



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

**St James' Assembly and Concert Hall, Guernsey,
Friday, 20th March 2020**

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

Volume 9, No. 13

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

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

Law Officers

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

People's Deputies

St Peter Port South

Deputies P. T. R. Ferbrache, 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

St Sampson

Deputies L. S. Trott, 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,

The Castel

Deputies R. Graham L.V.O., M. B. E., C. J. Green

The West

Deputies A. H. Brouard, A. C. Dudley-Owen,
E. A. McSwiggan, S. L. Langlois

The South-East

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

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

C. Foster (H.M. Deputy Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

R. M. Titterington, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller);
Deputies J. I. Mooney, and J. P. Le Tocq (*relevé à 09h 42*);
Deputies M. P. Leadbeater, P. R. Le Pelley (*indisposé*), J. C. S. F. Smithies, S. T. Hansmann Rouxel
(*indisposée*), B. J. E. Paint (*indisposé*), M. H. Dorey (*indisposé*), D. de G. de Lisle (*indisposé*),
V. S. Oliver (*indisposée*); Alderney Representatives S. Roberts and A. Snowdon (*indisposés*)

Business transacted

Evocation	969
Procedural – Proxy Vote	969
Billet d’État VIII.....	969
II. Review of the Structure of Secondary & Further Education: Next Steps – Debate continued	969
Procedural	973
Review of the Structure of Secondary & Further Education: Next Steps – Debate concluded – Propositions 1-10, 12 carried	974
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 11.21 a.m. and resumed at 11.44 a.m.</i>	<i>994</i>
Procedural – Order of Business	994
IV. Five-year Review of the Island Development Plan – Debate commenced	995
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.31 p.m. and resumed at 2.30 p.m.</i>	<i>1006</i>
Procedural – Suspension of debate on Item IV, Five Year Review of the Island Development Plan	1006
Urgent Propositions under Rule 18.....	1007
Covid-19 Pandemic – Initial Economic and Financial Response – Debate commenced	1007
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 2.55 p.m. and resumed at 3.05 p.m.</i>	<i>1011</i>
Covid-19 Pandemic – Initial Economic and Financial Response – Debate continued.....	1012
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 4.11 p.m. and resumed at 4.24 p.m.</i>	<i>1026</i>
Covid-19 Pandemic – Debate continued – Propositions carried.....	1026
Procedural – Live streaming of proceedings approved; thanks to Members and staff	1041
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.39 p.m.</i>	<i>1041</i>

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Deputy Greffier

EVOCATION

Procedural – Proxy Vote

Deputy Roffey: Sir, I am sorry I missed Deputy Paint. He is *indisposé* and I will be acting as his proxy vote.

The Bailiff: Thank you.

Billet d'État VIII

COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

II. Review of the Structure of Secondary & Further Education: Next Steps – Debate continued

Article II.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter entitled 'Review of the Future Structure of Secondary & Further Education: Next Steps', dated 11th March 2020, they are of the opinion:-

- 1. To agree to the continuation of the development, which is already well under way, of a single States' secondary school operating across a number of sites (initially four sites).*
- 2. To agree that the Policy Letter to be laid before the States by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture which will allow the States to determine the future model of secondary education must also include any revisions necessary to the timeline and authorised budget for the capital project associated with the development of The Guernsey Institute at Les Ozouets.*
- 3. To agree that the Policy Letter to be laid before the States by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture which will allow the States to determine the future model of secondary education must also include any revisions necessary to the timeline and authorised budget for the capital project associated with the redevelopment of La Mare de Carteret Primary School.*

4. To agree that the authority delegated to the Policy & Resources Committee by the States on the 6th of September 2019 to approve expenditure on various aspects of the Transforming Education Programme shall be varied by increasing the authority delegated in relation to digital infrastructure and services in schools and colleges by £600,000 and reducing the authority delegated in relation to the secondary school by the same amount.

5. To agree that the review of models of secondary education against the 'benchmark' model of two 11-18 colleges, which was directed by the States on the 3rd of March 2020, shall be restricted to models organising secondary education in one school in the following configuration of colleges or campuses:

- a) Three 11-18 colleges;
- b) Two 11-16 colleges and one 11-18 college; and
- c) Three 11-16 colleges and a separate sixth form college on a different site.

6. To agree that the review of models of secondary education against the 'benchmark' model of two 11-18 colleges, which was directed by the States on the 3rd of March 2020, and for which the baseline assumptions shall be those used in the model of two 11-18 colleges in order to provide a genuine like-for-like comparison, shall include assessment of the following indicative considerations but that the Committee shall be free to include other considerations should it see fit:

Quality of education –

- Promoting the highest possible standards and outcomes;
- Range and equality of opportunities, including curriculum and facilities;
- Curriculum breadth and opportunities to group students flexibly;
- Standard of and access to facilities indoors and outdoors;
- Recruitment, retention, flexibility, and resilience of staff teams;
- Pastoral support and wellbeing of students and staff;
- Support for students with special educational needs or disabilities;
- Pupil teacher ratios and average class sizes;
- Extra-curricular and enrichment opportunities; and
- Ease of transition between different phases of education.

Value for money –

- Capital expenditure;
- Revenue expenditure: making the best use of the funds the States are prepared to spend on secondary education annually; and
- Transition costs to move from the status quo to the new model.

Infrastructure & organisation –

- Infrastructure at the school sites;
- Infrastructure around the school sites;
- Capacity and capability of the States to implement the model;
- Consistency with States' strategic objectives; and
- School operational issues which are specific to any particular model (excluding those which are general to all models).

7. To note that many of the representations received from teachers and others in advance of the States' debate on education which led to the Resolutions made on the 3rd of March 2020 concerned issues which were only partially related or in some cases unrelated to secondary education models - in particular, these issues were the internal space planned and the external space available at the school sites and the configuration of that space and the day-to-day operation of the school and its constituent colleges - and therefore to agree that the review of secondary education models shall allow opportunities for discussions about space standards, the configuration of space and the day-to-day operation of the school and its constituent colleges, in particular with unions representing teachers and support staff, and to direct the Committee to take into account these discussions when recommending to the States the optimum future model of secondary education following the review of secondary education models.

8. To agree that the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture as presently constituted shall remain in office until the normal end of committees' terms of office on the 30th of June 2020.

9. To direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, following the review of secondary education models, to submit its Policy Letter to the States in time for the matter to be included on the 'Schedule for Future Business' not later than at the Meeting of the States which will start on the 28th of April 2021; and further to note that there would be nothing to preclude the Committee from submitting the Policy Letter sooner if it felt able to do so; and to direct the Committee to attach Propositions to the Policy Letter to allow the States to determine the future model of secondary education and to introduce the future model as soon as practicable.

10. To direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, as expeditiously as possible, to draw up a plan for stakeholder engagement to inform the review of secondary education models and this plan shall pay particular regard to the need for improved engagement with unions representing teachers and support staff in secondary schools.

11. To note that the costs of pausing the development of the two 11-18 colleges previously agreed by the States and carrying out a review of other secondary education models against the model of two 11-18 colleges are estimated to be up to £2.5million; and to direct the Policy & Resources Committee to make appropriate budget arrangements to fund these costs.

12. To note that pausing the development of the two 11-18 colleges previously agreed by the States and the consequential effects of doing so will result at least in the deferral of revenue savings on secondary and possibly further education; and to direct the Policy & Resources Committee to take this into account when recommending the annual cash limit of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture in future years and when assessing the success or otherwise of the Committee's extant revenue savings plan.

- 5 **The Deputy Greffier:** Billet d'État VIII, Article II – Committee for Education, Sport & Culture – Review of the Structure of Secondary & Further Education: Next Steps. Continuation of debate.

The Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Tooley.

- 10 **Deputy Tooley:** Thank you, sir. I am going to keep my speech brief. I waited to speak in the debate two weeks ago and was then cut short, in fact cut out by the guillotine motion and so, although I thought about not speaking today, in order to move things along more quickly, there are some things that I really feel need to be said and need to be said by me, because they are my things to say, if that makes sense.

- 15 I have to say that, while it has been said that there are lots of people out there who do not know why ESC are bringing this paper, there are a huge number, very many, who have contacted us to say how pleased they are that we are bringing this paper. That includes teachers who have told me that they have signed the letters and so on. Because having heard in the wake of the debate just what the Requête did and did not cover, they have decided that, actually, it did not say what they
20 thought it said and, while they did in some cases want a pause, it was not for the things that the Requête specified that they wanted that pause to happen.

- They have told us that they are glad this paper has been brought, they are glad that we are seeking to put some meat on some very wobbly, I was going to say bones, but more cartilage than bone, in terms of the skeleton of what we were presented with, with the Requête and that they are
25 pleased that this is coming to the States

- There are a number of them who have also said how pleased they would be to see the current Committee continue and I do not think it is accurate in any way for anyone to say that they absolutely know how the absolute majority of people anywhere on this Island feel on this issue. Because at no point have they been asked.

- 30 Deputy Dudley-Owen yesterday described a number of the Propositions in the policy letter as ambiguous and open to interpretation; ambiguous and therefore meaningless. I wrote it down because I remember thinking –

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Point of correction, sir.

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

Deputy Dudley-Owen: At no point did I describe the Propositions as ambiguous and therefore meaningless. I described the critical success factors in the quality of education as ambiguous, therefore meaningless. Thank you.

40

Deputy Tooley: I thank Deputy Dudley-Owen. That is not the way I remembered it, but I accept that that might indeed be what she said. It is interesting, because that is exactly how I felt about the Requête and, in fact, when we sat down with some of the requérants in advance of the of the debate, to talk about what they felt should be explored, what level of detail they felt should be gone into for the Requête, the answers were: 'That is for you to interpret. That is for you to decide.'

45

It was very obvious, in the conversation that we had, to me, that the Requête had been left, deliberately ambiguous; deliberately open to interpretation. While that is all very well if that was what was intended, when we are setting out the stall for what the review ought to be, into how our education should be delivered, it must not be ambiguous and open to interpretation. We must have absolutely clarity.

50

Because, otherwise, what will happen is that, whoever it is, will go away and do a review, and will return to the States, and will then be asked questions of, why did you not cover this? I do not think this is comprehensive if it did not cover that. In fact, I raised that exact issue with the requérants during that meeting, and the answer was, 'We will deal with that when we come to it.'

55

Well that is not good enough for our children and young people. This policy letter seeks to establish what it is that the States want investigated, what it is that the States want in terms of detail brought back to the Assembly, to enable them to make a decision that the States have decided may need to be revisited.

Because that is what the States have decided. That we might need to revisit this decision. Contrary to what Deputy Ferbrache said yesterday, the lyric of that song is, 'We have already said goodbye.' Well, we have not said goodbye. What we have said is we might need to change direction, so stop where you are while we work that out.

60

It is not we have already said goodbye, go now. It is we have said, 'We might have to change direction.' And that is what the review is about. Few people have more or even as much skin in the game as I have. I am a former teacher, I have five children in the education system, two in secondary school, one in year 6, and two in year 3, who had their eighth birthday yesterday. Children who will be directly affected, as many others who are related to people in the Chamber and thousands of others who are related to people out in the streets, have.

65

I have been working on the proposals for the agreed States' Resolution to the one school and two colleges model, for the last two-and-a-half years. So I was reluctant, at the last States' Meeting, to let go of the model that I believe is best for Guernsey, best for its children, best for its business and for its future. You bet I was reluctant to let go of that model. Do I still believe it is the best model? Yes. I do. And I am not ashamed to say so.

70

Now, that might lead some to think that my motives, in wanting to carry out and continue to be part of the ESC who deliver the review, are dubious. That this is a clever subterfuge, in order that we can go away for a few months, shuffle a few bits of paper and try to look busy, before coming back to say, 'Ta-da! Look, it is the one-school, two-colleges model.'

75

But that would be to suggest that we have proposed and worked on this model for some obscure reason, because we liked the number two, perhaps, or because I do not know, I am sure social media commentators will fill in the gap with dozens of false reasons why that is the model we resolved on as a States. Cost appears to be one of the main reasons people are suggesting.

80

I am interested in the costs, of course I am. But I would put education higher up the priority lists than an awful lot of other things. So, for me, this is not all about the need to drive down expenditure on education. Deputy Ferbrache, yesterday, quoted from The Moody Blues and I would like to bring

85 us a little bit more up to date, because when I started to think in the wake of the debate, about what I should do next, what my next move should be, I fell back on the words of that great 1980's spokesman, Joe Strummer.

Should I stay, or should I go now?

Should we stay, or should we go now? And I acknowledge that, if we stay, there will be trouble, But, if we go, it will be double. (*Laughter*) In the aftermath of the debate, two weeks ago, faced with
90 this, the new set of parameters, I had to make the decision about whether I initially wanted to be part of such a review, whether I felt I could be part of such of review, but the truth, and it is the absolute truth, is the only thing that the Members of this Committee have ever wanted, is to deliver for the children and young people of Guernsey the very best education system we can provide.

In this aftermath of the debate, faced with these slightly different parameters, the motive has
95 not changed. The motive behind transformation of education is to ensure that the children and young people of Guernsey receive the very best education Guernsey can provide, and I accept, absolutely, that if this States or its successors do not want that to be delivered through two 11-18 colleges, then we need to find another way. Another way, which will not compromise on curriculum offer, or on equality, which will offer children from all backgrounds the keys to the world of learning
100 and to the real world at their feet.

I am a parent. I, like all good parents, many of them in this room, many of them out in our streets, many of them keeping their children in at the moment, want what is best for my children. I want to give them the bright, brilliant present and future we know they deserve. I want that for all Guernsey's children. My motives, in seeking to continue to be part of the Education, Sport & Culture Committee
105 that will deliver that review, are pure and aimed only at ensuring that children and young people get the best education can offer.

I can and do promise that any review I and my fellow Members are involved with, will be fair and balanced and delivered with only one aim, that of ensuring that Guernsey is presented with the model of education that Guernsey's children deserve and which Guernsey's teachers will travel with
110 us on the path toward. Thank you.

Procedural

The Bailiff: Just before I call the next Speaker, Deputy Le Tocq, do you wish to be relevé?

Deputy Le Tocq: Please sir, thank you.

115 **The Bailiff:** And if I pause a moment, I think maybe Deputy Mooney might wish to be relevé and I just want to deal with a few other points before we move on. Deputy Mooney, do you wish to be relevé?

120 **Deputy Mooney:** Yes sir, thank you.

The Bailiff: You may both be relevés. I had a note passed to me about removing jackets. I suspect it is a joke, but if anybody is so warm in here, then they either need to go home and self-isolate or, if they are really satisfied they are well, they may remove their jacket! (*Laughter*)

125 A Statutory Instrument has been laid on Members' desks, which will need to be laid before the States later. Number 24/2020, the Emergency Powers (Coronavirus) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Regulations, 2020. That will be a Rule 18 Proposition, which will be laid before the States. We will deal with that this afternoon and there may be at least one other Rule 18 Proposition, which will need to be laid. It will be circulated, I am told, during the course of the morning. Members will have

the opportunity to consider those over the lunch hour and we will deal with them this afternoon, probably when we return at 2.30 p.m., to make sure that they are dealt with.

I just wanted to say one other thing. I do feel the layout of the Chamber is such that it would be possible to televise the Meeting. I leave the thought with you but, before we close today, I may be putting to you a Proposition that you consider granting permission to enable a television camera to be present when we next meet, but I am not going to put that to you now. I just leave that as something that you can think about. I do think the layout here enables one camera to perhaps capture the debate in a way that is not possible when we are normally in the Royal Court Chamber. So that was all I was going to say.

**Review of the Structure of Secondary & Further Education: Next Steps –
Debate concluded –
Propositions 1-10, 12 carried**

The Bailiff: Who wishes to speak next? Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Thank you, sir. Well, I will start by putting my cards on the table and then unpack some of the points that I want to make later. Firstly, I think Education were right to bring a policy letter to the States. I think they are proposing to look at the right options. I think they will need additional resources to do the work and I have confidence in the present Committee to do the work.

At the end of the last debate, turning to the first of those, I thought that ESC should simply sit down with the requérants and narrow the scope of the review. The terms of the Requête were clearly too wide, too vague, and the timetable proposed was clearly impossible to achieve and I thought that, by sensible negotiation between the parties, an agreement could be reached on what needed to be looked at. But we have heard this morning, from Deputy Tooley, that attempts to have that kind of conversation came to nought, and it seems to me clear now that the States have to resolve the matter and provide clarity about what needs to be done.

I give way to Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: I thank you for giving way. Perhaps to clarify the situation, I think the meeting that Deputy Tooley was referring to, was a meeting actually before the debate and not any meeting since. I was one of the requérants, and I have not been invited by anybody to attend any meeting since the States' debate, just to clarify that. There is no way that Deputy Parkinson would know that, so I thought it was useful just to clarify that and I notice Deputy Tooley was nodding as I said that. Thank you, sir.

Deputy Parkinson: Well ... I give way to Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: I am grateful to Deputy Parkinson. Subsequent to the debate, the contact I tried to establish with the requérants was through Deputy Dudley-Owen. I asked if she would be prepared to sit down and discuss how she saw the Committee and the review being taken forward and I did not have any reply. Subsequently, Deputy Dudley-Owen said to the media that she was not prepared to have discussions behind closed doors. But Deputy Prow is right, there was no contact between me or, as far as I know, any other Member of our Committee, and any other requérant.

Deputy Parkinson: Obviously, I was not party to any potential discussions or otherwise. Oh dear, do I have to give way? Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, Deputy Parkinson. Through you, sir, I very much appreciate that because I think it is here that there is something that I did not really want to say, but I was contacted by Deputy Fallaize at half past midnight, the night after the vote of the Requête, which looked like, to me, some sort of back door deal about sharing the presidency of Education, Sport & Culture. I do not do back door deals or dark room corridor conversations about presidencies, which are not in my gift to have and therefore I told Deputy Fallaize at the time that, if an opportunity arose, I would put myself forward as President of Education, Sport & Culture and it was up to his Committee to make the decision whether they stayed or they went.

Deputy Parkinson: Well, I think probably that conversation has gone on long enough. Can we move on, Deputy Fallaize? The simple fact is this exchange has vividly illustrated that there is no common ground between the two sides. The tone of some of the speeches of the critics of the present Committee yesterday, particularly, was to say the least, pretty uncompromising and there is evidently no middle ground on what this review should be undertaking or looking at.

So my point remains that it is right that Education bring this matter back to the Assembly and that the Assembly decides what are the options to be looked at. That was my first point. I think they are looking at the right options. Now, it is well known that I favour one option in particular and also that I think that some of the options that they are looking at should be rejected out of hand and indeed they have been looked at on several previous occasions and rejected for good reason.

But I accept they must be included in the review, because they have their supporters and the review will not be satisfactory to as many people as possible, which must be the aim of it, unless many of the serious candidates are given serious consideration. I console myself with the thought that the work involved in reviewing those options, which I consider to be a dead end, should not be too great, because they have already been considered several times and so, in a way, it should just be a case of pulling down the file off the shelf and listing out the pros and cons for each of them.

There is one new option, which of course is the option I favour, and which will require serious additional work and for that reason, and this is my third point, I accept that the review will require additional resources. I do not know whether £2.5 million is the right figure. I very much hope that the cost of the review will be contained well within that figure. But I am not going to vote against Proposition 11 because I do not have a better number to offer and I do know that Education, Sport & Culture cannot possibly be expected to find the resources from within its existing budget, which is clearly very fully stretched.

Finally, I have to say I do have confidence in the ability and integrity of the Members of the current Committee. I think they made a mistake in the last debate in being somewhat intransigent and unwilling to accept several offers of compromise proposals, but we all make mistakes and I am prepared to forgive them for that. They are, in my opinion, very able people. I do not question for one minute their integrity. I think they are the best-qualified people within the Assembly to undertake the review and therefore they will have my full support when we come to vote on Proposition 8 and that is all I have to say sir. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much. Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you very much. I will stand, if Members are okay with that. When the policy letter arrived at home, from Education, Sport & Culture, I have to say I groaned out loud. What I was expecting from Education, Sport & Culture was a four-page document basically saying the Requête was too wide in its scope, in its brief, this is a tidying-up exercise, bear with us, this is what you we want to do; support us.

It did have Deputy Fallaize's Remington typewriter all over it, there is no doubt about that. But, on reflection, if you do read the Requête, actually it did take some focus and discipline to get it in shape, to be the more, actually, concise and focused document that we have in front of us now. The ESC are absolutely right to come back and seek some direction.

Yesterday, Deputy Ferbrache had a fair bit of sport with The Moody Blues and shall we go now? Go now, he said. To me it did not sound like The Moody Blues, it sounded like the Moody Seven Requéants and I think that was evident by a rather kneejerk, impulsive response, from Deputy Meerveld, who issued a press release pretty much before his bottom was back on the seat of the chair that he is sat in. I thought the tone, if I can say this, the tone of that press release, some of the interventions still, now, from the requérants and previous Members of ESC evidence that there is nothing this current Committee can do to ever appease them.

I am worried, actually, about losing this Committee and not just about losing this Committee, if I can make this observation, I am worried about losing the senior management team at Education, Sport & Culture, because the chemistry and the discipline between that group of people is solid and they are intent on delivering and I do not think we should do anything that risks that relationship, that partnership, that ultimately delivers.

I do not want to over-egg the pudding, but I will say this. With the potential for Islanders queuing up outside Edward T. Wheadon House over the weeks ahead, as workers return home to their country of origin, as people fall into rent arrears, as businesses struggle to pay their leases, when families risk real hardship and some may even face eviction, now is not the time for self-indulgent politicking like this. I have full confidence in this Committee, and I ask States' Members to endorse this report and, in doing so, solidly endorse this Committee. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir I will be relatively brief. I just really, I think, will be building on Deputy Brehaut's last point there. I advised the President of the Committee for Health ... sorry, I have clearly spent rather too much time with the President of Health & Social Care! I advised the President of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture not to bring this policy letter and just to get on with, in essence, what was in the Propositions.

That was before the Covid-19 issue arose in the way it has and when it had done so I advised the President that, in my view, I thought he and his Committee should withdraw this policy letter. So it is not the first time and I am sure it will not be the last time that advice I give is ignored, but I will also say that I am very conscious, before proceeding with the comments that I do wish to make, that my tolerance is low. I am operating on a lack of sleep and rather too much stress in the last week and I have got 99% focus on one issue, and Members will know what that issue is.

So my capacity to focus on this, or indeed any other issue, is extremely limited, but I would emphasise really the point that Deputy Inder made yesterday. Covid-19 has changed the world in which we live. It is not the same world for us in domestic politics that it was two weeks ago. It is, and should be, our entire focus at the time being. This debate is, in my view, an indulgence.

The main reason I have risen, albeit now resumed my seat to speak, is Proposition 8. I am relatively indifferent in relation to the other Propositions and will be voting against Proposition 11 as the Vice-President of my Committee has advised the States when he spoke yesterday. But in relation to Proposition 8, in the knowledge that that would trigger the resignation of the Committee, I think it would be highly irresponsible of this Assembly to vote for that.

Whatever their position is on the underlying issues, whatever their views of individual Members of the Committee, for us as a collective body to engage in, frankly, a period of blood-letting, when we are dealing with a national crisis is highly irresponsible and self-indulgent and I urge all Members to resist the temptation to do so. If they do nothing else, please support, do not vote against Proposition 8.

The Bailiff: Deputy Stephens.

Deputy Stephens: Thank you, sir. I would like to begin by thanking Deputy St Pier and Deputy Soulsby for their focus on the Island's health and safety in recent days. But I do have to ask for

Deputy St Pier's indulgence. I do not speak in every debate, but I really do want to speak in this one. I want to begin and probably end with remarks on Proposition 8.

In a recent email, in which I was discussing matters that might be of interest to candidates for the next general election, whenever that might be, I wrote that in politics it is rare for one Member to ride to the rescue of another and, generally, I think that is true. I am not going to ride to the rescue of ESC now, but there are reasons why I think it is really important that they should remain in situ.

My recollection of Deputy McSwiggan's speech yesterday is that implicit in what she said was the claim of a degree of unfairness in what is being attributed to ESC as their motivation in bringing this policy letter and I agree with her. What came out in later speeches was contradictory in that one Member's reason for criticising ESC was that they have done very little since the last debate, countered by and sometimes in the same speech, the notion that they have done too much in bringing this policy letter.

