



**OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF THE**

**STATES OF DELIBERATION**

**OF THE**

**ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

**HANSARD**

**Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 1st February 2013**

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

**Volume 2, No. 3**

**ISSN 2049-8284**

*Published by Her Majesty's Greffier, The Royal Court House,  
St Peter Port, GY1 2PB. © States of Guernsey, 2013*

**Present:**

**Richard J. Collas, Esq., Bailiff and Presiding Officer**

**Law Officers**

H.E. Roberts Esq., Q.C. (H.M. Procureur)

**People's Deputies**

**St. Peter Port South**

Deputies P. A. Harwood, J. Kuttelwascher, B. L. Brehaut,  
R. Domaille, A. H. Langlois, R. A. Jones

**St. Peter Port North**

Deputies M. K. Le Clerc, P. A. Sherbourne,  
R. Conder, M. J. Storey, E. G. Bebb, L. C. Queripel

**St. Sampson**

Deputies G. A. St Pier, K. A. Stewart, P. L. Gillson,  
P. R. Le Pelley, L. S. Trott

**The Vale**

Deputies M. J. Fallaize, D. B. Jones, L. B. Queripel,  
M. M. Lowe, A. R. Le Lièvre, A. Spruce, G. M. Collins

**The Castel**

Deputies D. J. Duquemin, C. J. Green, M. H. Dorey,  
B. J. E. Paint, J. P. Le Tocq, S. A. James, M.B.E., A. H. Adam

**The West**

Deputies R. A. Perrot, A. M. Wilkie,  
D. de G. De Lisle, Y. Burford, D. A. Inglis

**The South-East**

Deputies H. J. R. Soulsby, R. W. Sillars, P. A. Luxon,  
M. G. O'Hara, F. W. Quin, M. P. J. Hadley

**Representatives of the Island of Alderney**

Alderney Representatives L. E. Jean, E. P. Arditti

**The Clerk to the States of Deliberation**

S. M. D. Ross, Esq. (H.M. Deputy Greffier) (a.m.)  
D. J. Robilliard, Esq. (H.M. Deputy Greffier) (p.m.)

**Absent at the Evocation**

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller)  
Deputy J. A. B. Gollop (*relevé à 09h.43*)  
Deputy S. J. Ogier (*relevé à 14h.39*)  
Deputy A. H. Brouard (*relevé à 09h.43*)

**Business transacted**

Fraud against the States – Statement by the Minister for the Home Department .....	155
Billet d’État I	
IX. 2020 Vision: Progress Report and Next Steps – Debate commenced .....	155

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.33 p.m.  
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

Billet d’État I	
IX. 2020 Vision: Progress Report and Next Steps – Debate concluded: Report approved .....	186
XI. Limited Liability Partnerships – Supplementary States Report Article withdrawn .	197
XIII. Speed Limits for Emergency Services Vehicles – Article withdrawn.....	197
Appendix 2. Guernsey Electricity Limited – Report for the year ended 31st March 2012, noted .....	210
Appendix 3. Guernsey Post Limited – Report for the year ended 31st March 2012, noted .....	213

*The Assembly adjourned at 5.09 p.m.*

*PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK*

## States of Deliberation

*The States met at 9.30 a.m.*

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

### PRAYERS

*The Deputy Greffier*

### EVOCATION

#### **Fraud against the States Statement by the Minister for the Home Department**

**The Bailiff:** Members of the States, before we start the business of the morning, the Minister for the Home Department will make a Statement under Rule 8.

Deputy Le Tocq.

5 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

Sir, with regard to the criminal investigation being carried out by Guernsey Police, along with law enforcement colleagues from other jurisdictions, Deputy Gillson is correct that I agreed to participate in providing updates to this Assembly along with the T & R Minister and the PAC Chair. However, I agreed to do this only after advice if (a) there was something substantial to share and (b) it was in the public interest to do so without jeopardising the criminal investigation.

10 I can assure the Assembly that the investigation is ongoing and there is nothing further to report at this stage, which was the reason why I previously decided not to waste States time by making a Statement this month.

15 **The Bailiff:** Thank you very much.  
Are there any questions arising from that Statement?  
No? In that case, Greffier, we will proceed.

## Billet d'État I

### POLICY COUNCIL

#### **2020 Vision: Progress Report and Next Steps Debate commenced**

*Article IX:*

*The States are asked to decide –*

*Whether, after consideration of the Report dated 26th November, 2012, of the Policy Council, they are of the opinion:*

*1. To agree that, in developing and implementing all strategic proposals, due account is taken*

*of the impact on, and interdependencies with other States Departments and the wider community.*

*2. To reconfirm the original resolutions of the States of Deliberation with regard to the 'Future 2020 Vision of the health and social services system', which were:*

*(i) To direct the HSSD to pursue the plans outlined in that Report to ensure the future health and social care needs of the population of Guernsey and Alderney are met with a financially sustainable model;*

*(ii) To direct all States Departments to contribute, where relevant, to each area of the plan which makes up this framework and for the Health and Social Services Department to establish a suitable governance framework with which States Departments can engage;*

*(iii) To direct the Health and Social Services Department to consult the public, professionals and other interested parties on the main objectives and the key elements of the framework (noting that each element will also have its own engagement and consultation plan, due to the size and complexity of the whole system).*

**The Deputy Greffier:** Billet d'État I, Article IX, Policy Council 2020 Vision: Progress Report and Next Steps.

20

**The Bailiff:** The Chief Minister will open the debate.

**The Chief Minister (Deputy Harwood):** Mr Bailiff, fellow States Members, in May 2011 the Health and Social Services Department presented the States with the document entitled 'The Future 2020 Vision of the Health and Social Services System'. At that time it set out a framework for development of health and social care in Guernsey and Alderney. The Department sought contributions from all relevant States Departments for each area of the plan making up that framework. The Health and Social Services Department also promised to report back on the progress and next steps. This Progress Report has now been produced by the Health and Social Services Department and it is contained in this January Billet as an appendix for a short Report from Policy Council.

25

30

35

40

Policy Council's intention in introducing this Report is to emphasise that this is a matter for *all* States Departments to engage with and, indeed, also with which to enable the wider community to engage. The 2020 Vision confronts very wide challenges. These include dealing with the consequences of an ageing population; moving to preventative measures to mitigate the rising cost of providing public services; meeting the needs of Islanders in a sustainable manner in relation to funding the Island's workforce and our environment; and working better with other organisations, both within and between States Departments and also with businesses and with the third sector. These issues are not the sole reserve of the Health and Social Services Department. The same issues are being faced by many other Departments of the States of Guernsey and this is why we need the whole of the States to co-operate in tackling them.

45

50

The Policy Council is, therefore, keen to support this major social policy initiative, providing an important cross-departmental framework. Health and wellbeing are influenced by many different factors. States Departments and the wider community all need to work together to promote healthy lifestyles, improve outcomes and ensure that vulnerable people are well protected. Factors such as poor housing, poor educational attainment, poor employment opportunities and disjointed welfare systems are seen, both globally and locally, as some of the reasons and as some of the contributing factors that cause people to require long term health or social care interventions. These factors, together with the generic pressures that the health and social care system is facing, including an ageing population, mean that it is vital for the whole of the States to move forward with this framework.

55

60

Many of you will have read or attended presentations by given by the Medical Officer of Health on his independent 113th Annual Report for 2011-12, which focused on health equity. Page 6 of the Report from the Health and Social Services Department in this Billet also recognises the impact of health inequalities by reference to differences in overall health status or in the distribution of wider determinants of health and wellbeing. These include factors that we, as individuals, have control over, such as our lifestyles and activities. There are other factors the States may have some control over, such as the built and natural environment, local economy and community. There are, however, many other determinants of health and wellbeing that are outside our control or the control of the States: by way of example, our genes, our age, our sex, the global economy or the global ecosystem.

Factors that are determinant of health and wellbeing also impact on the criminal justice system,

65 on social housing, the welfare system, education, economic activity, as well as people's daily lives. It is, therefore, important for Policy Council to ensure that the strategies and policies touching on these areas are complementary and co-ordinated. We need to be able to identify and recognise the interdependencies and differences and to be able to create synergy and resolve conflicts. The 2020 Vision has been seen as a new approach the development of coherent strategy that recognises its interdependencies.

70 This Report provides a context for a series of major changes that the States will need to consider making from this year onwards. These will concern the structure of healthcare services and of social care services, health improvement and protective programmes, regulation of care providers and professionals and the way that major decisions about developments and disinvestments are prioritised. Many changes have already begun and significant progress has already been made. I apologise if Members find the Report too woolly or too full of 'motherhood and apple pie', but that is the nature of a Report, the purpose of which is to provide an overview of policy development, a direction of travel. It is a Progress Report. The detail will be in the individual Policy Reports that emanate from this 2020 Vision.

80 The Policy Council is clear and content that the 2020 Vision is aligned with the current direction of the States Strategic Plan and, following discussions with many of you on the new States Strategic Plan, which is due to be debated in March of this year, I believe that the 2020 Vision framework will still be complementary to that Plan. What you are being asked to help to achieve with the 2020 Vision framework is to enable people to live and lead healthy and independent lives. To do this, you are being asked to support the principles of promoting good health and wellbeing across the community, of improving outcomes for people who use health and social care services, and protecting people through high quality well-regulated services. I want to emphasise the important contribution the Policy Council attaches to this work and the corporate approach that is needed. I believe the 2020 Vision will make a major contribution towards achieving the strategic social policy aims of the States.

90 The Policy Council is proposing that, in developing and implementing all strategic proposals, of which the 2020 Vision is one, due account is taken of the impact on, and the interdependencies with, other States Departments and the wider community. This is the way the States *should* be working in and across all Departments and Committees, but it is particularly important in the context of development of social policy. The complex inter-relationships between Departments, business, the third sector, and individuals means that there is a need to work collaboratively to obtain the optimum outcome to meet the needs of the community. In addition, the Policy Council is asking this States to reconfirm the original resolutions that were passed in May 2011. This gives new Members an opportunity to develop a clearer understanding of, and commitment to, the 2020 Vision framework. It also provides an update of the work for Members who took part in the original debate.

100 Sir, in presenting this Report, I would ask Members please to remember, however, that this Report is a blueprint for the future, and I would hope that the debate today will focus on the future and not be used as a *post mortem* of the present or recent issues. The Policy Council's social policy group has worked with the Health and Social Services Department and other Departments to support Health and Social Services Department's initial work. I have, therefore, asked the Minister of the Health and Social Services Department, who is also a Member of the social policy group, to make the closing remarks on the main debate, as well as the penultimate comments in response to any amendment or sursis. This will enable him to answer any more detailed questions that may arise during the debate and, sir, you have kindly agreed to this arrangement.

110 Once you have heard and considered Deputy Dorey's closing remarks, I urge you all to support the Policy Council's proposals contained in this Billet.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputies Gollop and Brouard, do you wish to be relevé?

115 **Deputy Gollop:** Yes, please, sir.

**Deputy Brouard:** Yes, sir.

120 **The Bailiff:** Thank you.  
I have notice of one amendment proposed by Deputy Fallaize, seconded by Deputy Le Lièvre. Deputy Fallaize.

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

125 The amendment which Members have in front of them has a small typo at the start of new Proposition 4 – I forgot to insert the words ‘To direct that’ – but, moreover, also I spoke yesterday with the Minister of HSSD and the Chief Minister and asked them whether, in the event that the States was minded to approve this amendment, the direction should be to HSSD or to the Policy Council to report back because, when I drafted the amendment originally, I was unsure because the Policy Council has this covering Report but the substance of it was from HSSD.

130 I have, therefore, drafted an updated version that corrects the typo and contains only the first New Propositions 3 and 4 of the amendment, so I wonder, sir, if I might ask –

**The Bailiff:** Yes.

135 **Deputy Fallaize:** – your permission to circulate it now?

**The Bailiff:** Yes, if that could be circulated. So this is the amendment you are actually laying, the one that is about to be circulated

140 **Deputy Fallaize:** Unfortunately, sir, it is titled ‘Revised version 3’, but yes. Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Let us just pause a moment, then, while that is handed around. Thank you.

145 *There was a short pause while the amendment was circulated.*

**The Bailiff:** Does the Greffier have a signed version, Deputy Fallaize?

150 **Deputy Fallaize:** Yes, sir.

**The Bailiff:** He does. Thank you. That has now been circulated.

155 I wonder, Deputy Fallaize, for the benefit of anybody who is listening at home, I wonder whether you want to just read the amendment, so that anybody listening knows what it is that is about to be debated.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you for allowing that to be circulated, sir. The amendment reads:

160 *To add new Propositions 3 and 4 as follows:*  
*‘3. To direct that by no later than December, 2014, and after consultation with other States Departments and other bodies as necessary, the Health and Social Services Department shall lay before the States of Deliberation a States Report or States Reports outlining a clear timetable and the likely costs and funding options for any policy initiatives and material*  
165 *changes to services which in the opinion of the Department it is necessary to introduce during the 2012-16 States Term in order to meet the objectives set out in the 2020 Vision with the financially sustainable model referred to in Proposition 2(i) above.*

170 That proposal refers to proposition 2(i) that is contained in the Billet, and new Proposition 4:

*‘To direct that by no later than December, 2015, and after consultation with other States Departments and other bodies as necessary, the Health and Social Services Department shall lay before the States of Deliberation a States Report or States Reports outlining an indicative timetable and indicative costs for any policy initiatives and material changes to services which*  
175 *in the opinion of the Department it is necessary to introduce during the 2016-20 States Term in order to meet the objectives set out in the 2020 Vision with the financially sustainable model referred to in Proposition 2(i) above.’*

180 **The Bailiff:** Yes.

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



I have to accept that I cannot find, among the 35 pages and 200 or so paragraphs of this States Report, perhaps more than two or three sentences with which I substantially disagree. Because the Policy Letter proclaims what is basically a utopian vision of the kind of health and social care that we might expect in the Bailiwick over the next few years, it is almost completely free of anything that might be regarded as even moderately contentious and it presents as though every component part of the Department's 2020 Vision is proceeding immaculately.

Well, sir, it was President Kennedy who said

'My experience of Government is that when things are non-controversial and appear beautifully co-ordinated, almost certainly, actually, there is not very much going on.'

Truthfully, and with apologies to our cliché-loathing colleague from the West, the Chief Minister is quite correct when he raises the possibility of this Report being interpreted as 'motherhood and apple pie'. It is all completely 'motherhood and apple pie'.

Now, in employing the Kennedy quote, I am obviously exaggerating, to some extent. I accept that there is more than 'nothing going on'. I commend the Health and Social Services Department for the way in which they articulate, clearly and persuasively, their 2020 Vision and I agree with almost all of the commitments contained within it. The problem I have is that I commended them for all of that when the States debated this Report last time in May 2011. What is presented today is substantially the same Policy Letter that was presented in May 2011 and the propositions attached to this Policy Letter rather betray that point because, apart from the nebulous and, as far as I can see, completely futile Proposition 1, the other propositions in this Report are exactly the same, word for word, as the propositions which the States approved in May 2011. Indeed, if the States were minded to reject the propositions in this Report, it would have absolutely no effect whatsoever because the extant resolutions, which read exactly the same from May 2012, would still be in place. So that, I think, is an indication of the extent of 'progress' in what is called a Progress Report.

I suppose that what has been presented to us today might be referred to, in the modern language of the States, as a 'high level' or 'strategic' document. I have to confess that, in my few years in the States, I have come to despise the words 'strategic' and 'strategy'. The other day when I was talking to a very senior civil servant locally, he said to me I think, only half tongue in cheek, 'If something is called a high level strategy, it is probably an indication that there is not much being done about it'.

I particularly despise 'strategy' which is continually re-presented, year after year – often with a change of title, incidentally, and cosmetically tarted up in some way – which, in terms of substance, is almost always without a credible plan of action and absolutely no way of turning the aspirational, vague statements of intent into real policy action on the ground.

Sir, the Report that we are debating today is not the most egregious example of this, and I acknowledge that HSSD are trying, in difficult circumstances, to push forward, but I still fear that it is becoming the latest in a long production line of strategies which, to a greater or lesser extent, we appear to have grave difficulty in converting into straightforward policy actions, which are clearly defined, adequately funded, for which there is a timetable for implementation, and a way of measuring, in due course, whether the policies have achieved their desired outcomes. Other examples might include – and there are many that one could pick from – the Road Transport Strategy, the Corporate Anti-Poverty Programme, early versions of the Government Business Plan, successive editions of the Social Policy Plan. There are references to some of these strategies in this Report: the Older Peoples Strategy is one such example. All of them are quite legitimate in their own right as high level strategies, containing aspirational and necessarily quite vague statements of intent. But the conversion of strategy into policy, and then action to produce desired outcomes for this community, continue to move, frankly, at a glacial pace or, to rehearse the former Chief Minister's apt phrase, 'at a pace that would hardly trouble an asthmatic tortoise'.  
(Laughter)

Sir, there are a small number of exceptions. As Deputy Trott would know, the Fiscal and Economic Strategy of 2006 was a notable exception. Although I did not agree with all of it, it certainly had contained within it the strategy and the timetable for its implementation. The *best* example is the Corporate Housing Programme, but that is the exception that proves my point, because the Corporate Housing Programme combines high level strategy *with* a credible plan of action, with reasonably detailed plans, which are securely funded and at least have an indicative timetable according to which they will be implemented.

Sir, talking of housing, on Wednesday Deputy Jones, in his predictable *ad hominem* attack on

me, (*Laughter*) did manage to say *one* thing that was of some use (*Laughter*) and that was his observation that it is necessary to expedite policy development because, as he said, only when you get policy development do you get action on behalf of the community. Sir, he laments my interest in process: my interest in process arises not for the sake of process but because I genuinely believe that it is because of flaws in process that policy development in the States remains so sclerotic. He and I may never agree on that but I do agree with his frustration and, in some cases – in my case – I would refer to it as dismay, at the repeated failure to turn strategy into policy and action. Surely, that must have to change.

Pressure for change and pressure for action has to come chiefly from this Assembly. As Mr Arditti reminded the States on Wednesday in his regrettably very persuasive speech, (*Laughter*) we are the executive, we are the Government, and the speed at which Government operates, and its capacity and determination to develop policy, is in *our* hands, in this Assembly, as the Government.

Sir, the proposal in this amendment – the new Proposition 3, at any rate – is to put in place a States resolution that, within the next two years – so a little over half-way through this States term – there will be developed a proper policy plan, a plan of action, which outlines a clear timetable and the likely costs and funding options for any policy initiatives and material changes to services which need to be introduced *during this States term*, up to 2016. If, as Government, we do not feel able to require, by December 2014, a clear timetable and the likely costs and funding options for initiatives to be introduced during this term, I think that the 2020 Vision might *immediately* be consigned to the growing ash-heap of unfulfilled States strategies. December 2014 will be fully four years after the 2020 Vision was first submitted for debate by the States. If we cannot reasonably expect to be presented, in two years' time, with a credible policy plan, a timetable and likely costs and funding option then, frankly, I think we are doing this community an injustice by making the sort of ambitious commitments that are contained in this Policy Letter to a radically different and improved health and social care system, which we will have not a clue how, or even whether, we are going to be able to implement, including fund, this side of the next ice age.

The commitments in the 2020 Vision are, obviously, not going to be fulfilled in this States term. I doubt that they will be fulfilled completely by the end of the *next* States term, but I do not object to that, I do not have a problem with that. I think it would be far better to start with slightly fewer commitments, less dramatic and ambitious claims about what we are going to do, but actually stand a better chance of delivering that to which we commit ourselves. I suppose a motto to sum that up might be under-promise and over deliver. And today in view of the position of public finances, it seems to me more desirable and necessary than it has been for a long time to desist from raising expectations with hugely ambitious and aspirational strategy and to concentrate, instead, on setting out that which is achievable and to combine *early* in the process of policy development policy ideas with ways of funding them and measuring their success or otherwise. That is the case that sits underneath this amendment.

Sir, I have said before, in words often since plagiarised by my good friend, the seconder of this amendment: 'if you try to do everything before you do anything, you will invariably end up doing nothing'. With that in mind, surely it is not unreasonable for this Government to require that, by the time HSSD produces the next instalment of this Report – and they intend to produce the next instalment of it during the course of the next year – it contains a timetable of action, costs and funding options, at least for those initiatives which they believe need to be introduced during this States term.

The proposal in new Proposition 4, which requires that, by December 2015 HSSD presents an indicative timetable and indicative costs for policy initiatives and material changes to services which they believe are necessary in the *next* States term, obviously is a more liberal direction to the Department and that reflects the acknowledgement that it is, obviously, more difficult for a Department to set out a timetable and likely costs for initiatives which they believe need to be introduced in the next term, than it is for them to tell us what they are actually going to do in the *present* term.

The proposals in this amendment are not overly prescriptive and they are certainly not radical. They do not seek to push Health and Social Services policy in any particular direction. They do, though, if approved, lay down the clear expectation of this Government that the high level strategy of the 2020 Vision must not go the way of too many other strategies and remain elusive and vague and aspirational but must, instead, give birth to credible plans of action with much more clarity about what, in policy terms, will be done, when it will be done, approximately how much it will cost, from where it might be funded and by when and how we might establish whether it is achieving its desired outcomes. Setting that expectation is more important, in my view, in respect

of the 2020 Vision than for almost any of the other various long forgotten and long neglected strategies because it concerns by far the single largest area of general revenue expenditure – health and social care – at a time of very slow economic growth and when there is already a deficit in public finances. Moreover, because health and social care will be affected so fundamentally by many of the most important social changes of which this community is on the verge: the demographic changes are but one example.

Sir, the words in the 2020 Vision are commendable and ambitious. What is needed now, or at least later during this term, is the policy plan that will convert these aspirations into meaningful changes on the front line of health and social care. I ask Members to vote for the amendment, to lay down a clear expectation from this Assembly that *that* is the sort of policy plan that we require next.

Thank you, sir.

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

**Deputy Le Lièvre:** I do sir, and reserve my right to speak.

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

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

First of all, I find myself speaking in favour of, and supporting, a Report that I had no hand in producing. I have no problem in doing this because like, I think most of us, I agree with the contents of the Report. However, sir I really do feel that this amendment is both unhelpful and quite impractical. It demonstrates to me, anyway, that the movers of this amendment have not really read and understood the full impact of the Report. It also, to me, demonstrates a complete lack of understanding of the planning process.

Let us look at the messages in the Report, because they are quite major messages. First of all, the forecast is that the current costs of providing health and social care services, to what will be an ageing population in the future, is projected to increase from about £157 million in 2010 to about £376 million in 2040. That is based on a constant population model, and it assumes that the current range of services and funding arrangements stay as they are. Well, sir, this cannot happen, but we cannot cut this figure by trimming round the edges and cutting little bits here and there. We need to do the whole thing differently. It needs a complete rethink about how we are going to provide the services that people need.

The health system is a very complex system and we need to look not only at the provision of changing service needs but how these services can be funded. Currently, sir, there are three main sources: the taxpayer through general revenue; the worker and employer through the social security and the long-term care funds; and individuals who fund their own care directly out of their pockets or through private insurance. If we are going to meet the requirements of the health care of this community in the future, this balance of funding may well have to change. The problem is not just an organisational one, relating to who provides what. It is also a fiscal and economic one. It is fiscal and economic, just as much as it is social policy.

Sir, HSSD *is* conducting a health review, it *is* getting on with the job, it *is* looking at health promotion, tobacco, alcohol, drug, obesity campaigns. It is looking at health care, it is looking at improving social care and it is looking at protection of the people of this Island. The presumption that there has been no progress is erroneous. There *has* been progress and, if we are going to go more into a caring community, then we need to make sure that these regulatory processes are in place beforehand.

I would just like to spend a few moments looking at those, if I may. First, working backwards, protection: as I said, this is becoming more important as we move towards care in the community. We have already moved forward on regulation of health professionals and work is being done with other Crown Dependencies – to try to save on the degree of thinking that we need to do in that area – and we have moved forward on protection of vulnerable adults. We are moving forward in respect of legal capacity and guardianship and that is work with the Home Department. In addition, we are working with Home Department in relation to domestic abuse, so we are moving forward in that area.

Improving social care: well, the supported living and ageing well process campaign is going forward and we are working with Housing and the Guernsey Housing Association and Social Services Department on a long-term care funding review, and we have already moved forward,

with Housing Department, in the provision of extra care housing. That building work is actually holes in the ground and soon it will be bricks and mortar above the ground.

365 The Children and Young People's Plan has to be updated every three years by law and we are working jointly with Education and the Home Department and Social Services Department to upgrade the Children and Young People's Plan, to make *that* fit for current purpose. So we are making progress in improving social care.

370 Improving health care: well the health system review is being produced and will be presented to this Assembly in the not too distant future. The input to *that* review involves HSSD, the Medical Specialist Group, the Guernsey Physiotherapy Group, the general practitioners, the Social Security Department, and other third sector contributors, such as St John's.

375 But I come, really, to the one thing which, to me, is most significant. It is referred to in the Report quite deliberately: it is in paragraph 70, on page 74 of the Report, and it effectively says that we are approaching a once in a lifetime window of opportunity to be able to review and fundamentally rethink the health system. That is because, at the moment, we are locked into our current system by the contracts with the MSG and Guernsey Physiotherapy Group and the GPs, in relation to the provision of accident and emergency facilities in the Island. The contracts with the MSG and the GPG expire in December 2017 and the agreement with the GPs on the accident and emergency services expires in 2018. Now, the way these contracts are re-negotiated will enable us to change the way in which services are provided but, sir, we are not going to know the results of those negotiations because they will be negotiations and there will be give-and-take in those negotiations. We are not going to know the final answers to those until reasonably soon – a short period – before the expiry of the existing contracts. So we will have a clear view of exactly how we can go, maybe in late 2016, maybe early 2017, as far as the MSG is concerned and, as far as accident and emergency, maybe 2017/2018. This amendment says 'We want a detailed plan, please, including all the costings, by 2014. Or, for the longer term things, 2015'. Well, there's an awful amount of what we need to do that hangs on re-negotiating those contracts, and, by the end of 2014, we will not know the answers to those negotiations!

390 **Deputy Fallaize:** I am sorry, sir, but may I just correct something that Deputy Storey has said about the amendment?

**The Bailiff:** Yes.

395 **Deputy Fallaize:** He is talking about an initiative that might be introduced, I think he said in 2016 or 2017. The amendment directs HSSD to report back by December 2014 in respect of policy initiatives which they are going to introduce during *this* States term so things which would be introduced subsequent to this States term are not covered by Proposition 3 of the amendment to which he has just referred.

400

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Storey.

