



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Wednesday, 27th March 2013

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

Volume 2, No. 6

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, J. A. B. Gollop, 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, S. J. Ogier, L. S. Trott

The Vale

Deputies M J Fallaize, 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. H. Brouard, 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,
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

J. Torode, Esq. (H.M. Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

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

Deputy D. B. Jones (*Indisposé*)

Deputy M. G. O'Hara (*absent de l'Île*)

Business transacted

Evocation	365
Delivery of draft answers – Statement by the Minister for the Health and Social Services Department	365
Billet d’État VI	
I. States Strategic Plan 2013-17 – Debate concluded and Plan approved	365
Billet d’État V	
IV. Members’ attendance – Report noted	393

The Assembly adjourned at 12.53 p.m.

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Greffier

EVOCATION

The Greffier: Billet d'État VI, States Strategic Plan 2013-17, continuation of general debate.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, before we continue the debate, the Minister for the Health and Social Services Department wishes to make a statement.

5 Deputy Dorey.

Delivery of draft answers

Statement by the Minister for the Health and Social Services Department

10

Deputy Dorey: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

On behalf of HSSD, I would like to apologise to Deputy Hadley and the Assembly that the answers to his Rule 5 Questions were not sent by 5.00 p.m. on Monday and were actually sent at 13.51 yesterday. It was due to an error by an officer at the Department and our internal procedures are being reviewed to ensure this does not happen again.

15

Thank you.

20

Billet d'État VI

POLICY COUNCIL

25

States Strategic Plan 2013-17 Debate concluded and Plan approved

The Bailiff: We will, then, resume debate on the States Strategic Plan.

30

Deputy Laurie Queripel.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

I stand to speak, but I am still undecided on which way to vote at the moment. I am not sure that I can sign up to this document because this is not so much an SSP – a States Strategic Plan – as an SOI, a statement of ideals... So I took the opportunity to look, this morning, in the dictionary

35

for the definition of ‘strategic’ and one of the definitions was the science of planning. There has not been a great deal of science or method in this Plan. It is too high level to be strategic.

40 Generally speaking, I have an aversion to this onslaught of plans and strategies, particularly when they are highly aspirational, but vague in nature, thereby lacking process or, in other words, gears or mechanism to drive them. Unfortunately, this Plan is no different, despite the fact that, ironically, it mentions the word ‘process’ no less than 28 times.

45 However, I do see the need to identify a destination and to concentrate our policy making and for that you need a plan of sorts. So to quote a classic TV series, I want to believe the truth is out there.

45 There is a view held in certain quarters in regard to the States of old, what some term the ‘golden age’ or the ‘golden era’ of the States... It is viewed fondly through somewhat dewy eyes, probably with some justification but, of course, those Assemblies were nowhere near the number of tipping points that we are now approaching, that have been over the last few years coming into sharp focus.

50 The States of the past were not particularly good at medium- and long-term strategic planning. Hence it falls upon this and recent Assemblies to deal with that legacy which, in my opinion, includes unnecessary spending; not putting enough into the contingency fund when the going was good; insufficient attention and funding in regard to maintenance of infrastructure; failing to properly foresee and therefore deal sufficiently with the following issues – population and
55 immigration, land use planning, transport and traffic – hence we now have more cars per square mile than anywhere else in Europe; and, a real doozy, the virtual give-away of Guernsey Telecoms, a vital and valuable strategic infrastructure; lastly, the failure to properly comprehend the impact – both good, i.e. greater prosperity, creation of high value jobs, and problematical, the inflationary effect on property prices and the cost of living, and the raised international profile and,
60 therefore, attention that we receive on the international stage – that the finance industry would have, and has had, upon the Bailiwick. Aside from that, they did quite well.

As a result, we have coming our way in the near future, for example, debates concerning population and transport and the need to arrive at appropriate and sustainable and proportionate measures will be crucial. Another crucial decision will be our future approach in regard to
65 planning and land use. Two of our most precious resources are land and the human resource. If we want to encourage our young people to see a future here, make their homes, have their families, build careers and create and grow businesses here, we will need to put the right conditions in place to facilitate that. We will need to take a more pragmatic and rational approach to land use and planning.

70 Guernsey people, by nature, are resourceful. Historically, all of our industries utilised local resources and, as a result, the Island’s ability to be self-determining is greater. We need to recapture that spirit and employ it in a modern context. We have been informed by Commerce and Employment that a 5% growth in the small business sector will actually add 2½% to GDP. Of
75 course, retaining sufficient agricultural and horticultural land makes good strategic sense so, once again, the important balance needs to be struck. Action in regard to economic diversity is long overdue. We need to walk the walk, not just talk the talk.

If we are to realise even three of the objectives in the States Strategic Plan, namely – and I think it is actually from the old Plan, but I am going to use it anyway – foster an inclusive and caring society which supports communities, families and individuals; protect the Island’s
80 environment, unique cultural identity and rich heritage; and improve the quality of life for Islanders, it is imperative that we reach the right conclusions in these upcoming debates. It is the resolutions arising from *these* debates that will inform our real and meaningful plan.

This is actually a very good time to be considering social policy because it is during periods of
85 austerity and recession that the most vulnerable and poorly off within communities can potentially be cut adrift. We need to be very aware of that and not only have the *intention* for that not to happen, but to take steps to make sure that it does *not* happen, or is perhaps even rectified. That is the difference between a visionary plan and a dream or a statement of ideals.

This document makes great play of the need for policies to complement and dovetail with each other and yet there are a number of paradoxes, ironies, concerns, that strike me; the fairly constant
90 reference to upskilling and high-value jobs. We actually also need, and will continue to need, the people that do the lower-value jobs. Our community would look very different, indeed would not function, without their vital contribution and they, in turn, need to know that they are valued.

Also, to a certain extent, an understandable request for States manual workers to exercise
95 restraint in their wage expectations, but this document calls you out and highlights the importance of high-value jobs to the economy and the requirement of high, personal incomes to fund public

services. If this only applies to the private sector, the gap between public- and private-sector pay will only widen. Ditto, the outsourcing of public services. This will probably require housing licences for workers on very modest pay. In fact, it has been whispered to me that this could already be happening in regard to outsourced work.

100 The same point applies to local tradesmen who, in some cases, have been accused of charging too much for their services and that may be the case, but hence we witness the influx of the so-called 'white van man' and terms like 'market forces' and 'competition' are bandied about as the reasons for this. This Plan calls for as many people as possible to be on high incomes which, in turn, heats up the economy and pushes up the cost of living. So what might be seen in one way as a virtuous circle can become somewhat of a vicious circle. It is possible even in apparently holistic plans that policies can clash and have a counter effect. So we need to reconcile these points, whatever we have in place.

110 This might seem rather trite, but another irony exists on page 397, where it tells us that the full plans are only available on the States website. I would suggest that if inclusivity is being encouraged and wide public and political buy-in, engagement and awareness is truly being sought, these documents should be easily and readily available in all formats.

115 It is something of an aside, but Deputy Lester Queripel informed me recently of the fact that the Human Rights law is not currently available from the Greffe in paper form. In other words it can only be viewed online or downloaded. That is sadly ironic. By definition, that law should be available and provided in all formats. I think that it is relevant, because I think those things are fairly simple to achieve. Simple steps could be taken to achieve those two things.

120 We now, or will eventually have, lots of strategies and plans, but very little cash, it seems, to fund them. If the will exists to see the dreams become reality, where do we acquire the extra funds? I do not think that new taxes and charges, such as GST, for example, are the answer. The answer for me in the long term, it will be far more honest, far more equitable to simply put a penny or two on Income Tax. I realise I may set nerves jangling and cause collective breath to be drawn, but I make *this* suggestion, but I still think there is some mileage in engaging in dialogue with the other Crown Dependencies, the Isle of Man and Jersey, and attempting to agree on a new harmonised corporate tax strategy of, for example, Two/Ten still hugely competitive and nobody gains an advantage. Regardless of what we say about these documents – good intentions, but vague and so on – the fact is that without extra funding this bird will not fly. It will remain a peacock, lovely to look at, but its feet will never leave the ground.

125 So, I am considering rejecting this Report, but my worry is that this document will be taken away to have more work done on it and eventually be re-presented and we will not just resort to the old SSP and I feel that enough time and resource has been expended to get us to this stage. It is an uncomfortable dilemma.

I will have to consider very carefully what I heard yesterday and what I will hear today.

Thank you, sir.

135 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Spruce and then Deputy Gillson and Deputy St Pier.
Deputy Spruce.

Deputy Spruce: Thank you, sir.

140 Members, I will keep this speech much briefer than Deputy Queripel's.
I have to say that I share the frustration expressed by so many during this debate. In fact, when the draft of this Report document was presented at the T & R Board meeting recently, I made two specific comments. The first one was that this Report is full of words, but it actually has no action. Secondly, I said what Members will want is a debate on the proposed Government Service Plans, not a 25 year horizon.

145 Needless to say, these views, whilst acknowledged, they did fall on deaf ears and obviously the Policy Council produced the Report before you today. So it is no surprise to me that there is so much frustration here. As a Member in my second term, I would ask you take this Report with a pinch of salt. (*Laughter*) It is the Government Service Plans that will count. They will cover a 4-year time frame and it is that debate that will be important to us and the public. I ask you... Sorry, the SSP, whether we like it or not, will make very little difference to the day-to-day running of this Government. Health have produced mental health and wellbeing proposals and all these things have happened in the last three months. Education have produced their Vision and T & R and SSD are working on a major review of the tax and benefits system, all without a new States Strategic Plan.

155 So in spite of actually supporting the need for a States Strategic Plan, it is absolutely vital that

we have our long-term aims, I believe that the short-term vision is more important to this Assembly and that we need to get on and deal with that.

160 I would also ask you to recognise that it is our own departmental business plan which is where the action really takes place. We are all working on projects right now. It is not as if we are not busy and the old States Strategic Plan is in place and will serve us well until the Government Service Plans are produced during the next few months.

165 So, basically, I am standing really to ask you to support – in spite of the frustration – I am asking you to support the Report, in the knowledge that we can continue to operate under our own business plans, continue to operate under the States Strategic Plan, which we currently have, so nothing will change. It will make no difference to the day-to-day running of Government, whether we argue for the rest of the day about the quality of this Report. We all know it could have been done in a different way, but we have got what we have got and when the Government Service Plans are produced, I am convinced that we will then have a working model that we can use during the next few years. So please, I will be voting for the SSP. I ask you all to as well.

170 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gillson, then Deputy St Pier.

Deputy Gillson: Thank you, sir.

175 I have some sympathy with this Report and to understand why I have sympathy, let us consider the constraints which we have to operate as a result of our form of Government. One of the drawbacks of our system of non-party government is that virtually no policy development can take place before an election. In the UK, for example, an incoming government would have had four years to develop their policy, effectively their strategic plan.

180 Without that system – and I am not suggesting we have party politics over here – but with a system such as ours, a new Government enters four years as a loose confederation of Deputies, all independent without any agreed policies.

185 Additionally, unlike a winning party in the UK, we will all have different political views and so trying to get a process which will amalgamate into a single policy direction 47 views is going to be more complex and it is going to take time. I accept this means that for any medium- or longer-term SSP to be able to survive an election, it will be a bit motherhood and apple pie, and we just have to look at the statement of aims and as Deputy Bebb noted yesterday, it is difficult to see how anybody from any political standpoint could object to them. So I accept this is a limitation of our system. The Strategic Plan has to be motherhood, apple pie, has to be such a high-level document.