On the one hand, they have failed somehow as they have referred to viable models for the Assembly to endorse, on the other hand they have not included enough options. It is not broad enough.

If I pick up on Deputy Inder's game-playing analogy, I think of the time in a game, maybe of chess, or Monopoly or cards, when a player who is losing the game sweeps the pieces off the table in pique and then what usually happens is that the game is over. It is abandoned. Now Members of ESC are clearly not shouting 'game over', they want to continue. Again, yesterday in speeches, there were contradictory claims that they have transgressed by not resigning, they have transgressed by seeking confirmation of confidence of the Assembly.

I am beginning to think that game over, in terms of educational transformation, is what some Members do want, and this is demonstrated in the range of contradictions in the attacks on the Committee. I do not want game over, because when the pieces are swept off the table, the result is that nobody wins.

Deputy Inder also displayed remarkable powers of telepathy in claiming that he knows what ESC are thinking. I would like to suggest to him that he does not need to employ those powers on me because there is not much to discover. But ESC's motivation in bringing this policy letter is to inform Members of what they think now, following the debate on the Requête. It is in the text in front of us. It is simple.

Deputy Prow objects to the use of the word benchmarking. Now, in his previous career it might have had a nuanced meaning that I am not familiar with but in educational and in many other contexts, it means evaluating by comparison and in Proposition 6 that is what ESC tell Members they want to do. They want to first compare alternative models, which includes evaluation, and second capture and preserve the important attributes that should underpin future educational policy.

Deputy Meerveld should be reassured that the lists in Proposition 6 are valid and comprehensive as criteria for consideration. I agree with Deputy Lester Queripel in his view on the industry demonstrated by ESC, and I share his desire for stability at this time. At times in the debate yesterday, I rather expected David Attenborough to appear. There were references to what was it – foxes? – no, it was wolves prowling in the hall, or maybe it was wolves in sheep's clothing. But I think this debate is entirely the wrong moment for self-promotion as a candidate for another ESC Committee.

At least the heat of ambition warmed us up a bit yesterday but the trigger for some of that ambition seemed to be the inability of ESC to carry the workforce with them. Well a new ESC Committee that works to reintroduce selection is not going to win unanimous approval from the workforce either and it would be interesting to know from other Members, who have within their mandate employees who have been uncomfortable with their leadership, how they recommend ESC proceed, rather than criticism of their performance. That would be a much more charitable and supportive way to proceed. It would show that we are pulling together.

Now, looking around the room, as Deputy Laurie Queripel suggested, replacements for ESC are thin on the ground and, if Proposition 8 is lost, then the challenge of what to do will be joined by the challenge of who is to do it and that is a recipe for disaster. Deputy Merrett said mudslinging does not serve our community well and how I agree with that.

330 She talked about playgrounds. Now, I know about playgrounds. I often benchmark all sorts of human behaviours against what I know of playgrounds and, in my view, the biggest danger to excellent education at the moment is firstly the global health challenge, but somewhere in the list of challenges to excellence is political behaviour that obstructs progress. One example of the results of political behaviour that obstructs progress was raised by Deputy de Sausmarez, when she spoke

335 of the deficit that the vote on the Requête has laid on all children, year 7 and below.

Members know that promises were made and endorsed twice, by us all, and have now been broken by the vote on the Requête and I think Deputy de Sausmarez is right, I cannot speak for PRC on this matter, and of course Deputy Trott has given the PRC view on Proposition 11, but I think that some restitution should be made of the new horizons promised to all those children, which are

340 now at risk.

Deputy Green is also correct in his suggestion that there is a need for compromise and ESC have demonstrated they are willing to compromise in the policy letter in front of us. I would add that this is a time, as I think Deputy Tooley was suggesting, for consolidation and recalibration of action and, above all, progress. A new Committee, and some of the possible candidates for a new Committee

345 have been unsuccessful in their tenure of ESC in the recent past, would not guarantee anything new, different, or better than the current Committee is able to offer. So I ask Members to support Proposition 8, put personal ambition aside, while ESC gets us to the next stage in the project. Thank you, sir.

350 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Sir, on my way up to the Chamber, with my coffee cup in my hand, almost, I met a very senior, retired – perhaps not permanently – Member from this Chamber, who is well known for his ability at leadership and plain sailing etc. and very much commended the senior

355 leadership team, especially Deputy St Pier and Deputy Soulsby, for the way Government has coped with the last week or two.

We are very much in a time when perhaps Government is more popular than usual, in a sense, and populists are unpopular. So, there you go. We are urged to perhaps take a responsible attitude, an attitude that keeps things going, that keeps essential teams in place in troubling times and very

360 much supports people of ability to continue. I have all of that in mind, I must admit.

But that does not mean to see the less angelic side of me is not a bit bitter, a bit sour, a bit self-indulgent about all of this. I am one of the seven requérants who have had a bitter pill to swallow, yes. Because, we keep on having these setbacks, it is fair to say. At the start of the meeting, we had the setback that the Scrutiny committee of inquiry and the public inquiry will not take place. Then

365 we had a setback that Deputy Meerveld, and myself, put forward a hasty, admittedly, *sursis*, which would have guaranteed consultation of the key stakeholders that were amongst the most significant reasons why this States, in a sense, did a U-turn, and it was rebuffed.

In fact, worse than that, Deputy Meerveld could not even give the speech that he had prepared to make. So minds were closed on that one, I am afraid. It is easy to see how quickly the political

370 landscape changes in a month. I do not know if the public wish Education, Sport & Culture to continue. Probably, if one did an opinion poll today, the majority would clearly say yes, because of the times we live in and the nature of managing schools, examinations, education, and everything else.

But that does not mean to say there is not a significant number of people who either wish to see a change of policy or a change of leadership. I think we have heard from Deputy Ferbrache, Deputy Dudley-Owen and others that they would be willing to step up to the plate. I said I would be,

although I am not perhaps an ideal role model for students in certain respects. But the point is you do need personalities who are willing to stand if those places emerge.

380 We also hear today that the President of Policy & Resources did not particularly want to debate this policy letter and that there may have been an offer on the table for one or two Members of Education, Sport & Culture to retire and allow new candidates to enter. But in reality that is done a lot better if there is a real election and a real position to build.

385 I have been sitting in the Chamber long enough, and as an observer for longer, to see examples where a Committee has sought re-election and most have been re-elected to their same positions. Health, Deputy Roffey might recall in 2001, there were some changes but there were some re-elections in Advisory & Finance in the 1990's.

390 I think there are flaws in this policy letter. I have to draw attention to the argument Deputy St Pier made. He said whatever else we should do, we should vote for Proposition 8. I think I will vote for Proposition 8, for all the reasons I have said, in favour of it. But if we read it carefully, and Deputies reading this can note it, Deputy Meerveld for example, Deputy Dudley-Owen, Proposition 8 actually says:

To agree that the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture as presently constituted shall remain in office until the normal end of committees' terms of office on the 30th of June 2020.

395 We are not sure, now, if we are going to go on into the late summer, autumn or to next year. So even if we vote positively on this Resolution, it should not necessarily guarantee ESC staying in office if there were problems that they perceive in implementing the decision of the States from last month.

400 I also might not vote for Proposition 11, but one thing that does concern me in this policy letter are the Propositions and text relating to Proposition 6, because back in the good old days, which were not necessarily that good, States' Members were on occasion quite whimsical in the way they decided matters, and you never knew for certain whether they decided they liked a particular model because maybe the idea appealed to them, or the colour or whatever. Possibly people would dispute that. But at least it was a political decision made. If one looks at the report, we see, page 2, 1.5:

The early stage of the review is likely to be more technical than political, but to start the work with confidence officials need clearer directions than those they have from the States at present.

405 But the whole point of this is to have an open-minded review that looks at all options and, going back to Proposition 6 and the text relating to Proposition 6, which is in the report, 10.4, page 11 in the paper copies, what concerns me is, whereas in the past States' Members would make a decision, for good or bad, based upon their gut instinct ... the Torode Amendment, perhaps, was a classic example of that, which I voted for at the time. Deputy Trott will remember that well.

410 This puts in a lot of complicated project management-type ideas of academic evaluation, whereby you put the genuine, like for like comparison, promoting the highest possible standards and outcomes, range and equality of opportunities, quality of education. The problem with that is it is likely much of the evidence base for that would be delegated from the States to senior officers and educationalists who would be weighting their arguments in a way different from perhaps States' Members or the public.

415 Because I think the point is we have to find a solution that is publicly and professionally acceptable and that is the dynamic that drives this. It is possible the two-school model was always the best for the Island, if you were looking at it from a certain perspective of educational attainment versus cost, but that did not mean to say it was acceptable to public opinion or to implementation in a way that was in accord with the Island's values.

420 So I have concerns about that, because, to be entirely honest, I was a semi-detached signatory to the Requête and perhaps saw it, in my own view, as effectively a vehicle for achieving a pause

and delay and a re-evaluation of the two-school model, which actually might work better on two other sites.

But I think the thrust behind it was effectively to put forward other models for consideration. It is more than just a neutral consideration. The States is not comfortable, at this juncture, with a two-school model. I am also surprised that I come into the Chamber today and there is no amendment on my table, because I thought Deputy Green made an excellent suggestion yesterday about an effective special committee. I chaired and was on for 10 or 11 years, the Parochial Ecclesiastical Rates Review Committee, which took 11 years to look at parish vicarages and rectories, which I am sure is not the kind of thing Deputy St Pier needs to bother about at the moment.

Nevertheless they can go slowly, but they can work, too. I think the States would be wise to form a committee of detached people, or representatives from different committees – Policy & Resources, Education, the requérants, etc. I would also say there is nothing to stop the requérants and/or other Members from taking a leaf out of Deputy Graham's book and having a gang of four, or gang of five, or gang of six – although probably a gang of six would not be allowed to meet in the present context. I will give way to Deputy Green.

Deputy Green: Sir, I am grateful for Deputy Gollop giving way. The thought about a special committee of the States is one that I think has an awful lot of merit to it, but bearing in mind Deputy Laurie Queripel sent an email to all Members last week and had no response and, until Deputy Gollop spoke in this debate, I do not think there has been any particular support for the idea of a special committee, I think the basic problem with it is that there is not enough support in this Assembly for it. If I am wrong on that, then I am sure Members will tell me. I think it is a good solution, I think it is the way forward, but clearly this Assembly is probably not going to support it.

Deputy Gollop: I thank Deputy Green for the intervention and think that he is probably right, that there is not support for it at the moment, for the good reasons of the circumstances we are in. But if we know for certain that the Covid crisis is gradually lessening, and we have another few months of our term, then I think that attitude might change. As I have said, there is nothing to stop States' Members working together in a sensible way.

So I think, given the times we are living in, and the need for Education, Sport & Culture to come back with their other perspectives on languages, sports and culture and so on, at this stage I would not wish to give out the message of a hostile vote of no confidence in the Committee. But I do think, as the weeks and months progress, if they feel as a Committee they cannot be neutral and they are still relatively wedded to the two-school model that they presented and believe passionately in, then I think they should find some mechanism of standing aside and I would say that if we had a more cabinet, presidential, prime-ministerial system of Government, the reality is that the leader would have probably swapped ministers around and we would have had a change. But we carry on as we are.

The Bailiff: Anyone else? No. Deputy Fallaize will reply to the debate.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir. Does this microphone pick up from this distance? Okay. I did not certainly suggest to anybody that there could be a sharing of the presidency of the Committee. Clearly, there could not be, and it would not be in my gift to set that up, even if it could be done. But I did think it was worthwhile having a discussion with the lead requérant about whether to try to construct or put forward a Committee, which had Members who had previously had a range of views on the various school models, whether that was under my leadership or that of the lead requérant. Those were the discussions, which I tried to pursue, and I do not think I need to take that any further.

I want to start with, really the most important part of this debate, I think, was the point about engagement with stakeholders and in particular with the teaching profession and there were good

points made on this by several speakers: Deputy Prow, Deputy Merrett, Deputy Green, Deputy Laurie Queripel and others.

475 Deputy Prow was concerned that any restriction placed on the models to review could inhibit the engagement with the profession. But the Requête, of which he was a prominent signatory, did restrict the models for review. It put parameters around the review by defining the models for review as those which had previously been presented to committees.

480 Now, ironically, the two models which had not been presented to previous committees, were the three 11-18 colleges, for which clearly there is some support, and what is described by some people as a co-located sixth form, for which there is also some support. The terms of the Requête, of which he was a signatory, did not include a review of the two models, which apart from the model that has been paused, have received the greatest enthusiasm amongst States' Members and indeed among the profession.

485 So the proposals in the Requête, the restrictions on the models to review, are in practice, in terms of models for which enthusiasm has been expressed, less restrictive than the terms of the Resolutions made following consideration of the Requête. That, I think, will allow more constructive engagement with the teaching profession.

490 Deputy Green asked how independence could be integrated into the review. I think his suggestion of a special States' investigation and advisory committee, whatever they are now called, I understand where he is coming from with that. They have got a bit of a mixed record. SWBIC worked particularly well, but the one that Deputy Gollop just gave an example of, was set up around the time of the Reformation and reported back in recent years. So I do not think it is necessarily a recipe for success. They can work well, and they can work very much less well.

495 I think he made this point, but the Committee had already agreed this, prior to the debate, that there is going to be the need to appoint some external support and assistance, in particular in relation to stakeholder engagement. I think without that, it just will not be possible to create the perception of impartiality and independence, even if we felt we could do it in reality.

500 In particular, I think facilitating engagement with teachers, and verifying any technical analysis is particularly where we need to concentrate on external support. I am not sure that the whole review can be handed over to an external body but I think, unless we are able to integrate sufficient external, impartial voices into it, from outside the Committee and from outside senior management, I do not think the review is going to have the credibility that the States expects, so we agree with him on that.

505 He asked what engagement would look like within the timeline of the review. This is also a good point. Remember that the current States' Resolutions, under which the Committee is now operating, require the report on the models to be finished by June, which is clearly not realistic. We are proposing a single report which has to be concluded by next April, which is ambitious, given the current circumstances, but more realistic.

510 Deputy Merrett asked how the next phase of work would differ in relation to engagement and my answer to that is I think this is now a different ballgame. We were in the process, since January 2018, of implementing a specific model, which the States had directed. Now, engagement about that is bound to be different and is bound to feel different to those people who are sceptical than engagement about various models, which are under review. That just stands to reason. She would know that as a Member of the Scrutiny Management Committee.

515 But if her Committee is ... I do not know, I will pick a topic that a previous Scrutiny Committee reviewed, the future of the dairy industry, the Scrutiny Management Committee is carrying out a review of that, it is doing it from a very different position than if it were a committee directed to introduce a certain set of proposals in the dairy industry in that example.

520 So we are now in a different ball game, we are under the terms of the existing Resolutions now and, if these proposals are accepted, we would be a committee charged with reviewing various models of secondary education and I can guarantee Deputy Merrett and other Members that we are able to get our heads out of the mode of implementing the model the States had directed be

implemented in January 2018 and into the mode of carrying out a review. So independence and impartiality are critical in this.

I also think that the engagement with the profession, and this is probably best done through employee representative groups, could be co-created. I think there is some merit in trying not just to get the engagement done with the profession, but actually getting the profession to agree to the terms on which the engagement will happen.

Now, clearly it cannot be done tomorrow, it is going to take a little bit of time, but I think there is some merit in doing that. I also think that, if other States' Members wish to provide constructive support and input into that process, then there could be scope for them to be involved, and I emphasise the word *constructive* because some of the criticism about stakeholder engagement has been made from a constructive basis, and I include Deputy Merrett, and some of it has been made, frankly, from a destructive basis, and there is no point in trying to incorporate in any review voices which do not wish to be constructive, but if there are States' Members who wish to make a constructive contribution, I think there could be room for them in that process.

Which brings me onto Deputy Meerveld. Now, Deputy Meerveld, I have to confess I have had quite enough of accepting Deputy Meerveld's accusations and claims about our Committee and sitting here trying, as courteously as possible, to suck it all up and, frankly, sir, he needs to be called out.

Now Deputy Meerveld said yesterday that, following the debate on the Requête, he had changed his mind and now had no confidence in the Committee. Well, ever since Deputy Meerveld was defeated when he stood for the presidency of this Committee two years ago, he has run a relentless campaign against the present Committee, sometimes using misinformation and inaccuracy, every bit as damaging as the fictitious guerrilla marketing campaign, which led to his resignation as vice-president a little over two years ago.

His most prominent point recently has been the need to engage with the profession. I wrote down a quote of his yesterday: 'You must take your stakeholders with you.' Now I will accept the criticism and the lessons on engagement from many Members, including most of those who made those points yesterday, but I will take no criticism or lessons on this point, or frankly on anything else, from Deputy Meerveld. The Committee of which he was vice-president first of all spent months trying to revive selection at 11, against the wishes of around 70% of teachers. Then it presented a model –

Deputy Meerveld: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Meerveld, if it is a point of correction.

Deputy Meerveld: The previous Committee did not try to resurrect selection; the previous Committee brought back to the States, because of broad-based concerns whether or not the new Assembly wished to endorse the ending of selection, brought it back to the States to get a definitive direction. As Deputy Fallaize knows, I was a poster boy for ending selection in this term, so in no way was I trying to work to resurrect it. Thank you, sir.

Deputy Fallaize: I can tell you, as someone who spent many years trying to remove selection at 11, I can tell Deputy Meerveld that, for most of us who were part of that campaign, he certainly was not a poster boy for what we were trying to achieve. His Committee, the Committee of which he was vice-president, came to the States with a proposal to re-establish or continue at that time, with selection at 11 and that was contrary to the advice of around 70% of teachers.

Then, the Committee of which he was vice-president, presented a model for secondary and further education to the States, which when it was put to the union which represents staff in the further education sector, did not achieve 60% or 70% or 80% opposition, it achieved 98% opposition and it provoked one of the two largest teachers' unions in secondary schools to say, and I quote: 'We have lost confidence in the Committee.'

Now, sir, in a minute ago he tried to set himself up as a poster boy, as he put it, for those who were opposed to selection at 11, at one time. I would say that, given his record and his Committee's record with teachers previously, he has got some front setting himself up now as the champion of teachers.

580 The fact is, sir, that today Deputy Meerveld has the opportunity –

Deputy Meerveld: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Meerveld.

585

Deputy Meerveld: I am not trying to set myself up as a champion of teachers, I am simply, and again this was stated in my speech several times, I am a champion of good governance and bringing stakeholders along in a project to ensure that it can be implemented effectively.

590 **The Bailiff:** That is becoming a speech, Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

Deputy Fallaize: I am sure that is something that we will all take away from this memorable session of the States, that Deputy Meerveld is a champion for good governance. Today, Deputy Meerveld has the opportunity he has craved for, for the last few years. He can vote to kick out this Committee and, if he is in the majority, and Proposition 8 loses, the Committee will step aside, and the States will no doubt have an opportunity to re-elect him to the Committee he once served.

595 If Proposition 8 is carried and the States endorse the Committee remaining in office, our commitment is to carry out a thorough and fair review of the models listed in our policy letter and to do so with the assistance of extensive engagement with teachers and their representatives. In return, if Proposition 8 is successful and in order to allow this process to happen constructively, Deputy Meerveld should commit to ceasing his campaign of misinformation about our actions and intentions and instead commit to playing a constructive role to help the States and the community find a way through what has been a challenging area of policy for at least the past five years.

600 Now, talking of being constructive, I want to thank Deputy Lester Queripel and Deputy Gollop, who were both signatories to the Requête, debated at the last States' Meeting but who recognised, I think, certainly in the case of Deputy Lester Queripel, because he said so, I think in the case of Deputy Gollop, recognised that the Committee is laying these proposals in good faith, to try to get the review, which they and other Members proposed and was accepted by the States, to try to get it moving from the right starting point.

610 Deputy Green said that he felt the proposals in the policy letter take us forward, because they are a better basis for pause and review and that is the basis on which the Propositions are being laid before the States. Deputy Inder used a game-playing analogy and I think what has actually happened here is that others have come along and swept our counters completely off the board and I and the other Members of the Committee are offering to pick them up again and to start trying to reassemble them onto the board, so that everybody can start playing the game again.

615 It might very well be that the counters have to be reassembled in a different order than they were previously assembled, but if so, so be it. Because the most important thing is not that any particular model is adopted, in a year's time or whenever that is going to be. The most important thing now is to try to get off the cycle of review, deliberate, decide, stop, review, deliberate and just carry on going around in circles.

620 That is the process which this Committee is offering to lead the States through, to get its mind into the place of saying the most important thing that is needed is to present the States and the community with a way through this enormous challenge, now, that it has not been possible to agree to anything and implement it in relation to the future model of secondary education.

Deputy Prow said he could support Proposition 2, because he does not want to impede the development of the Guernsey Institute. Now, while I accept he was making that point very sincerely, Proposition 2 does not achieve that. The Proposition he needs to vote for, to achieve the protection of the Guernsey Institute, is Proposition 5. Because, unless the review is restricted to that list of models, the review is going to have to get into models, which are not compatible with the development of the Guernsey Institute.

It is alright for Deputy Ferbrache, yesterday, to say, look, everybody can just agree on that, we can all do it through a sort of gentlemen's agreement or ladies' agreement, but where has he been for the last several years? That is a rhetorical question, by the way! Every move this Committee makes is challenged by several Members of the States. In fairness, not by Deputy Ferbrache, actually, but by his trusty assistant Deputy Meerveld most certainly, and others. Everything that this Committee does is challenged and accusations are made, and claims are made.

Okay, one accepts that. If you are doing this role, you have to accept that. But I therefore do think it is not really valid to say the review can go ahead on the basis that surely we can all agree on what is going to be reviewed and what is not and how long it is going to take and what it should be reviewed against? This is now such a contentious area that we need to set more extensive terms for this review and that is what we are trying to do.

Now, Deputy Laurie Queripel asked I think several relevant questions about the shape of the next policy letter. He said how would we set out the Propositions or recommendations? Bearing in mind, the way things are at the present time, it would be in the life of the next Committee that that is done, so this Committee would start the process, the next Committee would continue it. One does not know what the outcome of the report that SACC is going to bring on the general election is going to be.

My recommendation to the Committee, which brings the final policy letter back to the States, I hope it is the final one, is that there should be alternative propositions. Now that is a commitment without discussing it with my Committee, I have to say. I think I can say that because at the very least, quite clearly, the policy letter and anything appended to it, is going to have to be sufficiently extensive about each of the models reviewed that, even if the Committee had a recommended model, it would be possible there and then for the States to replace that recommended model and insert its model of choice, as it were.

What we cannot have coming out of that policy letter debate is another review. So I do not envisage a policy letter with a single model available. I envisage a policy letter with enough analysis of all of these models that the States can decide which one to introduce. The Committee wants to play the role of facilitating the process of review to get the States to that point.

I thank Deputy Parkinson, who I think summed it up well when he said that he felt we were listing the right models to be assessed against the right criteria, using the right timeline. He also said that we required additional financial resources to do it – and we do. It has not been easy in the short space of time available to assess exactly what is necessary but if Proposition 11 loses, there will be no budget allocated to the review, but whoever is going to carry it out and whatever the terms of reference are, clearly it is going to cost something. So I hope the States do vote in favour of Proposition 11.

Deputy de Sausmarez, I think, put forward an important consideration, which was the need not to prolong uncertainty for children longer than inevitable. I think what some of our critics want, when I listen to their speeches, is a lengthy period of consultation with teaches about which models should be reviewed, a lengthy period of consultation on the criteria the models should be reviewed against, then a review of all the models previously presented, which is many more than we are proposing. It looks to me like an attempt to prolong this process indefinitely.

I do given the undertaking that she requested that we will, as far as possible for the current Year 7 and in subsequent years, discuss with the Policy & Resources Committee how we can obtain the funding necessary to provide equality of opportunity or as close as we can get to it. We will not be able to do it in terms of the facilities, while we remain on the four current sites, but in terms of the

educational offer, we need to get as close as we possibly can. Equality of opportunity is one of the criteria listed in the proposed terms of reference.