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

405 I just want to recap on the situation. Sir, the degree of consultation within the Department and staff with other States Departments, with outside agencies and service users, is quite an enormous task and it is quite daunting in some respects thus the process, as I hope I have demonstrated, is not only in the power of HSSD to deliver. We are dependent upon co-operation, assistance, joint working with other States Departments and third sector providers.

410 To me, the amendment just exposes the lack of understanding of the contents of the Report and the lack of understanding of the complexity of the problem, on the part of the authors, particularly with regard to the opportunities available from renegotiation of contracts. This Assembly and the public deserve strategies that are based on informed data derived from full consultation with HSSD's partners, strategies that will, in practice, deliver the services that we all require.

415 Sir, I would say that it is *my* intention – and I am sure it is the new Board's intention – to bring reports to this Assembly covering those areas that can be looked at on an independent basis. We will bring them to this Assembly as soon as the various projects are completed, and we *will* report on the anticipated costs at that time. We will do all this as soon as it is practical but, sir, I have to say that the deadlines set out in this amendment are, in my opinion, quite impracticable. I am always up for accepting a challenge. I think I demonstrated that when I accepted a position on the HSSD Board (*Laughter*) but I, for one, sir, cannot accept a task that I know, from the outset, that I am extremely *unlikely* to be able to deliver.

420

So I ask Members to understand the situation that HSSD is in, the fact that they are not in a position to control the process which they are trying to undertake, and I urge you to reject what I consider to be quite a ridiculous amendment.

425

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Adam.

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

430

I have to accept that, to a certain degree, I find this amendment to be attractive. Why? Because, in the past, I have had my fingers burnt because a resolution was not made concerning a Strategy – it was called the Old Persons Strategy – as mentioned in several Reports over the last... since 2009, and it is still not here! The first time it came to the Board of Health of HSSD was in 2008 – the first presentation – and that is because there are no laid down timelines, resolutions for that Report. Therefore, if there was not sufficient resources, if everyone was not willing to get on board and progress it forward, it stagnated and now it has been changed to Supporting Living and Ageing Well Report.

435

However, one problem with this amendment is that it does bring in aspects of costing. That it is going to be a difficult amount – the true costing of these things. But a timeline for the overall concepts of the Vision should, in my opinion, be available by 2014. I feel, sir, that there are indications in this Report, on page 93, of the next steps that must be undertaken. Some of these will require resources and expert input but they are essential aspects of the overall Vision.

440

As you can see in Quarter 1, it is a 2020 Vision Health System Review which has been drawn up by the new Board – Mental Health and Wellbeing Strategy, Mental Health and Wellbeing Centre. The Health System Review, in my view, is the *cornerstone* of the 2020 Vision. As Deputy Storey has said, it covers a wide area – and we are talking about healthcare, as opposed to social care in relation to that.

445

What does it involve? Deputy Storey has mentioned that there are many people involved in this aspect, most of them medical related: General Practice doctors and nurses, dentists, opticians and other first point-of-contact services. They are called primary care services. They have to be looked at. They have to be discussed with. How is that going to change? Is it going to change? Remember the system of medicine in Guernsey has developed over the years. When I came in 1984, there were seven individual practices. The practice consisted of GPs and doctors with a special interest. As medicine changed, as techniques changed, ways of providing care changed in a medical format. The practices had to change and the major change was when the specialists or consultants came out of the general practices and moved into the Medical Specialist Group. By that time, the number of general practices had reduced to three to allow better concentration and better organisation of the GP's and the services provided. The MSG was formed because there was sub-specialisation and what Deputy Storey did not say was that there is increased sub-specialisation. Therefore, you may have an orthopaedic surgeon who simply does knees and hips and nothing else.

450

455

460

That is the way medicine is going. It is not only a problem for Guernsey, it is a problem for Jersey, it is a problem for the Isle of Man, Isle of Wight, Sky, Shetland and Orkney. It is not individual, this problem, to Guernsey. What Governments had to do, both in Scotland and England, is persuade the Colleges to make sure that there are doctors who can provide more generalised across-the-range types of treatment to provide support and help to small communities.

465

Your first and next services that have to be considered are secondary care services, which are the MSG, basically. The MSG consists of 39 consultants. They cannot supply the detailed care that is necessary in some situations. That is why patients go off- Island but also another way of providing that service is having specialists coming on-Island, coming from Southampton, having a contract with Southampton so they supply consultants across here. We have anaesthetists, we have the theatre, we have the theatre nurses: they can do the operations here and they can be looked after here. That may be a more cost-effective way of providing the service over a broader spectrum. Then, of course, you have got the tertiary services off-Island, acute services and long term placements. Therefore, the review has to assess all these areas, not just MSG, not just PEH. It is not a simple process. It is going to cost money. That review needs funding. How much funding? Well, this review has been written. It has been presented to Policy Council. It has been presented to T & R and HSSD and it was due to go in the Billet next month. It has made a suggestion for funding but the funding was not £200,000 or £300,000, it was probably up to £1 million or even more. When Jersey did their assessment of their hospital facilities, it cost them about £900,000 up-front and I am sure there is a little bit extra around the place, as well – and that was just for their

470

475

480

*hospital*. Therefore, it is going to cost money and, after they had the review, sir, the Treasury Department in Jersey decided to give the Health Service in Jersey an extra £25 million over the next three years to make sure the services would be... We are not so fortunate here... (Laughter)

485 The one thing that upset me slightly about Deputy Storey's speech was the contract with the MSG and the Guernsey Physiotherapists. If that contract is not well on the way to being signed by 2015 I will have deep concerns in relation to services and future services in Guernsey. If I am a consultant – there are going to be 10 new consultants: there are, roughly speaking, 10 due to retire  
490 over the next three or four years because a lot of them are a similar age to me, and it comes up to that age when it is quite hard to continue working – if there is going to be that number, you must attract new consultants to your business. Now if your business only has a life expectancy of two years, would *you* come and work for that business? *Plus*, if you leave your negotiations until 2016 – the end of 2016 – that is excellent! 'We've got them by the...' (Laughter) because you will not have any time to put in place *another* system.

495 If you are thinking of changing the system and you are going to agree to..., you must have some idea of what you are going to have when that contract ends. If you can just say, 'Well, it will be negotiated by two or three months before the end of that contract, sorry, that is completely illogical, absolutely, completely illogical! You will not get new consultants coming in, you will have to get locum consultants to cover the services etc. and this type of stuff. It would be  
500 disastrous, in my opinion, if the contract is not negotiated, or very near the end, by at least two years before the end of this contract. In fact, we are hoping it is going to be three years before, and that work is ongoing between SSD and HSSD, but it needs the Health Care Review – the cornerstone – because that is the review that is going to look at overall supply of medical healthcare in Guernsey. If you do not do that in the next two or three months, get it to the States, to  
505 this Assembly, agreed by the Assembly, and the funding agreed by T & R – that review is going to take at least six months before you get a Report – then, Deputy Fallaize, you may get some idea of the vision ahead of medical healthcare within Guernsey.

The independent providers of GP practices, dentists and opticians – the *Guernsey Press* made some comment about that is only criticism – *we* have to work with these people. The GPs have  
510 been here a long time. They have set up a business and that is what it is, it is a business. They have got their own premises, the nursing staff. I always find it interesting when people think they can go and just put 'competition into General Practice. We will have competition in General Practice.' Unfortunately, or fortunately, for the General Practices, people when they go to see the doctor want to see someone they trust, they know and they can speak to. Yes, they may complain afterwards about the cost of it – I accept that – but they do not ring up GPs and say 'Well, how  
515 much is your consultation today? £25? I will come and see you today.' And then the next one, 'Oh, you are only £20. I will come to you next time...' They want continuation of treatment. There is only about a 10% shift in patients between practices. The remainder stays faithful, even though they move house up to St. Sampson's and they belong to an old practice in New Street –  
520 we have patients from all over the Island. When you have to do visits it is a bit of a nuisance but, apart from that, they stay static so I am not too sure how much competition is going to help us in trying to control the price of –

It is so important that it will require off Island advisers, particularly including those with expertise in healthcare in small jurisdictions, who know how things might be provided across the States... [Inaudible] As Deputy Storey said, if the system stays as it is, the cost in 2040 is £340  
525 million minimum. That is *not* sustainable for this community. It is not sustainable. So until the review is done there is a vacuum and the longer it is left, the more dangerous in my opinion.

As far as social care aspects are concerned, in my opinion these are not so dramatic, are they? How often have you heard me say you can have a broken leg but not a broken head? Mental  
530 Health services in general, social care, pushed to one side. These have to be addressed, as well. Social care services help people live their lives comfortably, particularly those people who need a certain degree of extra help, physical, emotional or practical support. The pressures, although not directly the same as for health services, they are not exempt from financial, clinical or structural pressures.

535 We have already heard that the increasing demographic trend is a key issue in social care that needs early resolution related to funding of long-term care. Again, what happened with that? Yes, Deputy Le Lièvre, I accept you may have had some valid points at that time. What has happened was long-term care was assessed by T & R under the chair of the then Minister, Charles Parkinson – Deputy Gillson was on that group – to provide a business case for extra care housing: a business  
540 case for extra care housing. If you read that business case – I know some people say they have not seen a copy of it, but I have a copy of the business case at home and I have read it – in actual fact,

I would have said it was a bit thin because it relied on the fact that HSSD were going to take over 15 units. But then that was put to rest. It was put to one side, to be picked up again. Now, that was put to one side in February of last year. Has it been picked up again? I am not too sure who the leader is, but T & R are involved in that, SSD is involved in that and HSSD is involved in that. That is another piece of work that *must* progress because we must decide how the funding of long-term care is going to be provided.

As I have already spoken about the Older People's Strategy, Supported Living and Ageing Well, again, if HSSD stick to the timetable on page 23, 'the case for developing a strategy, the resources needed for undertaking the work and a timescale to deliver proposal should be submitted in the second quarter.' I would be delighted to see that. That has changed from the Older People's Strategy to Supported Living Strategy and Ageing Well because – and, again, we tend to forget that there are younger people who require help and support – HSSD provides quite a lot of accommodation for those with disabilities and learning difficulties and, therefore, why do HSS highlight the 'older'? Why should we not combine it across the spectrum of people who need supported living?

Again, Deputy Storey has mentioned the Children and Young People's Plan that is coming forward later on this year and also ideas concerning regulations for vulnerable adults. Therefore, Deputy Fallaize, I feel there is quite a lot in there, maybe not in the depth that I have expressed this morning but, if it is in my head, then I am sure it must be in some people's heads in the HSSD Department. that is only one aspect of the development in relation to the overall picture of 2020 Vision. HSSD in my belief should concentrate on its core business. its core business is providing health care and social care but it has to work with Housing, SSD etc. Environment Department as well, to make sure the housing aspect and supporting the community is there. If that is the core business, why do they have a considerable property portfolio? They manage something like 28 properties and, to me, that should go to another Department or the Guernsey Housing Association. HSSD runs, in addition to the PEH, Castel Hospital, King Edward VII Hospital, Duchess of Kent, Lighthouse wards, Lucas House, Perruque House, numerous homes for nurses and those who have a learning and physical disability. Therefore, it is a huge portfolio. That should go to either T & R, States Property Services, to do a system of leases etc or, as I say, Guernsey Housing Association could take over some aspects. Castel Hospital, as you are all fully aware, should close when Phase 6(b) is completed in early 2015 and the mental health clinic, special clinics and community service – which is based there – are also relocated.

Now there has been recent publicity about King Edward VII Hospital, 17 patients costing £2 million or thereabouts... Why has it not closed yet? Why is it not closed yet? Because you have got a hospital we decided to close in 2009 that, actually, has more like 100 patients in it: you cannot... Sorry, I am horrified at the way some people seem to treat patients. Treat patients, just get rid of them, yes, get rid of them! No, you must plan it. First of all, Giffard Ward was closed up at the King Edward, then Allan Grut: OT, Physiotherapy was moved down, *once the clinical block was built*. Then you are left with two wards functioning, plus all the other ancillary things that go on up there. Gradually, unfortunately, some of these people passed away because of their age and therefore it was possible, more recently, to close one of those wards, leaving only one ward. Now how do you – what term do you want to use – 'get rid' of these people? No, you do not: you have got 17 people now. These are, shall we say, difficult people to locate within the private sector because of the standard of care and support they require.

When people say, if there is place in the private sector, why not move them there – yes – when did these spaces occur in the private sector? It is only in the last six months, in actual fact, that there has been freed up beds in the private sector so, yes, people are being moved, *where possible*.

Likewise, we actually have to look after working staff. These nurses have worked there for a good number of years and, remember, some of these people have been resident in that hospital. It has been their home for maybe four or five years so it is not an easy process and saying it costs £90,000 per person, sir, how much does it cost for off-Island placements? I have a document here and it only highlights those that cost us more than £100,000 per year... £100,000 per year off-Island placements; usually the average is more like £200,000 to £250,000, with some going up nearer £400,000. These are off Island placements and here you are criticising HSSD for keeping the hospice open because it costs £90,000 per patient. Where else are you going to keep these patients and look after them in a caring environment? Sorry, sir, I just had to get that off my chest because I am so annoyed with it. I will come straight back onto ....

Likewise, to allow the view to continue on... [*Inaudible*] development, one has to develop aspects within the PEH and that, again, will need capital investment, plus there are a huge number of threads in the plan. There is, as I say, the cornerstone of a health care review. We have been

605 mentioning about prevention: there has been a review in relation to prevention and how much monies might be saved. That was done by King's Fund sometime last year, so look at it. It is not a fantastic saving but it might stop £25 million worth of spending over the next twenty years. It is difficult to see savings but, as Deputy Storey said, that is only one fraction of the total cost.

Thus, as I say, if it did not ask for the costings of everything, this amendment would be extremely acceptable because I do think this Assembly requires timelines but I can assure you a lot of things are happening but, again, we are missing out on transparency concerning where we are going so that we get a better idea.

610 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Adam, can I assume you were intending to speak in general debate in that speech?

615 **Deputy Adam:** Oh yes, sir, definitely. I will go home now!

**The Bailiff:** Yes.

Deputy Lester Queripel has attracted my attention. Do you speak on the amendment, Deputy Queripel?

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

**The Bailiff:** Yes, and then Deputy Gollop.

625 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, I was wrestling with this one until I heard Deputy Fallaize's excellent speech, (*Laughter*) which made perfect sense. I have said, on many occasions in this Chamber, that I want to be a part of a Government that makes sense. We have spent a lot of time over the last two days debating *saving* £31 million. We have implemented a whole team and a programme to enable us to do so and these savings simply have to be made: there is no option.

630 Today we are being asked to give our support to a vision that is going to cost millions of pounds and we do not actually have millions of pounds because we are actually trying to *save* millions of pounds so it is absolutely vital that we know where this money to fund the vision is going to come from.

635 I wholeheartedly support the direction of travel and all the good intentions within the Report but the fact that there is no funding means that I cannot support it as it stands. I endorse all the aspirations, sir, and, if I had to make a list of aspirations, at the very top of that list would be that I want all my fellow Islanders to be happy. That is a wonderful aspiration and I am sure most of us would sign up to it but the aspiration on its own simply is not enough. It is not enough because it is too idealistic, it is not realistic, and the reality is that even a wonderful aspiration like that needs funding. So the first question that would need to be asked is where is the money going to come from?

640 When Deputy Dorey was Minister of SSD, he led a valiant attempt to modernise benefit payments and the estimated cost was to be anything between £8 million and £20 million, if my memory serves me correctly. The proposals were rejected on the grounds that the funding model was much too vague. These 2020 Vision propositions, unfortunately, do not even have the funding model. So how can we justifiably support a Vision that has no funding? The way I see it, sir, is that we were voted into this Assembly to provide assurances to the good people of Guernsey that we know *exactly* where we are going and we know *exactly* how we are going to get there. Well, this 2020 Vision is a truly commendable plan of action but, unfortunately, it will not get out of the starting blocks without funding. Therefore, as it stands, it provides no assurance at all.

650 I am sure we all wish we had magic wands, then we could conjure up the money. We are not magicians, we are politicians and we have to live in the real world. The reality is that everything costs money and we need to know where that money is coming from. Therefore, I will be supporting this amendment, sir.

655 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

660 **Deputy Gollop:** I remember Deputy Quin, in one of his earlier speeches in the last term; he said I was the Harry Potter of the States so maybe I could get a magic wand and move the Strategy on! (*Laughter*). Well, moving away from Gryffindor, the thing about this is I will leave my general remarks for the main debate and hope that the sursis will not be placed, or whatever.



665 I am in a dilemma on this amendment because I agreed with a lot of what Deputy Dr Adam said. I agree there has been substantial progress made already. I have had the privilege, since being the Disabled People's Champion of sitting on a couple of HSSD, not exactly sub-committees but sub-groups. One revolves round disability – the work, and there may have been others, too – and the other is to do with mental health. I am aware that there has been *significant* progress in the past two years on plans, on updates, on ways of working, on cognitive development, on looking at how legislation how we inter-connect with other societies and practices and surgeries and so on. It is all happening.

670 I agree with Deputy Fallaize, philosophically, that things would be better if only the work had been done on identifying every workstream, corporate housing style, the numbers of people required and the amount of money needed because I think we could then have a more realistic debate about FTP, tax-and-spend and so on. But I am concerned that it delays what is already occurring. Proposition 1, or Proposition 3, of the Fallaize amendment here talks about

675 'to direct that by no later than Christmas, 2014'

and the second point is

680 'to direct that by no later than December, 2015 [...] the Health and Social Services Department shall lay before the States [of Deliberation] a States Report [...] outlining an indicative timetable and indicative costs...'

685 That is *years* ahead. Some workstreams you will not know the answer to – the negotiation with the specialists is one – others you could achieve at a much faster pace. I am aware, on Social Security, of the work being done in co-operation with Housing and HSSD. We have now got Deputy James as an important political link, as well, on top of the co-ordination, co-operation and joint meetings and I think much of this does not need to be prescribed because it will happen over the course of a year.

690 What I do not wish to see is the scarce resource of senior officers and policy writers being taken up on another progress process report at the expense of delivering action so, regrettably, I will vote against this amendment at this stage.

**The Bailiff:** Next, the Chief Minister, Deputy Harwood.

695 **The Chief Minister:** Thank you, sir.

I find myself in a position where I cannot support the amendment and I will be voting against it.

700 The amendment asks that two things be done by December 2014: firstly, that a declared timetable is provided and, secondly, that funding arrangements are set out for any of the initiatives or changes necessary to meet the 2020 Vision objectives. But if I may just also pick up on the point that Deputy Storey made – where there was an interruption from Deputy Fallaize – it also requires that, by 2015, there is a further Report which identifies not only timetables but also further funding on matters that will be brought to the States the next term, i.e. between 2016 and 2020. Deputy Storey is absolutely right. By that time, i.e. by December 2015, it may not be possible to divulge information relating to the re-negotiation of the various contracts he referred to and I accept Deputy Hunter Adam's point that negotiations certainly need to start sooner rather than later but I doubt that, by 2015, it would be possible to provide that information.

710 The 2020 Vision is needed to make the provision of health and social welfare affordable, not merely today or tomorrow: we are going for the next twenty to thirty years. I understand that HSSD would be able to provide a timetable of the work with an estimate of the resources needed to undertake the work by December 2014. It should, however, be noted that any timetable is always dependent on priorities, resources available, scope of the work and the quality required. However, in relation to the *funding* – this is the second part of Deputy Fallaize's amendment and is included in both sections, the reference to funding – this will be dependent on a number of factors. Some of these will be universal, such as awaiting the findings of the review currently being undertaken on the personal tax and social insurance systems, other aspects of funding will depend on the outcome of sensitive and commercial negotiations, and others will be dependent on the model of services which will be recommended following the work which will be undertaken in individual areas.

720 It should be remembered that the 2020 Vision is an over-arching strategy and it is the intention that detailed work under it will return to the States in a number of Reports. Many of those Reports

are already identified on page 93 of the HSSD Report: each of those Reports will need to deal with the relevant funding arrangements. I suggest, therefore, that the appropriate time for dealing with funding is as and when those Reports come back to this Assembly and not in some generic systemic Report in 2014 or 2015.

725

I therefore urge you not to support this amendment, as written, and vote against its inclusion in the substantive propositions.

**The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak on the amendment?

730

Deputy Hadley.

**Deputy Hadley:** Mr Bailiff, in his speech the Deputy Minister drew attention to section 70, which says that the renegotiation of the contracts that have already been mentioned... three major contracts are crucial to the provision of healthcare for the future.

735

Deputy Fallaize said that, in fact, he would rather that the 2020 Vision process was delayed so that we get it right but this is not an option because these contracts expire by either 2017 or 2018. Because they are so crucial to the whole mix of the services that we provide, in effect the groundwork for the 2020 Vision has got to be done before those contracts expire, the system that we have for delivering healthcare.

740

What worries me is that, as a result of, probably, the resolutions that we passed yesterday, the Health and Social Services Department will not have the resources to implement this crucial part of the 2020 Vision process. We have been told that the Chief Officer of the Health and Social Services Department spends one and a half days a week dealing with the FTP projects. Now we have also got to get these contracts re-negotiated for the benefit of the Department and the States and the reorganisation of our health service by 2016 or so. So I just do not understand how the Department will do this effectively without additional resources.

745

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon and then Deputy Le Tocq.

750

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

I was very grateful when Deputy Fallaize corrected Deputy Storey, in terms of Proposition 3, but it did remind me that Proposition 3 really is rather aimless because, if HSSD do come back to this Assembly in December 2014, there are only 15 months of this term left. Of course, the budget for 2014 will have already been debated and, hopefully, approved at that point so any new initiatives in terms of timeline and costing funding details, this Assembly will already have had to have presented to them and approved for it to be included and part of the budget, so I just think that the timing means that it is irrelevant. We already know the information that Deputy Fallaize is trying to get to.

755

And I have to say, Deputy Adam and the Chief Minister, Deputy Harwood, have made it clear to me why Proposition 4 really is not practical, simply not able to happen, so I do not think I will be able to support either of these Propositions.

760

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

765

**Deputy Le Tocq:** Sir, I cannot support either of these Propositions because, as the Chief Minister has said and, in fact, both Deputy Luxon and Deputy Hadley recently alluded to, what this is asking for is, basically, for us to employ more staff to do the work and that will imply costs and, as a result of that, whilst I am not against information being available and I agree with the move behind it, I think we have to realise where we live, the community we live in, the existing financial pressures upon us and, as a result of that, most of the Departments – and this was alluded to yesterday, sir – have staff that, when a Question is asked, they have to stop doing what they normally do: there is no-one else they can give that to, they have to start working on that particular question. The result of that would be, I believe, if these Propositions are passed, the information we get will either be, in the end, late anyway or, actually, not up to the standard that the proposer and seconder would want.

770

775

So it is not effective to do it in this way. We have got to cut our cloth, even in terms of our expectations of what we can do. I understand where Deputy Fallaize is coming from but we are not a large jurisdiction. Our staff is – Deputy Trott said yesterday – fairly lean. We run things efficiently compared to other jurisdictions. If we want to go in these sorts of directions we will

780

785 have to increase the number of staff substantially. I chair the Social Policy Group: we have one member of staff and, as a result of that, it means things take a lot longer and we have to bear with that. If this Assembly chooses to go in this direction, one of the things that is absolutely certain – and it will not only affect policies like the Report before us today – is that we will need huge numbers of extra resources. I do not believe that is a message that we have signed up to.

**The Bailiff:** Anyone else?

790 Yes, Deputy Duquemin.

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

795 I will just speak briefly on the amendment. I think that I probably share Deputy David Jones' comments on Deputy Fallaize's penchant for amendments but I was prepared to give Deputy Fallaize the benefit of the doubt on this one, originally, because I think in many ways his desire was for progress not for process in this instance and it was a very articulate way that he presented his case. I was only trying to head to the dictionary on a number of occasions to work out the definition of a few of the words he used.

800 But, in a way, I think Deputy Fallaize, in many of his amendments, does strive to set the Assembly and Government disciplines, in terms of timeframes and timetables. For me, this amendment is unnecessary and, moreover, possibly unhelpful because the timetable is already in place. I am not going to repeat in any detail the comments that have been already made, but the very fact that the MSG contract expires in December 2017 and the need, as Deputy Adam said, to sort out the situation – the contract negotiations – far in advance of that, is the best deadline we can possible have. I believe that setting any other deadlines would just add unnecessary workload for HSSD that really are not there.

805 Whilst I applaud the want for progress in this instance I just think that, in actual fact, Deputy Fallaize's desires were already met by the very fact that the deadline for the MSG contract is already in place and that overrides any requirement for the amendment to go through.

810 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Anyone else?

Yes, Deputy Le Lièvre.

815 **Deputy Le Lièvre:** Mr Bailiff, Members of the Assembly, it is my intention to speak on the amendment and the main propositions at the same time.

Paragraph 1 of the Executive Summary states that:

'By 2020, the groundwork will be laid to enable all Islanders to lead healthy, independent lives.'

820 2020 is seven years away and would represent the end of the next States terms. Now it sounds like a long way away, I admit, but given that policy development in Guernsey has been described as asthmatic, it is an impressive target – and would be an impressive target if the tortoise had perfect cardio and pulmonary function... *(Laughter)* I would like to stress that I am a very, very keen supporter – possibly this Assembly's most ardent supporter – of HSSD's 2020 Vision and it is a pity that Deputy Storey is not in the Assembly at the moment because I take offence at words like 'he has failed to read or understand' or that 'I have a complete lack of understanding' etc. etc. My CV, although not very impressive in Civil Service terms, would tend to give the impression otherwise. Indeed, I printed off a couple of days ago a four page memo to the Chief Executive of HSSD, when I was a member of HSSD, with regard to the structure of 2020 Vision and it predates the actual Report of the States by four or five months. So to say I have not read or understood this Policy Letter is, I find, insulting.

835 I have long espoused that the combination of a good standard of healthcare, quality housing, a good standard of education and a robust social welfare system, combined with regular employment, were the key drivers for social inclusion and that achieving any three of these states of being would, in most cases, automatically give rise to the fourth. And I spread that, preached that, gospel with the encouragement of the Chief Executive of Housing, with the encouragement of the Minister of Housing, for a long time before 2020 Vision was even envisaged.

