



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Wednesday, 1st July 2020

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

Volume 9, No. 30

ISSN 2049-8284

*Published by Her Majesty's Greffier, The Royal Court House,
St Peter Port, GY1 2NZ. © States of Guernsey, 2020*

Present:

Richard J McMahon, Q.C. 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, D. A. Tindall,
B. L. Brehaut, R. H. Tooley

St Peter Port North

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

St Sampson

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

The Vale

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

The Castel

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

The West

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

The South-East

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

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

S.M.D. Ross, Esq. (H.M. States' Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

R. M. Titterington, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller)
Deputy S. T. Hansmann Rouxel (*relevé à 10h 02*);
Alderney Representatives S. Roberts and A Snowdon (*absent de l'île*)

Business transacted

Evocation	5
Procedural	5
Urgent Propositions in pursuance of Rule 18.....	5
General Election 2020: Review of the date of the General Election – Debate commenced	5
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.31 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.</i>	<i>42</i>
General Election 2020: Review of the date of the General Election – Debate continued – Propositions carried as amended.....	42
Procedural – Order of business agreed.....	57
Billet d’État XIV.....	59
I. Revive and Thrive: Our Recovery Strategy for Guernsey Together – Debate commenced	59
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.33 p.m.</i>	<i>79</i>

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The States' Greffier

EVOCATION

Procedural

The States Greffier: Billet d'État XIII – the continuation of the debate.

5 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, I have had a message on behalf of the two Alderney Representatives. Of course the weather deteriorated last night, which is why they are not here, and there are only a handful of flights from Alderney at the moment. They will be joining us as soon as they are able to reach us.

Urgent Propositions in pursuance of Rule 18

STATES' ASSEMBLY & CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE

General Election 2020: Review of the date of the General Election – Debate commenced

The States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the policy letter entitled "General Election 2020: Review of the date of the General Election" dated 25th June, 2020, they are of the opinion:

1. To agree:

(a) to modify the application of Articles 26, 29 and 30 of the Reform (Guernsey) Law, 1948 to enable the 2020 General Election to take place in October,

(b) to appoint the date for the holding of the 2020 General Election as 7th October,

(c) to close the Electoral Roll in respect of the 2020 General Election on 21st August,

(d) that the end of the term of office of People's Deputies elected at or after the 2016 Election shall be 18th October, 2020, and

(e) that the next General Election to be held after the 2020 General Election shall be held in April 2025, and to modify the application of Article 29 of the Reform (Guernsey) Law, 1948 accordingly.

2. In accordance with, and to give effect to, Proposition 1, to approve the draft Ordinance entitled "The Elections Ordinance, 2020" and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

3. To approve the following draft Ordinances entitled:

(a) "The Electoral Expenditure Ordinance, 2020",

(b) "The Postal Voting (Amendment) Ordinance, 2020", and

(c) "The Elections (Nominations and Ballot Papers for People's Deputies) Ordinance, 2020". and to direct that the same shall have effect as Ordinances of the States.

4. To agree the following arrangements for polling stations:

to set the opening hours of all polling stations (including advance polling stations and the super polling stations) in the Island at 8 a.m. until 8 p.m.;

to establish an advance super polling station at St Sampson's High School and Princess Royal Performing Arts Centre on Saturday 3rd October and Sunday 4th October 2020;

to establish an advance and super polling station at the Princess Royal Performing Arts Centre on Tuesday 6th and Wednesday 7th October 2020;

to establish the Parish polling stations on Tuesday 6th and Wednesday 7th October 2020 as set out in the table at paragraph 6.22 of this policy letter.

5. To approve the draft Ordinance entitled "The Advance and Super Polling Station Ordinance, 2020" and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

6. To agree the following States' Meetings should be convened for Committee and other elections:

Date	Election of
a) Monday 19th October a.m.	President, Policy & Resources Committee
b) Monday 19th October p.m.	Members, Policy & Resources Committee
c) Wednesday 21st October	Committee Presidents
d) Thursday 22nd October	Committee Members and Non-Governmental Body Members

The Bailiff: Members of the States, I thought the first thing we would do this morning, because I have accepted the Urgent Propositions from the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee, is deal with General Election 2020: Review of the date of the General Election. Therefore, I invite Deputy Inder to open the debate.

Deputy Inder: Sir, Members, you have all got the policy letter, I am sure, with you. Members, for the third time in two months and actually 17 days I am presenting a policy letter to the Assembly on a General Election.

The first, considered on 14th April, asked the States to postpone the election until October and we asked for a no-go date and debates in July. The Committee proposals were rejected in favour of delaying the election for one year, and that was by amendment.

The second debate was on 20th May. We asked the States to agree the necessary changes to primary legislation to give effect to that April decision. Amendments to the Proposition attached to the policy letter and legislation reopened debate on when the election should be and the States eventually directed the Committee to review the feasibility of holding a General Election in November 2020 or March, April or May 2021, taking into account Public Health advice.

The third is in front of Members today, 1st July. It meets the Resolutions agreed 40 days ago and details a review undertaken by the Committee, its conclusions and its recommendations. The Committee has evidenced in this policy letter that it is feasible to hold the General Election later this year in line – and that it extremely important; it is information we did not have in the second round – with advice from Public Health. It proposes that the election should be held on Wednesday, 7th October and sets out the election timetable. It requests the States agree the relevant ordinances provide the legal framework to enable the election to take place. It proposes the polling stations to be established and the proposed dates of Committee elections.

35 Undertaking this review and producing this policy letter in just over one month has been no
mean feat and would not have been possible without the contribution of others, and I refer to and
thank the Douzaines for their ongoing support and flexibility and for confirming that by and large
the polling stations and polling station officials will be available to support the proposed
rescheduled election. We would also like to thank the Director of Public Health for her prompt
and helpful response to our request for advice and for her offer of ongoing support on the
project. Our third-party suppliers have provided confirmation of their services for the proposed
revised date and we appreciate their commitment to the project. Finally, I would like to thank the
Election Project Board and the Election Team, who swiftly reconvened after the main meeting and
40 contributed to the review.

SACC is mandated to advise the States on elections to the office of Peoples' Deputy; we have
done this. We were directed to review the feasibility of holding an election earlier than June 2021
in line with Public Health advice; we have done this. Having carefully and intensively considered
this subject in the last month, we have concluded unanimously to strongly recommend to the
45 States that the General Election take place on Wednesday, 7th October 2020 and ask Members to
support the Propositions. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, there have been four amendments submitted to the
50 Greffier.

Deputy Inder, is it your wish to move amendment 4 first on the basis that this is a Committee
amendment, as far as I can see?

Deputy Inder: Yes, please, sir, it is a technical amendment.
55

The Bailiff: Do you need the amendment to be read at all?

Deputy Inder: I would, sir. For the record it would be useful.

60 **The Bailiff:** Greffier.

The States Greffier read the amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

[Amendment 4](#)

To insert as Proposition 7:

*7. To agree that for the purposes of entitlement to claim the additional allowance and
termination of Remuneration further to the General Election to be held in October 2020, the
following provisions shall apply instead of paragraphs 3 (ii) and (iii) of Section 1 of the 'Rules for
Payments to States' Members':*

*"(ii) For the avoidance of doubt, following the General Election, Members elected to the position
of President of the Policy & Resources Committee; President of the Principal Committees,
Scrutiny Management Committee and States Assembly & Constitution Committee; Members of
the Policy & Resources Committee or an Alderney Representative elected to a seat on a
Committee/Authority/Board shall be entitled to claim the additional allowance for that position
with effect from the date the person elected enters office as People's Deputy.*

*(iii) The Remuneration shall terminate on the date set for the end of the term of office of People's
Deputies elected at or after the 2016 Election."*

65 **Deputy Inder:** Sir, just briefly, as stated, this is a technical amendment and we thank Policy &
Resources officers for pointing that out to us yesterday. We could have dealt with it under the

Rules but it seems appropriate to deal with it in the policy letter and hopefully we can move quickly to the vote.

Thank you, sir.

70

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

Deputy Merrett: I do, sir.

75

The Bailiff: Members of the States, are you content that I simply put this to you so that we can add Proposition 7 to the six Propositions that exist? In that case, those in favour of amendment 4, proposed by Deputy Inder and seconded by Deputy Merrett; and those against.

Members voted Pour.

80

The Bailiff: I declare amendment 4 duly carried.

Deputy Fallaize, you have two amendments seconded by different Members. Would it help to have both of those placed together and debated together rather than taken separately?

85

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, I think that would probably be a more efficient use of time, but could I request that we vote on amendment 1, the 2025 version, first when we go to the vote, please?

The Bailiff: Yes, that would logically be the way of doing it. So, Deputy Fallaize, if you wish now to move amendments 1 and 2, then we will take amendments 1 and 2 together.

[Amendment 1](#)

1. In proposition 1(e), for "April 2025" substitute "June 2025"

[Amendment 2](#)

1. In proposition 1(e), for "April 2025" substitute "June 2024".

90

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

These amendments have nothing to do with the date of the General Election in 2020 or 2021, or whenever the States are going to decide that the next election should be; they are relating to the date of the General Election after that one and more so the month in which the General Election should be held. I do not have a particularly strong view on whether it should be 2024 or 2025 and I have therefore submitted amendments with both of those years because I think the election should be in June irrespective of whether it is in 2024 or 2025 and the States will come to a decision on which year it should be; I am fairly indifferent to it.

95

In a moment I will refer to the main reasons why I am proposing June, which are really about engagement between voters and candidates and voter turnout, but first of all a couple of issues about States' processes and how I think the General Election date affects the timetable of those. If there is a General Election in April, States' committees are typically formed in May. The May and June States' meetings are dominated by items submitted before the General Election. July is really the first time when business from new committees comes before the States and then, just as the States are ready – or should be ready – to get stuck into their own new business they are faced with a fairly lengthy summer recess and it is September, which is five months after the election, before there is any public sense of the new States doing anything very much at all. Sir, I think that is an unhelpful timetable.

100

105

I think an April election date is even worse at committee level because committees are formed in late April or early May, then there is an induction period – bearing in mind that in recent elections around 50% of the Members of the States have not served in the States previously – and then again when committees are just about ready to get going there is a fairly lengthy summer

110

recess. It is the not quite the same at committee level in that the recess is not quite the same as it is in the States' Assembly, but it is a period where there is much less activity than there is in the rest of the year. I think that just gives the impression that as soon as the new States is ready to get going there is a recess and you do not have the same number of members of staff around, and I think then by the autumn there is a general sense that the new States have not done very much. As I say, I do not think that is very helpful. If the General Election is in June, the main part of the induction period can happen late in June and in July and then much sooner in September, but that is much closer to the time when the election would have taken place. Committees can get stuck into their serious work and they get an uninterrupted run of 10 or 11 months after the summer recess.

Then there is the issue of the annual Budget. SACC argue that April is a better month for a General Election partly because it is further away from the Budget date later in the year. This is slightly ironic given that their main Proposition in this debate is to hold a General Election smack bang in the middle of the period of preparing the 2021 Budget. We are told in the policy letter that we should not worry about that, it is okay, if there is a General Election in October there can be a budget in December and everything will run fairly smoothly and we should not be overly concerned about it, but then we are told that in future elections really the General Election needs to be in April if States' Members are going to have proper input into the Budget. Sir, I think if there is an election in June and States' Committees are formed by the end of that month, and if the Budget is in November or December, there is plenty of time for the new States to prepare, take ownership of and debate their first annual Budget.

But as I said, the main reason why I am proposing June is to do with voter and candidate engagement and turnout. The States try to avoid meeting in school holidays – I think there is still mention of that in the Rules of Procedure – and yet here we are faced with the prospect of a General Election in April coinciding with the Easter school holidays. Many people will be away and any candidate with childcare responsibilities will be disadvantaged. I should point out I am not saying that for a personal reason. I have stood in elections at this time of the year and my circumstances are such that it would not have any effect, but that certainly is not true of all candidates with childcare responsibilities. If the election is in mid-June, as of course this year's was going to be ... June was set as the date for the General Election and there is not really any argument advanced in the policy letter as to why, without even trying it, we need to move away from June, but if it is mid-June you get the whole period from nominations opening to the day of the election not coinciding with any holiday period except for one bank holiday late in May.

More importantly still, an election in June can take advantage of the time of the year when the days are longest, and the weather is likely to be better than if there is an election campaign period across March and April, and that inevitably provides more opportunities for voter and candidate engagement. With Island-wide voting it will not be possible for a candidate to canvass the whole Island but I would assume that most candidates will still do quite a lot of canvassing. Late May and June provide the maximum opportunities for canvassing to the advantage of candidates and voters. Even aside from canvassing, if there are going to be set-piece events for candidates and voters to engage, again May and June for the same reasons provide the maximum opportunities for this engagement. SACC's own policy letter tells us this is a valid consideration when they themselves are critical of elections, and I quote 'when the days are shorter and there is a higher risk of poor weather'. That is in their own policy letter. It is justify having an election in October rather than in the months that immediately follow, but they do say that elections should not take place when the days are shorter and there is a higher risk of poor weather. Finally, voter turnout – I know this is a judgement call but it seem to me that there must be more chance of maximising voter turnout if the election is held when the days are longest and the weather is more likely to be favourable.

These are the reasons, sir, why I think it was right to set the original date for the General Election this year in June. I do not think the arguments have changed. I think June is the best time for a General Election.

165 The key issue must be, in determining this, surely, what can promote the maximum opportunities for voters and candidates to engage, what makes it as easy as possible to encourage as many people as possible to stand for election. It seems to me that June is about the best time of the year when it can be done, so that is the reason for these two amendments, sir. As I say, I am fairly indifferent to the year but I would ask the States to support one or the other.

170 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby, do you formally second amendment 1?

Deputy Soulsby: Yes, I do, sir.

175 **The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez, do you formally second amendment 2?

Deputy de Sausmarez: Yes, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.

180 Do you wish to speak at this stage, Deputy Inder, or do you wish to wait to the end of the debate?

Deputy Inder: No, sir, I will go fast, go early, I think.

185 **The Bailiff:** Okay.

Deputy Inder: Deputy Fallaize in his opening speech has said he is indifferent to either amendment, which comes as ... I will get to amendment 1. I will go in reverse order. Amendment 2 is three years and eight months and the signatories to this are Deputy Fallaize and Deputy de Sausmarez. I will remind Members that we had a referendum not too long ago and the winning option was option A, one 38-Member constituency covering the whole Island. Deputies would serve for four-year terms. If you adopt the three years and eight months model, that is not four years – *(Interjection)* Sorry. **(A Member:** Nor is yours.) Well, that is right, that is also true, *(Laughter)* but you could make the argument that this term was four years and two months. It is Deputy Fallaize and the previous SACC Chairs, along with Deputy Roffey, that put the referendum together and that is what it clearly stated.

190 It is true that we are actually in position now for four years and two months and our own Proposition says four years and effectively six months, but that is fairly clear because we are going in October, we are clearly not going to do November, December, January or February. The earliest date we can get to is probably likely to be April and then Deputy Fallaize, under amendment 1, wants to turn our four years and six months into four years and eight months. Look where this comes from.

200 I am really not going to go on about this too long. Ultimately it is a judgement call. That is what it is, it is a judgement call. I hope we are not going to turn this into a four-hour debate, **(Several Members:** Hear, hear.) I really hope that we do not, and hopefully someone is going to 26(1) this and we can go to the vote fairly quickly.

210 I am not going to die in a ditch over the amendments, but I would really encourage people to reject the three years and eight months because I do not think that complies with the results of the referendum. If the argument is that it is a sunnier day and more people are going to engage in June, then we have heard this before – it actually comes from the 2015 policy letter, so at least Deputy Fallaize is consistent. Back in 2015 – I do not have the detail of the *Hansard* report – under 10.1 of the policy letter that moved us to June anyway, he presented:

At present, the term of each States ends at midnight on the 30th April and the new States take office on the 1st May. That means, as set out above, that the elections hustings period [...] Although the weather then is generally more

clement and the days longer than in January or February, for example, the Committee believes that late spring / early summer would be even more conducive to the election process.

So that is a view that Deputy Fallaize has held for a number of years and we are seeing it again.

215 So really can I ask Members please to reject the three years and eight months? I think you should actually reject the whole lot, myself, but if you are going to go for anything please reject three years and eight months. Stick with the policy letter, but if you must vote for one, please, it should be the four years and eight months.

Thank you.

220 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you very much, sir.

225 I suppose for some of us longer-serving Members of this Chamber we know people's favourite subjects and strengths and weaknesses and I do not think there is anyone in this Chamber who knows more about political processes than Deputy Fallaize or who has spent longer studying or being on the House Committee and its replacement successor, the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee. I remember he did a six-year leadership term in recent living memory.

230 If I look at the different arguments, the argument that June necessarily gives a better turnout is not in itself proven, and looking at the UK – which is not a good thing to do because Guernsey is Guernsey, but let's just look at the United Kingdom – since 1918 the arguments would actually suggest the opposite, because in 2001 the Rt Hon. Tony Blair had his second and nominal landslide. The turnout was really awful and it dropped to an all-time low – unless you count 1918, the demob year of the Great War – to 59.4% in June. The election was delayed by a month because of foot and mouth and whatever, whereas the December – the Christmas – election the Rt Hon. Boris Johnson successfully won. The turnout was 8% higher. In modern times the Brexit referendum is the highest turnout. That was not June but other high turnouts were April 1992 and February – of all times – 1974, when part of the country was in a three-day week and there were power and other shortages. The all-time high in UK turnout was 84% in 1950, when Sir Winston Churchill was Leader of the Opposition and Clement Attlee was Prime Minister, and that was in February or March.

240 To a degree, people will vote depending upon the calibre of the candidates, the interest in the issues and election, the quality of the electoral roll and all sorts of factors. In our evolving election I would say that postal voting, especially given the events of recent months, will play a stronger role than hitherto in the past. Another factor is probably by 2024 or 2025 we may well see what Deputy Inder, to be fair, wanted to achieve this year, which was an electronic way of voting that was security cyber alert and focused, and that would be a game changer as well.

250 That said, I do understand the arguments Deputy Fallaize made. I think I supported them four years ago, and his argument about June is not so much about turnout – if anything, it could depress turnout because many people, especially in a lovely Island like Guernsey, are focused on other things in June, from school parades and sports days to going out fishing. I met a lovely lady yesterday who was going out spearfishing and is probably saving herself some money as well at the same time.

255 All that is going on, but – and there is a 'but' – the argument is access of the electorate to candidates, and one of the ... We are not here to debate the merits of Island-wide elections or not, but I suppose one of the challenges of our first ever Island-wide election, as I think Deputy de Sausmarez and Deputy Hansmann Rouxel and others mentioned at the time, is equality of access to the electorate by the candidates, and I suppose there is a perceived danger of an Island-wide election that parties or associations or high-profile incumbents or high-profile candidates who are very well known because they are sporting superstars or legal superstars or millionaire superstars or charity superstars, will have a slight advantage over Joanna Soap, whoever she or he might be, who is an unknown quantity however good and representative and diligent that candidate might be.

265 I suppose the thinking behind Deputy Fallaize's original States' Assembly Committee approach is that it evens up the opportunity for the young Deputy – and we have seen many of them over the years – or young candidate who has succeeded against the odds, possibly defeating well-known challengers or incumbents or people who have spent a lifetime in parish or Island service, by successfully introducing themselves to the electorate by the traditional door knock and with a quality manifesto and dialogues over tea or coffee or whatever.

270 We have probably lost for good the hustings, the drama of the Vale or St Martin's or the Western -La Hougette school, when a star candidate like Deputy Dudley-Owen, Deputy McSwiggan, Deputy de Lisle, Deputy Langlois or Deputy Brouard have impressed the electorate over their peers in the room, and we are not likely to see a hustings of 100 candidates or 80 people speaking for a minute each. It is not going to happen.

275 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop, what is the relevance to (*Interjections*) what dates to put in this particular Proposition?

280 **Deputy Gollop:** The relevance is that the longer the daylight the greater the opportunity for a candidate who is not an established name to impress upon the electorate, because in the late autumn or winter there is a natural disinclination of both candidates to knock on doors and the electorate to receive them, and that is my reason for supporting June over April or any other date.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you for giving way, Deputy Gollop.
285 I wonder if Deputy Gollop would agree with me that you do not knock on doors necessarily after eight o'clock in evening, regardless of what daylight hours there are?

Several Members: Hear, hear.

290 **Deputy Gollop:** It might depend on the area and your visibility as a candidate and the type of area you are in. For example, a block of flats might be more acceptable in some areas than others. I think, though, Deputy Merrett has really answered my case for me because if you, for the sake of argument, had an election in early April it is rather dark at half past seven or eight o'clock and that would be intimidatory potentially to both candidates and the electorate, whereas it is very unlikely in June, unless there was an awful summer, that it would be dark or difficult to canvas at eight in the evening. So I think my point is made that, from the point of view of engagement with the electorate, June is better than April or winter months.

300 On the other amendment I think on balance I am going to support the States' Assembly Committee. I have thought a lot about this. My natural instinct is that we should be accountable to the public with short terms of office and that hanging on to office is not advised. You only have to look at many other countries like Australia, New Zealand and Congress in the United States where terms are shorter, but we have heard cogent arguments in this Chamber – Deputy St Pier, Deputy Le Tocq, I think Deputy Soulsby – that we cannot get our work done in four years. Whether we like it or not, we are going to be in this Chamber for a minimum of four and a half years since the previous election and to be consistent with that, because we are not going to follow strictly the view of the referendum either way, I think 2025 would be more appropriate than 2024, and I will give two other reasons for that. We do not know how stable the Assembly will be after an Island-wide election but we do know there will be an awful lot of work to do on reorganising Revive and Thrive after the difficulties of recent months. That is the first point. The second point is I think that we need a review fundamentally of our machinery of government and a slightly longer term would facilitate better engagement with that and maybe implementation in a more timely fashion. The third reason is that the United Kingdom is due to have a General Election in 2024. We do not know what will come out of that.

310 I think Guernsey will be better prepared for the challenges post-Brexit and the wider international world if perhaps we do not have an abbreviated term of three and a half years, and

315 given the backlog of business we have and the embarrassment perhaps of getting so many key decisions to the Assembly in the remaining weeks of the summer, I think on balance 2025 will be better – but I would not cry if 2024 wins.

Thank you.

320 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, is it your wish to be relevée?

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Yes, please. Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.

325 Deputy Roffey, to be followed by Deputy Le Pelley.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

I really do not care which month the General Election is in. I think it is sensible to have it in the spring or early summer rather than in the winter for reasons that others have elucidated, but beyond that I do not think it makes a lot of difference.

330 I suppose what brought me to my feet was Deputy Inder pointed out that in the superbly organised referendum when I was President of the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee (*Laughter*) our option A, which was chosen, included the phrase that it would be for a four-year term. Other than knocking in an October date as the election, which I do not think is sensible, I am afraid that *force majeure* has meant we are not going to have a four-year term. So, what should I do as a former President of SACC? I am going to vote for the thing that is closest to the four-year term, which is not what is in the policy letter and is not amendment 1, it is amendment 2.

340 Deputy Gollop says we need longer and longer. I have always heard this in the States: it is never enough, the term is never enough; there is always too much work to do. The first three terms I did in the States were three years each and I think they got more done in those three years than we tend to get done in four years. I have heard people say what about five years – I think Deputy St Pier has suggested that. I say if we need longer and longer to get the work done it is not the length of the term that it is wrong, it is our procedures and the way we go about business. (*Interjections*)

345 June 2024 was the original date. We were going to have it in June this year. It was going to be a four-year term and then another four-year term. We have had to push it back for a few months. Let's just get back on track. Let's do the three years and eight months and if we do not think that the next Assembly, despite the fact that they will have a huge agenda, can actually get much achieved in three years and eight months we need to take a good, long, hard look at ourselves.

350

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Pelley.

Deputy Le Pelley: First of all I would like to thank Deputy Roffey for pinching my speech, (*Laughter*) but, sir, if I may, as usual I am going to be a little bit controversial.

355 The end of our office, in the eyes of many, was yesterday, and in the eyes of many we have usurped an extension of office. It has been our own internal decision that has done that. We have not gone to any public meetings and have not had any consultation or anything like that. We have, as a group of 38 Guernsey Deputies and two Alderney Representatives, decided that for very good reasons: because of the Covid-19 outbreak and the Medical Director of Health suggesting that it would not be safe to have an election on 17th June.

360 We are where we are, but I would suggest, sir, that we are actually acting as a caretaker government and we are under some obligation to the public, to the electorate, to have an election as soon as we possibly can because we should not really be extending longer than we have to. If we are acting as a caretaker government then everything that we do from today until we have our election should actually be presented to the new body, the new States, for ratification. They should be saying, 'Thank you very much indeed for holding the fort whilst we could not actually

370 have our elections. You have made these various decisions, you have done it in good faith, you
have done it because the Island needed to continue to be governed, but from 1st July we need to
go back and double check what you did to make sure it is the will of the people. We are the new
Government.' Hopefully there will be many of us ... well, I will not be in it, but many of you who
are seeking re-election will still be in post or still be in the States anyway and you will be that
connection which goes from the old into the new. I would like to see that ratification of any
business that happens from today onwards happening as soon as we possibly can after the new
States is elected, and if they are going to ratify what has happened from 1st July onwards I would
375 suggest that they in effect would have come into some form of power from 1st July because they
would have been ratifying what had already been put on a plate for them, so to speak. They could
undo it, they could support it, they could amend it.

I think it is very important – and this is the bit that Deputy Roffey stole from me – that we get
back in sync. I think it is important that we get back to elections in June 2024 because that is the
380 four-year period. If we look back and we see how do we get to where we are now, that is
hopefully having a term of office that ended on 30th June. It was a two-month extension of a
four-year term and that was done by the previous States, not this States, deciding how long it was
going to stay in post, but the previous States determined that the next States, whoever that might
be – and there was no guarantee that any one of us who was in the States in the last term was
385 going to be returned, so there were not guaranteed vested interests involved. We determined on
the recommendations of SACC that we should really extend by two months to try and make
everything better, more voter friendly, so that elections could actually happen on a four-year basis
from June to June. We have been forced to extend that slightly but I think we do need to get back
as quickly as we can into the four-year cycle.

390 We have had all sorts of different terms. Presidents of France have been elected for seven
years and they have amended that down. We have had Presidents of America elected for five
years – I think they have brought that down. In 2000 or so we actually had Douzeniers who were
elected for a period of six years. I was around at the time. I was not a Douzenier but when that
actually came into being sorted we had to have all sorts of people put into a certain pecking
395 order. They had to have their six years reduced to four years and people were asked to stand
down at all sorts of strange times in the actual yearly calendar in order to get that rejigged. We
have gone through this before.

We are into a four-year period. I think people expect the election to be in June 2024. I think we
need to do whatever we can to get back on to that four-year cycle and get back into sync, so I
400 would be supporting the proposal which says we have the next General Election in June 2024, a
four-year period.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall.

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

I would just like to expand on the point that was made in relation to the length of term. In 6.8
in the policy letter it talks about:

Given the challenges the next political term will bring, the Committee concluded this was too short a period to enable
the States to manage a demanding work programme.

410 Whilst there was an allusion, I do not think it was mentioned that this is of course a famous
law, Parkinson's law, which is the adage that work expands so as to fill the time available for its
completion. (*Interjection*) It is sometimes applied to the growth of bureaucracy in an organisation,
and for me the demonstration of what has happened in this term, certainly not Covid and post-
Covid for us but certainly pre-Covid, in the sense that we got a lot done and then all of a sudden
we went backwards because the election was approaching.

