



STATES OF DELIBERATION

HANSARD

UNEDITED TRANSCRIPT

**Royal Court House, Guernsey,
Friday, 20th October 2023**

PLEASE NOTE:

As this is an unedited transcript, direct quotes may not be used, as corrections will still be made before the final Hansard report is published.

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF in the Chair]

PRAYERS

The States' Greffier

EVOCATION

Billet d'État XVII

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

5. Funding & Investment Plan – Debate continued

5 **Deputy Taylor:** Sir, before we get started could I test Assembly's appetite for a motion to decide when we are going to be over-spilling into tonight, tomorrow or whether we are going to be going into the next Meeting, just trying out some kind of outcome so that Members, yourself and your colleagues can make plans.

10 **The Bailiff:** What are you proposing, Deputy Taylor?

15 **Deputy Taylor:** Could I propose that we have a couple of options: the first being sitting a bit later; sitting tomorrow; reconvening before the Budget. And Members stand to show their preference so that we get an indication of who might be available, and when, whilst we are all in the room together, if that is a possible pragmatic solution.

The Bailiff: Let me just try and get a sense of what is going on ... it might be premature. I hope it is premature to be worrying about these things at this stage.

20 Who, if the decision were to sit tomorrow if necessary, would not be able to attend tomorrow? If the States were getting close to being able to vote at the end of general debate on the Propositions from the Funding & Investment Plan, who would be able to sit late today? No, let me do it the other way round. If there were to be, for example, a break at about 6 p.m., resuming 30 minutes later and continuing for a couple of hours this evening, who would not be able to do that? Well, I think we have got the sense as to where we might be going in relation to that.

25 Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

I will start with three things that were said yesterday. The first was that there are two groupings on this; those that care about the children, which was a direct quote from yesterday, and those who

30 are playing politics. I have to say I resent that. I do not doubt for one second that ESC and their supporters absolutely are coming from care about the children. I think every single Member of this Assembly is doing that. It is quite possible for us all to care desperately about Guernsey children and to have different views about what serves their interest best.

35 The other two things that were said: one was from Deputy Prow, saying that we were, I am hoping that I paraphrase, going wobbly on the Assembly's approved plans. Unfortunately, I do not think, and I will come to this later, that those approved plans still exist to go wobbly on; they have changed out of all recognition. The second thing was from Deputy Haskins, who more or less posed the question of what on earth has this education debate got to do with the Funding & Investment Plan? And my answer is: absolutely everything. Let me explain why.

40 Because, whether it is late tonight, sometime tomorrow, middle of next month or end of next month, we are going to be voting on the Funding & Investment Plan, on how much revenue we are willing to raise, and this very much goes to the point that Deputy Taylor was making yesterday. And, while I think we are mainly raising revenue in order to fund future revenue requirements, there is no doubt that, both in P&R's mind and the vast majority of Members of this Assembly's mind, there is an absolutely iron link between how much revenue we are prepared to vote to raise and how much capital spending and borrowing we are willing to do.

Now, what are we likely to pass in terms of revenue raising, given that all the alternative measures, in my view quite rightly, have been defeated? We will probably vote for the core proposals. That is useful but, frankly, in terms of even meeting our current revenue challenges and deficits before we go into servicing borrowing or splurging on massive capital programmes does not really amount to ??? (09:37:41) of beans. And even that core, if it is passed today, is a bird in the bush, not a bird in the hand, because the biggest part of it is actually saying yes, in principle we will raise whacking great stonking amounts from parking and from motorists. But I have been round the block before on this one. We keep passing that in principle; when it comes back in detail – and this time do not forget it will be an election year when it comes back in detail – there is a really strong chance that even that call will not be delivered. Even if it is, that does not allow us to do the capital programme that is in front of us. We will only really be able to do that if we pass the only remaining significant revenue-raising package on the agenda, which is the P&R-approved package of revenue raising that includes the GST.

60 When we come to general debate I am going to be arguing passionately in favour of that because I believe it is essential, not mainly because of our capital wish list but because of the other challenges we are facing, mainly through the ageing demographic. I am useless at predicting how the States are going to vote but, when I speak to all of the sages that seem to have it off pat, they keep telling me I am going to be on the losing side over that; that we are unlikely to be raising that. So if that is the outcome, unless we are the most irresponsible government imaginable, there is no way on the back of not raising any significant revenues that we are either going to go out and borrow £350 million or borrow £200 million and spend £90 million of our reserves with no extra revenue-raising to put in its place. Indeed, opponents of GST have said the worst possible outcome would be to go and borrow and it gets overturned. So they, clearly, are worried about the idea of borrowing without revenue stream and I think those of us, and I put myself in the more conservative wing of the Assembly on this particular matter anyway, are saying exactly the same thing. We cannot do massive borrowing unless we are willing to commit to revenue raising.

75 So I am afraid, and I say this as somebody who desperately wants the Guernsey Institute to go ahead as soon as it possibly can, the chances are that the ESC programme will not be financed at the end of this debate.

Now where does that leave our sixth formers? If, under the plans as they are, sees them going down to La Mare de Carteret with no realistic prospect of moving off again, what a prospect? And yet we are being told in this debate that for a few million, and it is a very few million, the Varendes site can be adapted and extended to facilitate it continuing as an 11-18 institution and accommodate the extra pupils that would be coming from La Mare de Carteret. What kind of choice

is that? I think it is absolutely clear what the choice is and it should be to continue with 11-18 at Les Varendes.

Sir, I told Deputy Matthews when he asked me to second his amendment that he should think long and hard about that because, and charge has already been levied effectively by Deputy Inder in his attack dog role, that I was on the old ESC that was in favour of two 11-18 schools and that I would be accused of somehow resurrecting that plan. To be clear, I am not. Now in some ways that is a shame; it was likely better than what is on offer today but that is completely water under the bridge. It is certainly not what Deputy Matthews is asking for and it is not what this amendment suggests; indeed, the likelihood is that, if it succeeds, this amendment will lead to far less radical reforms to the present system than the greater change that Deputy Roffey would ideally like to see. What it will do though, I think, is stop what I regard as a policy error of historic proportions, and I will come back to that in a moment.

But first I should say that there were two other reasons why I hesitated before agreeing to second this amendment. The first I have already alluded to: a passionate desire to see the new Guernsey Institute built as soon as it possibly can be and, indeed, I have made that clear to Deputy Matthews throughout. I was slightly worried about the wording of Amendment 8 because I was not sure ... but he assured me that would allow that to happen but I did not think it was explicit enough, so I was pleased he did Amendment 10 although I drafted another version which was even more explicit, which he chose not to take up.

But I am absolutely driven by seeing the Guernsey Institute programme go ahead. I do not think we are going to approve enough funding today to allow that to happen, sadly, but if we did that would be very much at the top of my wish list. Why? Because I am told by some that buildings do not matter when it comes to quality of teaching. And to a point that is true, sir, but you do cross a line at which they matter very much indeed and, in respect of the Guernsey Institute, we have well and truly crossed that line. In fact, an independent expert has reported that the facilities used by the Institute, and I quote, are some of the worst he has even seen. It is shameful, and I know that Deputy Dudley-Owen will agree with me on that. But there is a certain irony because that new, fit-for-purpose Institute would be up and running now if a group of Deputies had not put the kibosh on it in the last Assembly.

Of course, I accept that if the sixth-formers who are no longer going to go on the Les Ozouets campus ... there would need to be some minor redesign to reflect the fact that the new Institute would no longer be co-located, with a stand-alone, miniscule sixth-form college. But that should not be rocket science. And the idea that a whole project would be put back a year because we would need the DPA's behest to delete 40 or 50 parking spaces ... surely the officers of ESC and DPA can get together with a felt-tip pen in a room and delete 40 parking spaces without it costing £7 million and a year's delay. If not, then really what has happened to the government of this Island? Indeed, the ESC themselves keep pointing out that the Institute element is three-quarters or more of this project. So my message is tweak it to adjust for the fact that the sixth-form college will no longer be on site and then crack on with this long overdue project.

Deputy Haskins said but you will only save 6.8% of the total project scheme. Well, I say if you get a lower-cost scheme and a better outcome what is not to like about it? And I know for some it is the cost which is the issue here and I understand where they are coming from, and maybe that is the main point in relation to the Funding & Investment Plan. But for me, that actually is not my main beef, and to explain that I need to go back two years.

When this Assembly backed the plan for three 11-16 schools and a stand-alone sixth-form college I personally thought it was one of the worst decisions I have ever seen, both financially, but more importantly, educationally and, I have to say, the vast majority of professional educationalists in the Island agreed with me. But it was a decision, a decision of an assertive and relatively new Assembly, and I accepted that democratic outcome. So what has changed now? Why does Deputy Prow now think I am trying to undermine this Assembly's vision and plans?

Well, first is that the projected capital cost has grown massively. I accept totally that much of that may be down to building inflation rather than any kind of mismanagement of the project

whatsoever but an increasing cost is still an increasing cost and the cost has increased massively. And unfortunately our investments, investments in the capital reserve, have not grown anywhere near as quickly; indeed, I think last year they shrank somewhat, and so the project has become relatively much less affordable than when it was first approved.

The second point is, I think, the realisation has well and truly set in now within this Assembly that the challenges we face in meeting our future revenue spending requirements are massive. So why on earth would we choose an extremely revenue-inefficient four-school model ... three 11-16 schools plus a positively Lilliputian stand-alone sixth-form college, when we know it will make excessive demands on our limited available revenues, not just for years but for decades to come? We are told it will be marginally less expensive than the old four-school model but, frankly, that is feeble. In just the same way the burgeoning numbers of elderly on the Island are unavoidably driving healthcare costs upwards, and they are.

At the other end of the spectrum we definitely need to take advantage of the inefficiencies that can be driven and the savings that can be achieved with the projected plummeting numbers of school-aged islanders if we are going to balance the books; that is what it has to do with the Funding & Investment Plan.

Frankly, if we lose one of our four secondary schools, 25% of them, and only realise marginal revenue savings as a result is inexcusable, and we are really only able to do that by sticking up a tipping point for classes and increasing class sizes. So why are we not doing better? Why are we not making bigger savings because we insist on replacing that closed high school unnecessarily with a stand-alone sixth-form college, the size of which would not even be contemplated elsewhere? I have got nothing against sixth-form colleges; they work very well at scale but nowhere outside the private sector that can throw mega bucks at it will you find one of circa 400 pupils and destined to be fewer than 400 pupils in just a few years' time when the demographics take place.

But it was a third thing which has changed since the States decided, unwisely in my view, to back that four-school model two years ago, which was the straw that broke the camel's back for me and which meant I could no longer just sit on my hands. And I had been sitting on my hands. I have been sucking it off. I have been accepting what I thought was a poor decision but I could not do it any more because, through no fault of the ESC, the Plan that we signed off, our vision, the Assembly's vision if you like, can no longer be implemented in the way that was promised. Because, and it is no fault of the ESC, because of a major failure in the local construction industry, ESC are now planning to move the sixth-form college from Les Varendes to La Mare. And I have yet to meet a single person, teacher or lay person, who thinks that is anything but a very bad idea. In fact, most teachers I have spoken to, and I have spoken to a lot, have put it far more robustly than that.

Now, I know it was hoped, or I did think it was hoped, that transplanting the sixth form up north was only going to be for a year, although I heard two or three years mentioned yesterday afternoon. But let's assume it is only a year. Just think what that means for the pupils on the ground. There will be pupils, currently at La Mare High School, who will be moved to Les Varendes to take their GCSEs, then shuffling back to their old school at La Mare for a year to start taking their A-Levels, and then being moved again for the second half of their A-Level course to, hopefully, the new or co-located sixth-form college.

I do not know how many of those pupils will be studying at religious college but, for those who are, it is going to remind them distinctly of something out of *The Exorcist*. By contrast, retaining 11-18 education at Les Varendes and investing in that site as we know is possible – we have been told by ESC it is possible to make it fit for the demands on it – will mean pupils just moving one time and not three times. So that is a sub-optimal situation if the move to the sixth form, to Les Varendes, is really only for one year. But I have said it several times in this debate; I have been round the block of local politics and I have been around it long enough to know that one year can easily morph not only into two or three that was mentioned yesterday, but into far more. How many facilities are still at the Castel Hospital that were going to move out 15 years ago because it was being closed down but we have not really been able to achieve it yet? The sixth form ... other Level 3 studies; it is the

pinnacle of on-Island studies for our pupils. Are we really going to treat them like this? I am astonished.

Some Members have asked me how I can support the idea of continuing with the 11-18 offer at one of our high schools but the others will be 11-16. Isn't that rather unfair, they asked, and didn't you oppose that approach in the last Assembly for exactly that reason. Well, yes it is and yes I did. I do think that it will continue to be somewhat unfair, just as it is today. Nothing is changing. But it still remains a much better solution than the one we are blindly following just now.

Anyway, surely one can only regard it as unfair if, as I do, you think that 11-18 schools have some inherent advantage over 11-16 schools. But for those who don't, I don't get how they can possibly regard the concept of one 11-18 school and two 11-16 schools as in any way being unfair because they do not feel that their 11-16-aged pupils are at a disadvantage. And for those of us who do think that 11-18 schools have advantages, how irrational and petty-minded it would be to totally eradicate that advantageous system from our State education model and effectively level-down in blind pursuit of fairness.

Sir, I think it would be a deeply sad day when we completely remove 11-18 education from our State system. It would be a massive step backwards and this is possibly the last chance to correct that historic mistake. And I tell you one thing. None of the private colleges are going to be moving from 11-18 to 11-16. Ask them why; because they know it would be a big mistake. And yet Members who, in other respects, and we heard it during the debate on the Education Law, who urge us to take lessons from the way the colleges operate, will support doing to the State education system something which colleges would never even contemplate. Members, it is not too late to stop this folly.

And another thing about 11-18 schools; they are far easier to recruit to. We will hear lots in this debate about the impact of any eleventh hour change of direction. We have already heard it in the run up to this debate, on retention and recruitment. Now those are fair points in the short term and very regrettable but we also need to think long term. Survey after survey of secondary school teachers in the UK show a massive preference for teaching in 11-18 settings rather than in 11-16 settings. Even amongst teachers who have no wish to teach A-Level they still prefer to teach in an 11-18 setting.

Now we know there is a national skill shortage in teaching and there will be for some considerable time, and we know recruitment is very difficult. So why on earth would we deliberately shrink the pool of talent we have to fish in by adopting a school system which is a turn-off for not all but the majority of teachers that we might be trying to recruit. And certainly it is not just about trying to recruit the teachers; it is also about retention. I have been contacted by any number of teachers, particularly from Les Varendes, who have told me that the State system, particularly from the Les Varendes site, has lost teachers either going back to England or going to teach in the private colleges because they simply do not want to teach in the model that we are seeking to introduce. If Members can live with that, live with the consequences of recruitment.

But coming back to money, because this debate is largely about money, what do we know about our current path in respect of secondary education in that context? Firstly, that the predicted capital costs have mushroomed since we agreed it in principle. And I actually thought I had had a promise from both the then Vice-President of ESC, later confirmed by the President of ESC, that if it went outside the original envelope, and it does not matter what caused that, inflation or anything else, outside the original envelope, it would come back here for debate. Not happened. Why not?

Secondly, future revenue costs will be higher than they need to be just when we are facing huge revenue funding challenges. And, lastly, the scheme cannot even be implemented in the way it was sold to us. Instead it will require a redundant high school in fairly poor condition. Even the days when Mrs Tasker, bless her, was head-teacher, we were being told that it had really gone past its useful life, to be pressed into use to teach the Island's sixth-formers in. For how long? We do not know. It is not too late to stop this lemming-like madness. We do not need to send ESC back to the drawing board. The Guernsey Institute can still go ahead and quite soon if the funding is realised,

although I do not believe that this Assembly actually has the backbone to pass a fundraising package that will allow that to happen.

All that is needed is to tweak and expand the facilities at Les Varendes to retain it as the highly successful 11-18 school that it is today, rather than stripping it of its sixth form for no good reason, added cost and moving to a sub-optimal position.

Sir, for all those reasons I think we should support the Matthews amendment, but even more than that, as I said at the beginning, I suspect strongly that we will not pass a funding package that will fund ... maybe ESC have been outmanoeuvred by HSC, I don't know, under section 1, but I cannot see scenarios (3) or (2) unless we pass revenue-raising measures to support it. It would just be so irresponsible to borrow at that level without the revenue raising behind it. I think we are going to end up with a delay to ESC and I really regret that. I will not be voting for that. I will be voting for a funding package and I want the Guernsey Institute to go ahead. But I think that is a likely outcome so I ask Members what would they prefer? Finding three or four million pounds to put into the Les Varendes site, to expand it, to make it fit for purpose to continue as an outstanding 11-18 school, or moving the pupils to La Mare with no real being able to look at parents in the face, and the pupils to be honest, and say we do not know when you are going to come out of that situation.

Sir, I believe that this amendment should be passed.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Thank you, sir.

My concern is over the quality of education and the retention of key teachers that have made, actually, the sixth form centre what it is today; the jewel in the crown as one person has mentioned. I think that was Deputy Matthews. And a sixth-form centre which has attracted students from the private colleges with provision for courses not available in the private colleges but sometimes with choice with regard to the teachers providing the courses at the sixth-form centre. We have got something very special; something that people in Guernsey have pride in, and my concern is with the possible disruption, uncertainty and instability that could arise from this moving to and fro, particularly to a facility that has already been stated by the teachers that they are not particularly fond of, and the fact that they are very satisfied with the accommodation and facilities within the current layout of Les Varendes School, the old grammar school.

My concern also is that the sixth form teachers have objected to moving. The moving is quite extreme because it is not just a matter of moving once to La Mare but also the move back again to new facilities on the old St Peter Port School site, which is another concern perhaps for a number of individual teachers and could have an effect on hiring and retention of teachers in the future.

So it is a risk that we will not have the sixth form quality that is there currently and that, I think, we have to consider very deeply. There is nothing worse than disruption. There is nothing worse than instability in terms of attracting the type of calibre of teachers that you require in the sixth-form centre because you have to remember that there is a lot of pressure on those teachers to see not only that A-Level standards are maintained but also that they get the highest grades in competition with the private schools and in competition with schools in the UK. A lot of pressure is placed on the teaching staff and it is different from the pressures that might be placed on staff teaching Year 7, Year 8, Year 9. It is very different because here you have extreme pressure and you have sensitivities and issues with teachers suddenly saying they can get a better deal somewhere else, either in the UK or in the private colleges here. Those teachers have been attracted by facilities elsewhere and results elsewhere and that has to be remembered. So I think we have a particular problem here, a particular risk of disruption, uncertainty, instability and the possible effect on the quality of education at this very high level.

In terms of the larger school and the input of students from La Mare into the facility at Les Varendes, the old grammar school, this need not be a problem because, as you know, the intake currently at La Mare is from eight parishes. Eight parishes! There is no reason why those students coming in from St Sampson's and ??? (10:04:44) cannot in fact be accommodated perhaps at St

Sampson's School. There is no reason why those coming from the West cannot be accommodated at the other high school, and then the remainder from around St Peter Port and so on continuing to flood into the old grammar school. So, in fact, there really should not be a problem in terms of re-distributing that population so it does not provide that accommodation problem at Les Varendes.

Then, of course, we have invested in portakabins at La Mare de Carteret. That can all be moved over if we need to the old grammar school without any difficulty. In fact, the whole of the mathematics department was accommodated at La Mare de Carteret in new portakabins. There is nothing wrong with teaching in portakabins, by the way, because I have done it for years.

People also talk about the cost savings and they are very concerned that the move would incur larger costs than the more stable situation of remaining with the sixth-form centre where it is. So, in all, I would like to see that the sixth-form centre remains where it is because of my overall concerns with regard to the quality of education and with the recruitment and retention of teachers ... and these are very special teachers with a tremendous responsibility tied up in them which makes them look very quickly, particularly top-flyers who move at any time. We could be the losers in this particular area of education that is so important to our student population and to the parents of our children.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Roberts, Deputy Soulsby, Deputy Leadbeater is it your wish for each of you to be relevéd?

Alderney Representative Roberts, Deputy Soulsby and Deputy Leadbeater: Yes please, sir.

The Bailiff: What I am really seeking in this debate now is for somebody to say something new because we are getting a lot of repetition about the pros and cons. I will call Deputy Murray next but please do not repeat any of the arguments that have already been given by other methods.

Deputy Murray: All right, sir, I will do my best because there has been quite a lot of nonsense spoken. I will try to correct that. I do not suffer fools gladly, sir; I am not known for it. I do not say that proposer and seconder are fools but I do say this is a very foolish amendment.

There has been some talk even this morning of the advantages of 11-18 as against 11-16 yet again and I think what people are forgetting is that we were talking about an historical grammar school for 11-18, which is a very different proposition to what we currently have – a mixed cohort. In fact, we have even more of a mixed cohort because we still have in the sixth form some selective students. It is very much more difficult to teach a mixed cohort where you are trying between the ages of 16 and 18 to encourage academic qualifications – the pursuit of them – with adults, because 16-year olds are now adults, cheek by jowl with students who are children at 11 from a mixed cohort. It is not the same thing at all and our experience at the moment, I can assure you, is replicating exactly that. It is very challenging so please do not make the mistake of assuming that the 11-18 success that a grammar school education provided, and it was an excellent education system, can be compared at all with a comprehensive 11-18 in Guernsey. I say in Guernsey because it can be done in the UK for lots of different reasons.

But, sir, I cannot help but return now, because it has been forced on us, to 2020, when the previous Assembly decided on an approach which was then challenged and obviously a ??? (10:11:02) review was brought into place. That is what this ESC inherited, it inherited that. What was also the case, and I had better make this point very clear for Deputy Roffey particularly, the considerable inflation in cost is almost largely down to the TGI because the specifications for that were done on the back of a fag packet! Honestly. There was little thought given other than to put these three organisations together and £47 million allocated to it. I have no idea why £47 million. It is now £95 million. That is the bulk of the increase; there has been negligible ... apart from minor

inflation of the model that was brought here in the summer of 2021, so let's make that very clear. It is not moving the sixth form that has pushed that envelope up to the size that it is; that is a fallacy.

340 What we inherited, sir, was a review, the specifications of which had been designed by the previous ESC. We were astounded. This was supposed to look at the difference between a two-school model and a three-school model. One would naturally have thought that would look at the relevant three schools that that would represent to see what the cost differences would be. That is not what happened. They starting moving walls in some schools to give the same teaching space, 345 as the two schools – which was not actually even complete at this stage –

The Bailiff: Deputy Murray, I am concerned about the relevance of this to Amendment 10.

Deputy Murray: The relevance, sir –

350

The Bailiff: Deputy Murray, the history lesson does not matter. It is Amendment 10 that matters, whether you are going to insert some Propositions and if you are going to vote for them subsequently. Can we concentrate on what is in the amendment, please?

355 **Deputy Murray:** I am trying to give a background to people about the context and why I am saying that this is a very foolish amendment, and there are some misconceptions about why that model actually exists but I will move on in the best way that I can.

I am going to make clear that I have quite an interest in this simply because I come from a family of teachers so I do understand the teaching impact of what has been mentioned here this morning. 360 It is severe and it has been exacerbated by the dreadful times of COVID so I am by no means trying to underplay the impact on our teachers and the desperate need we are in for the right people and how to attract them. However, what we have with this amendment ignores what has happened in the last two years. A lot has happened in the last two years and it is why this amendment cannot go through because of the dangers that exist in actually pushing this through at this point. Even a 365 year later would have been a challenge; two years later so much has changed. So much of that transition has started to come to pass that there is a very real danger of causing major upset in our education system as a consequence of doing it.

So, for example, students from La Mare have already started the move to Les Varendes, the old grammar school. That has already started to happen. Parents have been told where their children 370 are going to go. Siblings know when they are going to join their other siblings. Teachers have been told what their jobs will be. Jobs have been ring-fenced. There is a model that the DPA have approved. We have residents who have been talked to, brought along and, furthermore, we are in danger of disrupting that – for the sake of what?

Deputy Roffey this morning spent quite a lot of time talking about his belief in an 11-18 system 375 and then also countered that by saying it is all about the money. Well, of course it is all about the money; we understand it is all about the money. But, much more importantly, it is about the students and the quality of education that we provide and we have been in this fix since 1986 one way or another. We have had huge disruption, telling teachers, telling students, telling parents we are going to go in this direction ... we are going to go in that direction. We have gone much further in this 380 direction, as approved by this Assembly in 2021, than even before.

Deputy Taylor asked what was Plan B. I can tell you what Plan B is. As far as the TGI is concerned it is teaching students in a tent and we are already doing that. Is that satisfactory? Of course it is not. But Plan B for the sixth form is to move the sixth form temporarily, but now we have a funding 385 problem. The difficulty that you have is that the sixth form and all the children from Les Varendes will not fit. And the figures are not small beer. I have to tell you that these figures have been quality-assured and by a quantity surveyor ... this is not back of a fag packet stuff. At the moment, moving the sixth form as expected is between £17.4 and £18.8 million – not an insignificant amount of money.

If you want to share the space with the 11-16 at Les Varendes it is between £9.6 and £18.7 million . If you want a separate sixth form, which is what we do not have at the grammar school at the moment – the sixth form was never built at the grammar school to be a separate sixth form – to save money, understandably it was incorporated into a grammar school, so 50%-60% of the teaching space is shared between those adults I mentioned before and the children. That is exactly where we are at the moment.

If you want to compare creating a new sixth form which is stand-alone, the figures are even worse, and I do not say that we do that but, by comparison you are talking about £25.6 million up to an upper limit of £30.6 million. These figures have been verified. I did not do them; specialists did them. So, if we are talking about money, and that is what we are doing in this debate, which is why we shouldn't even be talking about education, frankly, in my opinion, these are the ranges of numbers we are talking about. But there is a further difficulty because the transition model that we looked at before and have started to implement was to put the music centre, Share and the Youth Commission on that same site. They will not fit. So we are going to incur millions of pounds more to find them a home.

So the simplicity that this suggests is fraught with cost. It is fraught with difficulties of disruption to students (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and I am quite aware, more than aware, that I have no idea where we are going to get the money that we require to do all the things that we want to do, and this, to some extent is a casualty. But we are either going to carry on with the transition and move the adults out to a separate location for £141,000, and it will be adequate and, as Deputy de Lisle said this morning you can teach out of portakabins; La Mare having been doing it for years. If that is what it takes, that is what it takes – it is perfectly adequate. But do not think for one moment that this is a cost-free or relatively cost-free option to pursue an 11-18 environment on one school. The adults in 16-18 education are going to be better served by being with other adults of 16 to 18 in pursuing their futures, whether they are academic, technical, professional or otherwise, and they will mix.

And the reason that Deputy de Lisle mentioned that we do get some students coming from the sixth forms of the private colleges is because of the curriculum. Because the curriculum in a single sixth form is as broad as you can get it with 400-plus students. When you have 200 or less as you do have in most of the private schools there is a limitation and if you separate that, if you try to put, for example, sixth forms in three locations or even in two, students move from college to college to ensure they can get the full complement of subjects that they wish to study. In the model that we have suggested, which would be to some extent the same if you put them in La Mare de Carteret, the teachers move. Now, who would you rather have moving around on a daily basis, 16 to 18 year olds or a few teachers? It doesn't make sense in a small scale model in Guernsey.

We have talked about inter-generational fairness during this debate. Well, I can assure you, if we do not get a stable education system in Guernsey, that is the damage that we will do to inter-generational ??? (10:21:46).

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld, something new, please.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

I was actually hoping to speak last thing last night but unfortunately we ran out of time. Unfortunately, I think we ended on a bit of a testy and sour note last night. Deputy Le Tocq's speech was very prescient when he was saying that we were all getting tired and a bit irritable. Deputy Haskins made a very good, passionate speech and I agree with much of what he said. I share his obvious frustration as I have been intimately involved in the education debate for the last seven years, particularly last term but I do not agree with his characterisation of Deputy Matthews. Deputy Matthews is, in my experience, a very considerate Deputy, who has at his heart the best interests of what he believes is right for the Island, and I would not accuse him of not having consideration for the children of this Island. I do not think any Deputy of this Assembly would do so.

Deputy Oliver remonstrated quite loudly yesterday that it is about the children, not about the buildings; but again, yes, the debate has for the last seven years revolved somewhat around buildings. But this is a financial plan, a funding plan debate, and it is the buildings that cost the money, so there is a reason for buildings to be at the centre of discussion because that has the greatest financial impact.

If I had had an opportunity to stand last night I was simply going to say let us try to calm down a little bit and take some of the passion out of this, although it is a subject a lot of us are very passionate about, and proceed with this debate on this amendment in a slightly more focused way.

Ironically, I am happy I was not able to speak last night because I would not have heard Deputy Roffey's speech and had a proper opportunity to respond to some of the statements he has made. What I am not going to do, as the Bailiff has admonished us not to do, I am not going to re-debate the pros and cons of education systems. That debate has been going on not just for seven years but probably the last twenty. There have been decisions made, some of which I think were right, personally, some of which I definitely think were wrong and this is not the forum to re-hash an education debate or to make important decisions on the back of one sheet of A4 that may change the direction of education in Guernsey.

I consider Deputy Roffey to be the most eloquent speaker in this Assembly. Unlike me, he does very well written and thought-through speeches in advance, spanning many pages. I take a few bullet point notes on a pad because I like to treat this more as a debating chamber and less as an opportunity to have a grandstand speech and get it on the record. Deputy Roffey is also incredibly good as a politician at presenting his own truth and trying to convince others that it is correct but, as with many things, especially in politics, there are always other perspectives. Deputy Roffey said:

If a group of Deputies had not put a kibosh on it last term the school buildings would be built now,

– and I absolutely agree. If a group of Deputies had not brought forward the two-school model, of which Deputy Roffey was a leader, La Mare de Carteret would be built. The sixth-form centre would be built. It would be done.

Deputy Roffey: Point of order, sir. Point of correction.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: I had absolutely no role in the initiative to bring forward plans for the two-school model. I was merely elected to ESC after this Assembly had decided that that model was what they wanted.

The Bailiff: Yes, I think that is right, Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: I will take that on board.

Deputy Taylor: Point of order.

Deputy Meerveld: Deputy Roffey was one of the most eloquent –

The Bailiff: Point of order.
Deputy Taylor.

Deputy Taylor: Thank you, sir. Rule 17(6). We seem to be having another history lesson which does not actually speak to the amendment.

The Bailiff: Yes, I would encourage you, Deputy Meerveld, to just concentrate on the Propositions that would be inserted if this amendment were to be carried rather than all the

background. We have heard quite a lot about the background already in this debate about this amendment.

Deputy Meerveld: I take that on board, sir, although some issues ... there have been statements made that are inaccurate or misleading in my opinion. I am not going to re-hash the education debate but I think they need to be refuted in case they influence the vote. So the reason I bring up the two-school model, of which Deputy Roffey was a very vocal supporter ... this amendment to me is, as Deputy Roffey put it, the lost opportunity for change back to something that looks remarkably like the two-school model. It would result in 1,200 students on one site, and I would not think it would be long before someone would be crying about the idea of combining the other schools to ??? (10:27:43) a second large school.

What has to be remembered about the two-school model ... not only was it, and I will admit it was well-intentioned, but it was not practical and pragmatic for Guernsey and it became an election issue at the last election. In 2017, when it was proposed, the majority of Deputies in this Assembly supported it. Most of those Deputies re-stood at the election; very few of them are here now because it –

Deputy Taylor: Point of order, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of order, Deputy Taylor.

Deputy Taylor: I hate to be repetitive, sir, but we still seem to be having a history lesson that does not actually relate to the Propositions in front of us.

The Bailiff: I think that is right, Deputy Meerveld. We really do need to try and make some progress today so can you please concentrate on the effect or otherwise of what the Propositions, if they were to be inserted, are going to be.

Deputy Meerveld: Very well, sir.

As I say, this amendment will result in a 1,200 student school on the Les Varendes site and on the old grammar school site, so you are looking at exactly the scale of school that was proposed under the two-school model and was roundly rejected by our population and educationalists.

We also have an amendment today which is looking to move us back in that direction without any consultation with stakeholders. Deputy Roffey would be the first one to challenge making policy on the hoof in this Assembly without engaging with stakeholders and complain about the fact that stakeholders have not been consulted if, of course, it suited his argument.

Deputy Roffey also made comment about none of the private colleges are building separate sixth forms. He obviously has not heard of Perelle ??? (10:29:36) Court which, admittedly, is a little bit closer to the main building at the 11-16 centre than the La Varendes and Les Ozouets is, a building specifically built to cater to sixth-formers who, Deputy Murray pointed out, are very different people at 16 than they are at 11; even in the college environment they stop wearing uniforms and start wearing suits.

So, without re-hashing any of the education arguments, I would say that this is not the last opportunity to change the education system. If Deputy Roffey, Deputy Matthews or any others feel so strongly about it then I suggest they bring a requête and they do it after consulting with the teachers and with the parents and the students, to find out whether there is support from the people who are the stakeholders to have change, and have a separate debate that is well-informed and where we can dedicate the time to it.

I believe that Deputy Matthews' amendment is completely well-intentioned and I know that it is something he believes and has believed since the day he joined this Assembly because we have had this discussion before. So I do not, in any way, criticise him for bringing this amendment and I know that he believes it is in the best interest of the students.

So, whilst I absolutely defend his right to lay this amendment before this Assembly, I ask the Assembly to reject this amendment and I would encourage those who want to see a change in the education system to do it properly in a separate debate. I am not trying ... basically, I do not think Deputy Matthews intended it as a back door to a two-school model but that is what is in danger of him doing, as Deputy Roffey said, the last opportunity to change. So please, Members, reject this amendment and let us move on. I would very much like to finish today's debate by 5 p.m.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, we are an hour into today and all the speakers who have spoken today have spent most of the time talking about education. They have paid little heed to the actual amendment.

I accept, sir, your comments in relation to it and I very much hope that Deputy Matthews, when he sums up, speaks for about three minutes because that's all ... he has got 10 minutes. That is seven minutes too long because we have had very little debate from anybody about the actual financial aspects in relation to this particular project.

This is a Funding & Investment Plan debate; that is what it is about. It reminds me that Deputy St Pier in *The Guernsey Press* wrote a very interesting piece recently about ... he was looking at old films and analysing ??? (10:32:39) old films. I was a little disappointed that he did not cast me in the role of James Bond, particularly as James Bond died in his last film, but never mind. Of course we did have Deputy Trott as a fading matinee idol; I was not sure whether in his mind Deputy St Pier had Deputy Trott as either Victor Mature or Boris Karloff, I'm not sure which. But what this debate over the last three days reminded me of is a series of programmes by that excellent BBC journalist, Laura Kuenssberg, on the Tory party and all that arises of those in the last six or seven years, called: *State of Chaos*. And that is what we seem to be in as a government – a state of chaos.

We made a decision; this Assembly made a decision two years ago to build where we are going to build, to do all the things that we are going to do. That is the decision we made. So, what this debate reminds me of is both *Groundhog Day* and Mickey Mouse; *Groundhog Day* because we are just talking about the same thing time after time and Mickey Mouse because that is the way we are behaving. We have Rules which we never follow. We passed a Rule to suspend the Rules ... we passed a motion to suspend the Rules in relation to this particular debate, although this amendment has absolutely nothing to do in real terms with the Funding & Investment Plan. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

There has been both for the original Amendment 8 which was not tabled, and Amendment 10, there is Rule 4(b) or whatever it was – 1(b) – which says: no consultation with P&R. Why were P&R not consulted? The truthful answer is because they did not think it was a funding and investment matter; they thought it was an education matter. Why, then, did they not consult at any length with Education? They did not consult with P&R. Because this amendment is nothing to do ... we have heard the way that Deputy Matthews outlined ... he spent most of his time, three-quarters of his time talking about education – no, 85% of his opening talking about education, 15% talking about funding.