190 So why am I unhappy with this particular Report? Let us look at the statement of aims, the new ones compared with the original statement of aims. I do not object to the two new ones at the bottom of page 371. They are not particularly earth shattering: I have no objection to them, but what I do find pointless are the other changes, an odd word here, an odd word changed there. The most pointless change of all is the change to the last aim, which was ‘improve awareness to the culture and identity of Guernsey’, which changes to ‘improve the awareness of the culture and identity of Guernsey both internally and externally’. If adding those words is not bad enough, the Policy Council seems to believe that we do not understand what the word ‘internally’ means, because they have put in brackets ‘within the Island’! (*Laughter*) Why? Presumably that change was approved by the Policy Council, as opposed to just being drafted by civil servants and put in on the nod. So I have a question for the Chief Minister: exactly why does he think the words ‘within the Island’ are needed and what value do they actually add to this document? For me these are pointless changes. How are those words going to positively impact on Islanders’ lives. They are not going to: realistically, it is just pointless.

195
200
205 The Chief Minister mentioned we have all been to a number of workshops and that is true. I attended them, but the changes to these aims did not come out of those workshops because the fundamental nature of those aims has not changed. These changes make no real difference to the resolutions which are outstanding.

210 The best part of a year into Government and we are now having a debate about direction. Somehow we have managed to completely mess up the order of the three most important debates: the SSP, the Budget and the FTP debates. They are in completely the wrong order. We should have had the SSP first to set the direction, the FTP to set the financial constraints and then the Budget to allocate available monies. We have done them in completely the wrong order.

215 But going back to the Report, the meat of the SSP – or the new SSP – is obviously what the Government wants to achieve in the short to medium term, but that is not in this Report, it has been deferred at least until July this year. But it will not be until July 2014, a full two years into a

4-year term of government, that the Government considers the *full* Government Service Plan. This is only part of a Report; in effect, it is little more than a holding report. It separates the SSP into two parts, tweaks one half and then says wait a year for another. We are quarter of the way through a government and we have a Report that basically states the obvious. Its aims and political direction of travel, which already exists, but it lacks detail. Of course, all is not lost because we are going to have a completely new plan – the Government Service Plan – so this Report sets out a plan for us to have *another* Plan! (*Laughter*) It is time we say we have had enough of all these plans. We have more plans than Baldrick and his were *cunning!* (*Laughter*) I actually question whether we need the Government Service Plan, whether it is just an additional level of bureaucracy. For a moment, let us go back to basics. Under our former Governments, it is Departments that generate policy and, as Deputy Spruce says, they have been – we have had Education’s Vision, we have HSSD’s 2020 Vision. The Policy Council should co-ordinate policy to ensure that the Departments develop them in a co-ordinated way. The GSP, the Government Service Plans, are just not needed. Departments already have business plans. By now each Department should have a vision, a departmental strategy. There should be documents which define the Departments’ policies. Policy Council should be ensuring that those are co-ordinated and go together in a defined travel... They may need to expand them from more than a year to four years, but that is where the detail should be, not this new level of Plan. It is just not needed.

The problem we have with the SSP is it has taken on a life of its own. For some people it seems to have become an end in itself. We have got a Plan! Well, the Plan is only a tool. You do not go out and buy a nail because you want to buy a nail, you buy a nail because you want to fix two bits of wood together. The Plan is a tool, not an end in itself.

So I think we have had enough of endless rounds of Plan, tweak and Plan. The Report adds nothing significant to the existing resolutions, so these propositions are not needed. Deputy Conder suggested supporting this, because it is a start. He is wrong. This process started over a decade ago and it is still not working. This is not a start, it should be the end... It is time to call a halt to this ongoing waste of staff time and public money. (**Several Deputies:** Hear, hear.)

Unfortunately, I feel I have to vote against these resolutions, because to vote in favour just adds credence to what is half a solution and to put in place half of which we do not actually need. So I will be voting against it and I urge Members to also vote against this. (*Applause*)

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier, then Deputy Burford.

Deputy St Pier: Mr Bailiff, the Education Minister set me some homework last night. He told me to go home, come back this morning and inspire Deputy Green. (*Laughter*) So here is the presentation of my homework.

As an aside, I should also perhaps advise Deputy Perrot that, as Minister of the Board on which he sits, regrettably I do not have any power to put him into detention. (*Laughter*) I have to say it is a power which I am sure all Members of Policy Council would love to have! (*Laughter*)

Sir, Deputies Green, Trott, Le Clerc, Bebb, Gillson and Fallaize are right. This document is a direct result of our system of government. It is the output and consequence of consensus and that is why Deputy Green and many others are struggling to be inspired by it. ‘The States Strategic Plan is the gift for the political opportunist. It can be bent and shaped to take on whatever form a detractor or supporter sees fit.’ Not my words, but those of Deputy Brehaut in a tweet yesterday.

I am inclined to agree with Deputy Luxon that the frustration with the document, which is spawned from consensus, is really frustration with the system of government. We call it a States Strategic Plan; maybe that is part of the problem, it is not a plan and it is not supposed to be one. It is a process, as Deputy Laurie Queripel has said. I was taught that a strategy is a method by which a person, a company or an army, moves to a position of advantage. In our community’s case, if you prefer, it is a way of getting ahead in the world.

To use a synonym from a dictionary, in military usage a distinction is made between strategy and tactics. Strategy is the utilisation, during both peace and war, of all of the nation’s forces, through large-scale, long-range planning and development to ensure security or victory. Tactics deal with the use and deployment of troops in actual combat.

Deputy Storey expressed frustration that it would be two years or more into this term before we have a plan of action for the next few years and Deputy Perrot and Deputy Spruce say the Government need to concentrate on just getting the operational stuff done now. We may all share those views, but this misses the point of this document. It is a framework. It is a vision, not unlike HSSD’s 2020 Vision, which was similarly criticised for its lack of content, or Education’s Vision – which I think is excellent, by the way, and the Education Department and Board should be

congratulated, instead of them, too, facing carping criticism for it being light on detail. Like HSSD's 2020 and Education's Vision, the SSP is *not* supposed to be an action plan. For me it is a spot on the horizon we are aiming for.

280 Perhaps because of the electoral cycle, it seems that this Assembly's horizon is frequently and dangerously short term. The purpose of the SSP is to challenge us to lift our heads to a longer horizon, up to 25 years, well beyond the time when most, if not all of us, will have left this Assembly. The challenges of the environment, or of climate change, do not neatly fit into our short-term electoral cycle. Energy policy requires a vision of the future 20 or 30 years out. Social policy, whether it be preventing or responding to social problems, requires a long-term commitment. Our infrastructure investment requires a view on our population and needs 20 years
285 from now, and so and so on and so on.

Deputies Lester Queripel, Brouard and Spruce have perfectly understood and described the role of the SSP and its interaction with and the importance of the Government Service Plans.

290 Deputy Fallaize yesterday gave us the history of how we got to where we are. It is clear to me that we are on a journey. It is not a particularly scenic or a particularly interesting journey, but a journey nonetheless. It is a shame that so many Members from the last Assembly appear to want to distance themselves from the process, including the last Chief Minister, as signatory – and apparently little more – to the last SSP. This iteration is better than the last, as Deputy Conder has said, not least because it is shorter, whereas, as Deputy Luxon said, at 50 pages it probably is still
295 too long.

As Deputy Langlois said, having the SSP is better than having nothing at all. If we want to throw it out, we might as well go back to each Committee or Department Board determining their own priorities in accordance with their own whims, independent of any wider objectives or, as Deputy David Jones put it, acquiring their own baubles without any planning. The point of this document is precisely that the departmental business plans fit together – referring to Deputy
300 Gillson's point.

As Minister for Treasury and Resources, I must speak to the Fiscal and Economic Policy Plan. This clearly underpins the States Budget. Yes, in the short term we all know that we have the current fiscal deficit, but the Fiscal and Economic Policy Plan sets the framework for our long-term spending, given the demographic changes we face. There is the clear link to social policy in terms of how and what we provide in terms of public services, especially health care, social welfare and education.
305

The Plan assumes that the private sector remains the engine of economic growth and that it is desirable to increase the standard of living to fund increasing public services. It assumes that Government's role is to provide a conducive, fiscal and macro-economic environment. It assumes that fiscal policy's prime objective is to promote long-term economic growth, but, of course, none of these are givens. As a community and an Assembly, we could have chosen a more interventionist economic model. This debate and the States Strategic Plan should be about those high-level principles.
310

315 Bringing it back to the here and now and the practical, how does this long-term framework fit with the current term of Government? Let me give you some examples. If you turn to page 396, you will see three general objectives under the Fiscal and Economic Policy Plan. The first says:

320 'Appropriate size of the Government and sustainable long term finances and programmes.'

That is precisely the objective of the Personal Tax and Benefits Review.
The second says:

325 'Balanced, internationally competitive, high-value economy'

and it is precisely the objective of the economic development and financial sector strategy work of Commerce and Employment.

The third says:

330 'Skilled, sustainable and competitive workforce.'

That is precisely the objective, surely, of the Skill Strategy and I hope will be one of the outputs from Education delivering on their Vision.

335 Finally, I may not yet have managed to inspire Deputy Green, but I hope that the words from the St Sampson's Douzaine on Monday night will. (*Interjection*) A douzenier put it very simply

and it struck a chord. Members of the States, she said, I want you to take note of page 395. If you base all your decisions on what is in there, Guernsey will be a better place. So this is what I take from the SSP and this is what I take as my inspiration and I urge all Members to support all propositions.

340

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford, then Deputy Sillars and Deputy Stewart.

345

Deputy Burford: Sir, it was interesting to listen to how the debate yesterday seemed to be, for some, a convenient hook on which to hang a speech on the machinery of government. First we had Deputy Fallaize, who was against the SSP, but seemingly in favour of executive government. Deputy Jones weighed in in favour of the SSP, but *against* executive government. So it would be almost rude of me not to take yet another permutation and come out against the SSP *and* against executive government. (*Laughter*) Despite this, the Policy Council think they can bring the Assembly together in a political direction of travel. Good luck with that one!

350

If that were not enough we also had at least two Deputies who are against the SSP, but are going to vote for it anyway, the reason being that it will not make any difference to anything, so it does not matter... This is flawed logic. Defeating this Report will not leave us in a policy vacuum, as the existing suite of plans remains valid. Of course, it would be less challenging simply to retitle and rewrite them but, instead, we could be really radical and just start implementing them! (*Laughter*) Defeat of this Report might just stop us investing our time and energy in such essentially meaningless work and channel it where it can do some good.

355

Deputy Langlois exhorted us to ‘note’ the Report, but that is not what the first five propositions ask of us. They ask us to *agree* with them, but I have some deep misgivings about some of the statements that I am being asked to sign up to. There is, of course, a great deal that I would imagine no-one could disagree with. Who, for instance, would not wish to see high standards of education? Who would not want wise management of the Island’s resources? Although I daresay there would be considerable debate as to what constitutes ‘wise management’... For some, wise management of Belle Greve Bay would involve a great deal of concrete while, for others, it would be turned into a nature reserve.

360

There are apparent contradictions within the Report itself. Section 10.4.102 deals with energy from the environmental perspective. It states:

365

‘Needless to say, a big reduction in the use of energy would have a detrimental effect on Island life.’