415 For me, it does not really matter, to a certain extent, how long the term is. There will always be
this reversal, the gear that goes into backwards. It is so frustrating. I believe that if you are elected,
you are elected to the very last day and therefore everything you do is with that in mind and
nothing more. If you make a decision, you make it because it is ethical and the correct thing to do
and nothing to do with whether you get re-elected or not, and I fundamentally believe that. The
420 cold feet that have been illustrated by what we have seen, for me, is extremely disappointing.

I am also extremely pleased to see that the momentum has been regained because of the truth
that comes out of the terrible crisis we have just been through and that fact that some of the
things that were wobbly appear to be the right thing to do in any event, and as we have now seen
demonstrations of that we now see that these are the things that can and should be done, but
425 this is by example not by the length of the term. Therefore, for me, I agree with the shorter term
and I agree that we should actually get back in sync. Certainly in June I think I would go knocking
on doors past eight o'clock if the sun was still up and I had been working nine till five thirty – if I
was lucky to be working only nine to five thirty; I have never done that in my life.

From my perspective this is so important, that we have the ability to appreciate what we do in
430 a term and we ensure that the next term they will be concentrating on the Budget, they will be
concentrating on the recovery strategy, they will be dealing with Brexit, and all of these layers
(*Interjection*) will focus the mind. I just hope that they focus the mind sufficiently, support the next
Government and do everything they can, even if this is a slightly shorter term.

Thank you, sir.

435

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

Deputy Roffey is right – we used to have a three-year term in the early days when we were
440 both in the States. We met for two days at the end of the month and the reserve date was the
Friday. There were 57 of us. Now we actually have to meet three-weekly or monthly and there are
fewer of us, and we seem to make debates last forever and a day. So, yes, a lot more was done in
the three-year terms than we currently do.

We are hearing about this but we are not hearing much about the electorate. It is all about us
445 and what we can do and cannot do. This is not about an election; this is about the people out
there and their ability to be able to elect for their Government, and there is not too much being
said about that. For me, it is key that we actually do what we think would be right to suit the
electorate.

I know Deputy Fallaize has said about the April and clashes with school holidays and therefore
450 June. Do not lose sight of June as an extremely popular time for those who do not have children –
they go on holiday in June before the schools break up in July because the fares are cheaper,
hotels are cheaper. There is so much more that can be saved, and that is why so many take their
children out of school in June because they can save a lot of money going on holiday. Those are
the people when you are standing down at election day, watching those who go in and vote. We
455 know that a lot of those are the older generation or the retirees, who are the ones that are out
there as consistent voters. We obviously want to do as much as we can to get families to vote,
young people to vote, but I say there would be a huge chunk of voters that would not be around
in June, so there is no ideal date for actually a General Election; no date is absolutely suitable for
everybody. Certainly in school holidays – I saw more people in the Easter holidays, when we had
460 election that time, than previously because people were home in the morning and that is when I
was inclined to go, morning and perhaps late afternoon.

So, from experience it did not make too much difference if they were on holiday; I actually saw
more people during the April when we had the election in the April. There is no ideal time. Some
people like to canvas of an evening and stay out quite late. You have to do what suits you and the
465 electorate will make up their own mind whether they want to be interrupted of an evening or
whether they do not want to be interrupted in the evening. They will go by, hopefully, your

manifesto and not because you knocked in the middle of *Coronation Street* and they were watching it.

470 I do believe that the date really ought to be in April and go back to the time in April. I would go with the shorter period of time because we have heard it so much, especially this term – never heard it before as much as what we have this term – that they have been in post too long, we need a change. I accept it has been because there have been controversial items but there are always controversial items in every term, there are controversial items and the public wish has actually been ‘Let’s change the Government, we are not happy with those that are in there.’ They are never happy with those in there. There are always the wrong people there. Again that is a cry: 475 ‘It is the worst States ever.’ I have heard that a few times as well, this time more than normal, I would have to agree, and I can see the reasons why, with what has been going on in this States.

Let’s put it to the electorate. Let’s do what suits them and not what suits us here in this Assembly.

480 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: I turn to Deputy Fallaize, as the proposer of amendments 1 and 2, to reply to the debate on them and we will take the votes. Amendment 1 followed by amendment 2, Deputy Fallaize.

485 **Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir. It was a relatively short debate and I can therefore be quite brief in replying.

Deputy Lowe said that she favoured a slightly shorter term, but that really is provided for in my amendment 2, more so than in SACC’s original Proposition, so I do not understand why she concluded that she would vote against the amendments.

Deputy Inder was critical. His main argument against the amendments was that at the referendum each option was described ... not each option, actually the winning option. Option A was described as a four-year term, was part of the package, but as has been pointed out to him, the States’ Assembly & Constitution Committee itself is proposing a four years and six months term, so I do not really understand why it is unacceptable for an amendment to propose something other than four years to a set of Propositions which is proposing four years and six months. It does not make any sense.

The issue about the term being shorter than four years – and Deputy Lowe always says this, about when the Island-wide Conseiller office was abolished, that it was somehow unfair on the people because the term was truncated, but of course what happened is the States shortened the term and then gave the decision back to the people, and that was the effect. If you have a shorter term than was set out in option A in the referendum, it is not really a great affront to democracy because what you have actually done is you have said to people ‘Rather than having the power back to decide what your Government should be after four years, you are going to do it after three years and six or eight months,’ or whatever it is. That is not anti-democratic, but in any event I do not think the States’ Assembly & Constitution Committee can maintain that the next term must absolutely be four years when they themselves are proposing four years and six months.

Deputy Gollop talked about turnout in UK General Elections. The General Election which he gave an example of in June 2001 was probably the most boring and least contentious General Election for decades. I think the Conservative Party, which had almost been decimated at the 1997 election, managed to win back one seat between 1997 and 2001. There was nobody who was going to win the 2001 election other than Tony Blair. What happens in elections is that if you are in a politically contentious time, turnout tends to go up. In 1992 and 1974 they were contentious periods in UK politics, as was the period surrounding the most recent election.

515 I think it was Deputy Gollop who said – and if it was, he is right – that turnout is bound to depend partly on how engaging the voters find the candidates and how politically contentious the period is. He said he would support amendment 2. In fact, he was not alone in saying because he preferred 2024 to 2025 – (*Interjection*) Sorry, he said the opposite. Deputy Le Pelley and Deputy

520 Roffey preferred 2024 and I think Deputy Tindall, but I would ask them not to vote against
amendment 1, because then the possibility is amendment 1 loses and amendment 2 loses just
because you get a different kind of coalition of Members who defeat both, even though they may
think that June is a better month. So I would urge Members who think that June is a better month
to vote for amendment 1 and then there will be a vote on amendment 2 anyway and they can
525 vote for amendment 2, which would replace amendment 1 if it was successful. I hope Deputy
Roffey and others will not allow perfection to be the enemy of the good – I think that is the
phrase – but he is nodding, so I expect that he is going to do that. *C'est la vie*.

Deputy Merrett spoke about canvassing until eight o'clock and, as Deputy Gollop said, I
thought she really made the case for the amendment. Try canvassing at eight o'clock in the
evening – (*Interjection*) yes, in the second half of March, because if you do it ... It is all right saying
530 you must not canvas past eight o'clock because people will not like it if you go past eight o'clock;
they will probably like it a lot more at a quarter to ten than if it was dark at seven o'clock. And that
is the problem with trying to promote voter and candidate engagement, certainly in March. If you
have a General Election in April, typically the nominations have opened on something like 15th or
16th March. The first two weeks is canvassing before the clocks have even gone forward. That is
535 not conducive to voter and candidate engagement.

Deputy Lowe says we should not think all about the candidates. I am not; I am thinking about
the voters. I think it is in the interest of the voters.

540 **Deputy Lowe:** Point of correction, sir. I never said about the candidates.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: I said we need to be thinking about the electorate.

545 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: That is what I just said, sir. I said Deputy Lowe said we should not be thinking
only about the candidates, we should be thinking about the voters, but that is exactly the point. I
think it is in the interest of voters to create circumstances in which there can be the maximum
550 possible opportunities for engagement between the voter and the candidate, and I think that is
even more important in an Island-wide election where the choice that faces electors is going to be
vastly greater in terms of the number of candidates than electors have had previously.

Deputy Roffey said that when he started in the States there were shorter terms and more got
done. Well, maybe, but of course there was no General Election in those days, so there was a
555 much smaller turnout. I think if Deputy Roffey looked at the statistics he would find that in the
first few elections he stood in there were only about 10 new Members, 11 or 12 new Members at
every election, out of 57. In recent elections there has been a 50% turnover and I think that
accounts for the issue that he raised, more than whether it is a three- or four-year term.

Deputy Lowe said – and I wrote down the quote – so many people take their children out of
560 school in June. Well, fortunately they do not. There are a few who do, but the hordes of children
exiting school in June to go on holiday with their grandparents is a myth.

So, sir, for the reason of promoting voter and candidate engagement and to make it as easy as
possible for the greatest number of people to stand in an election, which must be to the benefit
of the voter, I think June is better, and for the reasons which Deputy Le Pelley has set out I think it
565 is better to get back ... I think he said 'in sync' or 'on track', or whatever the term he used was,
which does lend itself to going back to a June election, which of course was the intention this year
and nobody proposed moving the General Election from June 2020, so for four years it was
obviously accepted as a reasonable time to hold a General Election. I think I am giving way to
Deputy McSwiggan.

570 **Deputy McSwiggan:** Deputy Fallaize said that nobody proposed moving the date from June 2020 apart from the events of the pandemic, of course, but that is because it was our own term rather than somebody else's term and I think there is a material difference between changing one's own term and the public going to the polls already knowing that the length of the subsequent term will be different, whenever that is.

575 **Deputy Fallaize:** Yes, I accept that, but when the General Election was going to be held in June 2020 it was going to be for a term until June 2024. It is only two months ago that anybody has started speculating about anything other than June 2024 as the date for the General Election after the one that is now probably going to be in October.

580 I think June is a better month, sir, and I ask Members to vote in favour of amendment 1, and if amendment 1 is defeated to vote in favour of amendment 2.
Thank you.

585 **Deputy Inder:** Recorded vote, please, sir.

The Bailiff: There is a request for a recorded vote, so we will have a recorded vote first on just amendment 1, Members of the States, which is proposed by Deputy Fallaize and seconded by Deputy Soulsby. Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 19, Contre 17, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 2

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

590 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, the voting on amendment 1, which was proposed by Deputy Fallaize and seconded by Deputy Soulsby, was there voted *Pour 19, Contre 17*, 1 abstention, 2 absentees, and therefore I declare amendment 1 duly carried.

We now go to a vote on amendment 2, which would effectively substitute 2024 for 2025. It is proposed by Deputy Fallaize and seconded by Deputy de Sausmarez. Another recorded vote, please, Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 17, Contre 20, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2

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

595 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, the voting on amendment 2, proposed by Deputy Fallaize and seconded by Deputy Sausmarez, was as follows. There voted *Pour* 17, *Contre* 20, 2 absentees, and therefore I declare the amendment lost.

Before I invite Deputy Dorey to move amendment 3, if there is any Member who wishes to remove jacket and clothing who has not already done so, you are free to do so.

600 Deputy Dorey, amendment 3 next, is it?

Deputy Dorey: Thank you, Mr Bailiff. Can the Greffier read the amendment, please?

The Bailiff: Of course. Greffier.

The States' Greffier read the amendment.

605 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

[Amendment 3](#)

1. In proposition 1(d), for "18th" substitute "15th".

2. In proposition 2, immediately after ""The Elections Ordinance, 2020"", insert "subject to, in clause 1(c) of the draft Ordinance, substituting "18th" with "15th"".

3. In proposition 6, for the table of dates and elections substitute the following table:

<i>"Date</i>	<i>Election of</i>
<i>(a) Friday 16th October</i>	<i>President of Policy & Resources Committee</i>
<i>(b) Saturday 17th October</i>	<i>Members of Policy & Resources Committee</i>
<i>(c) Monday 19th October</i>	<i>Committee Presidents</i>
<i>(d) Wednesday 21st October</i>	<i>Committee Members and Non-Governmental Body Members."</i>

Deputy Dorey: Firstly I would like to thank Deputy Green for seconding the amendment.

If Members want to see a comparison between our amendment and the proposal from SACC, the explanatory note which is on the back of the amendment gives a table which clearly illustrates the different dates between the two proposals.

610 The main reason behind this very simple amendment is to allow the States thinking time between each type of committee elections by having an overnight period between the election of the President of P&R and the Members of P&R instead of having both on the same day, as proposed by SACC. By having the elections for presidents of the committees two days later, this is the same as SACC's but on a different day, the same gap between them, and having the election
615 for committee Members two days after that, unlike SACC, which has the committee elections the day following the election of the presidents of the committees.

This amendment gives an opportunity for anyone who, for example, was unsuccessful in standing for the president of the committee to decide where they want to stand as a committee Member and give some time for the president to put a team together. Very importantly, because
620 of the tight time schedule, there is no delay caused by this amendment as all the elections will be completed in fact one day earlier than SACC's proposal. One day earlier does not sound very much but every day matters, as they say, and there are some important decisions which will need to be made about Brexit, the Revive and Thrive strategy and the Budget, which will be imminent at that time.

625 The SACC proposals have the swearing in of new Deputies, the election of President of P&R and the election of Members of P&R on the same day. The swearing in and affirmations took approximately half an hour in 2016. However, if we look back to 2008 there were six candidates for the Chief Minister, equivalent to the P&R President now. For each of the candidates the Rules allow a five-minute speech for the proposer and a 10-minute speech for the candidate. This is
630 then followed by questions, which can last another 90 minutes if there are six candidates. This will make a total of three hours before voting will even start. There would be the time between speeches and between the votes, which will increase the total time for the process. I know some Members will say we will not have six candidates, but it has happened before and it is perfectly possible. We have no idea how the Island-wide election will turn out. We could have six party
635 leaders elected who all want to be President of P&R. So, I believe it would be beneficial to have overnight between the election of President and Members of P&R. It is possible to spend that evening on Friday, 16th October for the President to put together his team and for those who perhaps were not successful in the President of P&R to decide if they want to stand as Members of P&R.

640 This amendment will give slightly less time for the count after the election. The count will start the day after the election on Thursday, 8th October if these proposals go forward and there will be eight days to complete the count, which will include the 24 hours if an unsuccessful candidate wants to call for a recount, and the recount, which I believe should be more than sufficient. This is also the same number of days that was proposed by SACC for the count in their policy letter
645 which we debated in April. In that policy letter they proposed the election date on Wednesday, 21st October, the term ending eight days later on Thursday, 29th and Members sworn in on Friday, 30th. I believe eight days is adequate; it was adequate for SACC's proposals then and I believe is an acceptable compromise in the situation of trying to get the elections over in the shortest period as possible because of the closeness of the Budget etc.

650 Sir, some Members might be concerned that there is a cost of opening up this building to have elections for P&R Members on a Saturday, but it will only be a small cost – security staff and heating etc. and for officers to attend. In 2016 the Chamber was opened on Saturday, 30th April as a new term started on 1st May, which was Sunday, so Members were sworn in on the Saturday.

655 Also, if Members turn to page 49 in the policy letter they will see a table and in that table you see that in 2004, 1st May, which was the start of a new term, fell on a Saturday and the new States met on Saturday, 1st May to elect the first Chief Minister. I am merely saying that there has been a precedent for the States meeting on a Saturday after election time. It is worth the States meeting

660 on a Saturday to ensure there is sufficient time for thinking and talking between the various
elections in the new Assembly, yet still ensuring that the election process is completed in the
shortest time possible. On that table on page 49 Members can see the time between the different
types of elections in the past. It has always been at least two days. This proposal is the same as
that, apart from the P&R Member elections. We will not have two days for that, but I believe in
this situation it is acceptable. It is not generous but it will allow enough time between each
election for reflection and consideration by having two days between the other elections.

665 The elections of presidents and members of committees is very important and we need to get
it right as it plays a really important part in delivering good governance to this Island. We will
never get it totally right and there will always be some committee elections during the term, but it
is better that committee elections are not done too hastily in October so that we have a better
chance of voting the right team in each policy area so that we can really make a positive
670 difference for this Island.

I ask Members to support this amendment. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Green, do you formally second amendment 3?

675 **Deputy Green:** I do, sir, and reserve my right to speak.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: Thank you, sir.

680 I just want to explain very briefly why I support this amendment, simply because it is about my
own personal experience – that is why it is brief.

Come the elections in 2016 I stood for the President of SACC. As we all know, I also asked to
be on Scrutiny. Neither of those was successful and given the timeline it proved quite difficult to
be able to put myself forward for the principal committees. Ultimately I was very lucky in the end, I
685 think, personally. I ended up in DPA and I was elected Vice-President. I also consistently continued
on the Legislation Review Panel, having been a non-States member for the Legislation Select
Committee. I say that basically because that weekend, when everyone was discussing who was
going on to the principal committees, there was to-ing and fro-ing and discussions and right up
to the 11th hour people were being invited on and then invited off committees. Yes, 'invited off', a
690 nice way of putting it; 'kicked off' probably is a better phrase. But the point is there was this
moving around and discussing and finding out what people felt were the right committees and
make-up of those committees. Obviously we have seen a lot of changes since then, but I still feel
that getting it right in the first place means that the committee with a solid foundation in the first
place, right at the beginning, actually has more likelihood of success with their policy letters. I feel
695 very strongly that there should be sufficient time, albeit this does not give, in my view, enough
time, but there is never enough time for this sort of thing ... I think it gives more time and
sufficient time and better than the original Propositions. So for me, sir, I am going to support this
amendment.

Thank you, sir.

700

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder, you wish to speak now, so I will call you.

705 **Deputy Inder:** Yes, sir. Deputy Tindall plus a number of others have probably got more
experience of having a successful General Election, because I did not, so I do not really know what
happened after the declarations. I have no experience of who found who and who did what, but
what I did know, had I been successful, is where I wanted to serve. I also knew, had I not been
successful in putting myself forward, where else I wanted to serve.

The bit I do not quite understand with Deputy Dorey's proposal ... I get this impression that
once someone has been unsuccessful in possibly a presidency, Policy & Resources, or a

710 committee, they forget what they are going to be and have to reset themselves and decide. I do
not quite understand why some of these candidates appear not to be as prepared as they should
be. I am not giving way. If you put yourself forward as a candidate I genuinely think you should be
far more prepared than you are – actually what Deputy Tindall said – and I think I have got some
sympathy for what she said but it does not necessarily relate to the actual election process. What
715 she kind of said is that if there is half a day's more time here there would be more chance for a
president to put together a solid committee and effectively there would be more successful policy
letters going forward. That just cannot be true because when you all stood and you were all
successful in this Assembly none of you knew each other, with the exception of the incumbents.
The people who came in, you read manifestos, you chatted on the phone. Not one of you would
720 have known how each other worked within committee over the next few years, so it just cannot be
correct to say 'Because I have met someone over coffee, I have read their manifesto, they are
pitching themselves to me, they are doing great on the interview ...' Trust me, I passed my driving
test and I tried my damndest to get through it. I did the emergency stops and I did not go over
the humpback bridge at 50 miles an hour. As soon as they gave me my test I crashed around the
725 next corner and lost the wing, so there is no sense or even logic in the brand new candidates
within a very short period of time ... having an extra half a day here and an extra half a day here is
suddenly going to set the future for a successful committee. Actually, and this is probably for
another day and not under my presidency, I would make the argument for mid-term elections.
That is actually where you could do the real checks whether a committee has been successful, but
730 that is for another day.

Sir, Members, Deputy Dorey has focused on the wins here, the wins there, the half days here,
the half days there. That is not what I am going to focus on. This is about what happens straight
after the election. My main concern is we are in new territory. The last election: 32,000 on the
electoral roll. I think the average turnout was something like 70% and we know what the averages
735 were on the parish system. Now we have got effectively 38 seats, potentially up to 100 candidates.
I hate saying that figure because you know it could be a heck of a lot more. We know it is going
to be far more difficult than it will be. We have got brand new kit coming in and we have got
electronic counting kits. It is not untested out in the wider world but it is certainly untested in
Guernsey. Currently we are in phase 5 but we do not know ... Sensibly I do not have any belief that
740 we would ever be back to phase 3, but when you roll new systems out and it is a brand new
system, it is not a computer system, you have to build contingency and redundancy into that. My
fear, and I do not want to overstate it to Members, is ... Not dancing on a pinhead whether
Deputy Dorey is right or wrong, I genuinely can take or leave it; my fear is date of election 7/10
and election of Policy & Resources President on the 19th. We have got effectively 10 or 11 clear
745 days. On Deputies Dorey and Green's amendment they have got obviously the 7th because it is
the date of the election through to the Policy & Resources 16/10. They knock off three days
there – what he is saying is that we are only losing a day at the other end, which is the 22nd, but
actually what you are really losing is the three days of contingency between the closing of the
polls and whether our electronic counting machines are going to work properly, whether there
750 might possibly even be recounts, whether there is catastrophic failure in the kit. You are not going
to pop down the Vale Garage to get it fixed. If this stuff does not work, it does not work.
(*Laughter*) Well, no, it is just not going to work. So we have got potentially, if we follow the same
pattern as last year, 32,000 on the electoral roll, which hopefully we are going to at least hit, so at
38 votes something like 1.2 million. Quite clearly that is not going to happen. If we rack that down
755 to 70% we are now looking at let's say ... I will pick a figure of say 15 votes cast, and I do not think
that is unreasonable. I tend to think it will be less than 15 votes cast but you are looking at
330,000 votes to be cast.

I wrote to the Registrar General about this because I did not focus on the Dorey and Green
piece at the end, I focused on this piece here, so it may give some comfort or it may not. This is
760 from the email response from the Registrar General, because I posed a question about my fear of

the seven or eight days – the loss of the three days, rather than the loss of the one day under the Dorey amendment:

The Election team is yet to carry out a mock manual count, although one is scheduled for 23rd July. As you will appreciate, the time taken is dependent on a number of variables, particularly voter turnout,

– which I have touched on –

so it is impossible to be 100% accurate, but by making some reasonable assumptions

– which is all we can all do –

the team's as yet untested best estimate is that it would take 100 people five and a half days to do a manual count of 22,000 ballot papers

765 So that is the territory we are in. I will read that again: '100 people five and a half days to do a manual count of 22,000 ballot papers'.

I am not going to stick my bottom lip out because I am the first person to graze over everyone else's policy letters, but sometimes can I please just ask Members of the Assembly to look at the House Committee? They are a fairly sensible bunch of people. We are trying our damndest to
770 deliver an election, but there is ... I do wish sometimes Members would actually look at the whole picture right through the line because this is not just about the winning of half a day at one end, this is the three days that we lose of the contingency and this is about delivering our first Island-wide election.

I will move on. What I do not like doing is taking stuff out of context, so I would listen to the
775 100 people and the five days to do 22,000. I asked about the phase 3. The response that came back:

The question has been raised as to what we would do if we found ourselves in phase 3 with no counting machines. That would effectively be all the worst things would happen. It would be the imperfect storm where everything collapsed effectively within a week of the end of the campaign period.

Surely 2020 has been a miserable year, we cannot be that unlucky, but anything is possible in 2020. The response:

I would like to think that it is extremely unlikely we could find ourselves in a situation where we are in phase 3 or below, votes have been cast and we have no facility to count them electronically. However, if I have learnt anything this year it is that things once considered unthinkable can come to pass, and we have a dedicated contingency planning works team to consider how we would handle scenarios such as outlined.

780 We are now talking in the middle of the phase 3. We are talking ... What do they call them? Hazmat suits, full PPE – it is that kind of territory. I do not think it is going to happen, but you have to build that in as part of your plan.

At the end, talking directly to Deputy Dorey's amendment:

Looking at this in the context of Deputy Dorey's amendment, the timescale he has proposed, whereby the political term ends seven days after vote count, should be deliverable, but if we should find ourselves in a less straightforward situation than anticipated, e.g. lower stage of exit, failure of e-count equipment, then there is little contingency.

785 So that is the risk that Members take today. Do they want to tell the candidates to be prepared and get their ... I do not know what the new word ... together, be prepared for their committees, or do they want to risk the election by losing three days off the front end? That is the risk that you will be taking today. It is not about saving that one day, moving the 22nd to the 21st; it is about delivering an election.

790 Actually, your committees do not matter. I do not care about your failures, I do not care about your wins, I do not care about who is going to get in, I do not care about who is going to stand. I just do not care. What I do care about is delivering something that looks like a system which is a brand new system in a brand new scenario. I would ask Members to give that great consideration before they make this decision today because there are risks to losing three days between the closing of polling stations and the appointment of Policy & Resources President.

795 That is all I have got to say on the matter. Ultimately it is a judgement call. I do not really give too much of a fig about the back end of this, but I considerably care about losing the three days off the front end, and I will leave it to Members to make a judgement.

The Bailiff: Deputy Oliver, to be followed by Deputy Fallaize.

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

Before I make my decision I just would like to know ... It has got at the bottom that this amendment will involve some additional administration costs for the States' meeting to take place on the Saturday. While the States are trying to save as much money as they possibly can with the expenditure, I just want to know a rough figure of what it would cost. Are we talking tens, hundreds or thousands? Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

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

Just one point: I think it is possible to reconcile Deputy Dorey's argument and Deputy Inder's argument because I think they are both right. Deputy Inder is undoubtedly right that we are going into uncharted territory. The counters are going to have a vastly greater number of votes to count than previously, using a completely different system than has previously been used. That comes with complications and it is far from inconceivable that there may need to be a manual count. Deputy Inder gave the hours or the days for one manual count, but the margin for error is enormous if you are trying manually to count 300,000-plus votes. There could easily have to be a recount. I will give way to Deputy Inder.

820 **Deputy Inder:** I might be able to help Deputy Fallaize out. This is only if there is a catastrophic failure of the equipment there would be two manual counts. If, for example, someone challenged the electronic working version, all we would do is throw it through the machine again but there is no requirement in law to have a physical manual recount. I think I am trying to help Deputy Fallaize here – it is the double manual count which now would take us effectively to 10 days, but that is absolutely worst-case scenario.

825 Thank you, sir.

830 **Deputy Fallaize:** Okay, doesn't the Reform Law provide for the right of candidates to have a manual recount, or does it not any longer? Anyway, yes, Deputy Inder is right, but that really is the point I am coming to. If he is describing a catastrophic failure – and although it would be catastrophic it certainly is not inconceivable, it could happen, but if it does then there are arrangements in place. The Rules of Procedure provide for a group of people to be available to make decisions to deal with the consequences of that kind of catastrophic failure. I suggest what they would then do is say, 'Actually it is not possible to hold an election for a President of P&R on Friday, 16th October because we have had this catastrophic failure in the vote counting equipment and there has to be a manual count and it is going on for another three days,' or another week or another two weeks or whatever it may be. There is not going to be this kind of period of uncertain limbo. There are very clear arrangements in place for who would be empowered – if that is the right word – to make that kind of decision in the event of a catastrophic failure in the election machinery.