Deputy Trott, sorry, Deputy Roffey, said, 'Oh no, I'm not trying to re-hash education,' and then he spent 65% of his time talking about education. I am not giving way.

In relation to this let us talk about funding. If we delay it will cost more. It is alright saying it will only take four and a half, nine months, it will take that ... we are in the States of Guernsey. I heard a speaker on the radio this morning as I was working at my law firm before I came here. I was listening to the radio and I was only half listening to it because I was supposed to concentrate on the thing I was concentrating upon, but one chap was saying, 'Look, I have colleagues that have said they are only going to be at the Delancey Centre for a couple of years 25 years ago.'

When we look at these proposals to move what used to be called the College of Further Education, it is called different things now, 28 years ago – let's get on with it. We have had education

595 policy on the hoof today, Deputy de Lisle telling us, well, some of the St Sampson's children can go to St Sampson's to save the Island funding, some from the west who go to the school whose name he could not remember, but it is Beaucamps. They can do that on the hoof. They could go to portakabins on the hoof. My youngest – I have five grandchildren of school age who are going to various schools; three in the States' sector, two in the colleges, one of them is at the Capelles School – excellent school – she is going into a temporary classroom that was a temporary classroom 600 30 years ago. Great school, great teachers ... she is being well looked after and she is forthright anyway so she will get on; she does not stand backwards in relation to certain matters. But in connection with all of that we want our children, whether they are 12 or 14 or 16 to be in good quality classrooms and I do not want to go into the education matter because I ... we would go into that but I have my own strong views in relation to that.

605 We are where we are. We have to get on with this. We owe it to the children of today and that children that come through the system soon to give them decent places to be educated. We need to move this matter forward. We do not need education policy on the hoof. We do not need something dressed up as an amendment for F&P when it is really another last chance, or something like that Deputy Roffey said, last chance to avert catastrophe almost, is what he was saying. What 610 absolute nonsense.

We have shown no discipline at all. I do not know why we have Rules because whenever there is a motion to suspend the Rules we put yes, yes, yes, we are going to vote for it. I know we are talking about a health policy but we should be discussing why we cannot have more bosses going to ??? (10:37:45) on a Wednesday afternoon in November. We do that all the time. We are going to 615 have it in other instances: Deputy Taylor is going to try that later on. I hope we will kick that into –

Deputy Taylor: Point of order, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of order, Deputy Taylor.

620 **Deputy Taylor:** Well, 17(6) again, whether or not there is another Motion to suspend the Rules is totally irrelevant to this amendment so, whilst I appreciate the points that Deputy Ferbrache is making, they are absolutely no longer relevant to the amendment in front of us.

625 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache to continue.

Deputy Ferbrache: Thank you very much, sir.

The Bailiff: On the amendment.

630 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Yes, sir, and also on the amendment, and I apologise to you, sir, we should have raised ... I am sure it would have failed ... we should have raised 24(6). I hope we are going to do that in the future and if that offends Deputy Taylor it offends Deputy Taylor. He may want to consider whether in his personal circumstances he wants to bring that amendment anyway but that 635 is a different matter for the future. In connection with this we have made the decision. We made it two years ago. Let's get on with it. Let's not disrupt peoples' lives any further.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq and now Deputy Bury, is it your wish both to be relevé?

640 **Deputy Bury:** Yes, please, sir.

Deputy Le Tocq: Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

Having taken your advice I have cut large swathes out of my speech and also, listening to Deputy Ferbrache, I will be talking about funding.

650 Some 20 years or so ago Tony Blair, addressing a Trades Union Conference, emphasised to delegates that the choice they had was not between his Labour government and a different type of Labour government; rather, the choice was between his Labour government and a Conservative government and, in many ways, the choice we are debating now is quite possibly not between the secondary model in this amendment and the Committee's secondary model but rather the choice between the secondary model in this amendment and no new model at all.

655 I do not think I am anywhere near alone in this Assembly in being unable to support the funding for the Committee's tiny, stand-alone sixth form at Les Ozouets but I can support funding in whatever fashion for the version in this amendment. I am, and always have been, fully supportive of the Guernsey Institute; we need it and we need it soon. This amendment does nothing to significantly delay the Institute but, supportive as I am of the Institute, I cannot commit to funding it if it means removing 11-18 provision from the State sector and creating a sub-optimally small, separate sixth form.

Yesterday, Deputy Haskins called the amendment careless and misguided but I believe it is careless and misguided to lock us into 60 years, for that is the design life of the building, of sub-optimally small, revenue-intensive sixth form provision.

665 Deputy Le Tocq, a long-time supporter of 11-18 education, stunned me when he said that in a number of years we could look to do something different. Sir, if we are going to do something different the time to do it is now, not once we have constructed the building.

I agree with pretty much everything Deputy Prow said yesterday apart from his conclusion. Yes, we need better facilities; yes, we need skills training, but this amendment is not seeking to remove or appreciably delay those things.

670 We are in the lift of a skyscraper on a journey to the 50th floor. This amendment is a brief pause on the 25th floor before resuming our journey to the top. It is not someone pressing the button to take us back to the ground floor to start all over again. If this amendment is successful I have every faith that this Committee will put their shoulders to the wheel and make the adjustments to their plans that will deliver the Guernsey Institute and an integrated – and I stress that word – integrated 11-18 school as quickly and cost-efficiently as possible. I do not agree that 16-18 year-olds need to be segregated from 11-16 year-olds and neither do many successful schools in the UK.

675 I attended the Committee's recent presentation at the Performing Arts Centre, which I found extremely useful. Sadly, there were only a few States' Members in attendance, so many will not have heard a very senior member of operational staff saying that they did not consider the current model to be optimum. The argument made at that presentation for the Guernsey Institute was preaching to the converted and I doubt there are many, if any, Members of this Assembly who do not want the Guernsey Institute to go ahead. But of course that is not where the issue lies. The issue is with the sixth-form centre and, when we combine those who will not authorise funding or borrowing from a fiscal point of view with those who will not authorise funding or borrowing because of the model, the Committee's plans are hanging by a thread. This amendment is the key to moving forward and so I would urge that those who are in two minds about it seriously consider supporting it so that this Assembly can deliver for our young people.

685 I am grateful for the considered speech made by Deputy Cameron. When I saw Deputy Cameron's manifesto back in 2020 it seemed to comprise a large number of photos of him in various sporting poses, and I was not quite sure what to expect. But in my view he has proved himself to be an extremely diligent and thoughtful member of this Assembly.

Deputy Haskins: Point of order, sir.

695

The Bailiff: Point of order, Deputy Haskins.

Deputy Haskins: Sir, again, I think this is 17(6). My friend and colleague, Deputy Cameron, is indeed fantastic but that is nothing to do with the Funding & Investment Plan. Thank you.

The Bailiff: But it is, Deputy Haskins, responding to what has already happened in the debate, so to that extent I will allow Deputy Burford to continue.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir. That is indeed what I am doing.
So he is not afraid to stand up for what he believes in. He has spent three years on the Committee and his detailed and informed insight into this debate is invaluable. Deputy Cameron reminded Members of the views of teachers on the Committee's model at the time of the Cameron amendment. Of course, time has moved on but –

The Bailiff: Point of order, Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, you admonished and stopped Deputy Murray developing these arguments, you allowed Deputy Roffey to speak at length on education, you are allowing Deputy Burford to speak on education matters. There needs to be consistency in relation to the speakers.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford, having commended Deputy Cameron for what he had to say can we get to the amendment, please.

Deputy Burford: Yes, sir. The point I wished to make there was that Deputy Cameron is inside the Committee and has an insight and, as such, his views carry great weight (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and he referred to views of the teachers. Now, of course, time has moved on but by way of an update I and a few other Deputies have received an e-mail from a member of teaching staff who, for very understandable reasons, wishes to remain anonymous; however, I have been given permission to quote from that e-mail –

Deputy Ferbrache: Again, what has this to do with funding? We are talking about education.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sorry, sir.

The Bailiff: Stand up. Point of order.

Deputy Ferbrache: You have made the point of order, don't worry.

The Bailiff: I am keen, Deputy Burford ... I know you said you have cut out great swathes of what you were going to say ... simply to have what is new in relation to this amendment, which all it seeks to do is to insert some Propositions which may then be defeated at the end of general debate, but Deputy Burford, please continue.

Deputy Burford: Indeed, sir, that is noted, and I do believe that this speaks to the amendment. The teacher states that many colleagues are extremely concerned about the damage that is being, and will be, done to our system of education by forming a stand-alone sixth form centre. The opposition is not to a stand-alone sixth form centre *per se* but to the micro scale of the one proposed at Les Ozouets.

My correspondent goes on to say that Deputy Murray's recent claim that Guernsey is haemorrhaging teachers is correct but the reason he gives; namely, the delay in implementing the Committee's plans, is absolutely not. Rather, the reason that so many staff are leaving is not delay or uncertainty, it is the plans themselves. It is pointing out that since the housing licence limitations

750 have been removed we should be losing very few staff from Les Varendes but the dislike of the model is the main driver for the losses because teachers do not like working on split sites. Recruitment will be made even harder.

There are also significant concerns amongst teachers about timetabling on a split site of three high schools and a separate sixth form, and the impact of the new model on chances for promotion and, by extension, recruitment. That should concern us. That impacts on finances as well as our children's education.

Deputy Murray says who would we rather have move; teachers or pupils? Well my answer, sir, is neither. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

760 The Committee's claim that Islanders will not tolerate the number of pupils at the Varendes site if it remains as an 11-18 school does not hold water, as the school has previously held nearly 1,200 pupils with no backlash from parents: indeed, parents are baffled and disappointed at the sixth form move to La Mare. One of the reasons given by the Committee for the move was that –

Deputy Haskins: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Haskins.

Deputy Haskins: So whilst we are going on and carrying on in this regard, sir, we have 906 pupils at Les Varendes right now and we have had numerous complaints that it is already overcrowded.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Well, sir, indeed, and as the amendment points out it would need to be expanded.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: For what Deputy Burford has just said?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: For what Deputy Burford said about the number on the site. The peak numbers have been 1,067.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford to continue.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

??? (10:48:01) my last paragraph if that will help people.

This amendment is eminently sensible. Crucially, it makes progress on the Guernsey Institute much more likely. I urge Members to vote for it to save locking this Island into a financially inefficient, sub-par model of sixth form education; a model which will impact on the recruitment of teachers and a model which will permanently remove 11-18 education from the public sector, leaving it all to the private colleges who know and understand its value, for decades to come.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Roberts.

Alderney Representative Roberts: Thank you, sir. This will be a short speech, sir.

I have tremendous respect for Deputy Matthews. He is one of the Deputies that I can actually hear very well when he speaks. I have tremendous respect for Deputy Roffey in the nature of his speeches.

Since I joined Education I feel like I have been chased by a pack of hounds. *(Laughter)* The constant criticism of how things are being progressed does not help us at all. I am not going into the detail of the very good work this dedicated Committee and officers, who are on track to deliver a fit-for-purpose education structure for Guernsey and Alderney ... are all on track. The proposed system will suit post-16 Alderney children coming to Guernsey to learn in one place, to hold greater options of excellence.

We need to finance education as we are only as successful as our next generation. If education fails to reach proper funding the Island will suffer, our economy will suffer but most of all there will be a risk that our children will suffer, sir.

Deputy Oliver ... I cannot praise her speech enough, yesterday ... let's get on with the job and stop constant pulling the carpet from underneath the feet of people trying to do a very difficult job. Everybody has a better plan and there are so many experts amongst us. I am astounded by it. This is in danger of turning into Jersey Hospital, going on for years and years, round and round in circles and costing us money. How can that be? It continues with too many cooks and I hope this Assembly decides once and for all to go with the system that we all voted, which I was part of, and stick with it; stop changing, because the last Assembly that I was in ... it cost the job of a very good politician who had been a politician for a few years. He did not get re-elected over it and people going round in circles. Don't let this become another Jersey Hospital, please.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: Thank you, sir.

I would advise the Assembly that I am at least as cross as Deputy Oliver was yesterday on all this. I have been reading the paper that Education Committee has put out to us in response to this proposed amendment. I am beginning to get sceptical about, from recent experience, some of the papers we have had but I will give Deputy Dudley-Owen credit. I have no reason to think that she would give us a dishonourable paper or one that misses things out.

If we stick to the point of the money her final sentence on page 9 in highlighted text says:

We expect to deliver the construction works in the Policy Letter from between £2.9 million and £7.9 million less than originally estimated despite the significant challenge in global construction markets.???

So if this is a debate about funding that, so far as I am concerned, should end the matter.

I have various views on what sort of education system we should have, as between the sixth form here and there, but I do not think you want to hear what I think about that or what everyone else thinks; we are supposed to be talking about the funding so I will just go with what the current proposals that Education have all approved on the basis that that is what we have already voted for and there is nothing to suggest that should not go forward.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Queripel: Sir, thank you.

So the position I was in when we started debate on this amendment; I was undecided. I did not know which way to go on this so, when I am in a position I listen closely to speeches and I wait for the killer speech that nails all the issues to help me make up my mind.

Deputy Matthews' opening speech was pretty convincing and when Deputy Cameron spoke in support of the amendment he was even more convincing as he really did know a lot of the issues, and I commend him for not only making that speech but also for hanging in with the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture. As we all know, he is often a lone voice, and I have been there, done that and got the t-shirt. In fact, that was the most persuasive speech I have heard in this Assembly. After having listened to Deputy Cameron's speech I felt I was 90% of the way there. There was only the possibility that his was the killer speech that I needed to hear but I still had that nagging doubt.

And then Deputy Haskins spoke against the amendment. He is not in the Assembly at the moment and even though I was not in the Assembly for most of his speech I was listening to him on my little radio while I was walking round outside. At one stage I recall him saying something along the lines of: Sir, that wasn't a Deputy Queripel type of drawn-out cause for effect but I do not
855 know what he was doing; at the time I was not in the Assembly. But I was touched by that, sir, because it means he has recognised my style when I deliver my speeches and I do not need to ask him if he would like to borrow my book (*Laughter*) of the greatest speeches ever made.

On another side, sir, I came back into the Chamber for the last five minutes of his speech, during which he did actually employ several *trampolesque*??? pauses for effect and they certainly had an
860 effect on me because they gave me time to register what he was saying. And, after listening to what he was saying in objection and opposition to the amendment I was 99% sure I was going to vote against the amendment. Suffice to say I still had that nagging or 1% doubt.

And then Deputy Burford spoke this morning. She spoke in favour of the amendment. When she was allowed to say what she was trying to say she laid things out simply and she managed to make
865 some crucial points and also nailed several issues. She said this amendment is eminently sensible, which relates to what I said yesterday in my five-second speech, the shortest one I have ever made in this Chamber. This amendment makes perfect sense and I will support anything that makes perfect sense. I did not say common sense like Deputy Kazantseva-Miller thought I said; I said perfect sense. So, Deputy Burford really resonated with me when she ended her speech by saying
870 that; hence, I have now made up my mind and I will be supporting this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

I am going to make a real effort not to repeat any points and to keep this as concise as possible.

Deputy Ferbrache asked us to focus on the financial aspects because this is, after all, the Funding & Investment Plan that we are debating now, and I think this amendment has everything to do with the funding and investment, both in respect of the capital investment and, indeed, in terms of the
880 revenue costs. And on both counts this amendment is less expensive than what it would be if this amendment were not to carry.

Deputy Haskins: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Haskins.

Deputy Haskins: Sir, Deputy de Sausmarez is looking at the information that is included in the amendment; however, sir, that information is incorrect as Deputy Matthews did highlight to the Assembly. The least upper range will actually cost an extra £2.7 million.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez to continue.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

I think Deputy Haskins misses the point that that was a range. There are clearly a number of ways
895 to do this but I think the Committee would be under instruction to do things in the way that is the most economical and, clearly, there are ways of doing this that would be considerably less expensive.

Let us just take a step back and take a bird's eye view of this whole situation because I know there are lot of numbers flying around and a lot of different variations. But are we really asking
900 people to accept that it is more expensive to make some alterations to an existing site, an existing set-up than it is to create an entirely new building that replicates that facility 500 metres down the road? I do not think anyone with an iota of common sense will really swallow that so I am sure that

it is not beyond the wit of this Assembly to put in place something that is much more pragmatic. So, I do think that this offers savings in terms of the capital expenditure. And, of course, there is the very important –

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Sir, I do apologise. I have to make a point of correction.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: The amendment gives no direction to deliver any standard of redesigned sixth form at Les Varendes so the assertion that Deputy de Sausmarez was making in contention with the point of correction that Deputy Haskins made is incorrect because there is no direction for the Committee, for P&R, to deliver back either a sub-optimal, which the lower end could be, or the best type of quality environment, which the upper end would be, to furnish our young people to learn in.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I do apologise to Deputy Dudley-Owen because I had given her Committee credit for using their common sense on that point, but if she is telling me that that is not possible then I think we have bigger problems than anyone has articulated in this debate so far.

In terms of the revenue costs as well, Deputy Roffey has made this point, as has Deputy Burford, but I think it is one that bears not repeating but really just underscoring with respect to something that Deputy Murray said because, again, it is the case that there are inherent cost efficiencies and, indeed, educational efficiencies of teaching across the 11-18 age range as opposed to divorcing a sixth form and operating it as intended as a stand-alone institution when we know that there is no precedent outside of the private sector for such a small stand-alone sixth form.

We know that it is economically sub-optimal and I think the points that Deputy Cameron and Deputy Burford made about the fact that our student numbers are projected to fall in the very near future is really pertinent, and that feeds off what Deputy Le Tocq was saying, that if we think that we can just invest a huge amount of money in this and then a few years down the line say we did over-spec that rather, shall we have another think? Well it is a bit late by then. There is something called a sunk cost, also known as I think possibly a white elephant. So there are both educational and significant economic advantages to this amendment.

Feeding on something that Deputy Murray said, and he was talking about the transition being very well progressed and, of course, this does relate to costs before anyone tries to pull 17(6) on me I know the point has been made, certainly outside of this debating Chamber, that the Committee's plans are very well-matured and that jobs have already been offered and accepted. That is true but it is actually, as we have had confirmed to us by someone who is in the middle of this process, a very small minority of staff that that applies to. I believe only ... there has been some ring-fencing for sure ... but I understand that only the top couple of tiers of posts, which only covers the executive principal, the senior leadership team and the business managers, have actually been offered roles and so all of the actual teaching staff are yet to go through that process. That is what someone who has been in that process has told me.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: The process has been rolled out and we ... there are now over 50% of the 263 staff members who are involved in that process in this current phase.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

955 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Yes, I think that is the point. That process, those jobs, have not been offered or allocated. There is a great deal of unrest about it as Deputy Burford said. So I do not think that can be invoked as a reason to vote against this amendment; I think it is very much another reason to vote for.

960 Alderney Representative Roberts invoked the spectre of the situation that Jersey have had with their hospital and, again, I think that is a very real spectre without this amendment because, as others have made the point, this amendment provides the most certainty. I think we run a very real risk of moving the sixth form down to La Mare which, as Deputy Roffey rightly reminded us, no-one in this Assembly voted for and I am with Deputy Roffey as a parent with children in the State education system, including two children in secondary schools. I have not heard a single student, 965 parent or teacher tell me that they think that is a sensible idea, and I think Deputy Cameron did a really good job of reminding us where that is likely to lead and Deputy Roffey made the point that this is a very real risk that we run.

This amendment gives us more certainty. It is the least change. It was Deputy Meerveld, I think, who was talking about Elizabeth College. Well, this amendment gives us the opportunity to most 970 closely replicate the very model that Elizabeth College has set up. It is a very similar set-up. So, this gives us the least change from where we are, the least cost both in terms of the capital expenditure and the revenue cost –

Deputy Haskins: Point of correction, sir.

975 **The Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Haskins.

Deputy Haskins: I apologise for having to do this but I believe Deputy de Sausmarez is misleading the Assembly. She mentioned that this is the best way for ... the best model in terms of 980 revenue but unfortunately, sir, we do not know the full revenue costs, the extra costs that the Committee would have to put up with for an over-designed TGI and we do not even have the costs because of the lateness of this amendment for the ongoing revenue costs or potential savings that are apparently there, sir.

985 **The Bailiff:** Well, on the basis that Deputy de Sausmarez is simply expressing her view rather than anything else and trying to express it as a view rather than solid fact then it is not a point of correction.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

990 I was just about to wrap up but Deputy Haskins has said it is a shame we do not have that model. I think it is a shame too because I was very much looking forward to reading the much-promised review, which would have given us a comparative understanding of the relative costs. Sadly, his Committee did not deliver that.

995 But I think it just makes sense if you take a couple of steps back and look at the bird's eye view. I think any reasonable person will understand that there are more cost efficiencies to be gained through the Matthews amendment than there are through progressing with the plans as currently proposed. So I very much urge this Assembly to back this amendment.

Thank you.

1000 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Vermeulen.

Deputy Vermeulen: Thank you, sir.

Talking of finance, sir, we have to be prudent with our cash because we only have limited funds.

When I stood for election as a Member of this States I had no wish to be a Member of a zombie 1005 States. I have no wish to see things flip-flop, decisions made, prices agreed, contractors contracted

and then everything changes all over again and we keep revisiting it. This is what has happened for the past seven years. This debate is too long, sir, and I will try and be very quick on this.

I have spent 10 years studying at the Guernsey College of Further Education and at the end I got quite a considerable qualification in construction. I then went on to do some part-time lecturing in a carpentry and joinery workshop there. When I started, probably getting on for 50 years ago now, that facility had state-of-the-art equipment. It had a thing called a cyclone which no workshop had, which dust extraction, shavings and everything went up. I was taught in a class of 18 other would-be carpenters who learned their trade there and it was a revelation to see a workshop so good, with central heating, cork floors; it was state-of-the-art but that was 50 years ago.

Now we have moved on 50 years and construction is done by CAD system quite frequently, computer-aided design; some might call it artificial intelligence, but these are the things we need to be teaching. Some of the elements of construction that I was taught were about setting up sites and double-handling. You do not do things twice; you try to avoid double-handling at all costs. My word, sir, we could learn from that, couldn't we? How many times have we handled education? And what has it cost?

We were going down a direction before this election where we would have two schools and nobody wanted it. The teachers did not want it, the pupils did not want it, the Douzaines did not want it. Nobody seemed to want it but that was the direction it was going. And I think it was on a promise that it cost a lot less. Well, really, since the election, sir, has ended we do not seem to have been improving our situation.

I attended the excellent presentation by Education up at Les Ozouets campus and, sadly, there are only eight Deputies that attended, and two of them were in Education. I was very pleased to be greeted. I think I was just about the first one to arrive there and I was very pleased to sit down and see the presentation with the drawings, the costings. I am genuinely excited about that project. It has been drawn up, designed and costed. Bill of Quantities has been drawn up, quantity surveyors have priced it probably, and contractors are probably pricing at the moment, again following the failure of the originally proposed contractor. So we are quite far down that route. I did not see any drawings, costings or proposals of doing this at Les Varendes; that was not presented. So with someone without any construction knowledge I suppose you could say, well, I know, let's just move it 500 yards up the road and put that sixth-form centre up there and it doesn't matter because you can do that, you see. You can build it there instead of building it over there. So we will have one building site here at Les Varendes. And the College of Further Education replacement for that ... we will still do that block over there. So straight away you haven't got one building site; you have got two, which incurs extra financial cost.

I am not going to be able to support this one unless there is a brilliant summing-up, and I will be listening with interest. I am not going to support this one because it is going to cost considerably more money and it will not be as good. It is very short-termism stuff. It has not been fully costed, it has not been properly designed and you can build anything, anywhere, but there is a considerable cost and, if we are going to engage architects and go through the rigmarole again.

Sir, like I said, I want action. I want to see some spades in the ground and I will be going, I think, with the original proposals which were truly excellent and are exactly the right thing for Guernsey and the future of our children on the Island. That will give them a real high class for the next 50 years. So do not be fooled by this one, thinking it is better. Of course it is significantly more expensive and I think you will be trying to cram the proverbial pint into a half-pint glass, sir. I want to get rid of ... if it was a building site at Les Varendes I would not want my contractors coming in and out whilst they were teaching there. I would want the whole site empty to get on with some proper construction.

So it is fraught with problems, I am afraid, and so that is all I have to say, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, I will be brief. I do not want to repeat everything that everybody else has said.

1060 At the start I did feel like Deputy Oliver. I have had enough of hearing about the schools. Let's just get on with it. When we had the original debate back in 2021 I did vote for the Cameron amendment but then I thought no, we need to try and get something done; let us vote for what the Committee have put forward and see how we get on. But I think things have changed, and that is the trouble; what we are looking at now is a very different beast to what we were looking at two years ago.

1065 We cannot ignore the increasing bill ... cost, sir, that has absolutely fundamentally increased. I mean if we think that is immaterial then I question judgement from that point of view. We cannot ignore recruitment and recruitment costs and Deputy Burford covered that off very well when she referenced –

1070 **Deputy Haskins:** Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Haskins.

1075 **Deputy Haskins:** I am not sure if Deputy Soulsby has actually read the paper that Education set forward but the last paragraph on there, the last sentence, says:

We expect to deliver the construction works in the 2021 policy letter for between £2.9 million and £7.9 million less than originally estimated. ???

That is less, sir, not more.

1080 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby to continue, please.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, sir.

1085 And we cannot ignore the move to La Mare and when that will come back, and that has completely changed what we understood at the time. I think it is a really strange decision, an odd decision. I do not know how it is going to work practically. I worry for the children having to go there and back and I do not think it is a great solution, and I suspect they will be there for many years.

So, for me, because of all those issues, which all do relate to cost, I do feel that I can support this amendment at this time.

1090

The Bailiff: Deputy Fairclough.

Deputy Fairclough: Thank you, sir.

1095 Members, I will not be supporting this amendment and I will tell you why. Nine days ago I attended a presentation by Education, Sport & Culture at Les Ozouets and I am glad I did so, and I thank the ESC for putting it on. There were only seven or so political Members there, which is unfortunate. I know that there were some watching and listening online and I know that other people were out of the Island, but it was an excellent opportunity to question those who have to try and make our ever-changing policies work in the best interests of our students.

1100 At that presentation by education professionals we were shown the timeline which Members now have before them and, for me, it largely represents a catalogue of failure. One of those attending made the point that one of the most critical failures made by the States was November 2015: the failure to approve the redevelopment of the whole La Mare de Carteret site for a cost of £59 million, and I have to say that I agree with that.

1105 This timeline demonstrates that for more than a generation the Island's children have been let down by successive decisions or non-decisions of this Assembly. Currently, the last decision on that timeline, on page 8, is September 2021:

States approves three 11-16 schools and a separate post-16 campus and La Mare de Carteret High School to close.???

1110 That was the democratic decision of this Assembly, which I accept. So there is no point in looking back other than to learn from our many mistakes. We have to move forwards. If it is successful, this amendment will take us backwards and, in my view, more money will be wasted.

But while this is part of the Funding & Investment Plan, and I accept that, this is about more than money and about more than buildings. We have to support our teachers in doing their day-to-day jobs, and on Wednesday last week we learned staff turnover in our secondary sector has been
1115 around 20%. I asked whether exit interviews were being held to ask why the teachers were leaving. We all know how difficult it is attracting staff, retaining staff and all of the associated housing problems. Crucially, I asked the education leaders and union representatives present whether the course we were on had their support, and the message I took away was that another change to the direction we are heading in would be catastrophic in terms of recruiting and retaining teachers. That
1120 is not to say that every single teacher is happy with the model we have; who is with any model that is being put before us? But these are people who are trying to make things work in the interests of our students.

So, despite all the uncertainty, our education professionals have been doing their best to make the system work, whether they agree with it or not. What we need now is certainty and stability. I,
1125 for one, do not want October 2023 to appear on this timeline of failure. I will play no part in it and I urge Members to reject this amendment. Reject more disruption.

Thank you, sir.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

1130

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Sorry, my light is not working, sir, on my microphone and I have to unplug my power cable from my machine. Thank you. Trying to get my machine to work;
1135 unfortunately I am not able to work off paper at the moment.

Sir, I will start by saying if Members do not want to spend any more money, this is not the amendment for you. The outcome of this amendment is unlikely to save any money: indeed, it is most likely to require us to spend more than £10 million and as much as more than £20 million if we give effect to the way in which it is most optimum for students and staff.

1140 Of course, I want to encourage everyone to fund the currently planned programme of works at Les Ozouets because it really is long overdue and getting very urgent. We have now run out of suitable education estate for our post-16 students; however, I know and I respect that some of you cannot bring yourselves to support the package in scenario (3) or (2) of the Funding & Investment Plan. But you must not get caught, therefore, by this amendment, which will lead the States into spending and, perhaps, spending up to almost £30 million .
1145

Many speakers have already made very pertinent points which I do not need to repeat. These have covered aspects about the governance of bringing very raw ideas to the Assembly to discuss; the very little notice to produce anything other than the most high-level indicative cost ranges. Others have spoken about their frustration at continual attempts to undermine the democratic process and to elongate this sorry, long drawn-out saga of thwarted attempts to invest in our education infrastructure. And they have spoken about bringing this motion to the wrong debate.
1150

I need to summarise some of the points about the consequences of this amendment and reinforce the arguments that should be in the forefront of Members' minds when deciding on the

matter but it is also my responsibility as the President of the Committee to clarify some points raised in debate, which I fear may have been misleading at times.

Sir, let us weigh up the disruption to the children on site, who will continue to receive their education as significant building works are going on around them. It is vanishingly unlikely that the works required by the amendment could just take place over a summer school holiday or just be confined to one part of the building. Works will be spread through the building as we remove facilities from across the site to create the minimum required teaching spaces. If you are driven by pure cost alone, if the lowest cost options to creating that teaching space are adopted, you will have to accept severely compromised teaching environment, oddly scattered throughout the current school. As a result we would lose the current school hall stage, the sixth form independent study room, the seminar study room and all social spaces. Can the resulting school where students have nowhere to go between lessons and a lack of enriching facilities really be the right long-term plan for our children and sixth-formers?

If you are concerned about students having to move into temporary accommodation this amendment is not for you. Let me be very clear. Under these proposals, which at all cost levels will require alterations to the building on a live working school site, some students will need to temporarily move during the building works. As I have said, it is not a sprawling site where works can be done discreetly or separately and leave students uninterrupted.

Students now, who are expecting to have more space in their school because they are part of the 11-16 at Les Varendes or understand that they will move as sixth-formers temporarily to La Mare de Carteret – they have certainty now. They expect this to happen. Deputy de Lisle takes any disruption to the other end of education, into primary and secondary transition, which is where it is most vital. It is still disruption whichever way you look at it, and weighing up who is most able to cope with changes it is our young adults in training. It is our post-16 cohort, who are better equipped with the maturity to deal with this as they will be expected to do during their working lives.

A number have made statements yesterday which are misleading, and some today, and I really must put the record straight, sir. I hate to do this because some of those were made by Deputy Cameron, who has been working on the Committee, and he receives the same information as the rest of us do from our professional advisors. But it is so important to be accurate if you have the facts and figures to hand, and we really have a responsibility in this Assembly, as Committee Members, because we are party to a lot of information that lies behind the programme. And the presentation of the information in a factual way is essential so that we can be held to account.

Talking about La Mare de Carteret as an interim, temporary accommodation for sixth-formers, Members have asserted that the policy is not the same as agreed two years ago. This is not correct. The model remains the same: the vision remains the same; nothing has changed. Any suggestion that we risk placing students in interim accommodation for decades is also unfounded and, given that we have planning permission in place, we are at RIBA 4 design stage for Les Ozouets campus and we have an interested Bill partner, the likelihood of having to spend more than the two years is what we want to do ... temporary situation at La Mare de Carteret ... is very slim.

Furthermore, sir, and this is really important because it is Members in this Assembly –

Deputy Matthews: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Matthews.

Deputy Matthews: Sir, Deputy Dudley-Owen says that the likelihood of maintaining temporary arrangements at La Mare de Carteret for more than two years is very slim. That is assuming that there is enough funding available and they will be there for much longer than that.

The Bailiff: Deputy Matthews, on the basis that you will be the last speaker on this amendment, can you not just wait until then, please? Deputy Dudley-Owen to continue.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir.

So I will repeat – we have planning permission in place, we are at RIBA 4 design stage for the campus and we have an interested Bill partner. We are poised on the starting blocks, ready to roll. (A Member: Hallelujah!) And in response to Deputy Matthews, had he had the patience to let me finish, Members have it in their gift, sir, to move this on to the next phase, to construction. As I have said, we are on the starting blocks, ready to go and, sir, through you it is in your hands in this Assembly, Members, to grant the funding to progress the campus build.

Looking at the costs of La Mare de Carteret as an interim Deputy Cameron stated that revenue costs of this interim home are estimated at almost three times the £141,000 of capital costs to temporarily convert the mud hut for sixth form use. I really think it would be helpful to re-present these figures so that we are completely accurate because the annual revenue cost of running the site is actually £363,000 per annum, which is approximately 2.6 times the capital figure quoted. So it is just, I think, really helpful to be clear on that.

In relation to the running of the current sixth form it was stated that these are nearly £200,000 , but where this figure comes from is unclear and something that is not recognisable, sir. I worry, therefore, that it is misleading because we do not extrapolate a figure from the total revenue running cost for the whole site at Les Varendes, which is £659,000 per year. Deputy Meerveld will recall from his time on Committee that it has always been the case, because this cost is not subdivided by building and because sixth form provision utilises teaching and communal spaces across the site well beyond the sixth-form centre building. The sixth-form centre is the extension of Les Varendes High School and uses the 11-16 part of the school, so there is no precise and specific revenue cost that could be attributable to it. I think it is better to be accurate about these figures rather than making up assumptions.

When combining La Mare de Carteret and Les Varendes sixth form costs in his speech there was an implication that we should aggregate the running costs of these two schools but the sixth form would not be at Les Varendes so it would not make sense to use the running cost of sixth form at Les Varendes and La Mare de Carteret at once because we would be double-counting their costs, so this is not the case either.

As you will be aware, the full site at Les Varendes other than the swimming pool, which I will refer to soon, will be utilised in our future education model, by a combination of the 11-16 school and the education services specified in the 2021 policy letter. The size of the 11-16 school will be such that it will expand into parts of the sixth-form centre. There is not, therefore, any need or intention to mothball that site and the costs of running it will be associated with the essential services that will use it.

It is true that delay could lead to significant expenditure at La Mare de Carteret and we have flagged this as a cost risk in the programme. As I have mentioned before, this programme is a tightly-run ship, utilising and complying with all the governance protocols expected in best practice for a programme of this size and nature. Risk is recorded and risk is assessed on a rolling basis and so, where there is a risk, it is managed.

