

These changes are partly being driven by the so-called internet of things: the increasing array of everyday devices – from TVs, through domestic security devices, to lighting systems, and countless modes of transport – that constantly emit and receive data. If driverless cars ever arrive in our lives, those same flows will increase hugely.

1815 So those things are not really part of the solution unless they are used carefully and considerately. The study suggests that by 2040 ICT carbon emissions could account for as much as 14%, which is roughly where the transportation industry is right now. Smartphones were by far the worst contributors to tech's carbon footprint. That is because of several factors including the mining activity needed to extract the metals needed to make our phones, for one thing; your phone requires almost 10 times as much precious metals as a laptop or a desktop computer.

The report goes on to say that actually, and this is something that people can think about in their lifestyle choices, a call from a landline produces only one third of the carbon that call from a

1820 mobile phone does. These are things that people can be thinking about, sir. And there are some  
other factors from that report and that study: office lights left on overnight use enough energy in  
a year to heat a home for almost five months. Leaving a computer on overnight – we are going  
back to the standby issue to some extent – for a year creates enough CO<sub>2</sub> to fill 30 bath tubs. A  
photocopier left on standby overnight wastes enough energy to make 21 cups of tea. A  
1825 photocopier left on overnight produces enough energy to produce over 1,500 photocopies. So  
some of the things that we think are the answer to the solutions, unless they are used wisely and  
carefully, are not the answers and solutions.

I think to me, as I say, it is all about education, it is all about getting the message out there so  
that people can make more informed consumer and lifestyle choices and it is all about consuming  
in a sparing way, whether it is the use of our vehicle, whether the use of and the charging of  
1830 electronic devices and all those things in between.

I think I have proved my point; I am trying to live the life myself. I am all for us trying to live  
more sustainably, whether it is as individuals or a business or whatever it is and to be sparing in  
our consumer choices. But I am not for the imposition of lots of green taxes that will make life  
much more difficult for some of the poorest people within our community.

1835 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

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

1840 I will be very brief because I am conscious after Deputy Laurie Queripel's speech we will be  
wanting to get home to switch off our fax machines, telexes, wirelesses and radiograms!

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Well done, well done! Yes, that's right! *(Laughter and interjection)*

1845 **Deputy Le Tocq:** But, sir, I rise because, as has been said by my colleagues, P&R supports this  
amendment, and I do so because I was the one that was delegated to do most of the media  
interviews when the Policy & Resource Plan was published.

At that time, bearing in mind what else was happening in the world media globally, I think  
every single media interview just concentrated on climate change. That is all that they picked up. I  
1850 tried to divert to some other things because, as we know, this is not a small policy letter.  
Nevertheless at the time that is what they were interested in, and perhaps rightly so.

But as other Members have said, and particularly the last few Members, we are dealing  
sometimes with things that are here today and gone tomorrow. We can produce some words like  
this – and I support these words because I do think they are reasonable and practicable, and I will  
1855 come on in a moment to particularly why I support them – but let's not just be putting more  
words in without actually meaning that we will take action where necessary.

We need to take reasonable action because, I think, if we look at issues in isolation things look  
very simple but when we stand back and look at them in context they are far more complicated,  
and I think I mentioned, sir, before, there was a book I read last year that had the excellent title of  
1860 *I Think You'll Find It's a Bit More Complicated Than That*, is exactly what we are dealing with here.

We might get to the point where we are a carbon-neutral Island, a big tick in the box for us,  
but it will probably be a big cross in the box for other people who are having to deal with the  
things that we cannot deal with here because of our economies of scale. Now, if it is a climate  
emergency, let's all leave Guernsey and go to some big place where we can do things far more  
1865 efficiently and let's let Guernsey go back to the rural idyll that it was when a few pirates lived in  
the Island, perhaps a few centuries BC. I do not know. I am not suggesting that, sir, but it is more  
complicated.

1870 It is more complicated because when you look at plastics in the sea, and do not get me wrong, I am very much in favour of reducing plastics and certainly not just throwing them into the sea, but when you look at the issues of plastics in seas, it is estimated that 46% of plastics in the sea come from discarded fishing nets from big factory trawlers. So we need to see, proportionately, what we can do in Guernsey.

1875 That is why I am particularly happy the bullet points that are included in this amendment include things like, and working backwards, I think the international effect that we can have, because of our main industry here in the Island, through green and sustainable finance initiatives. We have already made headway in that area. I think there is a lot more we can do there. That will have global effects and we should support that as far as possible and make it known to the world that we are a world leader and a pioneer in that area. Let's continue to do so.

1880 I am also supportive of the work that Overseas Aid can do particularly in this. Now you would not be surprised, perhaps, to hear me say that. But I do think and agree with the comments that Deputy Yerby made earlier where our initiatives to help those poorest in the world – who often do not have the choices that we have – to be able to live more effectively without affecting the climate around negatively, which we often in the west have been responsible for affecting around them. If we can do that through, particularly, the small initiatives that perhaps others would not look at, some of the education, some of the training and some of the employment issues that we can be involved in, that is a very positive thing that I think we can deal with as well. Similarly the green and blue economies and others have mentioned that before.

1890 I think where it becomes very difficult is when we are talking about the very small things that might make a difference if we had a huge population, but over here are either not cost-effective or not efficient to run in Guernsey and therefore we have to rely on others to do that for us, which sometimes negates the effect on the whole climate issue in the first place. So we need to be proportionate and that is why I think the word such as 'crisis' – and I am happy to accept 'crisis' – 'emergency' I struggle with for reasons that others have given as well, because it is the wrong sort of thing.

1895 I engaged with some of the people that contacted me after the media interviews, particularly one young person who said, 'You did not sound panicked enough about the climate emergency.' I said, 'I don't want to panic.' He said, 'You should. I want you to panic.' I said, 'Panicking does not do any good at all.' And if we are getting to that stage where we feel that is appropriate behaviour or appropriate language, then I do not think that is leadership or becoming upon us.

1900 But I do accept crisis, and also the word 'critical' that is in this amendment, because they come from the same Greek root – it means 'a time to make decisions'. I think we are at that stage: a time to make decisions. This is a critical issue and we need to in a measured and reasonable way, and proportionate to Guernsey, see where we can have the greatest effect and target our resources there.

1905 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel.

1910 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, Deputy Leadbeater when he spoke early on, touched on hypocrisy and he was absolutely right. Deputy Merrett touched on it and Deputy Brouard. Deputy Trott actually has said in this Chamber on several occasions he is amazed at the hypocrisy in this Chamber. It is no laughing matter, sir, because this concerns me greatly, this hypocrisy.

1915 Climate change is all about the environment. It is all about the environment we create and the environment others create. Yet the vast majority of this Assembly voted in favour of an amendment laid by Deputy Merrett and Deputy Graham that allows anyone in Guernsey to light a bonfire any time of the day or night, seven days a week. The vast majority of this Assembly –

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

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

1920

**Deputy Leadbeater:** People are allowed to light a bonfire any hour they want, seven days a week, as long as they are only burning green waste.

1925

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, and they voted in favour of that amendment – this is all relating to this subject, sir, so please bear with me – knowing full well that there were two other amendments on the table, both of which I proposed and one was seconded by Deputy Prow and one was seconded by Deputy Soulsby. The one that I laid with Deputy Prow restricted bonfire lighting to two days a week, from seven in the morning to seven in the evening. Only two people voted for that amendment, Deputy Prow and myself. That was an opportunity to walk the walk,

1930

not just talk the talk. The other amendment, only eight Members voted for, the one I laid with Deputy Soulsby to restrict the lighting of bonfires to five days a week, from seven in the morning to seven in the evening. I give way to Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, sir.

1935

**Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** Thank you, Deputy Lester Queripel.

I realise in highlighting the numbers who voted for those amendments you might negate to include those Members who would have voted for the original Proposition or the original idea, which was to allow smoke-free weekends, which would have limited. It is not as clear-cut as Deputy Queripel is saying, that those who chose not to vote for his amendments were choosing to vote for Deputy Merrett's.

1940

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, I thank Deputy Hansmann Rouxel for that clarification but I disagree completely. The opportunity was there. The Assembly had a choice and what did they choose to do? They chose to allow any Islander in Guernsey to light a bonfire any time of the day or night, seven days a week. I rest my case, sir.

1945

Now before I rest my case on that one (*Laughter*) I was ridiculed by some Members of this Assembly for laying that amendment, I was ridiculed by some members of the community and I was ridiculed by some members of the media, and I am still ridiculed to this *day*. So do not talk to *me* about protecting our environment. Do not just talk the talk; walk the walk.

1950

If we were really serious about reducing pollution, our carbon footprint, surely we would have voted for at least one of those two amendments that I laid.

Now, sir, it might make my colleagues feel good and look good to be saying the right thing, but that is not good enough. It is irresponsible. When you have got the opportunity to do something about it, do something about it. Do not just talk about it. This whole debate is about taking responsibility for *yourselves, ourselves*, in everything we do in our personal lives on a daily basis. That is not just on the Members in this Assembly, of course.

1955

Yes, sir, I am going to support this amendment. It is laid with the best of intentions, but let's not give Islanders false hope. Let's not keep on saying things, that my brother Deputy Laurie Queripel touched on this before, like 'resources are hindering us', 'lack of resources are a stumbling block', because that would be hypocrisy.

1960

Deputy Yerby touched on this when she spoke, sir, and I thank her for touching on this, another example of potential hypocrisy. We import the vast majority of our food from everywhere else in the world. That food is brought on boats, some of it on planes but the vast majority by boats, almost on a daily basis, and every single one of those boats adds to the carbon footprint.

1965

The irony is we are, by tradition, an Island of growers and farmers, and the result of our allowing ourselves to rely so heavily on importing so much of our food is we now have 216



redundant glasshouses on Guernsey. That is an equivalent to the land mass of 251 football pitches lying dormant. Many of those glasshouses could be used, they are in excellent condition and could be used tomorrow.

1970 I will give way – and I will just remind colleagues the more I get interrupted the longer my speech is going to take – but I will give way to Deputy Inder.

**Deputy Inder:** Deputy Queripel, I actually agree with you. We used to have something like 15,000 vergées of growing land some 60 years ago. I do not think that has actually changed an awful lot, some of it has been covered by greenhouses, some of it is being used by horses. But as  
1975 a Member of the IDP, and I absolutely agree with him, we should not be building on our agricultural fields and as soon as we take a few of them away it is gone forever.

So he could take a clear message from, I believe, the majority of this Assembly, that we should not be building on any more green fields in this Island and we made a mistake when we voted through the IDP that Dolent, ... and all the fields in the north should not be built on and they are as equally valuable as contiguous fields of the agricultural south.

1980 Thank you.

**A Member:** Hear, hear.

1985

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, I thank Deputy Inder for that interjection. I would respectfully remind him I resigned from the DPA because I do not agree with development in green fields and I do not agree with any of this sort of development in Ruettes Tranquilles. I did not just talk the talk, I implemented an action. (*Interjections*)

1990 There is an element in here, I think, possibly, where people cannot handle the truth. I will leave that one in the air for the moment, sir. But what I was saying, before I was asked to give way by Deputy Inder, was we could reduce our carbon footprint considerably and grow more of our own food in those glasshouses that could be brought back into play tomorrow by increasing grants to farmers and growers.

1995 We could do that and yet when I have suggested that in the past, the argument has been put up, 'We are not in the business of subsidising,' – although we do subsidise to a certain extent – 'we are not in the business of financing businesses to that extent.' But it is a win-win. You reduce your carbon footprint, you supply more of your own food and you use the glasshouses that are lying redundant.

2000 Sorry, sir, I give way to Deputy Fallaize.

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

2005 Is Deputy Queripel seriously suggesting that we ought to provide some financial inducement to encourage people to leave employment in profitable industries and provide them with taxpayers' grants to work in industries which have become greatly diminished because they were not profitable? How does he anticipate us being able to run a reasonably successful economy if we adopt that sort of approach?

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** I am not saying that for a minute, sir. I am not saying that people  
2010 leave profitable industries to go and work in other industries. What I am saying is this is a serious issue and we need to take it seriously and we need to do something about it and the way we do something about it, to my mind, would be to provide grants and subsidies to existing growers who employ people to increase our production of our own food to such an extent that we reduce the importation of food and we reduce our carbon footprint. I say that knowing full well that some  
2015 of my colleagues might be thinking, 'But you have to heat glasshouses'. No you do not, there is such a thing as a cold house. Vegetables grow in cold houses.

2020 So, sir, moving towards the close, let's not just talk about reducing our carbon footprint, let's take the action we need to take to reduce it. I am not just talking about the Members of this Assembly, I am talking about every single member of our community. We all need to take a serious look at ourselves, because I suspect even the most avid supporter of our environment will themselves be guilty of adding to our carbon footprint.

2025 My brother, Deputy Laurie Queripel, touched on this earlier. How many mobile phones do you have? How many mobile phones do you actually need? How many computers have you got? How many computers have you got in your house? How many televisions do you have in your house? How many of your laptops and computers are left on overnight with screensavers being displayed all night long? It happens in our offices. You see it time and again, computers on all night in offices, with screensavers on. It could be argued they are not burning a great deal of electricity but they are still burning electricity. That is the issue.

2030 How many laptops and iPads are on in this Chamber right now? The vast majority of this Assembly uses laptops and iPads in this Chamber. Now, I understand it is for States' work most of the time, I appreciate that, but I very rarely bring a laptop into this Chamber. There are others who do not bring laptops into this Chamber. There are many, many things that I am sure we all do that, if we stopped doing, would reduce our carbon footprint.

2035 Sir, it is a serious issue. Do not give Islanders false hope. Do not just talk the talk. Take the opportunity to do something about it when you get that opportunity.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** We will rise and resume at 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.37 p.m.  
and resumed at 2.31 p.m.*

**The Policy & Resource Plan –  
2018 Review and 2019 Update –  
Debate continued**

2040 **The Deputy Greffier:** Continuation of debate on amendment 13.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Smithies, you were standing before lunch.

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

2045 In spite of the encouragement of my colleagues not to speak, I am going to – (*Laughter and interjection*)

I commend P&R for including this important topic of climate change in 1e) and, like Deputies de Lisle and Inder and Queripel, I just wonder what this amendment adds.

2050 Deputy de Sausmarez is the proposer, Deputy Brehaut has spoken, and so it is clear to me the amendment will be or would be incorporated into any climate change action plan in any case. But that is not really what it is about: it is about hearing a debate.

In this Chamber of all places it is obvious to say that words matter. They certainly matter to me and my difficulty with this amendment is the first nine words.

... recognising that climate change has reached a critical point ...

2055 Now, critical means partially to Deputy Le Tocq, a point at which a chain reaction is irreversible, amongst other definitions. Climate change has been reaching a critical point for 50 years and possibly longer, but that is as far as I remember. One critical moment was in the 1970s and 1980s but that was an ice age which was predicted. *(Interjection)* Another point was in 2009 when Prince Charles speaking in Rio assured us there remained only 100 months – that is nine years and four months – to save the world. He now says 33 years. *(Laughter)*

2060 Al Gore in 2007 and 2008 and 2009 claimed that the North Pole would be ice free by 2013. In 2007 a UN report said that the Himalayan Glaciers were going to melt. That was later disowned by the IPCC.

Now, I do not mention these forecasts to ridicule them but rather to urge the environmental movement not to try to frighten people. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)** It is in fact counterproductive. Just like the boy who cried wolf people start to disbelieve.

2065 I will vote for this amendment but with the reservation that the language is too inflammatory.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

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

2070 I will support the amendment but I will just pick up a few points that have been made and ask a question.

2075 Deputy Trott mentioned about waste in his speech: well, in the current Waste Strategy that was considered back in I think it was 2012, the environmental effect was one of the key points that was considered and that is why – the high recycling that Deputy Parkinson referred to – it was based on high recycling rates and also us exporting our waste. When I was on PSD we looked at the environment effects of exporting to further afield or exporting to nearer and it was more environmentally friendly to export to a far more efficient plant than to export it to a nearer plant. So the decision was not purely made on financial grounds, it was made on environmental grounds as well, but it worked for both environmental and financial.

2080 Deputy Parkinson mentioned about solar energy: well, I was involved in a building project which was done last year with south-facing roofs, and solar is still very expensive at least in a domestic situation and it cannot be justified. As I understand, all the work that has been done shows that the most cost effective is offshore wind, in terms of green energy. So that is, I believe – if we as an Island want to go – where we should be investing because in England, where the grants have now been stopped for that, it shows that is the most environmentally friendly and economic way for green energy.

2090 I would also like to pick up the point that has been made, which is probably slightly off the amendment, about where we should build. In my view, from an environmental point of view and energy point of view, the best place is to have proper town planning where we build near where people have got employment, recreation and shops so that people can walk to those facilities, and we should not be basing our land use policy on where greenhouses were built many years ago, because they are not the right places necessarily to put housing. We should have proper town planning and build our properties in the right place. Think when you fly over Guernsey compared to most other places the development which is spread all over the Island is a contrast to most other places. So I think we should think from an environmental point of view about the right places to put our development.