370

This is curious indeed. Clearly the opportunities to substantially reduce energy use exists. Megawatt hours of the stuff are wasted through poorly-insulated homes, leaving appliances on unnecessarily, overheating commercial buildings – the list is endless. What would be detrimental about less fossil fuel use, less pollution or fewer car journeys? Fortunately, a few pages on under ‘Headline Policies’ one of the objectives is ‘using energy wisely and not wasting it’ – phew!

375

In the Statement of Aims, I must mention a new aim of ensuring that everyone has the

‘opportunities and support where needed, to enable them to reach their full potential.’

380

I might be being too literal here – unfortunately, not something that can be levelled at the Report (*Laughter*) – but I doubt one person in a thousand achieves their true ‘full potential’, even if it were definable, or measurable, but we have it as an aim and no doubt we will try and measure it and then put the results of our measurement, complete with targets and KPIs, in another report. It is just words and, in the meantime, while we are drowning in words and rewriting the same strategies and reports with different arrangements of the same words, life goes on in the outside world.

385

We might as well say we are going to launch a space programme, for that is just as likely to be achieved. I am sure I will be told that this is high level strategy, but there are only so many things that phrase can forgive.

390

Moving on now to the key strategic policy topics, I have to assume the reason that the Transport Strategy does not appear in the list at page 433 is that it falls under the caveat on page 378, in the preamble. This states that the only matters making this list are those

‘where debate should help to identify ways of reconciling competing aspirations’.

395

So, following on from this, I assume that the Transport Strategy either (a) has no competing aspirations in need of reconciling or otherwise, or (b) debate would *not* help to identify ways of *(Laughter and applause)* reconciling competing aspirations. Then I started to think what the phrase ‘competing aspirations’ means, anyway, and I came to the conclusion that it probably means a contest for cash. It concerns me that the Transport Strategy has been omitted, as the Report in paragraph 10.6.4 will inform the Government Service Plan and the Government Service Plan will eventually inform the Capital Programme.

Finally, I have difficulty with the phrase ‘political direction of travel’. As Members of the States Review Committee will know, I like our current system. I like the tensions and debate and range of views and political persuasions. I like the ever-shifting consensus that throws different lights from different directions on all sorts of subjects. Yes, clearly we must have policy and we do. The current Environmental Policy Plan, for example, is a good document, the only thing wrong with it being that there is no money to implement it.

I also think the Departments do a good job in bringing reports for debate and the States does a good job in passing, amending and sometimes rejecting them, but to get all 47 of us to sign up to a defined political direction of travel – let us call it party light – stands to lose more than it gains and is likely to be as successful as herding cats. This was perhaps demonstrated at one of the recent SSP away days, although given the abundance of colouring pens, oversized sheets of paper and circle time, I am still not convinced that I was not actually attending an Education Department trial of free pre-school in error. *(Laughter)* We need a simplicity and honesty that people outside Government can engage with. It is *not* to be found in this document so I will be dismissing this emperor’s new clothes of a Report. *(Applause)*

The Bailiff: Deputy Sillars.

Deputy Sillars: Sir, thank you.

Within the Island, Deputy Gillson, if I recall rightly, was inserted at Members’ request following one of the presentations; I am not sure whether it was the three at Beau Séjour, or whether it was the two at Sir Charles Frossard House, but it was a request and, as far as our T & R Minister, I will be marking his homework later and, as long as it is more than half of 47, I will pass it...

The SSP is a document delivered by Policy Council, having consulted with all Deputies who wanted to participate over the early months of this term of office. It is a document that brings together the views of all Deputies who wanted to participate and did. This was because there were so many new Deputies that there were views needed to be taken into account. It is not so different from when we debated the FTP. The new States needed to debate it and it turned out to agree with the previous States. It was 100% – no, it was one against and one was not quite sure.

Deputy Luxon and others have said this debate and the woolliness of this Plan is a result of our consensus Government. Well, yes, but I am not going in to that, because enough has been said. It is frustrating. This Plan says it *is* deficient, it admits it is deficient in having a specific plan of action. Page 354, 2.5: it talks about the Government Service Plan and says this

‘...will provide a mechanism that is currently missing from this process.’

The Education Board Vision – and I am glad we did not call it strategy, road map, direction or anything along those lines – seeks to support the States Strategic Plan objectives by maintaining and enhancing – *(Laughter)*

Deputy Fallaize: Is that the space programme, sir? *(Laughter and applause)*

Deputy Sillars: I will take that as support!

Maintaining and enhancing Guernsey’s competitive position in order to achieve future economic success, whilst at the same time supporting a range of social policy initiatives, providing for health, social, education, welfare needs of our community.

The Education Department has identified three over-arching general objectives, which it believes will contribute to these aims, and they are:

1. Give children an excellent start in education, so that they have a better foundation for future learning.

2. enable all pupils to develop and equip themselves with the skills, knowledge and personal qualities needed for life and work, and

3. We want our children and young people to be prepared to meet the challenges and demands of the future, to encourage and enable learners to become creative, innovative and critical thinkers, to establish a strong work ethic and to equip them morally, socially, physically and academically to partake in our Island community.

460 The Education Board has also recently gone to consultation on its Vision for Education in the next 10 to 20 years and will be bringing this to the States for consideration later this year. Our Vision demonstrates our commitment to helping meet these objectives set out in this Plan. It has 14 actions and dates and I am going to read them out – sorry for this, but it is a good time for this:

465 ‘We will bring our vision during 2013. The review of the curriculum, assessment and qualifications framework is already under way, with implementation starting September 2014. Implementation of a new integral learning environment, the GILE 2, will begin in September 2013. We will submit proposals for the rebuild of La Mare de Carteret site and the capital prioritisation process Q1 2013 and for debating in 2013. We will bring a States Report to the Assembly in quarter four 2013 seeking approval, introduction and entitlement of 15 hours per week for pre-school education for all three- and four-year-olds in partnership with private providers before they start school. We will assist, with the Health and Social Services Department, with the update of the Children and Young People’s Plan to be published in 2014. We will bring a States Report to the Assembly in Q4, 2013, seeking to improve outcomes and opportunities in the primary sector. We will bring a States Report to the Assembly in 2014 on the new structure of secondary education. We will bring a States Report to the Assembly, recommending the creation of a new structure for post-16s during 2013. We will bring a States Report to the Assembly, recommending a new model of funding for higher education in 2014. The Education Department will be inspected by an internal body in Q1 2015. A new form of school governance will be in place by September 2014. A Bailiwick form of local management schools will be in place by January 2015 and we aim to have an Education Law in place by the end of 2015.’

470
475
480 These are Education’s actions. I expect the GSP to have actions and that is when we should have the real debate and the policy will be made. So please support this woolly plan, so we can bring on the real debate, which is the GSP.

485 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Stewart and then Deputy Duquemin.

Deputy Stewart: Mr Bailiff, I think it is important just to remember what we are debating. On the top of page 354, the very first lines:

490 ‘The States Strategic Plan is a mechanism to enable the States to decide what they want to achieve over the medium to long-term and how they will manage or influence the use of Island resources to pursue those objectives.’

495 That is exactly what it does; it is not about the detail. As Deputy Fallaize said, ‘Well, we have already got a plan, so why do we need a new one?’ The reason we need a new one is because things have changed. Since 2009 the whole global economy has changed. It has changed for us with Zero-10. We have got 21 new Members in the Assembly and that is why the Policy Council went out and engaged, through a series of workshops, with every single Member here, to make sure that the 47 Members – which Deputy Trott pointed out, we have a government of 47 people by consensus – are actually all, pretty much on the same bus... as long as it is not a number 7, of course! *(Laughter)*

500 And why is it important? Well, it is important and I will give you a practical example. It basically states what is the tone, what is the policy, of the States of Guernsey and a practical example from last week is a very large investor was looking to bring their business to this Island and, in the wake of the EU and what is happening in Cyprus, wanted to know, ‘How does your Government work. What are the fiscal policies? Do you own the banks?’ With something like this, this is not just for us, this is, as Deputy Lester Queripel quite rightly points out, about communication.

505
510 So whether someone turns up as an individual, or someone wants to invest in Guernsey and wants to understand what the tone of this Government is, what are our fiscal policies, we go, ‘There you are: £2.50’ and it basically states where we are with our general policy levels. As Deputy Brouard quite rightly points out, all the detail is with each Department. We all know – we are sitting on our Boards – we all know how much work is going on putting together the detailed policies, but I think, as an overall statement of where we are going as a Government, and to communicate that to the wider world, this is where we are. To be honest, Deputy Bebb can quote

515

Thatcher and everyone else: well, I will quote back. I think a lot of people are just ‘moaning Minnies’, because they are going to pick at this, they do not like the style of writing, everyone is going to have their opinion on whether this bit is well written or not, but does it sum up, as a States, where we see ourselves? As Gavin says, where is that light that we are heading towards?

520 I think it does and to say that it is written by Sir Humphrey... there has been a lot of input from every single States Member and I think that is the most important thing. We have all been involved in putting this together, but it is not about the detailed wording, it is about the general statement of policy and quite a lot has changed. If we do just turn to the fiscal policy side of it, some of the things which were not in the previous Plan, which are now extremely important: on page 402,

530 ‘Ensure an internationally competitive ICT structure...
 Improve the co-ordination of enterprise and business development support...
 Diversify key training markets towards emerging economies, in finance and beyond...
 Promote a thriving creative and digital sector showcasing the best of Guernsey, old and new...
 Promote Intellectual Property Rights.’

535 These were not in the previous Plan and are vital to take our economy forward. It is not perfect but, with 47 people involved, I think it is about as perfect as it can get and I say we should support this. I will be voting in favour.

The Bailiff: Deputy Duquemin and then Deputy Brehaut.

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

Before one States Department held an event recently to present their new Vision strategy to Deputies, one candid Member of the Board told me that their presentation was too long, there were too many speakers and there were too many PowerPoint slides, but he told me that there were a few very important nuggets that will make a real difference, so he told me to make certain to listen out for them.

545 I think it is the same with the States Strategic Plan. When we met at Les Côtils in the workshops to help formulate this document, one of my suggestions, as Deputy Burford said, written on a nice big sheet of paper and blu-tacked to the wall, was that the States Strategic Plan should fit on one page of A4. Yes, it should fit on just one page of A4. Forgive the cliché, but we needed quality not quantity.

550 Sir, I noticed a few Members in the Assembly yesterday raising their eyebrows when, first of all, Deputy Lester Queripel and then Deputy Brouard read verbatim from the top of page 395 – the same all-important page that I earlier highlighted in my speech on the Gollop amendment – but they found the nugget. They had found that one nugget and they were right to concentrate on it. In a verbose document, page 395 is the nearest we get to what I consider is our ‘one single page of A4’. If you will forgive me, sir, I am going to repeat the first 28 words – just 28 words – of that page again now. Why? Because this is the nugget and this is what can make a real difference. Page 395 says:

560 ‘The Government of Guernsey aims to protect and improve:
 [1] The quality of life of Islanders
 [2] The Island’s economic future [and]
 [3] The Island’s environment, unique cultural identity and rich heritage.’

565 Yesterday, Deputy Luxon said that the SSP was the core plank of what we do, and this is the core. These 28 words are the core of that plank.

570 Deputy Luxon, my Minister on PSD, recently arranged a series of master classes with leading business figures in Guernsey for the five Members of PSD and our Chief Officer. The master classes were varied and offered many different schools of thought, but two or three of them had one common thread. The industry leaders said they could always sum up their organisation’s vision, their strategy, in just a few words or a few minutes. Apologies to Deputy Perrot for the mumbo-jumbo management speak, but I think they call this something like the two-minute elevator challenge. They asked if we could do the same. The 28 words on page 395 are the nearest we can get.