840 It is when more than one of these conditions – and those are the four conditions, health, education, etc – falls below par that the other qualities of living become endangered, almost invariably resulting in social deprivation or social exclusion at *some* level for those so impacted. It all sounds very obvious but for an individual or family, the flaws in the quality of healthcare,

education, living accommodation etc. do not have to be very large to result in catastrophic breakdown. It is the cumulative effect of possibly unrelated and minor failures that degrades a person's self-esteem and, subsequently, their ability to function at a level sufficient to improve their lives. The costs of such failures, if immediately wiped out, would fill the black hole in double quick time. Enabling our health care systems to operate at an optimum level, in conjunction with the likes of Housing and Social Security, must, therefore, be a *priority*.

HSSD does not have to convince *me* that the journey it has decided to undertake, in conjunction with the other key agencies, is the right one to follow. It would, indeed, be a feather in the cap of HSSD if it met the 2020 target and I hope, very sincerely, that it does.

However, this most recent document does not fill me with confidence. It does not inspire me and it does not leave me with a feeling that there was a plan or timetable of delivery, other than promises to report back by certain dates in *some instances*. It did, however, leave me with the lasting impression that there was one heck of a lot of work going on and, at the same time, the rather nagging doubt that HSSD did not have the resources to come up with the goods in the time allowed. I felt, and I still feel, that progression might be so slow that public demand could change faster than new policies were developed, leaving HSSD and its strategic partners in a permanent state of being wrong footed.

Furthermore, given the rather wordy and, at the same time, rather vague nature of the Report, any hard-hitting message has been lost in a sea of inter-related policies and strategies, plans and frameworks, all of which appear to be held together with gaffer tape derived from the States Strategic Plan, yet another *Marie Celeste* of a document. The FTP features quite strongly in the document, quite properly so, but it is a bit like a Government health warning, in that it acknowledges that staff resources will be drawn from policy development to FTP duties, exactly along the lines we agreed yesterday and that does represent a risk to delivery: I do not deny it and it can do nothing else. The net result is that the relevance of HSSD's 2020 Vision has lost much of its original acuity and simply sticking on an equally vacuous Policy Council-inspired foreword is not going to turn this piece of Barbara Cartland *froth* into a work by D H Lawrence. (*Laughter*) In fact, I am at a loss as to why the Policy Council felt the need to involve itself. Presumably, we will once again witness a 100% Policy Council support for what is, basically, a Board Report tarted up for the benefit of the Assembly.

However, my worst fears focus on something that most Members will have little or no knowledge of and, listening to the Chief Minister, he has warned against a *post mortem* but I would be failing very significantly my duties to this Assembly, my duties to myself and my duties to the community, if I did not bring to Members' attention some of the significant failings that are not touched upon in this Report. At the centre of this promising-looking but, ultimately, taste-free piece of fruit lies an ethereal strategic worm and it has, in its relatively long life, pervaded so many documents that it is now accepted as having real substance. It is accepted as a driver for change and a force to be reckoned with. This unseen strategy has no shape, no form, it has never been seen, read or handled by anybody I know, yet it has been used as the justification for the expenditure of millions and as a key tool to take apart Social Security's long-term care scheme. I refer, of course, to the constantly evolving 'Older People's Strategy', now renamed 'The Supportive Living and Ageing Well Strategy'. This is the third name it has had in its life and this is a completely pointless and wholly forgettable title that, no doubt, has been evolved into something completely different by the time it reaches maturity.

This Strategy was conceived in 2007, I think in a Corporate Housing Programme Report, and at the time it had a claimed States Report date for autumn 2008. Paragraph 91 of that Report said:

'It is the aim for a Report with recommendations to be produced for consideration by the States in autumn 2008.'

Paragraph 92 went on to say:

'The Report will also review the funding arrangements for each of the types of revision.'

Unfortunately, the due date was out and the expected date of confinement came and went. However, in Billet 18 of December 2008, which I believe was a further Corporate Housing update Policy Letter, reference to this strategy in Paragraph 111 says:

'The Strategy will examine and recommend funding arrangements,'

whilst Paragraph 112 says

‘this will culminate in a comprehensive Report to the States in 2009.’

905 I can find no reference to this Strategy in 2009 whatsoever. However, further reference was made, in a Corporate Housing Report, to the Older People’s Strategy in May 2010 with a new promised reporting date later that same year. For the third time, the publication of this much vaunted and specifically, and expensively, resourced Strategy came and went without outcome. The fledgling Strategy was now over three years old and no-one outside Housing – and possibly not even *inside* Housing – had yet had sight of was rapidly turning into a phantom Strategy. In 910 May 2011, at the same time as the original 2020 Vision was published, Housing published its Report that focused on the rebuilding of Maison Maritaine and Longue Rue. This Policy Letter promised an Older People’s Strategy reporting date late in 2011 but nothing ever materialised.

915 Given that the original intention was for the publication of the Older People’s Strategy to *predate* – predate – the Maison Maritaine and Longue Rue House Policy Letter and to justify the rebuilding of these units, its non-appearance was, strangely, not seen as *any kind of impediment* to the last States spending £20 million and gifting away a further £10 million. Nobody ever mentioned the failure of the Older People’s Strategy to make a showing late in 2011 but, of course, by that time, responsibility for the Strategy had been very carefully and quietly slipped to HSSD 920 because, after all, from Housing’s point of view, the phantom Strategy had served its purpose. Maison Maritaine and Longue Rue House: the re-development had been approved and the ethereal worm could now be passed on to do more sterling work on the 2020 Vision project.

Over five years four separate delivery dates had been promised and, on each occasion, nothing has been forthcoming – and I am told that we should not treat this as a *post mortem*! This is about 925 strategy development. Five years, four separate delivery dates and not a word, not a peep, not a sight of any piece of paper to do with the Older People’s Strategy. I find it absolutely shocking and almost beyond belief that this Assembly can be so generous, or so slack, that it allows itself to be fobbed off year after year and then, in the final year, it agrees expenditure of £20 million and a free gift of £10 million and one Member had the *brass neck* to accuse me of being obsessed with process. (A Member: Hear, hear.) Oh, and by the way, I lost my job with HSSD. 930

The story is, unfortunately, not over. 2012 came and went without a single mention of the ethereal worm but, in 2013, it turns up in the 2020 Vision document, having lain dormant for twelve or so months. Once again, it is promised but a date is uncertain. However Housing’s hand is no longer on the tiller. Now it is with HSSD and, rather disappointingly, HSSD has not come up 935 with a date for the final unveiling of this epic piece of work. Rather, it promises ‘a progress report’ towards the end of the second quarter of this year and, wait for it,

‘This progress report is likely to outline a direction of travel’

940 – a direction of travel. That is quite some progress! Given we started our journey six years ago, we do not even know where we are going yet.

Unfortunately, matters have got very much worse for the ethereal worm in the meantime. The very real problem is that, let us call it by its real name, the ‘Supported Living and Ageing Well Strategy’ is now, thanks to the redevelopment of Maison Maritaine and Longue Rue, inextricably 945 linked to a review of Social Security’s Long Term Care Scheme which, by its very nature, must be equally closely linked to the review of tax and benefits being undertaken elsewhere.

My history with the Long Term Care Scheme goes back to the Walters Requête of 1983 and I clearly remember, in showing who was then Advocate Perrot into a Board meeting of Social Security in the 1990’s... I tell you why I clearly remember it because we received this letter at 950 Social Security about long-term care or about... perhaps Deputy Perrot can remind me at some stage. The letter was written in Deputy Perrot’s style and when he sat down at the Board room table, he said – and I remember the words: they are emblazoned on my brain – ‘If you think the nature of this letter is pompous and... something else... that is because I am’. (*Laughter*)

955 Now, Deputy Perrot might have difficulty remembering that but I am sure Social Security will have the letter.!

**Deputy Perrot:** Point of order. I cannot *believe* that is true, sir! (*Laughter*).

**Deputy Le Lièvre:** Well, believe it or believe it not!

960 As if the gestation of this important but still nebulous Strategy was not difficult enough, we know that HSSD is hard pushed to resource the re-development of the strategic living and Ageing

Well Strategy and, in all likelihood, SSD is equally hard pushed to review the Long Term Care Scheme. So when *are* we going to see this key Strategy? 2015, 2016? Or maybe we will never get to see it. After all, the last States did not so. I do not see why we should be any luckier and all the time the delivery date of 2020 for every strategy, framework, policy document and plan creeps ever closer and herein lies the essence of my dissatisfaction with this Report. I do not like being fobbed off with some wholly valueless promises that are worth even less than the recycled paper they are printed on. A whole States term has come and gone with promised delivery dates never once being adhered to. We are now nine months into my second term and the promised delivery date has been re-valued downwards to a Report ‘on the direction of travel’.

It simply is not good enough and yet every member of the Policy Council seems content to put their name to a document that promises much but delivers nothing, a document that hides the truth of failed deliveries and broken promises, of undelivered strategies and inadequately resourced policy development and of *massive* expenditure based on little more than fresh air.

Deputy Fallaize’s amendment seeks to put some meat on the bone and if that means that a little bit of plain, old-fashioned honesty has to creep into this Report related to admissions that, possibly, some aspects of the Report will not be deliverable before 2024, then so be it. This amendment does not seek to stop progress or even slow it down, if that were, indeed, possible. What it seeks is to add credibility and to remove doubt, to reinforce as opposed to undermine, to restore life to a document that has faltered and stumbled and to rid the Vision of false hope and mirage-like strategies which always prove to be slightly beyond our grasp. No doubt, the Policy Council will, to a man, oppose the amendment because it has to. It has put its name to this pile of lifeless strategies and the ethereal worm in particular and its corporate approach to Government will mean that it simply cannot do a U-turn. It will vote for rubbish because it created it!

*(Laughter)*  
I would ask and implore you to put a stop to this chronic case of the emperor’s new clothes and approve the amendment and also approve 2020 Vision. (A Member: Hear, hear.)

Thank you sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy David Jones.

**Deputy David Jones:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff, Members of the States.

To say that part of the Strategy, or some of the Strategy, is not being delivered, from Housing’s point of view, is simply not true. If you walk or drive past Maison Maritaine and Longue Rue House you will see the buildings coming out of the ground.

I think I am just going to address one of the areas that has been covered in Deputy Le Lièvre’s speech, which is about the funding. It seems we have got to keep re-fighting this old battle about extra care-housing every time we come to the States because, after a somewhat acrimonious debate, the States agreed in 2011, in May, that our two residential homes, Maison Maritaine and Longue Rue House, be demolished and replaced with new extra care-housing. Now, this is really for the benefit of a lot of new Members but it will not have escaped Members’ attention that, in recent months, there has been much activity on both of those sites as the new extra care-housing is constructed around the existing care homes. The fact that we have even got *this* far is a testament to an astonishing amount of work put in by Housing and HSSD staff and by the staff of the GHA also.

However, like constantly picking at an old scab, some Members of this Assembly who have, on every occasion they can, re-opened a debate that they lost heavily nearly two years ago and I am afraid here we go again today... That debate in 2011 was about how two schemes were to be funded. No matter that, since 2011, the Treasury and Resources Department has approved a 150-page business case for the two developments, or that Deputy Parkinson led a heavyweight political working party that examined the financing of long-term care and concluded that the extra care project could proceed. No matter that, in publication after publication, expert commentators report on how extra care-housing improves the health and well-being of the people who live in such schemes, lengthens their life spans and saves public money, more importantly.

Now we have a group of Deputies who know better and who would appear to like nothing more than to try and cause these two schemes to fail. Well, I have got news for these Deputies: you did not succeed in 2011 and you will not succeed today or at any time in the future. Extra care-housing is here to stay. It is part of the 2020 Vision and, if I have my way, it will see many more of the schemes before I leave this earth, probably not very quietly but, nonetheless. The fact is the new housing is being built and, next year, the residents of the two care homes and other Islanders will move in. One way or another, we will assist everybody who needs help to pay their

rent and their day-to-day living costs, which is what the entire uproar, really, is about in terms of the funding issues. Ideally, they would get help through the long-term care insurance scheme but, currently, that is not possible. Some of our critics think that if this happens it will cripple the scheme. Personally, I think that is nonsense. The scheme will be far worse off if people go into residential homes – that I can tell you. Other critics say that, if we do not fund extra care-housing from long-term care insurance, then supplementary benefit will not be able to cope. Well, it will and it will have to, quite frankly. There is no way we are leaving people hanging out there on a limb while we squabble over a funding policy.

The business case approved by T & R made it very clear that if no alternative was in place when the schemes were opened in 2014, then Social Security would assist the occupants of the two schemes with supplementary benefit and that is what will happen. And, contrary to all the political scaremongering, we are confident it will not cost them a fortune, plus there will be relocation of budget to soften the impact so there are already pots of money in the system that will clearly have to be reallocated and moved around in order to cover these costs. As I say, the money will be redistributed through the system. After all, Housing 21 is operating a similar extra care scheme at Rosaire Court and that is not bankrupting Social Security.

There will, of course, be those critical of the amount of time it is taking to sort out the long term policy and we have heard a very eloquent speech from Deputy Le Lièvre on that subject today and about who pays what for extra care housing. This, of course, is part of a much bigger and, indeed, a huge piece of work about how we meet and fund the services of all people who have long term care needs, whether they live at home in extra care-housing, in residential or nursing homes, or dare I even say it, the King Edward VIII Hospital (*Interjection*) VII, sorry! (*Laughter*).

**Deputy Brehaut:** I know the Corporate Housing Programme is going well but you have not built one of those, either!

**Deputy David Jones:** Sorry, it was a typo...

So that is not a five minute task and if staff at HSSD, Social Security and Treasury and Resources are as busy, or even busier, than Housing staff in taking forward other major policy work, the FTP and dealing with business as usual, it is little wonder that there have been some casualties along the way. But the important thing is that it does not mean that our two extra care schemes are in a dilemma or even that we cannot build others until we sort out a funding policy. Clearly, it would be preferable to have a long term sustainable method of funding extra care-housing but the world does not stop turning because we have not got there. If we had lost the debate back in May 2011, there would not be a brick in the ground now. We would have been no further forward, the demographic problems that are facing us are still trundling towards us and we would still be sitting here, rubbing our hands, thinking ‘Well, we should have done something’. We *are* doing something and those two schemes are well under way.

Treasury and Resources understood that point about the funding when they approved the business case and, more importantly, the present Social Security Minister knew the same when he was a member of Deputy Parkinson’s long-term funding... when he was on the working party, the long-term funding care working party. So can we please stop worrying the vulnerable older people and adults who will be moving into the new schemes by suggesting that we will not be there for them because we most certainly will. Whether it is when they get their first rent bill, or have to get the first week’s shopping or whatever, one way or another we will be there to help them. I am also very confident that, in time, we will also sort out a long-term sustainable funding policy but it may not be before the two schemes are actually opened. But that is not a disaster, either, just the reality of a Government which has got a huge amount on its plate and a limited number of people with the expertise and time to devote to the task. At the one time we are being told we need to slim down our Government to the bare minimum through these austere times – and that is what the FTP is trying to do – but at the same time, as I have said earlier, there will be some casualties in policy, in terms of trying to get all this sorted out. It is certainly not a reason to call a halt to the 2020 Vision or to put forward ridiculous timeframes to sort out matters that Governments with far more resources than ours struggle to find solutions to on a daily basis.

So my view is – and it is the view I have always had – let us keep going and do what we can, when we can, in our usual sensible and Guernsey measured manner.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb.

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

1085 There is much that has been said from Deputy Le Lièvre and Deputy Fallaize that I would agree with. There is an awful lot that can be said for the fact that strategy sometimes seem glacial but could I actually suggest a different vision of what Government and HSSD is doing at the moment and that is of a swan. It looks as if it is not doing much but, underneath, it is peddling like mad, in order to try and keep moving. That is exactly what is happening within the Department at the moment. There are a number of strategies that are associated with the 2020 Vision and that is why I think that it is incorrect to refer to the Vision as a strategy. It literally is a vision – the clue is in the name. I think the Vision and the fact that we had to have one is what is unfortunate.

1090 We have failed to develop strategy in so many areas of our general society that we needed something to identify all of the missing strands. From the Vision will come all those strands. We have the Mental Health and Wellbeing Strategy appearing shortly, we have the Disability Strategy being formed, the Ageing Well and Living Well Strategy – and I agree that it may well be better placed as an Old People’s Strategy – that is progressing glacially, I would agree, because, recently, in 2012 the previous Board decided that they needed to delay the Strategy further in favour of FTP.

1100 I see Deputy Le Lièvre making a tutting sound and I would have sympathy for that, were it not for the fact that Deputy Le Lièvre and Deputy Fallaize voted in favour of Proposition 3 yesterday. Proposition 3 referred to Paragraph 3.14 of the States FTP Report, and please do not bother looking at the Report because I will enjoy reading it out to you:

‘We accept the necessary diversion of staff resources.’

1105 Now, then, this amendment seems to place on the Department the requirement to do something, despite having voted for the acceptance of the necessary diversification of staff resources. Rarely does a Deputy have a moment of standing up and feeling self-satisfied as to voting the opposite way, but I have today, thank you very much.

1110 The Strategy itself, and the reason that this amendment needs to be rejected, is because the Department cannot guarantee the timelines. People have referred to the Fundamental Healthcare Review and, indeed, that is an *essential* part of the 2020 Vision. I believe that the Fundamental Healthcare Review is necessary and is necessary soon for the number of reasons that we have heard already relating to the contract delivery of services at this point in time. *But* the Fundamental Healthcare Review is a States Report that will come here and, if this Assembly chooses to reject that Report, then the Department – HSSD – will have to go back to the drawing board and think, fundamentally, how to deliver a 2020 Vision, having been told that they are not allowed the money to conduct the review on one of the largest parts of their system. Therefore, this amendment seeks to place a timeline on a Department for what is not wholly within the gift of the Department and, for such, I have to urge Members to reject it.

1120 With regard to the Report itself and why it is here, then I can understand why Deputy Fallaize has sought to amend it with the amendment that he has. The intention was to frame the following Strategies that will be forthcoming. Deputy Fallaize knows that the Mental Health and Wellbeing Strategy is well on its way and he is also aware, from the debate yesterday, where Deputy Kuttelwascher made reference to the Fundamental Healthcare Review, that is another Report that is on its way to this Assembly. It has been slightly delayed because of a few events within HSSD recently. Therefore, I ask Members to bear with the Department a little further. It is fair to say that we should have come forward with a report of progress but I do not think that progress report should be a reflection on HSSD but a reflection on the whole of this Assembly to *its* commitment towards a 2020 Vision.

1130 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

**Deputy Brehaut:** Thank you very much, Mr Bailiff.

1135 I think what Deputy Hunter Adam before was saying is that perhaps the MSG has us by the forepaws but I do not think he quite stretched to saying that!

1140 Politics is a curious old game. Deputy Adam before referred to the King Edward and I could not help but reflect that we were facing a Vote of No Confidence because we closed a ward and people were of the view that some very elderly and vulnerable people were in that ward and that we should resign and consider our positions. Fourteen days later some people almost want us to go again because we have not closed the King Edward VII Hospital, which contains some elderly



frail people. Politics is a very curious thing.

I have only got to my feet, not because – well, in part because – of Deputy Le Lièvre’s speech but particularly after Deputy Jones speech and it bothers me and I understand fully why it bothers Deputy Le Lièvre because we are not ‘picking at an old scab’ and we fully, fully, fully endorse the aspirations of extra care-housing. But I will never have my fingers burnt again in the same way I did over the Older Person’s Strategy. I resigned from the Board, as did Andrew, Deputy Le Lièvre, because in this Assembly on information they had, I think both Deputy Hunter Adam and Deputy Jones believed that the Older Person’s Strategy – and some States Members will remember, was around the corner. It is simply about timing; it is that you can, if you approve this capital project today your Older Person’s Strategy is just around the corner. That is how it was presented.

So in order to drive, what Deputy Jones did very successfully and other Members, was drove through nothing more than a capital project. That is all they did. Some of us said where is the strategy, how do you pay for this mechanism of extra care-housing, where does the money come from. It did not matter at the time because the argument was made, again, that there were some frail old people living in accommodation that was not fit for purpose, shame on us all, what are you going to do about it, States Members approved the capital, they approved the project but there is no mechanism yet in place that will pay for people to be there. Deputy Jones’ resolution is – his strategy – is quite inventive: ‘one way or another’. One way or another, we will pay for these people. What he is saying is that, as yet, there is no mechanism, there is no funding in place.

He may tell me who will be eligible, sir, who will be eligible for the extra care-housing. Who will be eligible? Before, it was people who needed it, Deputy Jones said. Well, that is an awful lot of people. That is awfully expensive and Deputy Jones does not yet know who they are. Deputy Andrew Le Lièvre, with his vast experience in Social Security and, with the extra care funding muddle in particular, has tried to convey, through his knowledge base, exactly how expensive that may be, to the extent that Social Insurance contributions are raised. [*Inaudible*] ...do you have to sell your property again to get in to a property where you are not a resident but you are a tenant – you have a flat, you have a property in your own right: I think that distinction between resident and tenant is misunderstood, because paying for tenants... at the moment we, of course... States tenants are the people we assist with a rent rebate. If you want to broaden the base of ‘tenant’, that is hugely expensive, but do not relax because, ‘one way or another’, we are going to pay for it.

I am in a very difficult position because my loyalty to the HSSD Board and my natural inclination, believe it or not, for the consensus, (*Laughter*) makes we want to sit and vote with HSSD Members but my experience over the extra care-funding model – which was a *total farce* and, like today, I have to say assurances were given – means that I will be voting *for* the Fallaize amendment, in the hope that it gives the HSSD Board an absolute clear way-points and a destination to follow. Because if it remains as ethereal as this, if it remains and aspects of it are aspirational, abstract, then actually the HSSD Board will not get to deliver.

So I will be voting for the amendment that gives these way-points that will be useful for the Board and, ultimately, for the States.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** If nobody else wishes to speak, then I will invite Deputy Dorey to make the penultimate speech.

Deputy Dorey.

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

This debate seems to have had two key topics, which were not probably the subject of the amendment: the health system review and also the Older Peoples Strategy, the Supported Living and Ageing Well Strategy, but I would speak on those a little bit further into my speech.

What I intend to do, I will pick up some of the comments made in the debate and then I will, as I have not had an opportunity to speak, I would make my comments in relation to this amendment.

Firstly, I would like to thank everybody who has spoken, opposing the amendment, because that is what I am going to urge you to do at the end. Deputy Fallaize started and I think he said there was not much going on but I think the Chief Minister, in his opening speech, spoke about ‘this is looking forward’ and I do not think that we can gain much from looking what has happened to date. But I think, as he has mentioned it, it is important to note that it does take time to develop policies. As you have all got your February Billet, you know there is a Mental Health and Wellbeing Strategy, there is also a replacement of the acute wards in that Billet and there will be a further Billet issued with another Report in relation to mental health before the end of February.

1205 We also have the new Mental Health Law, which has taken up an awful amount of work of the Department, due to commence – if the States approve the commencing Ordinance – at the beginning of April. The Department is, as has been said, working on the review of the health system and also, among other things, the Disability Inclusive Strategy.

1210 The purpose of this Report was to give an opportunity, with significant changes in membership, for the Assembly to debate and give their support to the resolutions and, hopefully, that is what it has done. It was not the purpose to come up with a timetable. To develop policies is, obviously, dependent on the resources that you have available and we will come up with a realistic timetable with the resources that we have available. That will be contained within the Government Service Plan and that is the whole purpose of the way the Policy Council is approaching policy development – that we have a States Strategic Plan and we will have a Government Service Plan, which will specify what is going to be done over the next four years.

1215 He mentioned ‘ambitious commitments’: well, the strategy, yes, it is ambitious but the only reporting back which is specifically mentioned in the Report is on page 93, where it details when we will report back on progress. There was, I think, what you could say was an ambitious timetable in 2011. Not all those dates have been met, and what I am committed to with a new Board is that we will discuss a policy development timetable, sir. It will be realistic and we will need to speak to other Departments who are involved in development of policies. When we know the resources that we have available, we will come up with that realistic timetable but we do not have a choice about going ahead with these policies. As I mentioned yesterday, the financial challenges to the Department, with the changing population, are such that we have to come forward with significant new policies so that we can provide a healthcare system for the people of Guernsey.

1225 Deputy Adam specifically mentioned the health system review and I will just cover it now: he said it was the ‘cornerstone’. Yes, it is *one* of the cornerstones – it is not the only cornerstone. We have not withdrawn it from the States but we have withdrawn it from the process of going to the States. We, as a new Board, with three new Members, need time to understand it and review it. And to make sure that we own it. That is our highest priority and we are well aware of the timetable with the contract and we will put as much resources as necessary to bring it to the States as soon as possible, knowing that timetable. But the process must respect the commercial confidentiality of contracts and it must follow the States rules for tendering.

1230 Deputy Lester Queripel spoke about it could cost millions of pounds. Well, we cannot reach that conclusion until we have developed the policies. We just do not know how much it would cost. He mentioned a review of supplementary benefit. Well, the Social Security Department in the previous States brought detailed policies and we still could not estimate the cost of those policies without a significant range. But we are being asked, by this amendment, for likely costs *now*, before we even have the policies.

1240 Deputy Le Lièvre spoke about 2020 Vision being an impressive target. I agree but, as I have said, the main changes have to happen if we are going to meet the financial pressures on the Department because of the change in population, but I can assure him that we will come up with a realistic timetable. We will talk to the other Departments and specifically in relation to the Older People’s Strategy, or as it has now been re-named, the Supported Living and Ageing Well Strategy. We will speak with the other Departments involved. We will speak with the Social Policy Group and the Policy Council so we can come up with a realistic timetable.

1245 The budget for 2012 did have something new, which was the Strategic Development Fund, so there is a significant amount of financial resources available to help Departments with key developments and to make sure that we have the financial resources to do that. So I think the Policy Council, through Treasury & Resources, has given a very clear message that we do realise that, because of the pressures of the FTP, Departments’ ability to develop policies has been made a lot more difficult. That is why that Fund has been specifically set up and, even when we are running a deficit, T & R have agreed to put £3 million in to it so that we can develop these Strategies.

1250 I can agree with him that the history of development has been disappointing for this Strategy and there have been a number of Reports that have gone... He mentioned it in the States, including this current Report – the timetables have not been met – but, as I said, we will come up with a realistic timetable. I do think it is disappointing that, in his frustration, he mentioned the word ‘vote for rubbish’. This is a good Strategy. I really believe it is only a Strategy. It is not ‘rubbish’ and I think it does give a very clear direction for the way forward.