2100 Deputy Lester Queripel mentioned about food and our greenhouses. Well, I know there were two farmers who were growing food in open fields which is far less intensive in terms of financial resources and they could not make it pay over here. We just have to face that we do not have the scale to be able to do food production. Perhaps we can do it in terms of things like potatoes because of the heavy product, but most food products do not work over here from a financial point of view and I would not want us to start bringing people in, and having that environmental

effect of bringing people in just to use glass houses because they were used for food production, but expensive food, in the past.

2105 Finally my points on resources, in paragraph 3.56 on page 22 it says:

While resources (funding and people) are not available until currently prioritised work streams are completed, some are heading towards conclusion. This does not, however, prevent preparatory work in developing a more unified climate change policy and commencing on the formulation of a 'Climate Change Action Plan'.

It then goes on to say:

The Assembly can then decide how to prioritise further activity when presented with a suitable programme of work with resources identified and objectives defined.

So we are struggling to have resources for the current commitment, obviously this is a bigger commitment, and I would just like some reassurance that there will be resources to do this amendment if we vote for it.

2110 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** I see no one else rising. Deputy de Sausmarez will reply.

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

2115 I was hoping that with the benefit of a lunch break I would have a beautifully co-ordinated and coherent set of responses but unfortunately I got a bit distracted by lunch so please do bear with me. Sadly I did not have time for cake, but do bear with me.

2120 I have actually been really surprised by the number of people who have engaged with this debate. I am not going to respond speaker by speaker and point by point. I am going to address some of the more common themes that came through.

First of all, I would like to thank Deputy Dudley-Owen for working with me on this and others who contributed and also thank all the member of the public who have engaged with this issue.

2125 So one the themes that came out which I should probably address first has been voiced most recently by Deputy Smithies and Deputy Inder is what is the purpose, what does this bring? Well, I think actually this debate is one of those things that I think has been really valuable in terms of drawing out some of the expectations, some of the preconceptions, some of the concerns of Members in this Assembly; and certainly as someone who is going to be working flat out on this, assuming it passes, I find that very helpful so I would thank Members for their contributions one and all.

2130 But more than that, when I first read the P&R Plan I was actually very grateful and glad to see that P&R had included it in the way that they had. I just did not think that it was focussed enough. I think that was my main issue.

2135 I think one of the concerns that had been bandied about especially in response to this idea of a declaration of some sort. My colleagues are very quick to respond with, 'It is about action; it is not about words'. I was actually a little uneasy reading the original iteration that it was just a bit too fuzzy and it did not really have that focus and commitment there. So that was one of the things, and I thought it would also be useful to provide an outline of scope, because actually I am not sure if I had asked my colleagues to write down what they thought would be included in that scope that we would have got necessarily all of those points from everyone. Actually I do not think we would, so I think it is great that we have been able to have that discussion. I have certainly learnt things from people.

2140 So, yes, the intention of the amendment was really to put a bit more of a spotlight on it and also provide a bit of broader context and really put the emphasis on action, so we are linking not just the words but the action required as a result of those words. There has been various talk

2145 about the language. I think certainly Deputy Dudley-Owen and myself are happy with the words that were put on the page. We did go over them very carefully, they were there for a reason.

Another broad thing that came out was – as I expected actually, I actually expected a little bit more of this – a bit of debate over climate change itself. We have had differing views and different insights and I think that is always helpful to hear those.

2150 But I think it is probably helpful if I explain what the consensus is, or more specifically how the consensus is formed, because I think people perhaps imagine that the consensus is a stab in the dark, that people are kind of assuming that this is what climate scientists think – maybe they have sent out a survey and surveyed 100-odd climate scientists and maybe that is how they got to this mythical figure of 97 in peoples' heads.

2155 Well, in order to determine a consensus is a very rigorous process and this is one consensus that has been tested again and again and again, and it has been robustly evidenced. It is based on literally many thousands of peer-reviewed academic papers and cross-examined, if you like, so it really is a robust evidence base on which to confidently state that degree of consensus. And, as Deputy Brehaut illustrated with his analogy of the lift engineers, it really is quite a sizeable majority.

2160 I do not doubt that there are certainly many differences in some of the opinion around the consensus, but in the explanatory note or perhaps the footnote, I cannot remember now, to the amendment, we do specify exactly what that consensus is. So I would just like to reassure Members that that is a robust and well-evidenced thing.

2165 I was not going to pick out too many individuals, but I would like to particular thank those Members on that issue who perhaps are a little bit more sceptical, and I think the most heart-warming speech of the day for me came from Deputy Paint, in fact, because I know that he has been a long-time sceptic on this issue and I thought his logic was really admirable actually. He thought, I am not entirely convinced, I have got my doubts, I have got my reasons for those doubts, but I am going to play it safe for the sake of my grandchildren among other things. I thought that was admirable logic and I do applaud him for that. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)**

2170 So, two specific questions though I think Deputy Dorey has pre-empted me on this. There were two questions, certainly there were more than that, but Deputy Trott asked the question: obviously if we are going to take all this into account then will we need to move to an on-Island system of waste disposal? Deputy Dorey has already outlined how the environmental criteria actually support the current system, but I would re-emphasise that of course our current waste system is a waste-minimisation system. I do find this on-Island thing a little bit extraordinary because if you extrapolate the logic I do not think anyone is suggesting that we should have smelting plants in order to recycle on Island. But people do get very hung up on this issue of the residual waste. As Deputy Dorey said, they did do quite an in-depth analysis on the environmental impact and, given factors such as the use of empty container capacity and the very much higher efficiency rating of the end plants, the environmental criteria did come out very strongly on that even though it was not a material consideration in the final decision.

2185 Deputy Brouard also asked a question about whether Mrs Le Page in Torteval – a figure I know well whenever I talk to Deputy Brouard about this kind of thing – would be better off running her Ford Fiesta rather than buying a EV. And, although it is not directly relevant to the amendment, my answer is a resounding yes, absolutely. When you do the lifecycle analysis, around between 50% and 60%, depending on what kind of car it is, of the carbon emissions involved in the entire lifecycle of a motor vehicle are used in the production process. So it is, from an environmental perspective, sound to run your car as efficiently as possible for as long as possible to maximise the use out of it rather than creating new cars. So, delaying the creation of new cars, and I would reassure Deputy Brouard that Mrs Le Page is going to be perfectly fine in her Ford Fiesta or whatever it was she was driving.

2195 Is this a fad, was a question raised by Deputy Merrett. Well, as someone who has been  
hopping up and down about this for a good – or is this a populist band wagon, yes, Deputy  
Merrett is correcting my ... The broad thing is it a fad or is it a populist band wagon, was  
something that was mentioned by a couple of people. Frankly, as somebody who has been  
hopping up and down about this issue for the last 20 years, I am quite delighted that it has got  
the profile that it currently has; and as Deputy Soulsby said I think, in a way it is a real shame that  
2200 it takes someone like David Attenborough to pierce the public consciousness in this way.

I mean, I remember actually at least 10 or maybe 11 years ago we showed a film locally called  
*Message in the Waves* which was about plastic pollution. It is a lovely documentary if anyone  
wants to look it up. And I think probably maybe 15 or 20 people came out of that local showing  
thinking 'Right, this is a problem we need to fix'. And of course it took another 10 or 11 years  
2205 before David Attenborough came along and did that so much better. But I am glad he has done it.  
So that is great.

I could talk for hours, but do not worry, I will not, on why there has been so much foot-  
dragging, so much inaction for so long, and part of that I am absolutely convinced is about the  
messaging. I do not really want to use the term 'catch-22', but there is something of a sort of  
2210 cyclical logic to part of the problem; because I think as members of the public for many decades,  
even though the science was actually pretty coherent from a very early – and certainly from the  
1980s there was a pretty strong consensus even then. Even though the science has been quite  
clear and scientists have been trying to get this message out I think members of the public have  
thought, perhaps subconsciously, 'Well if it were really such an issue then surely the government  
2215 would be doing something about it'. And of course the government is there, and they are  
responding to the needs of business and they have got a lot vested in the *status quo* and so we  
get into a sort of cyclical logic about it, and I think that is one of the reasons for that kind of stasis.

The other issue was hypocrisy: apparently there has been a big hypocrisy narrative, I have  
missed it completely but, anyway, apparently it has been something that has been discussed. But I  
2220 came across quite a nice little quote yesterday when reading about something not directly related  
actually – I should attribute the quote to someone called Lucy Mangan – and she said:

Talk about letting good be the enemy of better, perfection being the enemy of progress ... It can be used to  
undermine absolutely anything positive ... in a world urgently in need of all the good things we can muster

Again, I did say in my opening that any emissions reductions are better than none and it really  
is everything helps. So any mitigation we can do. No-one is perfect but these little actions – we  
live in a world where little actions are what count. These little actions do add up and they make  
2225 very big actions. But that said we are sitting in a very privileged position in this Chamber, we are in  
positions of responsibility and we do have some of those bigger questions to answer.

A few different people mentioned this issue of education and personal responsibility and I  
completely agree in terms of personal choice, but I would remind people that policy shapes  
choice – that is what policy does quite often and that is quite important. So to use an example  
2230 from another field sugar tax, I suppose, is one example. The UK Government introduced a sugar  
tax, and I have not read up on this because I was not anticipating talking about this today, but  
maybe someone on Health & Social Care can correct me if I am wrong. I understand that it has  
not raised very much money which actually is a very good thing, because it means the  
manufacturers have been responding to the threat of that tax and they have changed their actions  
2235 accordingly. So it did not have any knock-on effect in terms of the affordability for consumers or  
anything like that, or certainly very little, certainly much less than anticipated.

While I have mentioned the dreaded 'T' word I should also state at this point that I am in  
absolutely no way willing to pre-empt any of the potential options, or certainly any of the  
recommendations. What we are doing today is we are debating the gateway to that process, and I  
2240 think what the debate has made abundantly clear is what is currently lacking is that clarity and

that sense of perspective on those potential options. And it probably is also worth pointing out that there is a lot of work that has been done in other places, and personally I think we should be borrowing ideas and testing suitability left, right and centre.

2245 So, yes, I certainly would not want to pre-empt any specific options, I am not going to respond on any of those points except looking over at my Alderney colleagues I thoroughly endorse what they both had to say. I really applaud Alderney. I know Alderney makes some superb efforts in this area. I have got a lot of admiration for all the people who work very hard on that. And, as we have previously discussed, we are always very keen to work with you, with Alderney, on exactly the issues that the Alderney Representatives have kindly raised.

2250 So, yes, appliances. I thought I would respond individually one by one to all the appliances that have been mentioned if that is okay. No, I will not really, I cannot remember them! But just a broad point is that of course Deputy Laurie Queripel is absolutely right. I was fascinated by some of his statistics, I had not heard many of them before but of course it does boil down to what your source of energy is.

2255 I give way to Deputy Laurie Queripel.

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Thank you, sir. I thank Deputy de Sausmarez for giving way.

2260 That is only partly true, because you have the sourcing of the materials for these gadgets first of all which could create a great deal of energy use and pollution, then the manufacturing of them, then the shipping them round the world, then the use of them, then sometimes the disposal of them; and some people change their gadgets on a regular basis because they are gadget fans. So actually it is not just about the energy. That is part of it, it is partly about the energy supply, but it is also all about the other things as well.

Thank you, sir.

2265

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** I thank Deputy Laurie Queripel that is a very ... Absolutely I agree 100% with all of that.

2270 Deputy Tooley raised a topic – and I am very glad she did, because this is so close to my heart. For me, there is absolutely no separating climate change policy and social justice policy, they are so interlinked. Deputy Yerby gave an excellent speech fleshing out some of those issues both on an international level and on a local level and it is absolutely crucial; and Deputy Tooley is quite right and other people who pointed to the wording in the amendment that did specifically point to those social and economic factors and that was very much why those words were used. Absolutely, this is a social justice issue in many dimensions actually. I mentioned the inter-

2275 generational justice issues and of course there is socio-economic justice.

I would hope to be able to reassure Deputy Tooley that much of her logic hinges on the assumption that mitigation measures will have an adverse effect on the poorest or the most vulnerable in our community, and I would hopefully be able to reassure her that mitigation measures that we choose, because those are the words used in the amendment, it is about deciding – that word ‘decide’. It is not what we are doing now it is what we will do when we have got options set out in front of us. But that is in our gift; it is in the gift of this Assembly to decide what are the most appropriate mitigation measures, and I would be absolutely horrified to think that we would go down any kind of route which involved adversely impacting the people who can least afford to be impacted. So I hope I can provide her with some reassurance on that point, and

2280 I am very grateful to her for raising it.

2285

Deputy Parkinson, of course, did respond with the example of electricity bills, and housing insulation is actually another particularly for people perhaps – and I know I said I was not going to draw on particular examples, but this is one that I know has been used elsewhere. So policies, for example, that seek to improve energy efficiency of housing or insulation in housing can benefit

2290 people in the private rental sector, for example. That is a purely hypothetical example just by way

of illustrating that these outcomes can be mutually beneficial in the same way that environmental objectives and economic objectives can be mutually beneficial and mutually supportive, so can those social objections as well, along with those environmental and economic.

2295 So I do not know if I have addressed everyone's points but many apologies if I have missed anyone out, but I would reiterate my grateful thanks to the people who have taken the time to engage with this debate both within this Chamber and without.

2300 Oh, sorry, Deputy Dorey asked a very important question on resources, and I am very glad he did, because my initial response in terms of the media when I first read the P&R Plan update was that I was very glad that P&R had included it but I was concerned first of all that it probably was not focused enough, but one of my major concerns was that issue of resources. So I have to say I have spent quite a lot of time investigating this and I can give Deputy Dorey and other colleagues the reassurance that there have been identified within existing E&I resources, both in terms of staff who have got the capability and the capacity, and in terms of potential funding if that is required, we have identified enough that we are confident we can hit the ground running with this.

2305 However, I, in turn, would like to ask Deputy St Pier when we get to general debate or his summing up if he can maybe give us any assurances. Of course we have got an educated idea, we have got a good idea of what other people have done in other places but I would really appreciate an assurance from Deputy St Pier, an indication of whether there may be any contingency reserves available from the Budget Reserve come that particular process. So I would very much appreciate that.

2310 I think that is everyone. I cannot see anyone looking outraged, so I will take my opportunity and just – apart from Deputy Merrett who is, hopefully, just putting it on.

2315 So many, many thanks it has been a long and interesting debate and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** We vote on amendment 13, proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez, seconded by Deputy Dudley-Owen. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

2320 **The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.

We move on to amendment 11 to be proposed by Deputy Tindall.

Do you wish it to be read?

**Deputy Tindall:** No, sir, I will read it, thank you.

*Amendment 11*

*To insert the words '– a response to the Climate Change Emergency' after the words 'Mitigate climate change' in Proposition 1a)e.*

2325 **Deputy Tindall:** Sir, I start by saying I support the need for the work being done to mitigate climate change by responding responsibly. I did not speak in the last debate as I felt it was unnecessary as we had laid this amendment which clearly shows that support. I believe this amendment complements the previous amendment, although others may well disagree.

2330 This amendment simply adds a few words to a heading. It does no more than change the title of our proposed new policy priority areas to add the words that this policy is 'a response to the climate change emergency'. So why those words? I was asked why I did not use the word 'crisis' instead of the 'emergency': it is because I do not feel that we have satisfactorily explained why we



are not declaring a climate emergency. Many in our community have asked us to do that and we have not. We have already heard reasons given in an earlier debate as to why not but I, for one, am not convinced and I believe others listening may not be either.

2335 I lodged this amendment with Deputy Gollop's support as I believe we need to have this discussion, this debate. What does such a declaration really mean? Why are we so concerned that adding a few words acknowledging we are responding to that emergency without even making a declaration?

2340 Who could object to the words I have used? (*Interjection*) Well, we know P&R object for a start. Deputy Trott said action speaks louder than words and Deputy St Pier said words do not substitute the need for action. I say words do not replace action but emphasise it.

For example, we have been asked to change the title of the Policy & Resource Plan to the Future Guernsey Plan. If we agree to that – and three words are indeed important – then perhaps we should also change our top Committee's name to the Future Guernsey Plans Committee.

2345 Words are important, so why object? Is this because adding words that were set out in amendment 13 ensure we take the most holistic approach possible and reap the benefit of policies already in our armoury and those that will be recommended by the mitigation plan?

2350 I could refer Members to such policies in existence. I could even read out all of the climate change mitigation policies in the IDP and those in the DPA's action plan which we are looking at. But I fear I would still be talking at teatime.

2355 In the recent past there has been an increase in the calls for central and local government to declare a climate emergency. Many have, according to the website [climateemergencydeclaration.org](http://climateemergencydeclaration.org). By 16th June 2019, 658 jurisdictions in 15 countries have declared a climate emergency. This amounts to 190 million citizens with 36 million of those in the UK.