575 My other Department is Culture and Leisure. As well as putting on my wellies and forking the pitch at Footes Lane, one of my other key tasks in the Department is putting on my thinking cap and helping develop the Department’s own vision strategy document. I share Deputy Gillson’s concern that another layer of plans are not needed. We already have our departmental business

plans visions. In doing this, we have concentrated heavily on delivering against the aims of the SSP, the aims at the top of page 395, 'quality of life, economic future and the unique identity and rich heritage of the Island'.

Mr Bailiff, it may seem overly simplistic to many, but it is a very useful exercise to continually check what we all do in our Departments against these three aims and, in some areas, we are able to see that certain activities sometimes deliver a tick in the box against not one, but two, or even all three, of the SSP's aims. We can, in these times of FTP austerity, perhaps focus our resources more wisely and deliver real value for money for the taxpayers of Guernsey by looking at it in this way.

We should not pay lip service to the SSP, but we should use all the aims, all 28 words, as a real tool, a real planning tool to make a difference, particularly and we must, make decisions with a longer-term horizon, 25 years or more.

One Deputy said yesterday about asking the obvious: who, how, when, why questions. The most important of all of these is 'Why?' If we are setting out to improve, for example, the Island's economic future, why are we doing what we do? If we are setting out to protect and improve the quality of life of Islanders, why are we doing what we do? These 28 words are much more than – to borrow Deputy Gillson's phrase – 'motherhood and apple pie' if you take notice of them. The obvious questions need to be asked.

Deputy Langlois was right yesterday when he said that a little information can tell you where you are going, but with too much information you can get lost. The SSP document in front of us today for me is too long. Twenty-eight words would have been enough to tell us where we are going, but would not have been too many so we are lost in the detail. Many have spoken about the SSP as an amalgam of our own 47 manifestos. One year ago I was pounding the streets of Castel with my own manifesto, a nicely designed – even if I do say so myself – well-thought out, but arguably verbose document, but thankfully not as verbose as Deputy Fallaize's. *(Laughter)*

The one 2012 manifesto that stood out head and shoulders above all others was that of Deputy Perrot. Short and to the point does not even do it justice. *(Laughter)* During a speech in this Assembly Deputy Perrot said he had his A4 manifesto sheet with its five bullet points pinned up on the wall of his office at home and that all of the decisions that he took, including how to vote in this Assembly, were measured against it. Brilliant! My hope is that when we leave the Chamber today, we remember the sage words of the St Sampson's douzenier that were repeated to us this morning by Deputy St Pier. I agree with her 100%. I hope that we can confine this Billet, the SSP document, to a filing cabinet or a recycling bin, but before we do, we rip out page 395 and we pin it to our notice boards and we encourage all of our chief officers and our other civil servants to do the same.

Mr Bailiff, if we do all that, the SSP process and this debate will have been worthwhile. *(Applause)*

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you, sir.

I will just note before I speak, I was listening to the Chief Minister on the radio this morning and he said his favourite film, or one of his favourite films, was *Kelly's Heroes*, the story of a group of people going AWOL, *(Laughter)* which I do not know if that is an appropriate message... *(Laughter)* Of course, they then go on to rob a bank, do they not? *(Laughter)* I know we have a structural deficit, but please do not do anything rash, if you can – *(Laughter)*

Thank you, Mr Bailiff. I was interested to hear the Chief – sorry I have just said that! *(Laughter)*.

It is frequently being said that 'culture will eat strategy for breakfast' and I know it is usually me – and I will apologise for another cliché, Deputy Perrot. That observation could be written for a debate such as this. You will be aware, for example, the Environment Department are in the process of drafting a Road Transport Strategy. You will frequently hear the Minister from time to time inform you that it is all being dealt with by Deputy Burford and me, but it will ultimately become an Environment Department Report and getting the Report together could actually be the easy bit. The strategy that is, could well be the easy bit. The culture could turn that strategy into something, well, not unlike the SSP; earnest, sincere, in places even modest, but ultimately as pointless as going ormering in the North Beach car park on a high tide, in the dark, without an ormering book. Hypothecation, link funding, as part of any strategy, could well be consumed by the prevailing culture of the day. That is, if we were to suggest link funding, for example.

Some of you, no doubt, will be of the opinion that I and others are jumping on the bandwagon,

640 because fortune has presented us with that opportunity. For my part, I did not jump, I just slowly
climbed aboard. But that is not the case; the reality is that the SSP has become something of a non-
event, because we are all working our socks off already. We are immersed in the process of
government, despite the presence of the SSP. Like others, I am looking at those who have taken
ownership of this Report and asking how does this, how will this, impact on the work that I am
645 already committed to in my respective Departments? And why do those who want to take
ownership of the SSP project believe they have a document that will deliver over and above what
we are currently attempting to do? The fact that the PC might be embarrassed – and Deputy
Burford has already used this expression – by the fact that they presented us with a naked emperor
should not, in itself, bring about a major structural reform within Government. This is a consensus
Assembly and we tend to agree to disagree usually.

650 The system of government was touched on in debate yesterday, but the SSP appears to have
been written to *find* consensus, rather than being the result of *real* consensus. Consequently, it is
something of a pair of slippers, when at times like these we need running spikes. When Deputy
Stewart asserts that we have all been part of this process, to have an away day, to have the
coloured pens, to have the paper and pin sheets of paper on the wall with blu-tack, is useful at
655 times and, if nothing else, it brings the Assembly together, it brings Members together, to
exchange ideas. I am never convinced that it then does become manifest in policy or documents
such as this later on.

In conversation with other Members recently, I just asked to be given, within any four-year
term, for example, five things to actually do and, unlike the comments made by Deputy Luxon in
660 his speech yesterday, in the light of the structural deficit, our options are limited anyway, but we
still have enough, in fact more than enough, to be getting on with. But 47 people, especially in a
time of what is acute fiscal restraint, sitting around agreeing on a direction of political travel is just
ludicrous. I mean, really, what are the alternatives? We have about the same amount of control
over our direction of travel as the children who jump off the Havelet Wall in the summertime.

665 Deputy Jones said something late yesterday afternoon. He felt that past administrations had
been attracted to large capital projects at the expense of social policy and he presented that in the
past tense, but there are very real examples still, and even now, post the ground-breaking corporate
housing programme, strategy is still blighted by the embedded culture.

670 It has become usual, in fact expected, that the Deputy Minister of Housing will have a view on
HSSD. Perhaps for two minutes I could trade places and make a few observations on social policy
and housing matters that are contained, in a roundabout way or referenced, in the Plan. To get an
indication of how far-reaching aspects of Housing Policy can be – it may appear to be odd to be
starting with the emerging Transport Strategy – but the linkage is there, nevertheless. Whilst
675 interviewing a representative of a road haulage company, the topic moved on to his reliance on
seasonal workers at the busier times of year. He explained that he employed a large number of
local drivers who lived in social housing, specifically States houses, and if those drivers exceeded
a certain annual salary, then they would have to move out of their homes into expensive,
unaffordable, private-sector accommodation. So the high income policy objective of the Housing
Department which, in simple terms, means if you earn, jointly, over £40,000 or, individually,
680 £20,000 a year or thereabouts, you have to move out. Its implementation ensures housing licences
have to be issued for seasonal drivers and people who are earning between £21,000 and £23,000
find themselves in the aggressive private rental sector.

685 There is also an element where – I am sorry to be so specific; it does seem a bit dull – but this
is where we have over-arching themes, but it is the application. When ward managers are trying to
staff a ward, a busy ward, sometimes they cannot roster in nursing assistants in a manner they
would like, because it takes them over their earning limit and their staff then lose their
accommodation. On a recent tour of HSSD's Children's Services, it was fascinating to hear how
frequently it was observed that housing should be part of the solution and, by that, I mean actual
housing, not the Department. A bedroom, a friend's room, or the absence of, could leave young
690 people becoming more dependent, ultimately more expensive and less engaged.

If, for example, we had real emergency housing, it would mean families in crisis would not
become, potentially, service users of the women's refuge and all the men not become clients of St
Julian's Hostel and the children not being cared for within the grounds of HSSD properties – all
very expensive. Emergency housing is not just about housing a family after a fire, it can be seen as
695 a cost-effective intervention that keeps families together... That is more than cost effective. That,
of course, is just priceless. But where in the SSP do I find a remedy for that? There will be an
over-arching, all-encompassing, reassurance statement to let me know that someone in
Government is aware that the problem exists, but that is about all.

700 On the same tour of Children's Services, staff members expressed concerns that the clients they dealt with were not even eligible for States housing and, of course, they are not. Housing Policy ensures single people of a certain age cannot be housed by them. Personally, I believe the time has come to tear up the existing eligibility criteria and, yes, many more would be on Housing's books, if I can put it that way, but is that not why we have a multi-million pound CHP budget?

705 At this moment in time we are approximately five housing units short a year and that is on the basis that some are not eligible anyway, so just what is the real figure? Is it 600 or is it 700? We have the spectacle of homeless, unemployed, sofa-surfing 18- and 19-year olds. These people come at a cost. These young people should, ideally, be housing tenants receiving a proper housing benefit: when you have a place to live, it is ultimately easier to find a place to work. As of now, a large number of young people fall off the radar, only to be picked up again when they appear as benefit claimants. We do acknowledge there is a need for housing assistance in this area. The Housing Department support Action for Children who have six training flats – just six training flats.

715 We do not know how many people are in need of housing, but what we do know is those we will not house. We have policies in place that are actually designed to keep them out. Removing the current eligibility criteria does not open a Pandora's Box, it gives you real numbers, real people who require real homes.

720 I also have concerns that we are heading towards a two-tier social housing split with our current model. As the DHA press on with their developments, it has to be the appropriate split between their tenants and nominated housing tenants. That supply, if I can call it that, cannot go on forever. With housing the most vulnerable, the most complex family and, at times, rent or non-payment of rent, is a cost born with an acknowledgement of the complexities of social housing. A housing association cannot carry large levels of debt as they need a critical mass to pay off significant private borrowings and I do have concerns, if you have criteria for social housing that talks about housing people in 'real social need', I do not want to use a term like – well I am going to use a term 'cream off' – and that is... I think you get the essence of where I am going, but you cannot go back to what we used to have in the 1960s and 1970s, a given type of tenant all in one place and then you find the emergence of social problems.

730 Finally, just to close on my observations on housing, there were at one time about 2,300 States houses. The number is now about 1,700 and falling, I think, and that is a shame, too. Government should not become too reliant on one other social housing provider. As the number of States houses is reduced, the options for placing children into foster care and possible adoptions is reduced also. It is a tragic state of affairs to hear that good fostering families simply cannot move into two- or three-bedroom houses, because there are not enough and the consequence is that children are in care for longer without what we all know as a family and the cost to the community, fiscal and otherwise, must remain a concern to us all as corporate parents. I make that point because, some time ago I represented a family who were looking to foster and needed a three-bedroom property and, at that time, they were told that, if that foster placement – and bear in mind it is a considerable saving to the States if people foster locally – that they could foster, but what if that foster placement broke down, then Housing just may move them out of that property.

740 I make all of the above points, perhaps tangentially, I will acknowledge at times, but I make those points that, whatever strategy you sign up to, the sharp end of delivery at times can still be working blind. Boards, that is political boards, may well be working more closely and sign up to the strategy of the day, but at times our respective agencies still do not have the tools we all assume they have and the joint committee working does not percolate down to those who are trying to action the ever-increasing number of strategies and that is not their fault.