840 Although I agree with absolutely everything Deputy Inder has said in terms of his analysis of
the risks, because there is that failsafe I think we can just concentrate on what is the best schedule
of meeting dates for the election of committees. I think the schedule set out in Deputy Dorey's
845 amendment is better than the schedule set out in the Committee's original Proposition. I do think
it is a problem to have the election of a President of P&R in the morning and an election of
Members of P&R in the afternoon. I think that is problematic. Deputy Dorey at least allows nights,
evenings between each stage in the electoral process. So, okay, the difference is marginal
probably, but I think that the Deputy Dorey schedule is better. In the event that there is the
catastrophic failure that Deputy Inder describes, I think the Dorey schedule, if I can call it that, and
850 the SACC schedule are both banjaxed and there will have to be an urgent decision made by the
people empowered to make it, and that will be to postpone the whole committee election
process. Hopefully that will not happen.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey, and then Deputy Gollop.

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

Frankly, if nine days after polling day – which is when I think Deputy Dorey's amendment says
that the new States would take power – is insufficient, then what on earth have we done if nine
days after polling day we do not know the result?

I take Deputy Inder's point that the information sheet he has got from the Registrar General is
860 that if it required a manual count it would take 100 people five and a half days. Five and a half
days for a count is not acceptable, so we will need 500 people because we really cannot do it – we
cannot have a count that goes on for five and a half days. We all hope that the machinery will all
go clickety-click and it will be over very quickly the next day and that it will be there, but if not we
really have to think about plan B. I agree with Deputy Fallaize that I do not think that that
865 argument is an argument between the two schedules, the one in the policy letter and the one in
the Dorey amendment, because we are *in extremis* there and we will be either way.

The other thing that Deputy Inder said is that people should know their plan B, and I think
people sort of do, but just imagine the situation: you have the five or six candidates standing for
P&R, they are probably five or six of the strongest, most capable Members of the States, all ones
870 that you might want to be on P&R, they are all phoning each other up saying, 'If I am elected, will
you serve under me?' and they are all saying, 'Well, it is not going to arise. I am going to be
elected – by the way, will you serve under me?' Yes, they may have a good idea in the back of
their head what is likely to happen, but actually the person who succeeds does not know what
their idea in the back of their head is. Meanwhile, that person is probably asking other Members
875 of the States. It may not be quite as strong as 'I have got to have a team ready if I am going to
have to put somebody up the same day, straight afterwards, to be my team on P&R,' so they are
going for a B list to make sure they have at least got a list and then they have got the decision do
they vote them off the Committee saying 'sorry, I did want you but now actually this failed
candidate who stood against me for P&R has agreed that they want to serve on P&R and they are
880 actually better than you?' I think just a pause overnight sometimes between each phase is useful.
Not only that but actually by serendipity Deputy Dorey has managed to come up with a schedule
that actually gets the new States up and running 24 hours earlier than SACC proposed doing that.

I know I spoke to Deputy Le Pelley and he said when he got elected President of Education it
did take him a while to actually get his team together. I do not agree with Deputy Inder that we
885 have no idea who each other are. If we do not, then we may as well just have a lotto system. Once
we have elected the presidents they do not nominate their own team, we just give them five
Members at random because nobody knows what anybody's qualities are. I think we do. We do a
bit of research. We have got those eight days between the results of the election and the new
States taking office. You know where you ... but you do need to assemble a team that you think
890 you can work well with. That is the whole idea of the President putting forward their team.

I think on balance – well, more than on balance – Deputy Dorey, I do not think it is an aggressive amendment per se; I think it is just looking to hone their proposals slightly and I support it.

895 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Sir, I probably agree with much of what Deputy Roffey has said. Deputy Dorey is another Member, like Deputy Fallaize and Deputy Roffey, who has been around the Chamber for a number of years, and Deputy Dorey has served several times on SACC and House and been
900 very diligent in that respect. And of course he, like me and others, has seen lots of States come and go. We have lived through the ministerial system and before that and after that, and it has all been a quite funny can of fish, really.

I know, sir, you do not like too many anecdotes that go off the beam but they are relevant too. I remember a classic example. Two senior politicians, one of whom I think eventually became a
905 Deputy Chief Minister. One new Member said we should know more before we get into the Chamber about how it all works, about what committees to stand on, what roles to take, and the response was, 'Well, you should have learned that before you stood.' That is a hard-line view, but the reality is certain candidates have an advantage over others, incumbency being one of those advantages.

Actually I would say that many new Members of the States – especially in the old days when we had the Douzaines as a kind of training system, an apprenticeship – were quite knowledgeable on getting in. Members of the Bar tend to be and I would say people who have attended, as
910 several Members of this States have, the WEA courses have found them useful, and they bonded with other fellow new Members. Perhaps Covid has been a snag, but SACC really could have organised more induction courses for potential candidates, but we are having to live with that as an issue. The candidates really need to know where they are going. Some Members actually have worked with States' Members before, either in voluntary organisations or occasionally in
915 corporate or professional life in one way or another, maybe in finance, maybe in law, or maybe in education. So I do not think we come to this as babies and we have to acknowledge that.

Of course the issue following an election, as Deputy Roffey and Deputy Lowe identified earlier, has become more acute because we moved gradually from a large number of Members to a
920 smaller number of Members where each Member makes a more significant difference, and we also moved from a system whereby we had staggered elections not just for committees and presidencies but of course Douzaines, Conseillers and others were overlapping in turns and they were not elected on the same day as the General Election for Deputies. I was doing some maths on this and worked out that in the days when we had 55 Members, only 60% of the Members were actually elected as General Election Deputies and of those probably two thirds continued
925 round again. So we are seeing change as an actual dynamic. Whether an Island-wide election will see more change or less change is not for us to say today. But in that context I think we do need to get on with the job, and Deputy Inder has outlined ... and I am sure he is speaking on behalf of all his Members of SACC in this respect, and perhaps the advice they have received that there could be calamities – 2020, the year when the unexpected or impossible happens – and they are
930 right, but I think we have to overcome the worst-case scenario and plan for a middle ground.

We know we have done amazingly well this year in all the circumstances. We saw the States go
935 from meeting here to meeting online, we saw the borders kind of closed, we saw some activity largely stopped, businesses reorganised, all kind of things, and it happened quickly using common sense, political and official leadership and civil contingencies. If we did have a calamity in the General Election of a complete breakdown of counting we might have to go to plan B, plan B being the timetable SACC have presented before us, but I think it will be optimal to actually try
940 plan A, the Dorey plan, because I think that would give more time for the deliberations Deputy Roffey has identified. You would not see party leaders or potential P&R Presidents taking their supporters out for lunch, maybe for dinner instead, but it would make it easier, I think, to consider

945 these conversations. It seemed to be every single day a new adventure under the SACC presentation, and because we do not have a prime minister nominating people for a party whipping system it makes it a lot harder. Incidentally, if you want a little bit of context, in America they used to have four months between administrations changing, they now have roughly two and a half, and of course that was useful – they had to recount all the millions of votes of Florida and all the rest of it, but we will not have that problem.

950 Let's look at some relevant Channel Island examples, two from our recent past. This, in a way, is not the first Island-wide election. They did exist before the Great War, when there were not that many electors because it was generally moneyed male ratepayers only, but we certainly did have a bumper election in 1994 when there were 26 candidates for 12 seats. That was the year when Deputy Lowe and Deputy Ferbrache entered as Deputies. The Conseiller election was widely supported and the parishes were all counting separately in those days, until four in the morning, 955 but they got through the thousands and thousands of votes – admittedly probably only a quarter of this scale, but they got through it in a night. Another example is Sark. Sark is tiny but they had an amazing nearly 60 candidates for 28 seats and they managed to count them in a few hours. I think we could do the job, and the way we marshalled civil servants to manage the financial payments in recent times suggests that Deputy Roffey is on the ball there.

960 Let's just compare the two proposals. The SACC proposal has an awkward Sunday as the end. The Dorey/Green gives three extra days, three days less payment for incumbents, three days more for the new ones – probably better for that reason alone, but it gives another weekend and another working day. The successful President of P&R, whoever he or she may be, will be elected on the 16th in the Dorey/Green amendment and therefore will be able to consider the wider 965 framework of the States at an earlier stage. The election of the P&R Committee Members – maybe we should not have built superiority for them over the presidents, but that is how it is in both models – will be chosen on the Saturday rather than the Monday, and then they will have two days to look at the presidents.

I remember at the last election, Deputy St Pier, whether it was strictly constitutional or not, 970 kind of had a star Chamber whereby potential presidents would explain their motivations for standing and whether the President of P&R would propose them or not propose them or was neutral. Under the SACC proposal that would be extremely difficult to do in the time, and therefore we need that. It also gives more time for the election of committees. Deputy Tindall was spot on when she said it was extremely difficult for some of the newer Members to know what 975 was going on. I became President of Planning almost by accident because there were not candidates and somebody, kindly, on the top bench proposed me. There were two or three candidates in the Chamber who were new as Members. They said they could probably have done as good, if not better, a job than me but they did not quite realise the process because the incumbents have the advantage. The whole thing was done speedily.

980 Something else I will point out even though it is not strictly relevant. but I think it gives a context, is that up until 2008 we used to have heavily contested elections for committees and people coming in would not accept like puppets the choice of the presidents who would go on their committees; they would fight to have a role on that committee. The last two General Elections have seen – until people have wanted mid-term elections, which I do support – relative 985 harmony. We have a pattern of the Chief Minister, President of Policy & Resources and senior figures doing a formatting spreadsheet and everyone being boxed in. That might have worked to get things off the ground but proved to be painful.

I think we want to have a bit more challenge. We have so often woken up and thought, 'Well, 990 maybe we did not get the right five people for that particular committee.' Deputy Le Pelley made an excellent speech outlining the issues he had to balance, but I wonder if all of us would say that the five people he chose were the best possible five – maybe they were, but we chose a different Education Committee a few years later. That suggests that we need it to be clear not just on the skills and talents of people but maybe their deep persuasions, their natural policy frameworks. We too often think – in a way, SACC have encouraged this regrettable trend – that the president is

995 some kind of chief executive/minister who automatically imposes her or his policy agenda on the
committee. Every single member of the committee has a vote and every single member of the
committee sets the agenda, and it is a mistake to see presidents as some kind of dictators or even
shapers.

1000 We actually need more clever conversations, we need to get to know the newer Members, we
need more consideration. I have been, like Deputy Tindall, in a situation of not being invited.
Several times presidents have said, 'We would not mind you on the committee, John' and then I
have been dumped at the last minute, but at least I would have more chance to choose others if I
was in that situation.

1005 I do think on balance we should go for the Dorey/Green amendment, maintaining for fall-back
in the event of technological disaster the SACC proposals, but surely we can make that decision
after the election if real problems emerge. This will actually give us a clearer framework to begin
with.

The Bailiff: Deputy Green.

1010 **Deputy Green:** Sir, yes, thank you.

Very briefly, I agreed to second this amendment because I think, as others have said, the
schedule that is proposed in this amendment is just better and more sensible than the original
that SACC was putting forward. It does give that valuable thinking time and that time for
1015 discussions. In my view, Mr Bailiff, having more time to think things through in terms of the
committee seats that you may wish to contest is never a bad thing, and that is why I think, on the
face of it, the schedule in the Deputy Dorey amendment is far superior to the original schedule
that was set out.

1020 I think that most of the key points have been dealt with, but the main argument against this
amendment I think is the point that Deputy Inder led on, which was the risk of losing the three
days in the event of some sort of catastrophic event – which none of us want to happen, but we
cannot exclude entirely the possibility of that. But I think Deputy Fallaize made the point that if
something of that nature, some catastrophic failure, does happen, not only would that scupper
1025 the schedule that Deputy Dorey's amendment seeks to replace, it would also scupper the original
schedule that SACC are putting forward. So, in that context, if we are talking about a catastrophic
sort of failure, regardless of whether this amendment succeeds or whether it does not, you are
going to be faced with the same problems and Deputy Fallaize made the point that there are
provisions in place to make sure there is not a limbo, an uncertainty. There are provisions to fill
that vacuum in government in any event.

1030 So, really, sir, in my view it comes down to whether Members actually prefer the dates that are
set out in this amendment or in the original. In my view, the amendment is far superior because it
does give more time for the discussions and for the thinking time that candidates will need. As
Deputy Inder said, I do not think it is a question of candidates having to be better prepared and to
1035 have more a sense of plan B, because you cannot always necessarily think exactly how committees
will work and you do not necessarily know until fairly late in the day where you will be best
positioned to make an impact in the new government. I think some of these things do actually
require quite a lot of fine judgement and quite a lot of careful analysis and the more time you
have got to do that the better, so I would be grateful if Members could support this amendment.

1040 **The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez, then Deputy Merrett.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

1045 Following on from Deputy Green's analysis that really the main argument against the
Dorey/Green amendment is the possibility of a catastrophic calamity with regard to the counting
process, I have been boring myself more than anyone else but also the very long-suffering Deputy
McSwiggan, and I have mentioned this I think every time –

Deputy McSwiggan: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy McSwiggan.

1050

Deputy McSwiggan: I do not find anything that Deputy de Sausmarez says boring. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez to continue.

1055

Deputy de Sausmarez: I have made my views known on my concerns around some of the e-counting considerations, and what Deputy Inder said earlier about if there is a problem we will stick all the papers back into the box and the box will spit out another number gave me huge cause for concern, because one of the things I have been hopping up and down about most agitatedly is the auditing process. We need to have a system and I think this whole debate and the whole sort of argument against this amendment actually points to or underscores the importance of having a good auditing system for the e-count. I think it is absolutely essential. As well as expressing my support for the amendment for all the reasons that have already been articulated, I will take the opportunity to yet again reiterate my concern over the e-count process and my encouragement for SACC, which I am happy to help, if I can, to make sure that there is a really robust auditing and verification process.

1060

1065

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Merrett.

1070

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir.

I will try to be brief. After we spent an hour this morning deciding to move the election date by two months I am failing to get too excited about some of these amendments, which I apologise for, but I do feel like I have got *déjà vu*. SACC have already said ages ago let's review this in July, let's look at October, and then here we are again in July, and so I am just a little bit frustrated, to be frank, sir.

1075

If Members again do not wish to listen to SACC then that is obviously their prerogative, but I think what Deputy Inder was saying is that if we have to resort to manual counts and it will take approximately five and a half days, my maths is pretty good but I would consider the seventh to the 18th eleven days. Five and a half times five and a half is 11, so that would mean that from the time the last ballot paper is sent the election is closed, it could actually go to a manual count immediately if there was a problem with the electronic count. That would take five and a half days and if somebody wants to ask for a recount, that is five and a half days: 11 days, sir. To risk not having a democratic, elected government taking office on that day – because there is potentially somebody else, Deputy Fallaize, who could step in in an emergency – to me is just ... I am dumfounded by that, I really am, because to me, having an election and having the Members in place and sworn in is really important and so I would not want to put in anything else.

1080

1085

I think the reason why – I know the reason why, because I am Vice-President of SACC – we put that date in was to ensure that if we had to go to another manual ... something Deputy de Sausmarez said ... we do not know how many votes will need to be counted manually, we do not know how many will be such that a judgement call ... or they will have to actually be looked at by a person rather than go through a machine. We simply do not know what percentage of votes will need to be manually counted. We do not know that yet, so we want to give enough time. If Members do not want to take that into due consideration seriously, then so be it. We can only advise the States and they can vote as they see fit, obviously.

1090

1095

I think Deputy Roffey said those Members who want to serve ... When he was talking about presidents' elections and committee members he unfortunately said 'who wish to serve under me'. I think he probably meant who wish to serve 'with me' rather than 'under me'. As Members may recall, I went for the presidency. I did not get it but I was still absolutely prepared to serve on that

1100 committee. It was not 'I do not have the presidency, I will not serve on that committee.' I am sorry, I find it very difficult to ... A lot of elected Members, if they believe very strongly that they should be on a particular committee for whatever reasons ... 'If I do not get the presidency I am just not doing it' ... I would say it is quite a juvenile attitude, because I think if you do want to serve on a committee and you put your case to the Assembly, or put your case to the president or other people standing for presidency, and you stand by that ...

1105 I think Deputy Gollop said it is a hard-line approach to say you should really research and be proactive in deciding which committee you want to sit on. I do not think it is hard-line at all, sir. I think when I was canvassing I was asked 'If elected, where would you like to serve? I knew then where I thought I would like to serve. I told the electorate that when I was canvassing. In fact, I think Deputy St Pier made it quite clear in his manifesto that he wished to be President of P&R if he was elected – yes, I think he did say that; he is nodding, so I did actually see it in his manifesto.

1110 I was quite surprised when we went to elect the presidency of P&R because the candidates were known before we went into the Chamber. We knew who the candidates were. Some of the candidates had contacted us with why they wanted to stand again; I think Deputy St Pier was one of them, I think Deputy Ferbrache was another. I knew it was my duty to meet with those candidates and discuss what they wanted to bring and who they wanted to be on their committee. We had a Q&A session and I certainly remember – I think I remember, it was a long time ago – one of the key questions for me was 'Who do you want to serve on your committee with you and why?' That seems quite important, that I know who they want to serve with them and why they believe that, and if that person is willing to serve with them. Again, do not go on to committees if you have not read the mandate, if you have not done the research, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) if you have not discussed the potential of sitting on that committee with the Members. Just do the research, make the phone calls, read the mandate. Honestly, it is actually not very time consuming and it is not very difficult.

1115 So I think actually virtually every president for election can say who they would like to serve with them. The president standing for election will usually already have asked who they wish to serve with them – certainly Deputy Inder did when he stood for SACC, and that is the most recent one, I think, so that one (*Interjection*) obviously comes to mind. And of course you can stand from the floor, so if you are ... I think the word by Deputy Tindall was 'disinvited' or I think Deputy Gollop said 'kicked off', but whichever terminology you want to use you can still stand from the floor. When I stood from the floor I was very pleased to be elected ... well, not so pleased right now, sir, quite frankly, because I am getting *déjà vu* with being on SACC.

1120 I think if Members just want to say that is fine, the first amendment, clearly that is democracy for you. But, please, can we take into consideration what has been said about the count and the counting? It would be really disappointing if in the first Island-wide election we do not actually come out at the end of the counting with a democratically elected government and we say we could not quite do that because we did not allow enough time for initial manual count and second manual recount if so requested, and so therefore we have brought in this other emergency ... these people, these elected Members who may not be re-elected but anyway they can make the decision on when we elect the President of P&R. I think I personally would not take that risk, I think politically we should not take that risk, but it is up to Members. So, if you wish to ignore SACC again, Members, that is fine, I understand that, but if you wish to allow enough time for an initial manual count and a recount if necessary, then we do need that 11 days. It is as simple as that. It is not difficult maths anyway.

1130 Lastly, before I sit down, there is an argument to be said that the Dorey amendment takes off three days from the end of term if you have stood in the General Election. That clearly takes three days off from when you could be communicating with other candidates who may or may not be elected. I do not know, sir – I would argue nobody would know – but there is no reason why you cannot contact that candidate at any point, actually, even when canvassing, and say 'What committee do you want to go on? Where do you want to serve?' There is no reason why you cannot be doing that up to the 18th or the 15th.

1155 Lastly, I did go to see Deputy St Pier and ask him, after he was elected – I think I used the term
‘fantasy football’, which is probably regrettable – ‘Who do you think should be in which
presidency and why and how should the committees come together?’ because I think there is a
certain role of just bringing government together, but ultimately it is up to this Assembly. That is
what it is up to. I believe that if you do stand for election of any presidency you will know who you
wish to serve with you and have contacted them beforehand because you want to come in with a
strong position as to why you should be the president of that committee. I think if that is the case,
then the original SACC proposal covers that, but again let’s see how we vote on this – but I do
want a recorded vote, sir.

1160 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

1165 From what we saw this term we did not really see an election, we just saw appointments. I have
never seen a States like that before. It was finished in a couple of hours. It was staggering how
quick that happened because so much happened beforehand where there was no challenge from
the floor of the Assembly. Previously you would have nine candidates for four seats. People made
it very clear that they were keen to get on a committee, so there were none of these deals done
beforehand where ‘you will all actually go on this one, we will not go on that one because we have
already heard who is going to be on that one’. If you wanted to do something, you did it. There
were 57 of us then who were all fighting for seats, and they were annual elections so you had the
rolling staggered, which Deputy Gollop mentioned before. That was great. It meant consistency as
well, so at elections you did not start from scratch with a whole year of teaching people what it is
all about and the mandate. It did not hold the work up on the committee. It was a huge benefit
having annual elections each year. But we are where we are. It is now decided that everybody will
start from scratch, which makes it hard for the staff, it does not make it very good for government
and I think we have seen how that has actually worked out, where things actually come to a halt,
really, for a period of time. I am pleased to see Deputy Fallaize agrees with me on this one – thank
you.

1180 Again we had presidents and the Members all elected on the same day pre-2004. There was
none of this where the president has got to wait and see who he wants. It was done in the same
time. It might take a day and a half but that was it. You started off with the presidents and then
you would go for the Members after that, and there was all this jingling and jangling going
backward and forward. You would see seven more often than not. Every seat was contested. You
would get four people standing for two vacancies, or you would get seven candidates for three
seats. There was always a good turnout of candidates to be able to put themselves forward, sell
themselves as to why they believe they should be on that committee and what they could bring to
it, rather than what we have got currently. We have not got that at the moment, unfortunately, but
we have got here where SACC are actually saying make up your mind, stand from the floor if you
want to stand from the floor, get on with it, do it in one day and the sooner it can be done the
better, instead of all this overnight let’s do deals. If you want to be on a committee, stand for the
committee from the floor of the Assembly.

1190 Thank you.

1195 **The Bailiff:** I invite Deputy Dorey, as the proposer of amendment 3, to reply to the debate on
it. Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

1200 I think the main argument against this amendment has come from SACC, where they have
identified the five and a half days by 100 people if we have a catastrophic failure. Deputy Merrett
said they have allowed 11 days, so they have allowed five and a half days plus five and half days,

1205 but actually that does not work, does it? There are 24 hours for somebody to call for a recount, so you need five and half plus one for that person to register a recount, plus five and a half, which equals 12. So, if we have a catastrophic failure and it takes five and a half days, as Deputy Green said, we will still have the same problems, so we will be back where Deputy Fallaize said that we will have to have some failsafe mechanism, as we have, to fix it.

1210 I agree with Deputy Roffey that actually, in a modern democracy, to take five and a half days to count is not acceptable (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Obviously we use the machine. If we have a catastrophic failure we will just need more than 100 – I will give way.

Deputy Inder: Thank you for giving way.

1215 Unfortunately, again we have got two previous Members of SACC who have just effectively made up a bunch of numbers. We have heard from the Registrar General that they can string together 100 people out of the system. Deputy Roffey says ‘then we will just get 500’. Where will these magic extra 400 people come from? Some of this needs to be based in reality, it really needs to be cemented in reality, and – through you, sir – it is ridiculous to magic up numbers just for the sake of the debate, and that is exactly what is happening here again and again by ex-members of SACC who resigned. (*Interjections*)

1220 **Deputy Dorey:** I am not magicking up numbers. (*Interjection*) It is normal for an election to have a group of people ready, because if there is a recount it is normally done by civil servants. We will just have to have contingency arrangements, and that is part of what any government would do. We have seen with Covid that we have had to pull in a whole lot of people into various teams in order to achieve an acceptable government for this Island and we have just had to do it. It is not like we have a Civil Service of 100 people or 100 States’ employees, so we would have to start pulling people from outside. We can, and there are a lot of volunteers who participated in the count at the elections in the past in the parishes, so perhaps they will have to be pulled in. But ultimately if SACC really believed that they needed 11 days, why when they put their previous proposal did they have eight days? That is what they had when they brought it in April, it was eight days between the elections, which we debated in April, so I just believe it is not a valid argument.

1230 What is more important, as Deputy Tindall mentioned in her speech, is the to-ing and fro-ing that is necessary to make sure that we have the right people on the right committee and it is important that we get it right, we have more likely a successful outcome, and that is what we need to do.

1240 People like Deputy Fallaize, Deputy Roffey and Deputy Green have said that the schedule is far better and I believe it is better, you need to allow that time. Deputy Lowe has talked about what has happened in the past. Well, if you look since 2004 we have had three days, two days, even up to seven days between various parts of the elections because that is what people need. This is not generous in its time but the SACC proposal is too tight.

1245 I can give a personal example of what happened to me in 2012. I stood for the President of Social Security Department. I was unsuccessful. It is not unusual. You can look at a lot of the presidents’ elections: those who are unsuccessful often do not go on to serve on that committee. There are numerous examples. I am not going to quote people, but people can remember what has happened in past elections. So, faced with that, I then spoke to Deputy St Pier after the election and said I would like to stand on T&R, and he thankfully put me forward for it. So it is perfectly possible for that to-ing and fro-ing to happen after one election and people are unsuccessful, and it is not necessarily on the committee that they initially stood for, because sometimes it just does not work right, the dynamics of those people and personalities.

1250 I urge Members to support this amendment. I believe it is the superior schedule, it is right, and I thank everybody for supporting it. I urge you to put aside the arguments from SACC. I believe there is adequate time. If the machines work, there is perfectly adequate time, I think. If necessary, we should get more people in to count. If the worst of the worst happens we will just have to have

1255 a failsafe mechanism and extend the timetable for it, but it is not right to have to put proposals forward for the most unlikely event. It is better to have the right time for the committee elections and I believe this is the absolute minimum of time you can put the committee elections. Ideally I would be more generous, but this is a minimum amount of time. I urge Members to support this amendment.

1260 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, we come to a recorded vote in respect of amendment 3, proposed by Deputy Dorey and seconded by Deputy Green. Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 23, Contre 14, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2

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

1265 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, the voting on amendment 3, proposed by Deputy Dorey and seconded by Deputy Green, was as follows. There voted *Pour 23, Contre 14, 2 absentees*. Therefore, amendment 3 is declared duly carried.

We now move into general debate on the Propositions as amended. Deputy Lester Queripel, to be followed by Deputy Fallaize.

1270 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, thank you.

In a previous debate on this issue we were told in no uncertain terms by Deputy Trott that it would be complete and utter madness and totally irresponsible of this Assembly to set the date for a General Election in November 2020 because the first major issue the new Assembly would have to deal with is the Budget in November, and here we are being asked to agree to the election being held just 19 days before that Budget debate. Are those 19 working days really going to be enough time for new Members to get their heads around the Budget as well as focus on all the internal elections that will be taking place?

1280 **Deputy Trott:** Sir, point of correction.

The Bailiff: Point of correction Deputy Trott.

1285 **Deputy Trott:** My friend would want me to make this correction. I am sure, sir, if I have understood it correctly, the Dorey/Green amendment proposes that all committees will be populated by Wednesday, 21st October and the Budget will take place in December, so it is not 19 days, it is closer to six and half to seven weeks.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel to continue.

1290 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** I thank Deputy Trott for the clarification – in which case I will leave Members to work the days out for themselves.

The situation becomes even more farcical when you look at the dates for all those elections. To me, sir, it would be complete and utter madness, as well as being totally irresponsible, to put the next Assembly in such a precarious position.