2360 Extinction Rebellion here have highlighted this call even further by including a call for a declaration of an ecological emergency as well. They ask Guernsey to pledge to take action to reduce our greenhouse gas emission and engage citizens to do likewise. However, this call is not new as Australia mobilised with a similar call in May 2016. Many jurisdictions responded to the call but the UK was the first country to declare in May 2019 followed by Ireland.

2365 However, there is a debate over the effect of the declaration. In Wellington, New Zealand, all but one voted for a declaration, that councillor felt the policy would achieve nothing except make the Councillors feel really good. One councillor also said he was hesitant to declare a climate emergency as he thought it was lip service and window dressing if the Council did not take drastic action. However, the declaration was made and the Council say it will put protection of the environment and climate change front and centre of its decision-making. Surely Guernsey should do that too? The purpose of amendment 3 which Deputies Merrett and Tooley have lodged appears to me to want that.

2370 Staying with New Zealand, Auckland Council said climate change does not satisfy the definition of an emergency under their Civil Defence & Emergency Management Act 2002, unless a declaration of climate emergency has no other inherent statutory or legal implications. It did not stop them though as they declared a climate emergency. The Council gave their reasons for this and said:

However, such a declaration may further highlight Auckland Council's belief in the importance and urgency of addressing climate change.

Patricia Espinosa, Head of the United Nations Climate Change Secretariat, said:

We are literally in a climate emergency, and ... we are increasingly hearing that this is the fight of our lives ...

2375 I understand that calling a state of emergency is a very big thing. However, we did do so in 1976 before some Members here were born, I hasten to establish, under the Emergency Powers

(Bailiwick of Guernsey) Law 1965. I have the Statutory Instrument here and it basically is talking about declaring this emergency because of – and this is the irony here – ‘continuing hot, dry weather resulting in a grave diminution of the Island water resources’. It was indeed revoked on 7th October 1976.

2380

That Law was repealed and replaced by the Civil Contingencies (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Law, 2012 but actually this Law does not enable a declaration of a state of emergency or, rather, it does not use that phraseology. It provides for contingency planning for emergencies and the making of emergency regulations. In section 2 it also sets out what an ‘emergency’ means under the Law and that includes:

2385

... an event or situation which threatens serious damage to human welfare or the environment in the Bailiwick ...

Such damage to the environment is further clarified as:

... disruption or destruction of plant life or animal life.

As far as I can see, it does not exclude climate change as Deputy Dudley-Owen mentioned earlier. So maybe clarity is needed on that. However, I would have liked this Assembly to declare a climate change emergency and there has been reluctance from surprising quarters on this, and I still do not understand why. But this is not what I am asking the Assembly to approve.

2390

I believe that there are those in our community who do not understand why there is this reluctance considering so many jurisdictions have made a declaration and so many here are supporting the fight in respect of climate crisis. So why are we so reluctant to declare a climate emergency? Because surely this climate crisis fits the definition of emergency, as I have explained under our 2012 Law? I do not intend to repeat all the arguments as others have well said all that needs to be said. I will just take the words of Greta Thunberg in saying: ‘Listen to the experts’.

2395

Those at [climateemergencydeclaration.org](http://climateemergencydeclaration.org) say that:

Our call for declaring a climate emergency ...

– which they started in 2016 –

*[was]* not a structured movement with a specific guideline and a set of criteria ...

And they say, in respect of councillors' requests for advice:

... it is up to each individual council to make up its mind about what it wants to suggest and to implement.

2400

As I say, does this amendment declare a climate change emergency? No, it does not.

I felt that there was an unwillingness in this Assembly to such a declaration as can be seen by P&R advising they are not going to support this amendment. This amendment does not go that far but it does acknowledge there is an emergency, because there is one; and it does so simply by renaming the policy priority area confirming that acknowledgement. It does not seek further resources as it needs none other than perhaps extra ink. I do not consider these words up the ante on what is proposed to be done although I may change my mind when I see the Plan.

2405

In an article in Science Alert Editor called: ‘Yes, It’s Time to Update Our Climate Change Language’ by Signe Dean on 25th May 2019 it discussed the language used by scientists and journalists in respect of words used for climate change. Quote:

It was roughly in the 1980s that the general public started paying attention to the “greenhouse effect”, that most basic principle of atmospheric warming several scientists first outlined in... the mid-19th century. (Yes, we’ve known about the threat of rampant fossil fuel consumption for quite some time now, as a 1912 newspaper clipping from New Zealand readily attests.)

2410

Close quote.

Not this generation or even the 1980s, which is when I first learned about the deforestation of the Amazon Rainforest from Sting. Interestingly, a 2002 memo to President Bush authored by Political Consultant Frank Luntz, famously suggested that:

'climate change' is less frightening than 'global warming', amidst recommendations to continue to cast doubt on the scientific consensus of climate science.

The memo worked. The article goes on to say:

... we're way past musing whether 'global warming' sounds scary or not. For plenty of people, especially the younger generations, it's terrifying and they want to do something about it. From school strikes to support of policies that favour cutting carbon emissions, there is a renewed push for action.

2415 In an article by Brian Kahn Peter Gleick, a climate scientist who co-founded the Pacific Institute, is quoted as saying:

Scientists, the media, and policymakers must, of course, distinguish when we're talking about the fact of what's happening ('climate change') from the opinion about how bad it is ('climate crisis') ...

2420 So why this amendment? Because I want action. But I also want the debate. I would like to understand why there is such reticence in the face of the clamour for action. Some took the opportunity to give their views in the previous debate. Some may say in this debate what does adding a few words achieve? I believe it can do a lot because I believe in the power of words.

Deputy Le Tocq said it may imply panic and we should not panic but show leadership, which does raise a few images of *Dad's Army*; but this is not about panic, this is about emphasis. Some may say in that debate, 'What does adding a few words achieve?' as I say.

The Science Alert article concludes:

... if you're trying to get people to do something about the fire in their backyard, you call it an emergency.

2425 That is the point. If you are trying to get people to do something, call it an emergency.

I think we must do something, it should be done as a priority. I think we owe this to the younger generation and those not yet born. If we are not prepared to make a climate emergency declaration we can at least recognise that there is one. That there is a climate emergency and we are responding to it. Because we are. So let's just confirm that.

2430 I therefore ask Members to please support this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

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

2435 **Deputy Gollop:** Yes, sir, and will speak later.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier, do you want to speak at this point.

**Deputy St Pier:** Yes, I will speak briefly, sir.

2440 Sir, I would agree with Deputy Tindall that words can be important. The question is whether these words in this location are important. We are not by use of these words, I would suggest, actually declaring an emergency other than perhaps obliquely or indirectly by their use in the context. We appear to be referring to *the* climate change emergency in response to *the* climate change emergency – somebody else has declared one and we are responding to it. Our view is

2445 that these words used in this way are not particularly important.

I completely, we completely, respect and understand that others may disagree with that including some of those outside the States who have been campaigning on this issue, and including of course Deputies Tindall and Gollop who are presenting the case for this amendment

2450 today. Ultimately it is a matter for the States to decide whether these words in this context are or are not important.

Sir, for us there is no other priority policy area that seeks to explain why they are there in their description of a name in the way that this amendment would seek to do.

Sir, we described the previous amendment laid by Deputy de Sausmarez as being 'a valuable addition'. I would say, sir, that this amendment can probably be best described as 'an addition'.

2455 I think I would refer to Deputy Brehaut's speech in a previous debate, sir, on this, that what we need to be getting to is the doing bit and, sir, it is Policy & Resources' view that this is not the doing bit and it adds little, and therefore we do not support it. But, as I say, it will be for the States to decide whether they believe these words in this location in the Plan are important enough to support the amendment.

2460 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

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

2465 I thought we just had a fairly sensible debate from Deputy de Sausmarez and Deputy Dudley-Owen about what we believe is likely to be acceptable when we move towards, if we do indeed move towards, a climate change agenda. I thought this Assembly did not like the word emergency. I thought this Assembly accepted that crisis might be acceptable but emergency did not.

2470 What I expected Deputy Tindall to do was actually withdraw this amendment, that was my expectancy. But I will remind Deputy Gollop as well who is seconding it that 3.59, page 23, Policy & Resource Plan:

If the Island is to respond responsibly to the existential crisis that is climate change, it must plan to do so and prioritise the allocation of its resources accordingly.

I am assuming that will come out of option 1e) where Deputy Brehaut and Environment & Infrastructure will be coming back to us in May 2020 with a climate change action plan.

2475 Deputy Dudley-Owen very eloquently described what an emergency would be and if we were to declare an emergency today every car in Guernsey would probably be shut down, we would close the ports, the airlines and probably the power station.

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

2480 **Deputy Inder:** Well, we do not know we have not declared it yet.

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

2485 **Deputy Inder:** You can try and correct me.

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

2490 **Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** No area that has declared a climate emergency has suddenly stopped producing power or had cars ... The UK has declared a climate emergency: have they stopped producing carbon emission power straight away, the next day, as the disaster scenario that is being painted by the Deputy?

**Deputy Inder:** Yes, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel is absolutely correct and I will read 3.60:

In summary, it will serve no-one's interest for there to be declarations of intent alone as a substitute for action to salve consciences.

2495 I know what an emergency is; we are not in the middle of an emergency. We may be in the middle of a crisis. The debate we had this morning is the debate that we should have had and this not only is an addition, personally I think it is superfluous, and actually it should scare me and it should scare some people. As soon as we start using the word 'emergency' we start giving far too much power to potentially policies may – sorry, through you, sir, policies may appear that no-one can necessarily accept.

2500 When Deputy Brehaut spoke this morning there were two messages coming from E&I. Deputy Brehaut spoke about transport when I spoke to the ExR people outside today it seemed to be all about transport, cars and taking mobility away from the people of this Island.

2505 Now, Deputy de Sausmarez seemed to speak – not more *candidly*, necessarily – she had a more ... I am trying to think of the word actually (*Interjection*) sorry? (*Interjection*) More measured, yes, I think that is the word, sorry. A more measured response than I have heard before. So I can move towards that but what I cannot do is move towards anything that uses the word 'emergency' and I would ask everyone in this Assembly to reject this.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

2510

**Deputy Gollop:** Sir, I do not want a measured response altogether, we need to go a bit more than that. The gesture and the expression is very much the hundreds, maybe thousands, of people in Guernsey who are really concerned about this issue.

2515 Just to give a bit of context here, yes, the word emergency has different meanings – Accident & Emergency, Emergency Services. I get emergencies in my own life, but that is another story.

2520 But the climate change emergency has become a currency, a context that I think people can identify with. To cite some examples: the Rt Hon Jeremy Corbyn, the Leader of the Opposition put forward a climate change emergency and it was adopted without debate. Now, I know perhaps Mr Corbyn might not be everybody's favourite politician in this Chamber, but the point was that it was accepted in what is, frankly, a hung parliament where the largest single party of course is the Conservative Party. It has also been adopted by the Commonwealth Parliamentary, in the Wales Assembly, the Scottish Parliament, and of course in our sister Island, the States of Jersey – where only one person, I think it was Senator Ferguson, decided to vote against it. And I do not see cars being thrown off the cliffs in Jersey, or planes not being allowed to land (*Interjection*) or people being thrown out of their centrally heated homes or whatever. No, it is a conversation; it is an evolution.

2530 The thing is if Guernsey chooses not to go down that route I think it will just lead to a degree of public campaigning on social and other media, and more than that we may well get 'tut-tuts' from international bodies, our friends in Whitehall saying, 'Oh, why in Guernsey? Why haven't you upped your game and lived up to your international reputation for green funds and a personal identity?' So I think it is useful.

2535 I mean, if you look back at the earlier amendment that did pass – the De Sausmarez/Dudley-Owen – it very much focussed on what I would call certain elements of priorities, local action, mitigation, stimulation, focus, action. This actually is not the same as that because that really is going for further reports.

2540 This is specifically saying that our Policy & Resource Plan, the Future Guernsey Plan, we have added at short notice, because it was not there three years ago, 'mitigate climate change' as a response to the climate change emergency. We are responding to what is a British Isles phenomenon and an international phenomenon; and even, when I went on a CPA seminar once, I had the pleasure of meeting a politician, a lady from Tasmania who I think had been in the wine business and I note in Tasmania – Hobart, Tasmania, the capital of the State of Tasmania, thousands of miles away down under – has just adopted 8 to 3 a climate change emergency. So we need to kind of raise the game on this.

2545 If it does not get passed for the reasons Deputy Inder and Deputy St Pier pointed out, the fact that we do not like the word will be misunderstood and it will actually look as if we are being a little bit apathetic and a bit static and not willing to move forward, or not perhaps taking seriously the priority.

So I really do urge Members to go the extra mile on this one.

2550 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Yerby.

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

2555 I owe it, I think, to Deputy Tindall to explain why I am unlikely now to be supporting this amendment, because I came into this debate having had a conversation with her about it which left me thinking, 'Yes, I can probably set aside my discomfort and get behind it'.

2560 I am probably one of the unlikely candidates who is very uncomfortable about the use of the word emergency in respect of climate change. Not because I disagree that urgent action is needed on a wide range of fronts, but because of what it means for Government to declare a state of emergency. Now, Deputy Tindall has said, and the conversation that we had beforehand was about saying that this is not a declaration of a state of emergency but it is an acknowledgement that an emergency exists. (*Interjection*) But in listening to her opening speech I felt, well, really there is at most a cigarette paper between those two things, and a state of emergency, sir, is something that every government should approach with the utmost caution. (**Two Members:** Hear, hear.) Every citizen should be concerned about a government being too ready to declare a state of emergency –

2565 I will give way to Deputy Tindall.

**Deputy Tindall:** Sir, this is one of the reasons why I was particularly concerned about having this debate. There are three different, distinct things here. There is the declaration of a state of emergency, which is under the Law; there is a declaration of climate change emergency, which is what the campaigners are calling for; then there is the wording in this amendment. I really distinctly do not believe this is a declaration or even a paper-thin close to a state of emergency even if under the 2012 Law we can do that, but we cannot. We could under the 1965 but we cannot under the 2012. So for me there are three distinct things that I would like to be able to separate.

2575 Thank you, sir.

**Deputy Yerby:** I do appreciate that is how Deputy Tindall sees the situation completely validly and those were the arguments she set out to us in her opening speech.

2580 Possibly because of the libertarian, not in an American sense, but a libertarian streak that runs bone deep in me I find it very hard to go anywhere near something that risks infringing the liberty of our citizens when it does not feel like the right thing to do. (*Interjection*) For that reason I suppose I regret that we are having this debate. I do not think that it is good to fail to declare that this is an emergency either! (*Laughter*)

2585 Deputy Gollop strongly believes in the value of justice and politics and we groan whenever this comes up at Employment & Social Security, but I do understand why he believes that sometimes it is important for politicians to take the first step and to signal that something is important and that something will be addressed, and to bring the community with them. I think that we have done that and done it emphatically through the debate on the last amendment but I do still regret that tomorrow's headline may be well be the States refuses to declare a climate emergency.

2590 There was something in Deputy Le Tocq's speech on the previous amendment that almost had me thinking, actually, I want to get right behind this state of emergency business, because sometimes it is good for the grownups to get frightened and panicked. Sometimes things really

2595 are that big and that life-changing that is not right for us to look calm and confident, because a lot of the solutions are still beyond our grasp and they are going to require a huge effort of will and collaboration if we are going to get anywhere remotely near the kind of world that we want for our children and grandchildren.

2600 So there is an urgency here that we absolutely have to acknowledge and manifest. It is a bit head against heart, or heart against heart I suppose for me, this one, but I think on balance and particularly in light of the illustrations in Deputy Tindall's speech, I know that she probably meant to put my mind at rest by showing that Guernsey's first state of emergency was nothing to be scared of; but it sits so uncomfortably with me, sir, that I think I am unlikely to be able to support this.

2605 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dudley-Owen.

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

2610 I think I have already explained my position when Deputy Queripel kindly gave way to me earlier. But I do feel it is worth revisiting this subject because I for one am having difficulty with this particular debate because it is really uncomfortable, as Deputy Yerby has said, because we have clearly all acknowledged that there is a very, very deep and imminent issue that we have to deal with and we have to deal with it urgently.

2615 Yes, in common parlance we are going to describe that potentially as an emergency and certainly some countries in the world are facing emergency conditions as a result of climate change and all the other environmental degradation issues that are going on through industrialised farming methods and other things fossil fuel extraction. But in terms of building it into our governmental plan, for me, I will reiterate that the word emergency is part of a suite of administrative tools that we use to govern and therefore I feel very uncomfortable in confusing the two definitions of the word.