750 In closing, Mr Bailiff, when I try to get out of a room, I find myself looking for a door handle. I actually do the same in cars and in my own house and also in cafés, bars and the like, and I am lucky, because I have developed, over time, a getting-out-of-small-spaces strategy. I do not give that a second thought, I just do it. That is the problem this Government faces at the moment. Simply, we are doing the strategy and we are not doing enough of the 'doing' bit. This is the problem, the veil of strategy is now obscuring the face of the future, and we have become stuck in the moment when we should just be doing it.

755 I will be voting against the SSP, but I do not see that as a storming of the Bastille of the Policy Council. Besides, I would not want to wake them up! (*Laughter*) This is a difference of opinion and approach. Vote this SSP out for, after all, we do have a Plan B and that, of course, is Plan A.

The Bailiff: Deputy Hadley.

760 **Deputy Hadley:** Mr Bailiff, a lot of the comments just made by Deputy Brehaut are not true, not accurate, but I think, because of the length of the speech, I will arrange for the Department to give a full response to the allegations made in the speech.

The Bailiff: Thank you.

765 **Deputy Brehaut:** Sorry, Deputy Hadley cannot make that statement, sir. This is an evidence-based speech, effectively.

The Bailiff: He has made it.
Deputy Lowe.

770

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

Right, this Report: I quite like this Report, one part of it, and I congratulate somebody for putting this in. On page 376,

775

‘policy tensions are desirable, even necessary (‘tension is good’)’

Well, I am pleased about that because there is a bit more tension about to come out, sir! (*Laughter*)
It also goes on to say:

780

‘Not all tensions can be reconciled, but they can be the driver for debate and compromise within Guernsey’s system of government.’

That I welcome. I am disappointed that some are blaming this system of government for Policy Council bringing this repetitive Report. Was there a Requête directing Policy Council to bring forward another States Strategic Plan? No, there was not. They did hold some workshops, which was very welcome, not a route that I think we should be going down all the time, because this is the place where we make decisions, this is a debating Chamber and to hang on to sort of saying, well, that was actually said within a workshop, when not all Members are present and our consensus government is the right place to make the decisions for everybody present.

785

790 Then I look at this and I say, well, where are we now? Deputy Stewart said, since 2009 things have changed. We need to communicate to the world and what is it that you wish to communicate – oh, he has just come back into the Chamber. I want to communicate we have a stable government, not one who produces four States Strategic Plans in the last six years and that is for the medium- to long-term plan. Does that send out a good image to you? It certainly does not to me. If you are doing a medium- to long-term plan, I would not expect to see four Reports in six years. Indeed, we have had nine Reports in the last 20 years, whether it be a Government Business Plan or all the various titles and yet in this Report here today, hey ho, we have got some more to come. Well, I do not want to go down that route. I want to start saying what we have promised the public of this Island, the community of this Island. We promised them we would look for efficiencies; we promised them we would use staff better and more efficiently. Sending people off to do a Report, almost identical to the existing one that is in place in November 2011, in my humble opinion, is a waste of States’ time and it sends out the wrong image, that we have people there reproducing yet another Report.

795

800

805 What is wrong with the one that was approved in 2011? I do not see anything too wrong with it at all. In fact, in January 2012 the previous States published a guide to States Strategic Plan and it was one of the most positive things that we are able to hand to our successors in the next term. So, following the workshop – and there was very little difference – why did we have this Report? Because there is very little difference, it would have been far better to start putting the meat on the bone and have *real* Reports in front of you today, where you can start making real decisions on what we are doing in the short term, which the community are waiting for us to get on with things, than our medium- to long-term... and, as I say, it really concerns me that we have had so many Reports, and this is for a 25-year vision. That is not efficient.

810

815 I heard Deputy Harwood – and many in here, as well – but Deputy Harwood on the radio this morning and I quote, ‘It is irresponsible for the States to work without a long-term strategy.’ I am sorry he said that, because that is live on the radio, that is picked up on the internet for those listening and it implies we have nothing, absolutely nothing. We hear this a bit too often: the old States did nothing, but suddenly we have got something. Actually, you have got something; you

820 have got a strategy that is in place, a States Strategic Plan that was approved such a short time ago. The ink is hardly dry on it and yet we have sent somebody off to put another one here and we are sending out this message, ‘Oh, yippee, we are now going to have a States Strategic Plan for the medium to long term.’ I see that as an irresponsible message to send out and not a good message. The good message should be ‘Yes, we have a plan, it is a medium- to long-term plan and we will review that as and when necessary. In the meantime, we will get on and run this Government as it should be.’ I am disappointed some are using the system of government as an excuse. I think that is rather weak.

825 So let us have the courage of our convictions today. Those that have said that, actually, it is not a good Report, but they are going to have to support it, think again, please, because there *is* a Plan in place. Do *not* make staff time inefficient. Let us start being efficient. Let us send them off in the direction of doing something that actually is going to be productive, not yet another Plan. Four
830 Plans in the last six years for a medium- to long-term strategy. The States Strategic Plan is *dire*; that cannot be seen as being efficient.

835 Finally, sir, if you look at the Resolutions, what have we got here? We have got four to approve, we have got one to confirm and we have got seven to note. Under the Rules, the note does not mean whether you are voting for or you are voting against, so there is no guidance there from this Report, either. So I urge States Members, please reject this Report, you have one in place. Let us send a message to Policy Council that we do not want another Report coming before us, we want one that has actually got some meat on the bone and we can start getting on governing this Island with good policies that have been put in place.

840 **The Bailiff:** Is there anyone else?

Yes, Deputy James.

Deputy James: Thank you, sir.

845 My comments will, indeed, be brief. I have listened attentively to all the debates on this issue and I immediately picked up on Deputy Queripel’s expression this morning about feeling in an uncomfortable dilemma.

I think most of the passionate speeches made on this have called on Members of this Assembly to reject this document. I am mindful of Deputy Le Lièvre’s comments yesterday about the nonsensical comments about Christmas trees. I think the one common feel is that the document is, indeed, badly written. Deputy Le Clerc yesterday, for me, summed it up beautifully, saying that it would not win the Booker Prize and we could not argue with that... Deputy Burford’s comments regarding the coloured pens and the big pieces of paper – and I remember that day very well – and I recall both of us on that day felt very passionate that we wanted gender equality to be part of this and there is the most *cursor*y reference to promoting gender equality in this document. That
850 disappoints me dreadfully. That saddens me that we have missed the opportunity and I can understand why you were not best pleased.

I think the only other comment that I wanted to make on this was in reference to Deputy Gillson’s comment this morning on the Statement of Aims and his question was in relation to the comment ‘Identity of Guernsey both internally (within the Island)...’ and he asked, quite rightly, what did that add to this document. I think I can give you an answer to that, after borrowing the Procureur’s calculator this morning, and the answer is very simple: all it adds is three words.

Thank you.

865 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop and then Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Gollop: Well, it has all been said and got rather boring, but I am going to say it, anyway (*Laughter*) – but never mind. No, it is what it is, as Deputy David Jones often says and it is something and nothing, too.

870 The reality of the situation – and I have thought about it a lot – having voted against part of the FTP, I think I am going to vote *for* all of this, because the FTP was, as others have mentioned, Deputy Gillson especially, far more important and fundamental to the direction of travel we are in and, as collectively, we have supported that, it is pointless to vote against this, despite all the arguments that have been made that it is almost pointless to vote *for* it. (*Laughter*) No, but seriously, I actually think, well, we can go back to the point on arts, because it was pointless either way: people might as well have supported it, but never mind.

875 I think there are, though, nevertheless, some significant aspects to the Report. Of course, you can point out, as Deputy James just did, important issues that are not mentioned; gender equality

880 being one. Bus transport is another aspect and capital programme is rather light in this package,
 too. But I am disappointed that not much has been put of relevance to disabled people. There is a
 general reference to equality, the aims and objectives, improving the quality of life, a fairer society
 and so you can read into it what you wish to read into it. Nevertheless, it is not exactly prioritised.
 I could have done an amendment along those lines, but thought, no, because I do know, and many
 of us know, that a lot of very hard work is going on across Departments on the workstreams. That
 885 will come to the States within a sensible timeframe and that will be the time to look at these issues,
 but it only goes to show that this is like a snap photograph at a party and the party has already
 changed by the time the camera has developed it. One has to bear that in mind.

Nevertheless, I want to perhaps make three points. The first is a recapitulation of where we are.
 Deputy Conder said – and to a certain extent, Deputy Perrot – that this is a reasonable start, but not
 where we should be. I have to agree with Deputy Gillson and others that this is the culmination of
 890 20 years of Plans, certainly since the changes in government in 2004 and they have been
 constantly re-invented and restructured and the workshops that Deputy James and Deputy Burford
 found perhaps slightly patronising, we have been going to, we have pointed little dots and things
 for years and years and years. They occur because of the, not so much our *system* of government,
 although I take on board the eloquence of Deputy Fallaize and others, but because the way the
 895 system currently works, if you have got 47 different political personalities in the Assembly and on
 many issues you have got one very determined view one way, another view very determined the
 other way, people sitting on the bench and people who have not come to a view on the topic. It is
 the job of the Policy Council and, in a way, the civil servants, to get all of those 47 views or
 preferences out in the open and then come up with a form of words that are so diplomatically
 900 clever, that everyone can support it without feeling left out. So you are bound to come up, on
 occasion, with vague and woolly statements that do not give you any clarity of direction, when
 hard decisions have to be made.

That said, there are actually two or three aspects of this Plan which are more revealing than
 that. I would argue that it is not just about nothing and those two particularly are involving the
 905 Environmental Policy Plan and the Social Policy Plan that Deputy Le Lièvre identified. On page
 414 and page 415 of the Environmental Plan, the point is made:

910 ‘Traffic is one of the most immediate and visible environmental issues facing Guernsey. It is one of the major
 contributors to carbon emissions [...] Vehicle ownership is an outward sign of Guernsey’s prosperity, it is a significant
 employment sector; significant parts of the community rely on private vehicle ownership to undertake their day-to-day
 activities.’

Then it goes on, on page 10.4.78:

915 ‘Arguments against using the bus (which would reduce private vehicle movements) are based on a failure of the
 services to operate according to the published timetable and yet the delays are nearly always the result of traffic
 congestion. Motorists are frustrated at road closures and traffic delays...’

920 It goes on:

‘...it is no surprise that people choose to drive, thus adding to the traffic volumes. Many see the real problem as being
 the fact that Guernsey people’

925 – internally, rather than externally here, I think – (*Laughter*)

‘are unhappy with the prevalence’

– maybe external means Alderney –

930 ‘of vehicles and traffic but not so unhappy as to want to reduce their own reliance on private vehicle use in order to
 address the problem.’

Well, that is a discursive and a perhaps slightly biased analysis of the situation, but it does put
 the onus on politicians to bring forward policies which ask those questions and resolve them.
 935 Indeed on page 415 rather, there is even an interesting point about the contradictions of our
 situation, whereby it could be argued that social policy and environmental policy at times collide.

On the social policy front, there is a very clear analysis about shifting to preventative
 measures. Deputy Le Lièvre came out against that and I can understand his frustration, bearing in
 mind the failure to deliver sufficient incomes for people in certain categories, but preventative

940 measures clearly underpin aspects of the new Education Strategy, as well as the mental health and other points. But, on page 408,

945 ‘One further word of caution: whatever can be done to address spending by putting more emphasis on preventative measures, it would be unrealistic, given the significant ageing of the population [...] for the overall cost of social policy to be reduced in real terms. There does need to be a policy debate on how these costs are met in future, whether through universal taxation, social insurance contributions or by the individual. The Social Policy Group firmly believes that, by refocusing on prevention and better co-ordination, future costs overall will be significantly less than if the States continued to provide services as they do today.’