1295 Of course, getting themselves elected on to committees and trying to get their heads around the Budget will not be the only issues the new Assembly will have to deal with, because as soon as they have been elected on to committees they will have to start getting to know each other, they will have to start getting to know members of staff within the department, and they will have to start learning how their department operates and the procedures that are involved and to start learning how the States operates and all the procedures that are involved. At the same time, they
1300 will all be riding on the wave of elation due to their attaining a seat in the Assembly and being elected into the position of States' Deputy, and of course at the same time having to get themselves acquainted with a totally different lifestyle than they have been accustomed to previously. On that point I ask my colleagues to cast their minds back to when they were first elected and remind themselves of the euphoria involved and how they dealt with it – and of course I also forgot to mention the media attention that is focused on the new Assembly, especially new Members, first-time Deputies.
1305

I stood as a candidate in three General Elections, as I am sure my colleagues will recall. I did not get the support I needed to attain a seat in the Assembly in 2008, unfortunately, but I did get the support I needed in 2012. I remember only too well how I felt at the time because the memories are that vivid. Even though I had been preparing myself for years and even though I had spoken to a whole host of current-at-that-time and former Deputies in my quest to empower myself with as much knowledge as possible, I still found it difficult to adjust to life as a Deputy, as did many of my colleagues at the time. In fact, some of them were saying 'I will spend the first year getting my feet under the table', which I thought was a ludicrous approach to adopt because
1310 a year is a quarter of one's term of office. My approach was that I would do my absolute utmost to get my feet under the table and accustomed to all procedures in a matter of a few months. Regardless of the time an individual thinks they need to settle in, the fact of the matter is that life is no longer your own once you have been elected, as we all know. Everything becomes all too frantic and it is easy to be overwhelmed with all that goes on. I remember thinking on a couple of occasions just after I had been elected, 'This is totally illogical – why on earth do the States do these kinds of things in this way?' Because of that, I found myself running around like a headless chicken on occasion, to be honest, as did some of my colleagues as well, and I know that because I spoke to them about the issue.
1315

Even though I stood as a candidate for seven positions in the internal elections, the majority of the States did not want me, so I was not given a role. I was a completely free agent for several months until there was a vacancy on the Scrutiny Committee and the States finally gave me a role, but in those several months when I was a free agent and I did not have a role I was able to spend a lot of time working on one-to-one cases with Islanders and really getting to know how the States works. As we all know, there is a lot to learn, hence my concern about the new Assembly being expected to learn so much in just a matter of a few weeks, as Deputy Trott pointed out. It is a shame he has left the Chamber because I want to focus on a really important issue we all need to bear in mind when it comes to a new Member getting to know the ropes.
1320
1325
1330

1335 When I was first elected back in 2012, I was extremely fortunate and I was assigned to the seat
in the corner here that I always refer to as the best seat in the Assembly because from there you
can see absolutely everything that is going on – and not only that, there is a square metre of floor
that one can put all one’s paper work on and spread out to one’s heart’s content; in fact there is
more than a square metre. Not only was I extremely fortunate to be assigned that seat but I was
also extremely fortunate to be sitting alongside Deputy Trott. As we all know, sir, Deputy Trott had
1340 been Treasury Minister and he had been Chief Minister, and there I was, new kid on the block,
sitting alongside a Deputy with a wealth of political knowledge and experience. I learnt a lot from
Deputy Trott in that time, sir. I really appreciated his guidance and his advice, because a new kid
on the block can really benefit from listening to and taking note of everything an experienced
politician has to say – in fact, for me it really accelerated the learning process.

1345 There is no way of knowing if experienced politicians like Deputy Trott, Deputy St Pier, Deputy
Soulsby, Deputy Fallaize, Deputy Gollop, Deputy de Lisle and others with knowledge and
experience are going to make it through the next election – should they decide to stand, of
course. I have heard people say, ‘Oh, Deputy So-and-so will walk it’, but that is just talk, that is
pure speculation because until the votes are counted no one knows. Can we afford to risk losing
1350 the experience and so much knowledge of some of those more experienced and knowledgeable
Deputies at such a crucial time? Under normal circumstances we do lose a lot of knowledge and
experience after a General Election, but we are not living in normal circumstances or normal times.
The times we are living in are unprecedented and the reality is we are in uncharted territory,
dealing with a crisis the likes of which the Bailiwick has never seen.

1355 As I recall – I am sure one of my colleagues will correct me if I am wrong, sir – the reason why
we set the General Election for June 2021 in the first place was because 36 Members of this
Assembly voted in favour of that date just a couple of months ago on the grounds that we would
hopefully be well on the way to recovery by then. I cannot see what has changed for any of those
36 Members to change their minds and vote in favour of an election being held in just four
1360 months’ time as opposed to 12 months’ time. If any of my colleagues are aware of anything that
has changed I need them to tell me. I need to hear what has changed. There may be a
fundamental point I am missing somewhere along the line here, sir. I really do need to hear from
colleagues what has changed. We were concerned then, so what has changed that concern two
months later?

1365 While every Assembly has major issues to deal with, those major issues have never been
anything like as daunting as the next Assembly will have to deal with if they are elected this year,
because they will be expected to deal with them right away. I think it would be irresponsible of us
to hand over the reins to a new Assembly in the crisis situation we are currently in. We would
literally be saying ‘Here you are, ladies and gentlemen, we are in an absolute mess, we have done
our best to sort it out, now it is over to you: you sort it out.’ Sir, I am sure I do not have to explain
1370 to colleagues the mess we are in; they know too well. Businesses have gone to the wall, jobs have
been lost, hotels are wondering if they are going to be able to survive, there has been a massive
increase in domestic abuse, we have borrowed hundreds of millions of pounds to get us out of
this mess, which will need to be paid back by the taxpayers. The list goes on and on. The issue of
time being lost is a real concern to me, as it also is to some of my colleagues who have spoken on
1375 this issue in previous debates.

Sir, I will be retiring from politics at the end of this term, getting my life back and doing my
own thing as soon as the term of office of this Assembly comes to an end; but having said that, I
will give 100% until that time comes. I say that because I will not need to spend four or five weeks
on the campaign trail, but several of my colleagues in this Assembly will be spending four or five
1380 weeks on the campaign trail and their focus will be on getting re-elected – maybe not exclusively
but a lot of their time will be spent focusing on them being re-elected, and time spent focusing
their efforts on getting re-elected is time that really should be spent working on our recovery.

Due to our current circumstances I do not feel at all comfortable with holding an election in
October. I would much rather we had more time in office to hopefully get us to the stage where

1385 we are actually on the road to recovery because, as my colleagues know, sir, there is an incredible
amount of work that needs to be done to put us on the road to recovery. I want to emphasise I
am not saying that a new Assembly will not be able to do that; that is not what I am saying at all.
What I am doing here is focusing on time being lost. Of course I am also concerned, like others,
1390 about the lacuna – several weeks where nothing is really going to be done. I know Deputy Trott
corrected me, sir. He said the Budget debate is in December so holding an election in October is
no concern – I think that is what he was saying, no concern to him – but he seems to have
forgotten about that lacuna where nothing really gets done. People are learning how to do things
and that lacuna of several weeks comes after Members of this Assembly spending several weeks
1395 campaigning to get re-elected. All that time spent doing other things, with people focusing their
minds elsewhere, is time lost; time that needs to be spent working on our recovery and also doing
the day job, which in itself is incredibly intensive, as we all know. And I do not need to remind my
colleagues, I am sure, that the recovery strategy is still in the talking-shop stage. Nothing has
been decided, so there is a lot of talking to do, there are a lot of decisions to be made, there is a
1400 lot of work to be done and there is a lot of healing to be done, and one thing we cannot afford to
do is lose time.

I would very much appreciate some of my colleagues and some members of our community
who will be questioning the way I view this whole issue ... because just like my colleagues I have
been elected to represent the people to the best of my ability and make my judgement call when
the time comes. The way I have always done that is to listen to both sides of the argument and
1405 divorce myself from any hysteria and bullying surrounding the issue. And this issue, just like any
major issue we debate, has attracted a fair amount of hysteria and bullying coming from Islanders
who say we are using Covid-19 as an excuse to stay in office. Of course, the sorts of people who
spout that sort of nonsense are people who are not even happy in the good times, so that sort of
unbalanced and extremely distorted approach is to be expected. I divorce myself from hysteria
1410 and bullying and I make my judgement call in a calm and sincere manner, never allowing myself
to be bullied by anybody, which is why I resonated with much of what Deputy Graham said in his
speech in general debate on the abortion, and I applaud him for making that speech.

I think it would be completely unrealistic to expect the next Assembly to hit the ground
running if there were to be an election in October. As well as having to deal with the devastation
1415 caused by Covid-19 there will be a hundred and one other issues to deal with at the same time,
issues such as having to address our spiralling health costs, progressing our hydrocarbons
programme, trying to resolve our housing crisis, dealing with the Longue Hougue insert waste
issue and putting in place our future model for education being just five of those 101 issues.

As capable as the next Assembly will no doubt be, the time is not right for them to take over in
1420 October, in my view. As I said earlier, I say that as a Deputy who was very much looking forward to
retiring from politics at the end of last month but who recognises the need to stay in office for a
lot longer than that. On that note, sir, I think next March would have been a much more realistic
date for a General Election. Seeing as only 14 Members of this Assembly voted in favour of that
date during the previous debate I did not see any point in laying an amendment for this debate.

1425 Sir, moving towards a close, as I have said on numerous occasions during my speeches in this
Chamber, I am an optimistic realist, forever optimistic but firmly rooted in reality. As much as I like
fantasy, I am not prepared to venture off into the realms of fantasy on this occasion because the
reality is I have highlighted several reasons why I did not think we should hold a General Election
in October this year and hand over the reins to a new Assembly saying 'We are in a mess, we have
1430 done our best to resolve it: you sort it out, it is over to you.'

So, sir, suffice to say I will not be supporting any of these Propositions before us, and in closing
I ask for a recorded vote, please, when we go to the vote.

Thank you, sir.

1435 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

1440 I share some of Deputy Queripel's concerns, although perhaps for slightly different reasons. I do not think it is valid not to hold a General Election on the basis that there is lots of difficult work before the States. That implies that the present States are inevitably better equipped to deal with it than their successor, and my suspicion, if I may say this, is that that is probably not the case – but anyway, enough said about that.

1445 I ask Deputy Inder when he replies to this debate, assuming he does, is the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee going to come back to the States with a revised schedule of States' meeting dates between now and the date of the election? We do not have, at the moment, a typical pre-election schedule of meeting dates; we have a schedule of meeting dates set in the summer for when the General Election was expected in June 2021. Given the volume of business that is before the States, if nominations are opening early in September I expect the States will have to sit for most of August but certainly more meeting dates than there are at the present time, so if Deputy Inder could address that when he replies I would be grateful.

1450 I am sure the States are going to vote in favour of a General Election on 7th October, but I do want to place on record some concerns I have about that date. In doing this I acknowledge what Deputy Merrett said earlier, which is the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee has really been remarkably consistent in this matter. They were advising us as far back as March or April that there should be pencilled in an election date for October and that the States should decide in July whether the election could go ahead on that date.

1460 The body which persuaded the States not to do that was the Policy & Resources Committee and their arguments put forward at the time are reproduced in paragraph 4.85 of the policy letter. I think what has been lost in a bit of revisionism which is now going on – and as I say, 7th October is going to be approved, I am sure – is that the reason that the election was postponed to June 2021 was because we were in whatever phase we were in then, in quite a considerable state of lock down etc. But actually that was not their argument. Their argument was that the present States needed to be in place to deal with the unprecedented and unique consequences of Covid-19. That was the argument that was put by the movers of the amendment on behalf of that Committee to move the election to June 2021, that we were advised by P&R they were unanimously of the view and, notwithstanding the significance of the decision, that the community and the economy will be better served by a definitive decision to extend the current political term for one year. This will provide for continuity with the current politicians to steer the Bailiwick through what is an unknown period of extreme stress on the economy, public finances and the community in the context of the continuation of Brexit negotiations. It also provides the opportunity for the recovery of the public service that is now being stretched to meet extraordinary demands and will continue to be for an undetermined period to come.

1475 Those were the arguments put by the Policy & Resources Committee for an election in June 2021. They did not say 'We do not think we should have an election later in 2020 because the Island might still be in lockdown and we might not be able to go to the polls'; it was all to do with dealing with the consequences. So something has changed in the last eight, nine or 10 weeks, or however long it was since the Policy & Resources Committee unanimously advised the States of that. I personally thought it was quite rash to go straight to June 2021 and I did not vote for it, but a very substantial majority of the States did. Now the advice has been completely turned on its head and I think we should know why. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

1480 The concerns I have about the main Proposition are really twofold and I do want Deputy Inder, if he is able, to address these when he replies. The first issue – and I have been very consistent about this. I know it is not a view shared by all colleagues, but I have a concern about the notice period for candidates. It does not matter for serving Members, some of whom will stand and some of whom will not, but it does for first-time candidates. There will be people out there considering standing for the election who will have three-month notice periods in their present job. If the States decide that nominations should open in two months it is going to fall inside that notice period. I do not buy the image that all potential candidates who are currently not Members

1490 of the States are just sitting at home waiting for the States to decide whether the General Election should be in June 2021, March, October, June of this year, or whenever. The States, in my view, have made a complete dog's breakfast of this issue in the way that it has been debated. We have debated the date of the General Election now multiple times, with all sorts of months being speculated. Anybody who may be considering election – I will give way to Deputy Le Tocq.

1495 **Deputy Le Tocq:** I just wanted to say, sir – and I thank Deputy Fallaize for giving way – he is actually answering the question now as to why P&R would think it is better to have an earlier election or not. We have debated this issue so many different times; we are just going back and forth.

1500 **Deputy Fallaize:** But most of the Propositions have been put by Deputy Le Tocq. (*Laughter*) He proposed the amendment for June 2021 and he is a Member of the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee which has repeatedly brought it back since. I agree with him but I do not think that necessarily makes October the right date. But anyway, if October is the right date I do think some consideration needs to be given to this issue of the notice period for candidates.

1505 I just do not think that all potential candidates are sat at home waiting for the States to decide the date and will be able to react at quite short notice to submit their nominations in September. The whole process in the schedule set out by SACC is based on the idea that by the time a candidate submits a nomination they will have all of their election material ready, because they will have to have it ready to submit it for the booklet, and the whole election campaign will be prepared. I do not think that is true of many potential candidates who are outside the States. Maybe if all candidates are going to coalesce around political parties it is true, but I think a lot of them will not and there will be a lot of independent candidates who will be disadvantaged by having to put together an election campaign at very short notice.

1510 The second issue, which is really my principal concern, is that the proposal that is now before the States in practice is to run the development of the recovery strategy, the 2021 Budget and the General Election more or less simultaneously at a time when the UK's departure from the European Union is imminent. That is the proposal. My view is if that happens – and I think that is what the States are going to do – the recovery strategy is going to become the recovery strategy of the Civil Service, the 2021 Budget is going to become the Budget of the Civil Service, and it is true a General Election will have been achieved in October, and maybe that is of such pre-eminent importance that all other matters need to be relegated to secondary importance. Maybe that is the case. I do not dismiss that argument out of hand because I do think it is very important to hold a General Election as soon as is reasonable, but nevertheless I think that trying to mash together the timing of the development of the Budget and the recovery strategy with the General Election period is going to mean the current States will not own the recovery strategy or the recovery plans or the Budget, and the new States the next States will not own them either. Maybe that is a good thing just to get the elected Members out of the way and allow the appointed officers to get on with developing the Budget and the recovery strategy. At the very end of the process the States could act as some kind of giant scrutiny chamber, but otherwise the development of the whole thing can be left to the officers.

1525 Members will have different views about that but I think that is more or less the consequence of the timetable which we are now embarked upon. If the nominations open in September and the recovery strategy is being debated in July and there then needs to be a period of developing recovery plans, that inevitably is going to coincide with September and October when the serving Members who are seeking re-election – which is probably going to be more than half – will be off on an election campaign. So I think when the States need to be engaged in developing the recovery plan they will instead be engaged in General Election campaigns.

1530 The recovery strategy – okay, the States are going to be in office to debate it – is a very high-level document. Obviously what is needed are initiatives, action, (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) events – things actually need to happen in response to the crisis – (*Interjection*) and what Deputy

Inder's Committee is proposing is that at the very time when it would be possible for the States to be getting on with the actions States' Members will be off fighting an election campaign, so I think that is going to delay the meaningful action. Deputy Inder himself is one who would say with great gusto there needs to be action, we need events, but I think he is putting a timetable before the States which militates against action unless he wants to leave the whole of the recovery framework to (*Interjection*) the officers.

The 2021 Budget I think is even more of a concern. For the critical period when the Budget is being prepared, Members who are seeking re-election will be off on election campaigns, and as is accepted in the policy letter and P&R's advice, it will be too late when the new States is elected for them to have any influence on the Budget proposals. September and October are the key period for the development of the 2021 Budget and putting into effect the actions rather than just the words of the recovery strategy and the recovery plan. I stick to this view that I think this timetable will be agreed and I think that it is going to become a recovery strategy of the Civil Service and a 2021 Budget of the Civil Service.

The other thing is that we know this election is going to be with an unfamiliar and an untested electoral system, not just unfamiliar to Guernsey but pretty unique worldwide. The electoral roll is currently thousands of names short of the number inscribed on the roll at the time of the last election. There are obviously pandemic risks away from these shores and we do not quite know how that is going to play out. We are going to provide new candidates with two months' notice before they need to submit nominations and have all their election material prepared. Elections which are being held at the moment are generally suffering from very low turnout. I looked at the French local elections, which I think were held last weekend or the weekend before: that was the second round of elections and it was well down on where it was on the first round and well down on where it is normally. So I think we can expect a depressed turnout, particularly if we are in a different phase of the election – I will give way to Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you, sir.

I do think Deputy Fallaize might agree with me that he might be talking this down. We have currently got 25,000 on the electoral roll. A target would be at least 32,000 to match the 2016. We have got 25,000, so that is 25,000 as soon as we stopped marketing it, and he might be able to agree with me that he should have some confidence in the people of this Island to sign up to what is a fairly fundamental election, and secondly might he agree with me that he should have some confidence in the electoral team to deliver on the other 7,000, because I have got every confidence in them.

Deputy Fallaize: Well, fine, I hope Deputy Inder's confidence is not misplaced. All I said was that at the moment the electoral roll is many thousands of names short from where it was at the time of the last General Election, and what I do not know – and perhaps Deputy Inder can tell us – is how many names were inscribed on the electoral roll two months before nominations opened before the 2016 General Election; I would not mind betting that it was a lot more than 25,000. But anyway, I hope that his confidence is borne out in practice, otherwise there could be depressed turnout on a smaller electoral roll.

But my main concern is just conflating the General Election, the recovery strategy and the Budget. I think they should be separated. Originally what the Policy & Resources Committee was proposing to the States was that the demands of the recovery strategy and the Island's recovery generally and the demands of the 2021 Budget were such that it was necessary to defer the General Election until June 2021. If they have changed their minds, fine – maybe they are right and maybe the arguments for holding a swifter General Election are so great that that is what the States have to do – but I think the recovery strategy and the Budget should be put back so that the new States can properly take ownership of the strategic policy direction for the next four years after they have been elected and for their first annual Budget, which is of critical importance. I just simply do not think all these things should be done simultaneously because there will not be any

1595 political ownership either of the present States or the next States and I do not think the recovery strategy and the Budget ... I think they should be influenced by officer advice but I think they should be the recovery strategy and the Budget of the elected Government, and I do not think this timetable provides for that.

A Member: Hear, hear.

1600 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

1605 I agree with a lot of the issues that have been raised. I was an outspoken advocate for having an election as early as possible and practical once we went past the previous predetermined election date to validate this Assembly and make sure the electorate's voice was heard, but I am sure the date that is proposed today is practical. I do not know if it hits that criterion. This is in no way denigrating the work being done by SACC, because they have done exactly what this Assembly asked them to do and come back with the earliest possible date, but when you start looking at each of the components and the issue with each one you start questioning the practicality and feasibility.

1610 Picking up on the points that Deputy Fallaize made ... the notice period of candidates, whether we will get the candidates standing with the short notice and how they will prepare for marketing themselves Island-wide in the time still left. Then, post-election you have this very much shortened period for election of presidents and committee members. I know certainly from when I was elected at the beginning of this term I came into the Assembly knowing virtually nobody here. I had met some people on the campaign trail but I really did not know very many people here very well and I needed to get to know people and understand the committee responsibilities, who was going to be the president and whether I thought I could work well with them etc. I know that presidents like Deputy Paul Le Pelley struggled to populate committees with large workloads or in controversial positions like Education. Now we are being asked to do that in a very condensed period.

1620 You have to remember that in every election in the last few years we have had roughly a 50% turnover in Members in the Assembly. We already know that 20% or 30% of this Assembly are stepping down at the next election, so it is not inconceivable that we will have another 50% turnover at the next election, so half the people coming to the Assembly are likely to have little or no previous experience. I doubt if many of them will be candidates from yesteryear returning; it is mostly going to be new faces. We are expecting those new faces to get into their committee – find a committee, first organise what they want to do and who they want to work with based on the presidential elections and the mandates as presented, then get their feet under the table and start the induction process for that committee. On Education, with a sizeable portfolio we were still undergoing induction six months after being elected on to the Committee, so you have got to allow months of time for you to actually get to know what the portfolio is that you are in charge of on the committees you sit on and to be able to make informed decisions.

1635 Then, as Deputy Fallaize and others have alluded to, the Budget issues: you are going to be elected and several weeks later you are going to have to make decisions on budgets. Now you are on a committee and generally all committees at Budget time are usually asking for more money than P&R wants to give them. You are struggling with that debate of what we really need and what we can live with and what we want – and as Deputy Trott has mentioned several times in debates recently, it took him two years to understand States' accounts and how they function properly – (**Deputy Trott:** Six.) six years, I am corrected by Deputy Trott. So we have an issue. We are going to be presented with a Budget which may have to start reflecting some of the costs associated with both the recovery strategy and the loss of revenue that we have incurred because of Covid-19, and we have to do that seven weeks after the election while we are still trying to get to grips with our new committee positions, while we have got new people in the States who have

1645 no experience or little experience of the States and the States' work or even how it functions. I can tell you even coming from a business background, a senior management position, the States functions totally differently to a commercial entity. There is nothing quite like it and you have got to get to grips with that and start getting your feet under yourself and understanding how it works.

1650 We have got Brexit, which is likely to happen at the same time and also may throw up some issues for the Island, which again requires a certain amount of background knowledge and understanding of the political situations in the Island and how we need to respond to that – again, with half the Assembly potentially new. We have the Revive and Thrive strategy. I understand Deputy Fallaize's desire to push back the Budget and the Revive and Thrive strategy to a time
1655 when it can be given greater consideration by new Members, but hold on a second: do we really want to push back the recovery? Do we really want to make decisions later? Surely these are things that need to be made more urgently but also made urgently by people who have the knowledge and skills. The original argument of P&R to make a date of June next year for an election (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) was the fact you have to have this group of people who have
1660 been working together for now four years, and the knowledge and skills that they have acquired in that time period and the relationships and the understanding of what is required, to be able to implement that recovery strategy. Now we are looking at potentially that happening on top of an election with 50% new Members and a reshuffling of positions. The current presidents of committees who know their mandates and are working with it, and have been working now with it
1665 in most cases for a number of years, are not necessarily going to be in those positions – they may be in new presidencies or they may be just a member of other committees. We may have committees formed with nobody who has got experience in the last four years in that portfolio. You may have presidents of committees coming through who are new to the States, or at least new to that committee and that portfolio, who were on a different committee previously.

1670 Then we have the potential for a second wave, and this is where I have a question for Deputy Inder. If there is a second wave of Covid, what criteria will be required for postponing the October election if we end up with any social isolation, whether it be just the vulnerable ...? Remembering, of course, that the majority of people who vote in Guernsey tend to fall in the vulnerable, older category, if there are any restrictions at all on social distancing or restrictions on socialising then
1675 how can we possibly conduct an election? We have got a budget of £6,000 whether you are an individual or a party, therefore you do not have enough to really do display advertising in the traditional sense and high-cost marketing. Candidates may be standing who are not on social media, so forget that as a channel if they are standing as an individual and they do not have experience. I am not on social media. You will not be able to walk the streets and knock on doors,
1680 either as an individual or as a group, if you are social distancing. So we might be setting an election date for October, but what happens? On what basis does this Assembly have to turn around and say this is not going to work, it is not going to be democratic, it is not practical, we have to step back from this? There is a great risk that once we have started we will feel the desire to finish. Once we have all drawn up our plans to have an election we will push ahead, but if you
1685 see what is happening in America now, and even in England with Leicester, as we relax the restrictions we can have outbreaks and the last thing we need to have is a large number of people gathering at polling booths or people going door to door visiting the vulnerable if there is an outbreak on the Island at the time. So you have got to look at that as well.

1690 We are talking about the Revive and Thrive outline for what we are going to be looking at today, or later on in this debate, but that is a scoping document. We have not got a strategy in front of us yet. That is going to take a tremendous amount of work and it needs to be scrutinised by all the Members of the Assembly and all the members of our electorate and our population to see that they are comfortable with the way that vast amount of money that we are borrowing is going to be utilised. Bearing in mind it may take a generation or two to pay it back and incur
1695 higher taxes for the Island to do so, do we want that to be a new group of Deputies, 50% of whom have no experience and have never been on the job, or do we need to defer this election

further? Deputy Fallaize made the suggestion of a March election. I think actually – I give way to Deputy Fallaize.

1700 **Deputy Fallaize:** I am grateful to Deputy Meerveld. He is making a very important point about the timing of the recovery strategy, but does he not agree with me the bigger issue is that actually, even if the newly elected Assembly is very well equipped to do it, it will not be in place until November and if we wait to take any action until November we will have 16,000 unemployed rather than 1,600 – so the action is going to have to happen before then and if there is not a government in office to take ownership of it, it is going to end up being done at officer level? Does he not agree that is really the most likely outcome?

1710 **Deputy Meerveld:** Deputy Fallaize is absolutely correct and I agree totally that it will end up being driven by others. You have got to remember election in mode – and we are seeing somewhat election mode in some of the debates going on in the States in recent months, where Deputies are gearing up and raising their profiles etc. and speeches are taking much longer than they should – I will cut mine short shortly (*Laughter*) – you are going to have a hiatus. Remember you have got a month before no Deputies are going to be meeting up and discussing the recovery strategy, and a month before that they are probably busy planning their re-election. So you have got the Deputies who are continuing, a percentage taken out of the loop during that one month before the election, during the election period there is the embargo on the media even talking to existing Deputies and a lot of these issues will drop below the radar. This is a critical time. So whilst I was and still am an advocate for having the earliest possible election that is practical to reaffirm our democratic position, I am struggling to support and may well vote against this proposal on the basis that I do not believe it hits the practical aspect. I think we do need to have an Assembly that is fully focused on the recovery, that is in a position to review the Budget and everything else, that can actually draw up these plans and hand the next Assembly – with potentially 50% new Members with no experience – a plan that is worked up in enough detail and preferably already initiated for them to carry forward.

1725 I have got a feeling that October is not going to work. We could potentially have a second wave of Covid, we could potentially have any number of other issues, but the way you have this confluence of all these other issues and the way we are trying to cram everything into this contracted timeline I can just see it as a recipe for disaster. So, yes, I am struggling here and I may well vote against this proposal on that basis. Although I say all along that democratically we should do this at the earliest possible moment, it has to meet the practical aspects as well and I am not sure it does.

1730 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, it is just gone 12.30 p.m., so we stand to adjourn now until 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.31 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

**General Election 2020: Review of the date of the General Election –
Debate continued –
Propositions carried as amended**

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, Mr Bailiff. I shall be very brief.

1740 I have listened to many speeches this morning which seem to be putting up the argument that
the election is a massive impediment to good government, but the fact is this States is out of time
and its democratic mandate has expired. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) Sir, this States has
extended their tenure. We talk of policies that are not completed, but what we need is to engage
in the democratic process and return a set of Deputies that the public want to deliver on these
1745 issues. It is not about what is convenient to this current Assembly. It is time for this States to go to
the Island. We should not be arrogant and believe that we are the only ones who are competent
to sort out the considerable (**Several Members:** Hear, hear,) issues that have been discussed this
morning.