1260 I am now back to my speech that I have pre-written. The revised timetable requires HSSD to produce two Reports, with plans, in the next two years. These Reports will have to include a clear

1265 timetable, likely costs and funding options for any policy initiatives and material changes to  
 services, one for this term by December 2014 and the second Report for the period 2016-20 by  
 2015, with indicative costs and timetable. If this amendment was just asking for a timetable, I  
 would not be opposing it. Although it will be a challenge producing an accurate timetable for the  
 remainder of this term, it will be significantly more difficult to produce a timetable for the period  
 2016-20 with the accuracy this Assembly would expect and any timetable would be subject to  
 change in circumstances and even more so for that timetable, as I sure the Board will not be the  
 1270 same after the 2016 election. So if it was just a timetable, yes, we would support it but as is it not,  
 I cannot support it.

To calculate the likely cost, which is what this amendment asks for, is just not realistic  
 because, until the policy has been developed, you just do not know how much it will cost General  
 Revenue and I presume that is the cost that this amendment refers to. Also most of HSSD's  
 1275 services are financed from some or all of the following: General Revenue expenditure through  
 HSSD's budget; General Revenue expenditure on Social Security Supplementary Benefit budget;  
 Social Security contributions from the Health Fund, the Long Term Care Fund, and the Guernsey  
 Insurance Fund; private medical insurance funds financed by personal or corporate premiums and  
 by private patients. Trying to predetermine the cost of a new policy and the specific cost to  
 General Revenue I just do not think is possible, with an acceptable degree of accuracy, when you  
 1280 do not know what the new policy will be and you do not know who is going to pay for it, as that  
 will be part of the new policy. You have to so heavily qualify any likely costs that it will,  
 effectively, end up with a range of possible costs. I know what then happens is that those opposed  
 will just use the highest number to stop progress on the development of a policy, however unlikely  
 that it is to cost that much. Having guessed – and that is all we could do – the likely cost of a yet  
 1285 unknown policy to then determine the funding option makes, in my view, no sense at all.

Ultimately, if you are developing new policies, then they will have to be affordable. If they are  
 not, they will be unlikely to gain any political support from the States that day. Yesterday,  
 reference was made to the large surpluses of the not too distant past. I expect you would have then  
 concluded with a different policy, a different cost and a different funding option to what you  
 1290 would do now, when we have a deficit situation.

Mr Bailiff, I urge Members to reject this amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize to reply to the debate.

1295 **Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.

There was a contradiction in the opposition to this amendment because some of the opposition,  
 including the Minister's speech just now, was based on the fact that the demands of the  
 amendment are unachievable. And yet Deputy Luxon, in opposing the amendment, said 'Well,  
 1300 what is demanded by the amendment is going to happen anyway' so, on the one hand, the  
 amendment is meant to be too nebulous and, on the other hand, it is meant to be too far-reaching.  
 It cannot be both.

Deputy Storey said that the demands in the amendment were impractical, unrealistic, but what  
 new Proposition 3 in this amendment requires is a timetable and the likely costs and funding  
 options for policy initiatives and changes to services to be introduced in *this* States term. No, I  
 1305 cannot understand how asking HSSD to produce, by December 2014, the timetable and costs and  
 funding options for initiatives to be introduced in *this* States term can possibly be impractical or  
 unrealistic.

Deputy Storey said that the States Report from HSSD shows that, under the ambitious plans of  
 the 2020 Vision, health and social care will become much more expensive and he then went on to  
 1310 say, because of the condition of public finances, that that is not possible. Well, exactly! That is  
 entirely the point of the amendment. I am suggesting that there are ambitious aspirations contained  
 in this 2020 Vision that are not anywhere near remotely deliverable, and I think the States needs to  
 have that information. I do not think it is good enough just to produce vague, aspirational, woolly  
 Strategy, a sort of utopian vision for the future, when we know full well that we are not going to  
 1315 be able to deliver much of what will be necessary to realise that Strategy.

Deputy Storey also said that the timetable and the costs of policy initiatives within the 2020  
 Vision were not fully within the mandate of the Health and Social Services Department – which is  
 a reasonable point – but that is why both parts of the amendment require that before HSSD report  
 back to the States they consult with other States Departments and other bodies, as necessary.

1320 Deputy Adam spoke about his experience as HSSD Minister and the importance of having in  
 place States resolutions to generate proper policy development. He referred to the timetable at

page 93 of this States Report, but I think I need to point out, having made some enquiries, about what this timetable actually is. One of the bullet points in Quarter 1 has already been withdrawn but the second bullet point in the timetable for Quarter 2 ‘Supported Living and Ageing Well Strategy’ and ‘Long-term Care Funding’... well, States Members must not get the impression that that means that, in Quarter 2, proposals for the future of long-term care funding will come to the States. What that means is that something will come to the States, setting out a vague roadmap for how the States might go about changing the funding arrangements for long-term care. Well, that is not the kind of timetable I am talking about. I am talking about a timetable that lays out actions, actual policy initiatives, to deliver change and reform necessary to deliver the 2020 Vision and the commitments contained within it.

Deputy Adam said that the Health Care Review is the cornerstone of the 2020 Vision and that it must be progressed expeditiously and brought to the States with costs and funding options. I agree with that and this amendment is fully consistent with that. He also spoke about the policy vacuum that exists in some respects and, again, that is what lies at the heart of my laying this amendment.

I agree with something which was inferred, if not said explicitly, in Deputy Queripel’s speech, which was that putting in place a States resolution has the potential to unlock the development of policy because getting a policy plan written and getting it to the States – a policy plan which sets out a timetable and costs – is absolutely essential in order to generate action. Deputy Adam has already said what happens with strategy and policy if you do not get to the States with timetables and potential sources of funding: invariably, nothing happens. And I think that to allow Departments, or at least not to require Departments, to come to the States and set out timetables for action and set out the likely costs of those actions, and set out where that money is going to be found, is complacency in policy making. And I think that this Assembly has a right, has a duty, to require Departments to come to the States with that sort of level of information.

Deputy Harwood said that it might be possible for HSSD to come to the States by 20 December 2014 with a timetable for the development of Strategy and an indication of how much it might cost to put those Strategies together. What kind of commentary is that on the policy-making capability of this Government? I think it is extraordinary for the Minister of the Department and the Chief Minister to be able to say that part 1, or new Proposition 3, of this amendment cannot be complied with when all it requires is, by December 2014, a plan containing a timetable and likely costs and funding options for initiatives to be introduced *during this term*. I want to stress that I am not suggesting that, by December 2014, HSSD should be in a position to come to the States with a timetable and costs and funding options for absolutely everything that needs to be delivered to fulfill the long term aspirations for the 2020 Vision but I *do* think they should be required to come to the States by that date to tell us of the timetable and the likely costs and the funding options for those things which need to be delivered *in this term* to start fulfilling the 2020 Vision.

On that point, if the States, sir, wants to vote separately on new Proposition 3 and new Proposition 4, then that seem to me perfectly viable because I do not think that –

**The Bailiff:** I think the way to do it would be to pass the amendment and then, when it comes to the propositions, they can vote separately on the propositions.

**Deputy Fallaize:** The point is, sir – I accept that – but the point is that one can live without the other Proposition 4, if the States feels that that is too onerous to ask HSSD to offer *any* sort of commentary about what might be necessary in the next States term. That can be detached, but I do think that we need to oblige them to advise us, by the end of next year, of exactly what it is they intend to do – and how they would pay for it – before the end of this term.

Deputy Le Tocq said that more staff would need to be employed if HSSD were required to comply with the terms of the amendment. Now, I have just read out the direction in Proposition 3: I will not do it again. What I am saying to HSSD is, ‘Okay, you can have all the policy initiatives you want this term. You can have all the changes to services you want in this term, but just come to the States and tell us what the timetable is and tell us how you are going to pay for it.’ And that is meant to require additional resources to provide that information. Well, how can those changes be introduced without giving the States a timetable and an indication of how it will be funded?

My interpretation of what Deputy Le Tocq is actually saying is that, if you if you cannot provide the staff resources to tell the States what the timetable for action is and how that action is going to be funded, you are not going to get any action at all. And that is exactly what we are faced with, in my view, today in opposition to this amendment. We will deliver *absolutely nothing* this term in order to fulfill the commitments in the 2020 Vision. Now, I do not have a major

1385 problem with that. If that is what the fiscal policies of the States direct, then that is going to be the reality. But I do not believe that we should be making very ambitious – excessively ambitious – commitments to the community, which are contained right throughout this 2020 Vision, unless we are actually prepared to deliver them.

1390 In response to Deputy Duquemin, I would say, yes, this amendment and perhaps other amendments I have laid, are an attempt to provoke progress but I think that, sometimes, it is appropriate for this Assembly, as Government, to put its hand on the tiller and set expectations for States Departments. These are Departments of Government, they are Departments set up by the States. I want to leave HSSD to get on with developing their policy. I do not want to set health policy for them, I just want them to come back to the States and tell us what their timetable for doing that is and how they are going to pay for it.

1395 Sir, the fact that this amendment is so ‘objectionable’ makes me chuckle a bit because, on the States Review Committee, we are requiring ourselves to consider some of the things that are done in other jurisdictions. The two most comparable jurisdictions to us are Jersey and the Isle of Man. In both of those jurisdictions, Government Departments would be required to turn up in their parliaments and set out timetables, costs and funding options for *all* of the policy initiatives that they want to introduce during that term and to turn up with that information within a few months of every general election. And here is an amendment proposing that HSSD should do that in the *second half* of this States term and it is regarded as objectionable.

1400 Deputy Duquemin also said that the expiration of the MSG contract would provide enough pressure of itself and, in respect of that part of the 2020 Vision, obviously he is right, but that does not deal with primary care, or public health, or environmental health, or social care, or the Long Term Care Insurance Fund, or demographic changes, which are also key to the delivery of the 2020 Vision. In respect of all of those areas of policy, there is nothing external to the 2020 Vision that is going to force change in the way that the expiry of the MSG contract will. I support the 2020 Vision. There was a lot of general debate, some of which seemed to indicate that those proposing this amendment are not in favour of the 2020 Vision. I support it but I ask States Members to look at what is underneath it. What is underneath it at the moment is a soup of strategies, some of which, over a period of years, have sunk without trace, very few of which have any kind of timetable or funding plan. There is no way of implementing them over the next few years.

1415 Deputy Gollop raised the development of some of these strategies. As Deputy Le Lièvre said, the Older Persons Strategy, or whatever it is now called, every year since 2007 the States has been promised the Older Persons Strategy the following year. Its name has changed twice and still there is no Strategy. This amendment is about requiring, not delaying, progress and action.

1420 Deputy Bebb criticised the laying of this amendment after I had voted in favour of Proposition 3 on the FTP Report yesterday but, remember, I am not proposing the 2020 Vision. All the commitment in the 2020 Vision is coming from HSSD. If the approving of FTP propositions yesterday means that the aspects of the 2020 Vision are not deliverable, well, so be it. It is up to the Health and Social Services Department to reconcile its own policies against the fiscal policies of the States. If Deputy Bebb is saying that, having approved Proposition 3 yesterday, it is now not possible for HSSD to tell the States what the timetable is and what the funding options and what the costs are to implement the various things necessary in respect of the 2020 Vision then, by implication, it will not be possible for HSSD to introduce all the measures necessary to fulfill the 2020 Vision.

1430 Sir, I am alleged by Deputy Jones chiefly, but not only by Deputy Jones, to be concerned with process. I am told to leave all of that to one side – let us concentrate on action... But when you try and prompt a bit of action from States Departments, when you try to provoke a policy plan then, suddenly, that is regarded as ‘objectionable’. When a bit of scrutiny is applied to what Departments are actually going to do to fulfill some of these aspirational strategies then, suddenly, that is all a bit too difficult, a bit too much.

1435 Deputy Dorey spoke about what was coming up in Government ‘service plans’ – this new concept which we were introduced to a couple of weeks ago. As I understand it, in July we are going to be asked whether we agree with the new structure of introducing Government service plans, not the Government service plans themselves. Then, of course, they have to be developed. Now, I should say to States Members and particularly newly elected, recently elected, Members, we have had a lot of these things, these corporate policy planning documents for Government service plans. We had a Policy and Resource Planning Report, a Policy and Resource Plan, a Government Business Plan, a States Strategic Plan, version 2008-12: *now* we have Government service plans!

1445 The reality is, sir, the Policy Council keeps dreaming up new titles and new formats for corporate policy planning but *never*, not once in all those years of all those different plans, is the States presented with a clear explanation of ‘this is what Government wants to do. This is what it will cost. This is how we envisage funding it and here are ways of measuring whether those policies have been successful or not’. I do wish the Policy Council would stop dreaming up new corporate policy planning mechanisms and just bring to the States policy plans which detail all of the things which I am requesting in this amendment.

1450 When Deputy Dorey says that he could have supported the amendment if it referred only to a clear timetable, rather than likely costs and funding options, I suspect what he means is had I asked the Health and Social Services Department to update the table at page 93 and provide a timetable for when they would report back to the States with some more strategies, then he might have supported the amendment. But what I want is a timetable for the *actions* that will be necessary to deliver each of those strategies that sit under the 2020 Vision. And, again, sir, I really do ask the States to put this in perspective, that we really have to ... we must surely be able to require HSSD, by December 2014, to outline their timetable and the likely costs and funding options of their initiative. These are not our initiatives, these are *their* initiatives that *they* want to introduce, in order to deliver that part of the 2020 Vision that needs to be introduced during this States term.

1460 Sir, that is what the amendment is about. It is about laying down the expectation of this Assembly. I predict that if this amendment loses and the Assembly sets down no expectation of HSSD, no expectation of any Department of Government, to report back to the States by any time with timetables and costs and funding options, the 2020 Vision will go exactly the same way as most of the strategies that at the moment compile the 2020 Vision. It will more or less sink without trace. I forecast a name change in a couple of years and another rewrite, or reformatting, of the Strategy. It will become a 2030 Vision or a 2040 Vision, (*Laughter*) but what we will not see is meaningful action.

1465 I implore the States to stop making aspirational commitments to the community, which we know we cannot afford and we know we cannot deliver and, instead, to get into the business of requiring Departments to come to the States with meaningful policy plans, laying out timetables, costs and funding options for what they are going to introduce in that very term of the States. That is the concept behind this amendment, that is what this amendment would provoke. It is not radical, it is a perfectly reasonable request and I ask Members to support the amendment, sir, and I would be grateful for a recorded vote.

1470 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey?

1480 **Deputy Dorey:** I cannot allow that statement to go unchallenged. I can give the House total assurance that, while I am sitting here as the HSSD Minister, I will make sure there is progress. It will not become the 2030 vision, we will be committed to progress.

We are politicians and that is what we do is policy. We will develop the policies, but within the resources that we have available.

1485 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Can I just correct, if I gave the wrong impression: I do not dispute Deputy Dorey’s commitment.

1490 What was it? Six weeks ago, I was standing here proposing him for the job of Minister of HSSD. (*Laughter*) I understand his commitment to the job but the point is that the States has had all of those assurances all of the time and, because we know that the Minister is a jolly good chap, we say ‘Well, okay, we will not set any expectation by way of a States resolution.’ I did not intend, in my speech or in my amendment, to call into question Deputy Dorey’s integrity or commitment but I do think we need to set down requirements for Departments by States resolution.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb

1500 **Deputy Bebb:** Could I just correct one issue that was raised within Deputy Fallaize’s speech: he made reference to the fact that if we did not have a Fundamental Health Care Review there would be no review of primary health care and other aspects of health care. The Fundamental

Health Care Review will encompass *all* of those and it currently envisages doing so, although it is predicated on this Assembly passing that Report, obviously.

1505 **Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, what I said was, in response to Deputy Duquemin, that the review of the contract with the Medical Specialist Group would not necessarily, of itself, generate reform in the area of the primary health care.

1510 **The Bailiff:** Members, you are now being asked to vote on the amendment proposed by Deputy Fallaize, seconded by Deputy Le Lièvre –

**Deputy Bebb:** I am sorry, could I ask –

1515 **The Bailiff:** – on a recorded vote.  
Deputy Bebb, if you –

**Deputy Bebb:** I was going to ask for a recorded vote. I did not realise –

1520 **The Bailiff:** No, it has already been asked for.

The Amendment:

To add new Propositions 3 and 4 as follows:

1525 ‘3. To direct that by no later than December, 2014, and after consultation with other States Departments and other bodies as necessary, the Health and Social Services Department shall lay before the States of Deliberation a States Report or States Reports outlining a clear timetable and the likely costs and funding options for any policy initiatives and material changes to services which in the opinion of the Department it is necessary to introduce during the 2012-16 States Term in order to meet the objectives set out in the 2020 Vision with the financially sustainable model referred to in Proposition 2(i) above.

1530 ‘To direct that by no later than December, 2015, and after consultation with other States Departments and other bodies as necessary, the Health and Social Services Department shall lay before the States of Deliberation a States Report or States Reports outlining an indicative timetable and indicative costs for any policy initiatives and material changes to services which in the opinion of the Department it is necessary to introduce during the 2016-20 States Term in order to meet the objectives set out in the 2020 Vision with the financially sustainable model referred to in Proposition 2(i) above.’

1535

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Lost – Pour 20, Contre 26, Abstained 0, Not Present 1*

	<b>POUR</b>	<b>CONTRE</b>	<b>ABSTAINED</b>	<b>NOT PRESENT</b>
1540	Deputy Brehaut Deputy Le Clerc Deputy Gollop Deputy Sherbourne	Deputy Harwood Deputy Kuttelwascher Deputy Domaille Deputy Langlois		Deputy Ogier
1545	Deputy Conder Deputy Lester Queripel Deputy Gillson Deputy L Pelley Deputy Trott	Deputy Robert Jones Deputy Storey Deputy Bebb Deputy St Pier Deputy Stewart		
1550	Deputy Fallaize Deputy Laurie Queripel Deputy Lowe Deputy Le Lièvre Deputy Green	Deputy David Jones Deputy Spruce Deputy Collins Deputy Duquemin Deputy Dorey		
1555	Deputy Adam Deputy Perrot Deputy De Lisle Deputy Burford Deputy Inglis	Deputy Paint Deputy Le Tocq Deputy James Deputy Brouard Deputy Wilkie		
1560	Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Sillars Deputy Luxon Deputy O'Hara Deputy Quin Deputy Hadley		
1565		Alderney Representative Jean Alderney Representative Arditti		

*There was a short pause.*

1570 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, the result of the vote on the amendment proposed by Deputy Fallaize, seconded by Deputy Le Lièvre is 20 votes in favour, 26 against. I declare it lost.

Deputy Fallaize, you had indicated that, if the amendment was lost, you might seek to lay a sursis.

1575 **Deputy Fallaize:** No, sir, my indication was that the sursis would be laid only in the event that a motion pursuant to Rule 13(6) was laid and carried, in the event of the –

**The Bailiff:** Oh, I see, sorry.

1580 **Deputy Fallaize:** No, there is no sursis.

**The Bailiff:** No, there is no sursis. Sorry, I misunderstood that. Thank you. So we move into general debate, then, for anybody who has not spoken in general debate. Deputy De Lisle.

1585 **Deputy De Lisle:** Thank you, sir.

This Report, the 2020 Vision, is very timely, essential and concerning. The cost of health provision, going forward, is very large and the numbers given on page 70, paragraph 44, are quite frightening, actually, indicating another £70 million by 2020, if I work out the figures with respect to their £376 million in 2040. While the funding base is shrinking, as we support austerity in this  
1590 Assembly, and medical treatments and technologies continue to increase, and the growth in the Island's older population increases and the demand for health and social care services increase, so, given this challenge, this review is very important indeed to come up with a sustainable system and way forward for the future with respect to our health service.

Now, sir, Guernsey is a very small Island, one of a collection of islands surrounded by major  
1595 powers. Working and sharing services with other jurisdictions to reduce the cost has to be a very important part of our way forward. Yet there is little reference to this working in the Vision document that we have got before us. In fact, I cannot find any reference to it. There is reference to partnerships in the voluntary sector over the next ten to twenty years in paragraph 142, page 87, but nothing on partnerships with jurisdictions outside this Island. Nothing, either, under 'windows of opportunity' on page 73. Deputy Adam spoke of connections with other places, I think it was in  
1600 the Highlands and Islands and a few other areas but, given recent statements of Ministers here and in Jersey towards pan-Island working and also links and ties developed and developing currently beyond these Islands, partnerships with outside jurisdictions are fundamental to address the challenge facing the Department and need to be integrated within the 2020 Vision. I ask that this is  
1605 looked at in future working and deliberations of that Department.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Domaille.

1610 **Deputy Domaille:** Quicker than I thought it would be, sir! Thank you, sir.

Just a short speech. I am supportive of this Vision but I would like to draw Members' attention to the role of the States Environment Plan and the Environment Department in meeting this Vision. If Members turn to the diagram on page 67, they will see the wider determinants of health and wellbeing and the weight given to environmental issues, such as the natural environment, the  
1615 built environment, climate change and bio-diversity. It follows that the implementation of the States Environment Plan is key to the successful delivery of this vision and, for its part, the Environment Department will provide every assistance in development of this Vision.

In this regard, I refer to the section on 'Windows of opportunity' on page 73 and draw Members' attention to some *additional* windows of opportunity that fall within the Environment Department's workstreams. Within this States term, the Environment Department will be presenting firm proposals for a road transport strategy, a bio-diversity strategy a coastal defence strategy *and* new development plans. When these proposals are being considered by this  
1620 Assembly, Members will have the opportunity to begin initiatives that will improve the wider determinants of health and wellbeing and, consequently, aid the achievement of this 2020 Vision.

1625 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Yes, Deputy Green.



**Deputy Green:** Sir, Members, the position I take is I do support this general Vision.

1630 I do worry about it being a progress report because I cannot really see sufficient evidence of  
there being real progress but there is no doubt that there are some massive problems that are  
confronting the delivery of health and social services now and in the future, which we really need  
to get on with managing and mitigating. Just to touch on two of those, firstly the Billet at page 69,  
1635 paragraph 41, explains about the reality of the so-called 'demographic time bomb' and the  
dependency ratio and the figures in there suggest that the dependency ratio will increase from 48  
dependents per 100 working age people to 78 dependents per 100 working age people by 2040. So  
that is a massive challenge, a significant challenge: that does need to be emphasised.

1640 Secondly, as the Chief Minister touched upon in his opening speech, the Billet does highlight  
the issue of health inequalities, a problem very vividly and clearly illustrated by the recent report  
of the Medical Officer of Health, Dr Bridgeman, in his excellent Annual Report. Both of these  
issues, along with others, will require HSSD to come back to this Assembly and to offer real  
clarity and precision on how they are going to seek to provide a financially sustainable model, but  
also a more equitable health system. Also in the Report there is a lot of talk about joint working  
and I fully support more co-ordinated and joined-up social policy in order to improve health  
1645 outcomes. The Report is quite right in emphasising the role of poor housing, poor educational  
attainment, poor employment opportunities and disjointed work welfare systems in terms of  
adverse impact upon health outcomes.

1650 The point I would like to make is we know, from quite a wealth of data which is now in the  
public domain, that there is quite a clear correlation between societies that have greater amounts of  
inequality and worse physical and mental health outcomes. Now, I hope the Health and Social  
Services Department will continue to emphasise the need for more joined-up social policy and also  
consider the case for greater social equality, in terms of its role in reducing health problems in the  
future.

1655 I do support the Vision and that is all I have to say.  
Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Hadley

1660 **Deputy Hadley:** Mr. Bailiff, I was a little surprised when I saw this Report coming before the  
Assembly because, as it says in paragraph 4, the Report – which is substantially this Report – was  
unanimously approved by the States in May 2011, nearly two years ago. I think the Report does  
fail, to some extent, in being a progress report – yes, of course, the Department have done a  
number of things which the Deputy Minister outlined but these are not the core of what we should  
1665 be thinking about – I mean that it is a pity that the Report is so repetitive: I think it said, five times,  
they were 'promoting good health, improving outcomes and protecting people'. Long on rhetoric  
and perhaps short on detail, although, as I said, the principles of the Report are sound and based on  
current good practice and it does identify problems and challenges.

1670 Section 57 of the Report refers to the complicated and ambiguous role of HSSD in making  
policy, regulating some services and providing others and this impact was dealt with at some  
length by the sector report that is referred to in the Report.

1675 This Report was produced for the Public Accounts Committee and published in May 2011. The  
options in that Report I believe are being looked at by HSSD and, again, it referred, as has already  
been mentioned, to a once-in-a-generation chance to look at the whole structure because of the  
expiration of the MSG and GPG contracts. And the sector report discusses a number of options  
that do not seem to have been considered in this Report: it suggests that there should, for example,  
be a purchaser/provider split, with HSSD management becoming the purchaser and other services  
provided managed by providers.

1680 Deputy Adam dealt in some detail with section 49 and the problems of increasing  
specialisation of physicians and surgeons. This, unfortunately, is almost certain to be a very big  
cost issue for the Health Service, going forward, and, again, sections 50 and 51 deal with the  
problems of recruitment in a shrinking working population. I think this is, again, another cost  
problem that has to be considered for the future. Section 64 referred to the contract with the  
Primary Care Company Limited to provide 24/7 accident and emergency services and 24-hour  
1685 hospital medical cover and that, again, is one of the main contracts expiring in 2018. With this in  
mind, I would urge the Department to publish the report produced by the Royal College of  
Accidents and Emergency Medicine, which is now some two years old. This report was critical of  
the model that we have for accident and emergency service. It is an area that was identified by the  
Financial Transformation Programme for review and I am aware of the constraints of the contract,

1690 which expires in 2018. However, it is not satisfactory to wait five years before making the changes that were identified in that review. Indeed, publication of this report and many of the other reports that the HSSD commissioned would do much to enhance its reputation for openness and honesty, which it says that it is keen to enhance in section 155 of the Report.

1695 Section 152 deals with stakeholders and mentions service users in several places, and I do plead with the Department to engage more effectively with its many workers. We all know of the complaints about lack of consultation from all sections of the PEH and also a number of nurses that have resigned in recent weeks. Staff morale is low and the new Board will not repeat the lack of consultation that occurred before Christmas is something that I would hope.

1700 Section 122 says that the States will be asked to consider a report in February 2013 and we now hear this is, in fact, delayed, which is a pity.

I am glad that the Social Policy Group has identified a need for the States to improve the support it offers to families. I have been making speech after speech on this issue for the last five years and, indeed, we still have a shortage of social workers. Using agency social workers was one of those issues that was identified as a major reason for overspends in the December report.

1705 Finally, as I mentioned I think yesterday, there is some concern that part of the Health Service are not keeping up with developments in the UK and here I refer again to chemo-therapeutic drugs new drugs that are now in use in the United Kingdom and we are not using over here. If it does continue, as I said yesterday, it does worry me that people in Guernsey have a poorer quality of life and survival rate from cancer to those in the UK. Indeed, this is not new because the Board of HSSD was warned years ago that this was a looming problem, and I think it is, as I can only repeat again, a debate that I hope this Assembly will have in the future, as to what we want to do about some of these treatments. I worry because the cost of healthcare will almost certainly rise at something like 10% each year and I really do want the 2020 Vision to deliver to us healthcare that is comparable to the rest of the western world.