950 Then,

955 ‘Finally, the voluntary and community sector is often in a better position to help with prevention and to reach people who might be socially excluded, marginalised or wary of public services. The Social Policy Group, therefore, considers it important to establish, maintain and develop a good working relationship with the so-called ‘third sector’ at both the strategic and operational level. However, it needs to be understood that this is a substantial project in its own right and will need to be resourced accordingly.’

Then, at the bottom of the page:

960 ‘...the changing fiscal climate, an increased tension and polarisation of political views [right and left] developed between the need to maintain spending constraints to restore the States’ budget to fiscal balance, and the imperatives of meeting the health and social welfare needs of Islanders and ensuring their safety and security.’

965 In a way, I am bit surprised that the 11 Members of the Policy Council signed that off, because it runs contrary to some of the mood music we have been hearing over the past year. The statements there are clear.

Firstly, there is not an obvious way you can reduce social expenditure, unless you privatise it, but the expenditure would still go on, using a different vehicle.

970 Secondly, the voluntary sector has now been identified as a major resource – which is actually a change of policy – but the Report makes clear you need the resources of the State, as Deputy Le Tocq identified in a speech not so long ago, in order to facilitate that dialogue. There actually has to be a workstream, where people put into that.

975 Thirdly, the fiscal constraints that have been imposed: there is a conflict there and there needs to be a realistic debate on that whole structure. We need those debates, so I am not going to vote against the Plan, because the Plan has actually flagged up, in the small print, major issues that we have to contend with and go far beyond just a vague statement of aims and purposes. This is the nitty-gritty and if we have not actually got to the meat and drink of politics in this term yet, it surely flags up some testing debates ahead.

980 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Thank you, sir.

985 I would just like to express some views about Plans in general and, in that respect, I would just like to open with a question. It is ‘What makes God laugh?’ and the answer, I am told, is, ‘People who make plans.’ That, originally, I suspect, was drafted as a joke, but it has got a serious message, in that, whatever Plan you draft, it does not matter how well it is drafted, circumstances can change so rapidly that you will have to bin the Plan or amend it severely. So Plans have limited value.

990 If you have flown on Flybe recently and read the business magazine, a couple of pages in there is an interesting article by a management consultancy which actually challenges the value of Plans in general. It does not say you should not have them at all, but it does point out that Plans, if they are strictly adhered to, can actually stifle innovation and business, especially if you are, as it were, constrained by key performance indicators – a typical example might be the Health Service in the UK, where KPIs have resulted, in many cases, in a severe degradation of services to patients. So it is just a realisation that a Plan is just a plan and it is, as the word has been used before, a tool and must never become a rule. It is as simple as that. Plans are fine, but you cannot create Plans to cater for every eventuality.

1000 There has been some comment about the Plan keeps changing, but I go back to former Deputy Parkinson, who was very much involved with the Business Plan and it was always meant to be a living document, a changing document, so do not be surprised that we have some change. It may not be enough, but it is what we should expect. We are not going to have a constant Business Plan, Strategic Plan, looking forward, it will change as we go along and there may be another one in a

year or two, because of changing circumstances.

1005 At the Douzaine on Monday evening, I turned up for the usual discussion of what was in the Billet and we were given a presentation about the movement of the War Memorial and, indeed, shall we say, development of the sunken garden. It was an interesting presentation and I was curious myself as to what effect the Strategic Plan might have on such a proposal. When you look at it, it could fit within the proposal, so I was pleased that the States Strategic Plan could not somehow be used as a tool to stop this particular initiative, shall we call it, possibly going forward, 1010 but where it will pan out, I do not know.

The timing of this, I think, is right and the degree of detail is right, because one can actually put in all the detailed policies one likes, but policies without funding are a complete waste of time, because they are not going to happen. It is the funding that drives, in a way, the policies, because you can only deliver what you can fund. Last night was, I believe, the last meeting that we have had between Social Security and Treasury and Resources relating to personal tax review. There will be a document, a consultation document, going out shortly and that will inform the next Budget. Members will, no doubt, take part in that consultation and they will have lots of information there about what may or may not be required, if you want to raise a certain level of extra income, but do remember, at the moment we are all, at least by a majority, signed up to the Financial Transformation Programme, we are signed up to the last Budget, which says no new service developments: any savings from that will go towards reducing the fiscal deficit. 1020

So it is interesting that, by the time that the next Budget is presented, we should have a clearer idea of what monies may or not be available and I would suggest, at that point, all the Departments can tailor their policy plans to what funds are available. There is no point trying to spend what you have not got. 1025

Deputy Conder mentioned that if anybody suggested borrowing, he would be in opposition and so would many others. Borrowing in certain circumstances might be acceptable, if there is a funding stream to pay for it but, in that respect, I think the detail of this Strategic Plan is just fine. I was involved with the original Business Plan for three months and my sole input to that was to get the so-called priorities changed to being called objectives, because I said they were never priorities, they were just a list of objectives which were never prioritised. I remember, at Beau Séjour, saying that I did not like the name of the States Strategic Plan and I stood up from the floor and said, ‘Why do we not call it a mission statement?’ In fact, if we had called it a mission statement and just had the page and the 28 words that Deputy Duquemin said, I think that would have sufficed, but I did not get my way. The suggestion was dismissed but, nonetheless, what is here is, for me, sufficient. It will be developed, the Government Service Plans will come forward and that is where the debate will be, but we will have a better idea of the sort of funding which may or may not be available. 1030

Just on a lighter note, I remember that a lot of people have called it pointless. What is interesting, there is a programme on TV which I came across the other day, which is called *Pointless* and, if you can identify the pointless answer, you win! (*Laughter*) So if you want to be a winner, you know how to vote. 1040

I support this Plan and all the Propositions.

1045 **The Bailiff:** Deputy De Lisle and then Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy De Lisle: Thank you, sir.

I want the Policy Council to become more open and transparent with its reporting. There is no need to repeat what has already been approved in the States Strategic Plan of the past. That should be a given. If, as Deputy Stewart says, changes have to be made to it, because the world moves on and so on, then the Policy Council should bring forward, in an open and transparent way, a list of amendments to it, so that change is introduced into the Plan if you wish, but it is clear to the Members of this Assembly and the public at large as to exactly what is being changed. A word here and a word there can make a real difference but we have got more than that in this Plan in terms of real change. That should not be hidden; it should be right out there in the open and that really upsets me and many others. I note that the SSP in front of us on the desks today is only a summary, apparently, of the previous Strategic Plan, which is far more comprehensive and that concerns me, because I fear that much could be lost in the Strategic Plan of the past. 1050

For example, the Environment Policy Plan confines itself to two or three areas that the Department is thinking of putting some emphasis on with little funds. Many key areas of environment concern have been omitted in this summary in front of us and they are very important areas that I would not like to see lost into another Plan that will come up, which will repeat 1060

perhaps this summary and a lot of what was originally placed is lost. Even the stated aim of the Environment Policy Plan has been abbreviated, if you please, and sections of it cut out. It was approved unanimously in the last term by this Assembly and has been cut and abbreviated, just a few paragraphs, just a few sentences. Was that necessary?

Deputy Spruce says this document will mean very little. We will continue to operate under the States Strategic Plan; we already have. Well, that is fine with me. Let us do that, Deputy Spruce. There are changes in direction to this new Plan that Members have drawn attention to, that is true, and I have also brought attention to changes in land use policy. I also note a review of population policy. Actually, in terms of the review of land use policy, while we are on the environmental side, all the options that we had – we had three options offered us – they were all development options, how to cope with yet more development, but this is already an Island so densely developed... and in an Island so developed as ours, do we need or want over 1,700 more homes over the next five years? What we should be doing is addressing that particular issue. Yes, the key issue for the economy is creating jobs, creating jobs because of the rationalisation that is going on in the finance industry today. It is major. Do not rub it under the carpet. It is a real issue in Guernsey. It is job creation that is the key issue. We have got to do that; we have got to produce those jobs, otherwise we are going to lose our young people and then we will be looking, later on, to bring more and more people in because we will not have our own local stock.

That does not mean to say that we spread out all over the countryside with new development. It means that we have got to begin to use technology. As I suggested at the Airport, what a waste of land, whereas we could have used the new technology and been first in terms of bringing in the technology to avoid spreading over acres and acres of land.

So I would like a recorded vote, actually, on Proposal 4, the political direction of travel and what annoys me with that is that, in the lists given, it is a very broad list, it is very varied. Some may agree with some of them, others will not, yet we are all asked to vote on the whole gamut together and that, again, is really not a transparent and open way of doing things, so that I would like to see changed in the future.

Thank you for listening to my few words.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: I am going to be fairly brief, in that much of what has been said on both sides I had already planned to say.

I presume some things have been said positively, I might have missed them somewhere, so just to pick up on some comments that have been made more recently. Deputy Kuttelwascher, I can refer him to Psalm 2, verse 4, where it says, 'He who sits in Heaven laughs'. What God is laughing at in those instances are plans of men to plot against Him. So I am supporting the SSP, because I did not find any plotting against God in there, (*Laughter*) but I am still open to be enlightened if someone can lead me to the paragraph.

Having said that, this is serious because it is dealing with serious matters that concern our population, our Island, our communities. There has been a lot of humour and that is probably good in one sense, but I also want to remind the Assembly that this is serious and whilst we perhaps prefer generally to be dealing with details, we like to have such things as the Mental Health and Wellbeing Strategy to vote on, which we were dealing with last month and there is good news there, there are excellent changes, improvements and there is the opportunity for us to say 'money well spent'. This is not the same sort of debate.

I will start with an amusing story, however. This morning, in the early hours, I unfortunately woke my wife because I was going through my wardrobe trying to find a t-shirt. She said, what are you doing and I said I am trying to find my Government Business Plan t-shirt because, at the end of the time I was involved, with former Deputy Stuart Falla and Geoff Mahy, with the Government Business Plan back in the term of 2004-08, the staff – at the end of that period, after we had had the debate and the Government Business Plan had come into being – gave us, as the retiring Deputies, those of us who were leaving the Assembly at the time, t-shirts and the t-shirts said on them, 'GBP. It's better than nothing!' The reason for that was it was a phrase I had said at one point, out of frustration, because I and other Members of this Assembly will remember the previous policy planning debates that this Assembly took part in. They were heavily criticised because, at the time, Advisory and Finance would come forward with an annual debate and there would be, largely, a backward-looking Report which was trying to get this Assembly to consider policies in a forward-looking way, which was very difficult to do because, at the time, Advisory and Finance were dealing with multiple committees and lots of different conflicting things and so

was always criticised very heavily for being the sort of thing that people are criticising this as being today, funnily enough.

1125 Also, it was open to amendment by such one of the people as Deputy Gollop. Some of the friends he had at the time (*Laughter*) would have come with various amendments, sort of, on the hoof and it was criticised as being an opportunity for policy-making on the hoof, because these amendments would come through and somebody would say, ‘Oh, that’s not a bad idea. Let’s add that in.’ So that was considered to be an inappropriate way of co-ordinating – and I will use that term, because I will come back to that a bit later – a number of Members have used that term. It was considered to be an inappropriate way of co-ordinating a States policy in business. So after the changes in the machinery of government, I remember at that time actually thinking, to go back to Deputy Gollop and some of the comments he made, that we did consider whether the Chief Minister should always have the right to speak at the end of a debate before going and I did suggest that Deputy Gollop ought to have an automatic right to speak, because he always did a far better job of summing up what everybody had said and reminded me of, I think, the words of Ronald Reagan, who said he wanted his next chief adviser to be a one-armed man, because he was fed up with them saying on the one hand this and the one hand that!