2620 Actually, in trying to explain my position better I did a quick Google search, as you always do in these debates when you are a little bit confused and need something else to look at – I know Deputy Inder is saying he does not do it, well, I have *(Laughter)* and I was one of the people that put my hand up when Deputy Laurie Queripel said, 'Who has got their laptops on now?' *(Laughter)*

2625 I have, and I am pleased that I did because there is one definition that I found in a discussion paper from some academics at Salford University that actually I think highlights quite well for me the difficulties I have in putting this word in particular into our governmental paper, and that is that the definition of the word emergency, it says:

... emergency is defined as a state in which normal procedures are suspended and extra-ordinary measures are taken to save lives, protect people, limit damage and return conditions to normal.

2630 Now, until we got to return conditions to normal everything within that statement is what we are facing in different areas around the world and need to act to mitigate and prevent. Returning conditions to normal, well this is what I spoke to in the debate before. I do not know if I want to go back to the normal that is today and I think that this is what we are trying to move away from, the normal that we have become used to – extraction of fossil fuels and reduction in our biodiversity and all the other issues. So in that respect the word emergency conjures up that you come to a disaster, a crisis, and then put measures in to mitigate and return to a situation that you have come from, and that is not where I think I want to be. I think the vote that we had just before says that actually no Member of this Assembly wants to be where we are now. We want to move away from that.

2635

2640 So for me whilst the absolute good intentions and the discussions that we have had at length about the word emergency needed to be had and though they are uncomfortable I am really very sorry but I do not think I can vote in favour of this particular amendment for those reasons.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Smithies.

2645

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

I spoke immediately after luncheon about the need to treat words with care.

2650 Deputy Tindall referred to 1976. In 1976, and I was here, there was an emergency, it was real and actual. The reservoir was dry, the emergency desalination plant was switched on and immediately blew up, (*Laughter*) we had eight weeks' supply, even with rationing. We were putting bricks in the lavatory cisterns to save water. (*Interjection*) There was an economic crisis, the major export crop of tomatoes was threatened.

2655 This amendment presupposes an emergency because other jurisdictions have postured and exaggerated. Let us maintain a sense of realism and common sense and reject this amendment without delay.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy –

**Deputy Leadbeater:** Can I invoke 26(1), sir?

2660

**The Bailiff:** Does anybody wish to speak who has not already done so? No. Well, we will go straight to closing anyway. Deputy Tindall.

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

2665 The debate was briefer than I anticipated but I think, as Deputy Dudley-Owen intimated and others, there were conversations around this topic before in the previous amendment which I was aware was being drafted when I submitted mine but I had not seen it. So, again, I could have withdrawn the amendment and not had it laid as Deputy Inder intimated, but personally I felt there was still more to be said.

2670 I happen to agree. I think, whilst I do not agree with Deputies Dudley-Owen and Yerby in the sense that I still feel that there is this conflating of state of emergency and this declaration. I did resonate with what Deputy Dudley-Owen just said about the fact that we do not want to go back to normal. I think that is an incredibly important statement and if I may say merely laying the amendment for that I feel is worthwhile, because I think that is the important part about this –  
2675 that some of us here may not feel able to declare an emergency, maybe our tomatoes are not being threatened at this precise moment in time, but I do think it is extremely important for the public out there for example, as Deputy Gollop has said, they do feel that there needs to be some form of real important declaration to give the power to words to be able to take action.

2680 Now, Deputy St Pier indicates that these are just an addition. Yes, they are, and I acknowledge that, it was for the purposes of debate. I felt it was something we owed, as I say, to those listening, to show the way in which this Assembly absolutely committed to dealing with the problems not only on the Island but, as the debate in the previous amendment clearly illustrated, across the whole world in what we can do, and we can punch about our weight.

2685 I do not fear the word emergency, personally, it can be useful, it has been used and in this context I do not feel that it is either declaring a state of emergency or indeed of no benefit. I think it will be there, it will be there for everyone to see and for that reason, again, I have not gone through each and every individual point but I hope I have summarised the general discussion.



2690 I thank everyone for that contribution both in this amendment and the previous amendment, and of course all of those out there who have probably been the most vocal in this debate. I hope that they can understand the way in which this Assembly is focusing that we are doing everything we can and actions in this case *may* speak louder than words. I just would like action and words.

Thank you, sir.

2695 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, I just rise to ask for a recorded vote, please.

2700 **The Bailiff:** We will have a recorded vote on amendment 11 which is proposed by Deputy Tindall and seconded by Deputy Gollop.

**The Deputy Greffier:** The voting this month starts with St Sampson.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Not carried – Pour 7, Contre 28, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 5*

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

2705 **The Bailiff:** Well, the voting on that amendment, amendment 11, was 7 in favour, 28 against. I declare it lost.

We move on with amendment 12 to be proposed by Deputy Soulsby.

*Amendment 12.*

*To insert, after Proposition 3, the following Propositions:*

"4. To note that, since the publication of the Committee for Health & Social Care's "Committee Policy Plan Update" at Appendix 3(f) of the Policy & Resource Plan, the Committee has now identified certain gaps in services between primary and secondary mental health care, in both Guernsey and Alderney, by means of an evidence-based service-mapping, gap and issue analysis; 5. To note that the Committee for Health & Social Care will add an action to address these gaps in community-level mental health and wellbeing provision, in collaboration with States Committees, the Government of Jersey and the Third Sector, to its priorities for 2019-20, in fulfilment of the commitment in the Policy & Resource Plan to give parity between mental and physical health and wellbeing; and 6. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to work together with the Committee for Health & Social Care to ensure that appropriate provision is made in the 2020 States Budget in respect of this priority area, subject to the submission of a suitable business case (or cases)."

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

I refer Members to Appendix 3(f) – well probably you do not really need to, but it is at 3(f) and if you consider the Policy & Resource Plan as a journey of a mile it is about a kilometre in, Appendix 3(f).

2710 Within that, HSC sets out its Policy Plan update and we set a priority for 12 months to further 'embed an integrated approach to health and care' in the Bailiwick. Further, 'as part of that commitment to ensure mental health is given equal consideration and parity to physical health', we have said that we 'plan to focus on identifying perceived gaps in services between primary and secondary mental health care and to address any shortfalls in services where some Islanders might find themselves unable to access the help and support they need'.

2715 Well, since the P&R Plan was published this work has been completed. It has been led by our excellent Director of Public Health and has included primary and secondary mental health professionals, third sector and other stakeholders including Guernsey Mind.

2720 The results of this thorough evidence-based service-mapping gap analysis for Guernsey, and a separate one for Alderney, is set out in a link to the explanatory note to the Mental Health and Wellbeing page on <https://www.gov.gg> and from that Members will be able to see what a wide range of services are currently offered. However, it has also highlighted particular gaps in provision which we believe need to be filled. Some of these are already being addressed by the Committee through need that has already been identified and from other work that has been undertaken. This includes the lack of capacity legislation. We are really pleased to advise Members that a first draft came to the Committee the other week and so we hope to be able to get that to this Assembly later this year. We are really delighted to see that and we just hope Brexit does not take over again, and we can actually get it in place.

2725 The lack of appropriate environment for children and adolescents with mental health in Frossard Ward was also raised, as well as the lack of a safe and confidential area in the Emergency Department. Both of these are being addressed within the Hospital Modernisation Programme.

2730 But there are gaps which need additional focus. Firstly for Islanders experiencing significant stress or distress but who do not require secondary consultant psychiatrists. It is really difficult getting these things across within this Assembly and understanding the terms and the differences between poor mental health, mental illness, personality disorders – they are all slightly different; but this is where we say these are for people who do not need that consultant psychiatrist but they need management of their psycho-social difficulties that can cause them stress and distress.

2735 Secondly, there is a lack of somewhere for people to go when they are suffering mild and moderate stress or distress. The default is that when an incident happens the Police are called and the service user either ends up in a police cell or probably more usually ED – neither of which really is the best place for them, and does nothing to help reduce stigma either. A place focused

2740

on recovery would help the Police and Emergency Services to steer people to the right care at the right place and the right time, which will better help their recovery.

2745 Now, we plan to address these needs through a variety of means in working with other committees, the Police, third sector and the Government of Jersey. Our colleagues across the water are experiencing fairly significant challenges in the mental health area and we have been talking to them about what we can do together and indeed even how we can support them. But one area that has been identified already which they would like to introduce, and in which we see some merit, would be a telephone helpline. We also want to build on a range of complementary services to include signposting, social prescribing, peer support and advocacy.

2750 Now, of course we need to put together the appropriate business case before we do so and to assure Deputy Ferbrache, although he is not here to be assured, but to assure Deputy Ferbrache and other Members within this Assembly and P&R that we recognise that will not be enough, it will also need to be prioritised as part of the budget-setting process and if is not considered as a high enough priority by Policy and Reform, given all the other pressures on the public purse, it may not be funded. However, it is important that Members understand that HSC considers this is a high priority and that is why we have done the work and why it appears as a priority area in this plan.

2760 So we will be prioritising it in the bids we make for funding and as such we believe it appropriate to give the heads-up to Members in this amendment to the P&R Plan now. So I ask Members to support it.

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

2765 **Deputy Tooley:** Yes, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

2770 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, yes. Again I will speak briefly and hopefully it will help give Members a steer as to P&R's position on this.

2775 Sir, over the weekend in our draft thoughts on this we did have concerns about this amendment and had indicated that we were likely to oppose it. However, I would like to thank the Committee *for* Health & Social Care for their further engagement on this. The Policy & Resources Committee has shifted its position and now we will not oppose this amendment. But I think it is worth just explaining the cause of our concern and actually how we have been reassured by the Committee in our dialogue with them and indeed by the President's words that she has just delivered in opening this debate.

2780 Sir, certainly in relation to mental health provision on the Island, some Members will have heard me speak about this issue on a prior occasion having had personal family experience of severe mental health problems. So I have a great deal of interest and affinity in this and I would like to commend the Committee *for* Health & Social Care for their work and on elevating this as one of their priorities.

2785 The words which gave us concern were in relation to what would be new Proposition 6 which is 'to ensure that appropriate provision', and at first glance we interpreted that as effectively going to the head of the queue and potentially being an open cheque book. But I think the caveat that it needed to be 'subject to the submission of a suitable business case' is clearly there, but of course we might have 15 suitable business cases all of which meet the criteria of justifying spending in any one area, but nonetheless we may not be able to fund all 15. And that is the challenge we have.

2790 So we are very reassured by the Committee's assurance that they do fully accept and appreciate that all bids do need to go through the usual prioritisation process and this is not a means to jump to the front of the queue.

It is a good opportunity to make the point that all committees will need to self-prioritise any bids they make to the Budget round this year and the assumption is given what the President has said and the laying of this amendment that this one will be at or very near the top of the Committee for Health & Social Care's budget bids for 2020.

So, sir, on that basis to be clear, and contrary to our previous indication, the Policy & Resources Committee will not be opposing this amendment, sir.

2800 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Gollop:** Sir, this is where the Policy & Resource Plan becomes a little bit opaque, I think, for the outsider listening in, because you can read through the Plan and you see a lot of emphasis being made on us being a more inclusive society and strengthening social policy and a fairer society – that is another phrase that comes across. In a way, that implies attitude change, which I think we are seeing up to a point but it also implies resources, money and people and buildings. We can vote for all of this Plan and it will probably all go through with one or two exceptions, and then nothing happens because in reality it has been shaped by the prioritisation of resources through the rather curiously named 'Business Plans'; because a business plan – if I was wanting to form an ice-cream kiosk, I could imagine having to have a business plan – but it starts to become a little bit strange when you are talking about clinical issues of need and so on.

Therefore, I do not know where to go on this really. I mean, I will support the Soulsby/Tooley amendment but it is not clear even from the long explanatory note exactly what we are looking at.

During my time on Planning we had some useful dialogue with Health & Social Care at certain levels about the need for community hubs, for example, but whether that refers to this I do not know. We are aware there has been not altogether plain sailing in some aspects of mental health services and the profession, and we are also aware that the voluntary sector is filling in from coffee mornings at the Mind Centre, to mind-expanding in Alderney and so on.

What interests me here is that it is very much stressing a physical space for people with mild or moderate stress, and distress is lacking. Well, I do not quite know what that space might be because we do not have good rehabilitation facilities for people with addictions in some areas.

I sat on a sub-group working with Health Officers for at least a year on expanding a mental health café and that never really got anywhere. I know Caritas has reopened after a break but it was disappointing that there was not really the money or resources to go beyond the already good café at Beacons at Oberlands. But, I mean, this amendment implies you are looking for a facility different from Oberlands, because Oberlands has a specific kind of function.

Again, I do not quite know what the recovery orientated environment would be and whether we are thinking outside the box and we are actually think of holistic facilities that might include complementary therapy and counselling, might include yoga, Pilates and general wellness. Hopefully all of that is there. I support definitely not only the review and improvement in mental health and related services but we need very much to outreach beyond what is strictly speaking 'mental' to the behavioural world of autism, ADHD and other things that people will know I am familiar with.

So as far as things go I very much support this amendment but I think it will be a promise we will not keep if we accept it today on the grounds that, yes, we will support it in principle but it might go down the queue if not the back of the queue for Policy & Resources funding. Effectively we are either going to move forward on it in a quick, timely way or we are not. I think we do need stronger guidance from the Assembly on that point.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby, you may reply.

2840

**Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, there is not much to reply to.

I do think P&R got their knickers in a twist a bit on this, to be honest, *(Laughter)* because we do know that there is a priority process, we were not thinking about jumping over it and saying ours is more important than anything else here.

2845

But I have to say as a Committee we do feel very strongly about this and as I say we will be considering if it does not get funding through the Budget-setting process whether we then have to come to this Assembly and lay an amendment against it. But that is for back there; that is for the future. Really, this is about letting people know what is coming and either it makes the budget or it does not, but people now know what is there and what to expect.

2850

I have nothing else to add, sir.

**The Bailiff:** We vote on amendment 12 proposed by Deputy Soulsby, seconded by Deputy Tooley. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

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

2855

Greffier, when it is consolidated into the amendments you will have to just renumber it as we already have a number 4 as a result of amendment 8.

So we move on to two amendments on the Reciprocal Health Agreement which look fairly similar but obviously there are crucial differences between them because the proposers of both still want both to be debated and voted upon.

2860

Deputy Le Tocq was not here earlier this morning but I think where we have reached is that Deputy Prow will open on amendment 2 then you will lay amendment 15 and then we will vote on amendment 15 and we will vote on amendment 2 whether or not amendment 15 has carried. I think that is the agreement that has been reached.

Deputy Prow. This is amendment 2.

2865

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

Could I ask for amendment 2 to be read please, sir?

**The Bailiff:** Yes.

2870

*The Deputy Greffier read the amendment.*

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Prow.

*Amendment 2.*

*To insert the following Proposition immediately after Proposition 1:*

*'1A.*

*a) to agree that, subject to negotiating suitable terms and conditions with Her Majesty's Government, residents of Guernsey should enjoy rights to medical treatment whilst in the United Kingdom on a reciprocal basis similar to those available to residents of the Isle of Man and Jersey under the respective Reciprocal Health Agreements entered into by the governments of those Islands with Her Majesty's Government,*

*b) to direct the Policy & Resources Committee –*

*(i) working in partnership with the Committee for Employment and Social Security and in consultation with the Committee for Health and Social Care, to investigate opportunities to enter*

*into and, if possible, to negotiate a Reciprocal Health Agreement with Her Majesty's Government, similar to those in place with the Isle of Man and Jersey and to submit an update to the States in the Policy & Resources (Future Guernsey) policy letter in May 2020, and*  
*(ii) to redraft the Policy & Resource Plan to reflect this direction of the States, and*  
*c) to rescind the Resolution of the States dated 30th October 2015 under item VIII 32. of Billet d'État No. XVIII, dated 18th September, 2015.'*

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Prow.

2875

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

2880

Before I get into the meat of my opening comments I would just like to say two things. One, I am very grateful to be able to lay this amendment and speak to it. Deputy Merrett and I feel very strongly and we have done the work on the amendment and really wish to put this amendment as it is to this Assembly, and it is for this Assembly to decide upon it. I will limit my comments to amendment 2 but I will hopefully be able to speak to amendment 15 when we get around to it.

2885

The second comment I would like to make right from the start is that whilst I have been giving some challenge, hopefully respectfully and in the right manner to the ESS Committee, I should say right from the start I have every respect for the President of that Committee, Deputy Le Clerc, and that Committee, and it is really just on this particular issue that I have had challenge and is the source of this amendment.

2890

Sir, together with Deputy Merrett, I urge all in this Assembly to get behind this amendment and to urgently begin a process to give basic medical protection to all Islanders when they travel to the United Kingdom and to help the tourism and hospitality sector with regard to providing the same cover to UK visitors.

Sir, this States, and indeed the previous ones, have been described as 'States of Inaction'. Whilst this may be unfair in some instances, in the case of a Reciprocal Health Agreement with the UK never has a political can been continually kicked down the road, and for so long.