Talking to the use of over-provision at Les Ozouets as was mentioned in the amendment as a contingency for future increase in demand we need to be aware that some of this space is specialist facilities. It is not as simple as converting to additional flexible space for popular courses. It is not entirely accurate to state that keeping over-provision is standard practice either. RIBA 4 stage designs for the campus are without this over-provision and that is what is standard practice. What is being proposed is to retain this and remove up to 50% of the intended regular users from site, leaving some significantly under-utilised specialist and shared spaces.

There has been talk of using the swimming pool as additional space to fit the sixth form into at Les Varendes, because this is part of the problem which I think has become an urban myth, perpetuated amongst opposers of the model and those who are seeking to retain the 11-18 and because there is a definite misunderstanding, or a real reluctance to accept the facts here. I have to beg the patience of Members because there is significant detail that I have, and I will read the room

as best I can, and I will have Deputy Inder speak in my ear to hurry up if I do not get this right, and I will stop when I think Members have got the idea.

1260 The consultant's modelling found that there is sufficient gross space available to co-locate the sixth form and the planned 11-16 school at Les Varendes so long as it is accepted that students aged 11-18 to would continue to share facilities. They found, however, that there is a shortfall of between 469 square metres and 1,236 square metres in existing teaching space to do so. The same advisor found that La Mare de Carteret School has sufficient gross space and teaching space to house the sixth form with no shortfall.

1265 The type of modelling undertaken is part of wider area guidance used by UK mainstream schools which we have used for many years for our schools; used by the previous Committee as well. There is no arguing with it; it is what it is. These are not my figures; these are the figures of the specialists we employ from time to time to assist us with the right skills, the right expertise and the right qualifications. If certain Members want to take issue with them and take them to task about their
1270 figures, which are subject to the challenge and quality assurance by third parties as part of our governance process on the ??? (11:34:12) board then Members can do so. In actual fact, Deputy Roffey has taken advantage of this and, when he asked the experts that he worked with on the previous Committee to explain to him about their thinking, their modelling and their options appraisal, he remained unsatisfied. And I wonder why? Is it because it wasn't the answer he was
1275 looking for? Sometimes we just have to accept that the facts are the facts.

So the cost of the swimming pool refurbishment that is estimated at £2.4 million would not be included in the cheaper end of the ranges being considered for Les Varendes' repurposing. It is only with the introduction of a mezzanine floor, at some considerable cost, the sealed structure that Deputy Haskins spoke of yesterday, that we are able to achieve which, on the face of it, may look
1280 feasible to the trained and professional eye but is neither a comprehensive nor particularly cheap solution. And to this point we have heard that creating the space required in the swimming pool could cost as little as £700,000 using States' rates. Now this really does need correcting because it simply does not reflect the modelling work done and I have thoroughly checked this.

The cheaper options have an inherently inefficient result in design and the resulting poor layout
1285 of some of the facilities, such as teaching rooms without windows. I understand that generating the square meterage that expert, External Alliances, states we need would have some major problems in room design and would require that mezzanine floor. So I will stop that line of enquiry because I think that it does go down a rabbit hole. Suffice to say that the cheapest option is not touching the swimming pool. It is taking the non-teaching space available and creating a very sub-optimal
1290 teaching and learning environment. And that matters. It matters very much because it affects the quality of education and the way in which our staff can teach in the schools. It affects retention and recruitment.

So, sir, I hope that by having gone down that cul-de-sac there I am demonstrating that designing a school is a complex business. Redesigning one that is already in use is even more so. To do it on
1295 the floor of this Assembly is a folly and is not to be recommended.

I also need to reassure Members that the revenue costs will not be higher than they currently are. This does not align with the revenue modelling that we have done for SSP at all – the assertion that it would be. The States agreed the model on the basis that we would be delivering the new model for the same revenue or less and we are on track to deliver savings, and this position has not
1300 changed since the policy letter in 2021. I have been consistent with this fact every time we have reported on the progress or responded to questions about the model.

The programme has identified means of reducing annual cost in secondary and further and higher education between £1.1 million and £1.4 million in revenue costs compared with preceding costs of operating. Of this, £220,000 of savings has already been realised along with a further
1305 reduction of £365,000 which has been reinvested to support improved education provision. It should also be noted that a further saving of between £300,000 and £600,000 will become available once we have completed the programme and centralised services at Les Ozouets campus with the £200,000 of cost avoidance in maintaining the existing outdated estate. Nothing has changed.

Analysis by Peter Martin Consulting has shown us that Les Varendes is the least good option. This was originally done as part of the two-school modelling but it has been reiterated again this year in relation to the current model in the potential of Les Varendes being used to hold the sixth-form centre and a quote from that paper this year is:

Of the three schools being retained at Beaucamps, Les Varendes and St Sampson's, we consider Les Varendes campus is perhaps the least suitable for taking an expanded number of learners due to physical constraints impacting our student supervision, the relative shortfall of external space and the generally poorer condition of the building on the site; for example, the poorer circulation which includes corridors and walkways that lack natural light.???

So you can see, sir, through everything that I have said, where this advice ended up going in terms of the options available to the Committee; that the interim home of the sixth form – interim as a result of the very unfortunate split that we had with R. G. Falla; the necessary split that we had with our building contractor at the time and the ultimate recommendations that the Committee approved. Enough general and teaching space in one school and not enough in the other. £140,000 to remediate one school and up to £5.4 million to remediate the other. These decisions are never easy but sometimes they are no-brainers.

Let us just touch on the impact on staff. We have been told that teachers are nervous about political decisions taken without engaging with them, and I am not surprised. This particular suggestion during this amendment is a case in point. Reading the personal views received from one member of staff, either current or previous, as Deputy Burford has done today, who knows and is using a strong argument to support her case on which to base our policy, takes evidence-based decision-making to a new level. When dealing with this level of complex organisational change which, for Guernsey, is a significant transformation, best practice tells us when you are this far through an HR change process you do not stop and change tack. This is analogous to building the walls of a building and then stopping and not putting the roof on.

There is a liability on the States of Guernsey as an employer that cannot be dismissed as inconsequential. What happens when you offer people a job role and then renege on that agreement? I think we all know and that puts us in a very difficult position when you have done this for nearly half of your teaching workforce in secondary. This is no small beer to roll back. Last year we saw one of the highest turnovers of staff in the secondary phase, of 20%. Deputy Vermeulen has spoken to this because he heard all about it at the presentations, as did Deputy Fairclough. During exit interviews feedback from staff confirmed that it is the ongoing uncertainty about the delivery of the model, not the model itself that was a factor for many.

I do not think that many Deputies in this room or many staff members who have been talking to them will have been in those exit interviews with those staff members and HR professionals but that is the feedback that we have been given. Some may ask is it a coincidence that we have found recruitment and retention more challenging in secondary than in the TGI and in primary. No, we do not believe it is. We have evidence that existing and potential staff have voted with their feet and accepted roles elsewhere; we were told that during the presentation, where there is stability and certainty, and the TGI where the facilities are in better shape than in Les Coutanchez and Delancey. And, given reports that we have found, that is not hard to find in the British Isles because those facilities have been rated amongst the worst.

Let us talk about the impact on our students. The Committee has undertaken engagement with the Youth Forum and Deputy Aldwell has read some of this out but I will just reiterate that some of their feedback on the prospect of the campus is this:

The design looks really impressive ...
... interested to see what the teaching spaces look like ...
... we are pleased that teachers and lecturers have been involved in the design process???

They really liked the idea of the internal and external shared spaces between the Guernsey Institute and the sixth form. They liked that:

... that is how they want to learn ...

... it is great that there would be a wider range of skills available to allow young people to stay and continue their education on Island ...???

1355 Because, if we limit their choices they will have to leave and Guernsey suffers from our young people leaving.

They support the vision of bringing skills and academic qualifications together on one campus. They no longer, this generation, want to be segregated into the bright academic ones, so-called, who do A-Levels and IB and the not-so-bright vocational ones who excel at training and trades. That type of outdated anathema thinking needs to be dismissed (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and
1360 disregarded from this Assembly.

There was a feeling from those young people that the new facilities for the College of Further Education courses were long overdue and they felt it was important to be able to sell the future vision to children going through the system now, because there is excitement from those younger Youth Forum members that they might attend this educational establishment. They are excited;
1365 they understand that there are some politicians in this Assembly who want to invest in their future.

There were also lots of questions, very understandably, from those young people about how the buildings were going to be future-proofed and their environmental credentials, and we will follow up on this.

So, whilst Members may declare interests about having children in this system on the record
1370 here in this room and on social media, they need to be reassured that the best plans are in place for each and every child, young person and adult learner to have their needs met. Every child in the education system belongs to someone and we do not cater for our own children in this Assembly – it is not about our kids – we must think about all the children, not just our own. This amendment limits the realisation of our ambition to have an excellent education offer for all.

As I have mentioned, young people may have to leave the Island to achieve a broader, more flexible approach with their choices so curtailed on Island and awkward to deliver unless there is co-location between the sixth form and the TGI. It is fast becoming a mainstream offer across the UK; one that is forward-looking and recognises the value of broad and blended options at Level 3 for post-16; for example, combining B-Tech Engineering with relevant academic study such as
1380 Maths. It is not just pluck out any old A-Levels from the air.

Even today on the radio, when speaking on behalf of all unions, we heard a representative saying that they could see the attractiveness of co-located learning of the type the States has had the vision to support in the long term. And that is what we are planning for in the long term. And I agree with him. You can carve up the estate however you want; 11-18 schools, two of them, three
1385 of them. Hey, let's have four. Well you can do it the way that we have suggested. Three 11-16s and a separate sixth form co-located with the TGI and you can have an aspirational vision for the future. For the next 50 to 60 years it sets this Island up for success. But whatever way you do it we have agreed to it and we need to deliver it.

1390 **Deputy Trott:** Sir, may I raise a point of order with you?

The Bailiff: Point of order, Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Conscious as I am and all Members are of your guidance earlier on this morning
1395 is 17(6) in place, sir?

The Bailiff: I think it might be a little bit, Deputy Dudley-Owen. However much you want to speak about the Committee's plans we are really focusing on whether or not to add some Propositions, so can we concentrate on that, please.
1400

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Yes, sir, thank you for the reminder, and thank you to Deputy Trott for bringing me to order. I am coming very close to a close now.

I must inform Members that, very sadly, once more yesterday as a result of the rain, the catering block was closed at Les Coutanchez, due to water ingress, six weeks into the term, students unable to do lessons because the patch did not hold up during the heavy rainfall. Another winter in leaky, cold classrooms and temporary structures to learn in with staff mopping floors and drying the chairs, students covering the expense of equipment and kit at the end of the lessons so that it is not ruined if there is rain overnight. If we need to shore up the current estate, sir, for another 10 to 15 years, we will be spending £15 million to £20 million to do so and we will still be faced with the need to rebuild in 10 to 15 years' time. What a legacy to leave behind us! And considerable expense, in excess of the entire cost envelope that we have for this particular project for any future States to spend.

We really need to get on with this and fund it. We cannot constantly change education models on the fly on the floor of this Assembly; not when we are part-way through implementing the approved model. The amendment will not give any certainty – anything but. It will not bring any efficiencies in terms of savings. Let's stop this and let's give the assurance and certainty to staff, students and parents. I urge Members not to support this amendment.

The Bailiff: I am going to turn to the Vice-President, if he wishes to do so, to speak on Amendment 10.

Deputy Helyar: I will, sir, but I do feel a little like I have been called onto the black chair in *Mastermind* and somebody is going to give me the wrong special subject to answer. (*Laughter*) This is not clearly an amendment which goes directly to the ... more to do with the work of Education.

Before I start, I have to declare that I am a Director of Elizabeth College. I do not think that is of special interest here but I do think if this goes through and we end up with even more instability in the system it will lead to a bigger queue for private education and it will lead to more staff leaving for the private sector, so I ought to declare that.

P&R clearly objects to this. Some wag told me yesterday that if this went through we would have more flip flops than Cobo Beach. (*Laughter*) I struggle to understand why it is that everybody is so obsessed with tampering with this from outside the Committee; I think the Committee is doing a really good job with a very difficult mandate (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and lots of moving parts. It is not, therefore, that the contractor that was involved with this project collapsed and I really fail to understand that people cannot ... it is almost cognitive dissonance here as to how much disruption this is likely to cause if it passes. My grandmother used to say to me, 'Do not pick your *babas*???' For those who don't know, '*baba*' in Guernsey French is a scab and, of course, the more you pick them the less they heal.

I am starting to worry that the whole size of the Funding & Investment Plan and the fact that we have brought everything together under a Government Work Plan is too large for this Assembly to deal with; it is too much to eat in one go. And this shows we have not even got through the amendments yet and we are on the fourth day with more to come. I do think whoever follows on from this P&R is going to need to address how that is done from a procedural perspective because it is just too much. We cannot constantly rake over the coals on these things. We really do need to make some decisions and start implementing them rather than going back over them again and again.

I fell asleep last night in the chair at home, having put on *Mission Impossible* on the TV and I didn't see the end of it so I do not want anyone to spoil it for me, but it does go with the metaphor that Deputy Soulsby raised at the beginning about films, because that really is what we are looking at here at the moment.

If this amendment had a metaphor it would be somebody deeply believing that they were doing the right thing, driving down in a myopic way down a motorway slip road in the wrong direction to find themselves facing in the wrong direction against all the traffic travelling at high speed going the other way, with complete disregard for the mayhem and disruption that that causes. I absolutely believe that this was done in the best interests and with great belief in it but this is not the right

1455 time or place to be debating this. If it is not funded, it won't happen. That is what we need to be making a decision about.

I did, however, come up with a really useful plan, I think, for saving costs, which I shall pass on to Deputy Mahoney, which is that we should pay Deputies inversely proportional to the time they spend making speeches because there have been some Members who have been very conservative in their approach during this whole debate and I do much appreciate it. I shall pass that on to the Cost Savings Committee.

Just to conclude I am going to take the judge's approach. I will give way to Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: I am grateful. I do not think a little humour will hurt. The only problem with that is that Deputy Ferbrache would end up owing us money! *(Laughter)*

Deputy Haskins: That is good – that is very commendable.

I am going to take the judge's approach because it is fairly easy for a judge; they can just say, 'I find for the defence,' at the end, and that is what I am going to do.

1470 I think the defence was best represented here by Deputy Fairclough. Deputy Fairclough has invested the time to go and meet with the people directly involved and talk to them about their concerns about this kind of flip-flop government. And the disruption is real; I know as a Director of Elizabeth College how many staff were taken from the private sector recently and this will have a catastrophic effect, in my view, on the stability of the education system. I really think we just need to crack on. I would urge Members to vote against this amendment.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: And finally I will turn to the proposer of Amendment 10, Deputy Matthews, to reply to the debate.

1480 **Deputy Matthews:** Thank you, sir.

I would like to start with a is not which actually really, I do not think, a substantive point but it was really just to reply to a couple of speeches where people had said that nobody mentioned the children.

1485 Now I opened my speech with the line, 'As a parent ...' My eight-year old is at St Martin's School. If anybody thinks for one moment that I would have anything other than the best interests of the Island's children at heart, which includes my own son, they are entirely mistaken and making childish and immature political points with no basis in reality. Not only that but two paragraphs of my opening speech – I read it back – specifically refer to students in the state education system. So there has been a little bit of selective deafness.

1490 Perhaps some people just do not listen and just do not care about state secondary school students because they are out of sight and out of mind, because they are only interested in what happens in independent schools because that is where their children are going and where their friends' and families' children are going. I can assure the Assembly, if anyone has any doubt, I do care about students in state schools.

Moving on to more substantive points, sir, why is this in the Funding & Investment Plan debate was one of the questions that was asked a few times. The answer is because it is a consequence of the funding and investment decisions that we make today that will have an effect on what has happened in the education system and for the patently obvious reason that there is a very real possibility that the project is about to be de-funded. Surely to goodness there must be a contingency plan? But no, and so are we really about to leave the education system hanging in mid-transition with no clue, not one iota of concern or care in the world, about what happens next? It is quite evident that the plan, as it stands, is for ESC to move the sixth form to La Mare de Carteret and then, if P&R does not provide the funds, to build Les Ozouets campus and simply leave it there.

1500 Deputy Dudley-Owen can –

I will give way if she wants to correct me.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: No, thank you. I would rather just sit here and comment as we go along.

Deputy Matthews: Indefinitely. *(Laughter)*

1510 With Policy & Resources and ESC working hand in hand to create this plan there is no Plan B other than to send our children, who have worked so hard, who have gone through the state education system, the bright and hopeful amongst our youth, our hope for the future, to a sixth-form centre in a dilapidated school in a state of disrepair. That is disgraceful. It is deliberately and needlessly playing roulette with our children's future simply to try and win political points that GST is inevitable. But this amendment demonstrates that there is an alternative. It puts in a backstop, a failsafe, leaving the education system in a safe state.

I expect a little brinkmanship from Policy & Resources. It is entirely clear to anyone who is paying attention that their strategy has been to fabricate an artificial cliff edge –

1520 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Matthews, the word 'fabricate' is verging on saying it is an untruth so please be careful with what you say.

Deputy Matthews: Yes, sir, I shall re-phrase that. It is entirely clear to anyone who is paying attention that their strategy has been to construct an artificial cliff edge both the??? (11:56:52) GST – all chaos awaits – there is no alternative.

1525 The scenarios have been intentionally constructed to ensure that there is no option to choose between a school and a hospital. So, in the main debate we have scenario one, where you get neither; scenario two, where you get both but it is financially ruinous or scenario three, which is GST. And I don't buy it, sir, and Members should not buy it either. Pass or fail, this amendment shows there is an alternative.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, we come to the vote on Amendment 10, which is proposed by Deputy Matthews, seconded by Deputy Roffey, and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Amendment 10, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 16, Contre 22, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 0, Absent 0

1540

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Burford, Yvonne	Aldwell, Sue	Brouard, Al	None	None
Bury, Tina	Blin, Chris	Le Tissier, Chris		
Cameron, Andy	Dudley-Owen, Andrea			
De Lisle, David	Dyke, John			
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	Fairclough, Simon			
Falla, Steve	Ferbrache, Peter			
Gabriel, Adrian	Gollop, John			
Matthews, Aidan	Haskins, Sam			
Oliver, Victoria	Helyar, Mark			
Parkinson, Charles	Inder, Neil			
Queripel, Lester	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha			
Roffey, Peter	Le Tocq, Jonathan			
Soulsby, Heidi	Leadbeater, Marc			
St Pier, Gavin	Mahoney, David			
Taylor, Andrew	McKenna, Liam			
Trott, Lyndon	Meerveld, Carl			
	Moakes, Nick			
	Murray, Bob			
	Prow, Robert			
	Roberts, Steve			
	Snowdon, Alexander			
	Vermeulen, Simon			

The Bailiff: In respect of Amendment 10, proposed by Deputy Matthews, seconded by Deputy Roffey, there voted in favour 16 Members, 22 Members voted against, 2 Members abstained, everyone participated and I declare Amendment 10 lost.

1545 The next amendment that we will move to is Amendment 3, to be proposed by Deputy St Pier if you wish to move that amendment now.

[Amendment 3](#)

" 1 A. To agree that in order for the public finances to be placed on a sustainable footing, a wholesale, root-and-branch review of the tax system is required, to include consideration of all alternative sources of public revenue raising.

B. To agree that a Tax Reform Committee ('TRC') should be established as a States' Investigation & Advisory Committee comprising:

i) Five members elected by the States at the November 2023 States' meeting; and

ii) Two Non-States' Members nominated by the TRC and approved by the States. And that the TRC shall elect one of the States' Members to act as chair.

C. To direct the TRC to report back by 30th June 2026 with proposals and recommendations for tax reform that will ensure a tax system fit for the 21st century, taking into account:

i) An ageing population with a declining workforce as a proportion of the whole;

ii) The need for intergenerational fairness;

iii) The need for everyone to contribute towards the provision of public services enjoyed by all fairly according to their ability to do so;

iv) The need for the burden on business to remain internationally competitive.

D. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to reprioritise and make the necessary funding and resources available to the TRC to discharge their mandates."

1550 **Deputy St Pier:** I do, sir, and conscious of time passing I shall do so relatively briefly and, indeed, with your comments and advice to the Assembly ringing in my ears too, it is perhaps worth reminding Members that this is merely to add a Proposition.

Clearly, if Policy & Resources do get their preferred scenario three approved then Members may wish to reject the substantive Proposition at the end; they may feel it is no longer necessary. However, if that is not the outcome – in other words, if one of the other options is selected or there is some other outcome emerging from the many Propositions before us with the amendments that have been inserted, then Members may feel that it is actually necessary to continue this process of searching for a sustainable, long-term tax model.

1560 This amendment has been touched on briefly by others, sir, by Deputy Soulsby and Deputy Vermeulen and I am grateful for Deputy Vermeulen's thoughts and in seconding this amendment. But I think I do want to reference Deputy Helyar's comments. I think yesterday at some point, in relation to some other matter, where he quite correctly identified that the terms of the Tax Review recommended by the previous Policy & Resources Committee to the previous Assembly adopted before the General Election, which the current Policy & Resources Committee have inherited, from which the Tax Review debate in the winter of this year and indeed this Funding & Investment Plan all derive. The scope of that review was limited and, indeed, its predecessor, the Personal Tax, Pensions and Benefits Review, which I have referenced several times during this term, co-led by myself and former Deputy Alistair Langlois also similarly had quite tight Terms of Reference and limitation of scope. So it is worth drawing attention to the fact that this is suggesting that there needs to be a wholesale root and branch review in order to review all alternative sources of public revenue raising.

1570 The suggestion of the creation of a Special Investigation and Advisory Committee using the Rules of the Assembly of the States really acknowledges that, whilst of course Policy & Resources' mandate does include taxation, actually this is a significant and large piece of work, and Policy & Resources, both this Committee and its successor, do have a significant amount of work in their in-tray. This is clearly going to require a dedicated resource in order to undertake a much broader

1575 review and hence the suggestion of creating a Committee which is broadly familiar, in other words
five elected Members and two non-States' members, and that needs to really crack on through the
remainder of this term. As is set out in Proposition (C) to report back within a year of the General
Election, recognising that there will be, as there was a necessity at the beginning of this term, for a
1580 new Assembly to agree any proposals and recommendations in order that implementation can be
undertaken during the early part of the next term.

Proposition (C) also sets out some of the principles that need to guide this work, acknowledging,
as I think most now do, an ageing population with a declining workforce as a proportion of the
while. The need for inter-generational fairness, which Deputy Roffey again has touched on in
previous debates during this meeting, sir, acknowledging as he says that it is a subjective term;
1585 however, in essence, what it is seeking to do is recognise the challenge of a smaller, younger cohort
carrying a larger, older cohort. That is what in essence is recognised by the use of that term.

And then, in (3) the need for everyone to contribute towards the provision of public services
enjoyed by all fairly according to their ability to do so, introducing and ensuring equity in the tax
system and the need for the burden on business to remain internationally competitive. So, you will
1590 see, sir, that as I said, in contrast to the previous reviews the limitations are pretty scant, really
focusing on that international competitiveness for business, but otherwise it should be a blank sheet
of paper in the sense of looking at all sources of revenue and taxation including, of course, property,
income tax and so on.

Sir, I think that is enough by way of introduction. I do look forward to debate; I think as you have
1595 suggested, sir, it could and should be relatively short in that Members simply need to determine
whether they wish to have this as an additional Proposition and can then consider whether to accept
it substantively depending on how matters go with the other Propositions.

Thank you.

1600 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Vermeulen, do you formally second the amendment?

Deputy Vermeulen: I do, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow?

1605 **Deputy Prow:** Sir, may I request a motion under Rule 24(6) and ask you to rule if this amendment
goes further than the Propositions in the policy letters? Time rolls on, sir, thank you.

The Bailiff: I am satisfied that any insertion of a Proposition of this nature to create a new
1610 Committee does go further than the original Propositions. One has to look back to those original
Propositions and, therefore, I will put the motion that there be no debate on Amendment 3. Those
in favour; those against?

Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.

The Bailiff: I think that might have to be a procedural motion to be recorded as it sounds pretty
even to me. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting, please.

1615 *There was a recorded vote.*

Not carried: Pour 15, Contre 22, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 3, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	Blin, Chris	None	Brouard, Al	None
Dyke, John	Burford, Yvonne		Dudley-Owen, Andrea	
Ferbrache, Peter	Bury, Tina		Matthews, Aidan	
Gollop, John	Cameron, Andy			
Haskins, Sam	De Lisle, David			
Helyar, Mark	De Sausmarez, Lindsay			
Inder, Neil	Fairclough, Simon			
Le Tissier, Chris	Falla, Steve			
Le Tocq, Jonathan	Gabriel, Adrian			
Mahoney, David	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha			
Moakes, Nick	Leadbeater, Marc			
Murray, Bob	McKenna, Liam			
Prow, Robert	Meerveld, Carl			
Roberts, Steve	Oliver, Victoria			
Snowdon, Alexander	Parkinson, Charles			
	Queripel, Lester			
	Roffey, Peter			
	Soulsby, Heidi			
	St Pier, Gavin			
	Taylor, Andrew			
	Trott, Lyndon			
	Vermeulen, Simon			

1620

The Bailiff: The voting, pursuant to Rule 24(6) motion proposed by Deputy Prow was that there voted in favour 15 Members, 22 Members voted against, three Members did not participate in the vote, no-one abstained and I will therefore declare it lost.

I do see someone rising now – Deputy Gabriel.

1625

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, sir.

I am perhaps an unlikely candidate to be standing because, as I mentioned in debate a few days or perhaps even weeks ago it seems now, what I know about tax you could probably write on a pinhead and not in copper plate. But I do believe we need to have subject matter experts informing this Assembly, whether that is directly and indirectly, so I thank Deputies St Pier and Vermeulen for bringing this and the inclusion of non-States' members and also the five Members elected to be on the Committee. I thank them for bringing it and I will support the amendment. Thank you.

1630

The Bailiff: Deputy Bury.

1635

Deputy Bury: Thank you, sir.

It is just a quick question that probably highlights my lack of knowledge around States' Investigation and Advisory Committees. In terms of in the next term, presumably it would just be re-populated from new Members but I did wonder if the non-States' members that have been selected to it would be allowed to roll over? Presumably that would provide some welcome consistency. I would just be interested to know that, thank you sir.

1640

The Bailiff: Deputy Queripel.

1645

Deputy Queripel: Sir, thank you.

I am all in favour of this but I do have a concern regarding what we are told in (D):

D. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to reprioritise and make the necessary funding and resources available to the TRC to discharge their mandates.

What I would like to know is what is going to have to give to be able to do that?

Thank you, sir.

1650 **The Bailiff:** I will call Deputy Vermeulen because he took a long time to stand up. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Vermeulen: Thank you, sir.

1655 The previous debate about Deputy Trott's amendment to bring in income tax, you know – and we heard certain things there had not been modelled. An increase in income tax had not been modelled.

1660 There are many taxes on the Island, indirect charges from TRP through to landing fees for visitors. At the Airport, landing charges at the Airport, the cruise ship passengers – there is a whole array of taxes and this would be a root and branch. It might even be, sir, that GST did come in; this would be on the list to be reviewed. There is certainly a rich vein of talent in this Assembly, sir, and it is untapped talent at the moment. There are certain individuals I can think of that I would like to see on that Committee.

I really like the idea of a cross-party of all of the Assembly type review and I certainly like the idea of bringing in some outside experts onto that Committee too, so I am going to support this amendment and I urge others to as well.

1665 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

1670 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Sir, this is the sort of thing that this Assembly has loved doing over many, many years, particularly when we have done it before and it has not come up with the answer that we like. We like to do it again and see if there is an alternative opinion. And then it comes up with the same answers that we do not like and so we have to say, well, this is the report, this is what it has it come up with but politically we do not like it, or it is not deliverable, or whatever. It is a very smart way of kicking a can and we are about to do it again.

1675 Deputy St Pier mentioned the previous review that happened in 2015 which, if it was not a root and branch I am not sure what it was. What have we just been though? Deputy Vermeulen talked about experts that were necessary and the skills across this Assembly. We have had two years of opportunity for engagement; we have had experts, we have had a panel that has reviewed these processes, we have had independent people who are not States' Members who have been sitting on reviews of this sort. I cannot, sir, imagine that they will come up with anything different, so we have to grasp the nettle at some point.

1685 I think, while it is well-intended, those motivations are really behind this. It is a sort of presentation to the public that we are listening to you, but actually, are we? Because, as I have said even in this debate, we are here to take the evidence before us and make the brave decisions, even if they are not the popular decisions. And so I do think that, in terms of resourcing, and Deputy Queripel asked a sensible question – where is this going to come from? Well, we have not had enough time to even look at what we might do to have to resource this sort of thing. That is our fundamental problem. So creating more time, which costs money, more resource to put into facilities like this only to come up with very likely the exact same options that are before us at the moment in terms of revenue raising and cost saving, then I think is, in fact, a waste of resource, so
1690 I am afraid I cannot support it.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

1695 **Deputy Roffey:** Sir, I am not going to repeat what Deputy Le Tocq has just said about the work that has gone on in the first three years of this Assembly in review of taxation. More, I am going to focus on whether or not this is an appropriate use of a States' Investigation Committee.

I am a fan of States' Investigation Committees; very often matters, quite big matters, will straddle Committee mandates and there are two ways of doing that. You can have a joint working party

1700 between more than one Committee or you can set up a States' Investigation Committee to look at it.

But taxation falls absolutely squarely within the mandate of Policy & Resources. We are being asked to choose five States' Members to look at taxation. I presume that at the beginning of this term when we elected Members of P&R, when we looked at the mandate of P&R ... I am sure we
1705 looked at that mandate in order to try and choose the right people ... I am not saying they are all people that I voted for but they were the choice of this Assembly. We chose five people and a core part of their mandate was to look at matters of taxation. And to duplicate that with another five Members, or maybe some of the same, there may be crossover, who knows, seems to me a very strange way of going about governance.

1710 There are only two counter-arguments: one that Deputy St Pier used in his introduction and one that he did not. One is they are too busy and therefore give it to somebody else and the one that was not there was maybe they are the wrong people to be doing it. One the first one, if they are too busy to be doing their absolute core job, and considering taxation is part of their core job, then actually I would not give it to somebody else to duplicate. I would tell them to focus on the core
1715 part of their job and stop putting their tentacles into other people's business and other mandates. If they are the wrong people, if we have decided that the P&R is wrongly populated to do the mandate that they firmly have got, then change the personnel. Don't let us have a shadow P&R to do something the same.

So I will not speculate on how I would vote on such a move but that would be the correct way
1720 to go if the motivation is saying the wrong people have been looking at this problem. The mandate of P&R is really clear and this lies at the heart of it. This is almost a shadow vote of no confidence; this is the way I see it.

The Bailiff: Deputy Mahoney.

1725

Deputy Mahoney: Thank you, sir.

I have struggled to write down some notes on this because I did not see any purpose in it all.

The work that the Tax Review Committee would do, this new Committee, shadow Committee, whatever it is called, would exactly mirror the work that was undertaken and Deputies Helyar and
1730 Roffey and non-States' member Thompson. That work itself was following the tax review, a benefits review that was undertaken in 2015 that has already been noted.

The Committee could not seek advice from external parties since the amendment says there is no additional funding cost here so, unless Deputy Vermeulen is going to say he has someone lined up that will do all this work for free, or of course it could just be that Rule 4 is being completely
1735 ignored again, which we have seen a number of times this meeting, then I do not see how that would work.

Deputy Roffey has noted it: the Rules of the Assembly, the leading on fiscal policy is within the mandate of P&R. This does not just cut across that mandate; it drives a truck straight through the
1740 mandate of P&R and, as he says, if you do not like us get rid of us. Bring a vote of no confidence and get rid of us and let someone else get on with the job. This is not the way to do it. There is a way to do it and it is available to anyone if they want to bring it. So do so if you think that is correct.

Deputy St Pier is worried that we are too busy to do it and again is afraid as Deputy Roffey just said. If that is the case then tell us to get on with this and leave something else because this is quite important.

1745 If this is the way we are going to go from now on, what next? This is the FNIP, and we are bringing ... which the Bailiff ruled goes way beyond, sorry, beyond the Propositions, my word, sorry. So, should someone now bring something that says actually benefits should now come out of ESS, some other panel should look at that. Let us get someone else to do that; let's have planning, let's have five people that are not in the DPA have a look at that going forward. This is just anarchy writ
1750 large. This whole thing is entirely politically driven and looks to me like a pitch for some jobs for

certain Members without portfolio, and I urge the Assembly to reject this so that we can get on with a general debate and waste no more time.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

Well of course we did have a special Committee for Strategic Living and Ageing Well with that mandate.

But I would not be supporting this if I felt there was a reasonable possibility of us going away from this debate with some kind of outcome but it is not looking as though there is. The chorus seems to be where everything is. So, in the light of that I will support this as a backstop on the Propositions. If we come to a conclusion that means it is not necessary then it can be voted against but I think it is worth adding to the Propositions.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

I align my comments of those of Deputy Le Tocq. This is a comfort blanket to help us mask not making a decision.

If anyone knows the answer to the taxation problem I would put it down to perhaps being an ex-Treasury Minister, an ex-Chief Minister, a professional accountant by trade. If that person does not know how to solve Guernsey's tax problem we are really in trouble. We have got the answers in front of us from years and years of work that has come forward. We unfortunately, when the answers have come forward, we do not like them. But going away and asking the same question again is not going to make the answers any different. As Einstein said, asking the same question again and expecting a different answer is madness. Except, there is one exception – my home printer at home where I keep pushing the right buttons several times and eventually the printer decides to work. So the only exception in my world is that one.

So, please, let us reject it. We know what the options are. We know the sort of taxes that we can raise and we cannot raise. It is for us to make a decision today rather than kicking it down the road and having another Committee which we think maybe may find something else or something different. I think P&R, bless their cotton socks, have done their best over the last couple of years to look at the alternatives. They have them in front of us now. It is up to us to be strong enough to actually make the decisions that are right for us but also for the Island going forward. So, please, let us not defer it again, let us get on and come to a decision today, sir.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: Thank you, sir.

I am afraid I am going to have to disagree with my good friend Deputy Vermeulen on this one. I think we have too many amendments and this is one amendment too far.

P&R are capable of taking advice. We have already put in a tax sub-Committee of P&R, so we have gone there, so I think we need to stop being quite so busy doing this, that and the other and missing getting to the main debate which we ought to be getting on with today.

So, I am going to respectfully vote against this.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: The best reason I could think of for forming this Committee is maybe I could have a seat on it or perhaps share with Deputy Dyke because I think the public feel a lot of things have not been considered.

1795 From the point of view of a Member we have rejected again by the same margin the Parkinson ideas about territorial tax, we rejected the fairer alternative or new version of it by a bigger margin. We clearly rejected, unfortunately, the Deputy Trott/Deputy Gollop backstop and I believe with five politicians of the current States we would just be rehearsing the same issues. With experts – if they were left-wing experts they might come up with various recommendations we wouldn't like. Most
1800 economists are right of centre and I believe if we put on this Committee impartial people who looked at the evidence they would probably say we need GST.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

1805 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Inder – something new, I hope?

Deputy Inder: Unlikely, sir, because thankfully a number of Deputies have already stated what this could look like and what this might become.

But I do have one actual question for Deputy St Pier. He has been around longer than I have and
1810 I have been around a while. Does he honestly think that if this went through we could from this body of 40 people really find five Members that would not look, or have some sort of bias in here? It does not matter what we do in this Assembly in the 18 months before the election. There is not a cat's chance in somewhere very hot that we are going to get five Members from this Assembly that do not immediately have a counter-view to someone else.