1715 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Anyone else?

Yes, Deputy Soulsby.

1720 **Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, I would, firstly, like to say how useful I found this Report in providing a very clear impression of the challenges facing not only the Department but the States as a whole. Whilst I believe it is right to set a timescale, I would question the ability to get such structural changes sorted within seven years, especially given it has taken two years to get to this point.

1725 It is made clear in the Report that HSSD believes that a truly effective Health and Social Care system cannot be created through gradual change. This will mean considerable work to make sure services are linked financially and contractually. What is missing here, as was missing at the start of the FTP, is the absence of any recognition of the importance of the change management process and the faster you want to bring the completely new system in, the more important that process will be. It will certainly be impossible without the buy-in of every effective organisation, internal and external to the States of Guernsey.

1730 I would also like to raise the matter of the States outsourcing work to third party organisations. This has been an issue raised by the Chair of the Public Accounts Committee in the UK, Margaret Hodge MP. She has voiced serious concerns about the problems of effective scrutiny, where funds are passed to the third sector and other external organisations. I would like to echo her concerns and believe that there should be a States-wide policy regarding minimum financial reporting requirements placed on organisations as a condition of them receiving public money.

1735 Finally, I would like to advise Members that the Public Accounts Committee will shortly be following up the previous Committee's review into secondary health care in 2011 to determine actions taken against its recommendations at that time.

1740 **The Bailiff:** I see no one else rising.

Oh, Deputy Bebb is about to...

**Deputy Bebb:** Thank you M. le Bailif.

1745 I am a little disappointed to note the number of people who have actually spoken from other Departments about the 2020 Vision.

The 2020 Vision is a Policy Council vision and there is a reason for that. It is not all about healthcare and I know that we tend to focus very much on healthcare and I know that, given that is a Report that is primarily led by HSSD, I fully understand why we focus on it. But Culture and

1750 Leisure, for instance, have their role to play within 2020. If we do not get enough people involved in activities, we end up with obesity and what happens is they end up being the care of HSSD. Commerce and Employment have their role to play: if we do not increase the employment on the Island, if we do not have a good working environment, then we tend to find those same people who are unemployed and in the care of social security will then end up in HSSD.

1755 Each and every Department have their role to play in ensuring that we have a fundamentally good system, a good society, within the Island because it is only through the delivery of services effectively, it is only through ensuring that we have good cohesive policies that cut across all other Departments, that we ensure that we keep people out of HSSD's care. I think that that is fundamental within the 2020 Vision.

1760 This is not about how we deliver healthcare alone, this is also how we ensure that people do not rely on the healthcare that we have on the Island. We try and ensure that they *do* lead good, healthy, independent lives. Housing is evidently a fundamental part of that because poor housing does lead to poor healthcare.

1765 The second part that we have looked at, that people do focus on, is the cost of healthcare. The cost of healthcare in Guernsey is currently not particularly great, shall we put it that way. And that will not improve unless we tackle the system of healthcare that we have on the Island. I know that I am moving on to the Fundamental Healthcare Review by talking about it but the truth is that it is integral to the 2020 Vision.

1770 We have a system of healthcare in Guernsey that has grown organically over time and, in times of plenty, there was no reason to change a model that seemed to be working, because we could pay for it. Now, with changes within the delivery of healthcare in the UK in particular driving behaviours, as well as the very changing reality of our financial position, we really have got to rethink it. The model is both financially unsustainable and clinically unsustainable and the challenge that Guernsey faces in trying to attract specialists to this Island to deliver healthcare is an ever-increasing challenge and it is one that needs to be met. And do not think that it stops with  
1775 Doctors, it extends to nurses as well. At this point in time, as has been made very evident from Deputy Hadley's comments on a number of occasions – I know this is a matter of record – we struggle to retain nurses. That is not solely as a result of the housing rebate schemes, and so forth that we have. It is also to do with the fact that we have no junior doctors. Therefore, we ask nurses to extend their range of care to cover certain areas in the UK that would be covered by junior  
1780 doctors, but we do not recognise that within their pay structure, we do not recognise it within their job titles, we do not recognise it within a number of areas.

Part of the Vision will be about addressing *all* of our healthcare delivery. *How* do we model healthcare so that, when people say that they have worked in Guernsey, when they return to the UK they do not say they have worked in Guernsey with slight embarrassment: that is true at the  
1785 moment in a number of areas of our healthcare, because it is not a glowing example. We need to fundamentally change that, so that when people return to the UK and say 'I have spent years working in Guernsey', people will look at that and think 'Good God, you have worked in an excellent model of healthcare that delivers well'. It is unfortunate that we cannot say that at this point in time and I do believe that the Fundamental Healthcare Review has the potential to deliver that type of model of healthcare that we could all aspire to, but it is only a small part of the 2020  
1790 Vision. I sincerely hope that, when we return from lunch, we hear much more from other members of the Policy Council about what *their* role is within the 2020 Vision and how they seek to fulfill their Department's role in that Vision.

1795 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Well, that will be after lunch.  
We will rise now and come back at 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.32 p.m.  
and resumed its sitting at 2.31 p.m.*

Billet d'État I

POLICY COUNCIL

**2020 Vision: Progress Report and Next Steps**  
**Debate concluded: Report approved**

**The Deputy Greffier:** Debate continues on Billet d'État I, Article IX, Policy Council 2020 Vision Progress Report and next steps.

1800

**The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak or is it to...?  
Yes, Deputy O'Hara.

1805

**Deputy O'Hara:** Having been requested to say a few words, sir, I think I should.  
The Culture and Leisure Department have been for a long, long time helping the HSSD in assisting patients and so forth, who had operations and so on. Now, we have given our *full* support to 2020. We were involved with the initial discussions right from the beginning before it came to the Report in May: we gave it 100% in May and we are doing the same again this time.

1810

What we are conscious of – and I think all Departments are the same – we are conscious of the fact how far the resources can go? We will give 100% towards it. What I like about the 2020 is that it brings the Departments together genuinely to work together. That is what has really come out of it. If we could have similar kinds of initiatives, that would be wonderful. So I can honestly say that the Department will give it 100% and it will play the game, as they say.

1815

Thank you.  
**The Bailiff:** Anyone else?  
Deputy Gollop.

1820

**Deputy Gollop:** Sir, Deputy Mike O'Hara's little speech has given me an opportunity to comment on it, in one respect, that we served on Culture and Leisure together and, indeed, I think we had a good relationship with Health and Social Services Department.

1825

I remember, in one of our Board Meetings, Mr Mark Cook and other people came along to promote an initial draft of the 2020 Vision. Of course, that raises a bigger question that, over the years, I have heard noises off, not just on social media but from some Members of this Assembly, who kind of say 'Well, in an ideal world, wouldn't it be great if HSSD had an even bigger budget – another £5 million – and they took it all from Culture and Leisure'. Now, actually, that is not good thinking because Culture and Leisure is all about Guernsey coming together, stimulating leisure activities, sports, athletics, gymnastics and culture – both good on a mental and physical level. In other words, I think part of the Strategy is all about prevention rather than cure and we need to think of it in that way.

1830

There is a lot of good 'plums' in this Strategy. I point to page 87, reaffirmation – paragraphs 137 to 139 – saying

1835

'The Disability and Inclusion Strategy is part of a portfolio of work within the Social Policy Plan. It aims to ensure that disabled Islanders, and the family and friends who support them, have the best quality of life possible, and that obstacles to their social inclusion and participation are removed. [...] The Supported Living and Ageing Well Strategy will enable much of this to be put into practice.'

1840

'with a focus on independence and choice'. Another sentence:

'One of the main challenges which disabled Islanders face is getting the support they need to live the lives they want. [...] Other challenges faced by disabled Islanders – such as prejudice and discrimination, limited access to employment and social opportunities and poor accessibility – are [perhaps] beyond the specific remit...'

1845

but it should be taken as part of a wider strategy.

I support all of that but, like Deputy Fallaize and others this morning, I identify that they will cost in some cases and resources have to be prioritised to meet that need.

Looking to the wider question, on page 119 – sorry page 82, paragraph 119 – we read a keynote point, I think here:

1850

'The "health system" is delivered through a range of partners and independent providers, including HSSD, MSG –'

Dr. Adam mentioned them, Deputy Adam this morning.

1855 ‘– and the Island’s GPs. There is, however, no overall governance and direction, and thus no guarantee that the best outcomes are being achieved.’

1860 Elsewhere, the Report is not afraid to make the controversial point that, perhaps, the current system does not make the best use of specialists’ time and is, on occasions, unaffordable in terms of general practitioners for regular patients. These are questions, not just from a social nature but they have contractual, legal and financial implications and we have to be mindful of the changes and, as a Member of Social Security, we are well aware of the need for some fundamental reviews, working in partnership with HSSD, on these areas. They will, perhaps, involve difficult decisions because the nub of the 2020 Vision is quite complicated. The argument is made that the current model, as Deputy Bebb said, is not particularly effective in parts but, also, many Members, especially those of a fiscally conservative nature, question sustainability of the current funding model, based on our present economy and income streams. But I think one has to bear in mind that the healthcare system is, potentially, an entirely private one, as you might see, perhaps, in some parts of the United States and elsewhere. It is a business: indeed, there is little regulation to argue how many restaurants and cafés there are beyond certain legal guidelines. I do not think there will be a reduction in demand for healthcare. Therefore, there will continue to be a significant number of providers and the problem we are wrestling with is where the balance is between public provenance and private provenance.

1870 Deputy Hadley made some interesting points this morning about efficiencies of some areas. Accident and Emergency was flagged up, but also the interesting theoretical position that, to a degree, although I appreciate Social Security act as a referee in some areas, the Health and Social Services Department, with its empire – very large, by Guernsey standards – is both a policy maker and procurer of health services but a supplier as well. My suspicion is that, if we are going to see greater cost management, that relationship will have to be looked at and also competitive practices within the industry.

1880 I see this as only ‘Draft 1’ of a much bigger project but, as far as it goes, I support it.

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

1885 **Deputy Ogier:** I do sir, thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you.  
Deputy Laurie Queripel, then Deputy Le Tocq.

1890 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Thank you, sir.

1895 I am going to welcome this Report in a slightly different way to the way that most of the Members have welcomed it. I welcome its intended destination. As the Fallaize and Le Lièvre amendment pointed out this morning, or highlighted, there is actually no conveyance or no vehicle to deliver the Department’s objectives and aspirations as of yet, so I welcome its intended destination. I think it is good news that we want to look at providing progressive modern services and it is good news, it is a good idea, to review the social service and clinical services that we provide at the moment.

1900 And it is good and timely news, sir, because I have been contacted by a number of people who feel that they have not been dealt with in the best way by the Department, they have not been treated appropriately and they feel that they are suffering the consequences of that misservice. Now, sir, this is a behemoth of a Department. (*Laughter*) They offer an incredibly diverse array of services: they are not always going to get it right... I am comforted when I read that it is the intention of the Department to try and tailor and shape services more fully to the needs and the requirements of service users. That is an enlightened approach. It should help to prevent people falling between the gaps and there being a mismatch between people’s needs and the service they receive, and it should help to lessen the amount of unsatisfactory outcomes.

1905 Sir, as for the preventative or the proactive aspect of the Report, or the intentions of the Report, that just makes good sense and I agree with the sentiments of Deputy Gollop that there are many, many ways to look after the health of a society in a community, heart, body, mind and soul.

1910 I am less happy with the message that we have been hearing quite recently, particularly in regard to HSSD, that the Departments – and Deputy Le Tocq alluded to this morning in his own way – have a lot on their plate at the moment, a lot of problems to sort out and we should leave

1915 them to their own devices, that resources are being used unnecessarily to answer Questions and enquiries. Sir, to me that is not acceptable. I support HSSD. I wish them all the best. I will do anything I can to help them with their aspirations and their objectives but I will not stop addressing concerns to the Department that have been brought to my attention by distressed members of the public. All Departments have to deal with that: it is part of the democratic process and to suggest that it is 'not convenient at the moment' is not acceptable.

1920 So, sir, I welcome this Report or, hopefully, its final destination. I like its aspirations. I like its ambitious aims and I am looking forward to them coming to fruition.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Members who wish to do so may remove their jackets.

Deputy Le Tocq.

1925 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Mr Bailiff, the reason that the Policy Council is fronting, if you like, this Report, is to try and emphasise beyond all doubt that issues such as this – health and the vision for health – are not something that can be just departmentalised, very much like the Mental Health and Wellbeing Strategy which will come before us in due course. They affect all of us.

1930 There has been a culture of feeling that the responsibility and, indeed, the activity and the involvement should centre round one Department and, in this instance, I hope this Assembly understands that is not the case. This is something that we must all *own*, we must all take part in and, as a result of that, it is not surprising, perhaps, that some of the tone seems to be a bit fluffy and pie in the sky but, actually, the intention is to engage us in a process out of which many strategies will emerge.

1935 Sir, I want to address Deputy Laurie Queripel's points when he referred to me – just put them in a little bit of context. I do not disagree with him that Questions need to be asked. My point was if that is the case, and I believe it is the case, we have to realise, and our Island needs to realise, that everything will take time and it will have repercussions on that. With that in mind, the fact is, as someone mentioned, that this has taken several years to come back to this Assembly and, in many ways, someone saying 'Not a lot has happened in that time', I sympathise with that. When I took on the Chairmanship of the Social Policy Group, it was evident that there were *many* strategies and documents and work in progress – the work streams were numerous – that had been begun in previous years.

1940 Sir, the criticism has often come from Members of the previous Assembly, who were party to establishing these things. It should have been noted at the time that they would not be able to move forward as fast as, perhaps, some of us would have liked. I would like many of these to accelerate, to work at a better speed but, in order to do that, as I have mentioned in other situations, we need to have a re-view of the way in which we formulate and develop policy because it is not something you can suddenly switch on overnight. We have to change the way we do that and, if resources are scarce and if we, as an Assembly, are not willing to do something about that, to put more resources in, then we are going to have to think of alternative ways of promoting, discussing, developing policy in order to do things differently. And that is what we have been seeking to do, certainly in the Social Policy Group, but it takes time to change a culture of operation.

1945 I want to come to a few more specific points that relate, perhaps, more to my wearing of the Home Department ministerial hat. Sir, if Members turn to page 75, they will see in paragraph 74 there, a diagram with what is termed a number of 'pillars'. In that diagram they will see three pillar type headings – 'Promote', 'Improve' and 'Protect' – which are mentioned right at the start in the Executive Summary. Those who are more astute will notice that, actually, they are very similar to the wording and the structure of the Criminal Justice Strategy – the pillars of that Strategy. If you add 'prevent' into that, you are going to get something very similar. That is deliberate because it is very clear that the 2020 Vision and strategies related to Criminal Justice overlap in many areas. In fact, sir, obviously there are cross-departmental and even outside of this States, third sector and other agencies, businesses, employers, need to all be involved in owning this and that is the way, I believe we need to speak about this as we move forward.

1960 Perhaps in so doing, we may find new resources in order to do something that is appropriate to Guernsey because what I do not want to see us do, sir, is just to copy what is being done elsewhere, be that the UK or in other jurisdictions, and assume that will be appropriate for Guernsey.

1970 With that in mind, can I refer Members to the issue of what is sometimes called troubled families, or families with complex needs – and I have lost the paragraph at the moment... (*Interjection*) Page 83, yes, that's right, thank you. Page 83, paragraph 128, where it states:

1975 'The Social Policy Group has identified a need for the States to improve the support it offers to families who have repeated contact with multiple areas of the welfare system, including social care services. This important social policy issue needs to be explored and understood in more depth, and it is intended that this should be a priority for the Children and Young People's Plan for 2013 onwards.'

1980 Sir, this is something that was very much on my agenda because – I was not alone in this – the Education Minister and others, particularly in the run-up to the Election, came to discover a number of families, where there were multiple agencies, both statutory and voluntary sector, who were involved in families who had a complexity of needs and where there was actually no clear indication that there was any benefit being done but, if you added up all the resources in terms of time and money, it was absolutely huge.

1985 I can report – and it has been alluded to already in this debate – that key work has already begun on this, involving Health, Home and Education, as well as third sector agencies. Some things, sir, were actually quite simple to do, with issues such as data protection and just understanding how that worked, so that information could be shared between different agencies: there is still a learning curve there yet to happen, as we roll that out in terms of training. Often it was given as an excuse for not operating in a co-operative and coherent way. But we are talking about people's lives here and I have certainly come across people in my district where they are getting an immense amount of help and, if it were to be put in terms of statistics, you could say, 'Well, surely they have got enough help there!' but, in terms of co-ordination, it was not really making a difference and, in many cases, it was actually generational, so you could see that this had gone on for at least two or more generations.

1995 I believe that if we target, and we are planning to do so, those families with complex needs, that *many* of the issues that we seek to address, because they affect poverty, they affect mental health, it impinges upon education, it obviously impinges upon criminal justice, it impinges upon our welfare system overall. I believe sir, in targeting those families – and we can do that in a jurisdiction the size of Guernsey, we can choose to do that – in doing so, we will make huge headway where, perhaps, we have not done before.

2000 So this Report begins by stating, in the Executive Summary,

'By 2020 the groundwork will be laid to enable all Islanders to **lead healthy, independent lives.**'

2005 Elsewhere in the Report, sir, it makes reference regularly to the issue of outcomes and I would ask this Assembly to give it full support, not just today but in the days to come, in referencing this and using this Report as a direction of travel, to have that expectation that it is helping us to be an enabler to the people that we represent and to those who, at the moment, we could helping far more than we are and to give particular attention to strategies that are outcome-based, rather than just looking to tick a load of boxes – 'Have we got one of those? Are we doing this, because they are doing it elsewhere? – to look at outcomes and, wherever possible, to make sure that what we choose to do, what we choose to invest in, is focused on those outcomes.

2015 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Langlois.

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

2020 It will be a very brief intervention here. My support, both as an individual Deputy, a Minister and a member of the Social Policy Group, for this 2020 Vision goes without saying. The clue is in the unqualified signature of the States Report and it was unanimous by Policy Council and that is where the information comes from.

2025 The Social Security Department has got a major role to play in the funding and contractual side, in particular, because we have to be sure that good governance procurement practices are observed regarding the contract currently awarded to the MSG and, indeed, that that contract will need reform. That is dependent on identifying how we want to deliver specialist services in future and it has already been noted that the actual delivery of specialist services could become increasingly difficult, as mentioned by Deputy Adam this morning and by others, as the professional requirements on specialists and the number of particular procedures they have to do – and whether they are allowed to deal with the left knee as well as the right knee and so on – gets more and more tight.

2030 On funding, the whole relationship of funding crosses over with much of the other work the Department is involved in and, in particular, on the fiscal and benefit matters because all of this costs a lot of money, as has been remarked upon on many occasions.

2035 So full support for the principles; a very, very close look at both the contractual side of specialist delivery and on funding in general.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Duquemin.

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

2040 I think a lot was said yesterday about the FTP debate being one of the most important debates that we have had in this term of the States and I think that this debate, conversation, that we are having today starts what will definitely be the second most important debate and challenge that this States will face. I will start off by, hopefully, adding a little weight – no pun intended – to my Minister’s, Culture and Leisure’s, support of HSSD and the 2020 Vision.

2045 Not only do I, obviously as a member of Culture of Leisure, but I am also the States or Deputy representative that sits... I was picked to sit as a Commissioner on the Sports Commission... I do not think it was totally said tongue in cheek, but I think it is a nice analogy to build on Deputy Gollop’s ‘prevention-not-cure’ philosophy. Often the two Chief Officers – well, the most recent Chief Officer of Culture and Leisure and the Chief Officer at Health – have often joked that, in actual fact, Culture and Leisure is the ‘health service’ and HSSD is the ‘non-health service’!  
2050 *(Laughter)* So let us be very clear that Culture and Leisure – and I will add to that the Sports Commission – do have a very important role to play in making sure that we are the health service. By that, I mean providing Beau Séjour, whether it is provided as it is now, or perhaps outsourced, but also I would like to briefly, if I might, even just mention some of the work that the Sports Commission do right from a very early age, in terms of PE in schools, ‘Sport for a pound’ and  
2055 even the street sports programme, where probably the most disadvantaged members of our society get a chance to find sport at a very early age. So there is a lot of good work going on from the third sector and there is a multiplier effect with Government money, and it should not be underestimated.

2060 In terms of the prevention-not-cure philosophy, I would obviously say that was, basically, a very important point that was raised when many Deputies – and it was certainly a well-attended briefing by HSSD at the beginning of January – turned up for, I used the phrase yesterday, ‘Death by Powerpoint’, maybe I should have referred to this as ‘Health by Powerpoint’... I think, in many ways, there were two slides that I remembered vividly from that presentation. The first one was  
2065 the fact that it was entitled ‘The wider system’, but the health system, as we know it, is hugely complex and, in a way, the States of Guernsey and HSSD just sit above the tree but are just a small part. There are, obviously, businesses from pharmacists to the GPs to the MSG, to the physiotherapist group, even optician centres etc. We have also got the third sector, the St. John Ambulance etc. What we need to do is we need to make sure that everybody comes to the table to create the correct solution.

2070 The next slide I would like to mention was the all-important thing, what we can do in Government is change things and, hopefully, change things for the better, and there was a slide that read ‘Opportunities for change’. There were five points underneath that included the integrated health and social care system, the delivery of a more efficient system reflecting the ethos of the FTP, better mental wellbeing and changing the funding and service model for the  
2075 older people and others with long-term needs.

But I do not think it was an accident that the one bullet point that was put in bold was

**‘The window of opportunity for the review of the system of the MSG contract, the physiotherapist contract and the Accident and Emergency contract through the GPs’.**

2080 That was put in bold and I mentioned it this morning in my speech on Deputy Fallaize’s amendment, saying that was an important timetable, it was a deadline. I honestly think we are going to ask HSSD and the new Minister to do an awful lot of work in the next few months but, for me, what has to be the number one priority is getting to grips with that window of opportunity  
2085 and those contracts because, as it says in the Billet, it is a ‘once in a generation opportunity’. We can do other things, maybe, in twelve months, eighteen months, two years’ time but this is our one chance to get this right because the repercussions of that are huge. I think that is the one thing that I would like to leave all Members thinking. Yesterday I said that, when we go out of the door, we should be thinking of FTP: when we go out of the door today, that is the one thing that I think we  
2090 should concentrate on, whatever we can do to assist our colleagues at HSSD, either out of the Assembly, or when we return and debate their contracts, or provide them with resource to make it happen. That needs to be the priority. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)**



Thank you, sir.

2095 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Thank you, sir, I will be brief.

2100 There is a real danger that we might be setting ourselves up for a fall here because we have spent the majority of the last two days debating a programme that dictates the combined recurring savings of the States will have to be £31 million a year and that alone will be a *massive* undertaking for every Department. Every Department will now be involved in an internal tug of war to identify where they can make savings and yet we are asking them all to support a Vision that I think will undoubtedly cost them money. Whilst I *fully* endorse the direction of travel and the *good intention* of the 2020 Vision, I think the reality is that we have placed a lot of time on this

2105 list of aspirations that are unattainable, sadly.

As the Chief Minister himself said yesterday, we need to be real; this Vision needs a business plan. Yes, we know where we want to go, but how? That is the question we really do need to ask. How are we going to get there? And will we really support future propositions that are intended to ensure the wellbeing of the community, or are we just going to pay lip service to the intentions themselves? Because if we were really serious about ensuring the wellbeing of the community, we would have supported Deputy Le Lièvre's amendment to increase pension benefits. Because we did not, we now have some pensioners having to decide whether to eat or heat. What a horrible predicament for some of our pensioners to be in and, frankly, in 2013 I think that is unacceptable.

2110

If we were serious about ensuring the wellbeing of the community, we would have supported the fuel allowance amendment I laid before the States, seconded by Deputy Laurie Queripel. So it is simply not enough, sir, to pay lip service to good intentions. We *have* to deliver and, if we do not deliver, then, in a very real sense, we will be failing the people of Guernsey, which is why I said, at the beginning of the speech, there is a real danger we will be setting ourselves up for a fall.

2115

And the Vision itself: it is a wonderful wish list and whilst I *fully* support the intentions, the harsh reality is that, unfortunately, we are aiming too high. We have to be real. We have to aim for things that are attainable and, although dreams do sometimes come true, unfortunately this one will not and we cannot afford to inhabit the dream world. As I said earlier, sir, if I had to make a list of aspirations, it would be that I want every one of my fellow Islanders to be happy, but it is a wish, it is a dream and, sadly, in its current form, so is the 2020 Vision. I would love to be able to give my support to it but I am afraid my conscience will not let me. The Vision itself seeks to promote joined-up Government and the whole community would benefit from joined-up Government but we need a new realistic and affordable Vision that we can actually deliver. Although I realise a tremendous amount of work has gone into it, we simply cannot see how we are going to be able to deliver this Vision in its current form.

2120

2125 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Yes, Deputy James.

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

2135 I felt it was important to get to my feet fairly quickly to try and lighten the mood of this Assembly! (*Laughter*) Hopefully, you are all slightly happier than before I stood up! (*Laughter*)

As you may imagine – not that I am going to take up an inordinate amount of time in this Assembly on this document – I would just like to pick out two particular items in the document that I would like to focus on. One is on page 86 and it makes reference – it is paragraph 135 – to the need to progress the work of the protection of vulnerable adults. The last two or three years before my retirement, sir, I was involved in looking at the strategy on rolling out the work for the vulnerable adults. I feel that this is an absolutely vital area of work that we need to progress, I am thinking, particularly, in relation to the ageing demographics and the encouragement that we will be striving to care for people, often on their own in their own homes. They are a particularly vulnerable target, unfortunately, so I would like to see this work progressed as soon as possible.

2140

The one thing that saddens me – and Deputy Bebb made reference to our Mental Health Act yesterday, I think – I am not sure whether you said 'pre-Nazi' or 'pre-Occupation'. However, our current Mental Health Act, as you probably know, is based on the 1939 law, as amended in 1959, and, yes, we are lucky we are having a new Mental Health Act, hopefully, to be launched on 8th April. The one thing that is missing is our Lack of Mental Capacity Act in Guernsey: it has been enacted in the UK for quite a number of years so, again, it is vitally important for our ageing demographics, in particular, to see that we progress a Mental Capacity Act as soon as possible.