680 But the single best thing the States could do now to allow the Committee to provide, or get as far as possible to providing, equality of opportunity in this interim period, is to vote for Proposition 1, which is the continuation of the journey towards one organisation or one school. Because, in particular, while we are operating on four sites, that is going to be the way to allow us to use resources most flexibly and most effectively and, if that Proposition is lost, the task of trying to
685 provide some kind of equality of opportunity to students, which is already exceptionally challenging across four sites will be even more challenging and we will be letting down students.

So Proposition 1 is very important from that point of view. I thought Deputy Tooley provided a very good summary of what the Committee wants to achieve in this review and its commitment to the States and to the community to carry out this review in an acceptable and objective way and I
690 know the first test of that will be the vote the States come to in a moment, including on Proposition 8. I know that in terms of securing the confidence of the community in that respect, there is a long way to go and a great deal of work to be done, but if we cannot get through the first test of securing the confidence of the States, we cannot move beyond that.

I think all I would say is I have been accused, and the Committee has been accused of vigorously,
695 single-mindedly pursuing the States' Resolutions, which it was directed to pursue in January 2018. If the Committee remains in place and the other Propositions in this policy letter are approved, all I can say is the Committee will vigorously and single-mindedly pursue those States' Resolutions and that is the commitment that we provide to the States and I ask the States to vote in favour of all of the Propositions.

700

The Bailiff: I imagine that we will be voting by recorded vote, so that proxies can be exercised –

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, I did ask for a recorded vote. Would you like me to clarify what I was looking for?

705

The Bailiff: What I am going to suggest is that we try to minimise the number of recorded votes that we have, by identifying those Propositions that need to be taken separately. Clearly Proposition 8 and Proposition 11 need to be taken separately from the other Propositions.

710

A Member: Six as well.

The Bailiff: Proposition 6, you would like separate? So Propositions 6, 8, 11. Deputy Tindall?

Deputy Tindall: Seven, please.

715

The Bailiff: Propositions 6, 7, 8, 11. Deputy Prow? *(Interjection by Deputy Prow)*
We have 12 Propositions before us. Are you asking for 12 separate recorded votes?

Deputy Prow: I am afraid I have to, sir.

720

The Bailiff: Okay. It will take a bit of time, but if that is what we need then that is what we will do. I was just trying to move along. Just in terms of proxies, Deputy Leadbeater had appointed Deputy Lowe, who is now absent from the Chamber and, as a second proxy, he has nominated Deputy Dudley-Owen. Deputy Lowe, as I said, is absent from the Chamber because she is dealing
725 with a coronavirus-related matter. She has nominated Deputy Green as her proxy. I think those are the only changes to the proxies that we had yesterday unless the Deputy Greffier is going to tell me otherwise. No, she is shaking her head. I think that is a shake that is saying not that I am wrong but that I have got it right.

730 So we will start with a recorded vote and I think we need the Deputy Sheriff to just come over and assist. A recorded vote on Proposition 1, which is to agree to the continuation of the development, which is already underway, of a single state secondary school, operating across a number of sites, initially four sites. That will give him a chance to get into position and the voting will start. Recorded vote on Proposition 1.

There was a recorded vote.

735 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, while the votes are being counted, can I just have clarification, do we really need a recorded vote on Propositions 7, 11 and 12? They are just to note. It is irrelevant whether we note them or not.

740 **The Bailiff:** There has been a specific request for recorded votes. We could ask whether we need recorded separate votes on quite a number of them, but that is what has been requested. People do not have to give reasons for requesting. They have requested and that is the end of the matter.

Proposition 1

Carried – Pour 22, Contre 15, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 0

POUR

Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Merrett
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel*
Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Dorey*
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Brouard
Deputy McSwiggan
Deputy Langlois

CONTRE

Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver*
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Leadbeater*
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Trott
Deputy Le Pelley*
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Inder
Deputy Lowe*
Deputy Smithies*
Deputy Paint*
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy de Lisle*

NE VOTE PAS

Alderney Rep. Roberts*
Alderney Rep. Snowdon*

ABSENT

None

* denotes Deputies who voted by proxy.

The Bailiff: I can announce the result of the voting on Proposition 1: there were 22 in favour, with 15 against and two abstentions. I declare Proposition 1 carried.

We turn to Proposition 2, again by a recorded vote.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 2

Carried – Pour 29, Contre 8, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 0

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

* denotes Deputies who voted by proxy.

745 **The Bailiff:** The voting on Proposition 2 was 29 in favour, with 8 against and two abstentions, I declare Proposition 2 carried.

The Deputy Greffier: Proposition 3.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 3

Carried – Pour 31, Contre 6, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 0

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Prow	Alderney Rep. Roberts*	None
Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Oliver*	Alderney Rep. Snowdon*	
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Leadbeater*		
Deputy Ferbrache	Deputy Lowe*		
Deputy Tindall	Deputy Smithies*		
Deputy Brehaut	Deputy Paint*		
Deputy Tooley			
Deputy Gollop			
Deputy Parkinson			
Deputy Lester Queripel			
Deputy Le Clerc			
Deputy Mooney			
Deputy Trott			
Deputy Le Pelley*			
Deputy Merrett			

Deputy St Pier
 Deputy Stephens
 Deputy Meerveld
 Deputy Fallaize
 Deputy Inder
 Deputy Laurie Queripel
 Deputy Hansmann Rouxel*
 Deputy Graham
 Deputy Green
 Deputy Dorey*
 Deputy Le Tocq
 Deputy Brouard
 Deputy Dudley-Owen
 Deputy McSwiggan
 Deputy de Lisle*
 Deputy Langlois

* denotes Deputies who voted by proxy.

The Bailiff: I can declare Proposition 3 carried, by 31 votes to 6, with two abstentions.
 We come to Proposition 4.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 4

Carried – Pour 26, Contre 10, Ne vote pas 3, Absent 0

POUR

Deputy Soulsby
 Deputy de Sausmarez
 Deputy Roffey
 Deputy Ferbrache
 Deputy Tindall
 Deputy Brehaut
 Deputy Tooley
 Deputy Parkinson
 Deputy Lester Queripel
 Deputy Le Clerc
 Deputy Mooney
 Deputy Le Pelley*
 Deputy Merrett
 Deputy St Pier
 Deputy Stephens
 Deputy Meerveld
 Deputy Fallaize
 Deputy Inder
 Deputy Hansmann Rouxel*
 Deputy Graham
 Deputy Green
 Deputy Dorey*
 Deputy Le Tocq
 Deputy McSwiggan
 Deputy de Lisle*
 Deputy Langlois

CONTRE

Deputy Prow
 Deputy Oliver*
 Deputy Gollop
 Deputy Leadbeater*
 Deputy Trott
 Deputy Lowe*
 Deputy Laurie Queripel
 Deputy Smithies*
 Deputy Paint*
 Deputy Brouard

NE VOTE PAS

Alderney Rep. Roberts*
 Alderney Rep. Snowdon*
 Deputy Dudley-Owen

ABSENT

None

* denotes Deputies who voted by proxy.

750

The Bailiff: And Proposition 4 has been carried, by 26 votes to 10, with three abstentions.
 Proposition 5.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 5

Carried – Pour 25, Contre 12, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 0

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

* denotes Deputies who voted by proxy.

The Bailiff: On Proposition 5, there were 25 votes in favour, with 12 against and two abstentions. I declare it carried.

755

The Deputy Greffier: Proposition 6.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 6

Carried – Pour 26, Contre 10, Ne vote pas 3, Absent 0

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

Deputy Green
Deputy Dorey*
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Brouard
Deputy McSwiggan
Deputy de Lisle*
Deputy Langlois

* denotes Deputies who voted by proxy.

The Bailiff: Proposition 6, there were 26 votes in favour, with 10 against and three abstentions.
I declare it carried.

760 **The Deputy Greffier:** Proposition 7.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 7

Carried – Pour 21, Contre 11, Ne vote pas 7, Absent 0

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

* denotes Deputies who voted by proxy.

The Bailiff: On Proposition 7, we have 21 votes in favour, with 11 against and seven abstentions,
I declare it carried.

The Deputy Greffier: Proposition 8.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 8

Carried – Pour 24, Contre 9, Ne vote pas 6, Absent 0

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Prow	Alderney Rep. Roberts*	None
Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Leadbeater*	Alderney Rep. Snowdon*	
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Mooney	Deputy Ferbrache	
Deputy Oliver*	Deputy Le Pelley*	Deputy Inder	
Deputy Tindall	Deputy Meerveld	Deputy Brouard	

Deputy Brehaut	Deputy Lowe*	Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Tooley	Deputy Smithies*	
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Paint*	
Deputy Parkinson	Deputy de Lisle*	
Deputy Lester Queripel		
Deputy Le Clerc		
Deputy Trott		
Deputy Merrett		
Deputy St Pier		
Deputy Stephens		
Deputy Fallaize		
Deputy Laurie Queripel		
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel*		
Deputy Graham		
Deputy Green		
Deputy Dorey*		
Deputy Le Tocq		
Deputy McSwiggan		
Deputy Langlois		

* denotes Deputies who voted by proxy.

765 **The Bailiff:** On Proposition 8, the voting is 24 in favour, with 9 against, and six abstentions. I declare Proposition 8 carried.

The Deputy Greffier: Proposition 9.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 9

Carried – Pour 29, Contre 8, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 0

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

* denotes Deputies who voted by proxy.

The Bailiff: That was Proposition 9 and there were 29 in favour, with 8 against, and two abstentions, I declare it carried.

770

The Deputy Greffier: Proposition 10.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 10

Carried – Pour 32, Contre 5, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 0

POUR

Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Oliver*
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Trott
Deputy Le Pelley*
Deputy Merrett
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Inder
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel*
Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Dorey*
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy McSwiggan
Deputy de Lisle*
Deputy Langlois

CONTRE

Deputy Prow
Deputy Leadbeater*
Deputy Lowe*
Deputy Smithies*
Deputy Paint*

NE VOTE PAS

Alderney Rep. Roberts*
Alderney Rep. Snowdon*

ABSENT

None

* denotes Deputies who voted by proxy.

The Bailiff: And that was Proposition 10, with 32 votes in favour, five against and two abstentions. I declare it carried.

775

The Deputy Greffier: Proposition 11.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 11

Not carried – Pour 17, Contre 18, Ne vote pas 4, Absent 0

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

* denotes Deputies who voted by proxy.

The Bailiff: On Proposition 11, we have 17 in favour, 18 against and four abstentions. I declare Proposition 11 lost.

780

The Deputy Greffier: Proposition 12.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 12

Carried – Pour 26, Contre 10, Ne vote pas 3, Absent 0

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

* denotes Deputies who voted by proxy.

The Bailiff: That was Proposition 12. The voting was 26 in favour, with 10 against and three abstentions. I am going to propose now that we have a break to wash hands and I suggest, when we come back, we just need to think about what we take next, because the next item is the Island Development Plan, and then we have the requêtes, and as I have said this morning, there may be some Rule 18 Propositions to be circulated.

We are not going to finish all the business today, I suspect, although I do not know how long the Island Development Plan will take and I do not know how much debate there will be on the Rule 18 Propositions, but we do not have to approve those today, I do not think, do we? Certainly the CCA Regulations have to be laid before the States but they remain in force, even if they are not approved today. Is it that P&R are really seeking a decision on their Proposition, which I have not seen yet? Are you really seeking a decision on that today?

Deputy Trott: Yes, sir, I can confirm that that States' Report will be circulated to Members imminently and that it would be our preference that the matter be debated immediately after the lunch recess, in order that these emergency measures can be put in place, with immediate effect.

The Bailiff: Fine. We will have a break to wash our hands and, as I say, we will consider when we get back what we do next.

*The Assembly adjourned at 11.21 a.m.
and resumed at 11.44 a.m.*

Procedural – Order of Business

The Bailiff: Places please. Can we resume please? Before we adjourned, I said that, when we got back, we would just consider where we are. We have about 45 minutes or so before we break for lunch, if that clock is right, which I think it is. The next item is the Island Development Plan. Can I just have an indication of how many people would wish to speak in debate, either in general debate or on the two amendments that have been circulated? Is there going to be a lot of debate? Eight – I do not think we would finish that before lunch.

What we do not know at the moment is how much debate there will be this afternoon, particularly on the proposals that Policy & Resources are going to be laying. It would be unfortunate ... sorry, Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Sir, is it not within the Rules of Procedure that we could start debate on the IDP and suspend it?

The Bailiff: We could do that, but it might mean coming back next week. I do not know. If you are content with that, Deputy Tindall, that is an option that we could take.

Deputy Tindall: I am perfectly content, with that sir.

The Bailiff: Fine. In that case, that is what we will do. We will start with the Island Development Plan, so if you announce that, Greffier.

DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING AUTHORITY

**IV. Five-year Review of the Island Development Plan –
Debate commenced**

Article IV.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter of the Development & Planning Authority entitled 'Five Year Review of the Island Development Plan' (dated 10th February 2020), they are of the opinion:-

1. To note:

a. the Annual Monitoring Report 2018 of the Island Development Plan policies attached at Appendix 1 to the Policy Letter; and

b. that the Development & Planning Authority has an obligation under the statutory Island Development Plan 2016 ("IDP") to review Housing land supply and Employment land supply within five years of the adoption of the IDP by the States in November 2016 ("the Five Year Review") and additionally has committed to review Areas of Biodiversity Importance and, as such, these matters will be included in the Five Year Review.

2. To direct the Development & Planning Authority, in consultation with all relevant Committees and stakeholders, to extend the current scope of the Five-Year Review of the IDP to include specific reviews of:

a. Development Frameworks thresholds and process;

b. development of greenfield land and prioritisation of brownfield land for residential purposes in Centres;

c. Important Open Land;

d. Agriculture Priority Areas; and,

e. visitor accommodation,

as further detailed in Appendix 3 to the Policy Letter.

3. To direct the Development & Planning Authority and the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure following the Five-Year Review and in compliance with all relevant requirements of planning legislation, to –

a. take all necessary steps towards the holding of a Planning Inquiry to consult on and consider any proposed amendments to the IDP that the Development & Planning Authority considers are required as a result of the evidence gathered for the Five-Year Review; and,

b. following the Planning Inquiry, for the Development & Planning Authority to lay proposals for amendments to the IDP before the States for adoption by November 2021.

The Deputy Greffier: Article IV. Development & Planning Authority. The Island Development Plan – Five-year Review of the Island Development Plan.

The Bailiff: And debate will be opened by Deputy Tindall.

825

Deputy Tindall: Thank you, sir. I start by saying that we appreciate the need for brevity in such extraordinary times. There is also, of course, the fact that this is ordinary business and not something that may seem high priority at this time. The DPA did actually hope for brevity anyway, by fully taking into account all representations on the IDP and include them in an extensive extension to the five-year review, hoping this would go through on the nod.

830

We understand that we did not completely succeed and other comments may be made in debate, but we are grateful for this opportunity to get the approval of the States, so that the DPA can adhere to its statutory responsibility. I say that, even though that duty seems of much less importance than believed some three weeks ago.

835 So to explain briefly. The Island Development Plan, or IDP, was approved unanimously by the States in November 2016. It brought together the planning policies for the Island into a single document for the first time and has the aim to help maintain and create a socially inclusive healthy and economically strong Island, while balancing these objectives with the protection and enhancement of Guernsey's built and natural environment, and the need to use land wisely.

840 The IDP has a 10-year lifespan, but with a review of housing land supply and employment land supply after five years being a requirement, under the statutory plan, SLUP and IDP. This is unless monitoring indicates a need to amend the IDP sooner. Since the adoption of the IDP, the DPA have published regular monitoring reports, starting with a quarterly monitoring report from quarter one, 2017, and includes two annual monitoring reports, or AMRs, such reports being a monitoring tool
845 to inform whether policies require review and when evidence needs to be update.

The first annual monitoring report for 2017 was published in August 2018 and set out a range of actions for the DPA, including certain issues under review, and to find greater clarity and guidance where needed.

850 The States debated the findings of the 2017 AMR and planning matters generally in November 2018, and a range of issues were raised. To address these concerns, with approval of the DPA, I began working on an action plan in January 2019, which was approved by the DPA and published in June 2019. The action plan identified the issues to include in the wider scope of the five-year review.

855 The IDP Requête was laid prior to the publication of the action plan, but debated subsequently, During that debate, I gave a commitment on behalf of the DPA, to lay before the States the AMR for 2018, together with a policy letter, with amendable Propositions regarding the extension of the scope of the statutory five-year review of the IDP. That is what we have before us today to debate.

860 These Propositions give the States an opportunity to direct the scope and proposed purpose of the five-year review of the IDP. The proposed additional areas to include in the review, set out in the DPA action plan and repeated in this policy letter, are based on the feedback of States' Members, the public through consultation and planning application and development frameworks, and also the findings of the two annual monitoring reports.

865 These are development frameworks' thresholds and process, development of greenfield land and prioritisation of brownfield land for residential purposes and centres, important open land, agricultural priority areas and visitor accommodation. Taken together and with the research into housing land requirements, this expanded scope of the review will consider the concerns raised around development of greenfield land and other development of certain areas, these being some of the issues raised most frequently.

870 The review will include analysis of the delivery of housing in relation to the States' strategic housing indicator, and the appropriate supply of housing land for the next five years. In addition, a commitment was made by the former Environment Department during the IDP public planning inquiry hearing to re-survey and update some areas of biodiversity importance and to identify any additional areas.

875 This project was initiated in 2019 and is part of the five-year review. Members should note that the intention of this policy letter is not about making policy decisions at this stage. It is about directing the work of the planning service to carry out research in different issues, to see if any amendment is needed to the IDP or other action is needed by the States.

880 The IDP cannot be amended by States' Resolution at this stage, without a prior public inquiry, as that would be inconsistent with the legislation. Should any amendment have been laid that resulted in additional work, then additional financial and staff resources would have been required to ensure that the review is carried out in the appropriate timeframe.

885 If additional work had been required, then the project would have become a full-on planning review, which is not intended by the Strategic Land-Use Plan and IDP. Hence the DPA, through its action plan and subsequently through these Propositions, in short to ensure that all the concerns raised were incorporated in a realistic way, and a view to comprehensively cover a wide range of matters.

Work is underway on the elements of the review required under the statutory plan and those added by the action plan and the project is on track, or should I say, considering recent events, was on track for the delivery of the review by November 2021. Stage one research and information evidence-gathering is ongoing and expected and hoped to continue, primarily through the first half of 2020. The drafting of any policy amendments in response to the evidence gathered will be in stage two and will hopefully continue into the second half of 2020.

I hope the States agree today to the scope of the five-year review, giving clear direction and therefore continuity in the planning service's work over the change in Government. Finally I should like to take this opportunity to thank the Committees who provide valuable feedback for the annual monitoring reports, my Committee for supporting the action plan and the Propositions and, of course, the officers of the planning service, who have worked tirelessly in preparing comprehensive monitoring reports and the research of the five-year review, keeping it on track despite the extra workload.

I also wish to add our thanks to all those on the front line, supporting our community tirelessly and selflessly at this time, but I also want to thank those who are supporting those workers, paid or unpaid, enabling some of their colleagues to move to the front line, who are caring for the health of our own workforce and their families, but also who continue to provide a service with a semblance of normality in such devastatingly difficult times. Not just those in Planning and Building Control, but all across the Civil Service and in the community beyond. Thank you.

The Bailiff: We have two amendments. We will take amendment 1 first – a novel idea! – proposed by Deputy Merrett, seconded by Deputy Graham. Deputy Merrett.

[Amendment 1](#)

After Proposition 2 add the following proposition -

"2A. To direct the Development & Planning Authority, in consultation with all relevant Committees and stakeholders, to extend the current scope of the Five Year Review of the IDP to include a review of policies affecting Areas of Biodiversity Importance (ABIs), including policy GP3, giving particular consideration to strengthening the protection given to the biodiversity interest of such areas so that development on ABIs, in particular building operations, is only allowed where:

(a) the biodiversity interest of the area is maintained or enhanced; or

(b) any negative impacts of the development are appropriately and proportionately mitigated."

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir. Could I have it read?

The Deputy Greffier read out Amendment 1.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir. I hope that Members appreciate that I took a little longer on the explanatory note than I usually would, to help them understand the intent behind the amendment and to limit the time in which I would need to introduce it. It is simply to direct the DPA, in consultation with all relevant committees, and that would clearly include E&I, to consider if the policies in the IDP that are for areas of biodiversity importance, ABIs, could be strengthened and, by doing so, offer further protection; or at least a presumption of protection, meaning that building operations would only be allowed where ABIs are maintained, enhanced or inevitable impacts are mitigated.

The existing policy asks for ABIs to be supported, provided that ABIs are considered protective where possible, or if negative impacts can be appropriately and proportionality mitigated. For the avoidance of doubt, my preference would be to change existing policy, so that rather than have a presumption that development will be allowed, provided that it becomes a presumption that development will not be allowed unless, as it would shift the burden of proof.

However, there are unknown consequences to this and so it is a more measured approach to direct the DPA to consider, consult and return to the Assembly with their recommendations, as part

of the five-year review. Even more so, as the Director of Planning has advised us this amendment is capable of consideration in that timeframe and will not need any additional resource.

930 Lastly sir, I opened referencing the explanatory note and I will close with a comment regarding this. The photos that I attached, the planning application that had been approved, does have mitigation in place, because there was concern on the site, regarding German Ivy. Unbeknown to me at the time of submitting the amendment, this is when strict Chinese walls are not always helpful. There is a further outstanding planning application on the site. That is unfortunate and I apologise for using those photos, especially as Lovell Ozanne architects submitted the application, a firm of which Andrew Merrett is a director. So I will declare an interest, even though perhaps it is the
935 complete opposite interest to Mr Merrett. Thank you, sir.

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

Deputy Graham: I do, sir.

940 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Tindall, do you wish to speak at this point?

Deputy Tindall: No, sir.

945 **The Bailiff:** Any debate on the amendment? Yes, sorry, Deputy Lester Queripel in the dark over there.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, just briefly, colleagues know I am a Member of the DPA. I wholeheartedly support this amendment and I applaud Deputies Merrett and Graham for laying it
950 in front of us today, because any amendment that seeks to strengthen policies of the IDP is absolutely spot on, as far as I am concerned.

I see no reason whatsoever to not support this amendment. I see every reason to support it. Because if we look at the bottom of the first page of the amendment, we see, as Deputy Merrett has already said, the Director of Planning tells us that no additional resources will be required in
955 order to undertake this work.

And if we look at the fifth paragraph on page 2 of the amendment, we are told that this amendment provides for a review of policies affecting areas of biodiversity importance and also for consideration of the strengthening of protection and it goes on to say this protection is not specifically included under Proposition 1, 'which only covers a re-survey of the current ABI sites'. So,
960 sir, that is why I wholeheartedly support this amendment. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Yes, I of course sat for five years on Planning and I would say, in many ways,
965 much as I appreciated being the President, before Deputy Tindall, of the Development & Planning Authority, I preferred it really, I think, when Planning was integrated into an environmental ministry/department, because it perhaps allowed the Board and the administrative structure to appreciate ecological arguments.

The danger of separating planning from an environmental department is it becomes more
970 neutral in terms of development issues and a balance has to be struck with the needs of the economy and the needs of housing. But I think, on this amendment, the plan that we produced, which was a breath of fresh air at the time, and was a break from the past, was a little light on strength for biodiversity importance.

I would urge all Members to support and give the benefit of the doubt to Deputy Merrett's
975 amendment, as Deputy Lester Queripel has, because I think some Members here, they are not necessarily that concerned about little moths and butterflies and hedges, but what they are concerned about has been the parochial reaction and the popular reaction to over-development

and, frankly, we do need to see more of our green areas protected and enhanced and this, hopefully, will give a useful way forward.

980

The Bailiff: Deputy Graham.

Deputy Graham: Sir, thank you. I will be very brief. I speak with the background of having, in the 1990's, been for six years a non-States' member of the former IDC, so I am well aware of the running tension between development on the one hand and preservation of the natural environment on the other.

985

So I am always inherently and instinctively sympathetic towards what is now the Authority. I have to say I was one of those who voted for the Island Development Plan back in November 2016, together with all its 33 amendments, I think. But I am aware that there are some loopholes and one of the loopholes and one of the reasons why I was attracted to seconding this amendment is the link to the invasion of domestic curtilage into our open areas.