1815 I genuinely do not think it will work and, as I think it was Deputy Bury mentioned, what happens if those five people decide to stand down or are not elected? The next Assembly could just get rid of the whole lot tomorrow and come up with a completely different set of principles.

I am not going to say I see it for what it is but I would like to hear from Deputy St Pier if he can honestly say of this Assembly is he going to find five people – I say he, almost suggesting he would
1820 be running it – could this Assembly find five people that would not have a particular bias or, when elected, the rest of the Assembly is going to say well I knew this was going to happen anyway whatever colour views they may have.

The Bailiff: Deputy Moakes.

1825 **Deputy Moakes:** Thank you, sir.

Deputy Vermeulen stands up very regularly and says that what he wants to do is drive the economy. He wants to see growth in the Island and I am absolutely 100% with him on that so my recommendation to Deputy Vermeulen is actually to vote against an amendment which his name
1830 is on. P&R spent two and a half years investigating ways in which we could put public finances back on a sustainable footing. It has come back on a number of occasions; it has listened to concerns that have been raised and, in my opinion, it has done a good job.

If you support this amendment you will simply be voting to set up a new Committee which will spend the next few years going through the same numbers that P&R has probably already been
1835 through. They will probably talk to the same people and they will probably come up with the same conclusions. It will be a complete waste of time and money.

This amendment does nothing to support our ageing population. It does not do anything to support the need for building more homes and it does nothing for business which, to thrive needs, amongst other things, certainty and political stability. This amendment offers neither. I actually think
1840 it kicks two cans down the road: the first is the can of uncertainty and the second is the can of political stability.

I will absolutely not be voting for this amendment. I do not want to be remembered for kicking the can down the road any longer and voting for something that just heaps more misery, uncertainty and instability on Guernsey and its residents.

1845 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Sir, I do make a couple of observations.

1850 The first is that I would be more ... I mean I completely understand the reasons why this amendment has been placed and I would be more inclined to support it if it was reporting slightly earlier. The reason I say that is I think this Assembly would have behaved very differently if a report of this nature had been placed on its desks in, say, within six months of the start of this term. And why do I say it? Because the amount of opinions and change during that time ... keep States out of
1855 your pockets, no to GST and all these sorts of things where Members have in many cases had a complete hold fast. And I think that is part of the problem when we have a very high turnover at election time. It is a good thing in the sense it brings in new thinking but it is a bad thing because many of the arguments have to be cycled through over and over again to bring people up to speed.

On this occasion I am not going to vote for this amendment because I think the timeframe is
1860 too extensive but I see the merits of making sure that, whoever is in post next time round on P&R, a package is put together to enable new Members to understand very quickly the realities of public finances because the amount of denialists we had at the start of this term really was spectacular, even by recent history. As a consequence it has taken us this long to get here.

Thank you, sir.

1865

The Bailiff: I turn to the Vice-President to speak on Amendment 3, please.

Deputy Helyar: I will be very brief, sir.

The problem that we face is not going to change. Changing the team that is looking at it is not
1870 going to change the basic elements that we have.

Tax is a very complicated thing when you get into the minutiae but, where you collect tax from is relatively simple, and we have looked at all of it. It has all been reported on; it was all in the Green Paper, it was in the papers before that. We have been absolutely everywhere with this; we have been all over the shop. We have had independent people involved. Mr Thompson was a former managing
1875 partner of a local accountancy practice. It is not as if we have not turned all the stones on this; we have tried our best and I have tried my best. So one of the pleas will be that if this gets passed, please can I not be on the Committee (*Laughter*) and I think Deputy Roffey would probably say the same thing.

I am a natural tax reducer, which is probably why the proposals that are in the funding plans look like they do, because there is a reduction of income tax in it. It makes a vast number of people better off and that is one of the things I wanted to stand for. Now, I did not properly understand the States' finances and I had to get up to speed PDQ after the election, and Deputy Trott is quite right to point that out; but I never said never. He said do not raise taxes unless it is absolutely necessary and I have changed my view: it is absolutely necessary. This Committee is just going to
1880 be moving deckchairs round on the Titanic; that is all it is, and very soon we are going to find ourselves in a really difficult position.

One of the things I find difficult, and I will say it again, no doubt ... when we get to summing up is that ... I mentioned yesterday ... one of the reasons people keep getting this stuff from the public, saying well, just put up income tax, is because they are not arguing the case properly. You can persuade people that this is the right thing to do if you understand what the issues are and you are able to explain them to members of the public. I have had hundreds of conversations on social media, in Waitrose, shopping on a Saturday afternoon where people come up and buttonhole you. Really, if we invested enough time in understanding the issues, and unfortunately, and this is not a
1890

1895 criticism of Deputy St Pier, I do understand that there is a conflict between personalities in this place and I mentioned it on the day of the elections for Members of P&R. I said it feels like I have walked into a turf war and that has been going on for ever since.

I am really disappointed that Members who formerly supported GST as the only way out now are opposed to it. I just think that is a real shame because if we could have come together over this term and worked harder together we might have actually achieved something.

1900 Members, I do not think this is the solution. I think we have done the work and I really would urge you please let's throw this out and get on with the debate.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: And the proposer of Amendment 3, Deputy St Pier, to reply to the debate, please.

1905

Deputy St Pier: Thank you very much, sir.

I think if Members reject this amendment they need to do so knowing that if the States then go on to not support scenario (3) they are going to need to do this work anyway, it is going to need to be done anyway. Deputy Burford is the one who has spoken in the debate who has absolutely nailed what this amendment does. It is a backstop if scenario (3) fails. It is an option that should be available to States' Members. As I said when introducing the amendment, if the States support scenario (3) they are unlikely to want to set up another Committee to go through the process again. If they do not support scenario (3) this work is going to need to be done.

1915 So I thank Deputy Gabriel for his support. Deputy Bury, with regard to non-States' members I think the normal process would be that they, too, would lapse, if you like, at the end of the term and would need to be re-appointed, but that, of course, is something which the States could determine otherwise before the election if they felt they wanted to roll those individuals over, to use Deputy Bury's term.

1920 Deputy Queripel, sir, asked what is going to have to give – a very fair question – but the response to that really is can we afford not to do this work, given that we are going to have to do it anyway if scenario (3) has failed?

1925 Deputy Le Tocq said this is doing it all again but I say, again, to him, sir, that P&R are going to have to do it again anyway. This P&R may choose to hang up their boots, feel they have tried enough this term and leave it to the next one, but somebody is going to have to do it and my view is we are better cracking on with it soon after this debate concludes if scenario (3) is unsuccessful.

Deputy Roffey, and I think really endorsed by Deputy Mahoney, said the way to deal with this is through a motion of no confidence. If the key plank of Policy & Resources' funding fails then that is the right approach and I accept that that is –

1930 **Deputy Mahoney:** Point of correction, please, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Mahoney.

1935 **Deputy Mahoney:** At no point did I say if GST is not accepted that people should do it. I said if people do not have faith in this then they should do it.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: I think I was interpreting Deputy Roffey rather than Deputy Mahoney.

1940 Deputy Brouard, I think, used the phrase he often uses – bless their cotton socks, P&R have done their best. Well, there you go, that pretty well sums up where we are, (*Laughter*) but I think the key point, sir, is there is an opportunity for some ... and this really picks up on Deputy Helyar's point. The problems are not going to change, he said. He is absolutely right and I agree with him on that, but we are going to have to do something different; we are going to have to approach this in a different way in order to crack the problem.

1945

I would suggest, sir, that the principal failure in this term has been a failure to carry the public on the journey. I have spoken to this before in previous debates and I say so again now, and that has been my objection. Deputy Helyar and Deputy Ferbrache have referenced my previous position on GST. It was necessary for the tax review to have come back in 2021 for decisions to have been made then and implemented far earlier in this term. My position is quite clear: that GST is quite simply politically undeliverable at this stage. It was in January; it is even more so now and the public have not been carried on the journey. So we have to approach this problem in a different way and this is the stop gap, the backstop rather than, as Deputy Burford said, allows that.

I would suggest also, notwithstanding Deputy Helyar's comments that the sources do not change, we could apply radically different thinking in a way that no previous review has undertaken. For example, if we were to, say, move to a flat tax system the £90 million of allowances could be redistributed through the tax and benefits system in a radically different way, producing a much lower headline rate of income tax. That thinking has never been done or presented to this Assembly or to the public in an informed way. I am not suggesting it is the answer but I am suggesting it is something that needs to be done. That kind of thinking needs to be done if we are going to carry the public on the journey that is necessary.

Deputy Inder asked a very fair question, sir, about do I honestly think that this can be built in a balanced way and I think I am with Deputy Vermeulen. I think maybe I am naïve but I would like to think it could be. I think if the output of this debate is to reject the central plank of P&R's financing model then again we should try to come together to create a group that can work together in a balanced way. That is my honest answer to Deputy Inder. Whether that is possible or not time will tell. Clearly it will not happen if this amendment is not even put into the mix, onto that famous smorgasbord for decision if all else fails.

Deputy Trott's concern is the timeline. Sir, I emphasise to him that it is by 30th June. That does not mean that it could not be before. But he will know as well as I do that with an election on 22nd June 2025 individuals will not really have got their feet under the desk properly until September, which gives effectively this group six months in order to present a policy letter to feed into the system. So I think it is a reasonable time frame; I think it is the sort of six months that he was talking about, reflecting the realities and practicalities of our system which he is as familiar with as I am, sir.

Sir, do hope that those Members who either have, or adopted, a position against this will reconsider it in the context of Deputy Burford's comment but we do need, I suggest, to have some kind of backstop for if scenario (3) does not succeed because this work will need to be done and this is one way of cracking on with it in a different way with an open mind that has the capacity to carry the public with us on the journey for the reform that is needed.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, we come to the vote on Amendment 3, proposed by Deputy St Pier and seconded by Deputy Vermeulen, and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Amendment 3, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried: Pour 16, Contre 24, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 0, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Burford, Yvonne	Aldwell, Sue	None	None	None
Bury, Tina	Blin, Chris			
De Lisle, David	Brouard, Al			
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	Cameron, Andy			
Gabriel, Adrian	Dudley-Owen, Andrea			
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha	Dyke, John			
Matthews, Aidan	Fairclough, Simon			
Meerveld, Carl	Falla, Steve			
Parkinson, Charles	Ferbrache, Peter			

Queripel, Lester
Roberts, Steve
Soulsby, Heidi
St Pier, Gavin
Taylor, Andrew
Trott, Lyndon
Vermeulen, Simon

Gollop, John
Haskins, Sam
Helyar, Mark
Inder, Neil
Le Tissier, Chris
Le Tocq, Jonathan
Leadbeater, Marc
Mahoney, David
McKenna, Liam
Moakes, Nick
Murray, Bob
Oliver, Victoria
Prow, Robert
Roffey, Peter
Snowdon, Alexander

1990 **The Bailiff:** Members, the voting on Amendment 3, proposed by Deputy St Pier and seconded by Deputy Vermeulen is that there voted in favour 16 Members against 24 Members, no Member abstained, everyone participated and therefore I declare it lost.

The final amendment is Amendment 11 and there has to be a motion under Article 7.1.

1995 Deputy Taylor, without speaking to the substance of the amendment, why do you say that that motion should be carried?

Deputy Taylor: Well, sir, we were first given notice that the order of debate was going to be reorganised by Deputy Ferbrache via e-mail. I did highlight at the time that I thought that would flag up some issues in the order in that we would be agreeing things in the Funding & Investment Plan that we had not yet agreed to in the Government Work Plan.

I then did bring a motion to re-order the debate and just at the point when the issue became live – it was very close, 19 to 20 on the vote – and I guess, in essence it summed up in paragraph (1) of the Explanatory Note that we are effectively in the wrong order; we are allocating funds before we actually agree to do anything.

2005 So it is as simple as that. Because of the time it would not have been possible to have brought this amendment within the set timeframes, which is pretty logical. But to add to that, as a consequence of the amendment that was adopted by Deputy Roffey, Amendment 1, that has also changed the wording, which would again go into if this was debated but makes this amendment even more relevant.

2010

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier, do you formally second that motion?

Deputy St Pier: I do, sir.

2015 **The Bailiff:** Thank you very much. And therefore, Members of the States, I will put the motion under Article (7) one of the Reform Guernsey Law 1948 to suspend Rule 24(2), to the extent necessary to allow Amendment 11 to be debated, to you. Those in favour; those against?

Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre

The Bailiff: I think we might have to have a recorded vote on that, please, Greffier.

2020 *There was a recorded vote.*

Carried: Pour 20, Contre 19, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 0, Absent 0

Pour
Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina

Contre
Aldwell, Sue
Blin, Chris

Ne vote pas
Snowdon, Alexander

Did not vote
None

Absent
None

Cameron, Andy	Brouard, Al
De Lisle, David	Dudley-Owen, Andrea
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	Dyke, John
Fairclough, Simon	Ferbrache, Peter
Falla, Steve	Haskins, Sam
Gabriel, Adrian	Helyar, Mark
Gollop, John	Inder, Neil
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha	Le Tocq, Jonathan
Le Tissier, Chris	Mahoney, David
Leadbeater, Marc	McKenna, Liam
Matthews, Aidan	Moakes, Nick
Meerveld, Carl	Murray, Bob
Parkinson, Charles	Oliver, Victoria
Queripel, Lester	Prow, Robert
Soulsby, Heidi	Roberts, Steve
St Pier, Gavin	Roffey, Peter
Taylor, Andrew	Vermeulen, Simon
Trott, Lyndon	

2025 **The Bailiff:** There voted in favour 20 Members, against 19 Members, 1 Member abstained and therefore I would declare the motion under Article 7.1 of the 1948 Law carried, and invite Deputy Taylor to open on Amendment 11.

[Amendment 11](#)

To insert an additional proposition after Proposition 6 as follows:

AND ONLY IF PROPOSITIONS 4, 5 OR 6 ARE APPROVED:-

"6A. To note that the allocation of £35m for the Bridge Regeneration Project (as referred to in all Portfolios) is an in-principle agreement that to assist housing supply and affordability, the States should be prepared to invest to facilitate regeneration of the Bridge through the development of housing and related flood defence work and to direct the Policy & Resources Committee to revert back to the States with a Policy Letter before any financial commitment is made or procurement process begun and that the Policy Letter will include, but not be limited to:

- Proposed details of what is being invested into, or purchased, and at what indicative cost, including indicative future costs (for example maintenance contracts or sinking fund contributions),*
- Projected timelines for delivery and hand over of any completed units (where applicable),*
- Assurance of due diligence checks as may be necessary into any company (or entity), its directors (past and present) and its financial status, including assets and liabilities,*
- Where applicable, such information as required to understand what guarantees and warranties will be offered by any vendor, partner or main contractor regarding the purchase of any properties and also the completion of an overall scheme."*

Deputy Taylor: Thank you, sir.

2030 I have not seen who voted or who might have changed their vote there but thank you nonetheless.

Essentially I will try and be brief because I can see we only have 15 minutes to lunch.

2035 This amendment is pretty much split into two parts, so on 6(a) the first part is to note the allocation of £35 million for the Bridge Regeneration Project as referred to in all portfolios is an in principle agreement to assist housing supply and affordability. I will not read the whole thing; you have had time to read it. That is basically seeking to insert what would have been Proposition (2) or still remains as Proposition (2) of the Government Work Plan. The reason for that is that Proposition (2) in the Government Work Plan would be the very first time that this Assembly would be having any discussion on a potential investment into regeneration of the Bridge area.

2040 It is pretty simple. Because of the re-order of the debate we are in a situation where we may be allocating the £35 million that is attributed to that in principle agreement before we have even made the in principle agreement. I hope Members are following so far.

Now, that part of the Proposition is a 'To note', so it is simply noting; it is not at this point giving an affirmative action that we would be making the investment. It is just to note that it is an in principle allocation of the £35 million .

The second part of the Proposition is to give some direction. This is the part saying that if we are agreeing in principle that we will be allocating £35 million to the Bridge Regeneration Project it is requiring Policy & Resources to come back to this Assembly with some details. Now this is probably the importance of Amendment (1) to this amendment because before Amendment (1) we were dealing with lots of portfolios, different scenarios and under scenario (3) there was a caveat that Policy & Resources intend to come back to this Assembly with proposals. It does not go into any detail of what those proposals might be but scenario (3) no longer exists so, theoretically, that intent falls away as well.

More importantly is that the current Propositions, and I apologise I have not got the numbers correct now, as they are referred to on Propositions (4), (5) and (6) and this would be to adopt portfolios (3), (2) and (1) respectively. Each of those Propositions, and I can read one to give an example: Proposition (5) – so we would be agreeing to adopt portfolio (2) and in adopting portfolio (2) we would be adopting the £35 million allocation to the Bridge regeneration with no further details – estimated at £440 million.

The really important part is down at the bottom, after what would be 5(c). We then have this addition:

... and to authorise Policy & Resources Committee to implement these agreed measures.

I have checked with Mr Comptroller on this point and it is an arguable point but, although on one hand the Burford amendment that restricts opening capital votes over £5 million would put a restriction on that £35 million it puts some safety net. The Comptroller has agreed with me it is an arguable point that there could potentially be authority for Policy & Resources to just implement the agreed measures, and the agreed measure is a bridge regeneration, and that is when you pull back to what is Bridge regeneration. It is not to suggest that Policy & Resources would do that and, clearly, there was intent written into the policy letter.

So, what I am seeking here is to add in some terms ... what we might need to look at if we were to go through eventually to agree properly that we would make an investment up to £35 million in the Bridge Regeneration Project.

Now, the bullet points – I will go through them. They have all been taken from a letter that was sent to Members by Deputy Ferbrache, which included information on flood risk assessment leading to a briefing that Members had. So these are suggestive bullet points; they have been tweaked to be more appropriate for somebody late to the Assembly, but these are essentially bullet points that Policy & Resources, through Peter Ferbrache, have indicated that they would be doing anyway but not necessarily there was no commitment to bring them back.

Looking at the first bullet point, a policy letter that Policy & Resources would have to bring back would include, but not be limited to, proposed details of what is being invested into. I think this is probably the most key part of this amendment because I have spoken with lots of Members who are ... would not say, yes, I would support this, I am really in favour of it, I think it is a great thing. But when you actually then ask what is it that you would be investing into, where would your money go to, there is no known regeneration project.

Everyone has their ideas of what this might involve and it is all based on various bits of information that have come out, whether it is from the media, questions in this Assembly. So that is the principle part – what is being invested into? That is not limited necessarily to property because, let's not forget, a big part of this Bridge regeneration is flood defences and this is a key part because the flood defences would allow a safety net for properties that already exist in the area in the low-lying area which has been highlighted as a risk in previous flood reports. But it is keeping it quite open; it is not tying in one scheme or one set item that can be suggested, so what is being invested into or purchased? We all need to know these details, an indication of cost and an indication of

future costs. This is deliberately written in as indicative, taking in the comments contained within the letter from Deputy Ferbrache about the commercial sensitivity. I fully respect that and I think all Members would fully respect any ... we do not want to give away our position ... but we do need some kind of indication of what our money is going to get for us. And then it does give an expansion so, for example, maintenance contracts or sinking funds.

I am very conscious I do not want to go into a debate on what this project might be but, by way of example, if we were investing into buying one-third of an allocation of properties, we would be accepting potentially one-third of the future maintenance costs. Going forward that is something that we should be bearing in mind in the context of funding and investments for our futures. So that is the first paragraph.

The second bullet point: projected timelines for delivery and handover of any completed units where applicable. So, again, this is quite open but an idea of when we will be getting these units because the housing part of this – this is an agreement in principle to assist housing supply – I think that is quite important to drum in, the projected timelines ... again information about timelines has come up for response. I think it was a question from Deputy St Pier of what this investment ... when it might come back. That is just an indication from Deputy Ferbrache what the timeframe is that we might see completed units that we would be buying. And that is the end goal if we are wanting completed units or wanting something to move into, but having a timeframe on that so that there is some commitment to. I think that is quite key if we are going to make an investment because £35 million into housing on one site could be a good investment but if it is not realistically going to deliver for another five/six years that money might be better spent or invested elsewhere.

The third bullet point; this again is taken from Deputy Ferbrache's suggestions. This was a result of a discussion with Madame Procureur. Assurance ... so the due diligence that would come before the States would not necessarily go into the full details. It would not be supplying all the nitty-gritty information put before this Assembly because again you have to respect that would be potentially commercially sensitive information; however, some assurance that that due diligence has been done. Again, it has been left quite open as may be necessary, so there is a degree of flexibility built into it for Policy & Resources and again into any company.

Referring again, I want to go back to the briefing note or the letter from Deputy Ferbrache. This referred to two specific companies. I have deliberately moved that out because it is open-ended. I am not trying to fool ... or to reach the conclusion of what P&R were intending with the Bridge regeneration ... so it is deliberately open-ended because the Bridge, as defined as the Bridge main centre, is quite a big area so it would be wrong of me to assume that P&R are suggesting anything. So it is kept quite open; any company or entity. I have chosen to use Directors. The suggestion being looked into by Deputy Ferbrache was shareholders. I personally felt Directors was more relevant. If, and I do not know the exact reason for this, but if there is an issue with shareholders, if a Member was somehow a shareholder in one of the companies that would flag up in debate, it would flag up on their interests and Directors is publicly available information whereas the shareholders are not. So that was a minor change there.

Coming on then to the final bullet point ... where applicable, such information as required to understand what guarantees and warranties will be offered by any vendor, partner or main contract regarding the purchase of any properties and also the completion of an overall scheme. Now again, this is, I think, a fairly basic. If you were dealing with any contractor entering into an agreement for the construction of properties or a project you would seek some kind of assurance on warranty. It may just be that there is no warranty but at least you are going into that with your eyes wide open, you know what you are doing. I suppose the most important part here is the completion of an overall scheme, some kind of assurance on that because, coming back to the original wording, what ... without this amendment ... we are being asked is simply £35 million for Bridge regeneration. I think it is important that any project that is coming forward is a complete scheme, and we have assurance that it would not just be the most profitable parts of any scheme done and then the not so profitable bits, the public amenity spaces or the flood defences even do not come forward

because they are not going to generate income in the future. So, completion of an overall scheme ...
information about that.

So, that is, in essence, what this amendment is about. Going through the Rule 4(1) information because it may raise some questions in debate again, due to the timing, limited consultation has taken place. It was sent to Policy & Resources and it has used information that they have previously distributed, but I do acknowledge that the timing for any consultation is pretty short. I have e-mailed all Members; I have not had a response from all Members but I have e-mailed all Members of Policy & Resources. It has been submitted to H.M. Procureur and actually we worked through and refined and made tweaks. So it was quite a detailed process with Madame Procureur and Mr Comptroller as well.

As regards (4)(1)(d) there may be financial implications but, if Policy & Resources have given an intent to bring a policy letter back anyway and if it has previously been referred to that they are collating this information I do not think it is an unreasonable assumption that there would not be any additional costs. Certainly that was submitted to Policy & Resources. I have not had any comment about what that ... there might be some costs.

So that is basically it. Hopefully, Members will support it. I think it is a fairly simple and pragmatic – that is the word of the Meeting! – pragmatic amendment.

I just want to end by highlighting that this £35 million is currently not allocated to anything in particular other than Bridge regeneration because that is 18% of the smallest portfolio; portfolio 1. But – some people like maths – that actually represents a 22% increase in the cost of that capital portfolio. So it is not the biggest sum of money that we have been discussing during this week but it is a significant sum of money.

I hope that Members will support this amendment and I will see you all after lunch, I guess.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Just a minute, just a minute – Deputy St Pier, do you formally second the amendment?

Deputy St Pier: I do, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.

Deputy Dyke: May I ask a question?

The Bailiff: No, because I am going to turn to Deputy Prow first. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir.

Please could I request a motion under Rule 24(6) and ask you to rule if this amendment goes further than the Proposition in the policy letter?

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: I am satisfied that inserting an additional Proposition directing Policy & Resources to do something before something happens does go further than the original Propositions and therefore I will put the motion to Members that debate on Amendment 11 not take place. Those in favour; those against?

Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre

The Bailiff: I think we might have to have a recorded vote on that, Greffier.

Members, I will invite the Greffier to open voting on the Rule (24)(6) motion proposed by Deputy Prow.

There was a recorded vote.

2195 *Not carried: Pour 16, Contre 22, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 1, Absent 0*

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	Brouard, Al	Snowdon, Alexander	De Lisle, David	None
Blin, Chris	Burford, Yvonne			
Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Bury, Tina			
Dyke, John	Cameron, Andy			
Ferbrache, Peter	De Sausmarez, Lindsay			
Haskins, Sam	Fairclough, Simon			
Helyar, Mark	Falla, Steve			
Inder, Neil	Gabriel, Adrian			
Le Tocq, Jonathan	Gollop, John			
Mahoney, David	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha			
McKenna, Liam	Le Tissier, Chris			
Moakes, Nick	Leadbeater, Marc			
Murray, Bob	Matthews, Aidan			
Oliver, Victoria	Meerveld, Carl			
Prow, Robert	Parkinson, Charles			
Vermeulen, Simon	Queripel, Lester			
	Roberts, Steve			
	Roffey, Peter			
	Soulsby, Heidi			
	St Pier, Gavin			
	Taylor, Andrew			
	Trott, Lyndon			

The Bailiff: The voting on the motion pursuant to Rule (24)(6) that there be no debate on this amendment have voted in favour 16 Members against 22 Members, one Member abstained, one Member did not participate, and therefore I will declare that motion lost.

2200 We will now adjourn until 2.30 p.m. and resume debate on Amendment 11.

*The Assembly adjourned at 1.02 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

Funding & Investment Plan – Debate continued – Propositions carried as amended

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

2205 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, I do expect to speak for very long. Deputy Taylor sought to explain why there has been no consultation but we have had so many of these over the course of the last three and a half days. No consultation or 'I spoke to the vicar on his way to church and that must be consultation'. My microphone is on but Deputy Taylor cannot hear me so I will speak louder but the microphone is on.

2210 We have had very little consultation on so many things, so many key issues, and that is a shame but I have beaten that drum to no effect but the point in relation to this is that we are going to do this anyway. I have already said previously to States' Members we are going to bring back a policy letter. If this gets this far and we end up with binding but not binding till it is approved by the States negotiations with people in relation to this we will bring them back to the States and say, 'This is what we propose. Do you agree? Do you not agree?' We are going to do all warranties, we are doing all that kind of thing. That is what we do. We are carrying lots and lots and lots and lots of
2215 due diligence as you would expect on a project of this nature so my view is I think it is supported

by the representatives of P&R but we have not had a chance to have a meeting together because it is one of the last minute amendments that we have had to face. What was that Chris Evans? Was it the 'Late Late Breakfast Show', was it? It reminds me of that a bit.

2220 So, on the basis that it is not necessary, what is the point of voting for something that is not necessary? Let us wait and see. Thank you very much, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

2225 **Deputy Gollop:** I do not know whether to vote for it or not. I certainly voted for it to get this far because a lot of people, politicians and others, have been concerned about the convoluted history of Leale's Yard. I think in the final analysis, although I will not be unhappy if it went through and I accept and am pleased with Deputy Ferbrache's assurances that all of these steps will be taken and there will be a clear identification of the project and any risks in it, I really feel housing and regeneration are really key action this day issues that we need to get on with and, speaking as a
2230 past Planning President, and our Planning Committee approved the Leale's Yard Donald Robertson came up with in 2016-17, which, in my opinion, was possibly a superior scheme to this one because it included underground car parking and so on which used the space even better, but the frustration is we have had two or more decades and nothing and I would rather see the scheme go ahead as quickly as possible without extra bureaucracy, extra work, it has been through Planning many times,
2235 without extra debates in the States, maybe amendments, scarce resources that we all know our Committees do not have to write policy and projects.

So on balance I would hope we do not need this safeguard.

2240 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you, sir.

I could actually say quite a lot about this amendment but I will keep it very brief and it is a follow on from do Gollop because we have had Planning so many times on this and we keep saying, as this Assembly, housing is a priority. So what do we do? We go and put an amendment that is going
2245 to delay housing rather than actually just get it done. Please, can we just start using our common sense, having faith in P&R and letting us get on with the work that was set out to do.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

2250 **Deputy Roffey:** I am not going to get into the pros and cons of the Leale's Yard development as Deputy Gollop started to do because that is not the question here. I was the opposite of Deputy Gollop, I voted against proceeding to debate this amendment because I was not sure it was necessary because I thought P&R were going to do it anyway. But now it is there I will vote for it because a vote against it makes it sound like I do not want this stuff to happen and I do but I
2255 thought it was going to happen anyway but are really going to make a debate about what tax systems bring in? So, as it going to make not a jot of difference whether we pass this or not I urge people can we just go to the vote.

2260 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

On this rare occasion I agree with Deputy Roffey. I am reassured by Deputy Ferbrache's assurances that this will be following this process anyway, but it has been detailed in the amendment. I do encourage Members to make it a formal resolution so we know this is exactly
2265 what will happen and just get on with this and hopefully get into general debate and, fingers crossed, complete this debate today.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Mahoney.

2270 **Deputy Mahoney:** Thank you, sir, just very briefly like everyone else has been, thankfully, I am probably in the Deputy Roffey/Oliver camp that we need to get on with this kind of stuff and what we do not need is more hurdles in the way of doing it. Putting it in front of 40 people will be another hurdle to actually getting on and doing it. This is Procurement's job. They are doing it. It is on the list already; 40 more people putting their fingers in it will not speed it up.

2275 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, sir.

2280 I think we have all got a duty to be scrutineers and of course I trust P&R but it is £35 million, it is not a drop in the ocean, or perhaps it is when you compare it to the huge amount of budget that we spend anyway, but, just a one-off headline on the GWP Bridge regeneration project, yes, some people know that it is properly for the purchase of affordable homes and to kick start the Leale's Yard project but I said before I implicitly trust P&R but I do want some more security around how this is going to be approached. Admittedly, they are coming back to the Assembly but I urge

2285 Members to vote for this but I would like to see some more scrutiny.

Thank you.

Deputy Haskins: Sir, can I test this Assembly's appetite for a Rule 26(1), please.

2290 **The Bailiff:** Very well. Members of the States, those who wish to speak in debate on Amendment 11 would they please rise in their places.

Deputy Haskins, is it still your wish to move them?

Deputy Haskins: Yes please, sir.

2295 **The Bailiff:** The motion is that there be no further debate on Amendment 11 subject to the winding up that will follow of course in any event from the Vice President and the proposer of the amendment. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I am going to declare that carried.

2300 **Deputy Queripel:** Recorded vote, sir?

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Recorded vote please.

2305 **The Bailiff:** Greffier, please open the voting, Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 16, Contre 16, Ne vote pas 3, Did not vote 5, Absent 0

2310

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	Burford, Yvonne	Brouard, Al	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Blin, Chris	Bury, Tina	Moakes, Nick	Leadbeater, Marc	
De Lisle, David	Cameron, Andy	Snowdon, Alexander	Parkinson, Charles	
Dudley-Owen, Andrea	De Sausmarez, Lindsay		St Pier, Gavin	
Dyke, John	Fairclough, Simon		Trott, Lyndon	
Falla, Steve	Gabriel, Adrian			
Ferbrache, Peter	Gollop, John			

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Haskins, Sam	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha			
Helyar, Mark	Le Tissier, Chris			
Inder, Neil	Matthews, Aidan			
Mahoney, David	Queripel, Lester			
McKenna, Liam	Roberts, Steve			
Meerveld, Carl	Roffey, Peter			
Murray, Bob	Soulsby, Heidi			
Oliver, Victoria	Taylor, Andrew			
Prow, Robert	Vermeulen, Simon			

The Bailiff: So the voting on proposition, a motion to stop debate under Rule 26(1) there voted in favour 16 Members; there voted against 16 Members; 3 Members abstained and 5 Members did not participate in the vote so I have to declare it lost. It was obviously wishful thinking on my part.

2315 Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Sir, I think, after 25 hours of debate this week, I think we are starting to lose it or certainly at risk of losing it. I think I am starting to slightly get completely lost on this amendment because, on the one side we have Policy & Resources including Deputy Ferbrache say that this will be coming back to the States, then we had Deputy Mahoney who said, 'Well, no, it is not coming to the States because this amendment is going to be just another hurdle, then we had Deputy Burford's amendment to Government Work Plan debate, I do not remember, the green paper this Summer which I think the authority back from P&R that they have to come back for any kind of capital projects over £5 million back to the States. What is the truth? I really am lost and we have already voted through the authorisation to potentially borrow up to £150 million. With this we are close to £200 million authorisations that could stand without any kind of scrutiny so I am really getting lost. What is happening? I do think it is an important project, I think it does require scrutiny. P&R has committed to bring it back so let us just get on and vote for this amendment and cut the debate short because it also, I think, aligns with the Propositions that we have also approved in the Summer, Deputy Burford, so I am really confused and losing the will to live now.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

2335 Briefly, I fully echo the comments of Deputy Gabriel and if P&R were going to do this anyway then I am sure they can have objection to supporting it and I will be supporting it and I would urge other Members to do so. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Vermeulen.

2340 **Deputy Vermeulen:** Thank you, sir.

I am a supporter of Leale's Yard being developed and the Bridge regeneration and I want that to happen as soon as possible. I do not want more hurdles laid in the way, particularly if it is the 100 metres sprint we are trying to run, not the hurdles. So, let us just explore why we are bringing all this in. We have heard from the Chief Minister that this work is being done anyway so is it necessary? Well, a man a man, a word a word, and I can take the Chief Minister's word as just that so I do not think, on that score, it is necessary.

2350 Now, about three or four weeks ago in the *Press* there was an alarmist story run by somebody that said that these types of construction are a potential fire hazard and we have got these problems if you are doing that style of build. Again, completely false ideology, completely false, and the gentleman in connection was not a fire inspector or building inspector or anybody with that sort of experience in construction. I can tell you, any construction you build might have certain fire risks in it, any building, this building. Half hour fire protection, an hour protection on the fire doors, it is everywhere so now the latest, sir, and this one is beginning to wear very thin on me. Now, I know

2355 Deputy Inder quite well and look at him, sir, he has been around for donkey's years. He has been around the Bridge for donkey's years and when this risk of flooding came about I asked Deputy Inder, 'When did the Bridge last flood?' and he could not remember a time. He is a little bit younger than me, sir, so I asked a friend of mine who is just celebrating 50 years and works from the Bridge in the corner shop there so he has been on the Bridge for 50 years. It has never flooded in 50 years when I asked him.

2360 But he has noted that St Peter Port, sir, regularly floods, four times a year at least, along the front, along the key there so I see that we have got flood damage assessment and, to me, sir, this is beginning to smack of, 'Let's delay this particular project, let's put everything in its way so we can stop it from happening' and the problem I have got with that, sir, is I want that housing to be built. 2365 I want the Co-op to develop that site and I would like the quayside to be developed as well.

So I am not going to support this amendment at all.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Queripel.

2370 **Deputy Queripel:** Sir, it always concerns me when some of my colleagues try to rush us through a debate on an issue. I will respectfully remind them this is a debating Chamber. This is the only opportunity we get to comment on the issues laid before us to trying to rush through a debate is extremely bad governance in every sense of the word. To me it brings the States into disrepute.