1140 Coming back to my point, during that change, the changes in the machinery of government, it emerged that we needed a better mechanism than the old policy planning, because it was largely boring and this debate has been criticised for lacking in passion, except for those who have criticised the SSP, *or* it was an opportunity for policy-making on the hoof, which was not the way they wanted to go. So in order to bring together some form of co-ordination, the Government Business Plan sought to try and engage with all States Members if possible, and Departments, and to put together something that would be an opportunity for the States as a whole, this Assembly, by a majority, to sign up to and say this can be our measuring stick for all the policies that we do, whether in Departments, or whether corporately across Departments and it was a very difficult job, for all the reasons that have been given already.

1150 I am certainly not one to blame the tools, but I think, coming back to what certain Members have said, if we keep the sort of consensus system we have, this is bound to be the sort of thing that we get, because the other options are that we do something like what happens in Jersey, where you send the Policy Council away for three months to come back with a clear agenda, which is then debated and accepted or not. You could have that; we could have that. We have not got that at the moment and if we came and did that, as a Policy Council, I *guarantee* that we would have criticism from Members of this House, Members of this Assembly, to say, ‘You should not do that: you have not got the powers to do that. This is not executive government.’

1160 On the other hand, you could go back to the old policy planning times which were largely, again, looking at what happened in the past and seeing how they could be tweaked in the future. That was open, again, to the sorts of policy-making on the hoof and that would be criticised if we did that. So what we have got is a sort of middle ground that is *ni l’un, ni l’autre* – neither one nor the other – and attempt to engage everybody, which has certainly been the attempt of the Policy Council to do that. You may not have liked the system, but it is a system of doing that, in order to do what we always used to call in the Government Business Plan days ‘to find some form of golden thread’ that would be able to weave through departmental and other strategies and somehow hold them together. The problem with a thread is that it is not automatically noticeable and actually could be argued that, if it is not there, perhaps it is not necessary either, but I do believe it is necessary. It is necessary for where we are today and I do feel passionately about that, although it is not an exciting thing and it involves words that have been criticised for being too woolly and too vague. I would agree with all of that, but this is something that we have got to work with and we have got to improve. I do believe that, actually, what we have before us today is an improvement on what was there in the past and in a moment I will come to more specific things to do with social policy and I will illustrate my point on that.

1175 To take up, before I do that, a couple of points raised by a few Deputies, certainly Deputy De Lisle just now and Deputy Lowe, if we had just brought to this Assembly the previous social, sorry, the previous States Strategic Plan, or not, or just assumed that was going to continue, 22 Members of this Assembly did not have an opportunity to vote on that and we would have been criticised for being irresponsible there. We have an opportunity today to take something that is certainly a version of that which has been improved upon, it has been reduced in size, has been made more simple to understand than in the past. That was, in fact, the problem with the Government Business Plan and those of us who remember that, it was criticised for being bulky and cumbersome. Initially, I think, we had something like 48 different priorities. We did bring that

1185 down to about 12, which would have been more memorable. I think Deputy De Lisle at the time
and others added two more so we had 14 in the end, but we also had, behind that, all the
departmental plans and how they fitted in and, really, in terms of being an easily accessible
document, it certainly was not, but it was the first iteration of the sort of thing we have today.

1190 So Plans can be a number of different things and some of them can be... the word 'Plan' can
involve details and strategies and goals and aims and targets and measurable things. They can also
be policies, directions and the like; they can also be principles, values, themes, cultures, visions.
That is all there and we can argue forever on what words should be used. The SSP in my mind is
more, at the moment, what we have sought for it to be, more high level in terms of values, visions,
themes, cultures and principles and we have deliberately sought to separate that from the
Government Service Plan, which will be more detailed on how that looks in practice through the
1195 Departments working together, or individually, on particular aspects of that. We have already seen
how that has happened, because, as I mentioned previously, the Mental Health and Wellbeing
Strategy has been voted through and that comes under the Social Policy Plan and we have been
happy to support that and see it get through, because there are a number of workstreams that are
carrying on from the past Assembly that were not completed in that Assembly.

1200 So where is the forum to deal with principles, values, themes, cultures and visions, if it is not
here? Deputy Lowe will be the first to criticise us if we did not have that opportunity to talk in this
level and to agree together about the sorts of things that we have discussed. I, for one, found the
workshops useful, if for no other reason than I was able to engage with some Members here, who I
do not normally speak to and who do not normally speak to me, and find out what their views
were. I was actually very surprised in certain circumstances. I learnt a lot from that and, as a result,
1205 I was affected in my own views of things: we need those opportunities as well. But we also need
to come to this Assembly at some point and say 'Okay, are we agreed now on this direction of
travel, on this vision, on these values? This is what we are dealing with here.

To pick up on a point mentioned by Deputy Bebb, the Government Business Plan was actually
1210 called the Government Manifesto, to begin with. We used that term, but it was heavily criticised at
the time, because many Members of the States at the time said we are not a Party together and
therefore we cannot have a corporate manifesto. So, again, it comes down to compromise. If we
had the sort of clarity of vision that Deputy Bebb wanted, with regard to a political party – he
mentioned the Conservative Party: it was interesting that he mentioned grammar schools, they
1215 changed completely on their view on that, the Conservative Party, over the years, but that is
because all of that happens behind the scenes – then, when they come to an election, they produce
that as their policy and it can be accepted or rejected by the voters. We have not got that system
and so it is difficult for us to come up with that sort of manifesto. We have to work afterwards and,
as a result, this will always be like a continuous coalition and we know how difficult it is to run
coalitions. It is continually evolving.

1220 Now I will come to a few aspects of social policy and I refer Members to pages 406 and
following, particularly on this. I want to take up a point... I think it has already been mentioned,
but I will mention it again, because I was surprised at Deputy Le Lièvre criticising preventative
measures when, in fact, I heard him only just recently being interviewed and singing the praises of
1225 preventative measures as one of the reasons why we should support Education's Vision, especially
for pre-school provision. In fact, that is one of the areas we have mentioned in paragraph 10.4.33,
where it says about £1 spent on early years' education saves much more later on. That is an
argument that we are taking not only in that area, but in many other areas as well.

Certain Members of this Assembly will have been with me when we heard a Scottish chief
1230 inspector, who was involved in a murder squad for some time, talk about his journey as changing
from looking at the problems of crime to looking at preventing those problems and, as a result,
spending most of his time these days with mums and toddler groups and the like and finding ways
in which communities can help one another in the early years, so that we do not have problems
later on that cost a lot more. I am surprised that there has been criticism of that, because that is a
1235 theme, that is a principle, that is a value, that I think we should all be signed up to.

We understand that it is difficult to justify some of these long-term objectives, because it is not
easy for us to guarantee that, in 15 years' time, the investment that we make today, the extra or the
re-use of funds, or the extra funds, that we need to emphasise, to target, young children, pre-school
children, we cannot *guarantee* what will happen in the future. In fact, it will be difficult to sing the
1240 praises of such a strategy later on, because it will be preventative, it will be stopping things
happening and you will not be able to point to them, because they will not be happening any
longer. So these are some things that we have got to agree to in principle to set the tone, so that
means can be put in place now to change the way in which we operate.

Further down, in paragraph 10.4.35, it says that

1245 ‘The Social Policy Group is also very aware that a relatively small number of families and individuals require a disproportionate amount of resources to be devoted to them across the States, primarily in a reactive way. There is now a growing realisation that a more co-ordinated and focused attempt proactively to address their issues has the potential to reduce this expenditure significantly; and there have been a number of notable success stories elsewhere where such a preventative approach has been taken.’
1250

In agreeing to that as a principle – and I believe that this is something that I understand, from talking to very many Members of the Assembly, that many would sign up to – this is something that is already happening, this is work that is already ongoing. What we would like to do is to expand it, because there is more and more evidence that, instead of multiple agencies, whether
1255 statutory bodies or the Third Sector, getting involved in one family, you could argue that many... there is so much resource going into that, that surely it must be beneficial when, actually, a different approach is necessary. This is what we have tried to flag up in social policy. We need to do different things and do things differently and both of those things, I think, could be applied to many areas of our strategy and policy. We need to think differently, we need to act differently and that is what this is all about.
1260

We have sought, in this SSP iteration, to reduce the amount of words and certainly in the Social Policy Plan, when we first met, and not only the amount of words we have, but the number of people around the table was ridiculous. We had over 20 people around the table previously and, of course, not surprisingly, it was very slow progress and very difficult to get anything done,
1265 which is probably why there has been criticism of the last term, that not much was done. Bringing it down to a smaller number has enabled us to concentrate far more and we have also reduced the objectives down to an active and engaged citizenship, the quality of opportunity, social inclusion, social justice, personal responsibility and adopting healthy lifestyles. Yes, those are things, hopefully, any society could adhere to, could subscribe to, but we live in an age where you have to state the obvious. To take up something that Deputy Gillson, I think, mentioned, I remember a few years ago visiting Washington DC and in my hotel room there was a little tray of gifts and, amongst them, was a tub of peanuts. On the top it said ‘Peanuts’ and, underneath, it said, on a little label, ‘May contain peanuts’. Stating the obvious, actually, I have learnt that we need to do that for certain people, so part of this process, again, is stating the obvious just to make sure, because
1275 otherwise we end up being surprised further down the line by someone who says, ‘I did not know that was what we actually believe. I did not know that was the principle we were working to. I did not know that was a value we signed up to.’

There are themes here: sustainability of provision, of funding the workforce, of the social environment, working with the Third Sector – something I feel very passionately about and I will come to in a moment again – and prevention as a focus, rather than being reactive. These are things that we need to agree to and we need to send a signal, both to the States corporately and to the Island because it involves more than just those of us here in the Assembly today.
1280

I will come to a conclusion with this. I do feel passionately about many of these things. It is difficult to feel passionate about the document with the words ‘I agree’, but I do feel passionately about the issues that are touched upon here, particularly those involving social policy. Obviously, that involves my Department, along with other Departments as well. I believe that, working together – and by that, I mean all of us – we need to take a political lead, but also we need this to get this golden thread to get through all that we do and we discuss and we believe in and all that we vote on in the future, in order for us, together, to help young families and those who are the weakest in our society to find appropriate help, be that in education, healthcare or in their employment. I believe passionately about helping the elderly, a growing sector of our society, to live out their crowning years in life in dignity and comfort. This sets the tone and value of the sort of society that we want to have, in order for that to happen.
1285

I also believe passionately that we must continue to make Guernsey a great place to live and work. I would say to Members in the Assembly today that, one of the reasons we can have the luxury of joking about the SSP in the way that some of us have today, is because we live in an Island that is, compared to most places, cushioned from the sorts of problems and issues that the rest of the world has to face. We live in an Island that benefits from good healthcare, excellent education and great security and that is why we can be light-hearted about this, but underneath it all – I come back to the point that I made right at the beginning – this is deadly serious because it sets the tone for the sort of community and society we want in the long term.
1290
1295
1300

The Bailiff: Deputy Ogier.