990

Now Deputy Tindall knows that I am pretty exercised about this, she would probably say to the point of obsession, and I probably am. Just over a year ago, I did ask some Rule 14 questions of the Authority about the extent to which domestic curtilage was intruding into our open landscape. I had in mind, mainly, the preservation of the landscape and the Authority gave me a very helpful read out of how the matter had gone for the first 18 months since the IDP came in, and the statistics were quite telling, really, because there had been 189 planning applications to extend domestic curtilage into open land and, of those, 179 had been granted. Quite a hefty proportion of those were even the agricultural priority areas, as well as non-priority areas for agriculture and so on.

995

So under the Planning Law, and under the IDP, it seems to me there is almost a presumption in favour of granting planning permission to extend domestic curtilage and the relevance, really, to this amendment, and to policy GP3, is in that last line of policy GP3, which says this policy, roughly a protection for the biodiversity of an area, does not apply to household development within the curtilage of a dwelling. I think the connection was obvious and it would be helpful if Deputy Tindall, in replying to the debate, would just cover that aspect for me, please. Thank you.

1000

1005

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir. I shall be very brief indeed. As a general supporter of biodiversity policies and having made quite a few representations this term on behalf of residents, raising objections, it appears to me that the developers, who have much access to professional advice and a means to fund it, fare much better than the common person who seeks to make a case against a planning decision.

1010

The explanatory note of the amendment perhaps makes this point more subtly. It says:

1015

Some of those who voted for the Island Development Plan may be disappointed at some of the policy interpretations and implementations of the policies that were agreed.

Sir, I think that is nicely put. I suspect, therefore, that the proposers of the amendment share this frustration and I completely support their amendment and I thank Deputies Merrett and Graham for bringing it forward to us. Thank you, sir.

1020

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Sir, just briefly. One of the things I often say, I have got an awful lot of sympathy with the planners. They have an extremely difficult job, the phrase I have used before, is codifying subjectivity. What is good for one is not great for the other person. They have got an extremely difficult job, one phrase I have used before is codifying subjectivity. What is good for one is not great for the other person. They have got an extremely difficult job.

I think this amendment is a good amendment. I will be supporting it because I think it sort of ties people down and adds a little bit more – what is the word? – harder edges to subjectivity and moves us into a direction, which I think most of the Assembly will support, so I will be supporting this amendment and thank you to Deputy Merrett and Deputy Graham for bringing it. I am hoping the President of the IDP will support it as well.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir. I declare an interest in this matter. My husband is one of the team who runs the Guernsey Trees for Life and, as such, I am commandeered to help on rather a lot of weekends during the year and I wish I could do more. They do an amazing job in Guernsey, volunteers bringing together Islanders and enhancing the knowledge and understanding of the importance of our biodiversity and, in particular, native hedging and trees to that biodiversity.

There are all too many examples that we see, every one of us walking our lanes in Guernsey, of where hedges are being ripped out, not just by developers but by householders as well, and it is indicative of a lack of understanding of the importance of that hedging. It undermines subsoil and also denudes the landscape of important species.

So I really welcome much more strategy level initiatives such as this, because it supports the work of volunteers who are all too often fighting a tide of people not really understanding the implications of what they are doing, so I am really grateful to see this amendment and I will wholeheartedly support it. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall, do you wish to speak immediately before Deputy Merrett replies?

Deputy Tindall: Yes please. Thank you. Again, in the interest of speed, I will be as brief as possible. However this amendment does require a little detail to be discussed. The DPA wishes to support this amendment as, from the DPA perspective, officers are satisfied it is not extending the scope of the review to any extent and coming down within their workload, although I am afraid assurances on timeline cannot now, of course, be guaranteed.

I, for one, am happy to support it on the principle too. Deputy Lester Queripel has also spoken in debate and I am pretty sure, if my DPA colleagues that are not here today were present, I believe there would be similar sentiments expressed. However, this is on making various assumptions. In order to hopefully enable a speedier debate, I did send the assumptions and one query for clarification to Deputies Merrett and Graham, albeit only yesterday morning due to other pressures, unfortunately, on the planning officers who assist the DPA.

So, in order to ensure that clarity is given to the Assembly, as to the DPA's approach to the effect of this amendment, I wish to first point out that areas of biodiversity importance are areas of different habitat types that are of significance to nature conservation in the Island. The identification of these areas takes account of the need to ensure the survival of as many species as possible of Guernsey's native wildlife and to conserve representative examples of the Island's natural and semi-natural habitats, whilst balancing this with a need to provide for social and economic needs of the Island, in land-use terms.

The Island Development Plan includes a two-tier system of protection for sites of biodiversity importance in the Island. Guernsey's most important sites of biodiversity are designated as sites of special significance (SSSs), with a high level of protection and significant constraints to development. These can be designated at any time under the Planning Law and through the plan process, without waiting for the five-year review.

There are a number of other sites that do not have a sufficiently high level of special interest to be designated as an SSS, but nevertheless contribute significantly to the biodiversity of the Island. These sites and areas are designated as ABIs. The designation of ABIs provides a mechanism to offer some protection and enhancement through policy GP3, of such sites, when development proposals are being considered.

The primary difference between the two levels of protection is that SSSs are designated only where they are important for the conservation of habitats or species of national or international significance, whereas ABIs are designated because they support habitats or species of regional, Channel Islands or local importance, or have a particular local biodiversity importance, which is not of sufficiently high value to be designated as an SSS, but is nonetheless important.

Designation of an ABI is not intended to prevent development that is capable of satisfying the tests in this policy and would otherwise be acceptable under the policies of IDP. However, in recognition of the identified importance of the biodiversity of these sites, proposals for development within an ABI will be carefully assessed in order to secure protection and positive enhancement of biodiversity, through development where possible, and to minimise any negative impacts.

Where impacts cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation will be sought. In some cases, development provides an opportunity to reinstate or enhance the biodiversity interest of an area. La Société Guernésiaise and Environment Guernsey were involved in the assessment of SSSs and ABIs, albeit in data reports for 2003 and 2006. The outcome of the five-year review will include a recommendation of whether or not each site meets the guidelines and criteria for selection and any new ABIs that should be brought forward. However, the criteria will not be reviewed.

The information and evidence provided by this work will enable a more targeted and robust application of the IDP policies, increasing their effectiveness in delivering the intentions of the Strategic Land-Use Plan and the Biodiversity Strategy.

So the provisos I mentioned. Members are asked to appreciate that there needs to be an understanding of the limitation of Planning Law and policies in achieving the aims of the amendment; that there is a reliance by the DPA on policy direction from other relevant committees to be able to fully utilise the flexibility of all the IDP policies and that trying to achieve the aims mentioned in the amendment are no different.

Whilst DPA will consider the matters contained in the amendment, utilising, as always, the further explanations given in the debate, due to the amendment being open to some interpretation, clarification would be appreciated from the proposer and seconder, the proposer in this instance, provided as usual that those clarifications are not incompatible with the amendment. In any event, DPA cannot commit to any particular outcome of that review.

I should add these are the same provisos that we have requested in respect of Amendment 2. The issue of other Committees' mandates, particularly important in relation to both the protection of biodiversity generally, which is the role of the Biodiversity Strategy, and the Climate Change Action Plan, which both fall within the mandate of the Committee *for the Environment & Infrastructure*.

So, specifically, policy GP3 makes reference to the Biodiversity Strategy and those details emerging from it will be taken into account when considering proposals for development that may affect an ABI. There have been no such details published to date to take into account, when considering proposals for development that may affect an ABI. There have been no such details published to date to take into account.

I should also stress that not all the potential solutions to the issues raised by the proposer and seconder will be land-use based. I did go into detail about the specific mention of the application, which we could have mentioned, but I will skip that for brevity.

So, while Policy GP3 provides protection to biodiverse interests of an ABI, through consideration of that interest in the design and development, it needs to be understood that in some cases development on a site can enhance the biodiversity value through new planting or clearance of invasive species, etc. The policy does not prevent the clearance of sites because the clearance of

1125 vegetation, including unprotected trees, does not constitute development and does not, therefore,
require permission, including on ABIs. However, the meaning of development in SSSs has been
extended by law to cover this.

To clarify, the DPA have assumed by the wording of the amendment that the proposer and
1130 seconder are not seeking for consideration of the criteria of ABIs to increase the types of
development, which require planning permission to a greater degree, but less than that of SSSs, as
this would require amendment to planning legislation, rather than consideration of planning policy
and this is a question I raised with the proposer and seconder.

In terms of the amendment, additional work for the five-year review to assess the effects of
policy GP3 and any relevant policies is a logical progression of the work to take into account the
1135 findings of the ABI survey and to reflect on the concerns raised in relation to the case highlighted
in the amendment. The review will consider options to amend the policy wording to strengthen the
requirements to protect or enhance the biodiversity interests for the site.

A review of the effectiveness of Policy GP3 and any other relevant policy can be undertaken
within the existing resources and research would include a review of planning applications relating
1140 to ABIs for the decisions reached and conditions applied, cases where sites have been cleared of
vegetation, the potential for development of the existing ABIs under current policy, policy options
and their implications and other mechanisms to protect ABIs, such as planning covenants
referenced in policy GP3, tree protection orders and other IDP-designations such as important open
land.

1145 This does stress the point, and this is the real issue here, whilst this will assess the IDP policies
relating to ABIs and achievement the IDP aims and objectives, implementing the SLUP and
supporting the Biodiversity Strategy, we do rely on other Committees. Options to strengthen the
wording of the policy will be considered and scenarios tested. Any proposed amendment to policy
GP3 from resulting consequential amendments to other policies in the Plan being required and,
1150 therefore, as President of the DPA, rather than the IDP, I am very pleased to say that the DPA can
support this amendment. Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Merrett will reply.

1155 **Deputy Merrett:** Thank you, sir. Brevity in these times is important but it is also appropriate, as
I say myself, the backbenchers keep an eye on the policies that are put before us and react
accordingly. So I do thank the Assembly for its indulgence today and I will respond very speedily,
as I do not think I have got very much to respond to, other than to say thank you to the support for
Members that have spoken and thank you for support from Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, because she
1160 is not here, and I do hope we do not have to have a recorded vote.

I think Deputy Tindall had me on the more robust application of these policies, which is
appreciated. I also appreciate the clarity from DPA's perspective, but it is in the amendment to say
that they will consult with all relevant committees and return, so I look forward to seeing the work
progress and to seeing what they come forward with in due course. So I ask Members to go to the
1165 vote. Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: So, we will try going *aux voix*. Those in favour; those against?

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare it carried and it is clear a proxy vote would not alter the decision.

The second amendment is proposed by Deputy McSwiggan, seconded by Deputy de Sausmarez.
1170 Deputy McSwiggan.

[Amendment 2](#)

1. To insert the following Proposition:

"3. In its review of Agriculture Priority Areas, to direct the Development & Planning Authority to give particular consideration as to:

(a) The extent to which existing policies relating to Agriculture Priority Areas are effective in encouraging small-scale, sustainable farming projects, and/or whether any revisions may be needed, in order to foster a community in which local growing initiatives (including non-commercial initiatives) are positively supported; and

(b) Whether a separate policy should be drawn up under the Island Development Plan, consistent with the principles of the States of Guernsey's Climate Change Action Plan, which has the purpose of providing a clear policy gateway to support the development of small-scale, sustainable farming projects both within, and beyond, Agriculture Priority Areas."

2. To renumber the subsequent Propositions.

Deputy McSwiggan: Thank you, sir, I think the amendment and hopefully its explanatory note is indeed self-explanatory. The DPA have committed to look at agricultural priority areas, specifically as part of their five-year review. Deputy de Sausmarez and I and doubtless others in this Assembly are aware of instances where it appears that policies currently in place do not support sustainable small scale growing initiatives, as well as we hoped that they might and in a manner consistent with other States' policies, which either exist or are in the process of being developed, in the case of the Climate Change Action Plan.

In present times, more than ever, I am sure States' Members will acknowledge the value to us as a community of being as self-sustaining as we can be and therefore I ask Members to support this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez, you second it?

Deputy de Sausmarez: Yes, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall, do you wish to speak at this point?

Deputy Tindall: Not at this point, sir, thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir. At the beginning of the explanatory note on page 2, it says:

The aim of this amendment is to ensure that, so far as possible, Guernsey's planning policies are capable of supporting small-scale local farming initiatives, as well as larger-scale commercial agriculture. While this is already an aim of the Plan, anecdotal experience suggests it may not always be wholly effective in practice.

Well, sir, I am one such anecdote. I wanted to put a large, domestic, Victorian-style greenhouse in my garden for the purpose of growing tomatoes, aubergines, peppers, melons, and various soft fruit, and I had negotiated the price with the supplier, Hartley's in the UK, and said. 'I had better get planning permission sorted out first.' They said it would be a formality. 'We provide these all over the British Isles; there is never a problem.'

I said, 'Hang on, this is Guernsey. There might be.' So I went for a pre-planning meeting, I think I actually did it remotely, rather than actually going in, as you are advised to do, and I got told: 'No point in applying for that, because your garden is part of an agricultural priority area.' I have to say, it came as news to me as it had been very well wooded and mainly in orchard, but some forest trees many years before I moved in. While it is annoyingly big for a domestic garden, it is far too small and isolated to be a very useful field. But, nevertheless, I was told. 'You cannot have it because it is an APA.'

I said, 'Why? An agricultural priority area and what I want to do is grow stuff to be eaten?' 'Yes. But it is an APA, so if you apply for a greenhouse, we will have to treat it as a commercial,

horticultural application.' I said, 'That is absurd, because it is not. But, okay, if I do that, do I stand any chance of success?' 'No way, mate. We are not going to allow a commercial agricultural activity to take place on an APA.'

1210 So I gave up at that time. I have to say, and it goes back to what Deputy Graham was saying, I was pointed to the way forward. 'Why do you not apply for this area of your garden to be brought inside your curtilage and then we will be able to give you permission?' I will probably end up doing that, but actually I do not want to because I like the protection, because I will not always live there, I like the extra protection of it not being in the domestic curtilage for other reasons. I just cannot, 1215 for the life of me, understand why I cannot grow food on an agricultural priority area.

So, if that sort of nonsense can be addressed in a review, then I think that is a good thing and I am going to support this amendment; not just for my purposes but because I think anybody should be allowed to grow food for them to eat themselves rather than to send to Sainsbury's, in an agricultural priority area.

1220

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Sir, I have had a similar experience to Deputy Roffey. When I bought our place, we had 600 feet of glass on it and it was all pretty *futu* but it had to come down. So we cleared the 1225 land and I wanted to put another 200-feet block up. I was not allowed to, and the reason was, effectively, because it was not commercially viable. My argument basically was I had just taken it down, but once you have taken it down it is effectively not a vinery site any more.

So, having taken it down, let us say 10 minutes ago, 10 minutes later, it reverted into agricultural land, and I could not have put up one third of exactly the same thing that was wrecked in the same 1230 place. It was an oddity. Admittedly it was 15 years ago, and I would have had to have made an application to what was then, I think it was, the Board of Administration which was our economic development. I think it was Mr Case, but I gave him a call, he said, 'You have got no chance, Neil, there is 200 feet of glass there. It is not commercially viable.' It did not go anywhere.

So, actually, I am one of the 179 people that Deputy Graham mentioned. Or, I think it was 189 1235 people, that extended my curtilage. I am not going to turn it into swimming pools and patios. It does not look an awful lot different to when I took the vinery site down. But I think I have actually got more chance putting glass up on a curtilage than I would ever have had putting on something which was designated as an ex-vinery site.

It has always been one of those strange things. Again, I have got sympathy – I did say President 1240 of the IDP before, so I apologise Deputy Tindall, I think I meant President of the DPA – you are President of a very large book! In short, this has always been a bit of an odd thing, this vinery/field conversion; places like mine that have 600 feet, not quite a field, cannot do much with it.

I actually think, again, the IDP as it was written, actually recognised those oddities and actually 1245 tried to fix them in some way, but often the case is, sometimes when you try and fix something, the problem appears to get apparently worse or possibly abused. But to actually get back to the one we are talking about now, rather than the one we were talking about earlier, they are all sort of mixed up together so, in short, I will be supporting this because, again, I think it is another sensible amendment. Thank you.

1250 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, both Deputies Inder and Roffey have shown, by their examples, how if you make a plan over-prescriptive, it stops common sense being able to be developed. And yet we 1255 all passed this voluminous document in November 2016, which prescribes things. This is a very sensible amendment. It should be supported. I am sure it will be overwhelmingly, but if we had had a bit more flexibility and a bit more common sense and did not try to over-prescribe things, it probably would not have been necessary.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

1260

Deputy Gollop: Sir, I only partially agree with Deputy Ferbrache, but I will come back to that in a minute. We have heard the interesting and I know true life anecdotes about anomalies in the planning procedure, but I like to think I see the bigger picture. The bigger picture is that Guernsey has suffered for half a century of suburbanisation, the billiard ball lawn complex and so on, over-

1265

use of chemicals, and there has had to be a degree of rigidity in maintaining a biological, ecological framework.
In fact, I could have said, in relation to the last amendment, that it will be ever more important to conserve biological diversity as a way of combating environmental degradation and some of the changes that have been affecting both our climate and maybe our susceptibility to virus growth

1270

and so on.
The thing is, though, Deputy Roffey, Deputy Inder, Deputy Ferbrache and Deputy Prow, and Deputy Merrett in a way, have all hinted at a macro-issue behind some of this. Because I always get the impression that most of the professional community in the world of development, the architects and designers, the developers, and to a degree maybe the farmers who are commercial, support the framework of the Island Development Plan.

1275

But the paradoxes come from more the ordinary citizen, maybe the legal profession, the douzaines, because what we have done is we have created a policy-based framework based on evidence and professional advice and specialist qualifications that we admire in other walks of life. But that specialisation is not necessarily reflected in the political viewpoints of our community and maybe the way to get greater common sense, I am afraid, is to get more political decision-making and a higher proportion of test cases are actually given political oversight, whether it be in open planning meetings or a more traditional Island Development Committee framework that Deputy Graham remembered very well,

1280

So that is one point. In relation to this amendment, the agricultural priority areas, as I recall, was very much a codification and an acknowledgement within the plan that the officers and the community for Guernsey Together came to develop, of course with a planning inquiry process, of specifically designating lots of land as agricultural priority areas. I suppose, even when I was a Member of the Environment Board, I could not help but notice that there was a lot of land covered in the 'national park', as the late Deputy Dave Jones used to refer to it, of St Saviour's, St Peter's, Torteval, St Martin's even, but not so much in the Vale and St Sampson's.

1285

But that might have reflected, to a certain extent, the propensity for the north to have more horticultural land and also perhaps more suburbanised development, which made it harder for farming to be viable. The point I am making here is that the agricultural priority areas were really all about conserving viable areas of land of sufficient resilience and capability for the dairy sector. I do not think other areas were as considered as they might be, which is one reason I would urge Members to support this amendment.

1295

Because Deputy McSwiggan and Deputy de Sausmarez are clearly wanting a specific Proposition to give particular consideration to the extent to which existing policies relating to the agricultural priority areas, are effective in encouraging small-scale, sustainable farming projects, and whether any revisions will be needed in order to foster a community in which local growing initiatives, including non-commercial initiatives, are positively supported.

1300

Well, I think, since the plan was drawn up, because it was drawn up a few years prior to it being ratified by the States, there has been a significant growth in the interest of the slow food movement, of healthier living, of veganism. Even my friend and colleague Deputy Carl Meerveld is a smallholder of repute and I have just got to know him over a barbecue, when I think he had some chickens around. I know Deputy St Pier, amongst many other Members, is interested in the field.

1305

A smallholding, though, is not just a hobby or a way of getting in connection with ecological roots. It may actually be a strategic necessity for the Island at a time of uncertainty of imports and exports, of changes in our climate, of changes in our coast, of changes in our resilience to illness. So, it really makes sense for everybody to get behind this amendment and I believe we should have

1310

a separate policy. I think it is congruent with the Climate Change Action Plan and the explanatory note is about supporting small-scale local farming initiatives, as well as larger scale, commercial agriculture.

1315 I know Deputy Dudley-Owen, who has already mentioned her interest in conservation and habitats, would encourage economic development, as I am sure would Deputy Parkinson, to put even more emphasis on Guernsey produce, Guernsey food. It is a premium project, there are people willing to buy Guernsey home-grown meats, cheeses, foods, drinks, and everything else.

1320 We need to encourage that as maybe a diversification from our less resilient industrial sectors for the future. We maybe need to strengthen a presumption against development in certain areas, because I think, despite the good words of Deputy Tindall and I know the expertise, legal and underpinning that goes on in planning, I think there is still a disconnect between what the policy is and what the public think it is.

1325 The reality is there are some areas of the Island that are green lungs, that look like nice fields, that look like the recreational areas. But in strict planning terms, they are not areas of special scientific importance or environmental importance, and they have the potential for a degree of development.

1330 Now this amendment, really, needs to allow the review to consider changing, or extending, as I understand it, these areas, so that small, neat pocket areas, maybe even around Leale's Yard, for the sake of argument, could be used, but agricultural purpose is not about dairy cows and is not about puppy farming or something like that, but is about growing sustainable food for our community and, therefore, I support it.

1335 **The Bailiff:** It is now 12.30 p.m., I see four people wishing to speak and then I am sure Deputy Tindall wishes to do so, Deputy Merrett. We are not going to finish this in short order. I think there are other meetings that need to take place this lunch time, so we will rise and resume at 2.30 p.m.

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

**Procedural –
Suspension of debate on Item IV, Five Year Review of the Island Development Plan**

The Bailiff: Well, Members, as I indicated before lunch, there would be a Rule 18, Urgent Proposition, laid by Policy & Resources Committee. In order to do that, it will be necessary to suspend the debate on the amendment and the policy letter that we were having just before lunch. I put to you the proposition that we suspend that debate. Those in favour; those against?

Members voted Pour.

1340 **The Bailiff:** In that case, that debate is suspended and instead we will debate the Rule 18 Proposition and, for the benefit of anyone listening, I would invite the Deputy Greffier to read the Propositions.

Urgent Propositions under Rule 18

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Covid-19 Pandemic – Initial Economic and Financial Response – Debate commenced

The States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the policy letter entitled 'Covid-19 Pandemic – Initial Economic and Financial Response' of the Policy & Resources Committee, they are of the opinion:

- 1. To delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve measures that give direct financial assistance to companies or individuals, at a maximum cost of £30 million, to be funded from the General Revenue Account Reserve.*
- 2. To increase the existing authority for the Policy & Resources Committee to make available a temporary overdraft facility to Aurigny or guaranteeing external facilities by £27 million to a maximum of £52.7 million in 2020.*
- 3. To delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to undertake such negotiations, as may be necessary, to facilitate a loan guarantee scheme, for additional loans only, and to provide, on behalf of the States of Guernsey, underwriting guarantees of up to 80% of lending effected pursuant to the scheme in respect of Bailiwick businesses up to a maximum of £40 million.*

The Deputy Greffier: Policy & Resources Committee. Covid-19 Pandemic – Initial Economic and Financial Response.

1345

The States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the policy letter entitled 'Covid-19 Pandemic - Initial Economic and Financial Response' of the Policy & Resources Committee, they are of the opinion:

1. To delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve measures that give direct financial assistance to companies or individuals, at a maximum cost of £30 million, to be funded from the General Revenue Account Reserve.
2. To increase the existing authority for the Policy & Resources Committee to make available a temporary overdraft facility to Aurigny or guaranteeing external facilities by £27 million to a maximum of £52.7 million in 2020.
3. To delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to undertake such negotiations, as may be necessary, to facilitate a loan guarantee scheme, for additional loans only, and to provide, on behalf of the States of Guernsey, underwriting guarantees of up to 80% of lending effected pursuant to the scheme in respect of Bailiwick businesses up to a maximum of £40 million.

The Bailiff: And I invite the Vice-President of the Policy & Resources Committee, Deputy St Pier to open the debate. Sorry, Deputy Trott. I was either promoting Deputy Trott or demoting Deputy St Pier, or perhaps doing both. I am not really sure.