2895

Sir, the evidence is clear. Over eight years ago, in April of 2011, the other Crown Dependencies signed Reciprocal Health Agreements with HM Government which provided entitlement to specified free health services to visitors to all the parties to the individual agreements. However, Guernsey did not sign such an agreement. This has been a concern to many Islanders, particularly the lower paid, those who are retired and the elderly, those with pre-existing medical conditions, and the local hospitality and tourism sector who point out that visitors from the UK are disadvantaged in comparison with those staying in the other Crown Dependencies.

2900

Sir, Guernsey folk travel very frequently to the United Kingdom for a whole variety of reasons including essential and business travel, catching up with friends and relatives, their kids at uni, and on well-earned breaks. Sir, I believe it is the fundamental duty of Government to do all it can to offer a basic level of protection to all of our community identical to that enjoyed by our Jersey cousins and the Isle of Man.

2905

Sir, I am frankly mystified why we are in the position we are; why we have not renegotiated with the UK. Instead, the Committee for Employment & Social Security has suggested, but never delivered on, some sort of public travel insurance scheme. Instead of doing what the other Crown Dependencies sensibly achieved in 2011.

2910

There is an extant 2015 Resolution which states that:

... the Committee for Employment & Social Security shall report to the States thereon by no later than October, 2017" to "investigate the merits of including within the ambit of the Guernsey Health Service Fund the costs of healthcare and medical treatment incurred by Guernsey residents while travelling to the United Kingdom which would previously have been within the ambit of the States' reciprocal health agreement with Her Majesty's Government,

This has not happened and, some 20 months later, remains undelivered. So, sir, the can has received another solid boot down the road.

2915 However, sir, the can appears to have been retrieved from the very long grass not by ESS but through Policy & Resources Brexit dialogue with the United Kingdom. We understand through various update statements and answers to questions raised by me and other Deputies, whilst running behind the can as it flies down the hill, it appears that through this process the UK's Department of Health & Social Care suggested they were willing to renegotiate a Reciprocal Health Agreement with us. Indeed this appears in ESS's contribution to the P&R Plan at Appendix 3(d). Sadly, sir, the Billet has no page numbers on it so I will quote it:

The Committee met with representatives of the UK's Department of Health about this, and discussions were positive.

2920 So, sir, why in this P&R Plan have we not grasped this with both hands? Why are we procrastinating on this issue that so many Islanders care about? Sir, is the can somehow electrocuted? *(Laughter)* Far from it, sir.

2925 I have by way of preparation for this debate informally contacted Jersey's Minister for the Department of Health & Social Services, Deputy Richard Renouf. I did this by email, sir, and he very kindly allowed me access to a very senior member of staff in his Department. Whilst I stress that this is not a formal contact it was exceedingly informative.

Sir, I was informed that the agreement works well with no issues and to quote: 'Ticks away in the background with no effort needed by either party.'

2930 It works as described in the Jersey website. Whilst the definition of a visitor is well defined there is no real hard definition of emergency treatment, but a pragmatic and common sense understanding has become the norm and there have been no challenges either in Jersey or in the UK that the officer was aware of. He said the treatment in both jurisdictions means that it continues until the patient is stabilised and able to travel home.

2935 He gave an example of a visitor suffering from a stroke or a heart attack in either jurisdiction, where emergency treatment and hospitalisation would be given free and to the point that the patient has stabilised and can be discharged. However, sir, the most striking point he made and I quote: 'Importantly, no money changes hands between Jersey and the UK.'

2940 He also said that although it was back in 2011 that the RHA was signed, he was not aware of any money being exchanged to set up the agreement. Indeed, sir, the officer stressed several times that no money changes hands and everyone will receive emergency treatment until they are fit to discharge. I pressed the officer of any potential downsides and the officer responded by saying he could see no reason why Guernsey would not want to enter into such agreement.

2945 Sir, I mentioned the Jersey government website, the agreement is contained – and I have it with me here, sir – on three pages, and here it is. The RHA has been in place in the other Crown Dependencies since 2011 and according to Jersey I have been informed that it works well.

2950 Sir, it appears to do what it says on the can. Deputy Ferbrache made a very valid point in a speech earlier today around amendments causing extra officer work against a background where we are promised through Public Sector Reform of the loss of some 200 posts, it seems to me. I also have the Isle of Man Reciprocal Health Agreement which is a short, simple document that the resources needed to actually go and get on with a negotiation, particularly when two other Reciprocal Health Agreements in place have worked well apparently for a long time.

Sir, therefore this amendment asks the States to agree that:

... subject to negotiating suitable terms and conditions with Her Majesty's Government, residents of Guernsey should enjoy rights to medical treatment whilst in the United Kingdom on a reciprocal basis ...

– under a Reciprocal Health Agreement.

It also seeks a direction to be given to Policy & Resources Committee that it shall:

... working in partnership with the Committee for Employment and Social Security and in consultation with the Committee for Health and Social Care, to investigate opportunities to enter into and, if possible, to negotiate a Reciprocal Health Agreement with Her Majesty's Government, similar to those in place with the Isle of Man and Jersey ...

2955 Sir, I think it is absolutely right and proper for P&R through External Relations to lead on this; it is absolutely within their remit. But I think it is important, we talk so much about joined-up Government, that they do so in partnership and in consultation with the other key Committees who have been involved with this. But that does not mean that they are not leading on it; it does not mean, as far as I am aware or I can see, there is any direction to have joint policy letters. It is a  
2960 direction for Policy & Resources to get on with it. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) P&R are also directed in the amendment to redraft the Plan to reflect that direction of the States.

Sir, I am sure I might get some challenge from this about using the P&R Plan to assert this issue up the list of priorities, but as I have said it is a subject that is contained within the P&R Plan; and Deputy Merrett and I strongly believe that it is very well justified indeed.

2965 It is noted that the high level vision of the Policy & Resource Plan, Future Guernsey Plan states

We will be among the happiest and healthiest places in the world, where everyone has equal opportunity to achieve their potential.

It has identified four themes: our quality of life, our community, our place in the world, and our economy. These are underpinned in each case by specific references to a healthy community, becoming inclusive and equal, having a mature international identity, and a strong sustainable and growing economy which makes special reference to hospitality and tourism.

2970 I submit that an RHA with the UK ticks all the boxes and renegotiation is long overdue. I ask all in this Assembly to overwhelmingly support this amendment. Sir, I plead with all Deputies do not throw this particular can into one of Deputy Brehaut's blue recycling bags.

Thank you, sir.

2975 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Merrett, do you formally second the amendment?

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

**The Bailiff:** Now Deputy Le Tocq will lay amendment 15 and may also speak on amendment 2.

*Amendment 15.*

*To insert the following Proposition immediately after Proposition 1:*

'1A.

*a) to agree that, subject to negotiating suitable terms and conditions with Her Majesty's Government, residents of Guernsey should enjoy rights to medical treatment whilst in the United Kingdom on a reciprocal basis similar to those available to residents of the Isle of Man and Jersey under the respective Reciprocal Health Agreements entered into by the governments of those Islands with Her Majesty's Government;*

*b) to direct the Policy & Resources Committee –*

*(i) to investigate opportunities to enter into and, if possible, to negotiate a Reciprocal Health Agreement with Her Majesty's Government, similar to those in place with the Isle of Man and Jersey, consulting as necessary with appropriate States Committees, and to submit an update to the States in the Policy & Resource Plan (Future Guernsey Plan) update policy letter in 2020, or earlier if negotiations fail; and*

*(ii) to redraft the Policy & Resource Plan to reflect this direction of the States, and*

*c) to rescind the Resolution of the States dated 30th October 2015 under item VIII 32. of Billet d'État No. XVIII, dated 18th September, 2015.'*

2980 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Thank you, sir.



I will not ask for this to be read because it is very similar except in one particular aspect that I will come to in a moment.

2985 But, sir, the amendment that has just been paid by Deputy Prow and Deputy Merrett has a lot of merit in it and they can be proud of it – see what I did there? (*Laughter*) But seriously, sir, our issue is not to get into seeking to negotiate or to talk about negotiating a Reciprocal Health Agreement here because there is only one side here and negotiation, like tangoing, takes two.

2990 Sir, it is not the case that the can has been kicked down the road. As I mentioned in a previous session of this Assembly, during the time that certainly I was Chief Minister in the last term, we petitioned a number of Health Ministers, I remember writing to or speaking to Sir Norman Lamb, Alistair Burt, we even engaged with the Health Select Committee Andrew Selous on that committee, and asked again and again would they be willing to open negotiations on a Reciprocal Health Agreement. During that time under the Cameron Government particularly the answer was 'No', because we were told that if they could close the current agreements they had with the Isle of Man and Jersey they would do so, they certainly would not be looking at renegotiating them when that time came around. They were also evidently terminating similar agreements with other places and overseas territories, for example.

2995 So there was little more that we could do except to continue to knock on the door or to raise it and we have raised it and continue to raise it, for example, at the Channel Islands All Party Parliamentary Group where we did yesterday again, as my colleagues who were present with us will testify.

3000 There has been a nuanced change since the Brexit vote in the UK and that means that there is opportunity to talk to the UK about a new Reciprocal Health Agreement. It may not look like our previous ones, it may not look like the ones that Jersey and the Isle of Man have, but we could do that and we are very willing to do that.

3005 So I cannot disagree with the import of the amendment that has just been laid, sir, but we do want to change the wording of b)(i) particularly and that is why in our amendment we do not include the 'working in partnership with' because that would involve a joint policy letter with those other Committees and, as the Assembly knows, sir, we have done some things and we have made some Resolutions recently which are changing the funding and moving things from the Department for Employment & Social Security into Health. In terms of the Health & Social Care's responsibility that ultimately would be, if we get an agreement with the UK, to deliver the Guernsey end and it is not to negotiate.

3010 So at this stage, whilst we are very happy to consult – and we will do and we will need to consult – with other Committees, it is certainly a matter for P&R and for External Relations particularly to deal with that.

3015 So, sir, that is the simple difference between these two amendments and I would encourage the Assembly to support the amendment that Deputy Stephens and I are laying.

3020 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Stephens, do you formally second it?

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

**The Bailiff:** Thank you.  
Deputy Fallaize.

3025 **Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.

I am going to vote against both of these amendments and I am going to explain why.

The principal aim here obviously, as Deputy Prow has said, is to try to get to a position where some or all residents, local residents, who currently cannot obtain travel insurance or for whom it

3030 is prohibitively expensive can in the future be insured or at least have the assurance that their medical bills, if they incur any while in the UK, will be paid or reimbursed.

Now, nobody I think is going to dissent from the principle, that was – to a large extent, but not perhaps as much as some people imagine – the situation under the old Reciprocal Health Agreement. The problem with these two amendments is that there is a high risk that we will be  
3035 making it harder to achieve that objective if either of these amendments is successful. For two reasons.

First of all, because the prospect of a Reciprocal Health Agreement remains elusive. What we are being asked to do here in practice is to put all of our eggs in the basket of a future replacement Reciprocal Health Agreement on nothing more than a wing and a prayer. Nobody is  
3040 able to come to the States today and say we have had some kind of in principle indication from Her Majesty's Government that they are prepared to sign a replacement Reciprocal Health Agreement. We do not have any indication of them having signed any similar agreements in recent years. Deputy Prow identified two that were signed 10 years ago. We are told that they may be willing and there is reference to a throwaway remark made at some point indicating that  
3045 the UK may be swilling to enter into negotiations about a new Reciprocal Health arrangement, and Deputy le Tocq just talked about a nuanced change in the position of Her Majesty's Government. Now –

I will give way to Deputy Prow.

3050 **Deputy Prow:** I am very grateful to Deputy Fallaize for giving way.

He refers to the offer from the UK to negotiate Reciprocal Health Agreement as a 'throwaway remark', yet it has appeared in statements in this Assembly and it is subject to a very positive remark in the Policy & Resource Plan which we are debating. I do not think, if it was a throwaway remark, it would have been given that significance and it would have reached the level as worded  
3055 in the Appendix that I referred to.

Thank you, sir.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Well, it is not an offer. There has been no offer from the UK to reinstate the old, or something similar to the old Reciprocal Health Agreement, or to come to a new  
3060 agreement.

Now, if any Member of the Assembly can stand here and advise very clearly what the offer is, what the words of assurance have been from HM Government then, fine, by all means do it. But Deputy Prow cannot, I do not think; Deputy le Tocq did not when he spoke; Deputy le Clerc would not be able to. I know the discussions that were relayed to Deputy le Clerc from my time as a  
3065 Member of the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security. I am saying – not that they were making a throwaway remark – but at some point throwaway remarks have been made by officials in the UK which have given us some hope that at some point in the future there might be something not dissimilar to a Reciprocal Health Agreement on the table. But that is it. Previously the position of HM Government has been 'No' very emphatically, and the best Deputy Le Tocq  
3070 can tell us today is there may have been a nuanced change in their position. That to me does not seem very hopeful.

Now, that is not to say that I have any objection to any Committee taking advantage of any opportunity to discuss with Her Majesty's Government the possibility of a Reciprocal Health Agreement. There is no reason why we should be denied that opportunity.

3075 I am not quite sure actually why the explanatory note on the Deputy Le Tocq/Stephens amendment says:

The Amendment rightly places this policy development with the P&RC ...

I must say in passing I am not quite sure why it falls so squarely under the remit of the Policy & Resources Committee but Deputy Le Tocq will have an opportunity to tell us when he replies to the debate (*Laughter*) Go on, I will give way.

3080

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

It is simply because at this stage what is necessary to open the door for other Committees to come in on the action is for External Affairs to take a lead ensuring that we have got the right people and that we are speaking to the right people in the UK. I mean, it would be our secretariat irrespective of whether it is Health or ESS – and it certainly will not be ESS any more – that will be involved from that point of view.

3085

So that is simply why at the moment where we are, it has to be within the External Affairs because that is where the staff resource and our mandate lies.

3090

**Deputy Fallaize:** Okay, I appreciate that, but I think that makes it even worse. We have a need – I think it is a need, but some colleagues may think it is demands being made by residents – for us to respond positively to the problem that some people in Guernsey are more or less unable to travel to the UK because they cannot obtain travel insurance or because the premium would be prohibitively expensive. That is what we are trying to respond to.

3095

Now, actually, what we are being asked to do in these two amendments then, following Deputy Le Tocq's intervention, is to put all of our efforts to meet that need into what is being set out in the amendment which is simply that the Policy & Resources Committee will have some *discussions* with HM Government about whether there *might* be opportunities to negotiate a Reciprocal Health Agreement and if they find that there might be then they are going to put their contacts in touch with contacts at Deputy Soulsby's Committee –

3100

I will give way to Deputy Parkinson.

**Deputy Parkinson:** Sir, would Deputy Fallaize agree that in addition to the need, potentially, of Guernsey residents to have cover for their health treatment when they are outside the Island there is also a need for UK residents to be able to access a health agreement when they come to Guernsey on holiday? This is not simply a matter of the health of the Guernsey population.

3105

**Several Members:** Hear, hear.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Yes, I think that it would be beneficial if we were able to provide that to people who are here from the UK, but I think that is of less importance than ensuring that we can provide insurance to local residents who want to go to the UK. So I think they are both worth pursuing but I think it is of greater value to ensure that our local residents are able to benefit than UK residents.

3110

Now the point is, however, for the reason that Deputy Parkinson suggests, it may well be worth having discussions with Her Majesty's Government about whether it is possible to have a Reciprocal Agreement. I am not opposed to those discussions taking place. What I am opposed to is saying we recognise there is a need to provide some kind of insurance scheme or some kind of scheme of recompense for local residents, and the only way in which we will be pursuing that would be through this very hopeful prospect of having a Reciprocal Health Agreement, because both of the amendments propose rescinding the Extant Resolution which tries to deal with this matter through a different route.

3115

Now, I am slightly attached to this Resolution because it arose out of an amendment which I proposed which was seconded by Deputy Laurie Queripel and Deputy Prow read some of the Resolution out when he spoke.

3120

3125

Now, the explanatory note on Deputy Le Tocq's amendment refers to the Extant Resolution which essentially directs the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security to report to the States, having considered whether it would be possible to provide local residents with the benefits of the old Reciprocal Health Agreement but funded through the local Health Insurance Scheme.

3130 We are told in the Deputy Le Tocq amendment in the explanatory note that:

This is proving highly challenging ...

Well, I beg to differ. What happened is that the outgoing Committee – because this was a Resolution made late in the life of the last States – did not do anything on it, understandably, and when the new Committee was elected in May 2016 they started work and they decided that it was necessary to investigate all manner of different ways in which this kind of scheme could be produced including engaging with multiple private companies. Fair enough, those investigations went on and unsurprisingly the findings were that there was no public-private partnership scheme that was going to be cost effective or deliver what was necessary. So the Committee, on a point of policy, has now returned to the original intent which is to consider setting up a scheme and funding it through the local Health Insurance Scheme.