2375 Now, Deputy Ferbrache told us this work is being done anyway so this is completely unnecessary but told in the explanatory note and the last sentence of the first paragraph:

Without this amendment, the States will potentially allocate £35m funds to a project without any formal framework or direction.

2380 So, Deputies Taylor and St Pier obviously think this is necessary. Deputy Roffey said it matters not a single jot whether it gets passed or not but I want to hear from either Deputy St Pier or Deputy Taylor when he responds, can you elaborate please on that sentence, 'Without this amendment the States will potentially allocate ...' and I appreciate that there has been very little consultation with P&R but it says in the Rule 4(1)b. Information:

... consultation has been limited to email exchanges with members of Policy & Resources

2385 It is not as though there has not been any consultation. It says email exchanges so this issue must have been discussed in those email exchanges. Deputy Ferbrache would have said, 'This is totally unnecessary'. Deputy Taylor or Deputy St Pier would have said, 'Yes, it is necessary' so that must have gone somewhere else, it cannot have just been left like that. So I would like to hear what the result of that conversation was because I assume it took place via email exchanges.

Now, if it is the case that it is necessary, it makes perfect sense to me and, as I said yesterday in a speech, if something makes perfect I will always support it but, picking up on Deputy Gabriel reminding us that we have all got a duty to be scrutineers, Amen to that.

2390 I think some of us forget that sometimes. We either just do not even bother to look at the small print or we just do not realise sometimes what things mean and it is nothing to do with trust, nothing to do with trust, I trust my colleagues on P&R implicitly, I have got every respect for them. This is to do with us all being scrutineers and if you want to renege on your responsibility of being a scrutineer then you should not be a Deputy because this is taxpayers' money we are talking about 2395 here and they put their faith in us to spend their money wisely and to challenge and question where every penny of it goes.

2400 So I would like to think this is necessary, I am hoping Deputy Taylor is going to say it is necessary, we do need this and I will vote in favour of it. But, if it is not necessary, someone is going to have to convince me that it really is not necessary because of this, not just because it is being done anyway. Being done anyway can mean, 'Ah, it is getting done anyway but it does not matter how

long it takes. Let's just get it done. We will do it when we have got the resources, we will do it when we have got time but it is being done. It is on the list of things to do'. That is not good enough.

Thank you, sir.

2405 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Haskins.

2410 **Deputy Haskins:** Just in response to Deputy Queripel, sir, of course, sir, we are all scrutineers. Now each committee themselves are scrutineers. When papers get given to them you scrutinise information. You ask, 'Why? What is the rationale? Okay, what are the figures? Why? Could it be done like this?' so that, sir, is where I think that level of scrutiny should be and of course, sir, we then also have scrutiny.

2415 Sir, the second thing I wanted to address is the bad governance that Deputy Queripel was speaking to. In my opinion, I shall not give way, you will have to wait until I do a point of correction, sorry, sir. It is about governance and in my view, sir, bending the rules in this nature to have this type of debate here is what is bad governance. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

2420 So the third and final thing, Members, which I will try to remain to be correct, is that it might not be needed but I do not think I want it either way and the reason is this. We are going into a level of detail which I think is just too much for this Assembly. Deputy Le Tocq made that speech earlier this morning and I agree with him. Sir, we are here on the Friday after having how many many ... we have not even started the actual debate, we have not even started the whole process. We had to reorder and then bring this one first and we are worrying about something that we think might be done, we are not sure, okay, and we want to get into the level of detail, sir, of, 'Right, projected timelines for delivery, I think we can understand that' but there are many units that we want to be involved in, 'Right, so those units are the affordable housing that is there, those bits are that or that bit is the ...' sorry, sir, I do not think we, as an Assembly, need that level of detail.

2425 If we needed the level of detail on everything we would have the situation where myself or the President of Education would have to stand up here and say, 'Right, now, in the swimming pool at Les Varendes there is 855 metres squared of space'. Well, actually, yes, but that is non-teaching space. We would have to go and explain all of this. Sir, I do not think this the right place, I do not think so.

2430 So, the final bit is the third Billet ???15.51.40 point on here which is:

Assurance of due diligence checks as may be necessary into any company (or entity), its directors (past and present) and its financial status, including assets and liabilities,

So this should all be in front of us in the policies. Sir, I was under the impression that as a procurements role I am afraid I cannot support this amendment.

2435 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Blin.

Deputy Blin: Thank you, sir.

2440 Earlier today we looked at the £150 million for the GHA and we saw a four times higher figure and let that go through. Some good points raised by Deputy Haskins in the sense that there is a committee for P&R and actually there also another tool or resource is that there could be a scrutiny hearing to see how they are all doing it but when I do look at all these things, of the details or proposed details of what is being invested to purchase, indicative costs etc., if we did not do that on the GHA side, or even the number of properties or the timeline, why are we doing it for this? So what I would like to ask is if a member of P&R would be willing to ask me to give way to say that, actually, as it does say in the approval here, 'Resources Committee to revert back to States ...'

2445 I will give way to Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, I appreciate that.

2450 Just to say to Deputy Blin there is no intention on the part of the Scrutiny Management Committee to look into this ahead of when commitments are made so please do not rely on that and it does not obviate the need, obviously, for Members of this Assembly to be scrutineers.
Thank you.

2455 **Deputy Blin:** I thank Deputy Burford and before I continue I will just respond to that as well. I will give way to Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: I thank Deputy Blin.
Would he agree with me that GHA is a company limited by guarantee owned ultimately by the States and Guernsey public and a third party doing Leale's Yard is a commercial company not in any shape owned by the taxpayers and the public and that there is a difference in the level potentially of scrutiny because it has never done something like that before?
Thank you.

2465 **Deputy Blin:** I will thank Deputy Kazantseva-Miller and respond to that before responding to the comments by Deputy Burford but also, in that same GHA document, it says that, 'GHA or another provider', I do not know who that other provider is so I take your point that we have a known, as in GHA, but the other unknown I do not know and for Deputy Burford, when I gave way, it was basically I understand that scrutiny will always be after but, actually, the process is there is the committee, as Deputy Haskins was saying, the committee will amongst them and their officers looking into all the detail after there is the scrutiny. But what I am trying to get at is that it states here that:

... to direct the Policy & Resources Committee to revert back to the States with a Policy Letter before any financial commitment is made or procurement process begun ...

2475 Now the chances are at that point they would have all those details so all I would like to ask is if a member of P&R would want to interject and just say what would be the impact of that because it is just giving the information they have already got to just before stepping ahead. So I do not know if there is –
I will give way to Deputy Mahoney.

Deputy Mahoney: I will give it a shot. I am not sure it is going to answer Deputy Blin's question of not but I would answer it with a separate question and the third point there is:

Assurance of due diligence checks as may be necessary into any company (or entity), its directors (past and present) and its financial status, including assets and liabilities,

2480 – it goes on a bit. So I would ask the Assembly what checks did we do on other companies that have taken up. Did we just on ???14.56.06 when they got the hospital? Did the policy letter have to include all of the assets that ???14.56.12 have. No, it did not, those things will be done by Procurement departments, as is their job to do that. If we start saying that everybody that ever wants a States contract has to open their books publicly because, as soon as it is in this place it is public, then we are going to see a fall-off, hugely, in people that actually want to start undertaking contracts for the States of Guernsey.

2485 **Deputy Blin:** Thank you, Deputy Mahoney.
He did not actually answer my question but the point he made is very valid. I was going to reach that because, actually, that is not something we normally ask. There seems to be a bit politicised, this particular piece. In earnest, it is always right for us to actually be able to ask questions as Deputy Queripel says. It is our duty to ask these questions but there is also the element that we have –
I will give way to Deputy Ferbrache.

2495 **Deputy Ferbrache:** I am very grateful and I am sorry to interrupt ???14.57.18 and I am grateful to Deputy Bury to tell me to put my microphone on. Thank you very much.

It is that point. We have undertaken to bring back a policy letter to the States. At one time we thought it might be December, it might be the early part of next year, but it will be in relatively early course to bring back a policy letter to the States. Now, it may well be if I were the developer and I had to have my assets and liabilities chewed over in public by 40 people I might say, 'I am going to walk away from this, forget it'.

The Bailiff: Deputy Taylor.

Deputy Taylor: Point of correction.

2505 Sorry, I hate to raise this because I do have the ability to reply but just on this particular point this amendment is seeking an assurance that the due diligence has been done. It is not directing Policy & Resources to publish in the public domain all those particular details. Those particular details are actually lifted straight out of the due diligence checks that Policy & Resources said they would be doing so it is incorrect to say that this policy letter proposed would result in private company details being plastered around this Assembly.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Thank you.

2515 I am sorry to continue the point because I know Deputy Blin wants to continue with his speech. We are really using up valuable time but there we are. The point in relation to this is I have already said we are doing all of this, I have given that assurance, so what is the point of this? I can see the debate in the States developing into, 'What are you looking into in relation to this particular company? What are its assets? What are its liabilities?'.

2520 I am telling the States now, from conversations I have had with reputable developers, because I believe there is an absolutely reputable who bid open book and honest throughout and if we ask questions they endeavour to answer them even if I perhaps, on occasion, might have thought our questions are a bit dopey. They have done their best to deal with every single request. They are people of good repute. They might well say, 'Enough is enough, we have heard from Deputy Taylor, we think he has got an angst against one of our directors anyway, we really are ... Mr ???14.59.30 he thinks you have got an angst against him, we think we have had enough with this project, let somebody else do it', and then, in another ten years Leale's Yard will still be the same it is.

I am sorry I have had to say that but that is the truth of the matter.

2530 **Deputy Blin:** I thank Deputy Ferbrache for that.

I am going to get to the last part of what I was going to say, 'Where applicable, such information as required to understand what guarantees and warranties will be offered by any vendor, partner or main contractor regarding the purchase of any properties and also completion of an overall scheme'. The nicest way I can put this, this sounds like a witch-hunt. It sounds like it is very specifically targeting a known company, trying to target various things. This to me just does not feel right.

2540 We have not done this with others to this level and I am aware from a business history before with Procurement that the level of detail you have got to go through on everything, you go through that in Procurement, then you have the committees, then you have the officers, then you have the work on the whole thing, then you have the relationship with the businesses. That is all done so this piece of paper, honestly, I think what Deputy Haskins would ask to have a 26(1) a guillotine motion it was the best thing because either people have decided already why they are doing this, I would like to get through this, I will not be supporting this amendment but for slightly different reasons. Normally, I would want to see everything done. The way this has been drafted and written I just will not support it and I hope that others will not either.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

2550 **Deputy Inder:** I was not going to speak, sir, but I think it is Deputy Ferbrache who has made me rise from my seat.

Rule 15 asks us to declare interests and quite clearly there are no interests there but no-one can have not noticed the media coverage between Deputy Taylor and the named director of Leale's Yard. No-one could have not noticed it. In fact, Deputy Taylor accused me of having some kind of
2555 relationship with that director and I have still got a copy of that email. He asked me whether I had had any conversations with him, what I had discussed and I had never met the gentleman at all, with the exception of seeing him once at the rugby club and having him pointed out so Deputy Taylor does have a bit of a problem today. Even though he may not have a special interest in this I find it very strange that over the number of policy letters that we have seen relating to building I
2560 have not seen Deputy Taylor bring a policy letter like this which specifically asks directors to basically submit to an overbearing recruitment process.

It feels to me very targeted on an individual who has taken Deputy Taylor to court and evicted him from his cafe so Deputy Taylor is very good at getting up and using rules in this chamber so I am asking Deputy Taylor directly, even though I do not think he is in breach of Rule 15, we have
2565 within our rules we have a duty to act with honesty and integrity, can he assure us, this is a direct question and I expect an answer, his reasoning for putting this amendment together is not a direct attack on an individual within a company whose company or individual has evicted him from one of his businesses. So there is a direct question and I expect a response, Deputy Taylor, through you, sir.

2570

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, I do think it is deeply unfortunate that in the speeches that have been delivered, not least the one just delivered by Deputy Inder, that Deputy Taylor's motives have been
2575 impugned in relation to this amendment.

Certainly, I was very content to second this amendment without any knowledge or prior history of any relationship with any of the principals behind this project. For me, sir, this is simply a matter of insuring proper scrutiny by this Assembly. This Assembly, particularly during this term, has really shown deep reluctance to roll its sleeves up and understand what is being done in its name.

2580 Now, Deputy Ferbrache has, quite rightly said that he has given the undertaking that a policy letter will come. He has given an undertaking that the matters that are set out in the bullet points will in essence be dealt with in that policy letter. In that sense there is nothing to fear from this amendment. It really says the commitment that has already been given but there is no harm in this Assembly having the belt and braces approach that it actually wishes to have a resolution which
2585 directs P&R to deliver on the undertakings, the assurances which have already been given.

So, the language of the bullet points has directly come from communication with Deputy Ferbrache as the President of the Committee, in particular, this question of the due diligence. As Deputy Taylor has already pointed out it is assurance that the due diligence checks have been undertaken. There is no expectation, implicit or explicit, in the proposition that all of that detail
2590 should be made available to the Assembly and particularly repeating that it is only lifting the language that has already been used by Deputy Ferbrache.

But, sir, as I said, I was pleased to lend my support to this amendment as a seconder really because of the need for proper scrutineering through this Assembly for the reasons that Deputy Taylor has already set out and I hope that Members will take that responsibility seriously. I genuinely
2595 do not think there is anything from this amendment and I think, just to reassure Deputy Vermeulen actually, I have been a long-time supporter of the need for full redevelopment at Leale's Yard. In principle, from what I have heard so far, I am supportive of the project based on the very limited

information that we already have but I cannot say much more than that because we have got much more information and that is to come based on the policy letter that will follow.

2600 But this is really about saying that this Assembly should not be cutting any blank cheques for anyone and it is embedding in a resolution hopefully the undertakings that already been given. So I am a little bit surprised at the extent of any resistance from P&R because I do not think there is anything here that they should really fear or feel threatened by.

Thank you, sir.

2605

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: I intend to be brief, sir, but I think what I have to say is relevant. One of the most unpleasant times in my political career was an event Fallagate which happened during my time as
2610 Treasury Minister and it was very unpleasant for a number of reasons and it resulted in the entire policy council being forced to resign and it was all over one particular contract, the clinical block at the PEH.

Now, mistakes were made and I made a few myself at that time but one of the key recommendations of the Wales Audit Office that carried out an investigation into those inaccuracies
2615 was that there should be much more thorough due diligence undertaken on contractors that are carrying out multiple contracts for Guernsey. Now, sir, I cast no aspersions over the management and directors of R G Falla at the time. That is a matter of a historical document but imagine how horrified I was when I learned that one of the most basic requirements of due diligence, the access to the balance sheet to see the strength of the balance sheet in order to ascertain whether the
2620 company had sufficient resources to undertake multiple contracts simultaneously, was not done. So the requirement to have an extra layer of reassurance, an assurance of the due diligence checks, is an entirely laudable proposition.

A few years later that very business collapsed and it collapsed for a number of reasons but one of those factors was over-trading and an insufficiently strong balance sheet. Please, let us not make
2625 the same mistakes over and over again. We have a recommendation process. Due diligence checks need to be undertaken. Let us just have a confirmation in this place that they have been so that somebody is left accountable when things go wrong.

A Member: Hear, hear.

2630

The Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Sir, there is also the question within this of why the States are favouring one company in one area with respect to this particular principal agreement or whatever it is because,
2635 to be quite honest, it is £35 million and there are other properties and there are other companies on this Island that probably would look at this and ask why indeed is this particular company being favoured?

If it is because this company, over the period of time since 2000, has constantly come forward with projects for development of that site and have constantly reneged on those plans because
2640 they have been able to find market support for their plans then this is surely an issue whereby the company should have confidence in its own ability and its own market research to know whether, in fact, this is a go or not and if it is not then it has to come to the States for £35 million of support. I just wonder whether in fact we are looking at lemonade here at the end of the day whereby we are supporting something that really does not have the market strength to endure the development
2645 that is being proposed.

So it is just that I have sat through many of these proposals from the Co-op that we have looked at, we have approved their plans and yet nothing has ever happened and I just wonder whether in fact the States should be looking at other alternatives as well as this, particularly for that site

whereby the site is broken up into zones which can be developed perhaps by other companies and bought by other companies for development to succeed in smaller development tranches.

But it is just a matter of when the P&R come forward I think they need to bring in a rationale and also the other alternatives to the States that are feasible in addition to this particular spending of £35 million of taxpayers' money for the benefit of a company.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Murray.

Deputy Murray: Thank you, sir.

Deputy de Lisle brings me to my feet because I am afraid this is typical of what is going to happen the deeper we dive in as a government into contractual obligations. He has already cited a company he thinks is actually behind this project and, whilst they are part of the site, they are not necessarily bringing this particular project to market and this is very difficult.

Now, I would like to try and assure the Assembly because the education project, which was worth considerably more than this, was not looked into. I have been very close to it and all the due diligence and all the financial background and the capability of the organisations involved was looked at and crawled over the Law Officers and, consequently, when that started to get into trouble, it was the Law Officers that removed and relieved the government from an obligation which otherwise could have got quite messy.

So there are professionals who are actually doing this work but we are not. I am afraid we just are not so you have to take the assurance from P&R that P&R themselves have the assurance from the people who can do this work that actually everything has been looked at as closely as you would wish it to be. So, please, do not get hung up on this.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: I am going to turn to the Vice-President to speak on Amendment 11.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, sir.

I shall be very brief, I am not going to deal with any of the contentious matters that have been raised. I am reminded, Deputy Queripel is often quoting songs, this one for me would be a Police song which I very much like because I think the drumming is fantastic, 'Driven to Tears' would be the song.

When we started in this term we had a bonfire of Resolutions because Resolutions cost money. This will cost money; somebody is going to have to curate it, somebody is going to have check whether it has been done. We pay all these people to do this. We are just creating unnecessary bureaucracy. This is just backseat driving, it is nothing more than that.

The Resolution says, 'allocate'. You allocate in a budget because that needs to be preserved against a particular objective. There is no deal. We have a rough idea how it might go but there is no deal yet. None of this has been done. We are still discussing how it might work so there is no commitment from the States.

In terms of due diligence Deputy Ferbrache is a famous litigator. I have done dozens and dozens of deals. I have been paid very large amounts of money to do due diligence on some of the largest deals to ever happen in the Channel Islands; Condor four times bought and sold with me signing the due diligence package, me. I have been a director of several companies, financial services companies, globally in different jurisdictions, the MRLO. There is not really anyone else in here, I do not think, sir, that has more experience of due diligence than I do. We do not need this interference. There is no deal yet. This is an allocation. This is just interference. It is not necessary.

Whether you vote for it or not will really make no difference. Deputies have other means of establishing these things in the future; Rule 14, Rule 11. There will be a policy letter with the details in it. It can all be confirmed in it. This is just a waste of our time. Please vote it out.

The Bailiff: I finally return to the proposer of Amendment 11, Deputy Taylor, to reply to the debate.

Deputy Taylor: Thank you, sir.

2705 I will try and be as quick as possible. I am conscious of time so I will just run through most of it
in the order of debate starting with Deputy Ferbrache. A bit of a contradiction here as Deputy
Kazantseva-Miller pointed out because he told us we were going to do this anyway so I think thank
you for the support. You are going to do it anyway. Just vote yes because if you are leaving it to
2710 your committee it sounded like Deputy Murray may be supportive but I am not going to put words
in his mouth but it sounded like Deputy Helyar and Deputy Mahoney do not want to do this. It will
be extra work although I thought the work had already been done if they are going to bring a policy
letter in November so there is a bit of a contradiction there. I will not dwell on that.

Deputy Gollop, second speaker, I think he really probably summed up the reason for this
amendment because he identified in the second speech the project that this investment is
2715 earmarked for. I ask him what did he actually base that on? The project he referred to, do a little
search in either the Government Work Plan or the Funding Investment Plan, you will not find that
project referenced so if he is absolutely comfortable that is what he is committing money to here,
he knows more about it than I do. I will leave it at that.

I will not actually because he did talk about reduced bureaucracy, he was referring there to
2720 planning permission but it appears to me that planning permission for the site he is referencing had
been granted numerous times so, bureaucracy or not, that does not seem to be the block.

Deputy Oliver, in the same vein, referred to a specific project but very careful not to be identifying
and committing which I suppose goes to the point Deputy Blin made later on in the debate not
committing government to any particular project, identifying that there is already an allocation that
2725 has been made and trying to tie it to the proposition that would have come first to actually give
this some real meaning or some direction.

Deputy Roffey, I have just written 'double negatives' but thanks for the support. I am not quite
sure what I meant by that but I think he said it again, 'no need but might as well because if you do
not support it what are you suggesting?'

2730 I will give way to him if he wants to clarify.

Deputy Roffey: I thank Deputy Taylor for giving way because I want to ask for, I know you say
it does not really matter until this is passed, but, for my own sake, I want to know what bullet point
three refers to because I had assumed it refers to Omnibus but if it means anybody, any organisation
2735 remotely connected with this, including the Co-op and it relates to past directors, I now regret that
I even said anything because I will vote for it if it includes that but it is not clear at all whether it
means that or whether it means Omnibus.

Deputy Taylor: I am grateful for that interjection. Sir, bullet point three is quite open-ended.
2740 The original comment or letter from Deputy Ferbrache did refer to a modular housing supplier but
gave the caveat that this may change, it may be a different supplier, and also gave reference to
what would become the main contractor or lead developer but this has been left open so that it is
giving P&R, there is a some delegated authority in here that they can decide which companies
would be necessary.

2745 So I certainly would not envisage them doing due diligence on who is providing the sandwiches
to the guy that drives the lorry that delivers bits and pieces, but the main players that, if we are
going to be entering into a contractual agreement or proposing something, some kind of due
diligence here because, again, on the wording we are almost jumping ahead of a procurement
process. I accept that a lot of this would be dealt with at the procurement stage but to draw the
2750 parallel for Deputy Murray with the education debate, or education allocation, those funds have
been allocated against a policy letter for a set project and that project then, through the normal
procedures, progressed to procurement and that is when the checks were done and at some point

after that is when flags were risen and it was addressed. But we are a long way behind that stage. It is just some assurance, not the full details, just an assurance that checks have been done. So I hope that does cover off his concern.

CM, thank you for your support. You should be able to work out who that is. Carl Meerveld, thank you, Deputy Carl Meerveld, thank you for the support.

But then going to Deputy Mahoney, as I said, I felt like he in fact contradicted Deputy Ferbrache so I am not entirely sure but if you want to see things progressed and see housing done all this information or further detailed proposals could have been included in one of these policy letters. It does not have to be the full details but an idea of what this allocation is really for.

Deputy Gabriel rightly raised the question about scrutiny, level of scrutiny. What I have written down alongside his name is, 'there is no sunset clause', and I think that is quite an important point to add in here. In terms of scrutiny, define the period. There is an allocation of funds. When does it stop being allocated? Is it sitting on the balance sheet that we have to account for till the end of time? But I thank him for his support.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller as I said, thank you for her support, pointing out the double standards in whether P&R support or are going to do this and I thank also Deputy Burford.

Deputy Vermeulen, again a real interesting one because he again has committed to a single development. Now it may be that we all know, we have heard things through the grapevine, we have had bits of talk but that is not written anywhere and now I will give way to Deputy Vermeulen.

Deputy Vermeulen: Sir, I attended an information evening at St James on this project. I have followed it almost religiously, sir, since I first became a Deputy. This has been three years in the cooking and here we are still debating, still delaying, still slowing it down so I have got a pretty good insight into the project. Of course I attended the presentation along with other deputies at St James and it was very informative. I was supportive of that. I am supportive of the quayside development as well which is another and I am supportive of that because Leale's Yard, sir, has been an absolute eyesore and a bomb site for too many years, absolutely awful, and I think this will be a massive improvement to the Bridge and I am fully supportive.

Please do not think there is anything funny going on behind the scenes, Deputy Taylor, because I am afraid there is not. This is just another Deputy supporting an honest development and wanting it built as quickly as possible. Action this day I wanted. It has taken us three years and we are still going.

Deputy Taylor: I am grateful for the interjection from Deputy Vermeulen. I fully appreciate that he supports the project but that project is not referenced here and he has followed it so he probably does not need me to point out that this is a private development that he is referring to but it is a private development that has been described as unviable and that is why there might need to be a government investment in it. So it is absolutely appropriate that Government, if they are required to progress the project he is referring to, that some discussion has taken place on that. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)**

My good friend, Deputy Queripel, he wanted to expand on the point of the allocation. I really just find that very difficult to expand on because there just is nothing to expand upon and that is the real point. Although individual members have referred to individual projects there is nothing to tie that in. That is the basic **15.24.56** it is really we are just relying on a comment made by someone at some point to bring this back and to prove that it is the project that they think might be investing in.

His thought that P&R are saying it is being done anyway, well, when? And what is being done? It sounds to me that what is being done is all of these checks so, if they are being done, I am not quite sure why Deputy Helyar told us that it would be increased resources.

Going on, the comments about scrutiny in committee, yes, Deputy Haskins, SH, there is scrutiny in committee and there is a Scrutiny Committee but does that mean we can just allocate £35 million

2805 based on three words, two words, even – ‘Bridge redevelopment’ and ‘flood’. That is the extent of the detail.

Deputy Haskins: Point of correction, sir.

2810 **The Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Haskins.

Deputy Haskins: That was four words, not three.

The Bailiff: Deputy Taylor to continue.

2815 **Deputy Taylor:** I think one of his comments, paraphrasing so he does not pick me up on another point of correction, this is too much detail. If this is too much detail where do you draw the line? But I just draw back to the fact that a lot of these points are fairly open; there is an element of discretion that would be afforded to P&R and, again, the company information, I cannot stress this enough, it is an assurance. It is not directing the company details to be published outside of the norm. It is an assurance that they have been checked.

2820 Deputy Blin commented or referred back to Deputy Roffey’s previous amendment and a few comparisons there with how much detail will be going into GHA. GHA is almost within our net. It is independent but it is there to produce affordable housing or social housing provision. It is quite a different proposition but I would just draw the comparison that the amendment seeking additional ...

2825 **Deputy Inder:** Point of correction, sir. GHA is limited by LPG and it has an independent board of directors, no different to other development companies. It is not in our net and we have no control over it whatsoever. That is incorrect.

2830 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Taylor to continue.

Deputy Taylor: I will happily concede on that and the point I am making is that the funding, or the potential borrowing, that was included in that amendment had sufficient detail put in by Deputy Roffey that set out at least some parameters. So the borrowing had to be repaid, it could not be further financed by Government. So there is some checks in there. That is absolutely not here. If Deputy Blin could step up and tell what the terms of this £35 million are because no one does know and he does not need to but we do not know what the terms are. That is what I am seeking to get here.

2840 The question on what another provider might be, could there be another provider, I stand to be corrected but my understanding is if there is another provider of social housing or affordable housing it would need to be a registered housing association and I think that would need the approval of the committee for ESS. I think I might be right in saying that but that is almost a moot point.

2845 Again, Deputy Mahoney then interjected again about this assurance that due diligence is done, not publishing the due diligence details. That is information taken from P&R’s own words.

I suppose this is where it went a little bit south and I will address Deputy Inder’s points. Conflict of interest, no, looking at this moment, I do not see any conflict that I have to declare. Deputy Ferbrache might want to mention names; I think that is totally unnecessary, I really do. I will leave it at that.

2850 I will add one more comment. If the scrutiny really needs to be directed at me then we have got this one. I will move on.

Deputy St Pier, thank you for seconding and thank you for the well-reasoned comments.

2855 Deputy Trott, always speaking from experience, a classic example. Thank you very much for giving that and I hope Members have taken note but I will not dwell on that.

Deputy de Lisle, his point, it was a valid one. It was in my head when I was speaking with the Procureur, the favouritism. I was trying not to link this to any particular development but reflecting that it was included in the Government Work Plan as a Proposition to be around the Bridge. So I was not seeking to redirect, I was not seeking to really confirm anything any further than the Proposition 2 would have done.

I will give way to him if he has got another point.

Deputy de Lisle: Sir, my main point was to have the assurance that there is a market currently for a development of that scale without Government financing. I just want to be assured of that because, so often in the past, as I have said we have had all the planning done, I have supported the plans in the past with the Co-op and I have no problems with all the personalities that are involved in the Co-op. I think they are doing a great job in the two islands in what they are doing but I just want to feel that the company itself feels that there is a market there this time for proceeding with this particular project and if they do not feel that then I gave the alternative that perhaps we should be looking at other sites and other developers with regard to perhaps having a portion of that site if they feel that they can facilitate development there.

Thank you for that opportunity to clarify my position.

Thank you.

Deputy Taylor: I am grateful to Deputy de Lisle for adding in there. It is greatly appreciated. I guess that would potentially be coming up in the next stage when the policy letter comes forward. That is when the detail would be provided that we could then make that decision and vote accordingly but I did add in, in response to Deputy de Lisle, that the only alternative I saw for this amendment would have been to simply direct that the Bridge redevelopment allocation was just taken out of Portfolio 1 or all of the portfolios as they may be. But you can imagine the response I would have got from Deputy Inder on suggesting that so I think this was more pragmatic. It leaves it on the table; it is not actually making any decision today.

So finally I would say before everyone falls asleep because it is late in the day Deputy Helyar straight away referred to a bonfire of Resolutions that this would end up on which, if the policy letter is going to be coming back that would address all the concerns that any Member of the Assembly might have, you would be able to discharge that resolution anyway and if that is going to be coming back before the end of the year I do not think this will be adding fuel to the bonfire.

As for Deputy Helyar and Deputy Ferbrache's experience in this field, in due diligence, major respect. Hats off to both of them. I have not got that experience but if they have got that experience why do they not share it with the Assembly? That would be cracking.

So, with that, I will sit down. I will ask all Members to support this policy letter because it is sensible. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, we come to the vote on Amendment 11 proposed by Deputy Taylor, seconded by Deputy St Pier which would insert an additional Proposition after all the scenarios. I invite the Greffier to open the voting please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 17, Contre 16, Ne vote pas 5, Did not vote 2, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Burford, Yvonne	Aldwell, Sue	Falla, Steve	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Bury, Tina	Blin, Chris	Moakes, Nick	Roffey, Peter	
Cameron, Andy	Brouard, Al	Murray, Bob		
De Lisle, David	Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Roberts, Steve		
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	Dyke, John	Snowdon, Alexander		
Gabriel, Adrian	Fairclough, Simon			
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha	Ferbrache, Peter			

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Le Tissier, Chris	Gollop, John			
Leadbeater, Marc	Haskins, Sam			
Matthews, Aidan	Helyar, Mark			
Meerveld, Carl	Inder, Neil			
Parkinson, Charles	Mahoney, David			
Queripel, Lester	McKenna, Liam			
Soulsby, Heidi	Oliver, Victoria			
St Pier, Gavin	Prow, Robert			
Taylor, Andrew	Vermeulen, Simon			
Trott, Lyndon				

The Bailiff: So, in respect of Amendment 11 proposed by Deputy Taylor, seconded by Deputy St Pier there voted in favour 17 Members; there voted against 16 Members; 5 Members abstained; 2 Members did not participate in the vote and therefore I will declare it carried.

Now, Members, before we move into general debate, I have given permission to Deputy Oliver to make a personal statement under Rule 10 paragraph 1.

Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you, sir.

It is very brief. I am sure from my speech in favour of education in regards to Amendment 1 I wanted to throw out the amendment and unfortunately, due to my fault, I was slightly late trying to get to the vote and I accidentally voted, well, I did not think I voted but it did come up 'Pour' but I just wanted to set *Hansard* straight that I did want to vote 'Contre'.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.

Well, Members of the States, you will be provided with a paper copy of the Propositions as they currently stand. What I can simply tell you is, if you take Amendment 1 and you use Amendment 6, which substitutes Proposition 7, and then turn over towards the end, Amendment 12 inserts Proposition 9A. Amendment 11 will be taken next as Proposition 9B. Amendment 2 will be Proposition 9C. The five Propositions from Amendment 5 will then be added and then we get to Proposition 10 but you will get a copy. That is just to try and help you before we get started on general debate.

Who wishes to speak?

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Sir, could we get them printed because otherwise I think it will help in debate.

The Bailiff: You are going to get a paper copy. I have just explained that but I just want to move on rather than lose any time.

Deputy Trott

Deputy Trott: I do not want to speak. I just want to ask you if it is appropriate now, sir, to advise the Assembly of my intention to move a guillotine motion at 17.30 this evening. I think that would enable you, sir, to determine whether or not it was worth us sitting on, staying on, because if, clearly, that guillotine motion is not supported at 17.30 we will not complete today.

The Bailiff: Well, if nobody wants to speak at all in general debate then I will turn to Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Let me speak, sir, in relation to these various Propositions. I am very grateful both to you for the care and attention you have devoted to us over the last three and a half days plus to keep us on the straight and narrow, I have got to say that, despite your best efforts, you have not always succeeded but you have used your best efforts so to do. I am also grateful to the

2945 great staff for their hard work, States' Greffier staff over the last three and a half days because this is probably one of the most not only important but complicated debates that we have had.

A good thought from Deputy Trott because it gives us a limited amount of time to speak so therefore we should cut our speeches accordingly. As he rightly says, if we get to 5.30 and we have still got another 15 people speaking we are dead in the water at finishing today anyway so I think that is fine. So I am going to brief, I would have been longer but I take heed of his sensible suggestion.

We are really are a position whereby we have got to start balancing the books. We cannot keep making adjustments to difficult decisions. Now I fully respect, let me say this because sometimes over the last few months things have got heated and then you calm down and you reflect, I fully respect those who are against kind of thing that has got SGT in it. I understand that is their valid concerns but it is much more important than that.

If we want this Island to move, and I have lots of pages from the report of the Guernsey Fiscal Policy Panel that I was going to quote from but, taking heed of the helpful suggestion made by Deputy Trott, I am not going to do that. But what they basically said, the experts were, I think we would not question the veracity and the skill of the experts, what they were saying is that we have under-invested in our capital portfolio for too many years and if we leave it it will get worse. We have also been advised by Ernst and Young that the way to do it, if we want to do it, we have got plenty of headroom in relation to borrowing but we can only do that if have got a resilient income stream.

We have not got a resilient income stream. I know people have clutched at straws and said, 'Well, we are going to have an extra £20 million or thereabouts this year'. As Deputy St Pier said, that is more often than not in relation to budget services in the last ten to 15 years. There are one or two exceptions to that but they are generally the exception rather than the rule. That is not going to take us past the finishing post because once you take away the investment income, and we calculate it in a particular way which has been now the subject of not criticism but it said you should change it and this Policy & Resources is changing the accounting principles to make sure that they accord with what seems to be accepted practice.

But we are in a position whereby we could go home tonight or whenever this vote is concluded and say we have avoided GST, we have avoided decisions about our future, we have avoided taking Guernsey forward into the next decade, we have avoided matters till post the next election because there are very few people, I am not saying there is no one because I do not want somebody jumping up and saying, 'I am never going to vote for GST', but there are very few people in this Assembly I think would rule out GST forever or even for a long period of time.