1750 We have a comprehensive policy letter before us and I urge this States to do what I believe the
majority of the people want. The only valid reason – and we have discussed this several times
now – to delay was the safe, secure and fair argument. Well, sir, we have been given categorical
advice that it will be. Please, I ask this Assembly to support the detailed and well-worked policy
letter: go with 7th October.

Thank you, sir.

1755 **The Bailiff:** Alderney Representatives Roberts and Snowdon, is it your wish to be relevéd?

Alderney Representative Roberts and Snowdon: Yes, please, sir.

1760 **The Bailiff:** You are very welcome. It is your first return to this Chamber for a few months.
Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

1765 As Home Affairs holds the responsibility for the electoral roll, I thought I would like to take that
opportunity to allay some of the concerns Deputy Fallaize aired earlier. He seemed to suggest that
the campaign to encourage Islanders to sign up to the new roll had somehow been less successful
than on previous occasions, which is not the case. The last time we created a new electoral roll
was for the 2016 election. If SACC's proposals are approved today it will be seven weeks until the
roll closes for the 2020 election. At this time we have 25,539 names on the roll. At the same point,
seven weeks before the closure of the roll in 2016, it had 25,663 names. Basically we are at exactly
1770 the same stage as we were four years ago and 2016 was the highest number of enrolment we had
ever achieved. By the time the roll was closed for the 2016 election the total number registered to
vote was 30,361. Notwithstanding I agree it is a good time to aim to beat our previous best
performance, I did want to assure Deputy Fallaize and others that, thus far, the campaign to build
the roll has been as successful this time as it has been at any time in the past.

1775 I should also add that in four years' time the numbers on this roll will be higher, as it grows
annually by a few hundred. Thus the electoral roll stood at 30,361 when we were all elected in
2016 but had risen to 31,700 by the time it was terminated at the end of last year.

I hope that helps Members, sir. Thank you very much.

1780 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Graham.

Deputy Graham: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

1785 I was not going to speak, but something that Deputy Lowe has just said has brought me to my
feet. I am seeking to explain possibly why Deputy Fallaize suspected that the enrolment on the
electoral roll was not as high as we might have expected, and it is precisely, certainly in my case,
something that Deputy Lowe herself said when we last debated the General Election – I think it
was on 20th or 21st May. In those days we were rather disembodied voices scattered across the
Island, but even so I do recall very clearly, and I think *Hansard* will bear me out, that when I
advocated a fairly bullish approach to go for the 30th September – and bearing in mind back then
1790 there were 19 weeks to go between the date that we were debating it and the proposed

1795 amendment date of 30th September – at that point, amongst the reasons why those who did not want to bring the election forward gave was one by Deputy Lowe herself, who said that we would be disenfranchising an awful lot of people who would not have time to get on the electoral roll. I inferred from that that things were going well in terms of the electoral roll. I am delighted to hear that they are going well, but it is curious to me that six weeks ago, on 20th May, we still had 19 weeks to go to 30th September – six weeks later, here we are, we have only got 14 weeks to go before the new date of 7th October but apparently all is well. I am delighted to hear that it is.

1800 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Green.

Deputy Green: Sir, thank you.

1805 Can I associate myself with the very good speech that Deputy Prow gave us a moment ago? It was short and to the point. He absolutely nailed the key issue. For me, the primary issue in this is the urgent need for a democratic refresh. That factor is the primary factor. That is above all other factors, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and as Deputy Prow said, it is not about what is convenient for this Government or this Assembly, it is about the overriding need for that democratic refresh.

1810 Since the Covid-19 pandemic started I have always been in favour of an October election. I am an Octoberist in that respect. This States has made an absolute meal of when to set the date for the election, but I do think hopefully that we finally have got this right and I will be entirely supportive of choosing, selecting and endorsing 7th October for that General Election. I always thought, sir, that the rush to put back the election to June 2021 was done far too prematurely, and the case for such a lengthy delay was never made out to satisfaction and was simply not justified, in my view. So I am glad that sense has finally prevailed, albeit with some change in circumstances as we have perceived them in April, and we will now have in effect a relatively short deferral of the election, certainly not the 12 months that was previously envisaged but more along the lines of four months.

1820 I do think, therefore – and this is the real reason I wanted to speak in general debate – that we need to learn the proper lesson in this about the deferral of elections in this context, because I think we need to remember that when we start talking about deferral of democracy we need to tread much more carefully than we actually did (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) a few months ago. We do not need to make the key decisions too soon. We do not want to defer the election for too long in the absence of good evidence. I think that is what we did. We decided to go for a relatively long deferral of the election in the absence of particular evidence. We need to learn that lesson.

1825 Sir, this whole thing seems to proceed on the basis of something of a non sequitur, which was that if we could not have the election in June 2020 then we had to have it in June 2021. I never understood that at the time and I still do not understand that now. I am just glad that we apparently seem to have come to a consensus now for 7th October. So I am glad that we are back on track and we can have a relatively timely democratic election in October.

1830 As I say, this is all about having a democratic refresh. There may be issues about the Budget, there may be issues about making appropriate progress with the Revive and Thrive document, but the single most important thing here is for us to not outstay our welcome beyond what is absolutely necessary. I do think we are effectively in the role of a caretaker government now, but we need to ensure that we do go to the Island, as Deputy Prow said, in October.

1835 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you, sir.

1840 Yes, I do not want to outstay my welcome but I accept what Deputy Green says. It is difficult because I almost want to sit on the fence on this one, (*Laughter*) which is unusual for me, but I suppose by head tells me that it is important to follow the advice of the President of the States'

Assembly & Constitution Committee and that it is true what Deputy Green said, that we are reaching a consensus, I think, after lots of false starts and U-turns around the road here a bit.

1845 Deputy Prow is right, there is a degree of tension on the Island that we should not promote our extension in office any longer, and we have to look at it from a broader perspective. We saw across the water in France they had some elections with a low turnout. One or two National Front people unfortunately perhaps did well but there were lots of green candidates who did well as well, which looks like we live in interesting times whereby the new normal is changed. I think if we learned from the international media that there was a proposal in America to postpone the
1850 November election we would be concerned about that, and we therefore have to do what we have to do and go for October.

There are some points, though. Deputy Meerveld made an excellent speech and I think we who have been interested in supporting the Islanders know that giving 14 weeks between now and a probable poll date is not the best possible advantage for younger candidates, candidates in
1855 employment, candidates with businesses, candidates perhaps with disabilities, and it gives an extra advantage possibly to incumbents, past incumbents and maybe people who are retired or semi-retired. That is just the way of it, it is circumstances beyond our control, but the downside of progressing onwards to an uncertain date next year I think is not acceptable on democratic grounds or on logistical grounds.

1860 Part of me thinks we would be better to stay together, safe together and that kind of philosophy, not because we are in a comfort zone – I do not think we have been in this particular Chamber – but I think there are, as Deputy Lester Queripel outlined, many unanswered questions, from the issue raised in *The Guernsey Press* yesterday about the two schools model, to the way in which Thrive and Revive will actually be implemented, to for example everything from the public
1865 transport contract perhaps to building on changing models of transport, employment models and many other things. I know, having sat on Deputy Le Clerc's excellent ESS Committee, that we have had to hurry up a bit with some of the policy letters and they would benefit actually from a few more months of dialogue, consultation and revision, but we are where we are and we have to accept where we are, and I think two health models could have more time.

1870 So I think on balance we have to go with the 7th October date. Whether that will lead to a significant change in the Assembly only the electorate and the candidates will be able to answer – we do not know.

I agree with the common sense too of what Deputy Graham has said, and had we been more robust, as Deputy Meerveld reminded us earlier, of actually setting an autumn date – I still think
1875 November would have been the best time – a few months ago, that would have been ideal.

I think the pattern we have got ourselves into, as Deputy Fallaize and Deputy Inder have already alluded to, of having our year of electoral political cycle determined by Civil Service routines is something we need to look at. Deputy Fallaize made a strong argument that we do need to own our policies and maybe the conventional model of Members ... That is not true of all
1880 Members; actually, some Members have worked really hard on initiating policy – no names, no pack drill – but too many of us just wait for the Civil Service to send us something to read and then we approve it or amend it. I do not think that model is quite how it is done elsewhere, it is not how it could be done by parties or associations – it is not necessarily the fastest way of achieving growth.

1885 Moving on, I think what I want to say is actually commenting on the specifics of the policy letter that we have already seen at the Legislation Scrutiny Panel and one or two questions to place to the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee within the framework, assuming we move forward today.

1890 The first of it is managing government business. We know we have several meetings in August. Will we need an additional meeting in the first week of September, or even, heaven forbid, during the election period? That is one thing we might have to consider. It has been done historically as a precedent back in the 1990s, as Deputy Lowe and Deputy Ferbrache may recall, when you even

had a Member who had not been successful in the election continuing to have to serve in the Assembly, but these things happen.

1895 The next point is: are we completely happy with all the legislation going through wherever else it may have to go to, the UK Ministry of Justice? Has that all been done? Everything we have done today will be satisfactory?

1900 Another query perhaps is we have a lot of detail here, understandably, about the excellent work Public Health have done about phases 1 to 6, but of course we have to be clear, as Deputy Meerveld said, what would be the constraints upon candidates if we should go back to phases 3 or 4 or 2, and would that constitute a fair election if it became obvious that some candidates would have an advantage or a disadvantage in that context, whether they be shielding as candidates, or whether they would be able to engage with the electorate beyond the virtual universe – and we are not clear where we are with public gatherings. There is a paragraph about it on 26, postal voting – we need to be clear that that is possible and able to be done – and e-count solution.

1905 The one area that I thought was a little bit skated over, that has not been gone into by any speaker so far, which turns up on pages 30, 31 and other pages, is the Election Observation Mission.

It will be possible for an Election Observation Mission to be held if the Election were scheduled for September, October or November but

1910 – it says crucially –

adjustments may be required depending on the circumstances at the time.

1915 We had the privilege virtually, sir, to have our Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA) Annual General Meeting only a month or so back and we reconstituted our Committee, and that was beneficial, but I see within the framework that the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association are the agency of choice to oversee the election and they have been kept in the picture. I wonder if we need at this point an update on whether the tried and trusted CPA will be available to come over or at least in some sensible capacity oversee that the election is entirely fair and proper and very well done. We need to disprove one or two professors who have suggested that is – I give way to Deputy McSwiggan.

1920 **Deputy McSwiggan:** Deputy Gollop asked for an update on whether an Election Observation Mission will be able to come over and how it will be able to oversee the election. I apologise if the policy letter was not entirely clear on that point. We did try to be as clear as we could be.

1925 Obviously to some extent it depends on what phase of lockdown the Island finds itself in at the time the election is held, what decisions have been made about our borders and about quarantine after travel, but the Committee has been working closely with the CPA to ensure that Election Observation Mission is possible under whatever conditions the election is held. The CPA have been proactive in suggesting alternative approaches that they might be able to take if they cannot be physically present or fully physically present. So it is absolutely our intention to maintain that Election Observation Mission. We think it is important in the Island's first Island-wide voting election, perhaps even more so given the events of the last few months, and the CPA are constructively working with us to make sure that that is possible and achievable.

1930 **Deputy Gollop:** Thanking ... Deputy Smithies.

1935 **Deputy Smithies:** Thank you for giving way, Deputy Gollop.

I wonder if Deputy Gollop would agree with me that there are actually CPA members living in Guernsey who are not Members of the States of Guernsey and who might actually be prepared to act as observers.

1940 **Deputy Gollop:** I would indeed agree with Deputy McSwiggan's analysis – and she is particularly knowledgeable on an international perspective – and actually Deputy Smithies is very knowledgeable too on the Commonwealth and the role of the Royal Commonwealth Society, and I know he is right that there are distinguished members. One example of a very distinguished member would of course be former Conseiller Roger Berry, just to name a name who contributed a lot to the Commonwealth. Of course some of the distinguished candidates may be candidates in this election – you could not rule that out. But leaving that aside, I do hope that that really proves the doubters wrong in academia and maybe even in Jersey.

1945
1950 Deputy Lowe was correct, I think, to point out Deputy Fallaize may have been more historic than actual about the state of the electoral roll, but there was one other media – or medians, it should probably be, who were misleading and suggested that the deadline for enrolling on the election had passed. They were of course thinking of the June date. So that is work that we all need to communicate, assuming we vote for 7th October today.

1955 Two other points of detail on the timetable that we saw at Legislation, and it is on pages 42 and 43: we note that the nomination period closes on Friday, 4th September in this scenario, at four o'clock in the afternoon, and all candidates would have to have a valid nomination, through the good offices of the Bailiff.

1960 I remember in joking mode in previous debates some Members talked about Billy Billionaire – or was it Amanda Average and Danny Ditherer, different types of candidates. If Danny Ditherer is a candidate, he might not – 'he'; 'she' is Daniela – have his or her manifesto, literature, art work organised, and I think we need assurances from SACC and the President that such a candidate who successfully is nominated either as an individual or as part of an association on Friday the 4th is able over a few days to produce the material so they have as fair a chance as everyone else. I can give way to Deputy Inder.

1965 **Deputy Inder:** Thank you for giving way, Deputy Gollop.

1970 My view has not changed since last time this came up. If Danny – or Danielle – Ditherer does turn up, they need to be prepared like everyone else. It is not our job to handhold absolutely every single candidate because they have not got their act together. There is going to be candidate advice, there is going to be guidance; everyone will be prepared. We simply cannot run around this Island holding everyone's hand for one of the most serious jobs that we have got in this Island, and I am afraid unless some other Members of my Committee are going to get up I will not have anything to do with it. Be prepared, be ready, you are standing for government.

Deputy Gollop: A good message for the boy scouts and the girl scouts, I suppose. *(Laughter)*

1975 We have a changing landscape about parish polling stations and super polling stations with different venues because inevitably the October date will mean certain polling stations might not be available, but all that is in hand.

1980 But one area where perhaps the policy letter is not 100% clear, and it is not a matter of law but it is a matter that Deputy Green and others really wanted to see and that is a comprehensive, sensible and active induction campaign for the successful winning candidates. Let us assume there is not a recount, although there might be. We have now played around with the dates, thanks to the success of Deputy Dorey's amendment, but whatever happens the candidates who think or have reasonable cause to believe they have been elected after the election day need a few days ideally before they join committees but maybe in the half term, or if they are on holiday shortly afterwards as well. That is an unfortunate coincidence. They need to be given good instruction from senior officers, HM Procureur, HM Comptroller, the good officers, to know that they are on a level playing field. So I think when we get on with the election it is not just about the date; it is to ensure, as Deputy Fallaize said, there is a functioning government as well.

Thanking you, sir.

1990 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Thank you, sir.

We are, of course, in a very different place to that of 14th April, and I think with the wonders of hindsight that have been expressed through this debate some Members have forgotten what it was like at that point when we did make the decision to move the election.

1995 I thank SACC for bringing a clear and well thought through policy letter to the States. It answers the questions. I see Deputy Inder is nodding vigorously, which does not happen often. (*Laughter*) It is now in *Hansard* forever.

2000 I do think we made the decision at the time that we believed was best. I know that there are disagreements because not everybody voted for that, but that was the democratic decision that we made at the time and we are now armed with a much more comprehensive understanding in how we are dealing with the virus and how it might affect or impede a free and fair election. So I genuinely believe that this is a good day. We can finally stop debating this and actually take a decision.

2005 Having said that, I just wanted to point ... Like Deputy Fallaize – although I am slightly less lukewarm on this than Deputy Fallaize – my concerns run between the application between what is possible in phase 4 and what would be possible in phases 5 and 6, which is hopefully where we are going to have the election.

2010 In Appendix A, in the very handy table, under the electoral engagement column, under phases 4 and 5 my concern is if we are in phase 5 the public health guidance is that physical events and interactions are able to proceed subject to restrictions on numbers and gatherings. I do feel that as soon as we start restricting the numbers and gatherings we are getting into a territory where we need to ramp up in other areas if we are going to maintain the free and fair status.

2015 Again, if we were in phase 4 or had to go into phase 4, specific public health guidance would need to be developed highlighting the need to observe social distancing and canvassing, encouraging vulnerable Islanders or those displaying symptoms, however mild, to isolate. That is good advice and obviously those vulnerable Islanders would be encouraged to postal vote, as they would be, but what if there are candidates who fall into that category? I would be very concerned that we would be impeding the ability of those candidates to participate in a free and fair election. So, in his summing up, if Deputy Inder or possibly another Member of the Committee could explain what contingencies might be put in place if we did end up in phase 4 and those public health parameters were put in place ...?

2020 Again, when we look at phase 5, as we are now, the public health guidance is if you have got a cold or you are sick not to go out, not to attend work. Again, if there are candidates who fall ill they should not be going out canvassing. However, does that then impede their ability? Yes, we live in a virtual world but we are saying to them that you should not interact with the public free and fair because of public health advice which is still active in phase 5. So, even though that clear guidance is there I also would be concerned that some candidates ... There is a perverse incentive in some jurisdictions, where people are told, if they are sick, not to go into work; however, if they do not go into work they do not get paid and so there are examples of people going into work, being sick and getting sent home. I would not want a situation where you do have candidates who become ill and fear that they will not be able to electioneer themselves or bring themselves into the public eye enough and would therefore break public health guidance. I would hope that there is some way of monitoring that and keeping an eye on it. Yes, I do know in the 2016 election there was a candidate who fell quite ill and who was not able to canvas, but I think it is quite different if you are too ill to canvass as opposed to following public health guidance for the good of the Island and the public health guidance that is out there.

2030 Then, just briefly on polling station arrangements, even at phase 5 I have slight concerns again with people who are unwell. Even if symptoms are mild they would be asked to stay away from the polling stations. What happens – I would like to know if SACC have considered this or whether they can look at a contingency for this – to those individuals who are not signed up for postal voting, who become ill the day before the election or on the day of the election? They wake up

2045 and they have got a terrible runny nose and therefore, due to public health guidance, should not actually attend physically at the polling station. Is there some contingency that can be put in place for those members of the public to access their vote if they are unable to attend the polling station? You cannot always imagine that you would not be able to attend the polling station. I know there are many people signing up for postal voting, but not everybody will. Again, if that is in phase 4 I think there are more restrictions on who and how polling stations can be accessed, and therefore I just ask if when summing up SACC can clarify that those things are on the agenda.

2050 I know that they have got an awful lot.

Finally, in summing up, I do think that there is some merit – and not Jennifer Merrett – in the concern that candidates might not have enough notice, and especially new candidates, especially candidates who had not considered standing in the June election but have been spurred by current events and feel the necessity to serve their Island, but I do not think that is enough reason to put off allowing the electorate to renew the democratic mandate, and for that reason I will vote for 7th October.

2055

I do think that it is not only SACC's responsibility, it is all of our responsibility as democratically elected Members, given the fact that we have extended our term, to make sure that we are out there promoting getting on the electoral roll, promoting as many candidates that can stand and providing that enthusiasm so that we can actually have a free and fair election.

2060

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy McSwiggan.

2065 **Deputy McSwiggan:** Sir, I am sorry to prolong this debate but I got a very pointed look from Deputy Hansmann Rouxel during her speech, and since she had to rotate through 180° to give me a pointed look I thought I had better stand up and try and give some answers to her questions.

In terms of shielding candidates, of course the answer is that there is not a perfect solution. Island-wide voting was always going to rely on a fairly blended approach in terms of digital and physical engagement between candidates and voters. That is going to be all the more important in the context of earlier phases of lockdown. Candidates who may be shielding might have to rely more on digital alternatives than on face-to-face alternatives, but SACC is planning a range of digital and other ways for voters and candidates to engage with each other, so we are making sure that if these are platforms you are not used to, if this is your first time engaging with voters through different ways, it should still be straightforward and as meaningful as possible for you and for the people who might vote for you.

2070

2075

An earlier phase of lockdown does mean that there may more restrictions on candidates who are shielding engaging face to face with voters, but Deputy Hansmann Rouxel of all people knows that there are many people who might consider being candidates already who, for reasons of limited mobility, existing underlying health conditions and so on, find some of the physical rigours of the old-style canvassing really quite overwhelming already and quite limiting in terms of their ability to engage, so actually I think some of the things that we had already planned in for Island-wide voting, and which we will enhance given the public health risks of the pandemic, are going to make it possible for shielding candidates to still be able to engage thoroughly and should also be beneficial to a broader range of candidates who might not be shielding but who might have faced barriers to physical and face-to-face engagement in any election.

2080

2085

In the case of voters who fall ill at the last minute, we were actually having a conversation about this, I think yesterday night, amongst the Committee and its officers. There are obviously a load of contingencies that we have to think through in terms of how we will deliver this election at any phase of lockdown and we have tried to articulate the bulk of those in this policy letter – and I really appreciate those who have acknowledged that – but there is a lot of work that will be ongoing, really up until the point when we are delivering the election, to make sure that we have got all our bases covered and we are ready to cope with any eventuality. One of the things that we were talking about yesterday is what do you do if somebody falls ill at the last minute. Is there

2090

2095 access to another way of voting? Is there some kind of limited proxy voting scheme that might
work in Guernsey? These are things that have to be looked into in more detail and we have to
make sure they are possible within our legal and constitutional framework, but they are live issues
that are actively under consideration.

2100 It will not be possible, and I think we have outlined this in the policy letter ... There is a hard
cut-off for issuing postal votes, which is a number of days before election day, because they have
to be printed out, issued, go through that whole process and it is unlikely that you would be able
to opt people into postal voting at the very last minute, but we are actively finding workarounds
that will either work for the whole Island if we find ourselves in a very early phase of lockdown
2105 very close to election day, or will work for voters in specific circumstances if that is needed around
election day. So, again, that is a point that is subject to live consideration and I thank Deputy
Hansmann Rouxel for drawing attention to it.

The final point that she made, and which originated in Deputy Fallaize's speech, was this
question of notice and whether people will have adequate notice of the election. In the last few
days I have been really pleasantly surprised by the number of people who have started to talk
2110 about an October election, about being a candidate in an October election, people from all walks
of life, so some who will be of independent means and will not have much trouble picking up and
getting started with an election at any time, and some who will depend effectively on the grace of
an understanding employer. I think that was a factor that Deputy Fallaize's worry about notice
periods did not really take into account because I think if you are standing for election and you
2115 are a person who is employed and will need to continue to be employed well into the future, you
will only ever stand if you have the grace of an understanding employer. Unless things are really
bad you are not going to burn the bridge with your current employer until the point when it is
certain that you are in the States, so you need at least an employer who is willing to let you take
the chance of standing for election, going through that campaign period and knowing that your
2120 seat is still there waiting for you if you are not successful. There are not many people who are in
employment who also have the independence, the safety net of being able to say 'I am just going
to throw that up in the air now, take my chances on the campaign period and then see whether I
get into the States or not.' So it is generally a precondition for employed people that their
employer needs to be in some measure understanding and supportive, and because of that notice
2125 periods matter less – unless you work for the public sector, in which case you are not permitted by
your contract to be both in the States and a public servant.

I think a lot of us who came into the States from employment either continued that
employment while we were in the States or negotiated our way out of it at some point during our
time in the States, in those first few weeks or later on depending on how compatible private
2130 employment and States' work was for us, and in all cases it took an employer who was willing to
take that chance on us to make it possible. I think the situations which Deputy Fallaize is
particularly worried about are realistically highly unlikely.

I think I have addressed all the points that I can and I would ask Members to support the policy
letter.

2135

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

2140 I am going to start just by saying I know there have been a few mentions in speeches so far
that it is not about what is convenient for us. I do not think anyone is suggesting that and I am
actually surprised that that is even being alluded to. It is absolutely not. I cannot imagine anyone
making that argument about what is convenient for this Assembly. The focus of concerns that
have been raised has been about the workload and I think there are some legitimate points that
have been raised in that respect.

2145 I think an early October election is not optimal. However, we are not in the fortunate position
to be able to make an optimal decision, so we have to go for what is possible and it looks like it

will be possible – I am hoping it will be possible – to hold an election in October, and so my view is we really have to go for it and hope for the best.

2150 I am concerned. The policy letter is understandably littered with references to ‘we are working up contingency plans for this scenario’. There are an awful lot of contingency plans having to be made for a really mind-blowing matrix of scenarios, I imagine, so I do not envy SACC that particular task.

2155 One of the things that does concern me is, as Deputy Hansmann Rouxel referred to, any change in the phase and where that call is made. What is the threshold for making that call, and particularly in relation to the timeline ahead of polling day? I too agree with Deputy Hansmann Rouxel that phase 4 and below is really problematic. The policy letter rightly quotes the Venice Commission and says one of the conditions for a free and fair election is that voters should always have the possibility of voting at a polling station, but it is silent on how to hold an election in a pandemic. But I actually disagree, it says ‘always’ and I think that is really important, that voters
2160 should *always* have the possibility of voting at a polling station. Polling booths: I know that the policy letter does talk about potentially going to a one-in, one-out supermarket-style scenario or policy. I think if that is the case, are they willing to allow extra time, potentially an extra day or more, because that is going to have a significant impact if we have to go to that kind of policy.

2165 I am also nervous about postal voting. I have been on SACC and had to consider this myself. I completely understand why postal voting is being heavily promoted and I understand, particularly with reference to Island-wide and the ballot sheet that voters are likely to have to complete, why that is necessary and in fact in some cases probably preferable from the point of view of many of the electorate. However, I do have concerns about being over-reliant on postal voting, not just the fact that it allows for the possibility of more error, whether that is deliberate or accidental, but also coercion – yes, quite rightly from Deputy Gollop over there. I never really gave this an awful lot
2170 of ... I always understood that coercion was a potential problem with postal voting, but actually I was really shocked when a friend of mine who is a UK voter was telling me a tale from the recent UK election. He was saying that one of his friends was a young woman who still lives with her parents and she had applied for a postal vote, as had her mum, and when she came to fill out her
2175 postal vote she discovered it had gone and in fact it had already been submitted. Her mother had decided to fill it out for her and send it in, not for the candidate that she knew her daughter would have voted for but for the candidate that the mother wanted to vote for, so she effectively doubled her vote. Her rationale was ‘the one you wanted to vote for didn’t have a chance anyway’. That is a real-life tale. (*Laughter*) It does happen. It is just one of many things, but I thought that
2180 kind of cautionary tale is worth a bit of an airing. Mother knows best, yes. I am concerned on a few different fronts about being overly reliant on postal voting. I think we have to keep our eyes open to potential risks in that respect.

2185 I have got many questions – and I will pick these up with SACC separately; I am not going to take a huge amount of time going through them – about the kind of logistics and the practicalities relating to the system of voting, and particularly around the count. One of the things that is alluded to or touched on in the policy letter is that the ballot boxes will be transferred to a central location, transported securely. What happens to them overnight? The count is not going to start straight away. Are they going to be attended, unattended? CCTV? Are they going to be in public view? I would love a bit more detail around that. That is just one of several, but I am really
2190 conscious that we need to be clear about the process of everything that happens. There is quite a complex series of steps that I think needs to be taken and I think it is made particularly complex by the Island-wide system that we are trialling for the first time, and of course complicated further potentially by public health guidelines that may be present.