2150

I am now moving on to the next page, which is page 87, and I am looking particularly at item 141 and that is the paragraph that highlights and reads:

2155

‘Around one third of all Guernsey’s charities have a direct link to the health and social care system. An even greater number have a positive influence on the wider determinants of health and wellbeing...’

2160

I think that this is an area – we have heard, over the last few days, the importance of progressing FTP and efficiency savings – for me, this is one area that not only can we make efficiency savings with closer collaborative working with charities but we can actually create and develop more services that are more efficient and – I am just thinking off the top of my head – I am thinking of two particular areas of care and health. That is, we look at Guernsey’s very tiny population 60,000 people, probably the equivalent of a small village in the UK, small town, and yet Guernsey seems to think it is acceptable to have *three* drug and alcohol services. Why does Guernsey need to have three drug and alcohol services? Admittedly, two of those are in the voluntary sector, or third sector, whichever way you wish.

2165

2170

Many of these charities also survive on States grants. I would suggest that we should be looking at these sorts of charities and take a leaf out of Deputy Sillars book, when he made reference to the very efficient collaboration that they have had with the Guernsey Youth Service. I think that there is *huge* scope in Guernsey, when you look at the amount of charities. Just go on to the Association of Guernsey Charities website – we have a *phenomenal* amount of charities in Guernsey, many, many of whom are doing absolutely brilliant work! I think that this is an area that we, in Guernsey, could progress: we could develop services with the voluntary sector so, as I say, not just a case of efficiency savings but I quite seriously believe that we are looking at more effective services also.

2175

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Stewart.

2180

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

In common with Deputy Langlois, I stand as a Member of the Policy Council, a Minister and an individual Deputy.

2185

For Commerce and Employment: our biggest contribution we can make to the health and wellbeing of this Island is to try and facilitate full employment, or as full employment as we can, through our Economic Development Strategy, which will be underpinned by a Financial Sector Strategy and a full ICT Strategy. These are key areas of policy which Deputy Fallaize will be pleased to know will be coming to the States way before the end of this year, in a very short time. That will give industry a real certainty in the direction of travel we intend to go.

2190

Full employment: if we now look at our ageing demographic, one of the key issues I would like to further look at in Commerce and Employment is how we can keep this ageing demographic that we are talking about, how can we keep them active and still making a contribution to society, whether it is in some ways mentoring or enabling more home working through a proper digital literacy programme through our skills strategy? Of course, encouraging digital literacy will also enable disabled people in the community and if we look on page 87, paragraph 139, it says:

2195

‘Other challenges faced by disabled Islanders – such as prejudice and discrimination, limited access to employment and social opportunities, and poor accessibility – are beyond the specific remit of the health and social care system...’

2200

This is something that Commerce and Employment really feels that we can take the lead, in promoting working at home for some people with severe mobility problems and, something I had a very long discussion with Elaine Green a couple of weeks ago, in how we in the States, as the largest employer, can lead in that, in making some of our disabled Islanders make a real contribution to society and give them the opportunity to work.

2205

I think, further, of course, there is a massive cost to industry through sickness and absenteeism. One thing that has already concerned us at Commerce and Employment is the cost of primary care and we have already had a fairly lengthy meeting with the regulators, CICRA, because it did seem strange that every doctor arrived at £40.35 to charge their customers and it does seem to me that we could have a lot more competition in primary care. We all know that, if there is early diagnosis – and this is something that was on the news just a couple of days ago, perhaps the reason why there are more Britons suffering from cancer is that they attribute it to the stiff upper lip, that they were not going to their doctors early enough, they were not getting this diagnosis. I have seen those, not just amongst the elderly, when I was campaigning, who said that they often had to wait until they had certain monies to be able to go to their doctor so they, maybe, had a delay of a few

2210

2215 weeks, but also some quite young people who are working who had to wait until the end of the month for their pay cheque to go in before they could visit their doctor. Certainly, at Commerce and Employment, and using the new Competition Law that we approved, I think we should have a lot more competitiveness. I think the figures I have seen show that we are somewhere in the region of £90 per capita per head more in our primary care costs than areas such as Cornwall or Devon in the UK. That is something that concerns me enormously, as an individual Deputy.

2220 But C & E, as well, driving forward technology and engaging with industry: I have already had an extremely interesting meeting about Smart homes, about how people can remain independent through the use of technology, through the use of software that monitors them so that, actually, the amount of carers are reduced and these people's movements, the software loads their movements around the house, so there is an enormous amount, I think, that Commerce and Employment can feed in, more than just trying to create full employment in here, working very closely with HSSD.

2225 I commend this Strategy to the House and it will certainly get my full support, not only as an individual but also as a Minister, and my Board, but also as a Member of Policy Council.

2230 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Wilkie.

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

I have listened with interest today to the debate on the 2020 Vision and it seems to me that everybody is in favour of the 2020 Vision but there is some frustration on the lack of detail and the lack of finances and timelines produced in the 2020 Vision.

2235 I do not think the 2020 Vision, as a Strategy, should have that in it. That should be contained in the Healthcare Review, so I was quite surprised to hear that the HSSD Board had pulled the Healthcare Review for a further three months because this contains the information that everyone else is clamouring for and, without bringing that to this Assembly and ratifying it, I cannot see how HSSD can move forward with policy, so I would just implore that the Minister brings the Healthcare Review back to this Assembly for ratification as soon as possible.

2240 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Anyone else?

2245 No? In that case, Deputy Dorey, do you wish to reply to the debate?

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

I will go through some of the speeches that have been made and thank you very much for your contributions. We have taken note of what everybody has said and I will give my speech at the end.

2250 Deputy De Lisle started off and referred to paragraph 44, which mentions the increased costs, looking into the future but, at the end of that paragraph, it does say that, if funding arrangements and a range of services provided remain the same as they are in 2012 then that really... The whole point of the Report is that we have to reform our services and what we deliver because they will just not be affordable to the Island as we go into the 2020s and beyond and the post-War baby boomers become older and, therefore, become larger users of the Health Service.

2255 He also mentioned about partnerships with Jersey and beyond. Well, one of the unfortunate things is that this Report is an update and perhaps people should also have had the May 2011 Billet in front of them because one of the workstreams identified in that was joint working with Jersey, the UK and Europe – and we do have a tri-Island meeting with Jersey and the Isle of Man. I have not attended any so far but Deputy Adam has and there are further meetings going to happen in the near future to discuss all aspects of the Health Service, including regulation, service delivery and sharing of benchmark data.

2260 I think my fellow Policy Council Members have all spoken strongly in support of the Strategy – I think Deputy Domaille was the first of the Policy Council Members to speak – because what is important about this Strategy is not just that Departments have to contribute to help us but they also need to take into account the requirements of the 2020 Vision in developing their own strategies. That is important. As well as helping us, they have got to have it as one of their key thoughts as they develop their strategies and that goes for, I think, almost every part of the States if we are going to achieve our targets in terms of developing a health system in an economic way for this Island.

2270 Deputy Harwood spoke about leisure and also Deputy Duquemin spoke about the importance of Beau Séjour and sports commissions in terms of preventing.

Deputy Le Tocq spoke about the Home Department. He also spoke about troubled families and

2275 it is important that we break the cycle of troubled families, which are also big users of the Social Services. And I think it was good that he mentioned that element of it because people tend to concentrate on the health element but it is *Health and Social Services* and the 2020 Vision is not just about health, it is social services as well.

2280 Deputy Langlois spoke about funding and also Deputy Stewart spoke about the importance of full employment – I think that goes throughout society – and the Disability and Inclusion Strategy, which is a social policy group he is working on with Health and Social Services. He also mentioned about primary care and one point I correct is that, when he spoke about the charge for primary care, there is also the additional £12 grant which comes from Social Security’s Health Fund when you go to the doctor, which is what people forget why you always have to sign that slip of paper when you go to the doctor.

2285 Deputy Green spoke about social equality and that is key but, even now, in our Health Service you have got the ability to – and HSSD does that itself with Victoria Wing – you can use money to, basically, jump the queue and you can use money to get a better quality of accommodation at the hospital. However much we dislike that, according to where your political views are, that is going to have to remain as part of our system, if it is going to be affordable. He also mentioned 2290 about financing and, again, there is some more about that in the May 2011 Report.

Deputy Hadley mentioned about the Accident and Emergency Report. I am open and I will try and publish everything that we can. I have not read that Report myself. I will read it but I have been informed that it has some commercially confidential information in it. If we can release it, we will. If not, I will see if we can perhaps release a shortened version but, without reading it myself, 2295 I cannot give any commitment other than saying I will read it.

Deputy Soulsby spoke about a number of things. She mentioned about the third sector, the importance of scrutiny and that regulation is a key part of the review.

Deputy Le Tocq mentioned the pillars in the diagram and that regulation is key to part of the 2020 Vision.

2300 I will not go through what everybody spoke about. Deputy Bebb, particularly, spoke about retaining nurses and, yes, that is key and we do have a problem with nurses leaving. They do tend to leave after the end of the subsidy they get in relation to rent. That is where we have to work with Housing on the Key Worker Strategy that, unfortunately, has not been advanced that far. But we do have a different system to the UK: you would not get a general hospital for 60,000 people in 2305 the UK, so our health employees are going to have different responsibilities just because of the small size of the population.

Deputy Gollop spoke about the importance of working with partners and, yes, we do that. I have mentioned throughout this debate many of the partners that we do work with.

2310 Deputy Queripel – Lester Queripel – mentioned about the vehicle to deliver. Well, in next month’s Reports, which are on Health and Wellbeing, I think we show that we are going to be delivering. We have got Reports coming before us on taking the 2020 Vision ahead.

2315 It was Laurie Queripel who mentioned about the mis-service. We do have a complaints system and I do encourage you, if you do have people who have got complaints against our system, we have a proper complaints system and I encourage you to write in and those complaints will be investigated.

2320 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Sir, just to add to that, can I just say that, in the past, I have asked questions of the Department and made enquiries and they have been very, very helpful and very, very obliging up until now and I appreciate that greatly.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you.

2325 **Deputy Dorey:** Deputy Lester Queripel mentioned about lip service is simply not enough and, as I said, you have got an opportunity next month to show this is not about lip service, this is about debating Reports which will come out of this Vision. Those two Reports will come out of that Vision and, as has been mentioned by Deputy Wilkie and others, we do fully support doing the Healthcare Review and we will bring it back to the House but we – at least three new Members – need to make sure we fully understand it and support it before we bring it to the House/Assembly. 2330 The timetable that we faced, having been elected, was so short before those Reports had to go into the system it was such that I wanted to concentrate on the two: Mental Health and Wellbeing Report and, obviously, I did not want to delay the replacement for the acute ward at the Castel Hospital. The Strategy goes hand in hand with that, so I put my efforts into making sure that those two could go ahead. As I said before, I have got meetings scheduled for next week, and also the

2335 week after, to go through that Report in detail so we can bring it back to the House as soon as possible, as soon as we fully understand it and are happy with it.

I think that covers the main points that have been made – there is also about vulnerable adults, one point I missed. We have established a vulnerable adults multi-agency structure to mirror the child protection structure but it has stumbled due to the lack of resources to sustain it and we are now working out how we can resource it again at present. We need a good independent Chair and some admin support, similar to what we have for the Child Protection Structure, so we are fully committed to support adults as well.

2340 I would now like to just go through some additional points. The basis of this is that every Islander should have the best chance possible to live a healthy, independent life. We have made this commitment in every States Strategic Plan so far. It is a fundamental commitment that should go, perhaps, without saying. However, you are being asked to revisit the 2020 Vision today, as Guernsey will face some serious challenges across the next few decades which will make it very difficult for the Island to maintain the standard of health and wellbeing which we want for ourselves and our children. In order to be prepared for this, it is necessary for us to start taking action now to radically change the way we provide and fund health and social care across the Island. If the groundwork is laid in the years before 2020 – and that is why we are committed – then Guernsey will be much better equipped for the challenges of 2020 and beyond when we have the increasing elderly population.

2350 The 2020 Vision outlines three major kinds of challenge that will set the Island's health and social care system. These are financial pressures, workforce pressures and significant structural issues within our system. It has been widely recognised, and it is contained in the Report, that Guernsey's population is getting older. In 25 years' time, one in three people will be over retirement age. By 2060 one in ten people will live past the age of 85. That is something to celebrate but it comes at a cost

2355 The older you get, the more likely you are to have long-term or complex conditions that require medical attention or ongoing care and support. This means that an older population will lead to more demand for health and social care services over the coming years. At the same time, it is not getting any cheaper to provide those services. The cost of drugs, treatment and equipment continues to increase more rapidly than the rate of inflation. This places significant pressure on health and social care budgets. It is also going to become more costly to maintain our current model of secondary care services, as consultants and other health care professionals train in increasingly specialised areas, hence the Healthcare Review. These issues concern the whole Island. The ageing population is going to have much impact on private, residential and nursing homes and GP practices, as it will on the services provided by HSSD. The increasing cost of healthcare and ongoing workforce shortages will affect every provider of health and social care services on this Island, whether public, private or voluntary.

2360 As such, we will achieve the best results for Islanders in every part of the health and social care system, if able to work together effectively. At the moment, however, there are significant structural issues that prevent this being the case. In Guernsey alone, HSSD is not the only Department with a substantial policy and operational responsibility for health and social care. In particular, it has been mentioned that Social Security is a major funder of our services. This is, arguably, the largest commissioner of social care through the Long-Term Care Insurance Fund. Beyond the States there are many partners in the Island's health and social care system which are linked together very loosely without any over-arching structure and with little in the way of regulation or other safeguards to protect vulnerable people.

2375 One of the areas most in need of development at present is the connection between primary and secondary care and between public and private sectors. The more smoothly those connections work the better a person's care pathway and general experience will be and the more cost-effective services it will be possible to provide. There is, as has been said, a very narrow but important 'window of opportunity' – the words Deputy Duquemin used from our presentation – to make major changes in the way the entire health system functions, including relations between different providers across the whole system.

2380 The States contract for Secondary Healthcare Services expires in 2017 and, before this happens, we have an opportunity to redesign the system and create a much stronger foundation for healthcare. Whatever foundation we lay, it has to be flexible because just as it has changed over the last fifteen years, it will change again over the next fifteen years. Because the opportunity is so soon, the 2020 Vision makes it clear that dealing with the future of the Health system must be a top priority for the States. The previous Board of HSSD had planned to bring a Report commencing this work to the February States. The current Board, as I have said, are now

2395 reviewing this and intend to bring the work forward as soon as reasonably possible. However, the 2020 Vision also makes it clear that there are issues related to long-term care that the States cannot afford to ignore. As the older population continues to grow, the number of people requiring regular care or support will increase every year. There is a real need to review the model and funding of long-term care before the demographic changes really begin to hit us in the 2020s.

2400 The 2020 Vision itself is just a framework establishing the principles needed to support the future health and wellbeing of the Bailiwick. However, in one way a key element of 2020 Vision has already been achieved. You can see that by the way that the Report has been brought to the States today. Originally launched in 2011 by the then HSSD Board, the 2020 Vision has been supported by two further HSSD Boards since the election in April and has now been brought to the States by the Policy Council, representing the ten States Departments, to highlight that it is a States Policy, not just HSSD.

2405 It would take a concerted effort by all those States Departments to each play their part in enhancing the wider determinants of health and wellbeing, everything from Education and accommodation to an acceptable environment and financial security. This, together with effective public health measures, will help to create an inclusive and healthy community that supports the Islanders' physical, social and emotional wellbeing. We can act together to improve Islanders' chances of remaining healthy and well. More effective prevention of ill health and individual crises will, in turn, help to scale back some of the demand for health and social care services.

2410 But consistency of vision is also essential when it comes to making hard decisions about health and social care and these hard decisions will come. 2020 Vision makes it clear that, one day, it may be impossible to provide all the services Islanders expect, in the way that we have come to expect them. We will have to change the way we work. We will have to stop doing some things altogether, or restrict access to people in the greatest need. Until the detailed work on the future shape of the health system and long-term care system and support services have been done, we cannot say how things will change but we must recognise now that it is vital that the States take collective responsibility for creating a future which is acceptable to Islanders and is financially sustainable. That will require compromise and the States must not allow HSSD to stand alone when making these unpopular decisions. Health and wellbeing are everyone's business. Giving every Islander the best possible chance to live a healthy, independent life must be the vision and aim of this whole Government.

2415 We already face challenges. 2013 and 2014 will be difficult years for HSSD as we try to deal with the growing demand and the challenges of FTP within the constraints of our existing model of health and social care. Without radical change, this picture will only get much worse over the coming decades. We cannot afford to put planning for the future on hold, whatever the needs of the present.

2420 The 2020 Vision is more relevant now than ever and I would ask every States Member to endorse the Vision and to work with HSSD to tackle the challenges of the coming decades bravely and honestly and secure a future that is stable, safe and healthy for the people of Guernsey.

2425 Thank you.

2435 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, there are two propositions. They are on Page 95.

I will put both propositions to you together and there is no request for a recorded vote so we will go *au voix*.

Those in favour: those against.

2440 *Members voted Pour*

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

**Limited Liability Partnerships  
Supplementary States Report  
Article withdrawn**

*Article XI:*

*The States are asked to decide –*

*Whether, after consideration of the Report dated 11th March, 2009, of the Commerce and Employment Department, they are of the opinion:-*

*1. To approve the introduction of Limited Liability Partnerships in Guernsey as outlined in that Report.*

*2. To direct the preparation of such legislation as may be necessary to give effect to their above decision*

2445 **The Deputy Greffier:** Article XI, Commerce and Employment Department: Limited Liability Partnerships, Supplementary States Report.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Stewart.

2450 **Deputy Stewart:** Mr Bailiff and Deputies, the Commerce and Employment Department asks that the States permit it to withdraw the Supplementary States Report on Limited Liability Partnerships.

2455 The Report was finalised late last year and work on the draft legislation has been ongoing. In finalising that legislation, industry identified a potential change which could make the Guernsey Limited Liability Partnership more attractive to international business and ensure that it was competitive with the legislation in a number of key competitor jurisdictions. However, in order to ensure that the legislation is world-leading, it will be necessary for a further Report to the States, setting out one area of policy clarification.

2460 Rather than return to the States with a further Supplementary Report, the Department believes that it would be better to withdraw *this* Report and re-submit it to the States, in order to ensure that the policy changes can be considered in the whole. We do not anticipate that this will hold up the legislation unduly and I ask for your support.

**The Bailiff:** Members, shall I put that motion to you straightaway.

2465 The motion is that the Report on the Limited Liability Partnership Supplementary States Report be withdrawn.

Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

2470 **The Bailiff:** I declare that motion to withdraw carried.

**HOME DEPARTMENT**

2475 **Speed Limits for Emergency Services Vehicles  
Article withdrawn**

*Article XIII:*

*The States are asked to decide:*

2480 *Whether, after consideration of the Report dated 15th October, 2012, of the Home Department, they are of the opinion:*

*1. To direct the preparation of such legislation as may be necessary in accordance with that Report, to:*

2485 *(a) allow drivers of the agencies listed in paragraph 2.10 and their trainers to exceed the speed limit while training in Guernsey,*

*(b) allow drivers of the agencies listed in paragraph 2.10 to drive motor vehicles in excess of the speed limit in an emergency or for law enforcement purposes,*

*(c) impose the requirement that a motor vehicle cannot be driven at a speed exceeding 25 mph and that this restriction must be marked on the side of a vehicle on motor vehicles with a*

2490 *maximum authorised mass exceeding 3,500 kilogrammes rather than motor vehicles which exceed two tons unladen weight, and*  
(d) *remove the requirement that at a speed trial or race there must be an interval between the finish of one vehicle's run and the start of the next vehicle's run.*

2495 **The Deputy Greffier:** Article XIII, Home Department's Speed Limits for Emergency Vehicles Etc.

**The Bailiff:** The Minister for the Home Department, Deputy Le Tocq, will open debate.

2500 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Thank you.

Sir, this States Report proposes the preparation of legislation, firstly to allow drivers of emergency service vehicles to exceed the speed limit in an emergency, or for law enforcement purposes.

2505 Emergency services are defined in Section 2.10 as Fire and Rescue, Airport Fire and Rescue, Police, Guernsey Border Agency, Ambulance and Rescue Service. Existing legislation is limited to the Police having power to exceed the speed limit in an emergency or in pursuit of a speeding car, Fire and Ambulance when they have their alarms sounded. Currently, vehicles exceeding two tons are restricted to 25 miles per hour. The intent behind this was to prevent commercial goods vehicles travelling at dangerous speeds. However, this now encompasses a large range of saloon cars and 4x4 vehicles and the current legislation is deemed inappropriate, considering modern braking systems. It is proposed that an increase in the weight limit from 2 tons to 2.3 tons maximum. This would result in the legislation no longer capturing larger domestic use vehicles – which are not considered to be commercial – and this mirrors other jurisdictions.

2510  
2515 Thirdly, these proposals remove the requirement that, at a speed trial or race, there must be an interval between the finish of one vehicle's run and the start of another. This really relates to the hill climb at the moment: only one vehicle may go up the hill at any one time. However, modern safety systems, including CCTV and two way communication, mean that this historic requirement is now obsolete.

2520 Finally, sir, these proposals also allow drivers of Emergency Service vehicles, set out above and their trainers, to exceed the speed limit while training in Guernsey. Guernsey is the only jurisdiction throughout the UK and Crown Dependencies that is not able to train and test its emergency drivers' capability on the roads they are expected to use. In order for a Police driver to drive in excess of the speed limit while on duty, they must take a driving course in the UK and must be tested annually to ensure driving standards are maintained. It is considered essential that our Emergency Service drivers are tested in their continuing ability to respond swiftly and safely on our unique system of roads and not merely on their ability to drive at high speeds on motorways or dual carriageways.

2530 There is absolutely no intention to undertake any intensive initial training on Island. The proposal is that re-accreditation training – in other words, testing – will take place in Guernsey, allowing a driver's continuing ability to respond quickly and safely under local conditions to be properly assessed. Because of the unique local geography, re-accreditation training in the UK is not considered to be the safest or the most cost-effective means of training.

2535 In the Police Force, for example, there are currently 37 authorised response-rated emergency drivers. Best practice determines they should be re-accredited once every four to five years. This process is undertaken in the presence of a trained assessor, lasts up to an hour in total, during which some speed limits should safely be exceeded. This averages ten Police training runs a year.

Sir, apart from that, I have nothing else to add to the States Report.

2540 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Gollop:** Sir, with the partial exception of point 1.1 (d), removing

2545 'the requirement that at a race or speed trial there must be an interval between the finish of one vehicle's run and the start of the next vehicle's run',

I have a lot of problems with this particular States Report and I think it should be withdrawn for further consideration. We have had a busy week, anyway.

(d): the Val des Terres may well be changed, although you could imagine the scenario of an accident where there was an IT failure and, of course, that may apply to Vazon, but that is a sport



2550 and people take risk in their stride. We have to accept that. But if we turn to page 121, ‘Principles of Good Governance’, Principle 5 says:

‘developing the capacity and capability of the governing body to be effective.’

2555 Well, this Report might fit into that box but there are *other* risks and other corporate governance, too, like, for example, awareness of risk in public policy. Now, I read a lot of the papers. You often see me shuffling around with my little carrier bag full of papers (*Laughter*) and the *Daily Mail* this week, the *Daily Express* this week – and they are not even papers I particularly like politically or in other ways – are, nevertheless, putting across scary stories of emergency vehicles that, in one way or another, have overstepped the mark and through not necessarily any fault of their own – because I accept 99% of those drivers are very responsible, professional people – they have accidents which not only damage them and the capabilities of their organisations but can create serious health consequences for, if you like, ‘innocent bystanders’, some of whom may be children or other vulnerable people. When you look through this section, you have got here, trainees: now, trainees are, by definition, not experienced, but they would, nevertheless, be given permission. Now, I could envisage a scenario whereby we have found a road in Guernsey, such as the Pembroke Road or the Chouet Road, or one of those roads which you could, from time to time, appropriately fence off, and use it as a good training area, but *not* the Island-wide network as a whole.

2570 More to the point, I am concerned that it effectively widens the gateway on speed limits. If one looks at the requirements, vehicle weight and speed limits, I know there has been a loophole in the law, in a way, in that it has not been appropriately or technically policed but it makes the point that 4x4 vehicles and a range of large saloon cars – we are talking about the odd Cadillac or Hummers, I do not know, the yellow Rolls Royces – which are, in law, restricted to a maximum speed of 25 miles per hour. But this Policy Letter gives them a green light, through legislation, to go up to 35 miles per hour.

2575 Now, I think if I brought a proposition to this Assembly, suggesting we have double decker buses, or even large saloon or curvy, bendy buses that could go along at 35 miles per hour, people would not be pleased. And I could make the case you are having professionally qualified drivers who drive like that in the United Kingdom and that the vehicles are safer than they used to be – which is true – and that there is better prevention standards and so on. But that would not cut any ice, so why are we making the case that people driving these vehicles, 4x4s, large saloons, are somehow more competent than their predecessors a few years ago? Even if these vehicles are better designed than they were in the past, there may be some antiquated vehicles on the road that are less so and some of the drivers – not necessarily even local drivers, they might be drivers on holiday here – could be careless in the way that they implement the law. So I think we should be cautious on this, open it up to further consultation, consultation with road safety experts in other places, environmental groups, health and safety, accident and emergency statistics. Look at the risks and then come back to this, rather than supporting it when we are tired on a Friday afternoon this week.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Domaille and then Deputy Lowe.

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

2595 I rise to draw the Assembly’s attention to a particular concern the majority of the Environment Board has with regard to one element of these proposals.

2600 The Environment Department was asked for its comments on these proposals and it raised a number of questions. The Department is grateful to the Home Department for arranging for the Environment Board to receive an informative presentation on the proposals and for being given the opportunity to ask those questions. However, while the Board was, and is, broadly supportive of the thrust of the proposals, by a majority it is unable to support the proposals in their entirety, especially the on-Island training for high speed driving element of the proposals.

2605 The majority of the Board is concerned at the public safety implications of the training and, while acknowledging the importance of such training, the majority could not support Proposition 1(a) on page 123.

I ask Members to give careful consideration to this element of the proposals.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

2610

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

I, first of all, declare an interest as a Director of the St. John Ambulance and Rescue Service.

2615

With being a Director of the Ambulance and Rescue Service, I can assure Members that they are fully behind these proposals that are before you today and they welcome them. There seems to be this misconception that, suddenly, you are going to go in an ambulance, or you are going to go in a police car or any emergency service and – suddenly – you are just going to go away without any training and practice on the roads. Nothing could be further from the truth. This is not about basic driving training; it is about assessing already qualified advanced drivers once in every five year period.