Now, I do not like GST. It is a regressive tax unless it is mitigated. The panel that comprised inter alia of Deputy Roffey perhaps at one side of the ???15.41.06 perspective and Deputy Helyar on the other, amongst others, have said they have looked at everything. There is nobody who is going to be, pre 2007-08, although Guernsey people pay their taxes diligently etc., a large amount of our surpluses and our income came from outside because of the tax regime that was then closed down. As Deputy Trott has said on more than one occasion and also during the course of this week we had no option but to change. We had to change and he was the person in the office at the time and very much facilitated that change.

We may be coming out of it, and Deputy Parkinson has been valiant, stoic and determined in his efforts, and perhaps it is three or four years' time or perhaps it is seven or eight years' time, we will eventually move forward but that again is not going to take us to the promised land. We may have the wind farm income that Deputy Meerveld is so concerned about. He will be waving that flag then instead of hopefully there will be wind for him to wave it with but that is, when you look at every way that that happens, that is years off. If, all of a sudden, we discovered gold in one of Deputy de Lisle's fields and he allowed us on and we were ploughing that field and it gave us all the riches that we wanted, we would be able to say, 'We can reduce income tax, we can take away GST, we can do all the things that we otherwise might do'.

But the promised land rarely comes. We live in the real world and the real world is for this Assembly to make difficult decisions and it is for this Assembly to make those difficult decisions today.

3000 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

 Six pounds ninety-nine. I will return to that later. If all of us were at school and this entire process had been an exercise in working towards a common goal with different students having differing
3005 views on how to achieve that goal, all being tasked with working together, debating the pros and cons of each view in order to find some common ground and a consensus position, then our collective school report would say, 'Must try harder'.

 As I articulated when I spoke on Amendment 4, I fully understand that the projections show us that there will be a mismatch in revenue and spending that makes our projected fiscal
3010 position unsustainable in the long term. But again, as I spoke of in that speech, I have also attuned myself to the concerns of the public that we are here to serve, the very same people who voted for us to represent them, represent their families, their beliefs, their wants and their needs.

 Deputy Oliver, when speaking on Amendment 9, pointed to social media platforms as an indicator of public disapproval for a rise in income tax rates. Now, while I do not cast my votes
3015 based solely on the views on **??15.44.00** and Facebook, I do take public opinion extremely seriously because listening is part and parcel of our job.

 What public opinion has told me over the many months of this tax review is, by a large majority, the people of Guernsey are fundamentally opposed to the introduction of the GST, regardless of the package that has been put together in an effort to mitigate the regressive effects that that
3020 consumption tax brings. Regardless of the public engagement by P&R and the media campaign showing how they believe some will actually be better off Mr and Mrs Guernsey have told us time and time again they do not want a goods and service tax. Are we listening? Some of us are, sir, some of us not.

 At this juncture, sir, I will give an example of a young family that has already had to make sacrifices with their plans because they are struggling financially now without GST. They are a couple
3025 in their early thirties with a three year old child and a mortgage. He is a self-employed builder and he has a very good job in the legal profession earning more than her husband. For one reason or another they do not have a fixed rate mortgage so their monthly repayments have skyrocketed due to the rise in interest rates. They are also paying around £1,500 per month in child care costs.

 They had planned to have another child; they had always wanted more children. It was part of their plans, part of their dreams. They have had to make the decision not to have another child because they simply cannot afford it. The couple earn decent money, more than median earnings, and will be the bracket that is worse off with the introduction of the GST, even worse off than they are now when they have already had to revise their plans to enlarge their family due to their current
3035 financial position. Adding a GST will cripple them financially. Talking to the husband recently how a 5% GST would impact his family I could see the worry in his eyes and I could hear it in his voice. There is no way I could bring myself to pile more financial pressure on this family.

 It was not so long ago, sir, that Deputy Murray provided an update to the Assembly with respect of the GWP. When delivering that update reminded us of a famous quote attributed to Albert
3040 Einstein and that was, 'The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again whilst at the same time expecting a different result.' Deputy Murray then proceeded with his update and, without a hint of irony, informed us that P&R would be bringing GST back to the Assembly for a third time.

 Whilst I fully appreciate that P&R, and some other members may genuinely believe this is the
3045 only fiscally sustainable option, the public perceives a lack of openness to alternative solutions. P&R's steadfastness appears as a refusal to explore other possibilities and public sentiment leans

heavily against this stance. In the eyes of the majority of the public the supporters of GST within this Assembly are blinkered and unwilling to entertain any alternative.

Whether P&R or the wider Assembly agrees with that appraisal is largely irrelevant but that is what the majority of the public appears to believe at this point and we can hardly blame them for forming that view.

What I dislike about the approach taken by P&R and the other supporters of GST is being constantly told off because I chose not to support a GST. Those of us that have consistently opposed the introduction of a GST have been labelled by P&R and others as irresponsible, lacking in courage, having no backbone, amongst other things. Well, sir, they appear to be as good at garnering support and forming a consensus amongst Members as they are at listening to the public. 'Must try harder' springs to mind again.

So, let us look at the process from the start, Tax Review 1 P&R propose a GST and are told by the public and the majority in the Assembly, 'No, try something else'. Tax Review 2, they again propose a GST and once again are told categorically by the public and again by the Assembly, 'No. No, no, no', which is OMD in 1984. Here we are in Tax Review 3 and, *quelle surprise*, they again propose the same GST. Well, sir, it does not require the genius of Einstein to predict the likely result, does it?

It has been very interesting listening to the different speeches on the various different amendments to this policy letter, quite insightful, often, especially when some Members use a piece of information or a statistic as a reason to either do something or not do something and then, when speaking on a different amendment, dismissing the very same piece of information or statistic as nonsense or having no relevance to suit the narrative they are creating at that point.

Deputy Aldwell, when speaking on Amendment 10 this morning, told us that we have to listen to the public because over 5,000 signed a petition calling for a secondary education based on a three schools with a separate sixth form. I do not doubt that. I wondered though, sir, how many of those 5,000 also marched on Market Square in absolute opposition to the introduction of a GST. It seems that some Members will listen to public opinion if it suits their narrative and disregard it if it does not.

Now, I will return to where I started. Some Members may recall my speech on Amendment 4 on Tuesday. Members may also have thought that I had either spent a great deal of time crafting a speech so contrastingly eloquent to that which maybe consider my usual style or that I had swallowed a dictionary. *(Laughter)* It was neither, sir. I used a bit of extra intelligence to help me make my speech sound a bit more parliamentary. I wrote the speech and I pasted it into my AI app on my phone, asking it to improve it and make it sound a bit more parliamentary. If I had accepted all of the changes suggested to me by the app Members would have thought I was reading a script from a courtroom scene in a period drama. *(Laughter)* But it is a very useful tool, nonetheless, especially handy for those of us who know exactly how they feel and what to say in layman terms but do not necessarily possess the vocabulary to express those feelings in a manner more appropriate for a parliamentary speech.

A bit like F R David, sir, 'Words don't come easy to me'. Well, actually, they do now and all for the monthly subscription of £6.99! *(Laughter and applause)*

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

First of all I think I should just officially, now the amendment has been passed, declare an interest. I think it is an interest anyway in the additional proposals added by the Taylor Amendment because I think, when I said it was all the key players, the key players must be omnibus to the development company **15.50.47** builders, Co-op, the landowners and it relates to investigating all current and past directors and I am a past director of the Co-op. I wish P&R luck with all of the lay directors, particularly in Jersey as much as in Guernsey, that they are going to have to go and look at their affairs. I can tell them they will not find me in bankruptcy but nor will they find me with a great deal

of money as well. But I will of course open my books; I am not sure all the other lay directors who may have been 20 years ago since they served on it will actually co-operate in quite the same way.

Having got that off my chest, sir, I believe I have listened very carefully to what the Deputy has just said and I think he is probably right about public opinion. I am not sure that he is right because I think the opponents of anything are always far more vocal than those who I was going to say supportive. I do not think anybody is supportive of extra taxes and saying, 'Please may I pay extra taxes', but it is always the opponents of anything that are more vocal and I do sense a shift in public opinion in recent months, I really do, so I do not know what the public opinion is but he is probably right. It is just a truism, is it not, do you want to pay more taxes? I suspect, in whatever form, it has been GST because that has been on the book, had it been extra income tax I suspect it would have been exactly the same.

So he is probably right but, sir, it will be criticised in some quarters but I actually believe in representative democracy. I believe in electing representatives who have a duty to use their judgement on behalf of their constituents and sometimes I think parliaments have a duty to lead. When they have seen facts, when they have gone into things in detail in a way that their constituents cannot possibly do because they do not have time, or most of them, the time or the inclination to do so. That is the whole point. That is why we do not go and put pebbles in an urn like they used to in Athens or wherever it was and that is why they elect representatives. Having, this representative, having looked at this in depth, thinks that if the public, and they may well be against the proposals, the package of proposals put forward by P&R and I absolutely declare that I was part of drawing those up, if they think they are wrong then I think that they are wrong, having looked at it in great depth.

If I get removed from office as a result of that, that is fine and dandy. I will not go fishing because I am a vegetarian but I will go and do something else. In a way I think one of the shames of this debate has been tying together so strongly the amount of revenues that we want to raise with what particular capital portfolio we want to spend our money on and how much borrowing we want to do because, yes, I do see the link but that is not principally why we need to raise taxes.

Of course, if we were not doing any capital spending and we only had to balance the revenue budget we would need a little bit of extra revenues than if we wanted to a cycle of capital spending. But the main driver here, the main reason I am going to vote in favour of Proposition 2, I think it is still Proposition 2, we have not got the revised sheet yet, is that I know that if we want a civilised society where we treat our people in a decent way with the kind of public services that every other developed community expects we are going to have to raise, not just £25 million extra, but much more than that, at least triple that, probably more than that and it is down to the same problem that the whole of the developed world is experiencing. It is not blaming older people; I am one of the cohort that is causing the problem, or going to cause the problem. Yes, some of my friends are little bit ahead of me but it is a fact that we are going to have to spend an awful lot more on healthcare, an awful lot more on pensions and an awful lot more on social care.

If you think that any ribbon campaign against GST as being, 'Wow, that has been overwhelming public opposition', you wait till the cuts in public services that we are going to have to implement if we do not raise sufficient revenues to cope, not to expand the State, but it is expansion in a way, but not to necessarily expand the range of services, but just to deal with the additional demand on existing services and existing service areas because it will be massive in comparison. Unfortunately, people do not seem to believe that.

Sir, I said it was a heap of pain put in my lap when I was invited to go on the Tax Review Panel. Actually, it was not. It was never going to be anything other than a tour of duty but I enjoyed it. All I can say is Deputy Leadbeater says, 'People out there do not believe that everything has been looked at', well it is never everything that has been looked at as there is always another idea that somebody can drag out but the idea that that panel had a predetermination that this is what they wanted, and did not look at other things, we would have to be the biggest masochists on the face of the earth. We knew exactly what the result was going to be in putting forward that package we did. We knew, those of us that want to actually continue in contributing to public life, that we might

be finishing that. So why would we do it if we had not looked at everything conceivable that we could find to look at and it was not just our ideas. Of course, we were consulting experts in the whole tax field. I am not so arrogant to believe that Deputy Roffey and Mr Thompson and Deputy Helyar has all the ideas but, with that expertise, we believe that we were putting forward the best package and the best package to do three things.

Somebody has mentioned that the previous, 15.57.26 but some time earlier today or yesterday was mentioning that this P&R inherited certain criteria that they were supposed to apply to this fiscal review. One was broadening the tax base because Guernsey is in a dangerous position in having so much of its income coming purely from taxes on income. We absolutely have to broaden our tax base.

The second is, and I think it was actually in the Resolution that set up this review, was that those with the broadest shoulders should bear the most burden and that is exactly what we have come forward with. This package is redistributive in the extreme. As well as raising many tens of millions of pounds it leaves those on modest incomes better off. Now, some have said that could disappear like the mountain dew but they are misunderstanding what the mitigations are. When I say mitigations a large part, although this is 15% tax band, when I say it is largely Social Security, they say, 'Oh yes, you can give benefits now but will they be still there in ten years time?'. We are not talking about giving benefits. We are talking about changing the contribution system to a radically different contribution, rewriting it in a once-in-a-generational way that makes it fairer on people on lower incomes.

Now, I cannot deny that anybody can change anything somewhere down the line but this is not a here-today-gone-tomorrow mitigation. This is something really major, written into law which will take an enormous amount of changing but, of course, anything can be changed and, whatever we put forward, that would be the case.

So what I am urging, I really am urging, its almost a said point because everybody has made up their mind and, anyway, Deputy Trott is going to make sure we go home quite soon, we only need a couple of hours to debate and, of course, amendments is not the debate, to debate the biggest policy letter to come since February, I suppose. I am going to urge people to vote for Option 2 because there is nothing else on the table.

I heard Deputy Leadbeater say, 'You should have looked at everything else'. I accept the public are expected to come up and say what that something else is but I think if members of this Assembly are going to reject it ought to be putting forward, ideas have been put forward, Deputy Trott put one, bless him, it was not a very good one but there are some ideas being put forward ... what happens, as I expect is going to happen, that number 2 is not passed.

That will leave us with Proposition 1, the core, which is basically a bit more from the finance sector, a load more from motorists which may or may not disappear like the mountain dew later on, even if it goes through, £25 million will not touch the sides of the challenges that we are facing. It will not touch the sides.

We need to go back to the drawing board. Whether it is a new committee or P&R, Deputy St Pier said if work is going to have to be done, I am not sure. The work ought to be done as soon as possible but actually I am not sure there is any point in this Assembly having another go at it. I do not think there is a majority in this Assembly for any really major revenue-raising measure. I think the can is just going to have to disappear 18 months down the road to the next lot and good luck to them. I do fear, where Guernsey is going, I really fear whether we have the resolution. I have served in many Assemblies since 1982. Some were good, some were bad but most of them, when it really push came to shove, had the resolution to do what needed to be done. I am not sure we have any more.

But, then, what do we do about the other side in the equation having only raised an uncertain £25 million if we have not raised anything else. How much do we spend on capital and how much do we borrow? I have been accused at times in the past of being a tax-and-spend politician. I do not think I am and what I am certainly not is a don't-tax-but-still-spend politician. If we do not pass the only remaining significant revenue-raising measure, which is Proposition 2, then no way can I

vote to borrow £350 million more to spend on our infrastructure, most of it completely non-revenue generating infrastructure. That would be so reckless it would make us not just the worst States ever but one of the worst parliaments anywhere ever, I think. It would just be so reckless.

Nor could I vote to borrow £200 million and spend £90 million in reserves which and that adds up to £290 million with no revenue-raising measures. That is almost equally irresponsible. So then I am left with what do I do? Do I do the due minimum that was in there originally and has now been stuck back in again or do I do the due minimum plus the various what I call Brouard variations when he puts different ways of doing the minimum plus a hospital. I do not know.

Really, if all we have done is the core, the fiscal side of me says I should do minimum. I should not even do the Hospital but I find that really difficult having spent 14 years on the Board of Health and eight years as its President and knowing how badly, when I know the demographics is the biggest issue facing us and the pressure that is going to put on the Hospital, probably I will be reckless and go for due minimum plus the PEH development with half the money coming from the health fund and half the money coming from a limited amount of borrowing.

To be honest, I will go home and think that I have been quite indulgent and quite reckless. I hope not to be in that position because I know the responsible thing to do is to pass Proposition 2. It will not make anybody in here popular but it is just right.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I do not want to speak a long time and Deputy Roffey said much of the things I would like to say Possibly I would answer slightly more reckless than him but I also believe that it is unlikely this States Assembly while it lasts will find a consensus. Deputy Leadbeater made a good speech too and he mentioned the famous quote, was it Einstein or Deputy Murray's quote, of doing the same thing twice or more is madness and expecting a different result. You can get different results. Over time politicians' fortunes rise or fall and it will not be quite the same result as February because, fortunately, in that session, I got an amendment passed by Deputy Matthews about not putting food on GST and that is one of the options today and I will be voting for that second option. That is a change.

I will not be voting for the first one with the 5%, I will be voting for the 6% because, as Deputy Roffey has explained, I put forward other alternatives. I seconded Deputy Trott's. I am not unsympathetic to a higher tax band as a temporary solution. I voted for Deputy Parkinson. I have supported some other elements of the [16.05.53](#) alternative in the past and would support, reluctantly perhaps, motoring taxes and so on.

But I do not see, sensibly, conserving our current way of life an infrastructure and services we could do anything but because Deputy Leadbeater said in his speech, the centrepiece of it was a Guernsey family he knew who were reluctant to bring another child into the world because of the cost of living here and the impact on that that GST might make and he pointed out that they were, to some extent, the lucky ones because they were not necessarily in the lower half, socio-economically, of society where they would benefit from mitigation. I am not sure about that because my fear is even greater than Deputy Roffey's. If we do not get on with revenue-raising our options are very limited.

What we cannot do, despite a minority of the public wanting it, is to tax capital wealth, riches, to any extent because that weakens our major industry and our strength in the last half century. Another thing we cannot really do is offer a much lower standard living than the UK or our competitors and there people who say the Civil Service or public service is overstaffed and so on but States members, individually, even brave people on Policy & Resources, have not been able to run the department like a CEO would. The Civil Service has a contractual obligation. We need to retain and recruit the best and retention is a challenge at the moment.

I agree with the article and speech Deputy Aldwell made that she is a reluctant supporter, as are others, of GST precisely to conserve the public services that we need and not just that we would like. We actually need Financial Investigatory Officers and Home Affairs, for example. We need

3255 people in the healthcare. We absolutely need those and my problem with Deputy Leadbeater's family, and I would tell them this if I had a cup of coffee with them anywhere, is the fear would be that we will start to see a retraction. We will start to see charges for people going to hospital. We will see a reduction in community care. We will see less money, potentially, in the long term, spent on education, higher class sizes, less opportunity to recruit and retain special needs tutors where appropriate, the money not going into the education facility. The reason I voted for education is that, although I have a lot of sympathies with Deputy Matthews and Deputy Cameron and their arguments, I think the new build, the infrastructure, is a major contribution to our society and our ecology. I do not want to see that go and, if you want to see these public services supported, if you want to stop charges, you see, I have lots of friends in the States and I think we are all friends, and there are two distinct categories of people. There are some States' Members who are consistently anti-public expenditure on a grand scale and they are very cautious with taxpayers' money and I am not surprised that, given their mandate as conservatives with a small 'c', that they are consistently against some of these programmes and do not wish to see GST or an equivalent tax in any form.

3270 I think I can forgive them for that, even though there are sometimes inconsistencies about spending here and there. The people I have greater difficulty with are people on the progressive centre and centre-left because, if we do not find solutions to our public expenditure, we will just get more and more cuts. We will not get a fairer society. We will actually lose areas of what we have got. We are already seeing a slight retrenchment on the bus service for various reasons. We are seeing a potential retrenchment on sport. We are seeing possible retrenchment on arts, possible retrenchment on health. P&R cannot give them the extra £6 million they want and that is now, before we really need the money. We have a high building infrastructure cost.

3280 So we really have to ensure that that element of society is protected and the problem I have got is that we call this the GST debate at all. Personally, I would go with a different form of GST. I try to help retailers more, I might go for VAT, the Isle of Man is a very interesting system. There are lots of alternatives but the fact of the matter is the team have been working on this for several years, I was a fringe member of some of these meetings this time, I was more involved with the tax workshop before, and they have done their very best and we should rebrand the GST tax package as tax reform. Fundamentally, this is the first step of tax and social security reform to actually make people better.

3290 If you took away the emotive idea of GST from it and you presented it in the abstract, Deputy Ferbrache, who hates magic money trees and people who think that way, he would have seen and gone away and come up with a scheme that would deliver a new hospital, a new vocational college, potentially new electric buses, maybe money down the line for ports, maybe money, millions and millions, potentially, for new homes, keeping our credit rating high, ensuring that we remain competitive to the greatest possible extent of our competitors.

3305 It is not only just doing that with this package. He is giving money to 50% of our population so they might even be better off in a year or two's time but, unlike February, we are in a situation where the inflation that was so hyper then has diminished and we are also in a situation where, unfortunately, by the time this is implemented if it wins, it will be after a general election. That means to say any and everybody in here can go out on a democratic mandate and campaign for GST or not for GST. But the people who do not want GST also have to be straight with the electorate and say, 'You will be taxed in other ways or you will lose substantial tax benefits'.

3300 We already have an unfair social security system which is too high. We already have an unfair income tax so I think we need to get on today and not speak too long and support this.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you, sir.

3305 What I am not going to do is rehearse any of the arguments that we have seen previously. Deputy Roffey has fairly well set my position out. I am not going to tell anyone off for not doing

the right thing. I am not going to compliment anyone for doing the right thing or tell them off for doing the wrong thing. You are sentient beings; you were voted here by your electorate. You have decisions to make; the information has been put in front of you and your decision is entirely your decision. It is as simple as that.

So, to cut things down a little bit, I want to go through, and I might need some guidance from potentially Deputy Brouard and possibly Deputy Bury, where I am at the moment is Proposition 1, and this is in part the point of general debate, to try and explain how we get to our points, so at the moment I am effectively number 1 on propositions:

1. To agree that the financial positions of the States requires urgent attention ...
 - a. implementing the package ...

I will not go through it so that is effectively what to me looks like core. I think Deputy Kazantseva-Miller has previously made a good point that there **???16.14.53** alternative that are bolted on to this that allow us to do other bits of work which are things like registration levies, and looking for £10 million so there is all that kind of stuff so there is actually a package here.

Now, potentially, the States could at the end of this say I might be voting for nothing but this is not nothing. Core is something; it is not nothing. There is a lot of work going for us so it would be disappointing if, tomorrow, heads are asked to be rolled because we came out with nothing. If there is anything on where I am on Proposition 2 it is not any individual's particular fault and there could be made an argument part of this job is to sell. I think Deputy Trott has alluded to that but also we cannot deny that this Assembly has been extremely difficult. We came in in COVID, parties arose, all that kind of stuff and we have had, basically, glorified, I am sure there is another phrase but I cannot think of it, throwing the ball competitions between individuals which certainly have not helped the Assembly. There is another word for it and it is related to snow. So, Number 1 is where I am.

Number 2 is the full package including the 5% or 6% **???16.16.22**. It is where I am and I have every indication it is probably going to lose. We will find out shortly, Deputy Dudley-Owen.

After that I am a bit stuck and I am going to need a little bit of guidance because I did not actually support the Brouard/Bury because I am ultimately a Guernseyman at the end of the day. I have always watched my money. I watch public money and borrowing something that I do not ultimately control is the equivalent of me taking £200, leaving it on the garden wall in the evening and expecting it to be there in the morning. I am going to struggle to put, it is not the States, by the way, it is the people of Guernsey into significant debt.

Now, Deputy Brouard might make a persuasive argument but he has not guaranteed to get my vote. I am quite happy to leave this Assembly with core and the decision on to basically play that hand. I do not want to do that because I think 2 is important but I am quite prepared to play that hand. So I probably need a little bit of guidance. The problem I have got with this, with the exception of, and I am trying to help people in some way, the only way of getting to the less controversial 9Cs and 9Ds is to have voted for either 4, 5, 6 or 9A so those are the ones sitting at the back. Those are the Kazantseva-Miller/de Sausmarez amendments and I think it was the de Sausmarez/Roffey amendment 9C but they seem to be on prerequisite on 4,5 or 6 to have been approved.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder, if it helps you, that is not correct.

Deputy Inder: I am happy to take some guidance, sir.

The Bailiff: There will be a vote on Propositions 9C, 9D, 9E, 9F, 9G, 9H and 10, come what may.

Deputy Inder: Never come on any of my boats because I will run you up a beach, probably. Well that makes it somewhat easier but, I have not done this a while and I think we do need some guidance later, sir, and possibly a bit of a 15 minute delay, to assure we all get to our points and Deputy Helyar is going to give me more sage advice by the sounds of it.

Right now, Members, I would need some very strong convincing, I am not encouraging anyone to actually do it, to be perfectly frank with you. I am 1 and 2 and the less money-based amendments that you have agreed at the back and I am not even sure right now the extra borrowing for the housing.

3360

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Sir, I want to start by complimenting Deputy Helyar for a great opening speech which seems to be in another century now, three days ago. I do not disagree with almost probably anything he said there except for the final conclusion but I do want to say I think it was a really great opening to this week's debate.

3365

I do want to start by saying that Members, on numerous occasions, had raised that potentially the Rules of Procedure have not been met, whether it is a Rule 4(1), consultation or whatever and I really want to say again I sincerely think that for major policy letters like this one we have to allow for significantly more time between when policy letters are lodged and then how much time Deputies have to look into the propositions if they want to bring amendments, to develop those amendments, to consult and so on. So I really ask Deputy Meerveld and his Committee to take this feedback quite seriously from Members and really consider whether major policy letters require a different type of rules of procedure.

3370

We are approaching the end of our political term and here we are still debating the Government Work Plan and its funding requirements so, to some extent, I am thinking, 'Why are we doing this?' because, technically, in July 2021, at the first iteration of the Government Work Plan, we approved £450 million of expenditure, £200 million of borrowing, we approved the Government Work Plan and off we went. Then we had last year debate which reconfirmed a similar plan and then suddenly the tax debate was tacked on and I do want to remind Members that, back in 2021, myself and Deputy St Pier brought an amendment that basically said we should not really be committing to borrowing today because we do not have, currently, a means to repay it. We should not be committing until we have made a decision on the tax debate which, at that point in July 2021, was supposed to come to us in September 2021 and so the amendment sought to delay the decision on borrowing until we made a decision on taxation.

3375

3380

3385

Clearly that amendment did not succeed and I do want to raise some of the things that were said in that debate. What I said in my speech I said:

... the Financing and Investment Plan of the GWP is asking the Assembly to commit to a level of capital expenditure and additional borrowing of £200 million that will put the island in an unsustainable financial situation, breaking the agreed Fiscal Policy Framework and leaving future governments without recourse to funding unless further measures are taken such as increase in taxation, public cuts and accelerated economic growth.

So I said it would be financially imprudent to enter into any further borrowing until we make a decision on taxation in September 2021 and we, in that debate, were asked very strongly not to conflate the two things. Deputy Ferbrache said that this was a bad amendment, it was dangerous, it could cause financial chaos, it was poor governance, it is irresponsible, he said he was gentle with his language and he thought it was much worse. Well, interestingly, obviously nothing has happened because we never borrowed so it is one of those, whenever we say a dangerous amendment the world is going to end. Clearly, nothing like that happens.

3390

Deputy Mahoney said the tax review and the borrowing, people seem to be confusing those two things and they are not. 'People should disavow them of the belief that they are the same thing' and Deputy Helyar said that amendment had 'the greatest potential to derail the entire Work Plan' and the thrust of this amendment is that we cannot afford to borrow and, if we do, it will place the Island in an unsustainable financial situation, the reality being the two work streams, tax and borrowing, have been wrongly conflated. One is aimed at long-term funding and the other our immediate needs. The Funding & Investment Plan framework is the framework for spending in this political term. Taxation is about solving our longer-term needs.

3395

3400

Two years later here we are. The two are conflated and here we are in a mess and I think Deputy Helyar was also interesting in saying, during the education debate, he thought by bringing all of this altogether it is probably too much for the Assembly so here we are. We have gone from it being separated, being joined up and potentially this is too big for us to swallow and probably he is right.

What I want to say is I think it has been a very long week and I think we have to keep our eyes on the prize. It has been a long week. To me there are three key prizes; one is a clear commitment and intention of this Assembly to raise the revenue; the second is that we unlock capital expenditure and to me we have to unlock the commitment to spend money on the Hospital and the commitment to spend money on education. Those three, for me, are the most important prizes of today.

So we have choices in terms of revenue. We have actually two choices in front of us today and, in terms of capital expenditure, we have five choices so I really urge Members to really keep their eyes on the prize and really focus on that binary choice. In terms of revenue-raising what is currently being presented to us is we have two options; we either just approve the core which, within the P&R proposals will be committing to raising about £25 million of revenue and the second choice is that we complement that with the GST package which, combined, will raise about £60 million. So the two will then raise about £85 million but that is two choices we have today in terms of revenue-raising.

As we presented in Amendment 4 I think there is genuinely more scope for us to raise revenue beyond what has been outlined by Policy & Resources and Policy & Resources themselves have said, 'We are already looking at the levy and looking at open-market inscriptions and so on' and there has been one element, again, that I really believe has not been fully included and scoped within Policy & Resources proposals is the concept of the levy. This additional potential corporate levy and other measures are currently scoped within Policy & Resources proposals as able to raise about £5 million. This is really against what was presented to in the E&Y report back in February which said that that is the one option that can potentially raise, among all the corporate measures that they were suggesting, up to £20 million.

So I do really think there is a few millions missing there so I think, even though this is not in the policy letter scope, I genuinely think that we already have measures in train and workstreams in train and we can bring other measures that help us raise up to about £40 million of revenue. If the only thing we approve today is the core measures, we do not get to approving GST today, I would be happy to work with anyone, P&R and others, to make sure through this upcoming budget potentially we actually really indicate the commitment to bring up to £40 million of revenue-raising measures.

To me it is a question of how much do you think we should be raising today versus how much we will want to be raising in the second and third stages of future government programmes and I genuinely think raising £40 million today through non-GST measures is the right step and approach and really takes us a long way forward in trying to start to stabilise the government's financial situation. As I said in one of my speeches earlier £40 million of revenue-raising measures is more than adding 1% of GDP in terms of how much tax we raise out of the economy. It is very substantial and, just as a reminder, the majority of those measures will be concentrated on the corporate sector, whether it is through levies, company registry fees, Pillar 2 or OECD measures etc. They will not be, by and large, burdening household which I think we need to be avoiding at all costs.

So, I think this, to me, is the two revenue-raising measures that we as an Assembly have to decide on today. Raising up to £25 million plus or raising further with the GST package up to £80 million.

So the second side of the prizes is the capital expenditure. We, right now, through amendments have five choices, four which is £95 million of expenditure. Those projects are in train and, to be honest, I find it hard to think how you could stop them. I think that would be totally irresponsible. There are probably contracts in place. I am thinking of Guernsey Registry IT. I do not understand if we do not approve the core whether they will stop. I really do not think they will. They are projects in train through the procurement process so they are happening, to be honest, whether we agree it or not today. I feel they are happening. So it is almost not a choice.

Then we have the scenario 1, £190 million which will include the Alderney runway. Then we have scenario 1 plus through Deputy Brouard's various amendments which includes the hospital. We have scenario 2 which includes the schools as well and that is £440 million and then scenario 3 which also includes the inert waste facility and SAP and additional funding.

To me, I feel very strongly that we have to try to get to scenario 2 to unlock those two key capital projects and I actually believe we can get there and the reason I believe we can get there is because of partly what we were saying with Amendment 4 in terms of when the money is going to be due to be spent. So when we talk about those £440 million, and I am sure actually there is room for slightly reducing that and really focusing on the schools, Alderney runway and the Hospital, currently the way the policy letter is phrased is that those scenarios are for capital portfolio for this political term. As I always said, we are not going to spend that money this political term so, for example, look at the Hospital. The vast majority of that £120 million spent is not this political term. It is next political term and the one after so we do not need the cash today so just with the Hospital itself, if we say we want to commit to portfolio 2, £440 million, that does not mean we need that cash now, we are going to be spending it today. I think this is where the forecast for the timing of capital expenditure in a policy letter are not correct. They are really confusing and do not align with reality.

So the Hospital not this political term. It is moved out so £120 million is further in the decade. The school will require more immediate but, even with the secondary education programme, that is going to stretch into the next political term as well so it will stretch into 2026 and maybe 2027, hopefully not but certainly into 2026. That is when a proportion of the capital, of paying the invoices from the contractors will be made. So, again, even with the school which is equally big capital expenditure, a significant part of it is moving out into the next political term and the same is going to happen with other capital projects in that portfolio. So, whether we want it or not, our capital expenditure timing, even for the ambitious Portfolio 2, will smooth out much more into the next political term so we do not need to draw on the cash today. What will happen is what we describe in the Fair Alternative 2 as that there is going to be a much smoother capital expenditure curve.

So, if we were standing 2% of GDP, this year, next year and the election year, for three years, that is over £200 million. That is already more than scenario 1 and we are not far from balancing our books with additional revenue-raising and just maintaining that still ambitious 2% level of capital expenditure.

So I think we cannot just do core. We absolutely must do at least scenario 1 but, based on what I just said, based on the expected capital expenditure timing and the additional revenue-raising measures, I think we can just about look into affording capital portfolio 2 with the school, with the hospital.

What it would mean and, given the smoothing out of the curve, I think we are unlikely to need to draw on borrowing in the way that scenario 2 is currently described in the Policy & Resources paper saying that we absolutely need those up to £200 million of borrowing. I think Treasury and P&R have been very carefully managing the capital expenditure and borrowing this political term and I think they will continue to do so because, especially, the hospital programme does not need to be drawn until late in this decade, it may not be necessary for us to draw on borrowing, certainly in the short term and, if we do need to draw on that, we have potentially the affordable housing programme that we approved today. Actually, the timing for it in a couple of years' time will be right and will be better.

So, I think we can get there. I really do, based on what we have seen and how much capital we can actually stand with the best of our ambitions and I will repeat it again, we went with a bang approach in 2021 saying we are going to invest into capital, we are going to invest in infrastructure, we are going to reverse all the trends and what have we been able to achieve? We have been able to achieve £40 million of expenditure in 2021, £45 million of expenditure in 2022 and I think we are not far away from those numbers for 2023. I think they are a bit higher but certainly not in the £100 million plus numbers.

Based on what we have seen, based on the evidence of how much money we can spend, right now, and the projects we can execute through our current process I just do not think we will have such massive capital expenditure spent in terms of time. So, Members, I think we can get there to support scenario 2 which unlocks the most critical projects of our political term – school, the hospital, the Alderney runway and the raft of other projects. I think we will have to, more significantly, commit through budget or other means, whatever, to raising approximately up to £40 million of expenditure to make sure are saying we are raising a substantial amount. We will really have to work very hard as we were going to on the savings programme and try to make sure we do not just hit the £10 million target, we hit the higher plank of £16 million and this is one of the key things we need to demonstrate to the community. I think we will then take this time to develop the economic strategy with all the fancy new things we want to look into capital expenditure and all these things and then, by 2026, with the next political term, we will be in a much better position to then see do we need further revenue-raising measures and I think, at that point, this is when we need to be looking again, do we need to raise GST or not.

So I think there has been a lot of talk about courage and, as Deputy Leadbeater said, we have been accused of not having the courage and backbone to make a decision. I really do not think it is about that, I really think it has always been about a staged approach. It is about really demonstrating we can embark and commit to a significant savings programme. We can commit to developing and executing on our economic development strategy. We have to continue making sure we run public services, the Civil Service efficiency, transformation, with all the IT issues etc. we have, trying to use more AI and other tools we have. We have to look at pension reforms. There is a huge amount of work we have to do and, if we press the magic button of unlocking GST today, we are going to take our focus off, I think, all other measures because, ultimately, we have big resource constraints. We know that and we can probably do one thing well at a time and that one thing, if GST is approved today, is not going to be anything else than trying to get ready for raising GST.

So, I really respect and congratulate P&R on this consistent effort and I think there has been so much new insight and new information developed as part of developing the tax proposals over the two years that we have had. I think we have, as an Assembly, as a government and as a community, a much better understanding of where we are. I think they have done a fantastic job to get us there and I think they will probably be right in four years' time or longer. I just do not think we can get there today but I think we can still do quite a lot based on the work they presented today and I really urge the Assembly to find ways to support scenario 2 because I genuinely think we can get there without jeopardising and putting ourselves under unreasonable risk.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir.