2195 In terms of the contingencies that do need to be worked up, the two that give me particular concern are anything that has a reliance on a UK element, and the two that do give rise for concern to my mind more than many others are the e-count provider, the suppliers of that. There is talk in the policy letter of potentially having another provider up the sleeve, but we do have unique circumstances, not least the bath-towel size of our ballot sheets probably (*Laughter*) and

2200 the number of candidates and the number of votes. I think it is something that does need to be worked through very carefully with the providers. I do not think the UK is overly blessed with a profusion of them, so that is one thing that I would hope that SACC look to early.

2205 The other is the UK printers, because of course a lot rides on that in terms of the booklet of manifestos. My concern here really is not so much about Guernsey but more to do with if conditions in the UK are such that it impacts upon those suppliers being able to operate. I am worried about contingencies in that respect.

2210 Actually, one further point: this was brought to my attention by someone who has just very recently been through the process of registering to vote, I am happy to say, and he noticed and brought to my attention that when you are registering to vote at the moment it does ask you to declare whether you will be 16 on or after 16th June 2021. If the date is brought forward I am assuming that there is a record of dates of birth and that the electoral roll can therefore be filtered accordingly, but I just thought it was worth mentioning because it is the kind of oversight that could really cause problems if it is not caught early enough.

I will be supporting the Proposition as amended. Thank you.

2215 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: Thank you, sir.

2220 We have to say that we have achieved a great deal since first and last debating the election date. I feel, from a public health perspective, that we have done all we can to be prepared for the next wave or indeed a different pandemic, but is this reason to vote for a further change to the election date? Deputy Lester Queripel and Deputy Fallaize have raised the important point that this is no longer about whether we can hold an election but whether we should hold an election this year. Deputy Prow and others have often questioned our democratic mandate to be sitting today, being the first day of the extended term. Deputy Green said we have made a meal of setting the election date. I happen to disagree, as the pandemic was a first and resulted in the need for substantial restrictions to our human rights and changes to the democratic process. I say, sir, hindsight is a wonderful thing. Given the facts we faced at the time, I believe we made the right decision. Deputies de Sausmarez and Hansmann Rouxel say phase 4 was problematic but we need to remember that if we had not changed the election date the nomination period would have opened on 12th May 2020 in phase 2. Phase 3 only started on 16th May 2020. SACC says advice from the Director of Public Health states that if the Island found itself in phase 1 or phase 2 at the time polling stations were scheduled to operate they would be unlikely to be able to be open.

2235 Before considering further whether we should hold the election this year I want to cover whether we can. When considering changing the date from June 2020, some have said that other locations have succeeded in having elections during the pandemic. Given the differences we have in voter accessibility to the internet, smart phones, the introduction of Island-wide voting and the desire for voters to meet candidates on such a small Island, such an election I believe would have been virtually impossible. This is certainly one of the reasons I chose to postpone the election. When we have an election we must have one that if called into doubt in any way the work done by SACC must be robust enough to stand up to such challenge, and let's remember that was the case in 2016.

2245 If we were in phase 2 again – which is where we were when the nomination period was due to open if we had not changed the election date in the first place – I would like to think because of the preparation and lessons learnt during the last half of this year we are prepared for a second wave, and hopefully it is unlikely we will return to phases 1 or 2 but we cannot rule out phase 3.

2250 SACC considered the expectations the electorate have of a free and fair election and these are listed in the excellently written SACC policy letter. Some issues are still to be sorted out, as can be seen by many of the paragraphs in the policy letter, not least accessibility. We need to ensure also that the Civil Service support what is a significant workstream to undertake in a limited timeframe.

SACC recommends that the States approves the Election Ordinance 2020 to close the electoral roll on 21st August 2020. I have to say I am concerned about this, as the intention was for the roll to close as late as possible and to enable an update of those added after the nominations opened to be given during canvassing. It is therefore a lost opportunity, in my mind, to close the roll more than a month before postal voting closes on 25th September 2020.

2255

I am concerned about whether the election can be undertaken fulfilling all the expectations of the populace, but not enough to dismiss a 7th October election. So the question for me is whether we should go to the polls earlier. We are told there is a democratic deficit ... a new democratic mandate (*Interjection*) to be able to implement the recovery strategy through the underlining plans and Budget and also to navigate Brexit if needed. Whilst I think we cannot live in a political bubble forever and we must move on, I have great sympathy for the views of Deputy Lester Queripel and the difficulties faced by the new Assembly and the major challenges they will face. We know the Civil Service will support them in order to bring forward a successful outcome to Brexit, the Budget, the recovery strategy and plans, but the level of involvement of Deputies in creating these important policies will depend on the quality of those chosen to be the next People's Deputies, and this must be left in the hands of the electorate. I hope they choose wisely.

2260

2265

I do care that the next Assembly voted in by Island-wide voting with so few quality, experienced candidates from this term standing again when such important work needs to be done ... but considering the nature of the pause and repeat of this term I hope they do a better job of coalescing around a common goal, (*Interjection*) what is best for Guernsey and the Bailiwick.

2270

What I will encourage is for everyone, no matter where they were born, no matter their political views, to get on the electoral roll. The Black Lives Matter movement calls for action at the ballot box, and Guernsey is no different because the ballot box is where the peoples' voice is heard, so I say to Islanders get on the roll and vote.

2275

The policy letter says further this campaign will simply pause and should a decision be made to hold the election in autumn 2020 will be ready to roll out as soon as the decision is made. Taking all things into account, I say let's vote for 7th October 2020, let's rock and roll.

Thank you, sir.

2280

The Bailiff: I invite Deputy Inder, as the President of the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee, to reply to the debate. Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you, Members, sir.

A fairly wise ex-army-officer type told me that while the public feel under threat they do not particularly worry too much about democracy; what they want is strength. They want leadership and they want safety. As soon as they start feeling safer, they start worrying about democracy. We have gone through that process. It would be very easy to dine out on the different amendments that we have seen over the past months from Policy & Resources – one minute it is a year, next minute it is September and now they are happy with 7th October.

2285

2290

I think as we look back on this process, maybe a year from now, once we are in phase 6 ... It has been a very odd and very difficult process for absolutely everyone. No one would have woken up on 1st January this year thinking by 25th March we are all going to be under effectively house arrest. I think some of us have said it is very easy for us to basically criticise success. Whether we like it or not, this process has been successful in terms of saving lives and public health. Okay, it has not helped the economy, more than that, but that is where we are now. It is all very easy for us to criticise success, but as we move out of this, as we are in phase 5, as eventually, whenever phase 6 comes ... we are now feeling like a safer community and now is the time the people are starting to worry more about their democracy.

2295

We have had probably three or four certainly against – three or four certainly look like they are against – and then suddenly became 'Get on with it', one of them Deputy Tindall.

2300

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel I generally think gets it, but it is very interesting that she brought up the difference between phase 4 and phase 5 and it is a question I tried to ask of Health last time

2305 we were in the States. We are now currently in phase 5. I just want to give an example, and this is
the bit I am not particularly clear about; I do not think anyone is clear about it. We have not
actually heard from Health & Social Care on this. Let's say next week we find that one of our
smaller schools develops Covid and we find it is one of the smaller primary schools. Does that
2310 actually mean those instances of the disease which happen in a small primary school mean we
automatically go back to 4 or automatically go back down to 3? I am not entirely sure whether if
something like that happened – this is more to Deputy Hansmann Rouxel – mid-campaign period,
does it necessarily mean we need to go back to phase 4 or down to phase 3? Could there be
something like a 4.8 or a version 4.5?

2315 For clarity, we are only currently dealing with things that we have seen which are in categories
6, 5, 4, 3, 2 or 1. I am hoping that as we move towards this – and some of this may come out in
the Revive and – Sorry, I am giving way to Deputy McSwiggan.

2320 **Deputy McSwiggan:** Before anybody thinks I am derelict in my duty, I will remind Deputy
Inder that he does have a Member of the Committee for Health & Social Care on his Committee
(*Laughter*) and she does occasionally tell him that the kind of nuanced response to the situations
as they evolve, which he is outlining in his speech, is entirely possible and entirely likely.

2325 **Deputy Inder:** I absolutely accept that and I know we have had this conversation, but what I
am actually trying to do is whittle this out via this policy letter and asking HSC to actually talk to
the community a bit more about what is the difference between a 6, a 5, a 4.5 and a 3.2, and give
us a couple of scenarios. A primary school gets into significant trouble: does that mean we will
jump to phase 3? If that is not the case, I think it would have helped the debate if they had done a
little bit – Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: I thank Deputy Inder.

2330 We have actually set how you move from each phase. Yes, it is not nuanced between phase
3.65B or 3.25F, but it is going from phase 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 and backwards again. I do not see how
we could ever be expected to provide any more detail given where we are at the moment.

2335 **Deputy Inder:** Well, thank you for that. Unfortunately I disagree with that. I think it can be
more nuanced and more based and categorised and give potential scenarios, because we are not
just talking about the election, we are actually talking about the economy as well, but that is for
another day.

I thank Deputy Hansmann Rouxel for her support and I think it was her and basically Deputy
[inaudible] said effectively let's just get on with it.

2340 Deputy Yerby effectively – damn, (*Interjections*) every time, sorry, sir, (*Laughter*) I was doing so
well. Deputy McSwiggan, Deputy Green and probably Deputy Prow, in amongst all the positive
comments we have had through this, effectively between the four or five of them have, in short,
done in part or in whole the summing up.

2345 I am not going to be too hard on Deputy Lester Queripel (*Interjections*) but I am going to be a
little bit hard on Deputy Lester Queripel. I genuinely think he has fallen ... and to a degree Deputy
Fallaize and Deputy Meerveld as well. I never thought I would write at the top of the paper
'Deputy Fallaize and Deputy Meerveld are like peas in a pod!' I never thought I would ever write
that in my notes or ever say it in the States, but I think they are falling into a bit of a trap. Deputy
Lester Queripel has said that he has a duty to stay on and to involve himself in the various crises
which are emanating out of where we are now. What I do know about Deputy Lester Queripel is
2350 he is probably one of the most decent men I have ever met in my life. His speeches are too damn
long (*Laughter*) by a country marathon most of the time, rather than a country mile, but I know he
is earnest and I know he absolutely believes in everything that he says. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)
He is one of the straightest people I have met since I have been a Deputy. But I think there is a –
(*Laughter*) However, I have to say – and Deputy Fallaize can laugh but he is getting it as well – that

2355 some of their belief in their own possible importance to be at the centre of everything is in some way misguided. Having employed people over the past 30-odd years I can tell you now the unemployment queues in this ... probably not the best time to talk with 600 unemployed, but something I was always taught was the unemployment queues are full of those bodies that think they are indispensable. Absolutely no one is indispensable and it may come as a great surprise to
 2360 some Members that there might be people out there in the community who are better than us. Hold the front page! To a degree – and I think I have said it before – we need to get out of our own bubbles ourselves. I genuinely think there is a general bubble.

Sir, to finish, I think this is going to get through.

2365 Deputy de Sausmarez, there are a bunch of questions – through you, sir – that she laid out to the Assembly and I am quite happy, obviously, for her to rattle those off to the Committee to give her some responses, but really ... Again, as an ex-Member of SACC I just do not like our work being checked over every single detail. It will come as a surprise to her that we have actually thought this through well – okay, going down into the devilish detail for you, Deputy Green.

2370 Finally, sir, I am just going to read the last two sentences of my opening speech – I am not giving way Deputy Queripel: ‘SACC is mandated to advise the States on elections to the office of Peoples’ Deputy; we have done this. We were directed to review the feasibility of holding an election earlier than June 2021 in line with Public Health advice;’ – and that is critical – ‘we have done this. Having carefully and intensively considered this subject in the last month, we have concluded unanimously to strongly recommend to the States that the General Election takes place
 2375 on Wednesday, 7th October 2020 and ask Members to support the Propositions.’

Members, I know potentially there are a couple of you that are going to vote against this, but I will try and implore you not to. We need to submit this Assembly to the people of this Island. This is not our democracy, this is their democracy. Now let’s go forward positively – as touched on by Deputy Hansmann Rouxel and I think it came at the end of Deputy Dawn Tindall’s speech – let’s
 2380 effectively call an election today: 7th October needs to be the day and we will deliver it on behalf of the people who put us here in the first place.

Thank you, sir.

2385 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, there are seven Propositions. What I am minded to do is to put Proposition 1 to you first because if Proposition 1 were not to carry none of the other Propositions need to be voted on. Therefore it is Proposition 1 that will be put first. There has been a request for a recorded vote (**A Member:** Yes please, sir.) on Proposition 1.

I simply remind you at this stage, Members, that in Proposition 1(d), as a result of amendment 3, instead of 18th October it is now 15th October, and in Proposition 1(e) it is
 2390 June 2025 rather than April 2025 as a result of amendment 1, but other than that Proposition 1 remains as it was on your set of original Propositions.

So, a recorded vote on Proposition 1 first, please, Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 34, Contre 2, Ne vote pas 3, Absent 0

POUR

Deputy Gollop
 Deputy Parkinson
 Deputy Le Clerc
 Deputy Leadbeater
 Deputy Mooney
 Deputy Trott
 Deputy Le Pelley
 Deputy Merrett
 Deputy St Pier
 Deputy Stephens

CONTRE

Deputy Lester Queripel
 Deputy Meerveld

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Brouard
 Alderney Rep. Roberts
 Alderney Rep. Snowdon

ABSENT

None

Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Inder
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel
Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Paint
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy McSwiggan
Deputy De Lisle
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley

The Bailiff: Members of the States, the voting in respect of Proposition 1 was there voted *Pour* 34, *Contre* 2, 3 abstentions, and therefore I declare Proposition 1 duly carried.

2395 I am hoping, Members, that I can put the remaining Propositions to you collectively and *aux voix*, but before doing so I would ask you simply to turn to the draft Elections Ordinance 2020, just so that you are aware of what it is you are voting on in respect of Proposition 2.

2400 As a result of the successful amendment 1 which changed Proposition 1(e) from April 2025 to June 2025, when you look at the text, that text has not been amended by that Proposition – but HM Procureur, you are satisfied that we can just take that as read into this, so that in clause 1 April 2025 becomes June 2025 wherever it appears and the reference at the end of clause 1.b should be to the first day of July as opposed to the first day of May?

2405 **The Procureur:** Yes, sir, I am. Proposition 2 is drafted so as to give effect to Proposition 1. I am therefore satisfied, thank you.

The Bailiff: So, with that in mind, Members, there will textual changes as a result of the successful Proposition 1 being carried just now and being converted into Resolution 1, but rather than go through the motions of formally amending that we will take that as read.

2410 So, in respect of Propositions 2; 3, which is a collection of ordinances; 4, which is the polling stations that nobody has mentioned; 5, which is the ordinance on the polling stations; 6 has been amended as a result of amendment 3, the Deputy Dorey/Deputy Green amendment; and Proposition 7 has been added as a result of amendment 4 ... I am putting all six Propositions to you.

2415 Deputy McSwiggan.

Deputy McSwiggan: Sir, I think we may need to take a recorded vote on this because does it not require a two-thirds majority?

2420 **The Bailiff:** If everyone votes positively then there will not be a need to do so. If it sounds as though there is a sufficient number of opposition then that is fine – but I do not think we need a recorded vote, Madam Procureur.

The Procureur: I agree, sir.

2425

The Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, I did ask for a recorded vote in my speech.

The Bailiff: I could have saved my breath, couldn't I, Members? *(Laughter)* We will now move to a recorded vote on Propositions 2 to 7 inclusive, please, Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 35, Contre 2, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 0

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

2430

The Bailiff: Members of the States, the voting on Propositions 2 to 7 inclusive was there voted *Pour 35, Contre 2, 2 abstentions*, and therefore I declare Propositions 2 to 7 duly carried. Indeed all seven Propositions have been carried.

**Procedural –
Order of business agreed**

The Bailiff: Before we call the next item of business, shall we just take stock at quarter to four on day five? You have got five items to deal with, one of which cannot be deferred, which is the

2435 schedule for future States' business. Is it anyone's wish to propose that the order of business be taken differently? Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, I propose that we deal with the Revive and Thrive policy letter.

2440 **The Bailiff:** So we bring Article I of Billet d'État XIV, the Revive and Thrive debate, up to being debated now and before any other business is dealt with.

Deputy Brehaut: I would not oppose that motion. The General Housing Law was the next item on the Agenda. I am not opposed to moving it.

2445 **The Bailiff:** Do you want to comment at all, Deputy – ?

Deputy Ferbrache: No, sir, in fact I have already discussed this with Deputy St Pier. I support his ...

2450 **The Bailiff:** Thank you very much.
I am going to put the motion to you, Members of the States, that rather than taking the next item of business that is listed we bring 'Revive and Thrive: Our Recovery Strategy for Guernsey Together' up the running order and take that next. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

2455 **The Bailiff:** I will declare that carried and therefore –

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, can we have a recorded vote on that, please?

2460 **The Bailiff:** Greffier, we will have a recorded vote, please, on the motion that we take Revive and Thrive next.
Quiet, please, Members, so that we can do the recorded vote.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 32, Contre 7, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 0

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Parkinson	Deputy Gollop	None	None
Deputy Le Clerc	Deputy Lester Queripel		
Deputy Leadbeater	Deputy Le Pelley		
Deputy Mooney	Deputy Merrett		
Deputy Trott	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
Deputy St Pier	Deputy Smithies		
Deputy Stephens	Deputy Green		
Deputy Meerveld			
Deputy Fallaize			
Deputy Inder			
Deputy Lowe			
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel			
Deputy Graham			
Deputy Paint			
Deputy Dorey			
Deputy Le Tocq			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Dudley-Owen			
Deputy McSwiggan			
Deputy De Lisle			

Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley

The Bailiff: Members of the States, the voting on the motion to reorder the business to take the Revive and Thrive debate next was there voted *Pour 32, Contre 7*, which is why the motion was carried.

2465 Greffier.

Billet d'État XIV

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

I. Revive and Thrive: Our Recovery Strategy for Guernsey Together – Debate commenced

Article I

States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the policy letter "Revive and Thrive: Our Recovery Strategy for Guernsey Together" dated 10th June 2020, they are of the opinion:

- 1. To agree "Revive and Thrive: Our Recovery Strategy for Guernsey Together" as the strategic framework governing the scope of future initiatives of the States of Deliberation and to agree that committees of the States shall discharge their functions in a manner which is consistent with, and intended to support and give effect to, the outcome established by the Recovery Strategy.*
- 2. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to consult further in preparing the Recovery Action Plans for the Recovery Strategy and report back to the States as soon as practicable.*

The States' Greffier: Billet d'État XIV – Article I – Policy & Resources Committee – Revive and Thrive: Our Recovery Strategy for Guernsey Together.

2470 **The Bailiff:** I invite the President of the Policy & Resources Committee, Deputy St Pier, to open the debate.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

2475 Today this Assembly begins its debate on one of the Island's greatest challenges since our liberation following the Occupation, and in striving to meet that challenge we have the most significant opportunity, I would suggest, of our generation to improve our Island and our Bailiwick for the better, to create a well-being economy that supports health, wealth and community.

We are, of course, now in phase 5 of our exit from the so-called lockdown measures, measures that were put in place three months ago. As work begins to safely and proportionately alleviate

2480 the travel restrictions that have been put in place to protect our community, we can say with
sadness for those who have lost loved ones but also with relief and optimism that we are ready to
begin our recovery. I want to set out the scale of the challenge we face, why the Policy &
Resources Committee believe that this is the right recovery strategy to meet that challenge, the
opportunity that the recovery presents and how we can approach our recovery plans.

2485 We must fully understand and not in any way underestimate the scale of the challenge.
Economic modelling for the impact of 2020 predicts a loss of Gross Value Added (GVA) in relation
to the economy of an estimated 8%, or approximately £300 million in real terms, and its recovery
to previous levels without any action could take a decade. Unmanaged the consequences for our
community are severe, with an impact on Islanders' physical and mental health, their life chances
and opportunities for a generation and the well-being of our community.

2490 Several sectors of our economy – such as tourism, hospitality, aviation, retail and
construction – have of course been and continue to be severely affected. Some employers have
responded to the social restrictions by adapting their operating models, but nonetheless
indications are that unemployment has increased sharply and I think we can reasonably expect
more to come.

2495 Guernsey has been relatively fortunate in that the finance sector, which of course represents
directly 40% of the economy, is in large part sufficiently diversified and digitally enabled to
continue to operate remotely, and this has kept a significant proportion of our population
employed and productive. However, different parts of the finance sector will be impacted in
different ways and by different factors over different timescales. The challenge is to support the
2500 different parts of the sector in remaining competitive in a significantly changed global
environment alongside the inevitable global recession. Transport, connectivity, data security and
resilience, risk-based regulation and an effective long-term approach to skills and population will
be among the critical factors in enhancing our competitiveness, as will effective external
relationships, reputation management, and of course our promotion.

2505 Businesses will have applied a substantial amount of their reserves to weather the period of
enforced inactivity. This will have depleted the amount of working capital that many have
available in local businesses, and without it a return to a smooth flow of money through the
economy may be slow unless stimulus can be provided by government. This means that there is a
critical role for public stimulus to play in promoting activity and providing liquidity and demand
2510 facilities in the likely absence of demand from the private sector, and such demand stimulus and
other measures may help manage increased levels of unemployment as we move beyond crisis
but they will need to be carefully designed and co-ordinated within the whole strategy.

For households, recession on this scale is likely to have significant effects and most notably
high levels of unemployment, as I mentioned, persisting beyond the release of the internal
2515 restrictions, a reduction in earnings when comparing jobs on a like-for-like basis and of course
lower household incomes.

Modelling undertaken indicates the effect on Guernsey's public finances of the pandemic in
2020 will be in the region of £190 million comprised of the direct business financial support
schemes, reduction in States' revenues, increase in States' expenditure, a reduction in States'
2520 operating income, a significant impact on some of the States' trading entities, notably of course
the Ports and the Airline. Based on the projected impact on the public purse, prioritisation and
affordability must now be at the heart of all government and operational decision making. This
will be vital to enable investment to be targeted for recovery which has the best overall impact.

Economic modelling based on several recovery scenarios demonstrates that without a fiscal
2525 stimulus the economic recovery could take up to a decade. Consequently the recovery in
Guernsey's public finances would also take a similar period as the global and local economy
recovers. Initial estimates suggest the impact on public revenues in 2020 could total £75 million
across all revenue streams. Although it is likely that much of this lost revenue will be restored in
2021 as activity resumes, receipts in 2021 could remain some £30 million or £40 million short of
2530 their 2019 level. This underlines the importance of adopting a recovery strategy designed to

accelerate growth in the economy in a sustainable and resilient way and to rebuild confidence and resilience in our community at the same time.

2535 The economic aim of this strategy will be to develop and invest in initiatives which demonstrably improve the recovery curve and accelerate the return of jobs and wealth to our community. The strategy has at its core the ambition not just of restoring the majority of economic activity in 2021 but also promoting sufficient economic growth to exceed the previous growth path for the economy within three years. Achieving this ambition will require employers to be able to re-employ the majority of staff and have access to sufficient liquidity to invest in their recovery.

2540 Our ambition is to consider fiscal stimulus primarily around construction, financial and professional services and information communication services, enabling growth rates to improve on average at 1% per annum. This scenario would see GVA exceed its previous growth path by 2023 and provide a cumulative increase in GVA of some £1.4 billion between 2021 and 2030 compared to our central case. As well as exceeding the previously predicted GVA, stimulating the economy will improve States' revenues. If it is assumed that between 20% and 25% of additional GVA is translated into tax revenues with our current tax system, this represents an additional £280 million to £360 million of government revenues over the course of a decade. Such stimulus will also reduce unemployment levels, improve household income and reduce reliance on means-tested benefits, which will have a direct and positive impact on community well-being, of course.

2550 Guernsey must restore its financial security and community well-being through an approach which is innovative, dynamic and, I would suggest, co-designed with our community. To revive and thrive our vision for recovery requires investment and confidence rather than cuts and austerity. That is why it was right, I would suggest, that the Assembly was asked to support borrowing to be undertaken to invest in that recovery while maintaining our reserves.

2555 Our recovery will also need to rebuild community resilience. Over these past three months our community has faced significant challenge. The partial closure of schools substantially disrupted the school year for students from pre-school through to higher education. It has also impacted parents' ability to work. A survey by Island Global Research reported that 53% of employed or self-employed parents had had their capacity to work affected by childcare. Concerns over the risk of contracting the virus, the economic impact of lockdown, domestic stresses from working at home while home educating children and a more limited social interaction and activity have all had the potential to impact individuals' well-being.

2560 Some 20% of respondents to the community monitoring tool requested information on emotional and mental health. Longer-term physical health impacts in the community are a real risk. It is likely that individuals have avoided medical appointments or treatment due to concern over contracting the virus or financial limitations. Additional areas of concern are the decreased visibility of more vulnerable individuals who might be shielding and the delay in medical procedures, treatments and appointments due to the restrictions of movement and the limitations on care available.

2570 The pandemic has resulted in financial insecurity, stress and uncertainty, as well as the decreased visibility of some households. A 30% to 40% increase in domestic abuse cases has been observed as well as a spike of referrals for children at risk. It is likely that the number of recorded cases will increase as agencies return to more normal working practices.

2575 The growth in economic vulnerability has increased the number of people at risk of becoming homeless. This has been visible through an increased number of households on the waiting list for social housing. The impact of the pandemic has resulted in greater demand for services provided by the third sector from food banks to refuge accommodation, and at the same time it has impacted on the third sector's ability to raise their own funds required to provide those services. The effects of the pandemic will not impact, of course, all people equally; some parts of the community will have been disproportionately disadvantaged.

2580 It is possible that the relaxation of emergency restrictions will resolve many of the social impacts of the pandemic; however, some will take longer to emerge or require more resources to

2585 manage and support. Stimulating the economy in a sustainable and resilient way will help to improve individuals' capacity to support themselves and the States' capacity to provide social support where and how it is needed. The economic recovery and community recovery are not separate missions. They are interconnected and must be approached together outside of the usual mandate silos of our own machinery of government.

2590 We should remember that there have been some positive effects which the community has identified itself – for example, the traffic levels in Guernsey have reduced by approximately 60%, air quality improved and more people appear to be exercising and enjoying active travel to work or school. Recovery efforts will seek to build on the opportunities generated by positive impacts to support new ways of working and sustainable practice. Some jurisdictions, for example, are considering attaching so-called green strings to fiscal support, ensuring that businesses are rewarded by continuing to consider environmental and social as well as financial outcomes, and we will be actively exploring those. We are blessed, of course, with a rich and diverse natural environment and unique Anglo-Norman cultural heritage. We should nurture these to support environmental and community renewal, our economic diversification, and to promote the Bailiwick as a unique location in the world.

2600 This is our opportunity to ensure that we build a well-being economy and do not focus only on economic well-being, critical as that is. As we start to shape the Island's recovery post-Covid, it is important to recognise the role that our natural and built heritage plays in underpinning the financial security of the Island and the Revive and Thrive ethos of the recovery strategy. The connection between nature and our health and well-being was brought into sharp focus during lockdown, whether it was the feeling individuals got just being able to listen to the birds in the garden or enjoying a walk along our flower-lined cliff paths. Combined with recent reports by the World Economic Forum and PwC that calculated the economic cost of biodiversity loss at 7.5% of global GDP and that 50% of the global GDP is moderately or highly dependent upon nature, it is no surprise that biodiversity loss has been cited as the second most impactful after climate change and the third most likely risk to the global economy in the next decade.