1350

Deputy Trott: We certainly do not want Deputy St Pier demoted at this time, sir, that is for sure. On Wednesday – yes, Wednesday, just two days ago – the President of the Policy & Resources Committee, Deputy St Pier, updated the States' Assembly of an initial package of financial measures to ease the impact of Covid-19 on employers, employees, and our community. Today, we bring a policy letter to this Assembly, for the Assembly's consideration and, I hope, decisive support. This is our opportunity, as the Government, to tell our community that we are going to help them.

1355

This is how we get assistance to the employers who need it; to our shops, to our hotels, to our construction firms, to our restaurants, to our events businesses, to our tourism businesses, to our manufacturers, to our small gardening firms and to our commercial fishermen and so on. In other words, sir, to the real economy; to small and medium-sized businesses, to sole traders and the self-employed.

1360

We can afford to provide this support because we have been prudent. We have reserves we can now use to support our employers. These reserves are for a rainy day and, to use the language of my dear, late grandmother, it is blow-me pelting it down. We must do it because those employers have families, their employees have families. It is vital that we protect their incomes, their livelihoods and their wellbeing through the biggest challenge we have faced as a community since the Occupation.

We are focusing on getting support where it is needed most, to support business in reducing their costs fast. To support business in keeping their liquidity and cash flowing, fast. To support business in ensuring that they can keep workers during this period. To ensure that those workers who do face temporary lay-off through this period of upheaval have access to support, fast.

So, how will we do that? Certain businesses will be allowed to defer the payment of employers' Social Insurance contributions due in the first two quarters of 2020. The self-employed will, of course, also have access to this measure and we will review, in Quarter Two, if we need to extend this measure.

The collection of commercial TRP will be deferred over the same period, providing further relief on outgoings over this difficult time. Our aim is that commercial landlords will pass on that saving to their business tenants. We will do the same. Where the States of Guernsey is a landlord to local businesses, we will defer rent if our tenants tell us that they need that. Similarly, the mooring fees for commercial fishermen, will be waived over this period, in recognition of the particular difficulties faced by that sector. A huge boost for one of our historic and culturally significant industries; an industry I know well.

Where the States of Guernsey is a creditor to local businesses, every effort will be made to pay swiftly and not wait for standard credit terms. Where the States of Guernsey is a debtor, in other capacities, then every effort will be made to treat customers sensitively and supportively at this time.

Now, at this stage, we are asking the States to agree to delegate £30 million to the Policy & Resources Committee, to put these and any other measures into effect. It is a substantial initial sum and I emphasise the word initial. There will be £5 million for an individual hardship fund, administered by Deputy Le Clerc's team at ESS, further supporting the excellent work she and her team are doing to support individuals and businesses through the crisis. The detail on that is being worked up, sir.

There will be £5 million for a business hardship fund and we are now putting plans together in close consultation with various trade organisations. Why two funds? Well, for many businesses, one of the biggest if not the biggest expenditure commitments will be staff wages, which given working capital pressures will also be one of the first costs owners will look to reducing in order to rebalance their finances.

However, at the same time, there will be a reluctance for businesses to lay off staff or make them redundant, as they will, in all likelihood, need these resources when they are ready to resume normal trading, without which the ongoing viability of the business may be in question. To further complicate matters, employers will have a natural loyalty to their employees and a keen interest in their ongoing welfare.

The first tranche of measures announced was the establishment of a hardship fund, aimed at supporting individuals. Workers who suddenly find themselves without employment are a typical target audience for this fund, depending on whether they would qualify for Income Support/Unemployment Benefit or whether they would require a top-up. Therefore, given support is already being targeted at these individuals, there is arguably an alternative and better means of providing this support, via their employers.

We should be encouraging employers to retain staff on their books, not only for the benefit of the business, but also the benefit of the individual themselves. A means of doing this would be by the States contributing towards the wages paid by small businesses. In the policy letter, we acknowledge that we are looking at a period of uncertainty.

The additional funding will also be used to establish additional measures that come forward from business. We are actively talking to businesses and their representative bodies, to understand what is needed and how we provide it.

Now, many of my colleagues are doing likewise. I do not need to mention everyone but one or two, I think, are worthy of mention. Deputy Mooney and Deputy Inder, for example, have helped businesses bring ideas to the table this week and Deputy Mooney is, in particular, a strong champion for the visitor economy. It may also be that the additional funding is required to help meet additional Income Support costs. In short, we need to continue to move at a pace, to support employers, employees, and our community and this will enable us to do just that.

Further to that, we are establishing a Guernsey Disruption Guarantee Scheme, to get cashflow to businesses that need it. Now this week, I have held two meetings with our banks and Deputies St Pier and Soulsby have been involved in that too. The banks are stepping up and are determined to help, and I want to take this opportunity to publicly thank them for their efforts and approach, because they too realise what we all in this Assembly already know and that is that we are all in this together.

The scheme is not for every business on the Island. It is intended for locally trading businesses, which are experiencing difficulties as a result of the Covid-19 outbreak. The scheme has been designed with the intention of limiting the economic impact of the outbreak on the economy as a whole.

Licensed financial services businesses will initially be excluded. Under the scheme, the States will guarantee 80% of the new loans issued by the banks. The maximum lending of the banks under the scheme will be £50 million. The aggregate liability of the States, pursuant to the guarantee, will be £40 million, reflecting the 80% cap.

Now, the States guarantee will only be called upon where a local business is unable to effect repayment of its borrowing and the bank has exhausted all other options to seek a solution to the default. The scheme, and this is really important, will only apply in respect of new lending made by the banks, and not in respect of any existing borrowing. There will be no transferring of existing risk to the States under the scheme.

Sir, the States, while determined to help and support our people and our economy, will not at any time be reckless with public funds and, to this end, the banks will look at each application on an individual basis, in the context of the business interruption caused by the outbreak, and decide whether to lend, independent of the scheme, and therefore or pursuant to the scheme. So, we will be protecting the taxpayer in the way that we do this, by using our capital to back the banks in getting cash to businesses that needed it.

Our aim is that, if a business applies for funding at 9 a.m. on Monday, maybe not next Monday, but certainly the Monday thereafter, if support is agreed, it has the money in its account by close of business on the Wednesday. So, we really are talking about a very swift turnaround and the banks have told us this timeframe can be done, in fact, it will be done.

The scheme, as I said, could be up and running by the end of next week – a huge effort from the banks to get this in place, and I am pleased to say that Jersey and the Isle of Man will also be part of the same scheme. The package of measures announced thus far is primarily, although not exclusively, focussed on small businesses, sole traders and the self-employed. But we know that the finance sector drives our economy and its health is essential, for the health of many, many small businesses, sole traders and the self-employed.

We are talking to them too, about how we support them, and the GFSC, our regulator, are actively involved in those discussions. But at this stage, we are focusing on those who will be hit hardest and hit earliest. Indeed, so is the finance sector. On Monday, I am meeting with the Guernsey International Business Association, who have come forward to set up a panel to provide support to small businesses who need it, for example, financial and accountancy advice.

This, then, is our opportunity to accelerate the process of supporting our economy, our employers and employees. It is essential to our community's wellbeing. Now, I ask the Assembly

to please give it the decisive support it deserves, and I promise you that we will move with momentum and get meaningful help to those who need it.

1465 Now, my election to the office of Chief Minister many years ago, coincided with the start of the global financial crisis, although, contrary to popular belief, the two events were unconnected! I make this reference, because my team at the time worked hard to avoid a situation where we over-promised and under-delivered. As a Government, we will do our best. However, even with our help, some businesses will not survive this crisis. But I hope and believe that most will and, eventually, normality will resume.

1470 That normality is, however, likely to be many months away. Now, at this stage, there may be some questions, to which I am unable to provide detailed responses. Some of the detail will develop over the course of the next few hours, let alone days. I have, however, been asked to both focus and leave on this essential set of initiatives, on behalf of the PRC, and I am prepared to do so.

1475 I undertake to keep all Members of the Assembly regularly informed as matters develop, but at all times, we shall be putting the needs of our community front and centre, both in terms of deployment and priority, and I know all in this Assembly would not want it any other way. Thank you, sir.

1480 **The Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Trott. Deputy Tooley, are you wishing to lay an amendment?

Deputy Tooley: Yes, sir.

[Amendment](#)

In Proposition 1 to delete "Policy & Resources Committee" and substitute therefor the words "Presidents (or delegates) of the Policy & Resources Committee and the six Principal Committees, operating as a committee for this purpose,".

1485 **The Bailiff:** Hard copies have just arrived. Can we just pause while those hard copies are distributed?

Deputy Trott: Sir, I have had no advance notice of this amendment, I give notice that I may need to call an adjournment.

1490 **The Bailiff:** I think it has just been laid on your desk. I thought you might want an adjournment to consult with the Committee. If you wish to do so, then I will propose that we do have an adjournment to enable that to happen, but I will give you a chance to read it first. Does everyone now have a copy of the amendment? Yes.

1495 Greffier, for the benefit of those listening, who may be wondering what is happening, I wonder if it would be helpful if you just read the amendment, and then we will see whether Deputy Trott wishes to request an adjournment.

The Deputy Greffier read out the amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott?

1500 **Deputy Trott:** Thank you. Whilst several senior Members of the States have already advised me of their belief that this is totally unnecessary, I do need to consult with the Members of the Policy & Resources Committee that are here. I do not think I need more than five minutes, sir. So five minutes' adjournment is sufficient.

1505 **Deputy Inder:** Sir, I was going to invoke Rule 24(4).

Deputy Trott: I am happy for that to be tested in advance.

1510 **The Bailiff:** Let us do that. Rule 24(4) provides ... but 24(4) can only be raised after the amendment has been proposed and formally seconded. So, would you like to hear Deputy Tooley's speech in support of the amendment before you rise, Deputy Trott?

Deputy Trott: Yes, I think so, on balance.

1515 **The Bailiff:** What we will do then, Deputy Tooley will propose the amendment. It will then be formally seconded and then Deputy Inder may invite those Members who support debate on the amendment to stand in their places. There will be no speech at that point, but if fewer than seven Members stand, when invited to do so, the amendment shall not be debated, and no vote will be taken on it. So, Deputy Tooley.

1520 **Deputy Tooley:** Thank you, sir. It has perhaps never been more true to say that we live in extraordinary times and we are asked to make fairly huge decisions at very short notice, with little time to think over them and to consider them and so on and I do apologise that, obviously, this amendment is coming at very short notice. We did, very briefly, speak to the President of the Policy & Resources Committee about it, but obviously he is under huge pressure at the moment and for him to have time to then speak to his Committee simply was not there and I do apologise and I
1525 acknowledge that fact, absolutely.

We have laid this amendment because, with the limited information that we necessarily have at this stage, it seemed very obvious to us that there are individuals within the States, Presidents of our Principal Committees, who have a huge amount of background knowledge and information
1530 about things such as the Employment & Social Security weight that sits on the shoulders of individuals who are running businesses on the Island, or who are in hardship on the Island, who have a great deal of information about the businesses that these people are operating and so on across our Island, in terms of economic development and so.

1535 Actually, these are the people who we felt would be best placed to be sitting around a table, holding the delegated authority for how such a large sum of money, intended to help and support our community, was to be spent. That is in no way any suggestion that we think that the Policy & Resources Committee would not be capable of doing this job, but we felt that by, at very short notice, deciding that was the right vehicle to take for this purpose, we were perhaps ignoring a huge amount of experience that has built up over the years of this term and, actually, might be
1540 better deployed in this purpose.

We are placing this amendment in order that we give proper consideration to who should be sitting around the table for that delegation of authority, and I so lay the amendment. Thank you.

1545 **The Bailiff:** And Deputy Merrett, do you formally second the amendment?

Deputy Merrett: I do sir.

1550 **The Bailiff:** And Deputy Inder wishes to invoke Rule 24(4). Will those Members who support debate on the amendment please stand in their places. I see 10, is that correct, Greffier? **(The Deputy Greffier:** Yes.) There are 10 Members standing and therefore the Rule 24(4) motion fails, and debate will continue.

I suspect, then, Deputy Trott, do you wish to have an adjournment? **(Deputy Trott:** Yes please, sir.) We will rise, and I do ask that Members come back promptly, So, we will resume at 3 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 2.55 p.m.
and resumed at 3.05 p.m.*

**Covid-19 Pandemic –
Initial Economic and Financial Response –
Debate continued**

1555 **The Bailiff:** We are ready to resume, I believe. Deputy Trott, do you wish to speak at this point in the debate or do you want to reserve your right to speak later?

1560 **Deputy Trott:** Sir, I think I will speak now and leave it to other Members of P&R to deal with any matters that I may not be able to cover. I will start by saying that, with the exception of Deputy St Pier, whose view we have not been able to seek because he is busy elsewhere, but whose view I think I can predict with a certain degree of accuracy as being the same as other Members of P&R, is that this is an amendment that we unanimously oppose.

1565 The work that we will be undertaking is, to all intents and purposes, our day job. It is what we do. In fact, I would argue in my case, it is practically all I have done in my two decades in this Assembly. It has always been my focus. I have, personally, also left social committees to others whose understanding of social matters is greater than mine. That has not always been the case when it has come to fiscal matters.

1570 We already have, as a Committee, material delegated authority. This is, in many respects, an extension of that authority that has already been delegated. Of course, we will consult with other Committees and I can think of a number of people in this room, who are not necessarily the Presidents or Vice-Presidents of some of the Principal Committees, but who certainly have a very significant knowledge and understanding of our commercial activities in the Island, who one would look to call upon.

1575 Speed of decision-making is absolutely essential, and, in fact, I intend to spend most of this weekend on this matter, because the need to get to market and be able to offer these solutions is crucial. It is not time for a talking shop, which I fear, sir, with a rotating membership, a committee of this type would soon become. Something resembling, arguably the old Policy Council.

1580 The amendment may be well-intentioned, but it will undoubtedly impact materially on our ability to move quickly. That is the nature of committees or groupings of this type. I think the amendment is unworkable. I hope that there are sufficient Members who will appreciate the expediency that is needed at this time and who will join me, and Members of the Policy & Resources Committee, in rejecting it. Thank you, sir.

1585 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Mooney.

Deputy Mooney: Sir, I think this amendment is utterly ridiculous. We have elected leaders and we should just let them lead and get on with it. I would also like to thank P&R and the civil servants that are present for their patience in this. It is utterly ridiculous, what we are looking at here.

1590 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

1595 **Deputy Roffey:** Thank you, sir. I think in a similar vein, although perhaps slightly less aggressively, we elected the membership of P&R back in April, or was it May, rather, of 2016 and we elected them to do two things: one, to actually be the leadership Committee of this Assembly, and the other was in the allocation of resources. The clue is in the name Policy & Resources.

Whether we got it absolutely right in the Members that we elected to the Committee at that time is entirely a matter of conjecture and subjectivity, but that is who we elected to do this job. What I see, under Proposition 1 here, is very much a question of the allocation of resources, and therefore I do believe that they are the right people to do the job. Furthermore, if we were going to

1600 move away from that structure, I am not sure that the structure in this amendment is the one that I would move to.

I had the dubious pleasure of serving on two different Policy Councils, which were basically their Presidents, or sometimes the Presidents, actually it was a moving feast. Lots of other people came in on different days to represent the various committees of this Assembly, and I can tell Members
1605 it was not an efficient body for a number of reasons and this could engage half the Assembly at different times, particularly with the pressures on people to go and do other things inside their committees, sending delegates along. I am not at all convinced we should go to that.

I do, however, think that this amendment probably has arisen from a genuine concern that a number of us have felt, indeed I circulated, I think it was either last night or this morning, an email
1610 saying it was actually less about the role of P&R, it was more about the extended long-term role of the Civil Contingencies Authority – and this is no criticism at all of the Civil Contingencies Authority – because I think that the Members, and in particular actually Deputy St Pier and Deputy Soulsby, have been doing a remarkable job under enormous pressure, but I do think there is fear of a demographic deficit if that extends too far and, in particular, if we have to make very harsh or
1615 compelling measures on behalf of the community, we do have to make sure we get our governance right, to make sure that they are seen to have legitimacy.

That said, the last thing I want to do is go back to discussing education, but lots of people have accused other people of trying to devise systems of education on the floor of the Assembly. If this crisis is going to go on for six months and we need to look at a different form of governance, I do
1620 not want it invented on the floor of the Assembly, on the back of an amendment that I have only just seen and I had no idea it was actually coming.

So, I understand where this is coming from, but this policy letter is not about the Civil Contingencies Authority mutating into a long-term emergencies committee over the next six months, it is about the allocation of £30 million to businesses and individuals and I think, actually,
1625 if Members of P&R could get up early on, we have got a busy agenda, there is this policy letter we have got to get on and debate, it is really important once you get past the amendment, and give real assurances that they will engage in some of the key players – I am thinking of people like, certainly, Deputy Le Clerc, on behalf of Social Security, because she is going to be the conduit for ordinary families that need the financial support; I am thinking of people like Deputy Parkinson,
1630 who will be the conduit to business and the sort of support that they need.

If they pledge that, in carrying out what is their mandate – and it is absolutely their mandate – they will do it with a mind not to be high-handed, yes Deputy Trott is quite right, we need despatch; we do not need weeks of debate, no shilly-shallying, a stitch in time is needed here and we need to get on with it, but if they promise to engage in the people they really need to, I think the majority
1635 of us will say, 'Thank you Deputy Tooley, I understand your concerns, but you got it wrong on this occasion.' And we can move on to actually debating the meat – I am a vegetarian, I should not say that – the meat of this policy letter, which is what is really important this afternoon.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder wishes to move an amendment motion under Rule 26(1). Is that
1640 correct? Will those who have not already spoken and wish to do so, please stand in their places. Nine people are standing. Do you wish to go ahead? (**Deputy Inder:** Yes, sir.)

I put to you then the motion that debate be terminated. Those in favour; those against?

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I believe that is carried. You have got no right to speak, Deputy Fallaize, that was carried. Your knowledge of the Rules is usually greater than mine, Deputy Fallaize! Perhaps on this
1645 occasion not! Deputy Tooley will reply.

Deputy Tooley: I do not know, I am perfectly prepared to accept this amendment has almost certainly fallen but I would kind of like to get to the vote on it first. Thank you. I think Deputy Roffey's

speech has summed up a great deal of the reason behind why this amendment was laid and I think if we had had a little bit more time to think about the words that we had used and the phrasing, than the few minutes we had over lunch, we would probably, rather than having said in the amendment Presidents or delegates of, blah blah ... have referenced the Covid-19 Political Executive Group.

I mention that because, as Members of Principal Committees, we nominated our Presidents or, in their stead, the Vice-Presidents and so on, to act as delegates for those Principal Committees on the Covid-19 Political Executive Group and we did that last week. We understand, obviously, that things are moving apace but, to my knowledge, that group has not since then met. Huge numbers of decisions are being made about the way in which the Island should operate, irrespective of the fact that there is a group, constituted for that purpose, which is not meeting.

Decisions are being made, which are not being made in consultation with Presidents and Members, through the Presidents, of the Principal Committees, in whose mandate those areas fall. I am not going to list them, because I do not want to create huge amounts of concern about that, but decisions are being made that Presidents and Members of Committees are hearing about through media releases, and that is not an acceptable way for us to run Government, within our Committee system of Government.

I quite agree with Deputy Roffey that we need to be agile and we need to be fleet of foot and, with Deputy Trott, absolutely, I have no problem with that. This amendment was not aimed in any way at suggesting that Policy & Resources Committee are not capable of using delegated authority in order to do this, but there needs to be proper regard to the fact that not only should we not be designing a different form of Government on the floor of the Assembly, we should not be designing a different form of Government by rushing at the easiest thing to do in the circumstances, when we have created other groups to make that possible, as a more democratic – let us use that word – way of doing business in these very unusual times.

So I thank Members for their patience in allowing us to at least discuss this very briefly in the Assembly, because I do think this needs raising and I do think that, in addition to the assurances that were presented by Deputy Trott during his speech, for which I very much thank him, it is excellent to have those assurances there, we do need, as an Assembly, ongoing assurance that the Covid-19 Political Executive Group is meeting and is being consulted with and is operating as best it can be encouraged to operate in these circumstances and that we are using the tools that have been provided in order to be able to best manage and govern the country at this time and that, when a decision is made about whatever will happen in the next iteration of this, it is one that is agreed by the Assembly. Thank you, sir.

Deputy Inder: Sir, I need a recorded vote.

The Bailiff: There is a request, then, for a recorded vote on the amendment, which means proxies can be exercised, but only if those exercising the proxy have instructions from the person on whose behalf they are voting.

There was a recorded vote.

The Bailiff: I think Deputy Lowe, were you trying to suggest that you have a proxy vote for somebody? You were trying to attract my attention, I am not sure what you were trying to tell me.

Deputy Lowe: Yes, sir, I was just trying to ask if I am allowed to use my vote now I am back in the Chamber.

The Bailiff: Yes, of course you are. Sorry, I thought maybe you were trying to exercise a proxy on behalf of somebody else. Of course, if you are in the Chamber, you are allowed to exercise your vote. Deputy Dudley-Owen?

1700 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Yes, now that Deputy Lowe is back in the Chamber, presumably I still act as proxy for Deputy Leadbeater, is that correct?

The Bailiff: I am not sure what his current instruction is. I thought that you were only his proxy in the event that Deputy Lowe was not available.

1705 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Yes, I think we were not sure when Deputy Lowe was coming back into the Chamber after the CCA, so unless Deputy Leadbeater changes now, can we continue as is?

The Bailiff: What is his instruction?

1710 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** There has been no deviation from, or no variation from the original instruction.

The Bailiff: Which, originally, was Deputy Lowe, or failing that ...

1715 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** No, today's instruction, which was for myself to act as proxy.

The Bailiff: Okay. Sorry, I thought maybe that is why Deputy Lowe was trying to attract my attention earlier, but no. So you are his proxy, thank you.

Amendment

Not carried – Pour 6, Contre 30, Ne vote pas 3, Absent 0

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

* denotes Deputies who voted by proxy.

The Bailiff: The voting on the amendment was 6 in favour, with 30 against and three abstentions. I declare it lost. We move to general debate and I will call Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, I commend the work of Policy & Resources, I commend the speech of Deputy Trott and he and his Committee and all the civil servants that have been here and otherwise have my overwhelming support, so when I make some comments, they are meant as constructive comments, they are not meant in any way as criticism because, as Deputy Trott has said, things have changed dramatically in the last two days. They will change dramatically in the next two or three days. We are in a completely different zone than any of us, however long we have lived, have ever experienced.

This is a complete and absolute crisis and the fewer people that make the relevant decisions, having taken whatever instruction, information and guidance they need, so much the better. I appreciate the comments made about keeping people informed; of course that should happen as often as possible and as regularly as possible, but the main thing is to get on with the job. To save people's businesses, to save people's lives, to make sure this community has a future, to make sure that the people of this Bailiwick are well looked-after. In my view, they are being very well looked after in very difficult circumstances at the moment.

The way I read this package is as follows. Let me declare an interest, because clearly it is well-known that I have an interest in the hospitality sector and just two days ago, the managing director, who is my son-in-law, has worked all his life in the hospitality sector, had to tell 46 people they no longer had a job. So this package, through no fault, even if it had come two or three days earlier, would not have saved those people's jobs.

Let me also say this, because I think we have got other practical difficulties to look at and I feel at the moment, I am a bit like Deputy Gollop when he sometimes struggles to get into his iPad, I am struggling to get into mine. I have just had an email from one of my daughters, a daughter who is already in the business. These are practical things that we have got to look at. This is where we need to be fleet of foot. She said this to me, because we have still got some staff, whether we will have some staff after today, I know not.

A member of staff asked us today if he could leave us to temporarily work in a supermarket, as they are needing staff to fill the shelves at the moment. He wants to stay in the accommodation and pay us rent. Once this crisis is over, he fully intends to come back to work for us. He needs to keep his head above water, too. We have just paid £700 last month, for a long-term licence for him. As the law stands, we would have to cancel his licence and he would need to have a new one with his new employer. Say he comes back to us in a month's time, that is another £700 to reapply for the licence.

We have around six long-term licence employees, so that is another £700 a kick, that may all be looking for temporary work elsewhere. The rest are on short-term at £120. Now, I am not making any point in relation to my businesses. We need absolute flexibility. We need to say that those kinds of charges, these kinds of business ... do you want me to give way, Deputy Lowe? (**Deputy Lowe:** Yes, please, sir.) I will give way.