3135  
3140 The problem here is that the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security has difficulty finding officer resource to dedicate to that work. That is why it is proving highly challenging. It is not because it is hideously complex. It would not be that complex to either extend the terms of the Secondary Health Care Scheme to people who are travelling off Island or, better still, to try to replicate the benefits of the old Reciprocal Health Agreement and fund it through the local Health Insurance Scheme. But I do accept that Employment & Social Security has limited staff resources and at the moment has not been able to prioritise that work. But if the Policy & Resources Committee has spare resources – which obviously it does, because it now wants to take on an additional workstream – I suggest that they ought to reallocate some of their surplus resources to the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security to allow them to get on with this work.

3145  
3150 This is the problem I have with both of these amendments. We have in place a Resolution which directs Employment & Social Security to consider extending the terms of the local Health Insurance Scheme so that local people, or at least local people who cannot obtain travel insurance or for whom it is prohibitively expensive, can in future travel to the UK and know that they have travel insurance and know that they are not going to face significant medical bills.

3155 Even if the States want the Policy & Resources Committee to reopen discussions around a Reciprocal Health Agreement, why would we want to rescind that direction to the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security? Because there is a very high chance that the outcome of the discussions with Her Majesty's Government – whether it is through P&R or subsequently through Health & Social Care – will be that we will not be able to re-establish a Reciprocal Health Agreement, or that we will choose not to because it will prove to be prohibitively expensive, either in upfront costs or because of income foregone by the Committee *for* Health & Social Care in relation to UK visitors. I am not saying that is a certainty but there is a high possibility of that happening.

3160  
3165 If that happens, the States will have rescinded the Resolution directing the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security to investigate the alternative scheme. And I cannot understand why the States would want to put itself in this position.

So, fine, look into a new Reciprocal Health Agreement if it is felt that there has been some kind of change in the mood music the other side of the Channel; then, fine, look into it again. But for goodness' sake please do not rescind the direction to Employment & Social Security which could, if it had the officer resources available, get set up relatively quickly an insurance scheme which would provide the people of Guernsey with what is needed without having to increase social insurance contribution rates.

3170 I will give way to Deputy Merrett.

**Deputy Merrett:** I thank Deputy Fallaize.

3175 So it sounds through you, sir, that Deputy Fallaize is in agreement with a) and with b)(i) and (ii); and in fact Deputy Prow and I deliberately set c) as a separate Proposition, so if Deputy Fallaize does not want c) then he could ask – I look to you, sir – for advice. And I am sure he could ask for a separate vote on c) which would not rescind the Resolution.

3180 So maybe he could just confirm that he is actually supportive of negotiating suitable terms and investigate opportunities, which is basically a) and b) but in fact he is not at all comfortable with c)?

Thank you, sir.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Well, I think that is self-evident from what I have just been saying. I do not  
3185 whether, sir, you are going to allow a separate vote on c). It would probably help if the proposers and seconders of these two amendments advised the States that they were prepared to drop their attempt to rescind that 2015 Resolution, but I do not know. I can only speak and vote on the amendment that has been laid before us.

3190 What would be better would be a different amendment which knocked out this completely unnecessary section c). (*Interjections*) So we will have to take the Bailiff's advice on whether he is going to allow a separate vote on c) –

**The Bailiff:** Are you asking for it when we vote on the amendment or if the amendment carries  
3195 and then becomes the substantive Propositions? Are you requesting a separate vote when we vote on the substantive Propositions? What are you requesting?

**Deputy Fallaize:** I was not requesting anything, sir. I am happy to vote against the amendment  
3200 as it stands if I have to. (*Interjection*) But if there is a separate vote on c) I will vote in favour, at the time of the vote on the amendment, I will vote in favour of a) and b). If there is not a separate vote on c) when the amendment is put to the vote I will vote against the whole thing. Because I really do fear that by rescinding the Resolution that is set out in part c) of this amendment, I mean, Employment –

Oh, I will give way to Deputy Prow.

3205 **Deputy Prow:** I thank Deputy Fallaize for giving way.

Perhaps to try and make some headway on this, I would at the appropriate time be prepared to ask the Bailiff for a separate vote on c) and I think, as the Bailiff suggested, the appropriate time would be if the amendment was passed and it became a substantive Proposition, that would be when we would vote on it.

3210 But I see other Deputies shaking their heads sir, but in any case ...

Sorry, Deputy Fallaize while I am on my feet, what I am saying is that I would be very content to ask the Bailiff, however it transpires, for a separate vote on subsection c).

Thank you, sir.

3215 **Deputy Fallaize:** Well, I am very grateful to Deputy Prow for that and I think if he and Deputy Le Tocq, as the proposer of the other amendment, are prepared to leave that Resolution in place, then I think we can get to a sensible position where we have Policy & Resources entering into discussions with Her Majesty's Government to see whether there has been some material change in the position *vis à vis* a Reciprocal Health Agreement, but as a backstop. I do not really want to  
3220 use that word – (*Laughter*) but perhaps you could tell them that we have a backstop in place if they choose not to negotiate with us, but leave the 2015 Resolution in place as a backstop. And I think there is some prospect actually of the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security progressing that work before the end of this term.

3225 I know that they are not doing it at this very moment in time because they are working on  
other things, but I think there is some prospect of them doing it before the end of this term. But if  
the Resolution is rescinded they definitely will not do anything, and any potential backup plan for  
us to get the assistance that is necessary to our local residents so that those people who are  
currently not travelling to the UK, who are unable to travel to the UK because they cannot obtain  
3230 insurance at reasonable cost, we need to get some assistance to those people and we need to do  
it as quickly as possible and we are not going to aid ourselves in that task by rescinding that 2015  
Resolution.

So if you are prepared, sir, to take part c) of the amendment separately when we vote on the  
amendment, I think that is a reasonable way forward.

3235 **The Bailiff:** Well, we will see how the debate goes.  
Deputy Le Clerc.

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

3240 Sir, I would urge everybody if they are going to support one of these amendments that they  
support the P&R amendment. The reason I will give is the reason that we have just discussed and  
it is about c) and that is the rescinding of the outstanding Resolution on the Insurance Scheme.  
Because if you vote for the Prow/Merrett amendment you are diluting our already scant resources  
to not only take part in a consultation to carry on negotiating the Reciprocal Health Agreement,  
you are also asking that scant resource to bring back a policy paper on the Insurance Fund.  
3245 Therefore, if you are going to vote I would urge that you vote for the P&R amendment which  
means that if you want us to continue working on the Insurance Scheme we will still have to find a  
resource for that but at least the resource will not be split two ways.

As I have said before in this Assembly, I do apologise that we have not come back with the  
Insurance Scheme but every time we settle down to do that piece of work we have another piece  
3250 of work that comes along, and the piece of work that we have been working on, this one resource  
is the Family Allowance paper, and Deputy Fallaize has been putting pressure on us to sort out the  
family allowance and we have been working on that. Now we have got work on the Asbestos  
Compensation Scheme paper and again it will be that same resource that we need to put to that.  
So it has been very difficult.

3255 One of the most frustrating things – and I was going to say this in general debate – is the  
amount of time that is taken for that same resource to put together this Policy & Resource Plan. It  
was a huge amount of work and so every single time, we just get sidetracked on to something  
else that has got priority.

But I think we need to go back a little bit in time and I have spoken previously on the  
Reciprocal Health Agreement. It was Deputy Kuttelwascher that in the last term brought a requête  
3260 to the States on the Reciprocal Health Agreement. Both Deputy Soulsby and I were on HSSD at  
that time and we were unaware of the history of the Reciprocal Health Agreement so we signed  
that requête because we both believed that the way forward was to have a new Reciprocal Health  
Agreement, and I still absolutely believe that that is the way forward. But it was only when we  
3265 delved into the background and we had some history on that, that we realised actually it was  
costing us a substantial amount of money. Actually, I have gone back through records and there  
was a person – it was part of their job under the States of Guernsey Board of Health, Clinical  
Services Manager, accountable to the Director of Health Care Services – that was their job and  
they spent a considerable amount of time working out who was owed what. And, at that time,  
3270 Jersey was in the same boat.

Deputy Prow has been quite critical of Employment & Social Security and the reason we have  
got involved in this is purely because of the Insurance Scheme that was proposed by Deputy Matt  
Fallaize. The actual Reciprocal Health Agreement sits clearly within Health & Social Care which is

3275 his Committee, so he can drive this forward from within his own Committee if he truly believes this work needs to be undertaken. We have only got involved probably because I wanted to be a good corporate citizen and work with the Committee for Health & Social Care to drive this forward, and it was with the President of Health & Social Care and External Relations that we met the UK equivalent of the Board of Health, I think it was last year.

3280 I just want to set the record very, very straight that we are very happy to support as much as we can but we do not have the resources to take this on alone or take it on even with P&R. If we are going to continue to have the Insurance Scheme then we need to find the resources for that as well.

3285 But I just again need to send out some warning signals on this. It has not been easy and part of the reason that it has not been easy is to set that threshold so that it is not a huge expense to the States of Guernsey. So I think when we talk in this Assembly there is sort of an implication that everybody is going to be covered and they are going to be able to travel to the UK, and everything will be free, but actually it will not be, because the scheme that we have been looking at, the bar will be set really high, the threshold will be set high, so it is only if you have been turned down insurance on health reasons, or if the premiums are exceptionally high and we may  
3290 be talking about £200 or £300. We have not actually looked at that detail, but the average person will not qualify for this Insurance Scheme, they will still have to rely on their own either travel insurance or their own health insurance. So I think we just have to be really careful that we are not setting those expectations, as I say, too high.

3295 With regard to the full Reciprocal Health Agreement – and Deputy Prow says, ‘Oh, well, it will be knock-for-knock’. Yes, it will be knock-for-knock. But what will happen is those people that are visiting the A&E Department at the PEH, that visit will have to be paid for by somebody and that will be the Guernsey taxpayer and that will be through a budget that will need to come from P&R to Health & Social Care. So, again, we must not fool ourselves that this is going to be a free scheme, because it will have to be paid for. So if there are less people getting treatment in the UK  
3300 and more people getting treatment in Guernsey that will be a cost to the Guernsey taxpayer.

So, again, I just think we need to be very clear of expectations and managing expectations.  
I will give way to Deputy Inder.

**Deputy Inder:** Thank you.

3305 I am just intrigued. I do not know an awful lot about this Reciprocal Health Agreement. I understand the concept obviously but we hear that in Jersey it seems to wipe its own face.

3310 But in the past when we had a Reciprocal Health Agreement was the balance towards Guernsey paying more? Or, when we actually did the maths between the UK and Guernsey, who was likely to come out, I suppose, the financial victim? Because Deputy Le Clerc has given us fair warning that if tourists or people go to our A&E the Guernsey taxpayer will be paying for it.

I am just intrigued to understand where the actual risk was, based on previous experiences, where the actual financial risk would be. Did Guernsey do better out of it than English tourists coming to Guernsey in the past? And Deputy Trott –

3315 **The Bailiff:** He cannot give way to you on a give way.

**Deputy Inder:** I hope you got the general gist.

3320 **The Bailiff:** He is now finished. Deputy Le Clerc is now standing; I do not know if she would wish to give way to you.

**Deputy Le Clerc:** I am happy to give way to Deputy Trott if he has got the information.

3325 **Deputy Trott:** Well, only that I think the answer to the question is obvious. The UK was keen to see it end and the UK was not keen to see it reinstated. It was of greater benefit to us than it was to them and I suspect the situation remains today.

**Deputy Le Clerc:** This is like musical chairs. *(Laughter)*

3330 Yes, sir, I think Deputy Trott is right. When, again, we were looking at the requête that Deputy Kuttelwascher brought to this Assembly I think at that time it was about half a million pounds that it was costing the States of Guernsey.

3335 The thing is, Jersey has a very different health service to us. So they have a different way of going to A&E. I am sure Deputy Soulsby would probably know more about their cost infrastructure than I would be able to say, but they have a very different way of paying for their health care in Jersey – and I think there are probably greater GP subsidies. And that is something that has not even been talked about here. Will GP visits be covered or not? Because I think predominantly when people come to the Island, particularly those that are staying with family, they probably would not go to A&E probably they would go to their GP first. So there is quite a lot of detail that we need to sort out.

3340 So I am not averse to a Reciprocal Health Agreement, as I say it does need to be negotiated. I do apologise that it has taken us a while for the Health Scheme as I say that is down to resources. But I would urge you if you want us to continue with the Insurance Scheme that you vote for the P&R paper and vote to not rescind – which is c) – because that will enable us a better opportunity to bring that paper back to this Assembly this term.

3345 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

**Deputy Brouard:** Yes, sir.

3350 I thank Deputy Fallaize for bringing me to my feet because I was not cognisant of that full implication of that bottom c) position to rescind. I had not realised the full implications of that, so my apologies to the Assembly.

3355 There are quite a few myths on the Reciprocal Health Agreement that we had. It did not cover what everybody thought it did. It is a bit like reading the fine print, when you started to read the fine print it did not cover some of the long term conditions where you might end up for a long time in the UK hospital; it did not cover repatriation; it did not cover some of the very sad things of bringing a coffin back and things like that. So there was still a need for health insurance anyway.

3360 We also have this strange situation as well which I think is probably why Employment & Social Security were asked to look at the Insurance Scheme because, if you had the accident on the White Rock that required quite a lot of hospital care you would be covered, but go 70 miles forward and you are in Poole and you have the same accident you are not covered. So there was quite a bit of logic around looking for some sort of insurance scheme for Islanders because it is still our Islander if they are in Poole, as well as if they are on the White Rock.

3365 Of course, if we can get a Reciprocal Health Agreement that would be really good, but I think as Deputy Le Clerc mentioned we are in a different position from the Isle of Man or Jersey; and the way our Hospital is run and the way our doctors are funded as well.

3370 So you could easily have a situation where somebody who is here on a boutique holiday, paying quite a lot of money for a really nice hotel and finding themselves with an unfortunate accident going to doctor or going to A&E and having some very expensive treatment done. However, I will not use Mrs Le Page, but Mrs Brouard who cannot afford to go on holiday *at all*, *(Interjection)* has an accident at Rocquaine Bay and will find that they have got a very large bill when they go to A&E; whereas the holidaymaker who has come here does not. It is trying to



3375 square that circle. Are we happy that that happens and who pays for that particular point? I know it makes it more awkward but I think these are some of the adult things that we will need to address with a Reciprocal Health Agreement.

I definitely feel we do need a safety net for those who cannot get health insurance. Even the Reciprocal Health Agreement, I doubt if it will be all encompassing. It will be a great help but if it is not all encompassing and there are still bits left over I think we would still be looking at Employment & Social Security for that safety net for those who just cannot get insurance or it is just so prohibitively expensive.

3380 So please go ahead with the Le Tocq and Stephens amendment and I, like many of my colleagues here, will be looking to keep that Resolution for Social Security so we can make sure we do have a safety net because I think it will be needed whichever way, and whether we have a Reciprocal Health Agreement or not we will still need that safety net for those people who just cannot afford it.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Paint.

3390 **Deputy Paint:** Sir, there might people out there, and certainly some in this Assembly, who do not really know why Guernsey's health agreement with the UK had stopped, where Jersey and the Isle of Man have continued. What is the difference? What are we doing so wrong in the eyes of the English Government that they will not renew ours where they renewed the Isle of Man and Jersey?

3395 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Sir, he has given way; okay.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Paint is giving way to you.

**Deputy Le Tocq:** Thank you very much.

3400 I will just answer that now because I think if there is a genuine confusion actually all the Crown Dependencies were asked to renegotiate in 2011. Guernsey chose not to. That was a decision of the States (*Interjection*) it was open to Guernsey to do so. I was not in the Assembly at the time but for whatever reason I am sure Deputy Trott can answer if Deputy Paint wants to give way to Deputy Trott.

3405 But the point is this: it is not down to the UK's fault, at that time we could have done if we had wanted to, but I think as far as I understand it Guernsey balked at the price – somebody has mentioned half a million, it seems like a bargain now – but at that time that looked like something that we could not afford to do and Jersey and the Isle of Man have *new* agreements. They are not like our previous agreement or their previous agreement; and any future agreement we might have – I was going to get on to this later – probably would not look like our previous one either.

3415 **Deputy Trott:** Sir, the simple answer is the Health & Social Services Department of the day simply did not prioritise a Reciprocal Health Agreement with the UK as a priority, and it fell away as a consequence of that. Now, clearly there were some financial pressures on that Committee but it did not make the priority cut. That is the truth of it.