2610 If Covid-19 has taught us anything it is that we should not take everyday benefits and services for granted. We pride ourselves on our Island's stunning scenery, which has an economic role boosting tourism and helping to attract high net worth individuals to the Island. We rely on basic services which nature provides, be it flood and coastal protection, soil fertility, air and water filtration, pollination and carbon sequestration among many other examples. But these benefits and services – if you like, our natural capital – are not visible on the balance sheet during decision making. We would not overlook the management of infrastructure assets that are valued at 7.5% of our GDP or impact potentially 50% of our GDP. By not acknowledging the role of the environment in the delivery of a resilient economy for the future, we run the risk of falling into the same trap again to a point where our natural assets can no longer provide these services for future generations.

2620 The evidence is clear. The 2019 Habitat Survey has shown that our Island's habitants and eco systems, our natural heritage, are being degraded due to climate change and other human-made pressures. It is these other human pressures that are, in the main, within our control. How we choose to protect and build the resilience of our natural environment over the coming years will demonstrate whether we have truly learned the Covid-19 experience and gone beyond simply returning to the pre-virus status quo. As I said at the IOD annual conference in October last year, if we want Guernsey to thrive as a centre for green finance, our whole system, our whole culture and practice needs to be consistent and needs to be aligned if we are to be credible. In other words, we need to walk the walk as well as talk the talk.

2630 At the end of May 2020 the Committee *for the* Environment & Infrastructure endorsed the redesigned Biodiversity Strategy for Guernsey, now entitled the 2020 Strategy for Nature, to drive the long-term management of nature in Guernsey. This is not work that should sit on the margins of our recovery. It can and must be used to support our economic and community recovery. The recovery strategy's approach is informed by the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.

2635 These goals, scaled appropriately to Guernsey, will be critical to guiding how we plan and
implement our recovery: to end poverty and inequality of all kinds in our community; to ensure
inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all; to
2640 promote a sustainable supply chain, sustainable production and sustainable consumption; to
ensure healthy lives and promote well-being at all ages; to ensure access to affordable,
sustainable and modern energy for all – principles at the heart of the energy strategy that the
States decisively endorsed two weeks ago; to promote sustained inclusive and sustainable
economic growth, full productive employment and decent work for all; to build resilient
2645 infrastructure and foster innovation; to ensure our built environment is inclusive, safe, resilient and
sustainable and to take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts; to conserve and
sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development; and to
restore and promote sustainable stewardship of our natural environment. These goals provide the
framework for our recovery strategy and they must therefore be reflected in the action plans that
we co-design with our community.

The lockdown has magnified for many what is special about our Islands. We have seen an
2650 outpouring of community spirit, and for many the extra family time has enabled Islanders to
rediscover our natural and heritage assets. Opportunities for investment, innovation and job
creation need to be maximised, and the well-being of the community should be kept at the heart
of our recovery. We now have the opportunity to go beyond simply returning to the pre-virus
status quo and can strive to achieve longer-term socio-economic and environmental resilience for
2655 our community. The vision for our recovery is to work in partnership to recover our economic
prosperity, build our inclusive community values and capitalise on our many strengths to make
Guernsey and the Bailiwick a safe haven based on sustaining health, wealth and community.

The anticipated magnitude of the impact of the pandemic locally and internationally means
2660 that the recovery will be a multi-year effort. We will focus on a combination of short- and
medium-term measures designed to revive in 2021 and thrive within three years. We recognise
that recovery may take longer than three years to achieve but this time horizon provides a clear
focus and will enable progress to be tested and future plans adjusted before designing any
further phases.

Competitiveness is critical to our economic recovery. We have long been a good place to do
2665 business in order to recover. We must become a great place to do business. There are bedrocks
for competitiveness that we know we must work at pace to put in place – connectivity, data
resilience, investment in schools – and we are therefore prioritising these as our short-term
actions. Work is already ongoing as part of the implementation of the States' Economic
Development Strategy but it now needs to be implemented with even greater momentum and in
2670 the context of recovery. We have seen that during the lockdown period these were the critical
components of competitiveness that business needed. Now they form the basis on which we must
build our future economy and prosperity.

Transport connectivity must be addressed. The reviews of strategic air and sea links,
2675 infrastructure future and aviation policy will be completed. There will be clear recommendations
on the future of Aurigny, the provision of long-term resilient lifeline sea links, the potential for
investment in our ports and the network of destinations we need to connect into.

The President of the Committee *for* Economic Development has already advised the Assembly
2680 that the review of the use and licensing of 5G technology will now include an overhaul of our
existing telecoms strategy with clear recommendations for future investment for business, home
and government users. Through this we will build a data infrastructure that is resilient, secure and
world class. We will become a recognised global leader in respect of data. We will provide a plan
for investment in Guernsey's critical national infrastructure, in our economic infrastructure
including transport, data and energy, and in the regeneration of our seafront and our built
2685 environment. We must also ensure that the Island Development Plan is used as the tool to meet
our objectives and to secure the outcomes our community needs.

The strategic review of population management will be restarted with a revised scope to identify the people and skills our economy needs to recover and grow and to set out the changes needed to ensure that we can do that at pace. We will also start work on a human capital strategy that combines attracting the people we need from off Island with the training and equipping of our on-Island population to meet the challenges of recovery.

2690

Recovery will be made up of three inter-linked action plans which must be developed together and will be underpinned and framed by fiscal stimuli and investment to capitalise growth over the short and medium term. In endorsing the recovery strategy the States can set the community to work on the three action plans.

2695

The Sustainable Economy action plan will seek to build back better by identifying growth opportunities and resilience in new sectors and adjacent growth in existing sectors, of course, establishing the framework within which we can attain long-term competitiveness for supporting and attracting new businesses, the growth of existing businesses and to support the exploration and development of new economic opportunities, supporting environmental and social sustainability through economic outcomes and putting in place an infrastructure framework, including energy resilience, that prioritises and accelerates investment in areas that support the overall recovery strategy as well as the local economy.

2700

The Health and Care recovery plan will adopt an integrated approach to meet the community's needs by developing the holistic health and care system, its services and infrastructure, to meet the community's needs, ensuring that services are centred around the needs of Islanders and of course are accessible and affordable, ensuring that health and care services are sustainable and resilient against future challenges, ensuring backlogs built up during the crisis can be eliminated, and improving – importantly – population health outcomes through addressing the social determinants of health.

2705

The Community recovery plan will enable the community to thrive by ensuring recovery is inclusive, just and proportionate to the needs, fostering the whole community well-being and resilience, nurturing our natural environment and unique heritage, making greater and innovative use of our natural and cultural assets. The priorities in the plan will be informed by the community, ensuring the community has access to education and lifelong learning, working to support those in hardship as a result of Covid and minimise future deprivation, focusing on improving cohesion and connectivity and enhancing and creating a new meaningful community partnership.

2710

2715

So, three action plans will then be supplemented by further and supporting plans as appropriate.

2720

The fiscal strategy will be an important foundation for recovery. It will evaluate the structure of taxes and the role they will play in closing the gap through tax cuts, rises, new taxes or temporary incentive schemes, as appropriate, as well as the size and cost of public services. This will ensure that Guernsey is financially sustainable and stable, is able to invest in recovery and is resilient and prosperous whilst also meeting its obligations to the Islands of the Bailiwick. It will seek to maximise the opportunity for recovery through ensuring the fiscal structure of support and promote recovery and innovation and that we are able to deliver affordable and sustainable public services, and of course that we remain financially sustainable, stable and resilient.

2725

The public service will also be critical to the delivery of services and the commission of services. Using recent experience, the public service must continue to adapt to deliver the transformed efficient and resilient public services the community will need. It will be the engine that drives all of the action plans from development through to delivery and will play its part in recovery through continuing to adapt to deliver the transformed efficient and resilient public services the community needs, effectively managing and co-ordinating the recovery of public services during and following the exit and addressing the impact of any service disruption, of course clearing any backlogs that have built up and delivering the new operating model for public services that ensures provision does remain affordable, sustainable and appropriate.

2730

2735

2740 Then the final piece in the jigsaw of recovery is the funding and investment plan. Without
action the impact on public revenues of the central case could be in the region of £400 million
over a 10-year period, which would necessitate borrowing to fund day-to-day expenditure in the
absence of drastic austerity measures. The States of Deliberation have followed a prudent
approach to public finances for generations, which of course has put us in an excellent position
entering this unprecedented period. We do have strong reserves along with a stable Government
and a fiscally prudent approach, which has led to us retaining a strong AA- credit rating. We
2745 entered this year in a strong financial position, including of course a substantial budget surplus,
significant reserves and very modest borrowing. However, unlike larger economies, we do not
have our own central bank so we do not have the option to initiate quantitative easing or increase
the money supply in the economy in any meaningful way.

2750 There is a strong case developing to invest in our recovery now. We could provide a fiscal
stimulus to our economy that would help create jobs and opportunities as well as improving our
environment and our infrastructure. We could cover the gap in public finances in the short term to
allow our public services to continue to keep us safe and healthy. Borrowing to invest in recovery
could improve the gap in public finances by some £280 million to £360 million over that 10-year
period, as well, of course, as restoring confidence, growth and well-being in the community.

2755 Therefore, in order to deliver a confident and successful recovery it will be necessary to ensure
that it is appropriately resourced and funded. The aim of the funding and investment recovery
plan is going to be to understand the investment needs for delivery of the action plans to ensure
government funding is put in place to capitalise that growth, to examine opportunities for co-
investment and co-funding and joint investment, and to determine the necessary borrowing
requirements and the mechanisms for repayment. There is a lot to do.

2760 This is the States' opportunity to sharpen the focus of our recovery strategy, to agree to
prioritise our recovery work over all other work, to focus single-mindedly on what supports
recovery, our opportunity to work differently across the States and with our community, our
opportunity to rethink what we want Guernsey to be, reflecting the views of our community,
rethinking how our economy, our environment and our community are interdependent. The best
2765 next step will be for the States to take this opportunity with both hands.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey, to be followed by Deputy Lester Queripel.

2770 **Deputy Roffey:** Thank you, sir.

Of course I understand that the speed at which this document was produced means that #it
had to be at a very high level, but that said I think one of my biggest frustrations of serving in the
States of 2016, I think we can say now to 2020, has been the amount of fluffy, high-level, nebulous
vision documents that we have been asked to consider. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) My instinctive
2775 response to each one has been the same: that all sounds well and good in theory but give us
some firm, concrete proposals on how these highfalutin ideas are going to be turned into reality. I
just prefer dealing with firm proposals to philosophical concepts, so it probably goes without
saying that I am looking forward more to debating the various recovery action plans than today's
high-level debate.

2780 That said, I will do my best to engage, but before doing so let me address the form in which
this has been brought. It has been brought as a green paper. I was actually on the House
Committee, whatever it was called, when we put forward the idea of green papers and I think it is
sometimes useful, but this is a bit of a weird hybrid. Normally you have a green paper to stimulate
debate, which is unamendable and asks you to note something so that the Committee concerned
2785 can listen to the views of the States to take back their views – I know, Deputy Le Clerc, it is the
effect I have on the Assembly (*Laughter*) – or you ask the States to agree something which you
allow them to amend if they do not actually agree. We have got a weird hybrid here, where we are

being asked to agree something that we are not able to amend and I feel slightly uncomfortable with that, so I just wanted to put that on record – but I will do my best to engage, as I said.

2790 At the heart of this document is establishing an economic growth path which is steeper than
the one that was assumed before the pandemic, and of course that does make sense. We are
going to have to make up considerable lost economic ground. We are going to have to be bold,
we are going to have to be innovative, we are going to have to do things differently, but I really
hope that that does not translate into us being desperate or indiscriminate in our pursuit of
2795 economic growth. In particular, I hope we learn the lesson of Jersey and their response to the
economic crash of 12 years ago. They have really gone for growth big time, haven't they? It has
led to big increases in their GDP – GMP, or whatever you want to call it – and envious remarks
about all the tower cranes seen over St Helier while Guernsey seemingly snoozed. But when you
really drill down, the resultant big rise in Jersey's population has meant that that Island has
2800 actually done less well than Guernsey in terms of GDP per head of population, and they have also
created huge strains on their infrastructure.

I am certainly not at this stage in our history suggesting that Guernsey should do anything that
suggests it is closed for business. Indeed, I think we need more flexibility than we have shown
over the last few years because the situation is different. We simply cannot afford to be too
2805 restrictive, we are going to need to replace lost economic activity, but an economic plan which
requires a population of 75,000 in 10 years' time will, in my view, not be doing anybody any
favours. I want to put down that marker because if I am being asked to sign up for something and
if the States approve it today, then I do not want that throwing back at me if I have not actually
said that in debate.

2810 Coming on to a few specifics, she is not in Chamber but I very much agree with the point that
Deputy Tindall has been making over recent months that our planning function is going to have a
big and central part to play in our recovery. I could give many examples but I think the time for
detail will come later – hopefully not too much later – but today I give one example for
2815 illustration. If a legacy of the lockdown is a lot more homeworking, then demand for commercial
office space will obviously diminish. This is going to require flexibility from the Planning
Department if the value of such property portfolios is not to absolutely plummet. In some cases,
ironically, as our domestic properties are used more and more as our offices, so properties
currently used as office space will need to be converted into additional residential units.
2820 Sometimes in the case of larger office blocks it might be more appropriate to find alternative
commercial uses. My point is that Planning is going to need to be very flexible and innovative in
order to underpin our economic strategy.

Sir, I am always interested in the short term, so I was particularly interested in the four priorities
put forward in paragraph 1.11 on page 3 of this document, and I want to refer briefly to each of
them.

2825 The first is connectivity. That word has lots of meanings. Obviously digital connectivity is vital,
but that is probably covered off in the second bullet point, so I presume that this one relates to
physical connectivity and that too really can be broken into both external and internal
connectivity. On external connectivity I want to give a warning: we should not get too carried
away. It should obviously be as good as we can possibly make it, but viable connectivity is a factor
2830 of market size, which in turn is a function of population size and the scale of any visitor economy.
Of course we may need to speculate to accumulate, we may need to put money into improving
our connectivity, but it is the sort of area which, if we are not careful, could gobble up huge
amounts of the money that we are considering borrowing in order to pump-prime our economy –
huge amounts of that cash for very little lasting result – and I think we have to be very cautious of
2835 that, not to mention the fact that actually promoting huge amounts of air travel does not really sit
comfortably with the environmental section of this plan. I think the capability of chasing rainbows,
chasing unicorns and losing money is true of both the range of destinations that we aspire to be
connected to and the level of fares that we have to see in order to encourage travel. For example,
we may well wish to subsidise both air and sea links to Guernsey in 2021, assuming they are back

2840 to normal, in order to kick-start our economy. Fine, that is well and good, but let's remember it is
a competitive world and do not expect us to be the only ones at that game. Both commercial
carriers and other destinations will be heavily discounting in order to stimulate demand. I accept
that probably makes it even more important that we should consider doing the same thing not to
miss out, but do not expect it to be any sort of USP which is going to have the punters flooding
2845 in, because it is not. Before leaving connectivity I would also point out that, in my view, the case
for extending Guernsey's runway, which was never that strong, is looking even shakier at the
moment. I would also like at some stage to talk about internal connectivity, but rather than doing
that at this point I will leave it to my closing remarks about how we build Guernsey back better.

So, on to point 2 in that paragraph 1.11, which is digital. I think it will probably surprise no one
2850 in this Chamber – and there are not many at the moment but I do not think it will surprise many in
this Chamber when I fess up that my expertise in this area is fairly limited. In fact, I am desperate
for training because I live in a world where I do not even understand the language being spoken
anymore in this area. But I do not think it takes a lot of IT literacy to see, as a reasonably
intelligent person, how digital development can be completely transformational to societies and
2855 communities if done well. For example, less than 30 years ago Estonia was a part of the old Soviet
empire and it has gone in those 30 years to becoming a thriving digital economy within the EU.
Perhaps most importantly, for people like me who want to see healthy economic growth without
rampant population growth, is that many of the people working full time inside Estonia's economy
today have actually hardly ever set foot there; they simply do not need to. To my mind,
2860 investment in that sort of connectivity, the creation of that sort of economy in Guernsey, would be
money far better spent than digging physical tunnels to the outside world as if we were some
Colditz in the Channel. Of course I do not doubt that at first we are going to have unemployment
problems here in Guernsey, so actually it might seem perverse to be encouraging that sort of
engagement, but at some time, unless we make a complete mess of this whole recovery plan, we
2865 are going to see skill shortages develop again and immigration is sometimes the solution to that. I
am not anti-immigration. I think sometimes it definitely is the right solution to bring people
physically here, but if people can work from home then it really matters not – whether it is Mrs Le
Page or not – whether that home is in Torteval, Tunbridge Wells or Tashkent, they can still be
making a contribution to our economy.

2870 Sir, the third of the four bullet points in paragraph 1.11 is investment. This is a bit vague,
particularly when the next paragraph, 1.12, says that the four components in the paragraph above
have been prioritised for investment. So investment has been prioritised for investment – that is as
clear as mud to me but I am presuming that what it probably means is capital investment, in
which case I strongly support it and for two reasons.

2875 The first is that those people – and there are many of them at the moment that we can hear
out there in our community – who are saying we cannot possibly afford to build x or y at the
moment, it is the wrong time, the money is going to be tight, it is a financial challenge are
completely wrong. This is exactly the time to build new facilities, always assuming of course that
there is a case for building them in the first place. I am not advocating building stuff for building
2880 sake, but when there is a case for actually providing infrastructure, then now is the ideal time; it
has not been better in generations.

My second reason for supporting significant capital investment is that the last two States have
been supremely bad at it over the last eight years. I do not think they have been supremely bad
States – in fact, they have done very well in bringing a Budget which was in deficit back into
2885 balance, so two cheers for that – but they have been absolutely lousy at building stuff and as a
result we have now started to get an ageing infrastructure. As I have said, there has never been a
better time to address that, but I also think in doing that we need to ask ourselves why we have
built so little over the last eight years. While of course we need procedures in place to ensure that
the taxpayer of Guernsey is getting value for money from capital projects, ours are so complex
2890 and labyrinthine that at times it seems as if their main purpose is to stop anything ever being
built. If so, they have worked remarkably well, I have to say. I think it was Deputy Langlois who

once opined that our system of capital approvals was like something out of *Gormenghast*. I do not know how many Members have read that superb trilogy by a former Sark resident, but he is absolutely right. It is so tortuous that even Sourdust, the master of ceremonies in that dusty and convoluted world, would be scratching his head in puzzlement. I know the system is probably imported straight off the shelf from the UK and it may or may not be suitable for mega projects like HS2, but in the Lilliputian world of Guernsey it is completely OTT and it demands far too many resources. Indeed, it is ironic, in my view, that the system that was supposed to deliver value for money costs so many millions of pounds to operate. I am not suggesting the work has to be done, but academically I would be interested to see a comparison of how much has been spent on drawing up plans for capital projects over recent years, scrutinising those plans, drawing up business cases for those plans and scrutinising those business cases, compared with how much has actually been spent on putting one brick on top of another. I suspect it would reveal a fairly shocking picture.

We are going to have to change gear if we are going to make the sort of capital investment that this Revive and Thrive policy calls for. And it is not just about procedures – I think it is also a change of attitude from both this Assembly and from P&R. Once a project has been approved in principle then of course there should still be checks and balances to ensure it is being delivered in a value-for-money way, but they should be far more streamlined. But most importantly, once this Assembly, on behalf of the Island, has decided that a project should go ahead and that it is in the Island's best interests, everybody's focus should be on making that happen. We need to get away from the mindset of 'This may have been approved by the States once but you have still got to get it past us two or three times more because we are really going to stand in the way'. We need to get behind the decisions that we have taken in principle. The dog in the manger attitude needs to be consigned to history if we are really going to make this work. If not, then all of these fine words about investing in our future are pure rhetoric.

That brings me on, I think, to the fourth bullet point on paragraph 1.11, which is people and skills. Except for possibly in respect of renewables, where we may have some natural resources, really Guernsey's only natural resources are its beauty and its people, so it is vital that we do not mar the first and it is vital that we maximise the second. Of course giving people skills goes way beyond formal education, I accept that, but that is a really important component, so I think there is something that needs to be said, which is difficult to say but it needs to be said. For decades now Guernsey has been investing far more in secondary education than the UK but achieving mediocre results. There has always been a national conspiracy within the Island to pretend that that is not true. Many people I think genuinely believe that our system outperforms those elsewhere, but that is not true – it is a delusion. That is not an attack on anybody. Everybody involved is dedicated, skilled and hardworking, but Einstein told us that if you keep doing the same thing and expect different outcomes then you are a bit loopy – I think that is paraphrasing him slightly but that is pretty much what he was saying – and he was right. We need to aspire to better. Change is always difficult but we need to change. I am in no way pre-empting exactly what sort of change that should be, partly because that is subject to review at the moment and I am completely open minded, but staying in a comfortable rut is simply not an option – and if we cannot deliver change at a time in our history like this one, with the challenges facing us with the wakeup call that we have got, then when? Being a bit more specific in terms of skills, having identified people and skills as a prime driver of recovery, if we do not just cut through the red tape and fairly speedily deliver a new Guernsey Institute fit for the future – which I think just about everybody in this Assembly actually supports, as far as I can gather (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) – then frankly this Government should hang their head in shame.

I want to finish in a minute with Building Back Better, a phrase I remember very well from the aftermath of the Boxing Day tsunami in 2004; the Clintons were all over Sri Lanka talking about 'building back better'. The only trouble is that such a process is a medium-term project and we have an immediate problem. As Deputy St Pier has hinted, we have the sort of large-scale unemployment that we have not really seen since I was first in the States in the early 1980's and

2945 Guernsey's tomato industry was in rapid decline. What is not clear is whether all that
unemployment is ingrained or whether it is a blip caused by lockdown and the deliberate
cessation of some economic activity and whether it will rapidly recover from that. We do not
know; we need to monitor that very carefully. The coming weeks will be telling and I really hope
that our IT systems are up to speed to allow us to monitor it properly, but whatever the exact size
of the problem I think it is safe to say that we have a significant ongoing problem and it needs
2950 radical short-term solutions, if one is to hand.

Of course government work schemes are never a substitute for jobs created by the private
industries, and we want to stimulate them, we want them to recover, as Deputy St Pier said in his
opening, so they can take up the slack as quickly as possible. But being realistic I think there is
going to be a period of time when there is going to be a significant tranche of unemployment in
2955 Guernsey. I hope I am wrong but I believe that there probably is, and I think it is better for both
the States and for the individuals concerned if we pay them to work rather than pay them not to
work. The question is, I think, for this Assembly what sort of genuinely useful jobs can we create
and create quickly. In the past, life was a bit simpler. The filling-in of the Braye du Valle was only
partly a strategic move to allow the troops to march quickly north from Fort George and to not
2960 allow the French to get a beachhead at the Clos du Valle at high tide, just as much as a very clever
job creation scheme to deter young families from seeking their fortunes in what were then the
colonies at a time when jobs were very hard to come by. There was actually a military reason as
well, because it was the young men that made the militia up and they did not want to lose them
to the colonies. So that was a job creation scheme, and it is quite easy to turn on. Likewise, during
2965 the Great Depression we built the Val des Terres.

These days, large-scale construction projects just do not cut the mustard in terms of
employing hundreds of people with no background in construction. Such projects these days are
highly mechanised and require specialist labour. So the question is what, if anything, in the
modern world we can invest in in the short term to create much-needed jobs until the normal
economy is back firing on all cylinders and taking up that workforce. I stand here and openly
2970 confess that I do not have an oven-ready solution, but I would be very interested to hear what
ideas P&R or CRAG have considered over recent months for taking up that slack in the short
term – in a way, far more interested than hearing about the high-level vision for Guernsey's
recovery, important though that is.

2975 Finally, sir, I do want to talk ... and here probably I am more closely aligned with Deputy ...
Actually, I am quite closely aligned with Deputy St Pier on much of it but in this area in particular
about Building Back Better. 'Better' can be subjective and 'better' is a multi-faceted concept, but
let's start where I wanted to go before, with internal transport – and this is something that Deputy
St Pier has referred to. Few of us I think really enjoyed lockdown. I have known a few people who
2980 have confessed that they did but I think few of us really enjoyed being locked down, but at least it
did allow us to rediscover just how beautiful Guernsey is (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) during
our two hours – occasionally I went a couple of minutes over, sorry – of permitted exercise every
day. In fact, Guernsey was more beautiful than it has been for years. Why? Well, the glorious
weather that seemed to accompany lockdown, fortunately, did certainly help but so did the
2985 quietude, the relatively empty roads and lanes and the resurgence of nature ... I am sure we will
hear a long speech about those later. It would be so sad to lose all of that, but the signs are – I do
not mean to be negative – that unless we act really quickly it could become nothing more than a
golden memory. People will stop cycling and walking and will go back to driving instead, and
ironically their reason for doing it will be because there is too much traffic on the roads. This is not
2990 the time or place to go into detail about how one cuts through that Gordian knot, but it should be
done and it must be done, and the key ingredient I have no doubt about is a bit of political
courage. We live in a small Island which in some ways often acts as an echo chamber and which
just amplifies and amplifies the opposition to any progressive government action that is
proposed, but unless we occasionally have the guts to face down that noise we will never move
2995 forward or do anything progressive. So, let us ignore the sad dinosaurs who regard walking,

cycling or, heaven forfend, buses as the work of Beelzebub, and let us do something fairly radical for the majority of Islanders who actually enjoy a less congested Island.

3000 Talking of buses, obviously they were very little used during lockdown, for obvious reasons, but up until that point they were one of Guernsey's great success stories. Lots of you like to run them down but passenger numbers have been growing remarkably for years. The cynics point out that that is easy to achieve when most of the cost of running the bus service comes from the taxpayer rather than the punters. They are probably right, so why not build on that success? Why not build on the fact that actually a fairly small percentage of the income for the buses comes from the punters and most of it already comes from the taxpayer, and have the courage to trial –
3005 maybe next summer, because that is probably the best time to encourage people on to the buses – a free bus service for six months? (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) The cost involved, in terms of the amount we are going to borrow to stimulate the economy, is not going to be great because actually not a great deal of the money comes from the punters at the moment. It would be great for the locals, it would be great for the visitors that we are trying to get back here and trying to get a buzz about how good Guernsey is – and, if it works, great for reducing congestion on our roads. Maybe it will have no great impact, and if so we can simply go back and say that actually that was a good idea but it did not work, but at least we would be able to make an informed cost-benefit analysis of that sort of activity.

3010 Just before leaving our roads I would say to those driving forward these sorts of initiatives, do not be too scared of noisy opponents when considering further pedestrianisation. When I first came into the States I was not here at the time when the centre of town was pedestrianised but I shared the Assembly with many politicians who had been and they said the most vicious opposition they had from the commercial world was when the High Street and Smith Street and the Pollett were pedestrianised: it was going to kill town because people would not be able to
3020 drive up to Boots and pop in and get whatever. Instead, it has the highest footfall at that particular point of just about anywhere in St Peter Port. So let's have a bit of political courage, like our forefathers did when they drove that through.

3025 Sir, very briefly now because I know we are all going to speak for days about this and I will have lots of time to deal with the detail later – I really hope that this crisis will serve as a springboard to redouble co-operation between the different Islands of the Bailiwick. I know we are separate jurisdictions but that did not stop the West Indies becoming one of the best sides of all time and it should not stop us from working together either.