2620

When basic training is carried out on the Island, no traffic laws are broken. The speed limit is adhered to and it is done mostly in the daytime. All high speed driving has been carried out in the UK on advanced ambulance driving courses, not on our roads. The joint response from the Police, Fire and Ambulance Services to the risk is really the sole reason for this legislative amendment, that they contend that the compromise has already been reached in the practical application of the law as, once approved, unlike the other Crown Dependencies, as the Minister of the Home Department has said, training must still take place within the UK whereas, in Jersey, it takes place in Jersey.

2625

2630

Deputy Gollop has said about 25 miles an hour. All the emergency services now go faster than 25 miles an hour and I am sure he would appreciate that if he is lying in the road, or is injured, or he needs an emergency service. But they can only do so if a blue light is flashed and the sirens take place. This will help the noise pollution and the many complaints that the emergency services – especially the Ambulance Service – receive of a night time because, under the law, they *have* to use the sirens so this will eliminate that and give people a quiet night time sleep whereas, currently, it wakes people up and we actually get complaints.

2635

The St. John Ambulance and Rescue Service is the busiest emergency service for emergencies, by the nature of the business that they actually operate. We have approximately 4,200 emergencies per year. Not call-outs, emergencies – 4,200 a year – so they are fully versed with the roads and the conditions and driving in those conditions. But, under those complications, they have to be assessed, – not re-taking an exam – they have to be assessed and this is what it is all about. To actually have it on-Island, there would be a saving as well to the charity and, indeed, to the States, if this goes through. I do not see any problem with this whatsoever because we are not talking about putting a novice driver in any vehicle: they have to take their UK test exactly the same as what they currently do. This is the assessment that they have to have as part of that qualification.

2640

I urge Members to support this Report, please.

2645

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

2650

**Deputy Trott:** Members who have worked with me long enough, sir, know that my mind sometimes works in a slightly different way to others (*Laughter*) but, that strong caveat given, there is something in paragraph 2.12 on page 119 that does make me wonder if the scenario that I am about to envisage, or about to describe is, in fact, possible. That paragraph tells us that

‘...drivers from any of the emergency services or law enforcement agencies listed above’

2655

– which includes the Border Agency and the Guernsey Fire and Rescue Service –

‘should be permitted to exceed the speed limit “in response to an emergency or for law enforcement purposes”, without [any...] warning apparatus.’

2660

And I am wondering if, early one morning, sir, the Vascar Units are out along the West Coast and one of our lads, who is responding in an unmarked car, is whizzing along, goes through that Vascar trap and does not stop, whether the ludicrous situation could ensue where a police car with a siren gives chase! (*Laughter and interjections*). Whilst I am the first to accept it is probably an unlikely occurrence, it could happen and it draws into sharp focus the difficulties that we have for those that are carrying out law enforcement without necessarily knowing the occupancy of the car that they are either following or speed assessing.

2665

So I wonder if the Minister could disabuse me of my foolish assertions during his summing up.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

2670

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

The hour is late. It is Friday. We have been debating FTP, we have done 2020 and the Minister of the Home Department has, in a rather casual, if I may say so, understated way, presented what I think is something which should be withdrawn because I think the consequences are rather more serious than the... [*Inaudible*] presented by Deputy Trott.

2675

It says:

‘emergency service or law enforcement agency drivers and their trainers should be permitted to exceed the speed limit whilst undergoing driver training in Guernsey.’

2680

So breaking the speed limit whilst driver training on Guernsey would be for the Guernsey Fire and Rescue Service, the Guernsey Airport Fire and Rescue Service, the Guernsey Police, the Guernsey Border Agency and the Guernsey Ambulance and Rescue Service. I want to be delicate in what I am saying here, because there is nothing worse than being emotive to make the case, but it does need to be said that four very young people – two children – have been killed in accidents over the past few months. Not by speed, incidentally. They have been relatively low-speed accidents. Because Guernsey levels of traffic are very high, our roads are virtually saturated, so any child that takes that one risk, we know puts themselves in very real danger. Sadly, as I have said, there have been two accidents recently and two not long before that, at relatively low speeds.

2685

2690

I am sorry, I do not know his rank – I will apologise – but ‘Chief Inspector’ John Tostevin. Is that correct? (*Interjection*) I beg your pardon, okay. He was on the radio yesterday, requesting that speed limits in certain areas are restricted. Following the accident, he was saying that speed limits in this area... he will contact the Environment Department and make a plea for the speed limit in one area to be reduced to 25 miles per hour. So there is a correlation between excessive speed and accidents.

2695

The background – and it is what my colleague, Deputy Roger Domaille, just said, the Environment Minister – the Police approached the Environment Department and asked us whether... I think asked us to support these proposals. I think the aim of the approach was that, appended to the back of this Report was a letter saying ‘This Policy Letter/States Report is endorsed by the Environment Department’.

2700

I will not name the officer but the officer came in and gave a presentation to us and he used this term that alarmed me a little: he said the officers had ‘skills fade’, so you get a bit rusty if you do not drive at speed and so, rather than going off-Island, perhaps doing this on-Island for 37 police drivers only, then that may be a useful thing to do. My view is that if somebody’s driving skills are a bit rusty, then perhaps take them off-Island in a safe, sterile environment rather than let them re-educate, reconfigure the Guernsey roads at speeds in real time, amongst real people, amongst real families. I think this is considerably dangerous.

2705

2710

If we go back to one of the groups here, we must remember there was a significant incident at the Airport, where an emergency vehicle overturned. Now, do we want that same vehicle, travelling over 25 miles per hour, or 30 miles per hour, on our small Island roads because, now we have a single law enforcement post, I think it is not beyond the bounds of reason that, one day, we will have the Guernsey Ambulance and Rescue Services, the Border Agency and the Police carrying out a training exercise collectively. Now, you or I, anyone, could be going to work, going wherever you are going in your car, you pull over to let all these emergency vehicles through and it is a training exercise. There is a danger with that, of course, whereas if this is going to happen, year on year, people think ‘Hold on a minute. Is this another training exercise or is this for real? Do I have to get out of the way?’

2715

2720

I also think that an accident with an *actual* police pursuit, or an ambulance going somewhere having an incident that harms someone is understandable. I think an accident, where people are *training*, where they have perhaps caused injury to someone or harmed someone is of a different magnitude altogether.

2725

So, today, whatever the time is – at 4.00 o’clock – with a relatively short debate, I think we could be exposing our community to real risk and this Report is not long enough to deal with that risk. It is a very short Report. I cannot vote for proposition 1(a). I think that we are exposing our community to a danger as yet unknown, as I do not fully appreciate every nuance of these proposals.

I cannot imagine the Home Minister would want to withdraw this Report but I would urge Members, please, to vote against 1(a) because I do not think we fully appreciate the implications. If there were lighter Billets before us at this States sitting, I think we would have spent a bit longer on this and gone over the potential outcomes.

2730 So, please, Members, I would ask you to... We cannot prosecute speeding ambulances: that would be ridiculous. I understand the sense in that, but we cannot have the risk of training exercises causing harm to our community with speeding emergency vehicles during training exercises.

Thank you.

2735

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

**Deputy Lowe:** Sir, I just want to pick up something Deputy Brehaut said and just, hopefully, inform Members here of some of the facts that all the ambulance drivers – I do not know about the Police – we do not have any ambulance drivers who would be ‘rusty’ and suddenly going out training.

2740

These drivers are on the road every day of the week and, sir, we have got 4,200... We do not have the luxury of paying ambulance drivers to sit around and not be ambulance drivers. This is part of the requirement, that they have to be assessed on a job that they do every day of the week, 24 hours a day.

2745

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gillson.

**Deputy Gillson:** Sir, I, too, have reservations about 1(a) and I would probably vote against it.

2750

I think Members need to remember that, on a Report like this, we are not being asked to decide policy, we are being asked to put the wheels in motion to change the law. We know there are weaknesses in the way legislation is reviewed and, if we approve this, this is the first stage of the law changing. When the law changes, anything after that is taken out of the hands of this Assembly, and I am concerned – I can see the logic in some training, I can see the logic in some refreshing courses being in Guernsey – about any *initial* training.

2755

There is one – okay, the Minister is shaking his head – sentence in here,

‘There is no *intention* to undertake...’

2760

That might be right now but, once the law is changed, the Chief Officer will be able to change it. If the resolution here explicitly excluded initial training, then I might be more comfortable. But if we pass it as it is now, that assurance, that sentence, ‘There is no initial change...’ and any assurance the Minister is going to try and give us, once the law changes, is totally meaningless and has no effect.

2765

So, as it stands now, without a resolution explicitly excluding initial training, then I am afraid I cannot accept this.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb, and then Deputy Spruce.

2770

**Deputy Bebb:** Deputy Gollop, before lunch, on Twitter accused me of *Schadenfreude* in my pointing out of people who have supported Proposition 3 on the FTP debate.

2775

I promise that I will not spend the rest of this year, and the whole of next year, pointing out, once again, the folly of certain Members’ ways but I will actually point out that, once again, if we support this Report, then I would contest that we are, indeed, agreeing to commit to delivering this Vision and underpinning decisions through the ratification of this Report: we are agreeing to delivering FTP and savings targets. So the question is whether Members feel comfortable in *that*, or whether they feel that the *same* proposition that says – and would put the burden back on the Home Department and the Minister – ‘acknowledge the risk that not all the proposals will deliver the anticipated change or savings...’ I think this is a question that I know I am using this opportunity, because it is opportunistic, in order to point out the difficulty in it.

2780

I think that it is fair to say that this is one of the first challenges for this Assembly. Do you support the FTP and the savings, despite the risks that it contains, or do you send the Department back and tell them to find different savings? On this occasion, I find myself leaning towards supporting the Home Department in making its achievements with regard to the FTP.

2785

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Spruce.

**Deputy Spruce:** Mr Bailiff, Members, I shall keep this brief.

I shall not be supporting Proposition 1(a) of this Policy Letter. I am just unable to accept that

2790 there is an *essential* requirement to allow our law enforcement personnel to break the speed limit in order to maintain their ability to drive a motor vehicle safely on Guernsey's roads. In fact, it is my view that driving above the speed limit on more occasions than is absolutely essential is likely to result in an unnecessary danger to the public.

2795 I am sure that none of us object to the emergency services breaking the speed limit in order to save life or attend an emergency but all police drivers are already required to attend a UK driver training course and are, therefore, qualified to a much higher standard than any other typical driver on Guernsey. And the one thing, as Deputy Brehaut has mentioned, that we must remember is just how busy our congested road network is. This is the area that really concerns me. We will have emergency service personnel driving around at speeds in excess of the speed limit during normal traffic conditions and that, surely, is going to result in a problem at some time.

2800 So I would ask you all, please, to reject Proposition 1(a) of this Policy Letter. I have no problem with the rest but 1(a) is a step too far for me.

Thank you.

2805 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Clerc.

**Deputy Le Clerc:** As a Member of the Home Department, I will be supporting these propositions and I would just like to re-emphasise that this proposal permits those emergency authorities to exceed the speed limit whilst training and this is purely a re-accreditation training.

2810 I think there has been some confusion. They still will have to undertake the initial training in the UK. I have to disagree with Deputy... (**Deputy Brehaut:** Brehaut.) Brehaut, sorry. (*Laughter*) Long day! Surely, training off-Island in sterile situations does not provide sufficient training and skills necessary to ensure the skills of our people in the emergency services are kept up to date. We need to have that training, that re-accreditation, on-Island.

2815 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Storey and then Deputy Stewart and Deputy De Lisle.

**Deputy Storey:** I have to say that the idea of not requiring emergency vehicles to be sounding their sirens at night is one which I approve of, since I live on one of the favourite routes of the Ambulance Service, but I do have a problem elsewhere in the Report and it is with the recommendation 1(c).

2820 On (c) – it is talking about, effectively, removing the restricted speed limit on vehicles from those vehicles that are above two tons to those of a larger size and capacity – my question really is whether this is a matter of convenience, in that it has been difficult to impose that law, in the future, because I see large numbers of 'Chelsea tractors' on the roads that obviously weigh more than two tons. I have never seen any of them with their speed limit marked on the side of the vehicle. So I would ask the Minister whether this particular change is purely to facilitate the situation where the law is being ignored both by the drivers and by the Police, or whether it is really a situation where the Minister feels, honestly, that the law is no longer any addition to the safety of people on the streets?

2825 It seems to me that, by raising this weight limit, we are increasing the speed limit for builders' pick-up trucks, large vans on the roads, and the point is, sir, that we do not actually have an MOT test on this Island. Some of these vehicles that I see on the roads, that would be encapsulated in this category I feel quite sure would *not* pass a MOT test in the UK. Therefore, I am not too sure that they would be safe at 35 m.p.h., rather than 25 m.p.h., and what concerns me is that we are moving the law for the convenience of people who drive the 'Chelsea tractors' and we are, in fact, going to have the unforeseen consequences of ill-maintained vehicles within that category being now allowed to travel at 35 m.p.h. and to be a danger to people on the roads.

2840 **The Bailiff:** I said Deputy Stewart next, Deputy De Lisle and then Deputy Ogier and Deputy Soulsby.

**Deputy Stewart:** I do feel we are rather in danger of getting into a bit of micro-management here, really, as an Assembly.

2845 We have an extremely professional Fire, Police and Ambulance Service, people that, at some time in our lives, we will put our lives in their hands and will trust them. It seems strange to me that – and I hate to say this – I think some people have a vision that we are going to have a load of Kevs, (*Laughter*) – and it does bother me to say that –

2850 **A Member:** One is more than enough! (*Laughter*)

**Deputy Stewart:** – going up and down Bulwer Avenue without their sirens on, upsetting Deputy Trott with his Vascar. (*Laughter*)

2855 I really think that this is now getting into micro-management. If we *cannot* trust our emergency services to behave responsibly, then actually who can we trust?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy De Lisle.

2860 **Deputy De Lisle:** Thank you, sir.

I am particularly apprehensive over all of these recommendations, actually, and particularly, of course, with regard to 1(a), and I am a little concerned – well, very concerned – that these fast vehicles, there are very substantial vehicles, they are Fire and Rescue Service, very heavy vehicles, Guernsey Airport Fire and Rescue Service, Border Agency vehicles and the Ambulance and Rescue Service... Having them going past schools at these sort of rates at times, perhaps, even when children are actually walking to school and returning from school, I think is something that I could not could not in any way subscribe to, so I think this has to be re-written.

2865 I think the whole Report, actually, should be withdrawn. I agree entirely with what Deputy Brehaut has said and I certainly would not approve of 1(a), which is to allow drivers of these agencies listed, that I have mentioned, and their trainers, if you please, to exceed the speed limit while training in Guernsey. I mean, that is not on.

2870 And the sirens going, as well. I think that is another issue. That is something that could, actually, even add to the problem, particularly with young children and animals in the roads at a time of busy movement to and from schools.

2875 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier.

**Deputy Ogier:** Thank you, sir. I just wanted to say a couple of things.

2880 I will not be supporting (c). I think, if you buy a two ton vehicle to transport yourself around the Island, you are going to have to suffer a number of inconveniences and 25 m.p.h., in my view, is going to be one of them.

I wanted to pick up on Deputy Trott's point under 2.12, where it says that any

2885 '...drivers from any of the emergency services or law enforcement agencies listed above should be permitted to exceed the speed limit [...] without the requirement that warning apparatus is sounded.'

2890 However, that is not listed in any of the proposals and any resolutions that have come out of this meeting will not permit that, so I am wondering, in the drafting, how that was allowed for, and whether that is just a marker to come forward in the future or whether an error has been made?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

2895 **Deputy Soulsby:** I had not intended to speak on this, particularly bearing in mind that I am making everybody listen to the next debate, but I do have a problem with this Report, and point (c) in particular. I have to declare an interest, too, because I am a keen cyclist and I can even prove it because I bought the magazine today. (*Laughter*)

2900 We are what St John's Ambulance call a 'future customer'. (*Laughter*) Speed kills. It does not matter who is behind the wheel. I was involved in an accident on my bike which was a result of the fault of the driver, I hasten to add, and is one of the two occasions I have managed to hold up traffic on the Grange. Accidents like that really do bring home to you how vulnerable you are on two wheels and I was lucky just to be knocked over by someone in a Hyundai Atu. I think it might say something for the car but it looked in a worse state than me (*Laughter*) after the accident! I was also lucky the driver was not speeding. However, I know that if it had been a Landrover, Police or otherwise, training exercise or not, going over the speed limit, the outcome may have been very different. It is for this reason I have real concerns about these proposals.

2905

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

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

2910 I was going to speak. I always intended to speak! (*Laughter*) (A Member: Surely not!) But had I not been intending to speak, I would have been brought to my feet by Deputy Stewart, who criticised the States for what he called micro-management.

Sir, we are primarily a legislature and we are being asked here to approve, in principle, changes to legislation. This is clearly not micro-management. This is the fundamental task of a parliament. (A Member: Hear, hear) This is an example – and Deputy Ogier touched on this – where the way process works in Guernsey affects real life, because he is quite right, Deputy Ogier, in drawing our attention to the suggestion in paragraph 2.12 and then drawing our attention to the fact that it is not carried through, it is not converted into any of the propositions.

2920 It is not only that there seems to be some anomaly in that respect, but it is also left entirely unclear what the Home Department is actually proposing in respect of what requirements would be placed upon drivers of emergency vehicles when they are driving at night, because it implies that... there is a lot of reference to sirens – I can understand the argument that it may not be sensible to require the emergency services to sound sirens at 3 o'clock in the morning – but it rather implies from the wording of the Report that the Home Department actually *intends* that there should be no requirement for the emergency services to have blue lights flashing at 3 o'clock in the morning. I do not understand that argument. I cannot understand why we should not place a requirement on a police car or a fire engine, or an ambulance, to have lights flashing if they are attending incidents or training at any time of the day. The way that the Report is written, it does come across to me that the Home Department's intention is either to remove the requirement of present legislation for blue lights to be flashing or, in the event that that is not contained in present legislation, to leave it out of the repealing of that part of the legislation which currently requires them to sound their sirens. I would be more comfortable repealing legislation which at present places an obligation on these vehicles to have their sirens sounding, if it were replaced by some obligation for them to have their blue lights flashing, but it is completely unclear in the way that the wording of the Report has been translated into the propositions.

2935 Sir, responsibility for road transport in Guernsey rests with the Environment Department, and I think it is of significant importance that the Environment Department is opposed to Proposition 1(a). I do not think that that should merely be noted. I think that that should inform our thinking before we vote.

2940 In respect of 1(c), I agree with Deputy Storey and Deputy Ogier that lifting the present restrictions on *all* vehicles exceeding 3,500 kgs is not sensible. That may not have been the *intention* of the Home Department: that is the way the proposition is drafted. It may have been the intention that it applies only to emergency vehicles but that is not the way the proposition is drafted and I think *that*, in conjunction with the point that Deputy Ogier made about paragraph 2.12, it is indicative that this is, perhaps, a rather poorly drafted States Report.

2945 But the real problem with 1(a) is that it is no good saying 'Oh well, at present there are more restrictions in Guernsey than there are in the UK' because that is not comparing like with like. Actually, it is not comparing like with like to compare us with the Isle of Man or with Jersey because our road network is significantly different to both of those Crown Dependencies, as well as to the UK. There is much greater population density in Guernsey, our roads are much busier, there are far fewer wide roads in Guernsey and, of course, there is more ribbon development. That has had nothing to do with *this* Assembly but you know previous administrations have encouraged ribbon development and, therefore, there are many more gateways opening out onto even main roads in Guernsey than one would be likely to find, certainly, in the UK and in Jersey and the Isle of Man.

2955 Sir, under those circumstances, it seems perfectly sensible to me for a small jurisdiction to require the drivers of emergency vehicles to undertake training at speed off-Island. I think that there was a clear case for inserting that legislation at some point and that case must remain today. In fact, it must remain even more because, as the roads have got busier and population density has increased, the risk to public safety must have increased, too. It is all about balance of risk. I think we would all accept that there is some risk to the public in having emergency vehicles speeding in any set of circumstances, but it is a risk worth bearing when they are responding to an emergency. When they are not responding to an emergency, in my judgement, it is not a risk worth bearing. Doing so and voting in favour of Proposition 1(a) would, I think, contradict the final sentence of paragraph 2.9 in this Report, which states:

'Safety of the public is paramount.'

Now, paramount means 'more important than everything else' and if safety of the public is truly

2970 paramount then I do not think we should allow the drivers of emergency vehicles to exceed the speed limit in anything other than an emergency.

I would ask the States certainly to vote against (a) and probably to vote against (c), as well.

Thank you, sir.

2975 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford and then Deputy Duquemin.

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

2980 I will start by endorsing Deputy Ogier and Deputy Soulsby's comments. The impact that a vehicle will have will be proportionate to its mass and its speed, so I do not think I could support (c).

With respect to the opening speech by the Minister, he mentioned a figure of 2.3 tons, unless I misheard. I just wondered if he could clarify that in his response, only I was looking at a figure of 3.5. Also, I would like him to confirm whether the Police already use the airport runways and taxiways at night for high speed training.

2985 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Now Deputy Duquemin and Deputy Robert Jones, Deputy Quin.

2990 **Deputy Duquemin:** Sir, for once during this States meeting, I think I am going to almost agree with everything that Deputy Fallaize has said. Particularly his phrase that what brought him to his feet – or did not, as the case may be – was what the 'patron saint of Kevs', also known as Deputy Stewart, said. (*Laughter and applause*)

2995 Deputy Stewart made it sound so simple, and I am not going to argue with him at all, in that he implicitly would trust the professionalism and expertise of all our emergency services. That is not within doubt. But sitting here in the Assembly today, the voice in my head that I can hear is my Mum and, bless her, she is very sensible. When we are driving along, she says 'Darren, you are not the only person on the road'.

3000 Whilst we *could* trust the professionalism and expertise of all our emergency services, what we do not know and what we cannot control is the activities of other vehicles, of cyclists such as Deputy Soulsby, or even pedestrians and, for that reason, I will not be able to support 1(a). 1(c) I am struggling with and I think, like Deputy Fallaize, I do not think I will be able to support that element of the proposition. I would look to be convinced by, perhaps, other Members of the Home Department, also the Minister in summing up but, for me, 1(a) is a risk that is just not worth taking.

3005 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Robert Jones.

**Deputy Robert Jones:** Thank you, sir.

3010 I share some of the concerns of my fellow colleagues. In particular, I found it a little bit uncomfortable that we have an Inspector of Police requesting lower speed limits and we are then faced with these propositions, an unfortunate timing situation.

3015 What I would like to highlight is the difficulty – and I am going to fast forward now to the Legislation Select Committee's meeting when the draft legislation is put before us and, Deputy Gillson, thank you for highlighting some of the inconsistencies there that I had already noted, Deputy Ogier as well and Deputy Fallaize – that the Legislation Select Committee will have is that we have got to make sure that the draft legislation is properly and fully reflecting the policies that we set here today. I do not think, on the basis of this type of Report... and we are faced with lots of Reports like this when it comes to legislation reviews, that do not help us, they do not help the draftsmen, they do not help the Departments and they certainly do not help us in casting our eye over that initial draft legislation. We are often then left wondering why we have some unintended consequences of certain pieces of legislation. So bear that in mind today when you come to vote on this, that this is going to be very difficult for us to interpret and to be able to sit and review a piece of legislation that I think is going to have lots of gaps in it and we are going to have to try and fill the gaps. Those gaps will, initially, be filled by the Department, filled by the Law Officers, and it will sit there and can we...

3025 I do not think there is much more I am going to say, actually, on that. I think it is quite clear that we are going to struggle in that meeting to ensure that we have the policy that we want reflected in the legislation, sir. Bear that in mind.



3030

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Quin.

**Deputy Quin.** Well, well, well. We seem to be stuck on 1(a).

3035

I listened to Deputy Brehaut with the expected speech... I would have thought he was talking about Hell's Angels, not experienced police officers, ambulance drivers and fire brigade personnel. We had a lesson on driving from Deputy Gollop, who I do not think has ever sat behind the wheel of a car, maybe a pram but that is about it.

I am very confused by some of the stuff I have heard. Deputy Lowe covered the ambulances and she has covered it quite well or very well.

3040

Deputy De Lisle spoke about the danger round schools. Now, why on earth would a police officer take a trainee round parts of school breaking the speed limit? I am not quite sure where that was all coming from. I just thought that was a bit silly. These drivers – you are talking about children and schools – these drivers... the traffic sergeant that Deputy Jones spoke about is a parent. Do you think he would be recommending this type of thing could happen when he has got young schoolkids of his own? We are talking about experienced officers.

3045

Let's start from the beginning, where most good things start. The first training will take part in the UK. When that has been done, there will be touch-up trainings after. Best practice determines that each driver should be subject to a re-accreditation check run every four to five years. These check runs, which are undertaken in the presence of a trained assessor, will last up to one hour in total, during which some speed limits may be *safely* exceeded in a variety of traffic conditions – an average of ten of these check runs per years. The way I was hearing it earlier on, we would have dodgem cars flying all over the shop!

3050

I was quite surprised at some of the stuff I have heard. There were 3,000 calls last year to the Police in what are seen as Grade 1 call-outs: the others were not Grade 1 and the Inspector of the day says 'This is an emergency, you can speed'. Everyone does not just jump in. There are 37 response-rated drivers in the Force, a Force of some 160 officers. There are only 37 who would be involved in this – response-rated – who have passed out in the UK. I have been listening to some of this and I have been quite puzzled as to who they think is driving these things. As 'Deputy Kev' said, they are not on Kev runs. I am just puzzled by it all. I will not say any more because I will be taking the stuff that my Minister will be finishing off the discussion with but to say I am slightly puzzled by some of the stuff would be to take it lightly.

3055

3060

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

3065

**Deputy Trott:** May I ask a further legal clarification of the Procurer? He has been asked a question by Deputy Ogier: may I ask one?

**The Bailiff:** Well, you have already made a speech. Is this another speech?

3070

**Deputy Trott:** Clearly not, sir. It is a matter of clarification on law and it relates to what is a 'law enforcement purpose'?

3075

When I heard Deputy Robert Jones speak earlier, I thought 'Well, there is no definition of law enforcement' and I was wondering whether the mere fact that a policeman is carrying out his duty by driving the car means that he is undertaking a 'law enforcement purpose'. It would be difficult to argue against that, I think. If that is the case then, clearly, any officer at any time would be entitled to exceed the speed limit because, by definition, he would be undertaking 'law enforcement purposes'.