Deputy Lowe: Yes please, because I think it will help yourself and indeed others that are listening. Had the events not overtaken this morning by Civil Contingencies, it was the hope there would be a regulation placed out into the public domain where Population Management have dealt with this, have done everything possible to ensure that people like you are explaining there will not be in that position. We are doing all we can to support businesses and also those that are on short-term permits will be, under the current permit, they are not allowed to have another job, will be able to work within the community where they need to be if there are positions there and, of course, some of those fees will be waived as well.

Deputy Ferbrache: Those fees – not talking about my organisation – those fees must be waived, we must be as flexible as we can, we must get on and do it. Because there will be other industries.

The health industry are going to be crying out for people to work. The care homes are going to be crying out for extra people to work. Get rid of the bureaucracy, get it done, get it done now, get it done today, get the form-filling down to an absolute minimum. Let people do the jobs and worry about the pieces of paper afterwards.

1775 Let me speak about Aurigny, because that falls within the remit of the committee, or Board, that Deputy Roffey and I are the Members here today. Now, our Chief Executive told me this. He said, if it helps, the last three Thursdays are reference points, the numbers through the airport are: 5th March, arrivals 728, departures 892, total, 1,620; 12th March, arrivals 782, departures 968, total 1,750; yesterday, 19th March, arrivals 259, departures 107, total 366. Of course we have still got the
1780 remnants of the students coming back. That is why we have probably got more arrivals than departures. Those figures show just how dramatic our economy has fallen off a cliff at the moment and it has not reached the bottom.

It is always better when you get to the bottom, because at least you know that you can only look upwards. Here, we are still falling towards the bottom. Now Deputy Trott was not only a former
1785 Chief Minister, he was a former Treasury Minister and I have no doubt he would not want to tell us about his successes there.

But, in relation to this particular matter, we would be saying this, this reminds me of what the Chancellor in England did with his Budget and then, a week or a few days later, he came back with another package. This is like stage one, because this talks about, for example, and again I emphasise
1790 that nothing I am saying must be taken as any kind of criticism at all, it talks about suspension of TRP, suspension of certain payments, suspensions of those. In reality, those payments are going to have to be written off. I appreciate that is for a more considered policy letter, consideration, because you cannot just pluck money out of the air.

The figures that are put in here are very sensible. Now Deputy Trott, I am sure he does know,
1795 but if does not then he will tell us. People will go to the banks and say, I am making the figure up, 'I need another £200,000 to get my business through the next three months.' Will the banks be applying the same normal credit criteria that they have applied in the past? Because I appreciate the States are being asked to guarantee £40 million or so.

Because, indeed, if they do that, then in practical terms, it may be difficult for some of those
1800 businesses to get loans because what they are going to have to say is, I do not know how long this crisis is going on for, I do not know whether my business is going to be shut for three months or six months, I do not know what my turnover is going to be. I can tell you in relation to our restaurant business, without disclosing the figures to you, that we will do no more than a quarter of the business this week than we did in the equivalent week last year, and up until two weeks ago, every
1805 week this year, our business was up. So that just shows how business has fallen off a cliff.

It is not just the hospitality sector. The construction sector depends on specialist workers coming from outside of the Island. They are not going to be able to get here because they are not going to come here and be isolated for two weeks, before they can work, and then go back home and be isolated for another two weeks. So that is going to grind a large part of that sector to a halt.

1810 Now the figures in here, which I can speak about, Aurigny, our officers are very able officers, are in touch with Aurigny daily and will continue to be in touch with Aurigny daily and the situation changes daily. Aurigny's financial position is desperate, as this policy letter indicates. We will continue, and I have not had the chance to discuss it in any detail with Deputy Roffey or, indeed, Deputy Smithies, but it would be my intent that we will be meeting with the management of
1815 Aurigny, as a political body, very early next week, because that is important. The conduit has got to be from officer to officer and then come to us. But I want to look them in the eyes, to make sure that we have got the leanest, meanest, airline, that we can have, going forward.

Because this crisis will affect the travel industry for a long time. We are very lucky indeed, and I commend those Members of the States who are in the States now and those Members of the States
1820 who are no longer here, for the decision to purchase Aurigny all those years ago. Would we not be in a connectivity pickle without them?

What I say in relation to these Aurigny figures, they are frightening, they frighten me, and there are not many financial things that do frighten me, but these frighten me. The whole package frightens me, but we are in a position whereby we have got to allow those people, and I trust the judgement of Deputy Trott, I trust the judgement of Deputy St Pier, I trust them to speak to the people they need to speak to, as and when they need to speak to them. I trust the judgement of Deputy Soulsby and her team in relation to those matters. I trust the civil servants that sit over there. I trust the civil servants that serve myself and Deputy Roffey and our Committee. We have got to let them get on with the job.

If sometimes they do not tell us everything every second, we have to realise there are more important fish to fry. I commend Deputy Trott and I commend this package to the States.

The Bailiff: Deputy Laurie Queripel.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir. Firstly I would like to join Deputy Ferbrache in saying a big well done to the Policy & Resources Committee and to their advisers, for moving so quickly on this one. One can fully understand why these measures are being proposed and there is no doubt that businesses and individuals will need to access them.

Of course, we have only just had a chance to look at this policy letter. I am sure other Members, like myself, have several questions they would like to ask, but I am just going to confine myself to two and I am sure other Members will fill in the gaps. I firstly wanted to refer Deputy Trott to 2.7 in the policy letter, just roughly half way down, it speaks about:

Those measures designed at easing business cash flow will adversely affect the States' cash flow. However, measures are being put in place to increase the States' overall liquidity and it is anticipated that this can be managed, at least in the short-term with active consideration of options to seek our own credit-lines to avoid the requirement to sell financial assets in our investment portfolio in a falling market ...

Now, I do appreciate, as Deputy Trott said, he cannot give very fine detail on these issues, but I just would like, if could expand a bit more on what it means by our own credit lines, that would be very helpful indeed so one can better understand that.

The second thing I would like to ask about, and there are a number of elephants in the room, but for me the biggest elephant in the room is the bond. I know it is not easy to make any forecast at the moment, but I would like to know are there any forecasts or predictions in regard to the bond, because we know that the stock markets are falling, we know that investments are suffering.

So, I would just like to ask what is the immediate, and if possible can it be forecast what perhaps the longer-term future of the bond is. How do we stand in regard to the bond reserve, what about the coupon payments? Will there be a need to access public funds to repay in regard to the bond, or is the bond still able to be self-funding, as it were, or will we need to use States' monies, public funds, taxpayers' money in order to service the bond. So those are just the two points I would like to bring to Deputy Trott's attention, sir. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Yes, first of all, I would like to welcome the swift and decisive response of P&R to the current situation and I think the scale of the response is appropriate to the circumstances. I have said for some time that I think the health costs, in purely financial terms, of this crisis, will pale into insignificance, in comparison to the economic cost to the Island.

What we are talking about here is life support for businesses. Life support to ensure that, when the crisis has past, that we have industries in waiting, to borrow from some of the phraseology in the policy letter, which remain to restart and get the economy going again, as soon as possible. Of course, in that context, we need to minimise the scale of bankruptcies, which unfortunately will, inevitably occur in the down period.

Support will need to be substantial and sustained and it is important and Deputy Trott recognised this in his opening speech, to underline the word 'initial' in the title to this policy letter, *Initial Economic and Financial Response*. The life support will need to continue some time after the health crisis has abated. Other measures, of course, will be needed; not simply financial ones, and I welcome the statement from Deputy Lowe that Home Affairs are doing what they can to relax the Population Management regime.

We will have a number of people who are on-Island, particularly in the hospitality industry, who will no longer have jobs in the hospitality industry, but who will need to work, may find it very difficult circumstances to go home, and it would be far better for us to employ them in other sectors of the economy, like the grocery stores, which are doing quite well in these difficult times, and rather than have them sort of on the streets simply because their licence restricts them to the job they came here for.

So, hopefully, we will be able to avoid or mitigate most of those problems. Finally, I think all I need to say is that Economic Development will, of course, play its part in developing and implementing the policies that will be needed and we are fully aware of the scale of the task ahead of the States, but we will provide all the support we can to Policy & Resources and indeed to any other Committee, to whom we can provide assistance. As has been said many times, we are all in this together. Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir. I will be supporting this proposal wholeheartedly and I want to pick up on three words used in Deputy Trott's speech: 'initial', 'fast' and 'reluctance'. Initial, as Deputy Parkinson has picked up on, I think this is a very good first step, but I think it is inevitable that more will be needed and, when it is needed, we will need to support it. This is going to be a long haul. The damage is going to be extensive. Not just to Guernsey but worldwide. We need to do everything we can to support our local economy, our local businesses and protect them as much as possible, within our limited ability to do so.

Fast. I do have one question regarding fast. The speed of response, by bringing this policy letter, is good. But also the speed at which it has to reach the recipients is also important. Unfortunately, as a Government, we have an over-abundance of bureaucracy and, if the administration of these funds creates hurdles that people have to jump through, then the actual funds may not reach the intended recipients in time to save them or benefit them in the way we intend. So I would like to ask one question on the administration, how quickly we can expedite the actual delivery of funds.

Then, Deputy Trott mentioned the word 'reluctance', in the context of people being reluctant to lay-off staff. One of the feelings, the emotions that is coming from certain sectors of our population is denial. A lot of people are still under the impression that this will be a short-term anomaly and it will soon pass, and we will be back to life as normal.

I think this the Members of this Assembly, with the briefings we have had and the information we are getting and I think possibly a more macro view of how it is going to affect us, understand this will be months, and potentially many months of disruption. There is an issue. As individual business people, especially when it is an owner running a business, or a founder of a business, and I am guilty of this as anybody else, when a business is not going well, there is a reluctance to lay-off staff; there is a reluctance to make the hard decisions and to pull back and say, 'Actually I need to live and fight another day.'

I know there are considerations of trying to instruct certain businesses to close but I think, as a States, we may want to think about bringing that forward and going out to the restaurants and the services trades and actually advising them they should be closer sooner rather than later. The danger is that these businesses are in denial, that they think that there will be a few weeks of downturn and they will carry on running their businesses as usual.

They will have that loyalty to their staff and their customers, they want to preserve, but actually in the long-term the costs and debts incurred during that period, with reducing or no revenue, is

likely to kill them. So, in the long-term, bankrupt them. So I think, as a States, we have a certain responsibility, potentially be more aggressive in our advice to businesses as well, and I would like Deputy Trott's thoughts on that.

Then, on specifics, Proposition 3 talks about loan guarantees of up to 80% and the fact that this is to support loans outside of the independent lending policies of the banks. My question on that one is, on what criteria are we asking the banks to soften their normal lending procedures? Because if the States is saying we will guarantee loans, presumably that is only to facilitate the lending to people who normally would not qualify, people who do not have the reserves or the assets or the business case to support a loan, but need one at this critical time to bridge them over this crisis.

So I am interested to know, if a company has a strong balance sheet, it can get a loan anyway, it does not need the assistance of the States. What are we doing, what are the criteria we are going to be putting around those loans to say, 'here is a company which needs an 80% guarantee from us, otherwise it will not get access to that cash,'? Because that does increase the risk from the lender's perspective, the bank, but we are helping to take on that risk to a percentage of 80%, so I would be interested on that.

Then I have to put on one of my different hats, in this case, Alderney Representative Steve Roberts' hat, as he has asked me to ask a couple of questions on behalf of Alderney. The first question is can P&R confirm the closing of the direct Alderney-Southampton service, due to the Covid crisis, and when that is likely to be put into operation? Secondly, I think this is a very important question, will this package extend to the whole Bailiwick, including companies in Alderney and the other Islands, because obviously they are going to be suffering the same impact and he would like to know whether or not the other Islands will also be covered by these packages? Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Mooney.

Deputy Mooney: Sir, I would like to invoke Rule 26(1), in order to allow Deputy Trott to get on with the job.

The Bailiff: Will those Members who have not already spoken and wish to do so please stand in your places? I see three standing, do you wish to proceed?

Deputy Mooney: Yes, sir.

The Bailiff: I put to Members, then, the proposition that debate be terminated. Those in favour; those against?

Members voted Contre.

The Bailiff: I think that is defeated. Deputy Inder has requested a recorded vote. We will have a recorded vote. But on this vote, I remind you, proxies cannot be exercised, so only those Members who are physically present in the Chamber can vote.

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 7, Contre 15, Ne vote pas 4, Absent 13

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

1960 **The Bailiff:** The voting on the guillotine motion was 7 in favour, with 15 against and four abstentions. I can declare it formally lost.

Deputy Gollop has stood quite a number of times. Deputy Gollop.

1965 **Deputy Gollop:** Yes, I think there is a mood, certainly amongst some of the more business-minded Members of the States to get on with it and not debate and not have any kind of politicking, but I think it is important that we remain at least partially true to our parliamentary and Assembly traditions. Only this afternoon, we have had an important press conference by our senior leadership team, who are doing an outstanding job, which will effectively close non-food pubs and clubs.

1970 We are already entering a bizarre situation I would suggest whereby important announcements affecting our society and economy are being made to the public and the media and to Facebook before they are made to this Assembly, and that is not necessarily a pattern we wish to go on with indefinitely, especially when we are in session.

1975 I had a lot of sympathy for Deputy Tooley's amendment. I did not vote for it in the end because it perhaps would not have seemed particularly statesmanlike to support a model that would have been clumsy and difficult to interpret, just like that. But the Deputy Merrett/Deputy Tooley amendment had its heart and mind in the right place; because we run the risk of losing touch with connectivity and democracy at the moment and that point has to be made.

1980 I know some of my colleagues say to you, 'Deputy Gollop, you are an irrelevance.' But we are becoming an irrelevance. Many Members of this States are no longer, unless we follow the media all the time, and read our emails, if we can get through the dross, and work our iPads and all the rest of it, we are losing the plot, basically. What is happening is a very expert, inner political team, mixed with some highly competent and professional medical and Civil Service, are running the Island. That is where we are at.

1985 I have been saying for over 20 years we need executive Government, but we need it properly thought through and of a nature that is in some ways democratic. Nevertheless, I think the public are actually behind this approach to Government. I think it is pretty obvious that anyone who criticises it gets a degree of push back, because it is a unique and unparalleled emergency. But that does not mean to say we should not comment, at least, on the material that is put before us.

1990 We at Social Security – Deputy Le Clerc might go into this more later – we have met over lunch and we are already working hard on the Hardship Fund and other areas that are material to this, but one Proposition that I will struggle to give unqualified support to, before us, is Proposition 2. I quite understand, Deputy Ferbrache has made the point, that Aurigny needs a degree of safety, but why are we kind of promising what amounts to a big cheque of up to £25.7 million?

It could well be that that could be reduced if Aurigny reduced its workforce or sold a plane. Not that that might be advisable at this time. But that does seem to me to be a little bit of an upper trajectory among, because when we know we have to commit hundreds of millions to the economy, over the next year or so, I do not think Aurigny was in everybody's mind as being priority number one, although I will always support the nature of connectivity to the Island and of course we have learned the hard way this month that owning an airline is of strategic benefit to the community.

To go onto some of the other points, we have £30 million in order to fund measures which are well-judged, proportionate and relevant to the Bailiwick's needs, but they are not specified, particularly what the criteria will be. We have so many industries that are worthy of support, that range from the hospitality sector and horticulture and things like that, right across to the digital economy and the insurance sector. How we actually allocate those funds in the most proportionate way, maybe to those who are least well off, or maybe to those who are most important, is something we do not know.

I think it is probably right that Policy & Resources, at this stage, rather than the Emergency Council or a reformed Policy Council, are the obvious Committee to allocate those resources, but I wish the criteria was indeed clearer. Deputy Ferbrache and Deputy Mooney and others have raised an interesting point about the nature of recruitment and the employment population permits, because population permits on the Island, historically, at least with the old Housing Law and I think the new Law, allow people rights if they have been here seven years, 14 years and you can lose those grandfather rights if you go.

Now, if this crisis lasts for a few months or longer, then I think we should have some kind of a holiday to ensure that, just because somebody was in the wrong place at the wrong time, does not necessarily disadvantage them or their family or any employment that they have. That is perhaps tangential to this particular States' Report, but I think it is a matter that needs to be flagged up.

On 2.4, you have consideration given to companies and the self-employed, to be allowed to defer payments and tax. Whether that is deferral, or a kind of a loan, or whether that is cancellation, remains to be seen. But we have to take it at face value that it is a deferral, and the same goes to landlords.

I do accept the hardship fund and I also listened carefully to Deputy Trott when he suggests, probably accurately, that this is the first of a wide range of measures. But, apart from the Aurigny question, where I would prefer a smaller sum of money, maybe it is irresponsible to vote against this, but I certainly think it is an excessive cash envelope. I am very uncertain about the mechanics of the loan guarantee scheme. The loan guarantee scheme identified in section 4 offers a potential underwriting to Bailiwick businesses of some kind to £40 million, up to 80% of the scheme's lending.

Now, the point has already been made, we do not know whether the banks will be lending on current criteria, former criteria, or new criteria. But how can you guarantee that local banks or banks who service the Island or other kinds of investors will actually be kind and provide the £10 million, because the nature of this underwriting package suggests that we would not be able to give 80% if the other 20% was not forthcoming from your friendly neighbourhood bank manager and I think that the policy of banks to individual customers and corporate customers is something that I know Deputy St Pier, Deputy Soulsby and Deputy Trott, and other people have already been working on, but I suspect there is more work to go in ensuring everyone has a mentality of we are all in it together.

Also, to be fair, that the banks of the British Isles and other banks who service Guernsey, are in a position to lend and that they are in no way creating a situation, which happened 12 years ago, due to the credit crunch. So although I certainly support that, I think there is more work we need to do and more emphasis on the criteria for support and also the urgency and there have been proposals made, I think even in the UK today, of the Rt Hon. Boris Johnson giving cash to people in need.

Now that perhaps does not go well with our systems, but we need to find a mechanism of being fleet of foot, with both small amounts and large amounts and I suspect we may need, if we do not get it through a gentleman's agreement, or a gentlewoman's agreement, some legislation about

2045 eviction as well. But in general I support this package, with a strong reservation on the Aurigny section.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Clerc.

2050 **Deputy Le Clerc:** Thank you, sir. I could not agree to Deputy Tooley and Deputy Merrett's amendment earlier on, because there are things happening behind the scenes and I am not sure that everybody is aware of what is happening, so I would just like to spend a couple of minutes just talking through a policy paper that we received at ESS this week. My understanding is that it is going to be discussed at every Committee meeting. I think it is just we were fortunate we had one
2055 on Tuesday.

That was the establishment of a Covid-19 Political Executive Group and this is an expansion of the CCA and will include ... well it is a bit ambiguous at the moment. I know Deputy Trott will not be able to give all the answers, but it would be useful I think, not only for myself but for other Members if, at some point, P&R could come back with clarification.

2060 But it was indicating that this executive group would include the Presidents of all the Committees. However, there was another paragraph in the paper that also says that Education, Sport & Culture and the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security, would be co-opted onto the Covid-19 Political Executive Group 'as necessary'. So there is some ambiguity there and, so far, I know that I have not been asked to any of those meetings, but I do not know if it has actually met,
2065 so I do not know if it is still meeting under the auspices of the CCA, or whether it is now meeting under the Political Executive Group. But I think, for those Members that are not actually on a Committee, they were probably not aware of this happening behind the scenes.

I think it is just really important that we clarify this and get a message out to everybody. Then poor Deputy Parkinson, I do not know whether he has been included as well, but I think, again,
2070 because of his hat on with liaising with business and what is being proposed in this policy paper, I think it is really important that he has some input. I am not blowing my own trumpet here, but again I do think it is also important from a Social Security perspective, that we are involved and aware what businesses are already offering to employees.

That is just one thought. I will just go on now to some of the work that has been happening in
2075 Social Security and a lot of work has been happening. A meeting happened on Monday and a sum of money, £5 million, has been granted to us. Now, we are in a unique position because we know that, actually, some people will be eligible for unemployment benefit and sickness benefit and that actually will not come out of the Hardship Fund, that will actually come out of the Guernsey Insurance Fund.

2080 We also know that there will be some people that will be eligible for Income Support and what we are doing is we will be taking Income Support applications but with a light-touch approach, so that we can actually process those payments far more quickly and, if people have got bank accounts, we have got a same day payment facility, so we will be doing that and we were reassured when we met our staff team, at lunchtime and they are working really hard. They have seen an increase in
2085 calls. I said that during my President's speech. Then we have got the Hardship Fund, which is the £5 million, which will actually mean that, for those people that are not eligible for assistance through either the Guernsey Insurance Fund, or through Income Support, that we have got a buffer there, that we can give, again, some immediate assistance to them and we have come up with a tariff.

We are just about to have a media release, and I think that is part of the problem, we are here
2090 in this bubble, in this Assembly and actually there are lots of other things happening externally. I think the other thing to the credit of the team at Social Security, that they know there is a little bit of uncertainty and people are not sure, but actually will be open on Saturday and Sunday this weekend, from 10 a.m. until 2 p.m., with a skeleton staff that will take telephone calls and will actually they will not be able to process payments, that will happen on Monday, but they will be able to take
2095 people's details.

So I just want to reassure everyone here in the Assembly that there is a lot happening and to reassure the public that there is a lot happening. Yes, we can probably improve our communications a little bit better, but I think we are all in this crisis situation and doing the best that we possibly can. We are relying on the key worker staff. I think it is fantastic that the schools will remain open to support those key worker staff as well, but things are moving apace. What we put in over this weekend may have to change middle of next week, in light of incoming information and circumstances changing and we do need to be fleet of foot. But I just want to reassure everybody that we are doing everything that we possibly can. Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: Thank you, sir. I hope to be shorter than the guillotine motion. We do need to be fleet of foot and P&R needs to have our support, as do other Committees, HSC, ESS, as we have just heard, Home Affairs, etc. I am extremely proud to hear what is being done and will be done and will be done to help our community.

I stood earlier in respect of Deputy Tooley and Deputy Merrett's amendment so that it could be debated, so that the point behind it could be identified and reassurance given and I repeat Deputy Roffey's request, although obviously Deputy Le Clerc's comments were indeed very helpful and Deputy Ferbrache's statements, reassurance about Aurigny, although I do sympathise with Deputy Gollop's views.

The important thing to me is also, talking about the way in which the decisions are made, I appreciate what was done, and this consultation is very important. Deputy Tooley did actually mention the Covid-19 Executive Group in her summing up, although Deputy Le Clerc did repeat this. It is actually that was what I was more interested in, in the amendment, that sort of style and very much appreciating that actually communication to us is probably least important and we can be second, It is our community that really needs to know that we are working on behalf of them.

I am encouraged by the speed of the reaction and the hope it will benefit many in need. However, I hope that we encourage those in need to come forward, who would otherwise hesitate to ask for support, such as we see in respect of benefits. Though, in normal circumstances, these Propositions would seem extraordinary, we are in extraordinary times and therefore these Propositions are not only proportionate and reasonable but will be for the foreseeable future the new normal. Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir. Just following on from Alderney Representative Roberts' comments, through Deputy Meerveld, I would appreciate as well, on behalf of Alderney Representative Snowdon, who is not in the Island at the moment for obvious reasons, if Deputy Trott, when replying to the debate, can please explain what is and is not included in this package in terms of Alderney, and if there are significant differences, then what will be done in respect of helping support Alderney's economy in a similar way. Thank you.

Just picking up on a couple of points. A little bit further to what Deputy Le Clerc was saying. In paragraph 2.4, the fourth bullet point talks about the Hardship Fund helping people who would not otherwise be entitled to States' benefits, and it does fall into a similar category as those people, those circumstances which Deputy Le Clerc was describing.

I am just concerned that medical cover is also included in that package and that the Health Service Fund, which I think is the fund responsible, has got enough in it to cope with the potential increase in demands on it. I echo all the things that have been said about praise for P&R for the speed with which this has been brought forward.

Deputy Trott did mention the speed of decision-making, which I agree is vital, when he was talking on the amendment earlier, and I was reassured to hear him talk about consultation with the relevant people and I just hope those two things are not mutually exclusive, they do not impinge

upon each other and I would urge P&R to set up systems that allow them to collaborate with the people they need to collaborate with, or consult with, as expediently as possible. Thank you.