3030 Finally, I hope that there is no attempt – and it was almost indicated that there might be in Deputy St Pier's opening – to separate the recovery action plans into different beasts that are based on whether they are primarily economic, primarily social or primarily environmental actions. These should be seen as completely interconnected and symbiotic; they are not different beasts. I finish with one example to illustrate this point. If Guernsey were to invest over the next few years heavily in promoting and creating good thermal insulation within its housing stock, it would provide a triple whammy. Should that be in the economic recovery plan? Maybe it should,
3035 because the work involved will create an economic stimulus. Should it be in the environmental recovery plan? Obviously it should, because it would actually be a huge contribution to reducing greenhouse gases because you would not have to put so much energy into heating houses; and we know, don't we, that fuel poverty exists in Guernsey, so it would have a sizeable social benefit. So, these things should not be regarded as in compartments and separate; they are all part of the same thing.

3040 Sir, there could be lots of other examples but I do not think people want me to go on any longer. We can certainly build back better. The biggest barrier to that, though, is not how much money we can borrow on the markets, it is not any of that; the biggest barrier is being simply too scared of our own shadows to do anything progressive. So, let's see some courage and resolution
3045 over the months ahead, because that is the key ingredient in building back better.

Several Members: Hear, hear. (*Applause*)

The Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel.

3050 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, thank you.

As we all know, the recovery strategy is still at the talking shop stage and therefore, as Deputy Roffey has just said, this is a time to engage and this is a time for us to champion our views and our ideas.

3055 Seeing as my colleagues will no doubt cover off everything else, I would like to focus on sport and the arts, the need to support and fund sport and the arts a lot more than we do on our road to recovery. I am going to do that because governments throughout the world in general have never understood the value of sport and the arts to the community and therefore they do not do anything like enough to encourage sport and support the creative side of members of the community. Guernsey is as much to blame for that lack of awareness and that lack of investment
3060 as any other jurisdiction because historically we woefully underfund sport and the arts. The reality is if it was not the dedication, commitment and the input of volunteers, many events here in the Island would not even take place. So there is a lot of healing to be done.

I want to emphasise at this point that I wrote this speech long before I read the plan for sport which we will be debating in August. In fact, I wrote this speech in 2012. I have been saying these
3065 sorts of things for eight years in this Chamber. I have just added the words 'recovery strategy' and 'Revive and Thrive' occasionally.

Even though the plan for sport is asking for £1,150,000, it does not mean the States will agree to that.

3070 **The Bailiff:** Madam Procureur, we are down to 20 Members in the Chamber –

Deputy Lester Queripel: That's because I am speaking, sir.

The Procureur: Sir, it is Presiding Officer plus half the Members, as you are aware, so if we are
3075 now down to 20 – I have not counted in the last five minutes but I have no reason to doubt that number – then we would be.

The Bailiff: Keep going, Deputy Lester Queripel.

3080 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Yes, sir, thank you.

I speak from experience in relation to volunteering because ever since the early 1980's, when my dear friend the late and much missed Joan Ozanne nominated me for a seat on the Arts Council, I have been volunteering for all sorts of things to promote and support the arts here in the Island, and I still am, and the majority of those dozens of events I have volunteered for simply
3085 would not have taken place if it were not for all the volunteers committing their time and their input. Over the decades I have heard all sorts of comments from those volunteers, who enjoy being involved in the events but many of them have often said 'Why don't the States do more?'

Something that really intrigues me about this Revive and Thrive and Build Back Better initiative is how on earth are we supposed to do that whilst we are still having to work within the same
3090 frameworks, the same regulations, the same policies etc. we were working with prior to our being at the mercy of Covid-19. We were totally hamstrung by all of those then, so it stands to reason we are going to be hamstrung by them now – unless of course we do something different. That something, in my view, is to review every piece of legislation, every rule and regulation, every policy and every procedure we currently have in place to see if they need to be amended or even
3095 dispensed with altogether, because they are barriers to progress; they always have been and they will be on our road to recovery. That review might sound like a massive piece of work, but it is not, it does not need to be. I know that some departments have started that already. The DPA have been doing that for quite some time now, even before being at the mercy of Covid-19, via our own action plan. So, if we are going to have any hope whatsoever of building back better, then

3100 every Committee needs to take a long, hard look at the way in which they do things and come up with a proactive plan that seeks to streamline and improve the way they do things.

Of course it does not end there because as those actions are progressed other things come up and Members will find themselves asking questions of themselves like 'Why do we do things like that? It does not make a lot of sense. It is a long, drawn-out procedure enveloped in bureaucracy. 3105 Let's get rid of it.' In my view, that is the way we are going to build back better, by improving and streamlining our procedures and policies and being a lot more proactive, as Deputy Roffey said in his speech. We can be proactive by putting more money into the areas that promote the feel-good factor out in our community and consequently improve the well-being of the members of our community. It is a win-win situation; it ticks all the boxes. What the community needs right 3110 now, as Deputy Fallaize said in his speech earlier today, is action. Let's not spend too long just talking about our recovery. Let's get on with the doing bit as soon as we can.

I am aware that most departments produce a business plan from time to time, but surely everything that was produced pre-Covid-19 now needs to be reviewed. We have to look at enabling a lot more and remove barriers that hinder progress. The barriers that have always 3115 hindered progress in the arts and sport are the lack of funding and the attitude that the States of Guernsey have always had towards the arts and sport. In other words, they always tend to be put towards the bottom of the list in times of crisis, thereby not recognising the value.

Another approach in that situation that really does need to change if we are going to rekindle the feel-good factor we have in our community is put the smiles back on the faces of our fellow 3120 Islanders and bring joy back into their lives, because this is a time of despondency and depression and as John F Kennedy once said in a speech, 'We need now to illuminate the way out of the darkness.' We can do that as long as we change our attitude and our approach and do things differently.

Sir, I need to declare an interest here. I am still active in sport and the arts: I am a musician, I 3125 have several projects going on at the moment, I am a facilitator of the Guernsey Poetry Group and I am President of the Guernsey Walking Football Club. Just as an aside, walking football was the fastest growing sport in the UK prior to Covid-19, and the arts – and this may help Deputy Roffey if he is listening outside the Chamber, because he said 'Where are these new jobs going to come from?' – was the fastest growing industry in the UK, creating dozens of new jobs, in fact hundreds 3130 of new jobs every year. I need to clarify that, because the arts were not the fastest growing industry in the UK because of government investment; the money was coming from Europe as a result of cities in the UK being presented at the City of Culture awards. That means that several million pounds is given to whichever city wins that award and that is why the arts is the fastest growing industry in the whole of the UK, which is terrific news for cities like Hull and Liverpool and 3135 Bath. Unfortunately we are not liable to receive millions of pounds from Europe, so we have to do it ourselves, and there is no reason why we cannot; we just have to have the foresight and the will to do it. We have a golden opportunity in front of our very eyes as far as investing in sport and the arts is concerned and we really do need to grab it with both hands.

Sir, just as Deputy Trott said on several occasions recently we cannot afford not to borrow, I 3140 say we cannot afford not to invest in sport and the arts. We will only get one shot at this, and now is the time. Sport and the arts are proven to be economic enablers, so we really do need to put aside just a little of the tens of millions of pounds we have earmarked – hundreds of millions, in fact – for dealing with and recovering from Covid-19, for sport and the arts, because if say we were to put just another £100,000 into both sports and arts per annum we would see a return on 3145 our investment within the first year.

That is not just bravado speaking. I say that with knowledge as well as confidence because when the Guernsey Walking Football Club staged a walking football tournament last year we ended up with five teams coming over from the UK and two teams coming up from Jersey. That meant that just over 60 people were in the Island that weekend for the tournament. The vast 3150 majority of them stayed in local hotels, spent their money in the shops, in restaurants, in bars on taxis etc. We estimated we brought approximately £15,000 into the Island for that weekend, and it

did not cost a quarter of that for us to stage the tournament. That is just one sports club, one event, one weekend, so the return on any investment will be considerable.

3155 The same goes for the arts, of course. People come to Guernsey and spend money here on all sorts of events: the Guernsey Literary Festival, the Vale Earth Fair and the Chaos Festival to name just three – I have a whole list from the Head of the Guernsey Arts Commission here, but I will not rattle off the whole list. And of course thousands of Islanders also attend those events. But those events are privately sponsored and the money is not going to be there for this year or next year or the year after. Will it ever be there again? We do not know, so we really do need to raise our
3160 game and step up to the plate. If we do not, many of the events that normally take place simply will not take place and Guernsey will lose out big time.

We need to think outside the box, sir. I am going to give two examples of where we lost out recently by not thinking outside of the box. My colleagues are well aware of these; I have mentioned these before. One was when we did not turn the old HMV building in the market in
3165 town into a multi-functional arts centre with much-needed rehearsal and performance space for Islanders. The other was when we did not purchase the Bowl in Victoria Avenue, which incidentally has eight flats within the building so a ready-made income stream was guaranteed. We missed out because we are not proactive enough, and that sort of lackadaisical approach really has to change if we are going to have any hope whatsoever of recovery.

3170 We cannot keep on relying on charities and volunteers to do the things that need to be done to stage events and activities. If we look at paragraph 1.13 of this policy letter we are told that the vision for our recovery is as follows:

We will work in partnership to recover our economic prosperity, build on our inclusive community values and capitalise on our many strengths to make Guernsey a safe haven based on sustaining health, wealth and community.

Sir, that is a wonderful aspiration, and who would not sign up to it? But that is what it is: it is an aspiration. Without action it will always be an aspiration.

3175 If we look at paragraph 3.4, we are told:

The economic aim of this strategy will be to develop and invest in initiatives which ... improve the recovery curve and accelerate the return of jobs and wealth to our community.

Well, sir, investing more money into sport and the arts ticks all of those boxes because they are both economic enablers. They promote the feel-good factor out in our community and therefore improve the well-being of the members of our community, they tick all the boxes in relation to the healthy weight strategy, and at the same time as doing all of that they give our economy a
3180 much-needed shot in the arm. And of course we must not forget that other wonderful aspiration which is at the top of our list, which is of course to make the Bailiwick one of the healthiest and happiest places in the world. The truth is we were not doing enough for sport and the arts anyway to get anywhere near attaining that aspiration, so in order to do that as well as to build back better we need to invest a lot more in sport and the arts and it would be extremely short sighted
3185 of us not to do that.

Of course we have some very enthusiastic people working within our Arts Commission and our Sports Commission. They are all driven by a love and a passion for sport and the arts. We do not need any more passion or enthusiasm, although I am sure another paid employee at both Commissions would be most welcome; what is really needed right now is more money for them to
3190 be able to do more and to be able to build back better. Islanders can be extremely creative if they are given the opportunity and the facilities. Look what they did in the darkest hours of lockdown when they built several hundred wonderful pebble sculptures on the sea walls.

I ask P&R, through the Chair, please bear all of the things in mind that I am saying here when they are preparing the action plans for this strategy because they are all crucial points to bear in
3195 mind. I would even be so bold, sir, as to ask them to make that a Proposition in an action plan to ask the States to agree to another £100,000 – or more if P&R are feeling generous – to be added

to the budgets of the Sports Commission and the Arts Commission per annum to assist in their quest to build back better. In saying that, I realise of course if P&R decide not to include that Proposition I could lay an amendment, but compiling and preparing amendments takes up valuable time and resources so as to cause a debate on the amendment itself, and all of that valuable time and resource could be saved if that were an actual Proposition in the first place.

3200

Moving towards a close – I was just waiting for Deputy Inder to say ‘good’ there, as he normally says ‘good’ when I say that (*Interjection*) – I just want to spend a moment focusing on figures that would be involved if my idea were to be pursued. Bearing in mind there are approximately 45,000 taxpayers here in the Island, every taxpayer would pay approximately £4.45 a year, which breaks down to 8 pence a week to cover that extra £200,000 going towards the Arts Commission and the Sports Commission. I think that is incredible value for money, 8 pence a week per taxpayer. If we do not invest more money into sport and the arts then we do that at our peril, bearing in mind that in order for us to be able to build back better we are going to have to do a lot more than we were doing pre Covid-19.

3205

3210

I will close, sir, by once more taking a leaf out of my good friend Deputy Trott’s book and say can we afford –? I give way to Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you, sir.

3215

I was just intrigued. He has spent an awful long time, for a Member of the DPA, talking about his passion, which is sport. I was hoping to hear from a Member of DPA what they could do in terms of lifting some of the restrictions or possibly for giving some of the planning applications you could actually lift the economy over the next two or three months. I am not encouraging Deputy Lester Queripel to sit down because I did not say ‘good’; I was actually waiting to hear the killer argument from the DPA, which quite clearly is one of the restrictions he was talking about and possibly one of the solutions that could basically push the economy forward. So he might want to spend five minutes talking about what the DPA could actually do, because I see them as part of the problem.

3220

3225

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, if Deputy Inder sees the DPA as part of the problem, he needs to do something about it. (*Interjection*)

I said at the top of my speech I am going to focus on the need to fund and support the arts and sport a lot more. I made that quite clear. I understand Deputy Inder may not have been in the Chamber at that time. I am the second one to speak in this debate. There are five Members on the DPA. Deputy Inder seems to be forgetting that all of them could focus on the Development Planning Authority processes and procedures, but I did say – and again I appreciate he may not have been in here at the time. I would remind him we have got an action plan and I would remind him, sir, if he has not read it, to read it, and if he has read it to re-read it because a lot of what is in that action plan has been put together by the Committee Members on the DPA with the intention of removing all the barriers that we can see that hinder development. I repeat, sir: if Deputy Inder has got a problem with the way the DPA operates he needs to do something about it and not just look to somebody else to do something about it.

3230

3235

Sir, I need to move back to the top of the page – it is only a few sentences, if you will indulge me. Moving towards a close, I want to spend a moment focusing on figures that would be involved if my idea were to be pursued, because bearing in mind there are approximately 45,000 taxpayers here in the Island, every taxpayer would pay approximately 8 pence a week to cover the extra cost of £200,000 going towards the Sports Commission and the Arts Commission. As I said, I see that as incredible value for money and I can only hope P&R and all the people they consult with putting these action plans together agree with me.

3240

3245

Now, sir, in closing I will take a leaf out of my good friend Deputy Trott’s book once more and say can we afford not to invest more money in sport and the arts?

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

3250

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, Deputy Roffey said, rightly, what a beautiful place, what a beautiful Island this is, what a beautiful Channel Islands we live in, what a beautiful Bailiwick – I absolutely agree with him – and that we have had wonderful sunshine, we have had less traffic, we have had less traffic noise and we should encourage perhaps a more expansive bus service. I agree with all of that. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) He also said that perhaps we should change the way we think.

3255

I think this is the third or fourth speech today. We are coming to the conclusion of the fifth day of this States' debate, we had a long States' debate last time, so I am not sure what leadership we are showing in relation to the way we do things. We have gone back to our old trench warfare debates in the way that we are operating in this States. We are not showing any leadership, we are not showing any way of changing our way of working at all. Words are fine, but not if they do not do anything. It would be helpful perhaps if we restricted our speeches to perhaps just things that we really needed to speak about.

3260

In relation to this particular topic, I think it is not a fluffy document. I think it is a very well balanced document and I think Deputy St Pier's opening speech was good, pragmatic, realistic and optimistic. When I look at where we come from in Guernsey I do not want to forget our past because Guernsey ... My lot were here, peasant class admittedly but they were here when Abraham was a boy and they have been here for thousands of years, let alone hundreds of years, and Guernsey has given me, in my life, an opportunity that nowhere else would have given. From my modest abilities I have been able to live a very good lifestyle. I have travelled to over 50 countries, some of those countries I have travelled to many times and I therefore have experienced life elsewhere, I have lived elsewhere, and let me just say the quality of life that we have had over the last 50 or 60 years is not matched by any other community. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) Monaco may be richer, but who would want to live in Monaco? Other countries may have some countryside, they may be bigger, they may have more opportunities for travel, but they have not got all the things that we have got. So let's look forward, let's be optimistic.

3270

3275

Deputy Trott said – and there is no conflict between what he said and what Deputy St Pier has said; I am talking about what Deputy Trott has said in previous debates – that we are facing a heck of a recession, we are facing a heck of an economic challenge. He is being realistic. We have seen in other contexts other communities saying it is the worst for 90 years. It is the worst for 300 years. I think it is 300 years because the reason that Sir Robert Walpole became Britain's first Prime Minister in 1721 is because they had just got through a really bad economic crisis and therefore they thought they needed cabinet and executive government. We talk about consensus government here and there is one paragraph in the policy letter which says effectively we are in a position whereby we talk too much and we do too little.

3280

3285

When I was in the States in 1994 to 2000 it was not a golden age, it was a different age, and in relation to that I think our revenues were, by the time I left the States at the end of April 2000, something like £200 million or thereabouts. They are now not far short of £500 million, so they have gone up dramatically. They have gone up well above inflation because up to about 2008 or 2009 they were golden years. They were years of abundance: anybody could have been Treasury Minister in those days and turned in a balance, *anybody*. You did not have to be – and I am not saying that history showed that (*Laughter*) – a particular person at a particular time, but it became more difficult after that, and then seven or eight years ago Deputy St Pier came along and has helped our finances with his steady administration of those finances over the last seven years and we are in a much better position than we were six, seven, eight years ago.

3290

3295

But we are now in a difficult position. We have had the loss of revenue of £75 million to £90 million. The figures that Deputy St Pier has given are in the documents that we have seen. When you add another £40 million next year or thereabouts it is well over £100 million. For our tiny little economy that is a great sum. But although we have got the plaudits of a well-above-inflation increase in our revenues we have got the debits of the fact that our expenditure has gone up well above inflation, and that is because we and the previous Assemblies have put their

3300

hands up ... Somebody has come up with a pet project, up goes the hand: just another £300,000, just another £500,000, just another £1 million, and they all add up – £1 million and £500,000 and £300,000, that is £1.8 million. That is a mere bagatelle, of course. Why should we worry about a mere £1.8 million when we have got £450 million, £470 million to spend? Well, then we have got this and we have got that.

3305

The next policy letter that we will debate talks about, I think, four or five statutory reforms, all of which will cost a lot of money, all of which will be approved by this Assembly almost by a unanimous vote. We will approve more legislation, we will approve more documentation, we will approve more civil servants, we will approve more cost, we will approve less incentive – and we will do all those kinds of things and think we are doing a good thing because there is an election just round the corner and it is the right thing to do and we should be doing that. In fact, what we should be doing is stripping back and going back to the old Guernsey – the Guernsey where people were entrepreneurial, the Guernsey where regulation was not the king, the Guernsey where procedure was not important but substance was.

3310

Deputy Inder, in his proper interruption of Deputy Lester Queripel's speech, talked about the DPA. I do not criticise the DPA. They are administering the planning system as it is. We were in the States when the Island Development Plan was passed, and it was passed overwhelmingly by this States but it is now not fit for purpose.

3315

We have got a GFSC that administers all the rules and regulations with great propriety and great skill but we are stifling, in the finance sector, enterprise because we are overregulated, we are over cautious, we are averse to risk, we are frightened to do anything. Deputy Trott again in his four or five years as Chairman of Guernsey Finance has done his best to reverse that, but he has not been completely successful – and that is not a criticism of him because he has done his best.

3320

I am not going to give way. Deputy Tindall will be able to make another speech in due course.

3325

I applaud all of these good words. Deputy St Pier has laid the balance. Somebody said, 'What does CRAG actually do?' I think Deputy Roffey asked, 'What does CRAG actually, in practical terms, achieve?' The answer is not much. We have only met a few times and we do not really achieve much. We talk but we have not actually come up with any concrete policies. We have not come up with anything that is going to change Guernsey as it should be changed.

3330

Let me tell you what I would do. I know this is the detail sense, but Deputy Lester Queripel quite rightly talked about that in his speech, certain things that he would want to see with sport and the arts, and Deputy Roffey talked about certain things about public travel in his speech. I would say this: I would have a local action force in relation to the finance sector and it would be comprised of people with entrepreneurial skills and entrepreneurial experience who were not regulators, who would sit down perhaps under the chairmanship of somebody like, for example, Deputy Trott, and they would be mandated to come back in three or four months with proposals about, whilst keeping our reputation as a first-rate finance centre, reining back regulation and reining back the way that the GFSC works so that we are not so risk averse.

3335

In relation to planning, I would do the same with people interested in that particular topic and I would be saying to them, again within the same timeframe, come back and talk about changing our planning procedures completely. That is not a criticism of the planning service because I think the officers that operate that service do a jolly good job, but change the way that we do those things in relation to that.

3340

Deputy Roffey talked about our mediocre education results, and he is right – we say we have got a marvellous education system; we have not. We have made decisions in this States which I think will make it more mediocre and I hope we can change those going forward. I would be saying, in relation to the proposal to do the two mega-schools, that those are days of yore now, they are not going to happen (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and we should be addressing that and should not be spending £100-odd million, or whatever the pounds is, in relation to that system. We should be looking at something more innovative, more appropriate and better for Guernsey. I do not want us to be East Ham or West Sussex; I want us to be Guernsey.

3345

3350

3355 I would say generally in connection with rules and regulations on connectivity I agree to a large extent with Deputy Roffey. I voted unreservedly for the open skies policy because I do not like rules and regulations unless they are absolutely necessary, but we live in a different world now and just like you go to other airports and you see generally a preponderance of one airline's aircraft on the tarmac ... In Southampton you used to see Flybe. Well, you are not going to see too many of those now, but that was the kind of thing that you saw. In Scottish airports you would see Loganair or whatever. I want to see Aurigny. I want to see Aurigny because Aurigny will make our
3360 future, will give our air connections, so therefore I want to see – I do not know if we are allowed to use this phrase in the modern idiom, but I am going to use it – more subsidised routes to encourage air travel to and from this Island. I want to see a better relationship with our sea providers.

I generally want us to do things that are going to make this Island what it was, albeit better.
3365 People have got a much better standard of living now than they did when I was a kid. Not many people had got outside toilets – I am not going to mention that again – but we did and all my mates had them. The first time I knew people who all had inside toilets was when I met the fee-paying boys from Elizabeth College. (*Laughter*) They all had them. We went outside and they went inside – anyway, we have got over that.

3370 What the document that is attached to the policy letter shows is that at the time of writing it talked about a thousand unemployed; we have now got over 1,600. I saw Deputy de Clerc very sensibly ... she always does, but very sensibly talk on the TV last night about 5.2%, I think it is, of our working population. We have not had figures like that for donkey's years. Going back to the early 1980's, when the tomato industry was collapsing about our ears, that was a real worry. I do
3375 not think 1,600 is the end figure. I am not going to go and speculate 3,000 or whatever. A hundred is too many but 1,600 is far too many. But if we just carry on as we are and we just talk and we have five-day debates and we have a full debate ... What did we have, four hours? Deputy Inder said at the beginning of this morning 'I hope we are not going to spend four hours on talking about the election issues' and we spent four hours and 15 minutes, I think, so he was
3380 pretty accurate really. But if we are going to do that we are not going to take our society any further forward.

In relation to the hospitality sector I would sit down with representatives of the hospitality sector, again with a politician – e.g. Deputy Mooney, because he is the man who is responsible for that under Economic Development, a person I have worked with and I have got great confidence
3385 in – and say, 'Okay, ladies and gentlemen, what do you want? What can we do for you? What can you do for Guernsey? What can you do for the Bailiwick of Guernsey?' and come back with something not in three or four years but three, four or six months, because that is the kind of timeframe that we have got. There is no point in keeping hotels – I declare a conflict of interest; I have got interests in most things – in the industry that are never going to be able to be occupied or to be profitable. There is no point having the kind of procedures and practices that we have
3390 got, that trap people into poverty and make them run businesses they have got not a snowball's chance of ever making any money in.

The Population Management Law ... I do take Deputy Roffey's point, I do not want 75,000 people in Guernsey, I do not want our green fields built on, I do not want us having high-rise
3395 buildings, but people move in and out of economies nowadays. He talked about Estonia, which used to be one of the poor men of Europe. It is now, with its 1.4 million or thereabouts population, one of the success stories of Europe in every way. It has not only got beautiful countryside, it has got high national product, it has got high gross domestic product. It is a success. I want us to be better than Estonia – well, we are better than Estonia, we are better than
3400 anywhere, but we can be better than we are, better and better. But we are not going to do it by just saying we are going to do it; we have actually got to do something. We need some action plans. Let's get on with it.

A Member: Hear, hear.

3405 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Paint.

Deputy Paint: Thank you, sir.

It is all very well and good to make these fancy predictions or hopeful predictions for the future, but is it getting us anywhere? How practical can they be? We need to look at things that are practical and will gain us profit in one way, employment in others. It needs to be done.

3410 For a start, what are we going to do about Brexit? Are we going to be dictated to by the UK on whether we can trade with Europe, or are they going to give us a free hand in it – because that would be a real advantage if we could. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Some of us are actually looking at that at the moment – Deputy Ferbrache, Deputy Inder and a few civil servants – so that is a start, but at least we have got to make a start somewhere. It might fall altogether in December, but at least we will have tried.

3415 We hear a lot about the environment: we have got to do this, we have got to do that. In three to five years' time you cannot buy diesel cars. Just a minute, there are 700 ships going up and down the Channel every day burning hundreds of tonnes of fuel – how are you going to stop that? You will not be able to stop it. It affects our air from the Dover Strait down to the middle of the Bay of Biscay and perhaps beyond that, where the fumes from these ships are coming in depending on the wind direction. What can we do about the aeroplanes that pass over here every day within our airspace, burning hundreds of tonnes of fuel as well? Not only that, only 30 miles away there is a motorway that leads from Caen all the way down to St Malo on to Brest. When the wind is in the right direction we are going to get those fumes. We are 65,000 people if you include Alderney and Sark; that is all we are. The amount of fuel we burn here is nothing compared to what is being burnt round us and passes through us. You have got to think about that. We do not need to shoot ourselves in the foot to make regulations here that are going to actually damage our future. Really speaking, what can we do?

3420 We have to look at things differently, and I do agree with that but we have got to look at it practically as well. We have to make sure that we are not shooting ourselves in the foot, as I said earlier, because of what we do. This maybe a start but you have got to think about every aspect of it.

3430 Thank you, sir.

3435 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, I am going to put to you a motion that when we finish the business of today we adjourn to 9.30 tomorrow. Because you are in the flow of this debate it seems to make sense to continue it whilst it is still fresh in your memories, so I am going to put that motion to you now that, when we adjourn, we adjourn to 9.30 tomorrow morning. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare that carried.

Who wishes to speak now, or do you want to simply adjourn overnight? Does anyone want to suggest that we sit late?

3445 **Deputy Roffey:** Sir, I do not want to speak – I already have – but I wanted to ask you are we expected to put Friday aside as well, or not? Planning other activities is quite difficult at the moment.

3450 **The Bailiff:** I agree with that. Is there anyone who wants to propose a motion that if we do not complete the business of this meeting tomorrow we sit on Friday?

A Member: Yes, please, sir. (*Interjections*)

The Bailiff: Can I speak against that? (*Laughter*)

3455 In that case, Members of the States, I will also put to you the motion that if there is a need to adjourn from tomorrow – and I sincerely hope there will not be – it is an adjournment into Friday. Those in favour; those against.

Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.

The Bailiff: I think that is quite close.

3460 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Recorded vote, sir, please.

The Bailiff: We will take a recorded vote on this then, Greffier. This is to have an overspill day on Friday if it is needed, Members of the States.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 20, Contre 14, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 4

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

3465 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, the voting on the motion that if Friday is needed, Friday be a further day of sitting was there voted *Pour 20, Contre 14, 1 abstention, 4 absentees*, and therefore the motion is carried.

Members of the States, I think in those circumstances we will adjourn now until 9.30 tomorrow morning.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.33 p.m.