3080

**The Bailiff:** Mr Procurer.

**The Procurer:** Well, I read 'law enforcement purposes' as really relating to these agencies in paragraph 2.10, rather than pure Police purposes.

Can I say something? There is – thank you, Deputy Trott – a bit in here that says

3085

'The Law Officers support the legislative amendments...'

I want to make it clear that we do not 'support' them and we do not 'non support' them. It has been raised and the Law Officers have said 'There is no objection, as a matter of law, that we can see'. So I think that is wrong.

3090 The whole point is that this derogation, on ordinary principles, would only be used – and, surely, everybody appreciates that – in a situation where it was necessary to use the derogation for law enforcement purposes, without sounding your warning apparatus, isn't it, because that is where it comes in? Deputy Ogier is quite right. It is not in the resolutions, and it is not in the propositions and the reason it is not in the propositions is because the recommendation is wrongly worded. That is true.

3095 **Deputy Trott:** Sir, with respect to H. M. Procureur, I realise I have rather sprung this question on him but that was not a satisfactory answer, from my perspective, because... I will have to pose the question again. *(Laughter)*

3100 Is *any* aspect of law enforcement a 'law enforcement purpose' because, whilst his interpretation and mine may be different, we are about to resolve that all law enforcement purposes will be exempt from the requirement to adhere to a speed limit or, for that matter, any form of warning apparatus. I am more concerned about the speed limit and, if any element of doubt persists, then the sensible thing to do is for the Minister of the Home Department to withdraw this States Report, sir, and bring it back at the earliest opportunity (**Members:** *Hear, hear*).

**The Bailiff:** Mr Procureur.

3110 **The Procureur:** Sir, I am mortified that the response that I gave is not the response which Deputy Trott wanted, but I must explain again, if you look at the propositions which come from the recommendations, the only place where 'law enforcement purposes' are mentioned is nothing to do with training. It is to allow the drivers of the agencies listed in 2.10 to drive motor vehicles

3115 'in excess of the speed limit in an emergency or for law enforcement purposes.'

So it would only be in an emergency and it would be for law enforcement purposes. Of course, they can do that already. What it was supposed to say is to allow them to do that without sounding their sirens and it does not because it is wrongly worded.

3120

**Deputy Trott:** That is not right, because what it says *(Interjections)* is, it says

'emergency *or* for law enforcement purposes',

3125 and without the definition of 'law enforcement' it is clearly an open-ended proposition.

**The Bailiff:** Mr Procureur.

3130 **The Procureur:** I will only say it once more. 'In an emergency or for law enforcement purposes': the existing legislation says

'for police purposes in an emergency or in pursuit of the driver or rider of any vehicle which is suspected of exceeding any speed limit.'

3135 The change recommended, where you can do that without your siren, is for 'law enforcement purposes' rather than police purposes, but 'law enforcement purposes' clearly are in an emergency or in the pursuit of a speeding driver.

If Deputy Trott does not like it, well, we will have to disagree, but that that is my advice.

3140 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq... *(Interjections)*  
Deputy le Tocq is speaking.

3145 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Sir, as we are... it is getting late and I feel we are playing games now, to some degree, bearing in mind the messages that certain Members have said, I have decided to withdraw this Article.

**The Bailiff:** I will put to Members, then, the motion that this Article be withdrawn. Those in favour; those against.

3150 *Some Members voted Pour: other voted Contre*

**The Bailiff:** I consider that is carried, but if anyone wants a recorded vote on it, they can have it.

3155 **Deputy Bebb:** Sir, could I ask for a recorded vote, then we record who has and has not.

**The Bailiff:** Right, so a recorded vote, then, on the motion that Article XIII of Billet I, Home Department, Speed Limits for Emergency Services Vehicles etc, be withdrawn.

3160 *There was a recorded vote.*  
*Carried – Pour 33, Contre 9, Abstained 0, Not Present 5*

	<b>POUR</b>	<b>CONTRE</b>	<b>ABSTAINED</b>	<b>NOT PRESENT</b>
3165	Deputy Harwood	Deputy Bebb		Deputy St Pier
	Deputy Kuttelwascher	Deputy Fallaize		Deputy David Jones
	Deputy Brehaut	Deputy Lowe		Deputy Adam
	Deputy Domaille	Deputy Le Lièvre		Alderney Rep. Jean
	Deputy Langlois	Deputy Spruce		Alderney Rep. Arditti
3170	Deputy Robert Jones	Deputy Luxon		
	Deputy Le Clerc	Deputy O'Hara		
	Deputy Gollop	Deputy Quin		
	Deputy Sherbourne	Deputy Hadley		
	Deputy Conder			
3175	Deputy Storey			
	Deputy Lester Queripel			
	Deputy Stewart			
	Deputy Gillson			
	Deputy Le Pelley			
3180	Deputy Ogier			
	Deputy Trott			
	Deputy Laurie Queripel			
	Deputy Collins			
	Deputy Duquemin			
3185	Deputy Green			
	Deputy Dorey			
	Deputy Paint			
	Deputy Le Tocq			
	Deputy James			
3190	Deputy Perrot			
	Deputy Brouard			
	Deputy Wilkie			
	Deputy De Lisle			
	Deputy Burford			
3195	Deputy Inglis			
	Deputy Soulsby			
	Deputy Sillars			

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

3200 **Deputy Lowe:** Sir, can I, while the Greffier is doing the adding up there and bearing in mind that we have got *Hansard* now, I would just like it recorded that, actually, as a Member of the Home Department Board, I am sorry to have already upset the Minister by saying this, but we were not consulted and I want it on record that, actually, that was *not* a Department decision.

3205 **Deputy Brehaut:** Sir, can I ask for a clarification.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

3210 **Deputy Brehaut:** Just when Deputy Lowe got to her feet and said she was a Member of the St John's Ambulance and Rescue Board and had the following to say... Usually, you declare an interest and leave, but... (**The Bailiff:** No.)

It was a statement made of behalf of St John's Ambulance and Rescue.

3215 **The Bailiff:** That's not what the relevant Rule –

**Deputy Lowe:** The Rule is very clear.

The Rule is you leave if you are in a Department meeting and a Committee meeting because that is behind closed doors but every Member who is able to vote, providing they declare before, even if they have not spoken at a States meeting....

3220

Read the Rule Book.

**The Bailiff:** The relevant Rule, Deputy Brehaut, is Rule 12.8.

The result of the vote on that procedural motion was 33 in favour, 9 against.

I declare it carried.

3225

## TREASURY AND RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

3230

### Guernsey Electricity Limited Report for the year ended 31st March 2012, noted

*Appendix 2:*

3235

*Whether, after consideration of the Report and Financial Statements of Guernsey Electricity Limited for the year ended 31st March, 2012, submitted under Section 8 of the States Trading Companies (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Ordinance 2001, they are of the opinion:*

*To take note of the Report.*

3240

**The Greffier:** Billet d'État I, Appendix 2: Treasury and Resources Department – Guernsey Electricity Limited, submission of annual accounts.

The proposition is to take note of the Report.

**The Bailiff:** This is the motion to debate these Reports.

3245

First of all, the Guernsey Electricity Report.

Deputy Kuttelwascher, as Deputy Minister, you are going to open the debate, are you?

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Thank you, sir, I always get the best jobs, don't I? *(Laughter)*

3250

Mr Bailiff, during the year ending 31st March 2012, Guernsey Electricity Limited made a profit on ordinary activities, before taxation, of £5,058,000. This was an improvement of over £3 million on the profit in the previous financial year, largely due to increases in tariffs and a reduction in the cost of sales.

3255

After a tax charge of approximately £1 million, there is a profit, after tax, of around £4 million. The overall operating profit for the business over the first ten years of commercialisation is only around £1.7 million per annum in total, due to the inability, under the regulatory regime, of the business to pass through the effect of the volatile energy markets in a timely manner and those costs *were* incurred.

3260

Under the current agreed arrangements, a dividend of £1 million would normally be paid to the States of Guernsey but a decision has been deferred due to the exceptional circumstances arising from the failure of the Guernsey to Jersey electricity inter-connector, otherwise known as the cable. *(Laughter)* Now, I did not write this! *(Laughter and interjections)* The failure of the inter-connector meant that, during the summer of 2012, additional expenditure was incurred as electricity had to be generated on-Island, which is more costly. This will have an adverse effect on the profit realised in the year ending 31st March 2013.

3265

Guernsey Electricity is exploring all available options in terms of recovery of these amounts. For the sake of clarity, this is not the cable repair costs but the costs of more expensive on-Island generation to maintain supply.

3270

Assessment of pension liability remains a concern for the company and the Board continues to monitor and review its position, including assessing the latest proposals to change the States Public Servants Pension Scheme to which employees belong.

Future strategic capital investment is likely to be necessary to allow more affordable tariffs and secure electricity supplies with, it is hoped, future import prices being lower than on-Island generation.

3275

The Board remains committed to achieving the carbon reduction targets in the States of Guernsey Energy Resource Plan. All investment plans must take account of the Island's aspirations in terms of the environment.

So I will ask the Assembly to take note of the accounts of Guernsey Electricity for the year

ended 31st March 2012.

3280 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby, then Deputy Gillson.

**Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, what you have all been waiting for – double accounting last thing on a Friday afternoon! (*Laughter and interjections*)

3285 As a general comment, having reviewed the accounts of both the Guernsey Electric and Guernsey Post at the same time, I was struck by how different they are in style and content, despite having the same auditors.

3290 Guernsey Electric gives *no* disclosure of staff numbers, unlike Guernsey Post, but Guernsey Electric gives a breakdown of director remuneration, albeit not in accordance with best practice, i.e. remuneration and numbers banding. Guernsey Post has a Chairman's Report and Finance Director's Report: there is just the standard Directors' Report from Guernsey Electric. Guernsey Electric has turnover and cost of sales, whilst Guernsey Post has income and expenditure. This does not help make them accessible to non accountants and it does not help accountants very much, either! (*Laughter*)

3295 With respect to the specific accounts of Guernsey Electric, I have three questions for the Deputy Minister. My first two relate to the directors. Please can the Deputy Minister explain why the Board requires four non-executive directors and, secondly, bearing in mind there is not a *single* woman appointed as a non-executive director to the Board of Guernsey Electric and Guernsey Post – indeed, there is only woman out of 17 directors in total – does he agree with me that this sends out all the wrong messages to professional women on this Island and that the States of Guernsey should be seen to be doing better? (**Members:** Hear, hear.)

3300 My final questions are in relation to the effect of the pension scheme on the business. The Guernsey Electric pension loss is double its operating profit. Its net current pension liability is three times its annual profit and one tenth of its pre-pension net asset value. In the last four years, the fund has gone from a £2.5 million surplus to a £13 million deficit, an alarming trend if it continues. Does the Deputy Minister agree with me that these accounts bring home the fact that this pension scheme is completely unsustainable and action must be taken now before it is too late?

3305 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gillson.

3310 **Deputy Gillson:** Sir, I think Deputy Soulsby has mentioned things that I was going to.

I was going to comment about disclosure in these Reports, which are not really best practice. I think that, in some ways, these are comparable to a public limited company, albeit with two shareholders, and we should have far more disclosure in these. I would hope that the Treasury Board will, with their new found commitment to transparency, take that forward and have far more transparency and best practice in these.

3315 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

3320 **Deputy Gollop:** Sir, one of my concerns about the nature of our nationalised industries, in a way, is that they fall into a kind of limbo where they do not have shareholder drive but nor do they have political management. Here, if we turn to page 137, one sees with Guernsey Electricity Limited, profits for the financial year, after taxation, of over £4 million, compared to £1.5 million the previous year. Now that is quite a reasonable figure and it indicates that we need to have greater focus, I think, on our energy strategy, bearing in mind the significant increase in costs that the Electricity are planning and whether that should fall predominantly on the consumer, including those on lower incomes, or whether it should be borne by the State or investment vehicles of other kinds.

3325 One final point is, since the Election, States Members have been treated to the potential for a bacon butty in the sorting office of the Post Office, but we have not yet been, perhaps, given as many presentations as we could have done at the power station. I think, given the fact that these accounts are *not* particularly clear, that would be welcome.

3330 **The Bailiff:** Anyone else?  
Deputy Trott.

3335 **Deputy Trott:** I will make two comments, if I may, sir.

The first is in reply to Deputy Soulsby's comment about the number of non-executive

3340 directors. It is considered, these days, best practice for entities of this type to have a number of non-executives that are at least equivalent to the executives, in order to ensure that the non-executive director's voices have the appropriate level of weight. That is probably the answer that Deputy Kuttelwascher would have given and I would not have risen just to make that one point.

3345 I do rise mainly to make the point about the balance sheet valuations. The accounting policies employed by Guernsey Electricity Limited are to state their assets at the lower of cost or net realisable value – in this case, cost less depreciation. A combination of accounting policies shows the balance sheet footings of this business at something around £100 million, or thereabouts, from memory, of which the tangible fixed assets amount to a net book value of £93 million. It is quite obvious, I think, to any casual observer that the Electricity Company's assets are worth very considerably more than that and I wonder whether there is now a good reason, particularly since they have been established on a commercialised basis for many years, to revalue the balance sheet to reflect more accurately its current value?

3350 **The Bailiff:** Any other debate?

No? Deputy Kuttelwascher, then, to reply.

3355 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Thank you, sir.

Regarding Deputy Soulsby's questions about whether four non-executive directors are too much, I can refer to Deputy Trott's reply. In fact, it was an issue that we did challenge the Board upon and the reasons given were sufficient because it is a business which is technical and international almost and I think the four areas of expertise which are employed by the four non-executive directors are appropriate. However, I am happy to pass on the concerns at our next Board meeting on Tuesday to see if we can review it.

3360 I was rather interested about the comments about not having enough – women on the Board. There is a Director, whose first name is Sally Ann –

3365 **Deputy Soulsby:** As a correction, sir, I said there is only *one* woman director out of seventeen combined.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Sorry, I misheard you. In which case – and she is a highly technical lady, she is an engineer.

3370 I have no idea why there is only one, any more than I have no idea why there are only five ladies in this Assembly. In fact, at the last election, electors removed quite a number of sitting lady Deputies. I have no idea how many ladies have applied to go on the Board and I have got absolutely no explanation why there is only one.

3375 In fact, during the election I was contacted by the Soroptimists and I was asked whether I was in favour of positive discrimination and I replied 'I am not in favour of any sort of discrimination' and that did not go down too well! (*Laughter*) But it is not a question I can answer and, in fact, if the Board consisted of seventeen women, I would not find that objectionable. I do not have this big issue with the sex of the people running whatever they are running. I used to train lady co-pilots. In fact, we have got training captains, or did have training captains, in British Airways who were women. Women drive buses. I am quite happy with my wife to drive my car. I would not mind a woman surgeon taking out my appendix! (*Laughter*) I do not have this *issue* with women (*Laughter*)

3380 **Deputy Soulsby:** What have I started?

3385 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** I cannot make an issue of this. All I can suggest is they, most probably, have not had the applicants but I can ask. Next time I speak to any of the directors, I will ask them why there is only one woman and maybe they will give me some record of who they have had, as far as applicants –

3390 **Deputy Soulsby:** Just a point of clarification. The difference is that the non-executive directors are appointed by the States of Guernsey, not the Board of each of the trading companies, so there is some influence within the Board to be able to determine who is on those particular Boards of Posts and Electric.

3395 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** I agree and, in fact, the last time we made appointments there were no women on that list, as putting their names forward, so may I suggest to anybody out there listening

who would like to – who is a woman – who would like to be on the Board as a non-executive director, to put their name forward.

3400 **Deputy Soulsby:** And I would second that! (*Laughter*).

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** I can say no more!

Anyhow, the point is made but I will ask because I do not know why there is only one, anymore than there are two or three or none. I will try and find out.

3405 The pension scheme, I am afraid, is something which is left over from the commercialisation process, when all the employees who went to Guernsey Electricity transferred, under contract, remaining members of the States Pension Scheme and, until we get the results of the Pension Review, that will not be able to be brought forward. There are various options available to the Board but that is another matter. I think it would be foolish to suggest any solution to this pension puzzle, if you like, until we get a result from the Pension Review Committee, I think it is called, is it not? – Yes. So that is an issue and it is the same issue for Guernsey Post and it is left over from the way we commercialised both Guernsey Electricity and Guernsey Post.

3410 About the way the accounts were presented, you know, it is always an issue. In fact, our own States Accounts are only now beginning to be presented in a suitable manner and that will improve. So that is another issue I can take back to the Board of Guernsey Electricity, to say we would like accounts that can be read not just by accountants but by the public in general.

I thank Deputy Gollop and Deputy Trott for their comments and cannot wait to get onto Guernsey Post! No. (*Laughter*).

3420 I ask Members to note the Report which, if I can remind new Members, means you need to support them or accept them, or whatever, so the Proposition –

**The Bailiff:** Yes.

3425 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** – is to note the accounts for Guernsey Electricity.

**The Bailiff:** Yes, Members, the Proposition is to take note of the Report. Those in favour; those against.

3430 *Members voted Pour*

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

3435 **Guernsey Post Limited**  
**Report for the year ended 31st March 2012, noted**

*Appendix 3:*

3440 *Whether, after consideration of the Report and Financial Statements of Guernsey Post Limited for the year ended 31st March, 2012, submitted under Section 8 of the States Trading Companies (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Ordinance 2001, they are of the opinion:  
To take note of the Report.*

3445 **The Deputy Greffier:** Billet d'État I, Appendix 3 – Treasury and Resources Department – Guernsey Post Limited, submission of Annual Accounts.  
The Proposition is to take note of the Report.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher.

3450 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Thank you, sir.

Mr Bailiff, during the year ending 31st March 2012, Guernsey Post Limited made a profit on ordinary activities before taxation of £357,000. This was a significant improvement on the previous financial year, when a loss of £897,000 was incurred.

3455 This is an improvement, at an operating level, of approximately £1 million, which is the best underlying performance for a decade. An increase in the volume of bulk mail and a real payroll reduction of £600,000 in staff costs, with staff numbers down by 16 or 6%, were major

contributors to this improvement.

3460 As set out in the Billet, the Treasury and Resources Department has been impressed with how the management and staff of Guernsey Post Limited has responded to the challenges with which it has been confronted in recent years. As a result of the improved performance, the States of Guernsey received a dividend of just over £89,000 in respect of the financial year ending 31st March 2012. The company is also returning a further £5 million to the shareholder in the form of a buyback of shares. In accordance with the States Trading Companies Ordinance, the States  
3465 approved the buyback as part of the Budget Report in December 2012 and the £5 million will be credited to the Capital Reserve and will be available to help fund the States next capital programme.

As Members will be aware, the UK government has amended the rules concerning VAT – VAT on low-value imported goods – which has had an effect on Guernsey Post’s business. Total volumes are expected to fall by 38% as a result, with UK bulk mail down by 75%. However,  
3470 despite this, Guernsey Post is still predicting a small operating profit and a substantial underlying profit for the financial year ending 31st March 2013, as a result of being able to retain several key customers, substantial growth in packets due to on-line shopping, reduction in delivery days and further staff savings.

3475 Sir, I ask the Assembly to take note of the accounts for Guernsey Post Limited for the year ending 31st March 2012.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

3480 **Deputy Soulsby:** Nearly there, sir.

Firstly, I would like to commend the Board for the action taken to place Guernsey Post on a more sustainable footing. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) It is clear from the accounts that a lot of hard work has been done so effectively to turn the business around and praise should be given to management, unions and staff for working together to bring about a positive outcome. I was also  
3485 pleased that the Chief Executive contacted me before this debate to ask whether I had specific concerns about the business and I think this proactive approach comes out in these accounts. It does not mean that I have not got anything to say on them, though! (*Laughter*)

I would like to ask the Deputy Minister a question in relation to the foreign exchange business, Batif, which was acquired in 2008. In the Chief Executive’s Report, it states that foreign exchange  
3490 income rose by 1% in the year to 31st March. However, Note 6 implies, as the final instalment was reduced by £20,000, that it may not be as profitable as expected. Can the Minister advise whether, in fact, this business stream is profitable?

**The Bailiff:** Yes, Deputy Sherbourne.

3495 **Deputy Sherbourne:** Thank you, sir.

Just a brief comment. I would like to associate myself with the congratulations offered to the management and the Board of Guernsey Post.

Those of us who had the opportunity to visit and to tour the organisation and meet with the executive officers, I think every one of us fully appreciated the professional way in which  
3500 industrial relations were being managed and that the response to very difficult challenges were being met and I would like to put my congratulations on record, sir. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Thank you.

3505 **The Bailiff:** Deputy De Lisle.

**Deputy De Lisle:** Sir, I was pleased to note the improved performance and the profit in Guernsey Post, despite trying economic circumstances.

I do note that, in the Chairman’s Statement on page 164, he states that

3510 ‘confidence [...] could be achieved without the current regulatory framework and [...] the financial burden of an annual licence fee [...] of £180,000.’

I think, obviously, that is an issue. It is dragging the company and we could see increased profitability, perhaps, without it and that is the implication, I think, of what he is stating.

3515 One thing that we cannot gather – and this is a cost that I wanted to gather from the business – was how much the disagreements between the Post and the OUR were costing in terms of legal



and consulting fees over the past few years. I would like to have those figures and I would like to ask Deputy Kuttelwascher whether, in fact, he can provide me with those numbers in the near future so that we can see how much, in truth, the financial burden really is with respect to the current regulatory framework.

3520

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Any other debate?

3525

Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, two brief comments.

3530

The first is that when questions of the nature of those just posed are intended it is sensible politics to give advance notice of the person who is leading the debate, in order that he or she can ascertain that information. I will be amazed and incredibly impressed if Deputy Kuttelwascher can answer those questions, whereas had he had advance notice he almost certainly would have been able to. So I would implore Members to bear that in mind in the future.

I rise not only to echo the sentiments of Deputy Sherbourne in terms of the performance of this company but to draw Members attention, on page 164, to one line in the Chairman's Statement, which reads

3535

'Since commercialisation, the environment in which we operate has changed beyond all recognition...'

3540

Now, even those words are an understatement, sir. The journey over the last ten years that Guernsey Post has been on has been quite remarkable. Their performance under those conditions has also been quite remarkable and it is, in my view, and I know the view of many others, an endorsement of how successful the commercialisation process can be and, indeed, certainly in the cases of both Guernsey Electricity and Guernsey Post, has been. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

Thank you, sir.

3545

**The Bailiff:** Yes, Deputy Inglis.

**Deputy Inglis:** Mr Bailiff, thank you.

3550

I would like to endorse what Deputy Sherbourne said. I went on one of those visits: very impressive.

I have known the activity of Guernsey Post in a previous life, as Chairman of the Post Watch, and I was well aware of the problems that they experienced in the major changeover.

3555

I would like to ask the Deputy Minister that, as a result of that visit, it was very clear that the infrastructure of that building is now greatly under-used and I would like to have confidence in knowing that Guernsey Post is looking to use the building in a way that will create a further revenue stream for them.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Any further debate?

3560

Deputy Stewart.

**Deputy Stewart:** I just stand because it would be remiss of me, as Commerce and Employment Minister, not to also endorse the comments of Deputy Trott and Sherbourne.

3565

The amount of work that the Executive put in with C & E to help reduce the impact of the removal of LVCR was a massive amount of work and, to be honest, the change management that they have undertaken down at Guernsey Post is an example and something that, perhaps – maybe we can fire Capita and put Boley Smillie in charge of the Financial Transformation Programme! He certainly does deserve the thanks, I believe, of this Chamber for the work they have undertaken.

3570

**The Bailiff:** Any further debate?

No? Deputy Kuttelwascher, then, to reply.

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

3575

Regarding Deputy Soulsby's question about whether Batif is profitable, the last briefing we had was that it was but I cannot give an amount as to how profitable. There may be some difficulties in actually apportioning it because, if you look at the Post Office in town, they use the

same staff to give you letters and weigh parcels as they do to give you the exchange currency, so I will make an attempt to try and get a figure as to how profitable that is. I am not, at this stage, sure exactly how profitable it was expected to be but I will find out.

3580 Deputy De Lisle was talking about regulation: I will just make a point now that the whole issue of the regulation of both Guernsey Electricity and Guernsey Post is under review. Commerce and Employment and ourselves and a few others are reviewing the appropriateness of the current regulatory regime and one can expect some changes. The regulatory cost for both Guernsey Post and Guernsey Electricity are high. Not just in the licence fees they pay but also the person hours they spend in providing all the information required of the regulator, so it is an issue that is being reviewed and I expect that the regulatory regime will be less onerous financially on these two companies in the near future.

3585 I can give one figure, which is purely a verbal figure given me by a previous Chairman, especially when they got almost to the stage of litigation between the regulator and Guernsey Post. I was told by the previous Chairman that, to that date, they had spent approximately £1 million on employing consultants and staff time providing all the information required by the regulator, so it was that order of magnitude but that is not, obviously, the case at the present time. I do not know if Deputy De Lisle would want a more accurate figure but I am not sure a more accurate figure would be easily obtained at this stage because it is something that happened in the past and, again, it is difficult to apportion various items of staff time and resources.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy De Lisle.

3600 **Deputy De Lisle:** I thank the Deputy for providing whatever he had with respect to my question but I would, yes, like the full... because I am not sure whether he is referring to one year of £1 million, or over a period of years, but I take it that it was for a period of one year. I would like to know what has been spent in the last few years, please, and then to make that information available to other Members of the Assembly.

3605 Thank you, sir.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Yes, I will certainly look into that and provide the information as soon as possible.

3610 Deputy Inglis' comment was an interesting one because I am heavily involved in the situation. The States Property Services is part of Treasury and Resources. I am on the Property Services Sub-Committee and we are fully aware that the building that Guernsey Post has is under-used. In fact, it is about 50% too big and there are two options, where they could actually move somewhere else or try and rent part of the building. That has not yet been resolved because it is not the easiest building to split up for use by two separate entities but certainly, yes, it is an issue. We are aware of it and we are looking forward at the whole problem. I expect a resolution in the near term but the biggest problem would be, if we were to move Guernsey Post, where to move them, as there is no perfect building anywhere else. I think the building and site they occupy is highly valuable and could produce quite a return to the States Treasury. So, yes, it is an issue, it is a live issue and watch this space.

3615 I have nothing else to say except thank the contributors and, again, I ask Members to approve, or to note, the accounts of Guernsey Post ending 31st March 2012.

**The Bailiff:** Members, the motion is to note the Report.  
Those in favour; those against.

3625 *Members voted Pour*

**The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.  
That concludes the business. Thank you very much.

3630

*The Assembly adjourned at 5.09 p.m.*