**The Bailiff:** Have you finished, Deputy Paint, or – (*Laughter*)

3420 **Deputy Paint:** Well, I am still standing for Deputy Lowe and Deputy –

**The Bailiff:** Are you asking him to give way, Deputy Soulsby?

**Deputy Soulsby:** Yes, please, sir.

**The Bailiff:** He has given way.

3425

**Deputy Soulsby:** I think just to add extra to what Deputy Trott said, this was a time of FTP where everybody had to make savings, so to be spending another half a million pounds on top probably was not going to go down very well at the time. *(Interjection by Deputy Paint)*

3430

**The Bailiff:** You are giving way to Deputy Lowe?

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

3435

It is exactly that. I can remember being on Health at that time and we did not have the budget for it so we wrote to P&R to see if they would support us to be able to have, they reckoned, around half a million pounds and P&R would not support it at that time

**Deputy Trott:** On a point of correction, sir. There was no P&R at that time.

**Deputy Lowe:** There was not a P&R, it was Policy Council –

3440

**Deputy Trott:** Attention to detail often matters.

**Several Members:** Ooh!

3445

**Deputy Lowe:** Policy Council. And for – indeed, factual detail is even more important.

3450

If Members have a look back at an email that was sent by Deputy Shane Langlois – and if you have not got it on your equipment now, I am happy to re-forward it to you. This is exactly the reason why, all in blue here, it was costing the UK a fortune and it was not costing us as much money. So that was the reason why they actually pulled the plug as well on us. And, equally, although everybody keeps mentioning Jersey and the Isle of Man, we have not got the same system here. Jersey does not pay for its ambulances, it comes under the States; it is a different system here. The Hospital is another one that is different –

**The Bailiff:** Is this turning into a speech rather than a give way? *(Interjections)*

3455

**Deputy Lowe:** He gave way, sir. I was just saying about the system. I will cover it in a speech afterwards.

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

3460

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

3465

**Deputy Fallaize:** The States will be pleased to know I can advise that both Deputy Trott and Deputy Lowe are wrong. *(Laughter)* What actually happened is that the Health & Social Services Department requested ... All Departments were requested to submit their requirements for additional money for service developments for the future year. The Health & Social Services Department submitted one request, along with many others, for money to reinstate the Reciprocal Health Agreement. At that time, there was a sort of bidding process that took place through the States' Strategic Plan for a relatively small pot of additional money which had become available – I think it was £1.7 million in that particular year – and it did not make the cut that was proposed by what was called the States' Strategic Planning Group at the time.

3470

So that is why the States ended up not spending the money to, not reinstate, but to set up a new Reciprocal Health Agreement.

3475 **Deputy Paint:** Sir, I think I have achieved all I wanted to. *(Laughter)*

**The Bailiff:** I will now call Deputy Dorey – *(Interjection by Deputy Paint)* sorry, you have not finished yet? *(Laughter)* No, no, carry on! **(Deputy Paint: Oh!)** *(Laughter)*

3480 No, no, he has got to give the next speech, he is not asking you to give way, please finish your speech. Sorry, I thought –

**Deputy Paint:** Yes, I have given way, sir.

3485 **The Bailiff:** No, he is not looking, he is not asking you to. Sorry it was my fault, I thought you had finished your speech.

**Deputy Paint:** Well I had and I was just thanking everybody that explained to ourselves and the general public why we have got ourselves into this sad mess.

3490 **The Bailiff:** Yes, well, thank you for that.

Deputy Dorey, who will no doubt now give another explanation. *(Laughter)*

**Deputy Dorey:** Thank you.

3495 Deputy Fallaize is almost right. *(Laughter and interjections)* I think it was the Financial Transformation Programme savings which were going to be reallocated from the States' Strategic Plan and it was subject to a States' Resolution. A number of different options were proposed and there were amendments which were proposed to spend money on different things and one of the things was the Reciprocal Health Agreement and it was rejected by the Assembly at that time. So it was the decision of the Assembly because it thought that other projects were more important than it was.

3500 Bu I would just like to build on the point that Deputy Brouard made and I read from a report from HSSD in 2011, and this is why I am lacking in confidence of a Reciprocal Health Agreement. It says: 'The cost of repatriation was not covered in the former Reciprocal Health Agreement and would not be covered in any new Reciprocal Health Agreement and this could be a significant cost to an individual up to £15,000'. This was 2011 terms.

3505 It goes on to say: 'Even if Guernsey and UK entered into a new agreement the HSSD would still advise people travelling between Guernsey and the UK to take out medical insurance to cover the cost of repatriation which in some cases exceeded the cost of the medical treatment received itself.'

3510 I can remember when I was on Social Security about a case where somebody had a very significant bill and they just could not afford to pay it for repatriation.

3515 I think the biggest danger with a Reciprocal Health Agreement is that it will lull people into a false sense of security that they do not need insurance. Even if we had a Reciprocal Health Agreement people do need insurance, because the risk – obviously repatriation is a low risk, but it is a very high cost and most people will not be able to afford it. And obviously people with a health condition are more at risk of needing treatment than getting a Reciprocal Health Agreement; and those who struggle to get insurance now will possible struggle to get repatriation insurance.

3520 So I actually favoured what was the Fallaize amendment which was trying to negotiate an insurance, and I hope it would cover repatriation, because without that I think we are not providing the service that people want. If people want to be able to travel to the UK risk free in

health terms without having to take out insurance, a Reciprocal Health Agreement will not deliver that. And that is the key point. If people are lulled into a false sense of security by these amendments being passed there is a grave danger that we would not succeed in getting that message over to people.

3525

Also in this report of 2011 it said the estimate was that UK visitors currently paying on-Island emergency and non-emergency treatment in the PEH was £350,000.

So that is what they were paying at that time, but of course if you went to a Reciprocal Health Agreement as that diagram which Deputy Langlois sent to Members and Deputy Lowe showed, it does not cover Primary Care consultation. So if a Reciprocal Health Agreement is going to cost that, then the cost will be a lot higher.

3530

So this might seem popular, but I think we have to be very careful of what message we send to people.

I personally will not vote for these amendments because I think the best way is an insurance policy which will cover that repatriation, if you want to allow people to travel to the UK risk free, because neither of these amendments delivers that.

3535

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

3540

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

I have started so I will finish, sir, thank you.

Yes, what I was saying before and I sort of did slightly drift into the start of a speech, but I will repeat it again because it is just so important. How Guernsey operates currently is completely different to Jersey and the Isle of Man. Ambulance service here is operated by a charity and it is chargeable – it is under the States in Jersey; and also the Hospital as well is different again how that is; and a GP. And it has been explained by Deputy le Clerc.

3545

How do you think the public of Guernsey will feel that they have to pay what we often get complaints about, the extortionate prices to go to A&E, or whatever you call it these days? I cannot remember, it is not A&E any more, but you know what I mean. People still call it A&E! And indeed to go to the doctor. Yet if you come to Guernsey you are not going to pay anything because we will pick up the tab as the community.

3550

I do not think that is going to go down too well, personally. I think if they have got to be starting to pay a lot of money, and people who come over here are not having to pay anything, and yet *they* have got to pay an awful lot of money. How many times do we hear about people – we heard it this morning from Deputy Merrett – who cannot afford to go to the doctor and they will delay things. That is exactly what will make it even worse, I suggest, when charges will have to go up, because someone has got to pay.

3555

If you look at that chart which I have just re-sent, which I thank Deputy Langlois for because it is an excellent chart and he needs to be commended for that, because you could not have it any clearer to show you the huge amount that it was costing the UK against Guernsey. And, although the systems may have well changed that divide will still be there. It will still be much more for the UK than what it will be for Guernsey, I suggest. All that said, we could end up with having health tourism, because it would be why not come over here if they are not going to have to pay? So I think we have to be very, very careful on that.

3560

The other area that I have concerns about the message that is going out today, is actually it may be too expensive for people, and I accept that. I full accept that and if we can find an easy answer, fine, but it was a comment that was made by Deputy Le Clerc and I accept she said they have got a lot of work to do on that and they have not got the costs yet. So if it was going to be around £200 they may have to pick that up. I see, rightly or wrongly, that there may be insurance

3565

3570

companies whose little eyes are lighting up because their prices might go up a little bit higher if they think the States are going to pick up the tab.

3575 **Deputy Le Clerc:** Sir, we have explored the avenues with the insurance companies and I said in previous Question Times actually there was absolutely no interest from the insurance companies. We even looked at setting up a captive insurance and again it was not cost effective and we got nobody interested. So despite being an Island that provides financial services and proud of our insurance industry there was nobody coming forward.

3580 **Deputy Lowe:** Thank you, Deputy Le Clerc.  
Again, nothing has changed. I could have brought in speeches – oh, do you want me to give way?

**Deputy Tooley:** I thank Deputy Lowe for giving way and I apologise for the interruption.  
3585 I just wonder if she could explain, because I possibly was not quite focused on exactly what Deputy Lowe was saying. I understood that she was suggesting there was a possibility of some kind of health tourism where people from the UK would come to Guernsey because the medical treatment would be free. But of course medical treatment is free in the UK so there would not be an incentive for them to come to Guernsey to receive that.

3590 Thank you.

**Deputy Lowe:** Yes, but not everything is free in the UK, whereas under this it could well be. We could find ourselves in that way. So that is what I am trying to say there, badly.

I thank Deputy Le Clerc for actually explaining again about the insurance companies –  
3595

**Deputy Soulsby:** Point of correction.

**Deputy Lowe:** Pardon.

3600 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

**Deputy Soulsby:** Point of correction.

The Reciprocal Health Agreement does not work like that. You are treated like a person in that jurisdiction is treated. So if you come over here and you break your ankle and you go to A&E, you will still be charged at A&E; but if you go into Hospital you will not be charged. But that is, just as if you go to the UK, you will not have any charges because it is all free.  
3605

**Deputy Lowe:** Yes, until you are admitted. (*Interjections*)

3610 So, getting back to this year, then, I have concerns that we are going to be sending out messages here and, again, giving expectations when ... I could have brought in probably about three or four speeches over the years where this has come to the States. If we could find an answer to do it and I think the best one was actually Deputy Fallaize's amendment to try and see if there is something we can do under the Health Scheme I think that is the answer, I really do.

3615 If the Government of the UK decide that they will do something, there is nothing to stop that happening at the same time when actually negotiations are taken away, if somebody can actually try and get somebody through External Relations or through Health or whoever, I really do not mind who it is. In fact it is even better if everybody tries to do it. You have got External Relations then you have got Health, it is under Health's remit to be able to do that sort of thing, so there is nothing to stop them doing it.

3620 But at the end of the day I think that I would like to stick with probably what we have got already with that outstanding Resolution of the States, because I am a bit reluctant to be sending out a message that, 'Oh, it looks like it is going to go ahead again', when people have been very upset when the States have not been able to get an answer, and be able to get a Reciprocal Health Agreement. I do not want to send expectations to people that that is probably going to happen, because we are going to be out there and doing it.

3625 Deputy Le Tocq has already mentioned that he has tried and others have tried previously to do that. So, if we can get it done, absolutely great; but I do not actually see anything happening at this moment in time.

3630 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher.

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

I could not disagree with Deputy Lowe more on this occasion.

3635 But I am going to start with Brexit. Why? Because the information that I have gleaned over the past few months is this whole issue has come to the fore because of Brexit, because if the UK actually exits, which we do not know, their European Health Insurance Card Scheme will fall out of the window. I understood from the External Relations Group negotiations, the information I have gleaned is that the UK are now looking to see what they could do to replace it and that would include us. So this has come from without, which kind of contradicts a bit I think with Deputy Fallaize's view that why does not anybody look at it. The UK I think have made the first move.

3640 Now, whether it comes to anything or not I do not know. We have gone into so much detail now from health tourism, and it is all complete nonsense because we have not got a clue what such an agreement might be and it is generally only to provide emergency treatment to get you home.

3645 The other thing is, at the beginning I thought I would vote for both amendments hoping one would survive. I am now more inclined to vote for the P&R amendment because ESS is basically saying they have not got the capacity or the resources to do much with it. But it was 2015 that this requête I laid came up and it did not succeed – not that that would have made much difference anyhow, because even if it had succeeded we might not have got anywhere with negotiations, who knows. But the Fallaize amendment has been in play for four years and we have basically been told that the insurance companies are not interested, so the only way you could fund treatment for Islanders going to the UK is directly from the Health Insurance Fund, or whatever.

3650 The thing I have got against that is it is only half an agreement because there are hundreds, if not thousands of Guernsey folk, who happen to be living in the UK for now and they cannot get back some of them and with an ageing population and the demography, there will be more and more people who just will not be able to get any insurance so they will travel without, or not travel at all.

3655 It is also an issue for inward tourism. I remember at the time of the debate on the requête our colleagues in Jersey, when they were having their Boat Show, were advertising the fact to visiting yachtsmen, 'You get covered here with the Reciprocal Health insurance, but not in Guernsey'. They were using it as a marketing ploy against us, and they had some success.

3660 So my view is we need to at least have the discussion, assuming the UK is still open to such a discussion, and there will be some cost. But I think there could be such an enormous benefit that the benefit would outweigh the cost and you need to do a cost-benefit analysis. But certainly not having as Reciprocal Health Agreement is hindering our visitor economy. And most of our visitors, or the high-spending visitors, tend to be in the mature bracket. Now, they will not come if they either cannot get insurance or have all sorts of things on their policy saying, 'We will cover you for this but not your condition'.

3670 So I would urge Members to support one or other of these amendments. One is better than the other I think, but one or other; because I do not think this issue should be put to bed, not at this stage.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

3675

**Deputy Inder:** Sir, just briefly. I think Deputy Kuttelwascher saved me a bit of a speech.

I have got two questions really for whoever pops up towards the end of this portion of the debate.

How many Islanders cannot travel, do we think, roughly? A rough guess?

3680

And, has Economic Development done any work around – and this is from towards the end of Deputy Kuttelwascher's bit – whether the lack of a Reciprocal Health Agreement, because I remember that being used as a marketing tool, has impacted – (*Interjections and laughter*) I will give way to Deputy Le Clerc.

3685

**The Bailiff:** Give way to Deputy Le Clerc.

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

3690

I think we have already done some research in the work that we have done on the Insurance Scheme to find out how many people this has affected travelling to the UK and it has been very low in numbers, and that is despite me going on the radio and through other media outlets saying if you have got evidence that you have been turned down insurance or you have not travelled. So the numbers have been very low on people when we have called for data on that.

**Deputy Inder:** Thank you very much for that.

3695

It does remind me a little bit, a very tiny bit, and I know everyone matters in this Island. It reminds a little bit of the call to arms for the turning the greenhouse sites into logistics areas where there was a massive movement from the building industry and then when Government, and I think it was Deputy Fallaize and Deputy Queripel, brought an amendment to look at making changes to the IDP and opening up to investors, no-one really turned up.

3700

So I just wondered how much of this is actual ... I do not mean to diminish those people who genuinely cannot travel, but how big an issue this really is? I would really like to know how big an issue this is.

3705

Also, as I said before, has Economic Development done any work on the lack of an RHA and whether that has impacted at all on tourism figures; (*Interjection*) and Deputy Parkinson, I am sure, is behind me again. And I of course give way to him.

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

3710

I think the problem is, of course, it is very difficult to do research on people who did not come to Guernsey because we did not have a Reciprocal Health Agreement.

There is some anecdotal evidence and I have occasionally read letters in *The Press* etc. from people saying that they decided not to come to Guernsey because of this issue, but I think the numbers in reality would probably be very low. I think it would be difficult to put any very scientific number behind that, but nevertheless it is an issue and it is of concern to Economic Development.

3715

**Deputy Inder:** So what we are getting down to then, basically, is we have got a very low numbers of Islanders that cannot travel and, accepting anecdotally, potentially very low impact on

our tourism figures of tourists coming in. So Deputy Fallaize – Oh, it is another one, Deputy Queripel, I give way.

3720

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Sir, I am grateful to Deputy Inder for giving way.

But we have heard a lot over the last few years about the demographic situation we are facing an ageing population, so surely perhaps the demand for that Insurance Scheme will increase as the years go by.

3725

**Deputy Inder:** Well, when it happens, maybe that is the time to do it. But right now it would appear that the numbers of Islanders unable to travel are fairly low. And Deputy Prow is – I will give way.

3730

**Deputy Prow:** I thank Deputy Inder for giving way.

I think the debate is moving away from the main thrust of the amendment which is about negotiating a Reciprocal Health Agreement which is similar to Jersey and the Isle of Man.

3735

Now, I very much have every sympathy, and certainly I have had quite a lot of representation from organisations and associations about the medical insurance issue, i.e. those people who are concerned about being unable to travel. But the Reciprocal Health Agreement is wider than that, it is about an agreement for the community that if you need emergency treatment in the UK you can get that.

3740

I think the chart that Deputy Lowe referred to indicates that a lot of people from Guernsey would benefit; and I certainly think that we are disadvantaged from what the other Crown Dependencies offer to UK visitors.

So I think the debate is getting narrow into those who cannot afford insurance and I am absolutely supportive of them; but the Reciprocal Health Agreements that Jersey and the Isle of Man have got are far wider than that.

Thank you, sir.

3745

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

Deputy Prow does not have to fear, it does not mean I am not going to vote for either of the amendments, I am just always intrigued to know the extent of the issue.