2150

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe and then maybe it is time we had a hand-washing break. Deputy Lowe first.

2155

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir. I support this. I have no problem with this at all. Listening to a couple of speeches there, it reminds me of the message I passed across to Deputy St Pier the other day, after the statement that was being made, where it was being asked where Civil Contingencies are carrying out the work that they need to do under the mandate of Civil Contingencies, but equally some felt that they were not involved with that and wanted to be.

2160

The note I passed to Deputy St Pier at that time, which he referred to was, actually, there is a group now. It went to every Committee, for all the Presidents and/or the vice-president if they could not go, or another attendee. There were 32 invited to the meeting last Friday 13th. Not everybody went. The group is called the Covid-19 Political Co-ordinating Group. So that is an action group for every Committee. The paperwork that you get, I pass onto the rest of my Committee. So it is important that they know what you have had before you. They also know and get feedback, at Home Affairs, of what we have actually discussed.

2165

So it really is down to the Committees to make sure that they involve the rest of their Members. We do have this other working group going on. How many groups do we want? I would rather work was actually carried out than going from clipboard to clipboard, to another meeting, to actually take up time to say about all these various groups. This is fast-moving and really has to be ... Sorry? Yes, I am quite happy to give way to Deputy Tooley.

2170

Deputy Tooley: Thank you, sir. I just wanted to highlight the fact that I think both in the speeches that I made earlier and in the speeches that have been made by both Deputy Le Clerc and Deputy Tindall, we have made quite clear that there is a general understanding that that group exists, but that it has not yet been formally constituted since it was given the delegated authority, because I am told that the Friday meeting was an informal meeting of that group and was not a formal meeting of that group and it has not met since. That is my understanding.

2175

Deputy Lowe: It was a formal meeting as far as I can understand. That was the discussions that actually took place about Covid-19. It was not just –

2180

Deputy Le Clerc: Point of correction, sir. It was advertised as an informal meeting on Friday and I have not received any paperwork since, other than the paper that was discussed at Committee level.

2185

Deputy Lowe: Okay, thank you Deputy Le Clerc. We have had so many meetings in the last week, I am not really sure which meeting refers to what, to be honest. All I know is that we had 32 attendees and you can look in your electronic diary, it is actually there, to tell you all the names of the people that were invited to it.

2190

So that group is already in situ, to try and get as many people around the table to attend these things for something as serious as this, it really is a case of attend if you can, but equally if you go out to your committees, I do not really see where there is yet a need for another group. I am quite happy with what has been delegated here to P&R under this paper that we have got before us.

2195

We cannot have a committee of 38. It is ridiculous to have a committee of 38. But it is important that everything is fed back to the Committees so that they are fully aware. Actually, it was at this meeting last Friday where I announced that Population Management, they are changing that, and I gave assurances to Deputy Ferbrache at the time. That was something we were looking at. I am pleased to say that, as soon as we can get the regulation through, we will be doing that, so that the short-term permit holders will be able to take out another employment, if that was the way to go

2200 down, to be able to do that. Also, the medium-term we are looking at that and we will be waiving fees.

Those that have been around today will know that we have had to put things on hold. It was important that we dealt with the licensing issues today, which went above the priority for regulation. There is only so much St James' Chambers can do and they have worked tirelessly, day and evenings, getting emails through late at night for some draft regulations, so I would like to put on record please my thanks to everybody involved, staff, including St James' Chambers, because they have been absolutely brilliant.

2205 But this is the type of thing that we have already put into the domain, about the regulation for the Population Management today, but it was made aware a week ago. Thank you, sir.

2210 **The Bailiff:** We will have a break now for hand washing and we will resume as soon as Members are ready.

*The Assembly adjourned at 4.11 p.m.
and resumed at 4.24 p.m.*

**Covid-19 Pandemic –
Debate continued –
Propositions carried**

The Bailiff: Let us resume. Deputy Merrett, you wish to speak next?

2215 **Deputy Merrett:** Thank you, sir. I make no apologies for laying the amendment because I think we need to sometimes stop and think and ensure that we have considered what we are doing. I think this is about £95 million we are discussing here and the speeches so far, from the President of Economic Development, the interjection from the President of Home Affairs and the speech from the President of Employment & Social Security, really do emphasise the need to understand what we are doing and who it is we are aiming it at.

2220 I have been concerned about the tension, in recent months, between Employment & Social Security and P&R and it has concerned me. The targeting of these funds is of paramount importance. So my real concern, sir, is having all of our eggs *per se* in one basket. Now my understanding is we can parachute Members from P&R into other Principal Committees, but not *vice versa*, and no one should under-estimate the workload of the Civil Contingencies Authority at the moment and its lead, Deputy St Pier.

2225 I think yourself, sir, said that we do hope Deputy Soulsby and Deputy St Pier do not get ill and I obviously agree with that, but they have a massive workload. Deputy Trott said, I will try and find his quote if I can, it was along the lines of as a Government we will do all we can. I feel part of that Government and I do want to try and do everything I can.

2230 So, in 2.7, and this is where, if Deputy Trott can answer it would be appreciated. I think also we just need to understand that we were given this policy paper when we recessed and we literally had the recess to try and read through it and try to get to grips with it and try to see if we are happy and content with it or if we are not.

2235 I am not on a Principal Committee, sir, I did not know about this Covid, Co-whatever. Even the Principal Committee Presidents who have spoken today, there seems to be a little bit of misunderstanding, to say the least, of what has or has not happened so far. That does concern me.

2240 In 2.7, the last line, it says, I will try and paraphrase it, active consideration of options to seek 'our own credit lines, to avoid the requirement to sell financial assets'. I would like some definition of what that means, and I know what I think it means, but I think that at times like this, having clear, concise clarity around the intentions of the Government is really important.

I will end by saying it is the targeting of these funds, the targeting, that is so important and we need to make sure – there is a natural tension, there always is – between need to help business, but of course business is there to help people, the people are the businesses. So are we targeting this to help the businesses but also to help the people that are trying to put food on the tables, the people that have been emailing us, ringing us and saying, ‘if you do this, I will not have an income’?

Those are the people that I think in this, today tomorrow, next week, that we really do need to be targeting and actually I think those people, the greater understanding of those people, is potentially the President of Employment & Social Security and that is why I think it is really important that the President has a seat at the table and is able to relate – I have already asked Deputy Le Clerc if she can respond to the email received today – I cannot respond to that email because I simply do not know,

Deputy Le Clerc, I hope, can. We have had lots of emails about Education, Sport & Culture. I cannot answer those emails. I do not know. I am hoping the President of Education, Sport & Culture was fully aware of the school closure and fully aware of the plans that have been put in place to enable key workers to continue going to work.

Those are the conversations that, if I am not aware of them, I cannot help the community. It is really important that our Presidents, our Principal Committees, are fully informed, are taking part in the decision process and we ensure that we target the right people at the right time for the right reasons. Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Langlois.

Deputy Langlois: Thank you, sir. It seems like a long time ago, but it was probably only a few days, I listened to the UK Chancellor and Prime Minister announcing their initial financial and economic response to the pandemic and the way that differed, apart from the fact they were talking about tens of billions of pounds, rather than our tens of millions, they were very clear about where the money was going, in terms of loans, or grants or deferred payments.

When they finished speaking, one had a picture of what they were intending to do, which is missing, I think, from our Proposition 1 here and the policy letter. The bullet points are a mix of deferred loans, grants, that sort of thing. I have got no real picture of how this initial £30 million is going to be allocated by P&R. Obviously they need some kind of flexibility, but we are the States and we have got no real idea what their intentions are with that money.

Of course the other big difference is, despite the huge sums of money the UK Chancellor was talking about, you never had to mention opening up credit lines because everybody listening knew what he was talking about was funding it through Government borrowing, but obviously we are talking, initially at least, of using our reserve funds. I think that is why there was a degree of disquiet, which probably led to the amendment. We are not really sure; there is not much clarity here.

It might be asking too much, because obviously this was rushed out, but I think there is an obligation on P&R to keep the States informed of decisions and how they are actually going to allocate this money, not on a case by case basis, but just whether they believe, for instance, Deputy Ferbrache mentioned deferred payments and said something like, ‘Of course they will be written off.’ Decisions like that when you are talking about, from Guernsey’s perspective, huge sums of money, I think P&R should be keeping us informed about, if it becomes more granular, their decision-making, what conclusions they have reached and how they are actually going to allocate these funds.

Deputy Ferbrache: Point of correction.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: I did not say they would be written off, I just asked if P&R would be looking at it in due course.

2295 **Deputy Langlois:** Thank you. It brought up the issue, maybe I should have said, of the possibility of deferred payments being written off, or loans being written off. Guernsey has got a history of that, of swapping backwards and forwards between loans and grants. That is all I am really asking for, a bit of clarity and, also, a bit of perspective.

2300 Because we talk about this as if this is, I hope I am not misquoting Deputy Ferbrache again, but he talked about the economy falling off a cliff, or words to that effect. The economy is not falling off a cliff, we the States have pushed it off a cliff in the hope of flattening the curve and avoiding further problems in the future brought about by the pandemic. It was a call by the States to take these measures, which will have this result in our economy, and therefore we are responsible for the situation and P&R are putting these Propositions before us because it is up to us to address the consequences of our actions. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Green.

2310 **Deputy Green:** Sir, thank you very much. I will be brief. Just to respond to what Deputy Langlois was saying in terms of the absence of specifics in this policy letter, the absence of detail, I think on that I would have thought that P&R would be very clearly, which is that they are going to be borrowing from ideas in other jurisdictions. I do not think this is a situation where they are going to be necessarily developing new things, new ideas from scratch. I think things are already in train in other jurisdictions. Clearly, there will be communication with Jersey in terms of how they are approaching this.

2315 I think the key thing about this policy letter and I, like others, commend the commendable speed that has been evident in bringing this to us at such short notice is just a message of reassurance that it actually presents. The detail will come later. I am the President of the Scrutiny Management Committee. If I saw this policy letter in normal times, I would be asking where the detail is. Today is not a day for asking about that detail. It is about endorsing a principle, the detail comes later.

2320 I do want to make the point that I really do think it is absolutely essential that we ensure that our structures of Government are appropriately streamlined as soon as possible, to make sure that the pace of the changes that we are going to need to make can be maintained. It is brilliant that this policy letter has been able to be brought to us with such speed, but we are going to have to maintain these decisions at pace and I think that is going to be an ongoing challenge.

2325 These Propositions obviously constitute the framework for an enormous and perhaps unprecedented level of positive state intervention in a local economy. It is totally and utterly justified. The figures are huge. Perhaps not enough but, like others, I agree, this is only an initial package. We will hopefully in due course know and understand what the criteria and what the governance arrangements will be around the financial assistance, the funds on offer, so we do need that clarity in due course. But, as I say, today is really about setting that principle in place.

2330 I do think P&R, or whatever executive group that emerges to full their functions will, at some point, have to be clear in terms of how every pound that is actually spent is going to be spent well. But the other thing is, like Deputy Gollop, I do not really understand the exact mechanics of how Proposition 3 is going to work so again, in due course, I think some greater clarity on that will assist. It is quite a complex area for some of us who are not entirely *au fait* with these things.

2335 The specifics that I, certainly, would like P&R or whoever the Executive Group is going to be to consider in due course must include, in my view, things like help with mortgage payments and also help with those who are renting and cannot afford their rent, otherwise are going to be in default. I think those are specific areas where that is absolutely going to be required.

2340 I think the final point I would make is that actually there comes a point, when you look at this and you look at the efficiency of how a programme like this would actually operate, and actually in many ways, it would be much more efficient if you actually moved to a system of universal basic income and that is something that has been doing the rounds for a long time but it is only in crises

2345 like this where you actually want to start looking at that, because it would actually sweep away one large piece of bureaucracy in terms of the application process.

2350 So, I entirely endorse this policy letter, I commend P&R for bringing it, but I do think that the pace has got to be maintained. I do think the structures of Government have got to move very quickly. In that, I place on record clearly the role of Scrutiny and the function of Scrutiny is going to be a much changed one in the coming months ahead, particularly if the election is postponed and there is a caretaker Government in place. But my colleagues and I are absolutely up for that challenge in terms of understanding what that new role will be for us, but I congratulate P&R on this.

2355 **The Bailiff:** Next, Deputy Inder, then we will go to the dark side of the hall again, to Deputy Lester Queripel! Deputy Inder.

2360 **Deputy Inder:** Sir, I will not be too long, but I am effectively going to endorse everything Deputy Roffey said, Deputy Green has noted, Deputy Ferbrache has noted about the intention of this policy letter and if I have missed anyone else who said exactly the same, it will be them as well.

2365 It is fairly obvious what has happened over the last week or so. Everything has changed. We have, basically, a system that allows emergency rules and, as soon as you have got an emergency, the last thing you ever need is too many people in a room. Deputy Roffey has also said that we have that Policy & Resources team, we have a CCA and that is what we, as a parliament, have decided are the people that are going to basically run the show, at least start the show off, when we have got extreme circumstances. There has been nothing more extreme than this, I think Deputy Ferbrache said, in anyone's living memory.

2370 But I have got some good news and I will declare an interest in it, as like Deputy Ferbrache I am in the tourism and the accommodation sector, and this is more for, certainly, for Members, and this shows, really, how efficient the Guernsey I know can actually be. The one that takes the opportunity. The one that can move quickly. Now, two weeks ago, we saw, I think we all fairly understood that we were not going to avoid this in any way, shape or form. Things started to move fairly quickly, it was declared a pandemic and I am going to get the day wrong, but I think it was the end of last week.

2375 In the accommodation sector, because that is what I am in, we have seen the bookings falling, I will not say falling off a cliff, basically they were doing quite well, but effectively people were cancelling their bookings, refunds were being given out and everything was being sensible. As soon as you have got a situation where you started hearing about this word, self-isolation, a brand-new word to me. Actually thinking about it, as a father of two kids and with a wife of 15 years, maybe I have been self-isolating for a while.

2380 I raised this, via email, I think it was to Members of what was then Policy & Resources, certainly Economic Development and I am just indicating how quickly we can move, and the suggestion was, if this epidemic is going to turn up here, if people want to isolate, then quite clearly we have got holes around the Island which may be useful. I am not a medic, but it looked like this word self-isolation that people could move into other areas, which as one goes in, something else goes out.

2385 When I think how efficient Guernsey can be, that was mentioned last week. It turned up on Economic Development's email over this Thursday and Friday. I think it was nodded through -ish on the Tuesday. Deputy St Pier, who is not here so I can point at him, mentioned it on Wednesday. Actually, going backward, we were already told that Visit Guernsey were already talking to the DPA about lifting some of the rules around the planning.

2390 So, in four days, we have basically managed, as a Government, to move extremely efficiently and today, because I am clearly on the email exchange, fantastically, States of Guernsey marketing and tourism, have sent the accommodation sector an email confirming, and I will not go through it, just the top headline, that non-visitors can be accommodated temporarily in visitor accommodation premises.

2395

Now that was probably done with some very dedicated officers, a couple of ideas and done within four or five days. Can you imagine if there were 25 politicians sitting in a room making that decision? By the time they had agreed that, we would have done it and would have been back out having a functioning economy.

2400 From that regard, I think Guernsey has done well. I think officers have done well. The situation is not fantastic. We have got two or three people that we have put in a corner to do a job. I think we have done well. So, in that regard, I hope we can move fairly quickly to the vote and hopefully totally and absolutely to a man and woman, endorse this policy letter.

2405 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, thank you, I would like to be able to take a leaf out of Bruce Springsteen's book and say I am *Dancing in the Dark*, in the dark corner, but I cannot with all this paperwork around me, unfortunately. I will start by focusing on Proposition 2, which relates to Aurigny.

2410 Colleagues and Islanders are well aware of my views about Aurigny. They should never have ever been allowed to accrue the kinds of debts they have accrued. They should have been made to cut their cloth to suit, a long time ago, by dispensing with loss-making routes and only retaining profit-making routes. I have consistently voted against Propositions to re-capitalise Aurigny and pile debt upon debt.

2415 However, we are where we are. Aurigny needs money to survive. They are in crisis. We are all in crisis. So, therefore, I wanted to make it absolutely clear, sir, that I will be voting in favour of that Proposition, as well as the other two Propositions, because these are good news Propositions for the whole of our community in times of crisis. So I applaud everyone concerned, involved in collating and compiling these measures before us.

2420 Obviously, a huge amount of work has gone on behind the scenes. I very much doubt if any of the people involved finished work at 5 p.m. and went home. I suspect they have been working around the clock. Civil servants, colleagues and the like, sir, and I commend them for that.

2425 There is no doubt we are in crisis with a capital C. And it is at times like this that Government really needs to step up to the plate, in an attempt to ensure the wellbeing of the people. Therefore, I take great comfort from these Propositions in front of us, because this Assembly is now providing fellow Islanders with a much-needed lifeline. It would be far too easy to launch off into a Churchillian type of speech along the lines of, 'We will never surrender; we will not be beaten.' I am sure, sir, colleagues will breathe a sigh of relief when I say I am not going to launch off into that kind of speech. A colleague on my left has just breathed a huge sigh of relief, sir.

2430 But what I do want to say is that it is in times of crisis that community spirit really comes to the fore and I am heartened by notifications that have appeared in the *Guernsey Press* recently, in which people offer their services to anyone experiencing difficulties due to Coronavirus. People are offering to shop for people, spend time comforting people, do odd jobs for people, and there was even a notice, yesterday, somebody offered to do, 'Whatever you need done, I will do it.'

2435 These are, of course, offers of help that are offered as an act of kindness and that is a perfect example of the Guernsey community spirit I am talking about here. The reality is we are now fighting a war, a war against a deadly virus, and we are going to beat it and come out of the other side. We are at the moment in the zone of damage limitation. So this States, one of the things this States will be remembered for, is the States who did their utmost to limit the damage that will be caused by this virus and I feel privileged to be a Member of this Assembly at this critical time.

2440 I know that every one of my colleagues in the Assembly is doing their absolute utmost to limit the damage and the measures in front of us are a prime example of that. I am sure the Assembly will be unanimous in their support of these Propositions, but I would like names on record, please, so I ask for a recorded vote when we go to the vote. Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize, then Deputy Graham.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir. Often our way of operating is quite ponderous; but is certainly participatory and I generally think that our committee system, it takes longer to formulate policy but often I think one ends up with a slightly better, more rounded product at the end of it. But it is often slow, and it does not always foster appropriate leadership and accountability.

As it happens, in a crisis, Guernsey normally responds very well, and our system of government seems to be able to adapt on a very short-term basis. I can think of several examples over the last 10 or 20 years and, generally, when faced with a crisis that is well outside the norm of routine business, the States responds very effectively.

I think that is the way we have to see these Propositions, 1-3, laid out by the Policy & Resources Committee. They seem to me to be very sensible. The policy letter is brief. I think the Members of the Committee and the officers have done very well to get even this before the States in short order and I commend them for their work, and I think it would be almost improper for the States not to support the Committee's judgement in this matter, on the advice of its senior officers, even though the policy letter, as Deputy Green has said, is very brief and lacking in detail.

But there is a problem, now, in relation to the way in which Government is going to function over the next few weeks and months and it has to be dealt with. I think what has happened so far, where the political efforts have been led by Deputy St Pier and Deputy Soulsby, with support through their roles on the Civil Contingencies Authority of Deputies Brehaut and Lowe, I think all of them deserve our thanks and support because, particularly Deputy St Pier and Deputy Soulsby have clearly been working exceptionally long hours in very demanding circumstances and in my view have been doing an outstanding job and deserve credit and thanks.

But, and what I am about to say is not in any way to criticise them because I think they have responded in the only way that they could have responded, clearly the present arrangements cannot survive for a period of weeks or months. The reason is because any system of government, in order to facilitate appropriate decision-making and levels of accountability, needs legitimacy, and the present arrangements do not have any legitimacy, because there is no logical explanation for why Deputy St Pier and Deputy Soulsby should effectively assume all of the executive powers of the States of Guernsey.

As I say, I do not think they have had any choice but to do what they have done and if they had not, we would be in a much worse position than we are in. But the question has to be addressed, the States' Assembly can never act as an executive on a daily basis. In the event that the committee system cannot, and I think we are fast approaching that question if we have not already gone past it, the question has to be asked which body, or which group of people is going to assume the executive authority of the States. I will give way to Deputy McSwiggan.

Deputy McSwiggan: Sir, while I do not disagree with the thrust of Deputy Fallaize's argument, I would ask him, while he is still speaking, to withdraw the comment that he made that the current arrangements lack legitimacy, because they are set up under emergency laws, which this Government or its predecessors have made. They are not, in that sense, illegitimate, although he is right that in the long term I think we need arrangements that are more inclusive and that have the weight of parliamentary support behind them.

Deputy Fallaize: Okay, that is a perfectly fair point. They cannot be maintained is the point I am trying to make. So the question is which body is going to assume executive authority and I think it is going to have to be executive authority to do, effectively, everything that the States are empowered to do. It cannot be the Civil Contingencies Authority because that body was only ever intended to deal with very short-term emergencies. In fact, I think the legislation that it makes remains valid only for 30 days, so that obviously was not intended for a crisis of this nature.

This policy letter before the States delegates significant authority to the Policy & Resources Committee. I think that, given the financial nature of the proposals, that is appropriate, but I do not

think the Policy & Resources Committee can be the body, which assumes all the executive authority of the States.

There has been a group set up of Committee Presidents, I forget its name, and Committees have delegated authority to their Presidents. That is a sort of recreation of the old Policy Council and anything that gets anywhere near recreating the Policy Council ought not to be given too much time.

We cannot have a Government only of two Members, because it is not reasonable to expect that of those Members. None of the obvious solutions are credible or tenable. I am of the view and I am happy to be persuaded otherwise, but my view at the moment is that the States probably need to elect a controlling committee very similar to that which existed during the Occupation.

We are saying that this is the greatest challenge the Island has faced since the Occupation, so I think it might be wise to go back to looking at how that challenge was addressed, so I think probably that is going to be necessary and we ought not to remain in this very grey area for any longer than necessary. I think it was Deputy Merrett who asked the question about school closures. I was informed that schools could be closed imminently. I read of the decision in the media release. So I was informed about that.

Now the decisions that have been made subsequently about who is on the essential workers' list to be on schools, I know nothing about, other than what has been released to the media because I have not been involved in any of that. I am not criticising that at all, because a very small number of people are having to operate under great duress, with very little sleep and having to make decisions at short notice, in order to protect the life and wellbeing of this community. But obviously we cannot carry on with that sort of decision-making arrangement for very long.

So the point I am really trying to make is somebody needs to be –

The Bailiff: Are you straying off the Propositions that are before us, Deputy Fallaize? It is now 5 p.m., we do wish to try and finish this debate this evening. Because P&R have requested that we have a vote this evening. It maybe you are sticking to the Propositions, but it does seem to me you are wandering from them. There are other people who wish to speak, and it would be very unfortunate if we do not get to a vote before 5.30 p.m.

Deputy Fallaize: I apologise. I was wondering who was going to be the person who provoked you into saying that. I was listening upstairs to the debate and this had become the main theme of the debate –

The Bailiff: I know and probably I should have stamped on it sooner, but I thought it was probably better that it did get better ventilated up to a point. But there is an element of repetition coming in some of these speeches. I am not saying you are particularly guilty of that, but I do think we need to get back to the Propositions that are before us, so that we can take a vote on those Propositions and get it this evening.

Deputy Fallaize: I was reaching a conclusion in any event, sir, which was in relation to the issues around delegated authority, which I think are engaged by these Propositions, somebody needs to be giving some thought to how the States, and it has got to be the States' Assembly, is going to delegate, I think personally all of its authority, but at least a significant degree of its authority, to some group of its Members in order to deal with the challenges over the next few weeks and months. I do not think that those who are in the centre of the crisis at the moment have the bandwidth to be giving that matter thought.

So somebody needs to be, whether it is going to be a group of Members of the Assembly or working with senior officers, I do not know. But I think that is going to have to be done next week, if not over the weekend. But in relation to these Propositions, they are very sensible. I am sure that they will be only the first stage in the economic and financial response that will be necessary and I

2550 commend the Policy & Resources Committee for bringing them to the States as speedily as they have and the Committee has my full support in exercising its delegated authority in this area.