Now I have a microphone that works I am very grateful. I just need to make a comment that I am really grateful that I followed Deputy Kazantseva-Miller's speech. I love the way that she is trying to bring everybody together after at sometimes divisive periods over the last few days. It has been quite a heavy debate at times and I think it is good in these last few embers of the debate to stand back and take a little bit more of a holistic and philosophical approach to things and I agree with much of what she said.

I am not going to talk to the technical detail that sits behind the scenarios that we have been presented with by P&R. We have been through this time and time again but I would also like to put on record my thanks to the Committee the immense work that they have done but also to others who have challenged them because, to my mind, the challenge has ensured that there has been a robust conversation which has, in my opinion, again and again, revealed the sense of the package presented in scenario 3, far-reaching though it may be and I do possibly agree with Deputy Kazantseva-Miller about that possibly ... this may not be the time for all members to get behind it,

however, I will be getting behind it because, whilst I do not like the idea of GST and I do not like the idea of borrowing and I do not like the idea of raising taxes, it is clear as day that our problem is sustainability in raising revenue to fix the structural deficit and providing sufficient surplus to regrow our reserves.

Now, there are so many way of skinning a cat but it is clear in my opinion that, despite significant ... I do apologise, Deputy Gollop, it is not a very nice image to conjure up, is it. I should have thought of a different phrase. So there are only so many ways to bake a cake. I actually tried that one, Deputy Gollop, and it is clear in my opinion that, despite significant efforts to provide alternative ideas and other packages, nothing is demonstrating a far-reaching and encompassing proposal put forward. So I have to bite the bullet and make the uncomfortable decision to raise taxes and scenario 3, which is now Proposition 4, is the one that will get my preferred vote and then, failing that, scenario 2, which is now in Proposition 5 as well as, of course, Proposition 1 which are the core measures.

What I want to focus on, sir, is a matter that has been mentioned countless times throughout the course of this debate, whether that be debates on social media, in the newspaper, amongst business leaders, amongst people in the street, amongst members here in the Chamber, and I have touched on this already today and that is the link between quality of education and economic growth because it is economic growth that is the vital tool in the box that we need in order to have a sustainable future as well as other revenue-raising measures. The Singapore case study is an evidence template for growth and there have been countless studies over the years, certainly since the emergence of the roaring tiger economy of Singapore which has achieved stable annual growth for decades and the research that has gone into the secret to their success and what policy levers they us to improve in such a convincing way their staggering economic growth. Studies undertaken for pre-eminent organisations such as the OECD and the World Bank, who have oodles of cash by the way available for research and evidence that supports our policy-making as well, concludes that there is strong evidence that the cognitive skills of the population, rather than mere school attainment, are powerfully related to individual earnings and to the distribution of income and therefore to economic growth.

Now, Singapore is a place where I was lucky enough to live for nearly a decade during my teenage years and I saw a massive change in the fortunes during the 1990s. It underwent significant change and a big improvement in the educational achievement and standard of living for many of their population. The post-war position they found themselves in, having been through the most horrific occupation under the Japanese, when the people were brutalised and the economy was ruined, then independence from British rule, along with Malaysia, which resulted in a parting of the ways in the 1950s and a small island state was required to go it alone.

I witnessed and experienced and learned from the growth and that changed to my other island home at the time, an island home which actually does have similarities with us, such as historic entrepreneurial endeavour, innovation and strategic location. Yes, Singapore does have a GST but, that aside, that is not the point I am trying to make. Singapore, the garden city, is booming and has boomed for some years. Guernsey does not need to boom but it does need to strive and it cannot fall into managed decline and it is essential that we look at following tried and tested methods.

A corporate service provider, who themselves, has invested in Singapore says, 'Singapore's true natural resource is its people and in a growing economy this could not be more apt. As the economy grows both local and non-local companies have access to a pool of an educated workforce and eventually a burgeoning consumer market'. So, in short, Singapore invests in education because it believes in investing in its future. That is the approach we need to follow. We have done it before and we need to do it again. We have been complacent for many years, dining out on the fact that, as an island, we had full employment and enabled many of our young people to leave school and walk into a job with few or little qualifications, or any qualifications sometimes. We enabled adults to get promotion without further qualifications and education but times are changing, sir.

I cannot lead the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture content with mediocrity. I am aspiring for excellence in our education system for each and every child and will support all efforts to make this happen.

So, as one of the tools in our box, I have said the education for our children, young people and adult learners is the highest quality we can get and I do not want members to be left with the impression that I am endorsing unfettered growth because I must caveat the personal discomfort that I have and, despite my love of shoes and handbags, I am in fact quite frugal by nature and at my happiest shopping vintage and second-hand. I love the 'reduce, reuse, recycle' ethos and there is nothing better than hand-me-downs. Why is this relevant? Because I do not like overconsumption and unconstrained growth but I believe that we need to get a boot up in our economy just to keep up now.

So please do not misunderstand me that I want to incite a boom in Guernsey but I think a slow, sustainable burn is more our style and that, along with a strategic view of the economy, a skills strategy, maximising the development of our human capital and an excellent education system, we can grow and sustain our economy. Our people are, after all, the natural assets we have so let us invest.

Now, before I close, because I can hear Deputy Ferbrache in the corner, he is like the little voice on my shoulder saying, 'Come on, hurry up, hurry up, we have got a race to run', now I will just touch on what I mentioned earlier today and that is about Les Ozouets campus and also Le Coutanchez but if we look at Les Ozouets campus, let us call it the nursery or even breeding ground for the love of learning, education, training and excellence, ensuring we have a pipeline of skills for all sectors of business and industry but, right now, that pipeline is clogged up and here is why. I have mentioned already during this debate the water ingress at Le Coutanchez. Two days this week we have had to close the catering kitchen for 24 Catering and Hospitality students and that will realise disturb Deputy Vermeulen, I know, and our teams have worked really hard, hand in hand with the hospitality industry to attract those individuals into our sector. I can hear members and the public crying, 'Well why are we not fixing it?'. We are, but we are constantly having to make choices between a quick fix and a make-do-and-mend for a couple of year and a much more significant and costly repair.

With the promise of the build always just around the corner we have patched them when the patch has failed so do we keep throwing good money at a patch, do we go for a more long-term solution or do we, here today, bite the bullet and make the right level of investment in our public service infrastructure. Are we going to unblock that pipeline? I completely understand the need for new housing and I do not intend to pit education infrastructure needs against hospital infrastructure needs but I will ask members to join the dots and query who is going to build these infrastructure projects. Our site and bench joiner apprentices had the start of their term delayed because demand for these courses has changed and we need to provide temporary accommodation for them. These types of courses are space hungry. Imagine the space you need for a group of people to learn, hands on, how to build a staircase or a roof truss. Deputy Leadbeater lives and breathes this. He knows they are not classrooms, they are workshops that are needed. We have got a really strong link with industry and we have compressed some of our construction apprenticeships from five to three to four years so that we can get them fully qualified and into the workplace more quickly but we need the right facilities to cope with the combination of this compression and high demand. We need to unblock the pipeline, build the facilities and fill the new fit-for-purpose education and learning spaces we create with eager to learn apprentices.

What about other courses? Members might be surprised by this statistic, we have a waiting list right now of 40 adults wanting to complete their Level 2 Maths and English qualifications, that is GCSE or equivalent. Why do we have a waiting list? Because the demand for lecturers to teach adult learning is high and a pretty coastline is not enough to attract lecturers to come to Guernsey if they have to teach all day in the learning environments that we are offering them.

So you might ask why demand for these courses? There are a number of reasons because for too long we had a school leaving age of 15 coupled with complacency about the value of education

3660 but we also have a reasonable number of people in our community who do not have English as a first language. So, if adults in our community want to learn so that they can better their potential earning by moving into better paying roles with minimum entry requirements or because these qualifications are a gateway to further learning for Level 3 qualifications for adult apprentices or Deputy Brouard's nursing associates, for example, and we have to put these eager to learn adults on a waiting list. What message are we sending them?

3665 We need great facilities to attract great teachers and lecturers in an inflated labour market. We need to unblock that pipeline, build the facilities and fill the new fit-for-purpose education and learning spaces with eager to learn students.

3670 Sir, I will close by saying I have already said in this debate that we have to shore up the existing secondary and post-16 estate. If we have to shore it up for another 10 to 15 years it will cost us between £15 million and £20 million and we would still need to make an investment of £100 million plus on new buildings after that. It is a false economy not to fund the investment in education now and complete the circle on this argument. The investment in our education system now guarantees a return into economic growth and a reduction in public service costs such as benefits support, health and justice.

3675 Please, Members, find it within yourselves to support a package that unlocks funding into education, health and housing together so we can push forward with the vital investment in our Island's infrastructure. Thank you.

3680 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: Thank you, sir.

First, I should thank P&R for all the work they have done on this. Predictably, I am respectfully not proposing to vote for the GST and the off-setting package. In terms of putting a package together that was a pretty good effort, there is quite a lot on the 15% tax side and removing some of those cliff edges, I think that is good stuff but, at the moment the Island does not want GST. I think we would have problems introducing it because of all the IT issues we have so I will not be voting for it.

3690 I have been working down the page and I was particularly taken by Deputy Kazantseva-Miller's presentation which I think gets closest to what I think. What I do not like about the whole thing that we have got now that it appears to be such a big all or nothing deal and if we get nothing it only falls apart or we have got to do something. I do not subscribe to that. What, personally, I prefer is what I think they call in the United States House of Representatives a line item veto. I would like this to have been turned around so that P&R come to us, to the extent that they have done already, we have already approved the education plan but, to the extent we have not approved things already, I would like them to come to us line item by line item and in that regard I am conscious of the Burford amendment that says that projects over £5 million should come back. Does that still stand? That was my question I was going to ask earlier, sir, and –

Deputy Burford, I will give way.

3700

Deputy Burford: Perhaps I am anticipating where Deputy Dyke is going with this but it does not apply to projects that already have capital votes open which would include both the Hospital and the schools.

3705 **Deputy Dyke:** Thank you for that intervention. So, subject to that, I would also echo the points that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller made regarding timing and sequencing. We have to do all that, it cannot all come immediately, therefore it will be spaced out so the borrowing requirements should not hit us tomorrow. There is not going to be an urgency tomorrow morning for Deputy Helyar to rush down to HSBC to beg for some money. It is going to be spread out over time and during that time we have discussed and approved and, even if they were not approved and instructed, P&R

3710

have got them and got their minds round them, they are looking at pensions and all that sort of thing. I will not go through them all.

So at the end of the day I was going to be a bit harsher but I think I am going to go for Proposition 5 as the base case. I do not particularly like the big spending but the borrowing figure of £200 million that is in it is something we approved three years ago so I do not see a necessity to go back on it. The understanding is, I think, these projects will be spent because they have to be and amongst that there are also going to be some social housing and other housing expenditure that will be necessary but I think that should come in in tranches, project by project. I will not be voting for a global £150 million. I think that is a bit horse-frightening but projects will come, year by year, for us to approve and to carry on.

So, on that basis, I think I will support Proposition 5 and then there are a lot of the other smaller things to go with. One thing I would say regarding the list of items in Table 1 of the vital things that we have to press on with, again, P&R are going to be pressing the button on those in stages, with some of the IT projects I think we are probably going to have to delay some of those until our IT Department is fully up to speed. I do not think we want to take a lot of new stuff this instant on the IT front.

On a slightly discordant note I know there has been a bit of emailing around. I have seen some more information that really worries me about the Alderney Airport project. I know I voted for it last time but that is something to maybe discuss on the side. But, subject to that, I am going to vote for Proposition 5 that seems to get us through a difficult situation.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

I was not going to speak but I just rise to my feet to follow Deputy Kazantseva-Miller really on scenario 2, Proposition 5. I cannot help feeling, looking at the original proposals from P&R, that a vote for that was possibly the most irresponsible vote this Assembly could make in terms of borrowing with no visible means of paying it back. It really worries me and I just feel that, as seductive as Deputy Kazantseva-Miller's speech was, nevertheless, it does not matter if we do not need to draw down this money just yet, we will need to draw it down to pay for these projects and we will need, more importantly, to repay it for 25 years or 30 years or however long and repaying that money will be money that we cannot be spending on other things. It is not free money as though it has almost been tried to propose and in those coming years, the remainder of this term and more importantly next term, there will be new essential projects that need doing, capital projects and we will need to fund those.

So I just want to caution members that borrowing £200 million with no revenue stream identified is hugely risky; it is not free, it is not without risk and it will affect all other projects so I think that is the main thing. I do not think it matters too much whether we are going to move from 2% of GDP to 1.5%. We do not have that revenue headroom of £45 million or £70million so I just ask members to think cautiously about that.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tissier.

Deputy Le Tissier: Thank you, sir.

I am conscious of the time and I would say to Deputy Ferbrache in his standards this will be a short speech but in mine it will be probably be one of the longest I have made so far. I spoke once this week about the Deputy Trott amendment so I am going to say everything I am going to want to say now.

I have got déjà vu being here today. I thought we had decided back in February and so did the public that GST was ours but it is like a zombie that P&R know its dead but they will not stop. It is

coming back and back. To me it is like the runway debates on speed. When is the next one? Next year? The year after? Who knows but I think GST is basically a very regressive tax but it has been
3765 magically transformed into a so-called progressive tax by a mishmash of very selective amelioration. I want to look, and this is going to be the focus of my speech, at the pensioner age group.

Now we are all going to be pensioners unless we die young, of course, sooner or later or unless we adopt the Logan's Run policy. Now I know nothing surprises me in the States but I do not think we are going to go that far so I would like to talk about how many pensioners have been truly
3770 thrown under the bus by P&R and, I have to say, Deputy Roffey. Of course, I disagree with Deputy Roffey's rebuttal of my assertions in the paper recently but I note he is silent on one issue and that is the main issue in my view. That is that many pensioners, through no fault of their own, are suffering on poor pensions and are being ignored by the States. Now I do not want to hear that there is a point of correction that pensioners can ask for supplementary benefits. It is true some can
3775 but many cannot as their savings are deemed by Social Security, and I am blaming the politicians, not the staff there because they are very helpful, but they will tell you if you are over the savings limits then it is no from them, no to supplementary benefits.

I think that is a morally indefensible position to ignore mainly women who have paid the married woman social security stamp back in the day. Now I have some experience here and I can verify that
3780 married women were encouraged to pay the married woman stamp. I have been contacted by several women in this position and two of them were outside on Tuesday and I have had some emails and a letter but one of these letters was very moving and I had permission to quote it:

I started work at 15 years old, paying my insurance stamp as it was known then. In 1963 as a married woman I worked for my husband in the growing industry. He was paying a self-employed man's contribution which would allow me to have a pension when I reached 65 years of age. When the growing industry hit problems in 1977 I went out to work. I had two part-time jobs, paying the married woman's contribution then that was changed to a full contribution just before I was 65. I was sent a letter to inform me that I had not paid enough contributions to receive a full pension. As I was still working I phoned the Pensions Department and asked if I could continue paying contributions as I was still working and I wanted to pay the necessary amount and I was told no. 65 years was the cut off point.
We have been badly treated over the years because of the changing of legislation from time to time. I won't hold my breath to see if anything good will come with this as the Policy Committee, that is P&R, are determined to bring in GST at any cost.???

And that is the end of the quote but this policy letter does not even mention these women. It assumes that all pensioners are caught up in the growing benefit culture. As though it is the answer, in the past, Deputy Roffey has given me, 'Apply for benefits'. We are heading down the benefits for all culture. Sooner or later we will all be on benefits and I pity the single poor remaining worker who will have to support us. But, as I say, what about those who do not qualify for supplementary benefits?
3785

Now I am unhappy with P&R proposing GST and telling us we will make savings. There is even a Committee but in my view these promised savings will evaporate quicker than the morning mist if we pass GST. P&R and the committees, they do not have a great track record in savings and I do not think it is going to change. When P&R asked the Committee for savings what did they do? They came back asking for more money, not less, and I think this really does highlight the lack of executive government.

Now, even though P&R have no power to direct committees, I accept that as a consequence of the way our government is structured, they do have power over their budgets so they could enforce cuts by simply reducing them but I also accept that this might be difficult to get through the States as committees would no doubt be bringing amendments such as GSC and Active 8 proposals. So I think P&R need to step up to the plate and grasp the mettle, mixed metaphors, sorry.
3795

The Civil Service are servants of the States and if P&R really wanted to cut a few people they could and I ask them to act like Mrs Thatcher please. Having said that, if they will not put on their big boy trousers as Deputy Helyar's previous speech in February said we all needed to, they could at least make a start in easier ways. The last time I looked on the States' website there were nearly 100 vacancies. I do not think this included agency staff at the Hospital. I stand to be corrected but,
3800

3805 of that 100, around about 50 were health-related so if we discount those, at a stroke, these remaining 50 could be removed. I would say the world has not come to an end. Services are still being delivered even without those 50 staff.

Now a member of P&R, and sorry he is not here at the moment to hear this, told me that we cannot do that as it would lead to 'intolerable pressure on staff'. I have an answer to that. Welcome
3810 to the commercial world. Now I know the States is not a business and that is a fair comment but everyone should be working to the same amount, the same levels, whether you are working for the States or working in commerce. When I was in finance we use to review open positions every few months and, if they had been outstanding over that time, we would just get rid of them but the difference here is that companies sink or swim by their ability to make profits but in the States there is no such pressure because there is the bottomless pit of the taxpayer.
3815

I think that we have failed dismally in cutting costs. Even by this simple as I just outlined we could save a considerable sum. Assume these 50 staff earn £30,000 per annum, and that is on the low side but let us just take that as a figure, if you add in pension and other benefits, I reckon that might come to £40,000. Simple maths 50 x 40, that is £2 million a year we could save at a stroke
3820 and, even if you ignore the increments and the RPI increases, that is £20 million over 10 years. I hope that P&R would look at this but somehow I doubt it so I do not want to hear from P&T that I have not made suggestions because there is one I have just made but I think it is not in the P&R play book.

Then we go on to tax caps. There are only 30 and they bring in £7 million a year. P&R have told
3825 me that at least one of these multimillionaires has been making threats to P&R that they will leave if we tinker with their tax. I have not seen any of these threats myself but I am told they exist and I believe it but, of course, these mega-rich people would say this, would they not? If I was a multimillionaire I do not want to pay much tax. Who would not but it is that old chestnut again, they are threatening to leave but I think my island home has more going for it than just its headline tax rate. There are numerous advantages to living in Sarnia Cherie. It is a fantastic place. They will not all leave. They know the benefits of living here. They have got great restaurant, it is safe, they can easily get to London and many more.
3830

So Guernseymen were called donkeys and were stubborn and we do not take threats lying down but Guernseymen also do not take kindly to the basic unfairness of the current tax arrangements, that is where the average Guernsey resident, like me and probably many of you here, pay 20%, less
3835 allowances, of course and the mega-rich pay a fraction. To coin a phrase from COVID, 'We are all in it together, except we are not'. Please remove this inequality before imposing GST.

Deputy Inder said something earlier in the Fairer Alternative debate. He said Guernsey is a steady-as-you-go jurisdiction, no sudden shocks, or words to that effect. Then in Deputy Parkinson amendment debate some Deputies said territorial tax scares people; do not rock the boat. I agree
3840 with both of those but it seems to me that introducing GST is one of the biggest shocks to the system that we have seen since the 1940s. Whether you agree with GST or not no-one can legitimately say that its introduction will not be a big shock to the system and in my view it is not populist to oppose GST. Sure, local folk are against GST by a large majority but there are sound economic reasons which I will not go into because I am conscious of the time but it is not right for Guernsey.
3845

Then we have borrowing of these huge, very large, sums. I am not against borrowing where it is justified for sound economic reasons provided, and some people say I am a dinosaur in this, but provided each scheme has an income stream from which to repay the borrowings and, no, I do not
3850 really mean using GST to repay the borrowings. Borrowing to build house, I am good with that. The rent is used to repay. Another project such as the marina would fit this criteria if private funding was not forthcoming. Schools, sixth form, great in principle but we need GST to repay the loan. Hospital, maybe there is some income from Vic wing, I am not sure if the new one is going to be called Vic wing but we all know what I am referring to, but medical tourism. That has been mentioned but I somehow doubt that is going to be a big source of income. Our charges at
3855 Guernsey hospital are quite often very much higher than some you see in the UK and then, on top

of that, you might have to pay GST. Where are these 90-odd nurses going to come from? Where are they going to live and how are they going to be paid for?

3860 It seems to me this is more can-kicking and unfortunately, Deputy Queripel is not here, but, if you drive a car I will tax the street. If I try to sit I will tax your seat. If you get too cold I will tax the heat. If you take a walk I will tax your feet'. Four very famous people wrote that and Deputy Queripel would know what that means.

I could continue at length but I will not because I think we have all made up our minds. So, inclosing, I would just say that the five members of P&R are continuing their ride into the Valley of
3865 Death, paraphrasing Lord Tennyson, GST, glory or death, not literally, I stress. As far as I am concerned it is no to GST and no to borrowing if it does not have an identifiable stream of income to repay.

Thank you, sir.

3870 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

As the flag bearer for the red ribbon brigade I feel obliged to say something but it is interesting. The red ribbon brigade which, incidentally, despite the fact that some people seem to think so, was
3875 not just me. It included the sponsors of the campaign, Deputies Blin, Dyke, McKenna, Le Tissier, Vermeulen, de Lisle and Parkinson never had to persuade anybody to vote against GST. In fact, we never actually asked anybody to vote against GST. What we did was present a vehicle or a venue for people to express their opinions and it resulted in the largest march that Guernsey has ever seen, a protest march, and innumerable red ribbons that everyone refers to, unlike P&R. They ran
3880 their initial campaign at the beginning of this year and I must admit, I did criticise them at the time for how poorly they did it, dictating basically, 'You have got to have GST or else'. I must complement them. Project Fear has been run far better this time. Of course, one would hope so with the complete resources of central comms and the taxpayers' money to help fund it. I must admit we should all admire them for the ability to go from one failure to another with no loss of enthusiasm. *(Laughter)*

3885 So why are we here today? Why are we discussing tax increases which is actually a good question, considering we turned it down in January, February and we stipulated we wanted two working groups formed to look at cost savings, one of which David Mahoney has already publicly said we are hopeful that will achieve its aimed £16 million savings and another one to look at different tax approaches or different tax packages, neither of which have reported back yet. So some would claim
3890 this debate is a bit premature but the bigger reason, of course, is the ageing population and I will not bother repeating all the statistics or going into analysing it.

But there are other elements that are contributing to this as well, one of which is the continual introduction of new services by this Assembly. I cannot count how many times I have heard Deputy Roffey and others say, 'They have got it in the UK. We have got to have it here too'. They are
3895 constantly, virtually every meeting, coming up with a new way to spend money so part of the problem is this Assembly and it is ongoing propensity for introducing things that our parents and grandparents would have never considered doing and maybe we should think twice about doing as well.

So what is P&R's and Deputy Roffey's answer? Let us increase taxes. OK. We have got an ageing
3900 population and the pension pot is unsustainable because those people who are retired now and are retiring soon did not put in enough in contributions during their lifetime to actually pay out the amount of money they are drawing from it now.

We have a problem with healthcare. Why do we have a problem with healthcare? We have got an ageing demographic and they are requiring a lot more money to sustain them in good health in
3905 their old age because the States and previous ones had never collected enough money to build up the reserves to be able to pay for that retirement.

So the answer is let us tax the next generation to help the previous generation retire comfortably and live well into their old age. This is called generational inequity and effectively it is a giant Ponzi

scheme because, eventually, those people who are now coming into employment and paying taxes will find that, when they are older, who is going to be left to tax to pay for their retirement?

So there structural issues here that have to be addressed. So I would say, before increasing taxes, let us stop introducing and expanding our services and look at, potentially, those hard discussions about cutting taxes. We also should be looking at economic growth and ways to increase revenue and, yes, because Deputy Ferbrache mentioned it earlier, wind farms, I believe and Deputy Blin and anybody else who watched my presentation, is a viable option for doing that and that is the kind of things we should be pursuing.

So, I am going to make it very short because I am conscious all of us want to get out of here. I am going to end with that and just finally say to Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, who raised earlier the bombardment of amendments and way policy letters come, SACC absolutely will be looking at that and the use of suspension of the rules to bring in amendments as well and coming to the States with proposals to try and make this introduce better governance and better process to make this job a little easier because you need a [17.23.46](#) supercomputer and a week to work out the different voting options on what we are going to be faced with in a few minutes, or hopefully a few minutes, in different voting combinations and the danger is some Deputies will end up voting for things they did not intend to.

Anyway, with that, I will close and allow Deputy de Sausmarez to ...

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir, and apologies to Deputy Mahoney who I think was actually a little quicker to his feet but I will try to keep it brief. I am very conscious of time so I am going to keep my comments focussed very narrowly.

On the issue of the tax packet that is proposed in Proposition 2 my rationale really remains the same as the last time we debated this and in fact that rationale has been strengthened because I think it is not deliverable so I have great respect for the people who have proposed it and for the people who intend to support it. I cannot because I think it would leave us, essentially, with significant unfunded borrowing because I do not think the revenue-raising measures are deliverable and that leads me on to the point that I really just wanted to focus on.

Deputy Roffey, when he spoke, and I know it has been a long afternoon, he spoke relatively early in general debate, I think he used a metaphor of children in a sweet shop and talked about scenario 2 being the most irresponsible of all options and I have to say I agree. It just goes fundamentally against my Guernsey DNA to support unfunded borrowing in the way that I am sorry, so scenario 2, so Proposition 5 suggests and actually that seems to be the sense coming out of the policy letter as well. I think it is just worth reading paragraph 1.18 from the policy letter which deals with scenario 2 in the executive summary. It says:

1.18 Although Scenario 2 is an improvement to continuing "as-is" and allows sufficient funds to enable progression of key capital projects, it does so by placing significant pressure on scarce reserves at a time when the States should be protecting their liquidity as a matter of priority.

'As a matter of priority', and I could not agree with that assessment more. I do think this is the worst possible time to be contemplating such significant amounts of borrowing and it is not just £200 million. I would remind members that it also, scenario 2, also involved using the full balance of the health reserve fund as well, £90 million of that so I think this is one of those issues that has not got an awful lot of traction because no-one in the public has really considered it a realistic outcome but I think the public would be absolutely shocked and horrified by that level of irresponsibility, fiscal irresponsibility. To use Deputy Roffey's metaphor it is wanting all the sweets in the sweet shop without having the money to pay for them, or was it the cherry and the bun to use Deputy Gollop's favourite metaphor and, at a time of fiscal constraint such as this, I really do not think there can be a worse possible look in the eyes of the public, I really do not.

So I very much respect the members who have set out their rationale for supporting the tax package as proposed in Proposition 2 and I can completely understand their reasons for supporting that. I hope I have set out but not at length, because I know there are other people who also want to put their views on record, the reasons why I cannot but I really am alarmed as I think many members of the public would be about what I believe to be the least responsible option that we could possibly take which is supporting Proposition 5.

Thank you.

Deputy Trott: Point of order.

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Sir, I think the Rule is 26(1) and it is just before half past five.

The Bailiff: Let me first invite those members who wish to speak in general debate to stand in their places. Deputy Trott, is it still your wish that the motion pursuant to Rule 26(1) be put? Well, Members of the States, the motion is that, apart from hearing from the Vice President replying to general debate, debate on these propositions now be curtailed posed by Deputy Trott.

Those in favour; those against. I think that might have to be a vote, remarkably even, so I will not try and call it. Greffier, if we have got a ... If everyone has fired up their machines I will invite the Greffier to open the voting please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 18, Contre 17, Ne vote pas 4, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	Aldwell, Sue	Bury, Tina	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Burford, Yvonne	Brouard, Al	De Sausmarez, Lindsay		
Cameron, Andy	Dyke, John	Dudley-Owen, Andrea		
De Lisle, David	Fairclough, Simon	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha		
Ferbrache, Peter	Falla, Steve			
Inder, Neil	Gabriel, Adrian			
Leadbeater, Marc	Gollop, John			
McKenna, Liam	Haskins, Sam			
Meerveld, Carl	Helyar, Mark			
Murray, Bob	Le Tissier, Chris			
Parkinson, Charles	Mahoney, David			
Prow, Robert	Matthews, Aidan			
Queripel, Lester	Moakes, Nick			
Roberts, Steve	Oliver, Victoria			
Snowdon, Alexander	Roffey, Peter			
Taylor, Andrew	Soulsby, Heidi			
Trott, Lyndon	St Pier, Gavin			
Vermeulen, Simon				

The Bailiff: So on the motion pursuant to Rule 26(1) there voted in favour 18 Members; against 17 Members; 4 Members abstained; 1 Member was absent at the vote and therefore that is declared carried.

I will turn to the Vice-President, Deputy Helyar, to reply to the debate.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir. May I have a revote?

The Bailiff: The system should not be broken but, if you want to invoke the second vote, Deputy Brouard, then we will have a second vote.

Deputy Brouard: Yes please, sir.

3995 **The Bailiff:** I would invite the Greffier to open the voting, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 19, Contre 17, Ne vote pas 3, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

4000

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	Aldwell, Sue	Bury, Tina	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Burford, Yvonne	Brouard, Al	De Sausmarez, Lindsay		
Cameron, Andy	Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha		
De Lisle, David	Dyke, John			
Ferbrache, Peter	Fairclough, Simon			
Inder, Neil	Falla, Steve			
Leadbeater, Marc	Gabriel, Adrian			
Matthews, Aidan	Gollop, John			
McKenna, Liam	Haskins, Sam			
Meerveld, Carl	Helyar, Mark			
Murray, Bob	Le Tissier, Chris			
Parkinson, Charles	Mahoney, David			
Prow, Robert	Moakes, Nick			
Queripel, Lester	Oliver, Victoria			
Roberts, Steve	Roffey, Peter			
Snowdon, Alexander	Soulsby, Heidi			
Taylor, Andrew	St Pier, Gavin			
Trott, Lyndon				
Vermeulen, Simon				

The Bailiff: It has changed from last time. This time there voted in favour 19 Members, against 17 Members; 3 Members abstained and 1 did not vote. Therefore the guillotine motion has been successful and I would invite the Vice President to reply to the debate.

4005

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, sir, and really thank you to Members.

I have to say it has been far better spirited than I expected it to be when we compare say to what in January, February. I think, generally speaking, the debate has been really quite good-natured which is a surprise.

4010

There is an awful lot at stake here in what we are about to vote on so I urge members to really think very carefully before they press buttons, perhaps even the wrong ones, potentially.

I would like to start off with a bit of Dickens which I was going to use in the first place and then I used Victor Hugo because I had been to that presentation. It is *The Tale of Two Cities*, 'It was the best of times; it was the worst of times. It was the age of wisdom; it was the age of foolishness. It was the epoch of belief; it was the epoch of incredulity. It was the season of light and it was the season of darkness. It was the spring of hope; it was the winter of despair and we had everything before us and nothing before us. We were all going to heaven; we were all going direct the other way'.

4015

Now, sir, as part of my summing up of debate I will go through the Propositions with your permission. If I make any mistakes I am sure you will correct me as we go. Thank you very much.

4020

Various Members have said, and this is just thematic, I will go through the points some Members have made, I will not go into them in a lot of detail because I know we all want to get off and it is half-term and some people have got to travel and so on over the weekend. The basic premise, GST is not something that P&R has got any political affiliation or theocratic desire to impose on anybody. You would have to be the biggest masochist in the world to pursue this non-endingly for three years.

4025

One of the important things to come out of this debate is the fact that there is no viable alternative of which we are all agreed. It may be, in time, that some of things that we have debated,

whether it be territorial tax or amending the income tax system, will come to pass but clearly not enough has been done at this stage in order to make that decision. There has been a lot of talk, right throughout the debate, from the outset, that we will come away with nothing and that cannot be true because I think the one thing that members have missed here is that we have all acknowledged that we cannot afford everything that is on the list and that is a really important thing for all States' Members to acknowledge. We have all acknowledged, I think, to a man and a woman that we are going to have to cut our cloth if we do not raise revenues and I think that, if anything, has to be a sensible conclusion to a debate like this and I hope that the public really take heart in that because it is a sensible decision to make. If we do not want to increase taxation on the public then we really have to start cutting our cloth and that is going to be really difficult and, if anything, this is going to give P&R much more of a mandate to say no about pretty much anything that comes through the door that is asking for more cash going forward. I would rather it not be that but this is where we have got to.

Deputy Leadbeater spoke early on, asked really why P&R had not found alternative. Well, because there is not one. That is the simple answer. If there is, suggest it. It has been three years; we have had several debates.

I will give way to Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Sir, I thank Deputy Helyar for giving way.

I did not say that I was looking for P&R to come forward with alternatives. I am saying that was the public perception.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, it is a valid point, thank you, and you are right; you did say it in that way.

I am not wedded to GST. Deputy Roffey, I think, in the last debate talked about burning political capital. I think I have burned all of mine but that is my job. I was given this job. I did not ask for it. It came up and I accepted it and I have done it to the best of my ability and I absolutely have no regrets about what we have done. I think, eventually, this will turn into the right answer but I think, as members say, if it is not deliverable now then fine. We have argued the case and I hope we put it forcefully and I hope we have changed a bit of the public debate about where public finances stand and how much expectation there should be as to what services can be offered, given those restrictions.

Deputy Roffey made a powerful speech and I really again want to thank him for all his support right through this. It has been invaluable. I think, as we said at the start, we are not necessarily on the same side of the political spectrum all the time but we actually have worked together very productively and I think we came up with a potentially really viable solution. It is not for everybody at the moment. I think, eventually, there may be a turn back towards it but we shall see.

Deputy Gollop talked about Einstein. We often raise this one, do we not, about the madness of doing something and expecting a different outcome. Really, I do not think I was expecting a different outcome but I was hoping that, because we have a series of options before us, that States' Members would understand if we do not have the money we cannot spend it and that does seem to have dropped as a penny. We need to change our aspirations if we are not willing to raise revenue and it is as simple as that.

I thank Deputy Kazantseva-Miller for her eloquent speech and her support and also her support for Proposition 5. I really wanted to comment on this one in particular because there have been several comments about borrowing, how scary it is, I think the thing that has perhaps been missed is that the repayment of borrowing under effectively scenario 2, which is now Proposition 5, is already funded in the model. It is costed within the model and it refers to it at section 8.17, section 7.49 and 14.12. This is costed. It is not a borrow-and-hope-we-can-find-some-money-to-repay-it. It is based on us accepting today the core and I really hope that all members will get behind the core principles because, if we do not do that, then we are probably going to be having this debate again before much longer because we really going to be at the very bottom of the cookie jar.

Thank you again and, if there is more money to come from a levy, everybody will be happy with that and if it can be done without causing any harm to the industry which supplies most of our income then all the better.

4085 Deputy Dudley-Owen, thank you. I was reminded of JFK when Deputy Dudley-Owen, I am not sure for what particular reason, but that quote about the moon, 'We choose to go the moon in this decade and do other things, not because they are easy but because they are hard' and that is really what this debate has been about, is it not, looking to find the optimum solution but perhaps the most difficult.