3750

So from that regard we have established two things, that certainly those who cannot travel today because of health issues to the UK does not seem to be that large; and the effect on the tourism industry does not appear to be particularly large. So I suppose one of the questions is if it is such small beer, I wonder why we have not done it through the original Health Insurance (*Interjection*) and that really is the point I was probably trying to get to.

Thank you.

3755

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

3760

**Deputy Gollop:** Sir, I have been sort of champing under the bit, this is probably my fourth or fifth, I do not know, Reciprocal Health Agreement debate and think I feel like being one of these hopefully non-existent politicians who say 'Rubbish!' all the time and get really cross. Because there is so much of what we hear, it is quite odd really. I know I should follow Deputy Le Clerc's advice and go, if I have to, for the P&R amendment, the one that Deputy le Tocq has put. But I quite like the Deputy Prow one as well, because one has got to go through the whole issue here.

3765

We have had an excellent – well, two members of staff really, assisting us in ESS who could not have done more in a timely input and learned way. But their time very much has been taken up by, ironically enough, the P&R Plan in recent months; and of course we have been saddled, post-



social policy, with all the rigours of the equalities and disability rights and many other things as well.

3770 But the point is that the great driving force I think behind using the Social Security Insurance Scheme as a way of resolving the problem for Islanders, it was probably Deputy Fallaize who very much saw it as an achievable and affordable solution and that is not the same thing, as he said clearly, as a Reciprocal Health Agreement.

3775 The Reciprocal Health Agreement in some ways is a prisoner of history; and one reason why perhaps Jersey and the Isle of Man got the goodies and Guernsey did not was not just the FTP and the fact that Guernsey was making different priorities in the Zero-10 era, and actually took a lesser dip in its economy than Jersey, as Deputy Trott will remember very well. But there was another reason and that is Jersey's tourism, whether we like it or not, is of a slightly larger scale than Guernsey's and that makes a difference perhaps to the economics of it and the UK point of view.

3780 I want to give my own perspective on this and I am not saying I am 100% accurate here, but this is just my perception of events. But when it came back after Deputy Kuttelwascher's requête and Deputy Fallaize's amendment to Employment & Social Security, we have sometimes given the impression in Question Time to Deputy Prow and others that we did not do much. The *opposite* was true. We had meeting after meeting after meeting on it and many, many hours and acres of trees, or *vergées* of trees, were used.

3785 But there were sticking points that have just been hinted at. One was that – surprise, surprise – the commercial private domestic insurance industry in Guernsey did not particularly want Government offering freebies. That perhaps is an obvious point. Another point is when you get into the more technical areas of thresholds and payments and so on you do get into the whole field of actuarial risk analysis and that is where perhaps we, perhaps some of us, would have taken the risk with the insurance fund but the wise men or women and souls who populate Policy & Resources were a bit wary about open-ended commitments it is fair to say, because there is always the case you do not necessarily plan for, somebody who falls over at Southampton Airport Railway Station who is in an emergency hospital there for months and months, or whatever. So all

3795 of these points were kind of in the frame.

In some ways a Reciprocal Health Agreement from a Guernsey point of view is a middle-class tax break, because the point has already been made that the ultra-wealthy do not necessarily need it because they have their own kind of captive insurance resources to cover it; and the poorest people probably do not travel much or are under a different kind of package. So it is a benefit for society and I think it would enhance our tourism, but it is to some extent a collective insurance scheme that we would all support for each other but would benefit a certain category of person.

3800 The argument, 'Are there people who do not travel because of it?' Yes, I think there are but I think the real issue is that they are reluctant to travel because of the extraordinarily high cost for people in certain age groups and with conditions. So, inevitably, people with disabilities who do travel and who have the ability to travel, financially disproportionately suffer.

So I am completely in favour of it but I would also say, frankly, that if we have to raise the insurance funds or pay more towards it then that is what we have to do.

3810 What I do not understand is why it is so incredibly difficult to actually make a commitment to do it, because when you go back to the Jersey Health Agreement it is just a three-page document, not 300 pages like Island Development Plans or policy plans. It is signed the first day of April – April Fool's Day – 2011, and it was between the Department of Health and the Minister for Health & Social Services of Jersey, and it is still on their website so it is extant. Amongst other things, (A), (B), (C), and (D):

The Participants are desirous of entering into a reciprocal Arrangement ... from 1st April 2011 to lay down the basis of this arrangement.

3815 That is 2011, one year into the Cameron/Clague austerity government, by the way. And point (D) of it:

No public funds are intended to change hands under this Arrangement.

So the idea that there would be problems with tourists and the boutique tourists taking money unnecessarily, it would be effectively a tit-for-tat.

They just have one page of definitions: Health Services, Residents, Territory – and:

“Treatment” means treatment the need for which arose during the visit and comprises—

- (a) diagnosis of symptoms or signs occurring for the first time after the Visitor’s arrival in the host Territory; or
- (b) treatment which, in the opinion of a medical or dental practitioner providing Health Services pursuant to the national legislation ...

3820 – then that brings the point that it is different from Guernsey to Jersey depending on what package is offered:

... of the host Participant, is required promptly for a condition which—

- (i) arose after the Visitor’s arrival in the host Territory;
- (ii) became acutely exacerbated after the Visitor’s arrival; or
- (iii) but for the treatment would be likely to become acutely exacerbated after the Visitor’s arrival;

“United Kingdom” means England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland;

“Visitor” means ... a person whose stay in that Territory has not exceeded and is not expected to exceed three calendar months.

Its Entitlement to free Health Services which is:

... free of any charge to the Visitor, subject to any charges, such as prescription or dental charges, which are also payable by Residents of the Territory in which the Treatment is provided.

It excludes travel, and:

Each Participant shall bear its own costs of complying with this Arrangement; there shall be no reimbursement between the Participants.

3825 And that is it. I mean it is actually two and a half pages long. The Isle of Man have an almost identical document, I have read that in the past as well during ESS meetings. Why can’t we, when we are so active in working together with Jersey and the Isle of Man and sending off senior ... We have got three Chief Ministers on Policy & Resources, after all if you think about it. Why can’t we just say, ‘We want that scheme’? And they might say, ‘Oh, there is a price to be paid’. But it is so simple and that is the frustration of it.

3830 So it is just time to get on with it; and not forgetting ESS has a different kind of back-up idea. But, I mean, it is what it is on the tin, really.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

3835 **Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, I feel like this debate is just going round and round in circles.

We know all about the old Reciprocal Health Agreement we know it is very different from the current agreement that Jersey and the Isle of Man have got. Yes, it is simple, Deputy Gollop, but that is because it does not really provide very much.

3840 If you have an emergency in the UK you go in they will stabilise you, wrap you up and send you off. You will need aircraft and whatever repatriation costs are on top. Only last month the Isle

of Man was putting stuff out on Twitter saying, 'You know we have got a Reciprocal Health Agreement but you really need to make sure you are insured because it does not cover repatriation costs'.

3845 It is not going to be the answer; it is not the answer to everything. It does not mean that we should not have it, but we really need to be aware this is not the great solution to all our problems and we will have lots of tourists coming here.

3850 That was the argument when we had Deputy Kuttelwascher's requête, which was saying, 'Well, look, this will bring lots of tourists to the Island, we should do it'. So we said, 'All right then we will take the money from the Tourist Budget', and they said 'No, no, do not touch that'. So the money has got to come from somewhere.

3855 But just to comment, I do not like to counter anything Deputy Le Clerc says because I know everything she says is wonderful. (*Laughter*) But under the old system, yes, I am sure there were lots of administrators working diligently to make sure that the thing would work. But under that system I cannot see ... Really if the Jersey, Isle of Man system was brought in it would not make any difference to us. The only difference it is going to make to HSC is we will have less money and really that is what all this boils down to. That and – I have forgotten what Deputy Gollop was saying – actually having the UK wanting to enter into a negotiation with us.

3860 That was why I did not end up supporting the requête, even though I had signed it. It was because the UK had made it very clear at the time, 'We do not want any more Reciprocal Health Agreements'. We had that in writing. That was in writing: 'We don't want any more, we're getting rid of them, and that's it'. And in Jersey and the Isle of Man, you can expect they will lose theirs pretty soon as well.

3865 Now, of course, that was when they were really all the big 'I am' and they were the big jurisdiction across the water and could tell us to go away, but now I think life is a bit different and they have got their own problems, and those problems might benefit us as they realise that if they have a no-deal Brexit all their citizens will need insurance or something if they are going to go on holidays to the Costa del Sol, or wherever.

3870 So, really, that is what is changing here which is why it might be worth us getting on the coat-tails of that. If they cannot have access to the EHIC, but the EHIC is very different from the Reciprocal Health Agreement because I believe the repatriation costs *are* included in the EHIC which is why it is a really valuable document and why people really benefit from it from the UK.

3875 But I still really do not quite know what to do in terms of this. I do want us to continue negotiations on the Reciprocal Health Agreement. I am hearing that I do not think HSC and ESS can support External Relations and P&R in their negotiations. We do not really need to be heavily involved in it. We can provide the advice as and when required, but it does not need a huge great 'Yes, we will talk to you', and it does not have to be embedded in an amendment for that to happen, that will happen as a matter of course.

3880 So I thought that it sounds from Deputy Le Tocq that this is happening anyway, and if they can update us and tell us what they are doing that is fine.

I must admit with number c), I might have a different view to Deputy Fallaize because I can see that being the area where we have a lot bureaucracy and a lot of administration to actually be able to manage that Insurance Scheme; but then again I do hear how it might still be a benefit to people rather just having a Reciprocal Health Agreement. So I am more tempted to support the Le Tocq amendment and not support (c) than throw both of them out.

3885 But I would like to make one final point and it is something Deputy Dorey was talking about, about the decisions that were made back in 2011 about whether to support the Reciprocal Health Agreement then. Basically, it was decided not, because of priorities, and it was not high in the priorities. It was done as part of a process looking at all the various things that needed to be considered and then to say in the scheme of things now – and that was a difficult time under FTP and things were really tight – what do we treat as a priority? And it did not make the cut.

3890

3895 Now, we have got issues coming up here, we have got a lot of people in this Assembly saying we ought to provide all NICE drugs and treatments. Earlier today we approved amendments relating to Mental Health. We know we have got gaps we want to fill. We have undertaken a joint strategic needs assessment – it is the first one that has ever happened on the Island which will become the future of how we decide priorities in Health and Social Care. That was on the over-50s and that has shown there are various areas of need that need to be addressed, so that is something else.

3900 Then we have got Primary Care funding and everybody says it is too expensive. We had the debate about in-work poverty today and about how Primary Care and Secondary Care need to be looked at so we could address the problem of in-work poverty. Then we are having a debate about a Reciprocal Health Agreement, it is only going to cost half a million pounds or so, and we *should* do it because this is what this bunch of people want.

3905 So we have got a bunch of people that want a Reciprocal Health Agreement; we have got a bunch if people that want all the NICE drug TAs; we have got another bunch of people that really want to be able to afford (*Interjection*) their Primary Care *here* let alone going somewhere else and having a holiday.

3910 So really, what I am saying to people here is, all these things sound wonderful in isolation, but we have got to look at them together. And that is why this Budget is going to be really important for people to actually understand what their priorities are and then if they think they want everything just how we pay for it. That is the key thing to this.

We can say whether we support any of these amendments or not but you have got to put your money where your mouth is and when we do the Budget it is going to be a very interesting time.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache.

3915 **Deputy Ferbrache:** I think Deputy Soulsby and Deputy le Clerc made the point really, that everybody wants everything; (*Interjection*) we all expect; 'this is a priority'; 'Oh, hang on' ... At the next States' meeting 'this is a priority'; and at the States' meeting after 'this is a priority'. Who is going to do that work?

3920 We talk about resources we are going to spend. We have already spent the day talking about x number of amendments, we have got another x number of amendments tomorrow to debate and probably the day after. We are all going to go away – well, most people will go away, I will not – thinking we have done a wonderful job, we have made it good for Guernsey, when we have probably not put any food on anybody's table; we have not improved the education system; we have not made the world less bureaucratic; we have not taken away more civil servants; we have added to cost. You can do everything if you have got all the money.

3925 Now, I was very interested to hear in history from four experienced Deputies about why the Reciprocal Health scheme came to an end and why it was not renewed, but we had four different versions of history. (*Laughter*) Deputy Trott was reminding Deputy Lowe that she should be attending to detail but apparently his own detail was not correct. (*Laughter*) Probably the best version, the most accurate version, with due respect to the other three Deputies, was that of Deputy Dorey and that does not surprise me.

3930 But the point is in relation to that, if you recall, my former legal partner and very good friend Roger Perrot came into the States in the early 1980s saying, 'We're not going to build a prison, the Home Office are not going to tell us to build a prison'. Within a year or two he was voting for us to build our new Prison because we had no option because the British Government were saying 'We are not going to take your prisoners here'. We cannot send them to Devil Island because it does not exist anymore as a penal colony, and we are not French – well, some of us are partly French, but we are not French. So we could not do that, so we had to accept the reality.

3940 The Education system in 1823, when I went to do my law studies (*Laughter*) Guernsey really  
were given it for free almost by the British Government. That has changed now; it costs a fortune  
to send students to do their tertiary education in the UK. (*Interjection and laughter*) Of course it  
does, and for parents too much more expensive in real terms than it ever was. And it is the same  
with education, the British Government stopped it in 2011 because it was costing them too much,  
3945 probably a mere bagatelle in relation to all the other monies they were spending but they were  
making a point.

Now we can have everything – we can have everything: we can have no charges for Primary  
Care; we can have no charges for various mental health treatments: we can have the old-age  
pension thing where you pay your contribution when you are post-65 so that you do not lose  
3950 your house and all of that is going to be reviewed, Deputy Le Clerc has told us that previously. We  
can do all of these things and we can then put income tax up to 65p in the pound to pay for it, or  
have sales tax at 23p, or whatever it may be. We can do all the things if we have got that money.  
You have got to be realistic.

I am going to support the P&R amendment for two reasons. Firstly, the point made by Deputy  
3955 Le Clerc: her officers cannot do it; they are already snowed under. It is all right saying you give  
work to a busy man or woman to do, but sometimes that busy man or woman cannot do the job  
properly because they have got too much other work to do and they will neglect things.

Secondly, because all it says is to look at the possibility of negotiating a similar scheme to that  
of the Isle of Man and Jersey.

3960 Deputy Dorey is absolutely right, we have got to tell people what their expectations are, and  
that if they fall ill and they need serious treatment in Warrington, Wigan or Skegness or whatever  
other exotic place they are likely to go for their holidays, they will get their emergency treatment  
at a local hospital but, if they need to come back to Guernsey, that is going to have to be paid for.  
We are told that you cannot get insurance for certain people because of their age, etc. but we  
3965 have got to make that clear.

But it is very easy: we ask Policy and Reform – because that is their responsibility, they are our  
External Relations Department and it is our External Relations Minister, really, that is leading this  
amendment – to go and see what they can do. That is all we can do.

But I implore Members of the States to not just keep bringing Resolution after Resolution, or  
3970 amendment after amendment to the States saying, 'We feel for the poor; we feel for the sick; we  
feel for mental health; we feel for that. (*Interjection*) None of you feel any more of that than I do,  
not one of you; but you have got to be realistic, we have only got so much money, we have only  
got so much resource. I would commend my fellow Deputies to actually have a degree of social  
responsibility.

3975

**The Bailiff:** If it is very short, Deputy Brehaut.

**Deputy Brehaut:** It is very short.

I thought I would end on an upbeat story and I will try and do this without a handkerchief  
3980 because I am useless talking about this subject.

On 12th August 2015 I was chasing my son round the garden, clapping my hands and saying  
to him 'Get out of the house, the sun is shining'. Some hours later he was in Southampton General  
Hospital having a lifesaving heart operation. Fortunately he is 6'4", extremely healthy, if you fell  
asleep in front of him he would probably want to eat you, he has got quite an appetite. (*Laughter*)  
3985 Having been discharged from Southampton we were told, 'Relax, enjoy your family holiday'.

We were in France and he had a secondary infection, very serious; he was in Chalon Hospital,  
he had to go to .... The ambulance crew said 'Hold on tight and follow the ambulance'. I did that  
and I drove like a lunatic behind this ambulance through Chalon through to .... The ambulance

3990 stopped. I panicked, I ran out and the doors of the ambulance opened, 'What's wrong?' 'Can you please pay for the ambulance?' they said to me. I had to pay €242 on the way to a hospital.

Our system works, that is my message; (*Interjection*) and I am just concerned that the message we are giving to our community at the moment is that our system does not and that some people may be more concerned than they need to be. When we, as a family, needed it desperately it worked and we should not forget that.

3995

**The Bailiff:** We will rise now and resume tomorrow at 9.30 a.m.

I remind Members there is now going to be the Annual General Meeting of the CPA Guernsey Branch starting in 10 minutes.

*The Assembly adjourned at 5.31 p.m.*