The Bailiff: Deputy Graham. I said Deputy Graham, I was going to come to you after Deputy Graham, Deputy Brehaut.

2555

Deputy Graham: Thank you, Mr Bailiff. When Deputy Ferbrache, some time ago, commented that this is as dire as it gets in our collective living memory, I permitted myself a wry smile because, of course, Deputy David de Lisle and me, our very clear memories go back to the early 1940's, when some pretty nasty stuff was going on then, too.

2560

But, having said that, back to the present. I was engaged with Proposition 3, really, and the allusion there to Bailiwick businesses and I wanted to address really or invite Deputy Trott, when responding to the debate, and perhaps Deputy Brouard as our representative on the Bailiwick Council, to talk about Sark in this, where it fits in, or if it fits in at all. I had better declare an interest here because I am a non-executive director of the Isle of Sark Shipping Company, which of course provides a lifeline service to Sark and I might add employs far more Guernsey residents than it does Sark residents.

2565

But I am not here to make a plea to them. It is this. I am certainly very clear that the responsibility for having a fiscal regime that raises sufficient revenue for the purposes of an island like Sark lies with Sark itself. So I am not special pleading for them. But I think even the most parsimonious of Guernsey men and women, and there are some, would accept that, for an island of 500, or around about there, there is a limit to the resilience that you can expect of an island of that sort and, to that extent, I hope that there is room in the collective hearts of P&R, and of the Assembly, for the notion that we are all in this together and should we, as Guernsey, be able to lend support not only to Alderney but to Sark, then let us do it.

2570

I really just was inviting Deputy Trott to give me some idea of where Sark might figure in this and also, if Deputy Brouard were able to comment, whether this is an item for the Bailiwick Council at any stage. Thank you.

2575

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

2580

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you, sir. I will be brief. I do not think we should be afraid to say that these are exceptional circumstances and I, for one, am learning, and I do not think we need to be afraid to say that we are learning. Who would have ever imagined that the Island would be in the situation that it is just a few weeks and months ago and, regrettably, it may feel at times that people's toes are being trodden on and that people may feel excluded and, as a Member of the CCA, I appreciate that and I feel, I am aware of people who may feel excluded and marginalised.

2585

The benefits I feel of what is happening at the moment is that, from the public's point of view, we have three, familiar, identifiable faces, they have Dr Brink, they have Deputy Soulsby, they have Deputy St Pier. I do not any of those people by the way. That is what you want. Clear, concise messaging from familiar faces and we have got that at the moment.

2590

Just on the Covid-19 Political Executive Group, it met just a week ago, on the 13th and events have really moved apace. So I do not think we really need to, again, apportion too much blame or imply there have been too many failings. I do not want to sound overly defensive for this reason. When I joined the CCA I never imagined I would have met four times in 24 hours and have the responsibility of the decision-making that I have got.

2595

Things will need to change as the situation evolves and I think, in moving forward, there is no doubt that we do need to be a little bit more inclusive. Just on the policy letter itself, just a couple of questions. My concerns were that who does the due diligence on these companies and businesses, assuming that you will be inundated? Do we have the staff at the very centre, whether it is through P&R, whether it is pooling all the resources of the Civil Service? Do we really have the staff that can do the due diligence on companies and individuals that were 'failing' before the arrival

2600

of the virus and the consequent downturn in the economies? It is the due diligence that interests me.

The other thing is that how do we know that employees are the real beneficiaries? If we are keeping companies afloat, we are keeping sole traders – well they cannot be sole traders with employees – but if we are keeping small businesses afloat, we need to be confident that they are, in turn, paying their employees and their employees can go to pay rent. It would be an awful situation if a company or an individual was not propped up financially by the States, to find that they did not have that duty of care to their employees.

The problem is when you deal with something so large, it feels a bit small-minded to get granular and deal with the detail, but I did have a concern about rates. For the States, we take insurance and tax, but the companies also pay rates. If the parishes are not getting their rates then that is perhaps something we need to look at. Maybe there is a bit more resilience, for example, in St Peter Port, but who knows, disproportionately the number of businesses in St Peter Port or less resilience in the small parishes. But we should not overlook this aspect of rates and the payment of rates when regrettably businesses fail or businesses that do benefit from the States, to ensure that they go on and do the trickledown that we assume that they are all going to do. Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen and then Deputy Tooley.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir. I will endeavour to keep my speech short. First of all I would like to extend my thanks to Members of P&R and HSC and other colleagues and also supporting officers, whose dedication and commitment has been unrelenting over the last couple of weeks and I really take my hat off to those individuals for what they are doing for our community, helping to keep us going at this really important time of crisis.

I have risen really because I want to place on record, I have, like Deputy Queripel, been very reluctant to offer any support to what I consider as bailout provisions for Aurigny over the last four years and I was very pleased to hear Deputy Ferbrache, earlier on this afternoon, state that they would be looking at maybe redesigning the business model for Aurigny going forward. That really is very heartening.

On this occasion, however, I will support these measures, which are noted in Proposition 2, making available the temporary overdraft facility. These are exceptional circumstances and I give my wholehearted support to each one of the Propositions and just to finish that I think that these measures are unprecedented, and I hope that everybody in this Chamber supports them this afternoon. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tooley.

Deputy Tooley: Sir, having laid the amendment to this policy letter, I think it is right that I place beyond all doubt my support for the assistance packages that are providing by it. It is not just right but essential that we exercise all the power and strength that we have in order to protect the vulnerable, whether that is protecting them directly from the throes of illness where we can, or financially from the effect of global pandemic, and I welcome this first step to do so. I would echo the comments made by Deputy Fallaize, but I do so while reiterating that I am in full support of the proposed measures outlined in this policy letter. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Anyone else? No? Deputy Trott will reply.

Deputy Trott: Thank you, sir. Right at the end of my opening remarks I said two things, which I want to repeat now. The first, because I want to get this message out at the start, rather than the end. It is that I said that, as a Government, we will do our best. However, even with our help, some businesses will not survive this crisis. But I hope and believe that most will and, eventually, normality will resume. That normality is, however, likely to be many months away.

2655 I also said that, at this stage, there would be some questions to which I am unable to provide detailed responses and, unsurprisingly, that is the case. However, there have been a number of questions that I am able to provide some fairly detailed responses to and I shall come to them shortly.

2660 But, first of all sir, I would like to take this opportunity to echo the comments of almost everyone in this Assembly with regards, firstly, our staff. They really have been quite exceptional. I sent an email to a member of our staff at 1.55 a.m. this morning and I got a reply three minutes later. That is quite exceptional. It shows how hard our teams are working and they are a credit to this community. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)**

2665 Deputy Lester Queripel remarked about the community spirit of our beautiful home and, of course, he is absolutely right. But I am sure all of us have noticed, and it is not just the environment in terms of this place, St James', but it is a result of the crisis, we are all working so much more closely – despite social distancing – we are all working more amicably, more generously and it has been, despite an unprecedented week, a genuine pleasure to be part of this Assembly at this time of crisis, because of the manner in which we have all been working. I extend my compliments, gratitude and thanks to you all.

2670 Now some have talked about the CCA and have quite justifiably lauded the members of the CCA, in particular the two political Members who have had such a heavy workload. I certainly agree, they have been doing a fantastic job.

2675 We also, of course, knew when we set up the CCA, who its members would be, but I think most of us hoped that we would never see, or for that matter expected, a crisis of this magnitude. We should be grateful that having had this black swan event that we have had people who have been able to raise their game from already fairly lofty levels to step up and undertake this function.

2680 However, the CCA is as odd to me as it is to everybody else currently in this Assembly. Because, in the absence of Deputy St Pier, I become its chair; but I do not go normally. So, a really quite odd thing happens. I get a briefing about all the things that have been discussed immediately prior to taking the chair. So it is odd to me as well. I am by no means different to anyone else in that regard.

2685 Now down to the nitty gritty. Deputy Ferbrache, I think, summed up the debate, or summed up the proposals, when he said we need to get on with it, the future of our community depends on it and we need absolute flexibility in the manner in which we deal with the crisis. He gave a very practical example of how numbers have fallen away, and he asked about the lending criteria of the banks.

In some respects, I wish I had jumped up then and asked for him to give way to me, because I think we would have had a slightly different debate. Because, completely understandably, a lot of the debate has been around the issues around viability from a banking perspective and, importantly, how the Guernsey Distribution Guarantee Scheme will work.

2690 I can tell him, as a consequence of a meeting I had early this morning, that the banks have told us that the facilities will be subject to minimum underwriting standards, which will be used to attest to the fact that the bank underwriting the loan consider the underlying business to be a viable one and the definition of viable is a key criterion.

2695 Now, they have provided some narrative around what that means. Remember, they are going to have skin in the game. We are underwriting the majority of this, but they still have one fifth of this debt, which if they go bad, they will have to endure. So they will be doing this properly, as one would expect. The viabilities will be based on was the business able to demonstrate its ability to meet all liabilities as they fell due and service debt before the outbreak, and will it continue to be able to do so based on current data suggesting it could be six months beyond the peak before they return to financial stability. He specifically asked that question.

2700 So the banks will be analysing that. These are people who do this as their day job. They know how to lend money. They certainly know how to lend money properly, since the global financial crisis, that is for sure.

2705 Are there likely to be any long-term impacts for this customer once the current outbreak subsides? If yes to the above, what is the severity of those impacts likely to be and could they

jeopardise ongoing viability? What will be the likely impact of Covid-19 on their customers and suppliers and do they believe that management have the skills to navigate the business through the immediate impacts and will the loan from this scheme allow sufficient cash liquidity to be freed up through the period under consideration and beyond?

2710 In other words, are these businesses likely to remain viable with this help at the end of this crisis? If the answer to that is no, they are probably not going to get some help. Which is why I have laboured the point that we will do our very best for most but there will be some, unfortunately, who were not sufficiently strong going into this and will not, therefore, qualify, under these criteria. But these will be independent criteria assessed by the banks as they would in the normal course of their business.

2715 Deputy Laurie Queripel asked, if I may say so, a very sensible question and one that is particularly relevant to our jurisdiction. He asked about the words contained in paragraph 2.7, which read:

However, measures are being put in place to increase the States' overall liquidity and it is anticipated that this can be managed, at least in the short-term with active consideration of options to seek our own credit-lines to avoid the requirement to sell financial assets in our investment portfolio in a falling market ...

Now, as he will know, we have very substantial investments and many of those investments are long-term investments, not all. We have significant short-term liquidity. More than enough to deal with the present crisis. However, if we needed more, work is underway to obtain credit lines with the Bank of England. These are asset-backed credit lines. So this will be the Bank of England lending us money against assets, against equities, effectively, which is an entirely legitimate way of doing things – (a) to avoid a fire sale and also (b) because I think someone said earlier the Bank of England was issuing a huge amount of debt in order to fund their rescue package; they are not actually, what they are doing is printing a very considerable amount of money, which they are able to do because Sterling is a reserved currency and because they have a lender of last resort. We do not, we do not have that opportunity. It is one of the reasons why we have been so prudent with our financial affairs over the years. But we are able to plug into that in a slightly different way.

2720 So there will be no need for there to be any fire selling of our equity position and hopefully significant credit lines with the Bank of England, in the weeks and months ahead, should they become necessary.

Now, sir, Deputy Parkinson was one of many who referred to these measures as a life support and he said that they will need to continue. He is, of course, absolutely right. He said this is going to take some time and I recognise that, as I do his intentional underlining of the word 'initial'. This is not going to be the end of it. In fact, what we are doing here, right now, may not even be the beginning of it. It will certainly be the beginning of it, but it may be nowhere near enough.

2730 Why have we chosen £30 million? That is what we currently have in the particular reserve that we can draw on without going outside of our normal processes, which is why when I said earlier these delegated powers already exist in terms of reserve. If we need more, we will have to tap into our contingency reserve and that, at the end of January, had a valuation of nearly £200 million. So we have plenty of dry powder, so to speak, should we need it.

Deputy Meerveld also made, if I may so, some very sensible comments. It should not be a surprise with him as well, bearing in mind the background that he comes from. But he asked how quickly can we expedite the delivery of health, in terms of the loan scheme? I think I have touched upon it in my opening remarks, the banks have said that it could be as early as this time next week. We may even beat that target, so it will be pretty quick.

2740 With regards other measures, I can be less specific, other than the fact that I would hope, I am aware in some cases, measures have already been activated. But I would expect that, during the course of next week, that position will become a lot clearer and, certainly, our target can be measured in days, rather than weeks or months.

2750 Deputy Gollop asked about the lending criteria and I talked about the lending criteria before, but what I have not done yet is dealt with some questions, which I anticipated Members would ask – they did not necessarily ask these questions, but I am going to pose the question and give the

answer to you now, because they get to the nub of how the Guernsey Distribution Guarantee Scheme will operate.

Others have asked questions around is it only for Guernsey, is Sark included, so I think these questions and answers will catch that. Will the scheme help all businesses in Guernsey? The scheme will offer help to many good quality businesses in Guernsey unfairly hit by the change in circumstances caused by Covid-19. The banks and the States have built in safeguards to ensure that taxpayers' money is not given to businesses who are, in ordinary market conditions, not viable, and I read out the viability criteria to you earlier, so you can see that is in fact the case.

What will businesses have to do to get the money? They will have to apply to their bank in the ordinary course of business. So, let us be clear, there will be no sort of civil servants or politicians involved in this process in any way, shape or form, at the decision-making level, so they will have to apply, the customers, to their bank, in the ordinary course of business and be subject to a credit assessment to allow the bank to determine if the business is viable in ordinary circumstances, and the banks have assured us that they will be able to process most applications, all but a few, in 48 hours or less.

So, by this time next week, banks will be making decisions as to whether people who approach them under this scheme can have the liquidity that they need, which I think is an entirely acceptable, or pleasing timeframe.

Is the taxpayer on the hook for everything and what stops the banks ripping the taxpayer off? Well the banks are only being guaranteed for up to 80% of each loan, so they are all required to have skin in the game, to use a banking term. This means that their incentives are aligned with the States' incentives. We may both suffer some credit losses. Let me be clear about this, we are not, probably, going to get all our money back. Clearly we hope we get most of it back because that, in itself, will be a barometer as to how successful this has been and indeed how robust our economy is when we come out the other end of this crisis.

But because we will both potentially offer credit losses, that will focus the bank's minds and we will be receiving a periodic, a sectoral report on exposures from the banks, but not the detail behind it. It is not for Government to know who has been borrowing, it is for Government to know that the criteria that have been lent at have been met appropriately and that will be the level of the governance, to come to a question I think Deputy Brehaut asked.

How is the States stopping itself guaranteeing bad debts that banks have already incurred? Well, the terms of the scheme made clear that only new money is guaranteed, so if anyone who has any existing debt sees this as an opportunity, I am afraid they cannot. Existing loans will not be covered by the terms of the guarantee. So the guarantee scheme will put new money into the system to help businesses. It will be new money, genuinely new money that was not there before, was not circulating before.

And does it cover the financial services sector? The answer to that is not at present. Our States' Report does make this clear. The Guernsey Financial Services Commission requires regulated firms to keep money aside to ensure that they can be wound down, if necessary, in an orderly fashion, should they experience severe difficulties. I think this is called the financial resource requirement and those of us that work in the industry will be familiar with that. It normally covers, I think about three months of expenditure.

But it is an inherent buffer that regulated firms have to have in place every day of their trading lives. It may well be that the GFSC will allow some relaxation of that. It is a matter for the professional regulator. But I know that they will be listening, if businesses approach them, sensibly as one would expect at this time.

Okay, why are we being less generous than the UK and why have I not pledged that we will try to save every business? This goes, really, to the question that Deputy Laurie Queripel asked. The UK is in a different situation. It has a currency which is one of the world's global reserve currencies and it can print money, in the short term, as I have said.

We do not have that and therefore we could never be as generous. But what we do have are very substantial reserves that most other countries do not have and the asset-backing loan opportunities via a credit line, that I referred to.

What are the banks otherwise doing for small and medium size enterprises? The banks have assured us that they will show forbearance, where necessary. So this will involve, for example, turning delayed interest payments into capital. This is existing debt that they have. They will be structuring some of that debt in a way that aids businesses' cash flow.

Then to a question that was raised by Deputy Graham. How about Alderney and Sark? As far as this scheme is concerned, Alderney is covered, Sark is not. However, other States' measures apply to Sark. So Sark and Alderney will be treated with parity, but this protection scheme is for Alderney residents as well as Guernsey residents.

Finally, a question that I was certain would come up did not. How much for each individual loan? The banks have told us that they believe that the minimum loan will be £5,000 but they basically do not think that there will be many businesses that have not already got overdraft facilities to that level, so the minimum loan will be £5,000, the maximum, they say, could be as much as £300,000 for some businesses in Guernsey and the scheme will be capped, initially, at £10 million, but has the capacity to rise quite significantly, as the States' Report suggests.

Now Deputy Le Clerc, very helpfully expanded on how much is going on in her department. She also referred to her hard-working civil servants, which I think is a States-wide effort at the moment. I am grateful, particularly, to her and her Committee. I am aware that not all the detail has emerged yet. I apologise for that. It will very shortly. But of course they are a very competent group of people who are very capable of making sure the machine remains oiled in the short-term and it will only be the short-term.

Now I wrote down something that is a little sarcastic, with regard to Deputy Merrett. And do you know what, sir? I am not going to say it. Because I completely understand why Deputy Tooley and Deputy Merrett felt the frustration that they felt. In some respects, I do too. I suppose the difference is that I have absolute confidence in the people that are carrying out these duties –

Deputy Tooley: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tooley.

Deputy Tooley: While I absolutely believe that Deputy Trott has absolute confidence, so I am not correcting that, I think he is giving the impression that Deputy Merrett and I do not and I would not wish that impression to be given, because that would not be the case. Thank you.

Deputy Trott: Thank you, sir. I will move on from that item.

Deputy Langlois. Now Deputy Langlois, again, made points that I completely understood. I am going to refer him, if I may, to two paragraphs in the States' Report. The first is paragraph 1.3, that explains that the £30 million is funded from the General Revenue Account Reserve and the £30 million that we are asking for delegated authority on will exhaust that reserve and it is likely that any further funding requirements would require the use of the core investment reserve, established to be used in the exceptional and specific circumstances.

I think he was inferring, I may have got the context slightly wrong, but I think he was saying why £30 million? Well it is no more sophisticated than that liquidity is available to us immediately. It is probably more than we need initially and that is where the figure comes from. I say that in the expectation that it probably will not be enough and that we will be back, as and when the situation requires it.

Lastly, to Deputy Graham. I think it is always nice to end on an amusing note. Deputy Graham, referred to the early 1940's and, because he and Deputy de Lisle were around in the early part of their lives to some unpleasant things, he talked about those unpleasant things with reference to comments made by Deputy Ferbrache and I immediately thought of Deputy Ferbrache's outside

toilet. (*Laughter*) I cannot imagine, even in this time of crisis, of a more unpleasant environment, sir! I hope that Members will support this States' Report unanimously. I do not think I need to ... I give way to Deputy Laurie Queripel, sir.

2860 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Sir, I am grateful for Deputy Trott, for giving way. There is one question I did ask, and that was about the bond situation because, bearing in mind the effect that this crisis is having on the stock market, on investments, we do have quite a fair sum of unallocated proceeds from the bond. I am just worried about the effect on the bond reserve and the coupon payments and things like that, so I am just concerned, also, that we might need it eventually to have to tap
2865 into public funds to make those coupon payments. I know it is a long game, in regard to the bond, I just wondered if any forecast had been made in the short or longer term in regard to the effect on the bond in lieu of this crisis or because of this crisis, sir. Thank you.

Deputy Trott: The bond money is secure. There is a sinking fund to deal with capital repayments. There is absolutely no chance whatsoever of us defaulting on our interest payments. The bond money is wrapped up in our overall reserves; some of it is in fixed-interest instruments, some of it in unlisted securities, which are, in some cases, less vulnerable to significant market movements, notwithstanding the state of the global economy.

So my reassurance to him is that, whilst our aggregate portfolio has suffered a fall, it is a fall that is at a discount to the fall that global markets overall have endured, because of the manner in which these assets are deployed. So he need not worry.

I am not going to ask for a recorded vote. I do not think it is necessary –

The Bailiff: I think Deputy Lester Queripel has already done it, though.

Deputy Trott: In that case, it would be nice to see a long list of *Pours*, including those who are listening at home, who will be exercising their proxy.

The Bailiff: Nobody, as far as I can recall, has requested a separate vote on any of the Propositions, so it will be a recorded vote on all three Propositions together. Can I just add, if there is any person who is not present and who has given a proxy and who has not had a chance to give instructions – it may be that they are not well or whatever – they may not be following this debate, the proxy must say '*je ne vote pas*' or '*il ne vote pas, elle ne vote pas*' but that does not necessarily mean they do not agree with the Propositions, for the benefit of those who are listening. It may just mean that they have not had the chance to give instructions. So, if we do have abstentions from those who are not present, as I say, it does not mean that they are not fully supportive, it may just mean they have not had a chance to give instructions. I thought it was helpful to explain that for the benefit of anybody listening.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 39, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 0

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Soulsby*	None	None	None
Deputy de Sausmarez			
Deputy Roffey			
Deputy Prow			
Deputy Oliver*			
Alderney Rep. Roberts*			
Alderney Rep. Snowdon*			
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Tindall			
Deputy Brehaut			

Deputy Tooley
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Leadbeater*
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Trott
Deputy Le Pelley*
Deputy Merrett
Deputy St Pier*
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Inder
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Smithies*
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel*
Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Paint*
Deputy Dorey*
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy McSwiggan
Deputy de Lisle*
Deputy Langlois

2895 **The Bailiff:** Members, while those votes are counted, it has been suggested to me by one Member that it might be nice if the Assembly, in the traditional way, showed its appreciation for all the hard work of civil servants and all the staff who are supporting us, so I invite those who wish to do so to show their appreciation in the traditional way. (*Applause*)

2900 I can confirm that that last vote on the three Propositions was indeed unanimous, including all those who are not present in the Assembly. There were 39 votes in favour, with no one against and no one abstaining. I think that more or less brings this Meeting to a close.

**Procedural –
Live streaming of proceedings approved; thanks to Members and staff**

The Bailiff: Can I just remind you that I said at the outset that I thought that this was a venue that might lend itself to filming or live streaming, perhaps more easily than the Royal Court Chamber. I have been reminded that, back in 2014, the Assembly approved allowing the streaming of proceedings of the States of Deliberation, so there is already a Resolution in favour that permits that and I would be proposing to ask SACC and/or the Greffe staff, I am not quite sure who it is, to see whether it might not be possible to organise live streaming, particularly important in the present environment and when we have not got members of the public present, but I would not want to do that if that does not have the support of Members.

So could I just please ask whether you would support live streaming if it is possible to arrange that. Those in favour; those against?

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I think that is generally in favour.

Before we close, can I just thank you and congratulate you all on the way that you have dealt with the business this week. I remind you that you are collectively, together with those who are not here, the Government. You are all the Government. It is very important at this time that the Government works together.

Although you have shown some political differences, I think the atmosphere and the mood amongst you has been noticeably supportive, encouraging and it is very important that the Government sends a united message to the public. It is very important at this time that the public in this Bailiwick and those listening beyond get a clear message that the Government is supporting the measures that are being taken and that unanimous vote is indicative of that support.

So I thank you on behalf of the community for that. With that, I would just say that Members have already been asked to reserve Wednesday of next week for the continuation of this Meeting, if it was not possible to finish today, so I will be adjourning in a moment to next Wednesday and I remind you there may be at least one other policy letter circulated in the meantime, that may be in respect of looking at the election date and whether or not to suspend that date and, if so, to what date.

There may or may not be some other Propositions in view of regulations that the CCA have made and may need to make, which need to come back before this Assembly for approval. So we will adjourn until 9.30 a.m. next Wednesday to complete the unfinished business, including the IDP debate that we are in the midst of, and as I just reminded you, there may be some additional business as well that you are not yet aware of, or not yet aware of the details. With that, thank you very much and thank you to the staff of St James' and to Regency Events. Thank you.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.39 p.m.