4090 Deputy Le Tissier makes some very unusual comments, 'GST at any cost', I think that was in a letter that had been written to him. Really, that is just not correct. There are options here. You do not have to vote for it if you do not want it. That is the whole purpose of structuring the policy letter in the way it was. Apparently, we can save several million pounds a year by firing civil servants. Well, here is news for you, we cannot do that. We have no authority to do that. We act as employer. The only person that P&R can remove is the Chief Executive. That is it, by law. The Civil Service is self-governing, in effect, so those kind of things would have to come from committees based on what they believe their resources are and the idea that costs have gone up, yes, I know it is a trope and I know in public the view is that costs are spiralling out of control. We had another column today saying, 'P&R this and that and the other', from somebody who really just does not understand the Constitution.

4100 The main costs over the last decade are nurses and doctors. There has been almost no change in the core of established staff, almost none at all, so, if we are going to have to get rid of people in order to save money, it will be nurses and if that is what members want to do and that is what the public wants then everybody, I am sure, is quite happy to get on with it. Really? Really?

4105 We have taken action to reduce costs on vacancies, for example, as part of the budget process this year, we have introduced a vacancy factor at home which was not there before and Deputy Prow will be familiar with this because it is a different way of allocating budget for resources towards staff that have not yet been hired because that has to be allowed for in case they do get hired in the period.

4110 But there are several committees, and Deputy St Pier has referred to this several times, because I suspect as I did he saw this immediately. He looked at the accounts on joining the States as an opportunity to cut costs because it is exactly what you would do if you were a company, 'We are just not having any provision in the budget for new people. We will build it in as we go'.

4115 Deputy Le Tissier says he pays 20%. Well, if he earns over £90,000, yes he does. If he earns less than £90,000, and I do not know and I am not going to ask, but I will declare I am not on a tax gap, he does not pay 20% because he gets an allowance that cuts that amount that you are paying down on what your earnings are.

Deputy Mahoney: Point of correction.

4120 **Deputy Helyar:** There were not many other speeches.

Deputy Mahoney: Point of correction?

4125 **The Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Mahoney.

Deputy Mahoney: I apologise to Deputy Helyar for correcting him but he has to earn over about £150,00 to have the 20%. It starts kicking in at £90,000 but you need to still earn the £1 for £5, it is about £150,000 before you are paying 20%.

4130 **The Bailiff:** Stand corrected.

Deputy Mahoney: Sorry.

Deputy Helyar: No, it is absolutely right.

4135 There were not many other speeches. I think everybody's minds are made up. Deputy Meerveld clearly made a rhetoric-filled speech about Project Fear. I completely understand his position and I understand and respect everybody's positions on this thing. Everybody has made a decision based on a different reason. It is time for us to all come together and move forward in some kind of conclusion to this. I really urge Members we must approve the core because, if we do not do that, we are in a really difficult circumstance.

4140 I will be voting for the full package. I will then be voting, Deputy de Lisle, are you wishing to intervene? Yes, of course.

Deputy de Lisle: Just a comment, sir.

4145 You were mentioning the core area. You were hoping everybody would support that. The core is divided into a number of (a), (b), (c) and (d) and (a) is taxes on transport, paid parking and motor taxes. I take it that that is understood.

Deputy Helyar: Yes, absolutely.

4150 **Deputy Le Tissier:** Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Le Tissier.

4155 **Deputy Le Tissier:** I am sorry it took me a short while but I found what I said. I said, 'The average Guernsey resident pays 20% less allowances' and I certainly did not refer to whether I paid 20% or not. Thank you.

Deputy Helyar: Sir, if I misheard it and reported that then I do apologise.

4160 Deputy de Sausmarez, just before I move into the Propositions themselves and run through so we are a bit clearer before we start voting on what is what, under funded borrowing, it is built into the model, the repayments are built into the model but I do appreciate the comments that were made.

I will give way to Deputy Roffey.

4165 **Deputy Roffey:** Would Deputy Helyar agree with me that, while the £25 million under the core may be what is required to fund the borrowing under Proposition 5, that will mean that not one penny has been raised towards addressing the underlying structural deficit that P&R has been going on about for the last three years because it will all have been diverted to pay for borrowing costs.

4170 **Deputy Helyar:** Yes, potentially, and clearly some of those things that are in that are aspirational, for example, the delivery of £10 million of savings so we have struggled with that this year in terms of budget process and I suspect that will continue but we will endeavour to continue that way.

4175 Now, Members, you have all got a composite set of Propositions. I am going to walk through them for anybody that may be confused about the list. Deputy Queripel is now rising. Is this an interjection?

The Bailiff: Well, you do not ask. You have to decide whether you want to give way or not.

Deputy Queripel: It is a give way, sir. I thank Deputy Helyar for giving way.

4180 I asked a couple of questions in my general debate speech which I made on Tuesday so I do not blame him if he has forgotten those. One of them was, 'If GST is introduced we have to find, I believe, nine new staff members and income tax is in a mess now so where are those new staff members going to come from and will they be able to handle all the work involved?' If we are

needing nine new staff members should they not go and work for Income Tax to sort the mess out there? That was one question I asked.

The second question I asked was, 'Bearing in mind we are looking to raise revenue, and Deputy Meerveld is the member of this Assembly who knows more than anyone about wind farms, why was the person who knows more than anyone about wind farms removed from his post?'. Do we not need people with knowledge of such potentially money-making positions in place?

I think that was the only two questions I asked, actually, sir. I shall look forward to those responses to those two questions.

Thank you, sir.

Deputy Helyar: Deputy Brouard, I give way.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you very much and, unfortunately, because of the guillotine, I was not able to do my speech or suggestions to the Assembly. In your going through the amendments, Deputy Helyar, would you be so kind just to flesh out a little bit more on Proposition 6 and the cascade because I would have given the members the option, I think, for Deputy Inder in particular as to which bits have got borrowing in, which bits have not and where we use our savings for those who like to use savings.

Thank you.

Deputy Helyar: Yes, I would be very happy to do that, thank you.

Just to respond to Deputy Queripel's question, if GST is introduced I understand we will need nine new staff. Should they not be working somewhere else? If you are going to introduce it you need nine new staff. One of the reasons that the Revenue Service is struggling so much with dealing with income tax returns is because the IT system does not work properly and needs investment, circular argument.

Second one, windmills, I was going to stand up and interject on a point that the matter was irrelevant when you were speaking but I did not want to be rude. That was not only outside of the format of this, it was actually a completely different policy letter which is the Government Work Plan. That is where that focus is put so it is not really a question, in my view, sir, for this debate. If you wish to ask Rule 14 questions then I am sure the Committee would be very happy to answer it for you. So, sir, with your indulgence, I shall start on the Propositions.

The first one, number 1, is what has been referred to throughout the debate as 'core'. It is what the Committee is recommending we absolutely must do to take away. It is a package of cost-reduction targets and revenue-raising measures that are set out in Appendix 1. That aims to raise, not to raise, that is strictly not correct, £25 million will be raised and £10 million saved which is £35 million, hopefully, of headroom and possibly, as has been suggested, there are other opportunities for revenue-raising measures, for example, in the Registry, then of course they will be done anyway.

A really important principle for us to adopt, very important part of this, is to maintain the current level of general revenue reserve during this terms because, as I explained, if we spend our reserves we lose investment income and that is potentially creating a spiral and loss for us in terms of what is making up any major surpluses at the moment. Investing up to £95 million to complete in-flight capital schemes set out in Appendix 1 to the policy letter. Investing in the policy strategies and plans agreed as part of the Government Work Plan over the remainder of this term of government until the next election and to authorise P&R to do them.

So, ruling on from that, if that one goes through, which I really do hope it does because it should not be that contentious, it might be when paid parking comes back, we shall see, the next one is the tax package. This is the one that people refer to in terms of GST but it includes a whole raft of measures as we have discussed in the past, a reduction of income tax up to £30,000 making the poorer, poorest, in society better off by not charging them so much. That is the GST one so if you do not want GST do not vote for Proposition 2.

Then we go on to Proposition 3. That is to direct P&R to return to the States by 2026 and that is only if Proposition 1 is approved but Proposition 2 is not approved, in other words, because Proposition 1 does not put us on a stable background there will have to be report back to the States in any event in order to resolve those things and I do take into account what Deputy Trott was saying earlier in terms of the package. It would be really helpful, I think, to get new members in after the election very quickly to do a package on that.

One of the things that has caused a bit of confusion, sir, if I am honest, Proposition 3 and Proposition 4 are not conjunctive. They are disjunctive clauses so, once we have done Proposition 3, Proposition 4 becomes a stand-alone one is my interpretation.

The Bailiff: If Proposition 1 loses we go straight to Proposition 4.

Deputy Helyar: Yes, If Proposition 1 loses we go straight to Proposition 4. Proposition 4 is scenario 3. This is the full Monty. It can only really be approved if we approve Proposition 2. I hope that is clear. That is the one with the most borrowing but also the most revenue in it.

Then we go over the page to Proposition 5. This is scenario 2. This is the one that does not have any GST in it but it has all of the core propositions for fund-raising which help to cover the borrowing which would be required under that and has a different and reduced portfolio. Effectively the ones that are not in that portfolio are the waste plans and also SAP implementation.

Then we go on to what I would call Option 1(b). It is Deputy Brouard's amendment and he has asked me to go through these in detail so the proposition effectively carves out of what was the old scenario 1 it puts the Hospital back in. Then there are a whole series of options that follow that in terms of how that would be funded. So the first one would be to change some of the wording in what was the old scenario 1 from 340 to 190, but we go through a series of options.

The first one is to agree on the basis that funding available is insufficient from the amended Portfolio 1 and the amended Portfolio 1 is effectively the portfolio with the Hospital added back in to authorise P&R to implement these agreed measures and direct the States by September 2026 with proposals for addressing the deficit. So it takes out new borrowing effectively to cover that so there is borrowing in that Option 1.

In Option 2 so, if that is not approved, we then cascade to Option 2, so agree that, on the basis funding available is insufficient to fund that, new borrowing should be taken out to support the funding of Cap Ex in addition to a maximum of £46 million from the Guernsey health reserves so the first option is all borrowing, the second one is lower borrowing but with £46 million from the capital reserve and then, if we do not like that one, we jump on to Option 3 and so this will keep going and if we do not get through any of these and they are all turned down then we go on to the backstop proposition.

So that one is to use £90 million from the health reserve and new borrowing to make up the difference and then Option 4 is £90 million from the health reserve and then money from general revenue reserves. So there is a cascade that goes all the way from borrowing everything to using all of the health reserve and some of the general reserve money. Is that clear enough? Yes, okay, thank you.

So the next Propositions are Propositions 7 and 8. Really these are conjoined. They only work if Proposition 2 in connection with the full tax package is agreed and these relate to what rate of GST would be imposed and whether it applied or not to food or not to food.

Then boiler plate Proposition 9 that adds the power to create the legislation that is necessary to bring those things into effect if Propositions 2, 7 or 8 are approved.

Then we go to the backstop which is reinserted by P&R which is to reinsert scenario 1 but this is scenario 1 without any hospital option in it. This is what I would call the tread-water option is to do the minimum amount, spend the minimum amount, protect general reserves as much as possible.

Then we go on to Deputy Taylor's amendment which is Amendment 9B which interposes those requirements which were approved this afternoon and then we go on to Deputies Roffey and de

Sausmarez's amendment which is interposed as Amendment 9C and this an 'and' so we do Amendment 9B so all of these we do one after the other from now on.

4290 Then Deputy Kazantseva-Miller's amendment with Deputy de Sausmarez really goes pretty much down to the end and then there is a last one, a sweep-up boiler plate one for the preparation of legislation.

4295 So, P&R will be voting for the tax package because that is what we have advocated and that is what we should vote for and we will be voting for Option 3. After that I suspect we will be cascading our votes as we go to make sure we come away with something because it is an important thing for us to do. I suspect, Members, we have not, to be fair, had a huge opportunity to discuss the options that come under the hospital model but I am sure those members will make a decision according to their conscience.

4300 I just say again, thank you, Members, very important decisions now to make. Thank you for your time. We are coming up to six o'clock. Let us start the voting. Thank you very much.

The Bailiff: Is there any request that there be a pause before the voting starts?

4305 **Deputy Inder:** Sir, I am going to make a suggestion because the two principle beneficiaries of this are going to be Health and they are going to be Education and I genuinely think we should possibly have a ten minute recess so both Deputy Brouard and Deputy Dudley-Owen can ensure that we understand what gets us to what point. Well, Deputy de Sausmarez can shake her head all she wants but this is quite a critical vote.

4310 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Inder, if you are simply asking me to put to Members, for it will be for Members to decide whether they agree or not, that there be a break until ten past six, shall we say, now before we start going through the votes. Those in favour, those against.

Members voted Contre.

4315

The Bailiff: I declare that lost. Right, what we are going to do – Deputy Helyar.

4320 **Deputy Helyar:** Sir, I do apologise. I just wish to apologise for Deputy Le Tocq not being present. He was taken ill at lunchtime and is at home unwell so he will not be here for the vote.

4325 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, the first Proposition on which quite a lot then turns, is Proposition 1. There will be a vote on Proposition 1 alone. I am just hoping that people have fired up their devices in readiness and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 1 only.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 35, Contre 4, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	De Lisle, David	None	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Blin, Chris	Le Tissier, Chris			
Brouard, Al	Soulsby, Heidi			
Burford, Yvonne	St Pier, Gavin			
Bury, Tina				
Cameron, Andy				
De Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Haskins, Sam				
Helyar, Mark				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Mahoney, David				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				
Oliver, Victoria				
Parkinson, Charles				
Prow, Robert				
Queripel, Lester				
Roberts, Steve				
Roffey, Peter				
Snowdon, Alexander				
Taylor, Andrew				
Trott, Lyndon				
Vermeulen, Simon				

4330

The Bailiff: So the voting on Proposition 1 was there voted in favour 35 Members against 4 Members. There is one Member each time on the votes each time who will not be participating as we have heard from Deputy Le Tocq so I will declare Proposition 1 duly carried which means we go to Proposition 2, taken in isolation. This is the tax package. Now that that should be on your screens I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 2 please.

4335

There was a recorded vote

Not carried – Pour 15, Contre 24, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	Blin, Chris	None	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Brouard, Al	Burford, Yvonne			
Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Bury, Tina			
Ferbrache, Peter	Cameron, Andy			
Gollop, John	De Lisle, David			
Haskins, Sam	De Sausmarez, Lindsay			
Helyar, Mark	Dyke, John			
Inder, Neil	Fairclough, Simon			
Mahoney, David	Falla, Steve			
Moakes, Nick	Gabriel, Adrian			
Murray, Bob	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha			
Prow, Robert	Le Tissier, Chris			
Roberts, Steve	Leadbeater, Marc			
Roffey, Peter	Matthews, Aidan			
Snowdon, Alexander	McKenna, Liam			
	Meerveld, Carl			
	Oliver, Victoria			
	Parkinson, Charles			
	Queripel, Lester			
	Soulsby, Heidi			
	St Pier, Gavin			
	Taylor, Andrew			
	Trott, Lyndon			
	Vermeulen, Simon			

4340 **The Bailiff:** So the voting on Proposition 2 was that there voted in favour 15 Members, against 24 Members and there is the 1 Member not participating so I will declare Proposition 2 lost which means that the alternative of Proposition 3 now needs to be voted upon in isolation.

I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 3 please. There will be a vote on Proposition 4 come what may next but we have got to do Proposition 3 first because Proposition 2
4345 lost.

There was a recorded vote

Carried – Pour 37, Contre 2, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	Gabriel, Adrian	None	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Blin, Chris	Soulsby, Heidi			
Brouard, Al				
Burford, Yvonne				
Bury, Tina				
Cameron, Andy				
De Lisle, David				
De Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gollop, John				
Haskins, Sam				
Helyar, Mark				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Mahoney, David				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				
Oliver, Victoria				
Parkinson, Charles				
Prow, Robert				
Queripel, Lester				
Roberts, Steve				
Roffey, Peter				
Snowdon, Alexander				
St Pier, Gavin				
Taylor, Andrew				
Trott, Lyndon				
Vermeulen, Simon				

4350 **The Bailiff:** In relation to Proposition 3 there voted in favour 37 Members, against 2 Members, so I will declare Proposition 3 duly carried.

The next vote is on Proposition 4, otherwise turn to scenario 3, which we will take in isolation because the vote on Proposition 4 depends on whether we move on. So, Members, it should have
4355 appeared on your screen already and I will ask the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 4 please.

There was a recorded vote

Not carried – Pour 2, Contre 37, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

4360

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Brouard, Al	Aldwell, Sue	None	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Gollop, John	Blin, Chris			
	Burford, Yvonne			
	Bury, Tina			
	Cameron, Andy			
	De Lisle, David			
	De Sausmarez, Lindsay			
	Dudley-Owen, Andrea			
	Dyke, John			
	Fairclough, Simon			
	Falla, Steve			
	Ferbrache, Peter			
	Gabriel, Adrian			
	Haskins, Sam			
	Helyar, Mark			
	Inder, Neil			
	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha			
	Le Tissier, Chris			
	Leadbeater, Marc			
	Mahoney, David			
	Matthews, Aidan			
	McKenna, Liam			
	Meerveld, Carl			
	Moakes, Nick			
	Murray, Bob			
	Oliver, Victoria			
	Parkinson, Charles			
	Prow, Robert			
	Queripel, Lester			
	Roberts, Steve			
	Roffey, Peter			
	Snowdon, Alexander			
	Soulsby, Heidi			
	St Pier, Gavin			
	Taylor, Andrew			
	Trott, Lyndon			
	Vermeulen, Simon			

The Bailiff: Now the voting on Proposition 4 is that there voted in favour 2 Members; there voted against 37 Members and therefore I will declare Proposition 4 lost which means that we move on to a vote on Proposition 5 as the next alternative. This is scenario 2. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 5.

4365

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 17, Contre 22, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	Blin, Chris	None	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Brouard, Al	Burford, Yvonne			
Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Bury, Tina			
Dyke, John	Cameron, Andy			
Ferbrache, Peter	De Lisle, David			
Gollop, John	De Sausmarez, Lindsay			
Haskins, Sam	Fairclough, Simon			
Helyar, Mark	Falla, Steve			
Inder, Neil	Gabriel, Adrian			
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha	Le Tissier, Chris			
Mahoney, David	Leadbeater, Marc			

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Moakes, Nick	Matthews, Aidan			
Murray, Bob	McKenna, Liam			
Prow, Robert	Meerveld, Carl			
Roberts, Steve	Oliver, Victoria			
Snowdon, Alexander	Parkinson, Charles			
Vermeulen, Simon	Queripel, Lester			
	Roffey, Peter			
	Soulsby, Heidi			
	St Pier, Gavin			
	Taylor, Andrew			
	Trott, Lyndon			

4370 **The Bailiff:** In respect of Proposition 5 there voted in favour 17 Members; there voted against 22 Members and therefore I will declare Proposition 5 also lost. Which means we move on to a vote on Proposition 6 but omitting the four options at the moment so it will simply be whether or not you are minded to approve Proposition 6(a) and 6(b) and if Proposition 6 is then approved we will move into the four options to see which ones of those are carried.

4375 Members of the States, what you have got on your screen at the moment is the full Proposition 6 including the four options but I am going to ask you to vote first simply on Proposition 6(a) and Proposition 6(b) and then we will get votes on the options which hopefully we can extract if Proposition 6 were to carry. We will not need to consider the options if Proposition 6 is not approved. So as long as you understand that you are not voting on any of the options at the moment, the options come as phase 2 of this.

4380 **18.08.40:** Sir, just to make it clear that we need Option 6 to get through in order to then vote on the options.

4385 **The Bailiff:** That is right, so if you support Proposition 6 and want to then decide how it is going to be paid for, then you vote *Pour* at this stage and then we will get to the options thereafter. If you vote *Contre* and the majority vote *Contre* then we simply skip the options.

So I hope that is sufficiently clear to Members that, although you have got everything on the screen, you are not actually voting for any of the four options. They come as a second phase and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 6.

4390 *There was a recorded vote.*

Carried – Pour 23, Contre 16, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	Aldwell, Sue	None	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Brouard, Al	De Lisle, David			
Burford, Yvonne	Dudley-Owen, Andrea			
Bury, Tina	Dyke, John			
Cameron, Andy	Ferbrache, Peter			
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	Haskins, Sam			
Fairclough, Simon	Helyar, Mark			
Falla, Steve	Le Tissier, Chris			
Gabriel, Adrian	Mahoney, David			
Gollop, John	Murray, Bob			
Inder, Neil	Oliver, Victoria			
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha	Queripel, Lester			
Leadbeater, Marc	Soulsby, Heidi			
Matthews, Aidan	St Pier, Gavin			
McKenna, Liam	Taylor, Andrew			
Meerveld, Carl	Vermeulen, Simon			
Moakes, Nick				
Parkinson, Charles				

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Prow, Robert				
Roberts, Steve				
Roffey, Peter				
Snowdon, Alexander				
Trott, Lyndon				

4395 **The Bailiff:** Now on Proposition 6 there voted in favour 23 Members, against 16 Members, the one Member is not participating each time so that Proposition has now been carried which means that you have to vote on the cascade of options if we can get those up. We will take Option 1 first which, as Deputy Helyar explained, is about borrowing for the difference in value. So I am going to invite the Greffier to open the voting on Option 1 which should be on your screens.

4400 *There was a recorded vote.*

Not carried – Pour 6, Contre 33, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Brouard, Al	Aldwell, Sue	None	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Bury, Tina	Blin, Chris			
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha	Burford, Yvonne			
Matthews, Aidan	Cameron, Andy			
Moakes, Nick	De Lisle, David			
Roberts, Steve	De Sausmarez, Lindsay			
	Dudley-Owen, Andrea			
	Dyke, John			
	Fairclough, Simon			
	Falla, Steve			
	Ferbrache, Peter			
	Gabriel, Adrian			
	Gollop, John			
	Haskins, Sam			
	Helyar, Mark			
	Inder, Neil			
	Le Tissier, Chris			
	Leadbeater, Marc			
	Mahoney, David			
	McKenna, Liam			
	Meerveld, Carl			
	Murray, Bob			
	Oliver, Victoria			
	Parkinson, Charles			
	Prow, Robert			
	Queripel, Lester			
	Roffey, Peter			
	Snowdon, Alexander			
	Soulsby, Heidi			
	St Pier, Gavin			
	Taylor, Andrew			
	Trott, Lyndon			
	Vermeulen, Simon			

4405 **The Bailiff:** In respect of Option 1 there voted in favour 6 Members, against 33 Members and therefore I will declare Option 1 lost which means we move on to a vote now on Option 2 which is a mix of taking from the Guernsey Health Reserve and taking out borrowing. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Option 2.

There was a recorded vote.

4410 *Not carried – Pour 15, Contre 24, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 0*

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	Aldwell, Sue	None	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Brouard, Al	Burford, Yvonne			
Bury, Tina	De Lisle, David			
Cameron, Andy	Dudley-Owen, Andrea			
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	Dyke, John			
Gollop, John	Fairclough, Simon			
Inder, Neil	Falla, Steve			
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha	Ferbrache, Peter			
Leadbeater, Marc	Gabriel, Adrian			
Matthews, Aidan	Haskins, Sam			
Meerveld, Carl	Helyar, Mark			
Prow, Robert	Le Tissier, Chris			
Roberts, Steve	Mahoney, David			
Roffey, Peter	McKenna, Liam			
Snowdon, Alexander	Moakes, Nick			
	Murray, Bob			
	Oliver, Victoria			
	Parkinson, Charles			
	Queripel, Lester			
	Soulsby, Heidi			
	St Pier, Gavin			
	Taylor, Andrew			
	Trott, Lyndon			
	Vermeulen, Simon			

4415 **The Bailiff:** So the voting on Option 2 is that there voted in favour 15 Members, against 24 Members, the one Member is not participating so I will declare Option 2 also lost which means we move now to a vote on Option 3. Option 3 is taking a maximum of £90 million from the Guernsey Health Reserve and possibly some borrowing, probably some borrowing. If everyone is ready I will ask the Greffier to open the voting on Option 3 please.

There was a recorded vote.

4420 *Carried – Pour 21, Contre 18, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 0*

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Brouard, Al	Aldwell, Sue	None	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Bury, Tina	Blin, Chris			
Cameron, Andy	Burford, Yvonne			
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	De Lisle, David			
Fairclough, Simon	Dudley-Owen, Andrea			
Gabriel, Adrian	Dyke, John			
Gollop, John	Falla, Steve			
Inder, Neil	Ferbrache, Peter			
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha	Haskins, Sam			
Leadbeater, Marc	Helyar, Mark			
Matthews, Aidan	Le Tissier, Chris			
McKenna, Liam	Mahoney, David			
Meerveld, Carl	Murray, Bob			
Moakes, Nick	Oliver, Victoria			
Parkinson, Charles	Queripel, Lester			
Prow, Robert	St Pier, Gavin			
Roberts, Steve	Taylor, Andrew			
Roffey, Peter	Vermeulen, Simon			
Snowdon, Alexander				
Soulsby, Heidi				
Trott, Lyndon				

The Bailiff: The voting on Option 3 was that there were 21 Members in favour; 18 Members voted *Contre* and therefore I will declare Option 3 the winner which means that it is Proposition 6 incorporating Option 3 and there is no need to vote on Option 4. Because of the vote on Proposition 2 there is no vote on Proposition 7, 8 or 9. Because of the vote on P6 there is no vote on Proposition 9A but there is a vote on Proposition 9B next because of the success of Proposition 6. 9B. And I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 9B.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 20, Contre 15, Ne vote pas 3, Did not vote 2, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Burford, Yvonne	Aldwell, Sue	Falla, Steve	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Bury, Tina	Blin, Chris	Roberts, Steve	Roffey, Peter	
Cameron, Andy	Brouard, Al	Snowdon, Alexander		
De Lisle, David	Dudley-Owen, Andrea			
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	Dyke, John			
Fairclough, Simon	Ferbrache, Peter			
Gabriel, Adrian	Haskins, Sam			
Gollop, John	Helyar, Mark			
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha	Inder, Neil			
Le Tissier, Chris	Mahoney, David			
Leadbeater, Marc	Moakes, Nick			
Matthews, Aidan	Murray, Bob			
McKenna, Liam	Oliver, Victoria			
Meerveld, Carl	Prow, Robert			
Parkinson, Charles	Vermeulen, Simon			
Queripel, Lester				
Soulsby, Heidi				
St Pier, Gavin				
Taylor, Andrew				
Trott, Lyndon				

The Bailiff: On Proposition 9B there voted in favour 20 Members; 15 Members voted against; 3 Members abstained and on this occasion 2 Members did not participate in the vote but I will declare Proposition 9B duly carried. For the remaining Propositions we will take each one in turn rather than trying to bolt them together so Proposition 9C next, on its own please. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 9C.

There was a recorded vote

Carried – Pour 27, Contre 9, Ne vote pas 3, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	De Lisle, David	Oliver, Victoria	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Blin, Chris	Dyke, John	Roberts, Steve		
Brouard, Al	Haskins, Sam	Snowdon, Alexander		
Burford, Yvonne	Le Tissier, Chris			
Bury, Tina	Mahoney, David			
Cameron, Andy	McKenna, Liam			
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	St Pier, Gavin			
Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Taylor, Andrew			
Fairclough, Simon	Vermeulen, Simon			
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Helyar, Mark				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Leadbeater, Marc				
Matthews, Aidan				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				
Parkinson, Charles				
Prow, Robert				
Queripel, Lester				
Roffey, Peter				
Soulsby, Heidi				
Trott, Lyndon				

4440

The Bailiff: So the voting on Proposition 9C was that there voted in favour 27 Members, against 9 Members; 3 Members abstained and on this occasion 1 Member is not participating still and I will declare Proposition 9C duly carried. Proposition 9D on its own next please. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 9D.

4445

There was a recorded vote

Carried – Pour 29, Contre 7, Ne vote pas 3, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Burford, Yvonne	Aldwell, Sue	Roberts, Steve	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Bury, Tina	Blin, Chris	Roffey, Peter		
Cameron, Andy	Brouard, Al	Snowdon, Alexander		
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	De Lisle, David			
Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Haskins, Sam			
Dyke, John	Mahoney, David			
Fairclough, Simon	Oliver, Victoria			
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Helyar, Mark				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				
Parkinson, Charles				
Prow, Robert				
Queripel, Lester				
Soulsby, Heidi				
St Pier, Gavin				
Taylor, Andrew				
Trott, Lyndon				
Vermeulen, Simon				

4450

The Bailiff: So the voting on Proposition 9D is that there were 29 Members in favour; 7 Members against; 3 Members abstained and I will therefore declare Proposition 9D duly carried. We move on to Proposition 9E and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 9E.

Carried – Pour 31, Contre 7, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Bury, Tina	Aldwell, Sue	Blin, Chris	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Cameron, Andy	Brouard, Al			
De Lisle, David	Burford, Yvonne			
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	Haskins, Sam			
Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Mahoney, David			
Dyke, John	Roffey, Peter			
Fairclough, Simon	Taylor, Andrew			
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Helyar, Mark				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				
Oliver, Victoria				
Parkinson, Charles				
Prow, Robert				
Queripel, Lester				
Roberts, Steve				
Snowdon, Alexander				
Soulsby, Heidi				
St Pier, Gavin				
Trott, Lyndon				
Vermeulen, Simon				

4455

The Bailiff: The voting on that Proposition is as follows. There voted in favour 31 Members, against 7 Members; 1 Member abstained and therefore I will declare Proposition 9E also duly carried. Now Proposition 9F on its own and I will ask the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 9F.

4460

There was a recorded vote

Carried – Pour 31, Contre 7, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Burford, Yvonne	Aldwell, Sue	Blin, Chris	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Bury, Tina	Brouard, Al			
Cameron, Andy	De Lisle, David			
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	Haskins, Sam			
Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Mahoney, David			
Dyke, John	Oliver, Victoria			
Fairclough, Simon	Roffey, Peter			
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Helyar, Mark				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Parkinson, Charles				
Prow, Robert				
Queripel, Lester				
Roberts, Steve				
Snowdon, Alexander				
Soulsby, Heidi				
St Pier, Gavin				
Taylor, Andrew				
Trott, Lyndon				
Vermeulen, Simon				

4465 **The Bailiff:** The voting was remarkably similar to last time. There voted in favour 31 Members; 7 Members voted against; 1 Member abstained, still the Member not participating so I will declare Proposition 9F also duly carried. Now Proposition 9G and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 9G.

There was a recorded vote

Carried – Pour 30, Contre 8, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

4470

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Bury, Tina	Aldwell, Sue	Blin, Chris	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Cameron, Andy	Brouard, Al			
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	Burford, Yvonne			
Dudley-Owen, Andrea	De Lisle, David			
Dyke, John	Haskins, Sam			
Fairclough, Simon	Mahoney, David			
Falla, Steve	Oliver, Victoria			
Ferbrache, Peter	Roffey, Peter			
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Helyar, Mark				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				
Parkinson, Charles				
Prow, Robert				
Queripel, Lester				
Roberts, Steve				
Snowdon, Alexander				
Soulsby, Heidi				
St Pier, Gavin				
Taylor, Andrew				
Trott, Lyndon				
Vermeulen, Simon				

4475 **The Bailiff:** The voting on Proposition 9G was that 30 Members voted in favour; 8 Members voted against; 1 Member abstained; 1 Member did not participate so I will declare Proposition 9G also duly carried and now Proposition 9H. This is the last of those inserted by amendments. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 9H.

There was a recorded vote

Carried – Pour 31, Contre 8, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	Aldwell, Sue	None	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Burford, Yvonne	Brouard, Al			
Bury, Tina	Haskins, Sam			
Cameron, Andy	Helyar, Mark			
De Lisle, David	Mahoney, David			
De Sausmarez, Lindsay	Roberts, Steve			
Dudley-Owen, Andrea	Roffey, Peter			
Dyke, John	Snowdon, Alexander			
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				
Oliver, Victoria				
Parkinson, Charles				
Prow, Robert				
Queripel, Lester				
Soulsby, Heidi				
St Pier, Gavin				
Taylor, Andrew				
Trott, Lyndon				
Vermeulen, Simon				

4480 **The Bailiff:** There voted in favour 31 Members, against 8 Members. No Member abstained so I will declare Proposition 9H also duly carried. Now, out of an abundance of caution, although I am not sure it is going to be needed, we have a vote on Proposition 10 which is directing the preparation of legislation. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 10.

There was a recorded vote

4485 *Carried – Pour 39, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 0*

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	None	None	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Blin, Chris				
Brouard, Al				
Burford, Yvonne				
Bury, Tina				
Cameron, Andy				
De Lisle, David				
De Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Haskins, Sam				
Helyar, Mark				

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Mahoney, David				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				
Oliver, Victoria				
Parkinson, Charles				
Prow, Robert				
Queripel, Lester				
Roberts, Steve				
Roffey, Peter				
Snowdon, Alexander				
Soulsby, Heidi				
St Pier, Gavin				
Taylor, Andrew				
Trott, Lyndon				
Vermeulen, Simon				

The Bailiff: There voted in favour 39 Members; no Member voted against; no Member abstained but Deputy Le Tocq has been missing from the votes and therefore I will declare Proposition 10, if needed, as carried.

4490

7. Schedule for future States' business – Proposition carried

Article 7

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the attached Schedule for Future States' Business, which sets out items for consideration at the Ordinary States Meeting on 22nd November 2023, they are of the opinion to approve the Schedule.

The Bailiff: Now, Members of the States, it 18.25. The suggestion is that the business that we did not reach at this meeting simply be deferred till the meeting on 22nd November when we will pick up these matters.

We will simply ask the Greffier, on that basis, to read the final item of business that we have to do at this Meeting which is the Schedule.

4495

The States' Greffier: Article 7, Policy & Resources Committee – Schedule for future States' business.

4500

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: I am very pleased to say nothing.

The Bailiff: There have been no amendments to the schedule. It is going to be a more extensive Meeting at the end of November because of the unfinished business from the meeting but I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on the schedule.

4505

There was a recorded vote

Carried – Pour 38, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 1, Absent 0

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Aldwell, Sue	None	Gollop, John	Le Tocq, Jonathan	None
Blin, Chris				
Brouard, Al				
Burford, Yvonne				
Bury, Tina				
Cameron, Andy				
De Lisle, David				
De Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Haskins, Sam				
Helyar, Mark				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Mahoney, David				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				
Oliver, Victoria				
Parkinson, Charles				
Prow, Robert				
Queripel, Lester				
Roberts, Steve				
Roffey, Peter				
Snowdon, Alexander				
Soulsby, Heidi				
St Pier, Gavin				
Taylor, Andrew				
Trott, Lyndon				
Vermeulen, Simon				

4510

The Bailiff: The voting was 38 Members in favour; no Member voted against but 1 Member did abstain and Deputy Le Tocq was not here to vote so I will declare the Schedule duly carried. Can I simply say thank you to all Members for the four days of debate. At least you have got some outcomes on the Funding & Investment Plan which may or may not assist in preparing for the Budget debate which we will see you again on 7th November.

4515

Deputy Ferbrache: Can I say, on behalf of all States' Members I am sure, thank you very much for your skill in which you have taken us through the last four days (**Members:** Hear, hear.) and also to the very hard work of the States' Greffier. (*Applause*)

4520

The Bailiff: Thank you all very much. I would invite the Greffier to complete the final task of this Meeting which is to read the grace.

The States adjourned at 6.29 p.m.