1305

Deputy Ogier: Thank you, sir.

I would like to thank Deputy Le Tocq for that valuable reminder of where we have come from and how much progress has already been made from what could be termed the bad old days, in planning terms at least.

1310

It is quite apparent many Members want different things from this SSP document. Members have been saying for a while now that the SSP is too large and too unwieldy and that it required a three-day debate and an inch of documentation. Well, it has been reduced significantly. Now Members, faced with this document, want more meat on the bone, it does not contain enough – or they do not; they say this document is still too big. It is, of course, apparent that it is simply not possible to please every Member, when Members have such varied ideas of what the SSP is for. The important parts for me in all of this are the action phases, the individual plans themselves, like the Social Plan, the Environmental Plan, the Fiscal Plan, the Energy Plan, which are all untouched by this over-arching document and they still continue. Yes, they are summarised in the SSP, but it is just a summary for the purposes of this document. The original full Plans are still in effect, still in their complete format, still with the originally agreed resolutions and amendments and that is where the running shoes with spikes on are, that Deputy Brehaut was asking for.

1320

This chameleon of an SSP document, which changes every few years, is seeking acceptability by all, which is proving impossible. Personally, I am happier in its slimmed down form. I am happy that the individual Plans are still in force and our approach is evolving and will continue to approach... I see the worth of a slimmer, strategic document summarising the meatier individual Plans, giving an easier understanding of the Government's agreed outlook. It is more acceptable in its shorter form.

1325

This document is more usable than the previous ones. I welcome that and I do accept the compromise, but I do look forward to the debates on the Policy Plans themselves, where we arrive at the meat of the subjects. I will support the SSP in its current form as a shorter version of the Government's aims and objectives.

1330

The Bailiff: Does anyone else wish to speak?

Yes, Deputy Wilkie.

1335

Deputy Wilkie: Thank you, sir.

In the fourth and fifth century BC, the Greek democratic city states were often overrun by warrior kings. The reason for this was that the long-term planning was restricted, to a crippling degree, by their annual elections. It was the best time to invade. So the conundrum of how to plan beyond the election cycle has been an issue facing democracies since their inception. The problem across the ages has been how to have a Plan which reaches across up to a 25-year span without dictating to subsequent assemblies how to govern and that is the Plan we have before us today.

1340

I have heard it said that it is very similar to the previous Plan. It is supposed to be. If we completely changed it every four years, it would not be a long-term Plan. What should be done is that the Plan is tweaked for the changing world we live in every four years and this is what we have all done.

1345

I agree it is not a document that inspires the hearts of the nation and if the SSP is approved I doubt I will be skipping down the steps, punching the air in joy: 'SSP, yeah!' I will, however, feel satisfied with our two days debating, knowing that we have a long-term Plan which reaches beyond our short-term democratic cycle, which does not put the future assemblies in a strait jacket. For these reasons, I will be voting for this Report.

1350

The Bailiff: Anyone else?

No? Chief Minister, are you ready to reply to the debate?

1355

The Chief Minister: Yes, sir.

Mr Bailiff, Members, this debate has been interesting and informative, if a little bruising, as it has, perhaps for the first time, thrown into stark relief the division that perhaps exists between those who recognise the importance of the States to have a long-term vision, a statement of aims and objectives, and those who would prefer to ignore the long term and prefer to focus on action in the short term, action within the term and, therefore, perhaps, irrespective of the long-term consequences of those actions. There are those who also question the need for *any* long-term, strategic planning whatsoever.

1360

Now the former Chief Minister, in his Foreword to the guide to the States Strategic Plan, which

1365 I agree with everybody, this is an excellent document, himself recognised the importance of such a plan when he said:

1370 ‘We do not as readily think about the processes that make sure that our policies and decisions are consistent with each other and that what we do is an effective use of public money and Island resources. The SSP, however, is about these processes and the efforts being made to improve them. It looks towards a 25-year horizon and seeks to ensure Guernsey’s Government is pulling in the same direction in the interests of all members of our community.’

I repeat, those are not my words, but those of my friend, Deputy Lyndon Trott.

1375 Again, former Deputy Carla McNulty Bauer, in her capacity as the then Chair of the States Strategic Plan, said:

‘The States Strategic Plan is all about developing more consistent and joined-up ways of working. We are continuing to develop the Plan and good progress is being made. The need to make the best use of public money and other Island resources is increasingly necessary, given global economic uncertainties.’

1380 Mr Bailiff and fellow Members, I suggest the current States Strategic Plan, which is placed before you in this debate, represents further progress in a process of the development of the Plan that was last debated in 2011. This Plan is evolutionary, it is not revolutionary. I do not, therefore, accept Deputy Fallaize’s suggestion that this Plan is a phoenix, rising from the ashes of previous attempts to achieve a coherent planning process. This Plan builds on the previous Plans.

1385 I also share Deputy Luxon’s observations that the speeches of Deputies Fallaize, Bebb, Trott and Green and others are criticisms of the system of government that we enjoy and the hope that the Review Committee, upon which a number of us sit, will come up with radical solutions when it reports later this year. Deputy Bebb goes further; he clearly hankers after a full-blown Party manifesto, rather than a Strategic Plan.

1390 Deputies Bebb, Soulsby and others were critical of the numerous platitudes contained within the Plan and Deputy Soulsby, in particular, was critical of references to ‘directions of travel’. For the information of all States Members the statement set out in paragraph 10.6.2, the political direction of travel, were distilled from statements made by States Members themselves at the various workshops we held last year and early this year. If they are platitudes, then they are your platitudes.

1395 I also share with Deputy Storey his frustration at the delay in producing the Plan and particularly the further delay before we will be able to present the first four-year, rolling Government Service Plan as part of the budgeting process. I am not sure, however, that I agree with him that a four-year rolling timeframe is insufficient and does not allow adequate time to achieve objectives. To the extent, however, that he may be right, then I am sure that he must welcome the longer-term horizon of this Plan.

1400 I also note Deputy Perrot’s generic distrust of management speak and management concepts in the planning process as a whole, but I welcome his albeit somewhat reluctant endorsement. To extend his maritime analogy, even if the Plan does not plot an exact course, it does attempt to identify the danger areas and the pitfalls that lie in wait for the weary sailor.

1405 Deputy Green welcomed the section of the Plan that deals with the development of the Social Policy Plan and I would remind Members that the Plan includes updates on each of the corporate policy plans and it is those updates that Members are asked to note in the Proposition.

1410 Like Deputy Le Tocq, I also was surprised that Deputy Le Lièvre took strong exception to the principle of prevention espoused in the update report of the Social Policy Plan. Paragraph 10.4.30 on page 405 encapsulates that concept, the concept of prevention. It recognises the importance, in the social policy context, also of cross-departmental working. Surely that is wholly consistent with the stated aim of protecting and improving the quality of life of our Islanders: to be proactive, rather than relying upon crisis management.

1415 I am grateful for the support shown by Deputy Conder and I fully agree that no plan should be so set in concrete that it prevents us from reacting to whatever wind shifts or current changes the world may throw at us. Again, to quote from Deputy Kuttelwascher, a plan is a tool and not a rule. Like Deputy Conder, I also recognise Harold Macmillan’s observation ‘events, dear boy, events’. Events will come out of nowhere to blow us off course, but they should not stop us from embarking upon that true course towards our stated aims and objectives. I submit this Plan does that. It seeks to set us on that course.

1420 I also welcome the support given in this debate by my fellow Ministers, with particular reference to those sections of the Plan and the Report that relate to their particular Departments, or to those policy or resource groups with which they are associated. One crucial element of this

- 1425 Strategic Plan is to bring about cross departmental co-operation in the development of policy.
- The nature of the problems identified within the Plan and in the Report that are faced by our islands requires that we deliver joined-up solutions. I would remind States Members that many of you will no doubt have used the phrase ‘joined-up government’ in your manifestos, when you were walking the streets at this time last year. This Plan and the family of plans that help to make it up, populate it, is a means of delivering joined-up solutions.
- 1430 Deputy Lester Queripel and others crave optimism and I would urge them to support this Plan. For optimism, I believe, can be achieved through planning for the future to ensure successful outcomes when the inevitable will hit us.
- I also thank Deputy Le Clerc for her acknowledgement of the merit of engagement of the States Members through the various workshops facilitated by Policy Council, although I am not sure I necessarily agree with her description of our Plan as being a Mills & Boon novel, but I have to confess I have not read a Mills & Boon novel! (*Laughter*) I thought perhaps it worked along the lines of Dostoyevsky or Thomas Hardy or one of the more reputable authors might be appropriate.
- 1435 (*Laughter*) It could be said, maybe the Report is as dense as some of those Russian novelists, particularly. As I said at the commencement of the first of those workshops, this Strategic Plan belongs to *all* States Members. It attempts to be representative of the views and opinions of States Members, as articulated at those workshops. This Strategic Plan is not intended to be something imposed upon you by Policy Council.
- I also welcome the comments of Deputy Laurie Queripel, who appreciates that the Island faces a number of tipping points. He regrets also that the Strategic Plan is at too high a level. I recognised in my opening speech, at the outset, that it is inevitable that the Plan *is* a high-level document. In the context of a Plan that has an horizon of 20 to 25 years, it would be irresponsible to try and set policies in concrete, to be too prescriptive and, again, with a few apologies to Harold Macmillan: ‘Events, dear boy, events will always come and hit us.’
- 1440 Deputy Spruce is correct to identify the importance of the Government Service Plans and he is correct, of course, that action is already occurring at departmental level, but we need to co-ordinate the outcomes of those Departments.
- Deputy Gillson also recognised the limitations of our system of government and I note that he questions the need, also, for Government Service Plans, in any case. He does, however, recognise the need for Policy Council to co-ordinate the development of departmental policies and I submit to you, sir, that the States Strategic Plan is the framework within which Policy Council can provide that co-ordination.
- 1445 Deputy Burford recognises many of the competing interests between the individual corporate policies. Within this Plan we have recognised the need to draw together those different Corporate Plans into one, hopefully, comprehensive Plan, the Plan that hangs together. I would submit that that is another reason why it is important to support this new Plan, which takes that process further, rather than rely upon the existing Plan, the last Plan that was adopted by the previous States in 2011.
- Deputy Duquemin reminded us of the importance of encapsulating the essence of the Plan on one page of A4. I agree. I suggest that the essence of the States Strategic Plan can be found on pages 395 and 396, literally back to back, two sides of A4. The rest of the Plan and the rest of the documentation is providing, by way of update against the Corporate Plans, providing updates as to how we will provide and plan for the Government Service Plan and is also an essence of the history through which we have arrived at the current Plan. But it does not take away from the fact – and Deputy Duquemin is absolutely correct – that the essence of the Strategic Plan, the essence of the aims and objectives can be found on two sides of A4.
- 1450 Deputy Brehaut correctly identified the need for a joined-up approach between Departments in his speech and a clear recognition that problems do span different Departments and the need to deliver pan-departmental policy is one of the outcomes of the States Strategic Plan through the Corporate Policy Plans.
- Deputy Lowe took me to task in relation to the answer that I gave in an interview on radio this morning. The question which prompted that answer was why do we need a Strategic Plan?
- Deputy De Lisle would prefer that the Policy Council presented a list of amendments in order to be transparent and to identify the changes from the previous Plan. In essence, what we have tried to do by slimming down the Plan is to encapsulate the Plan in a single document. To have produced a set of amendments would have created, I suggest, a disjointed approach. But Deputy De Lisle also mistakes the fact that Corporate Policy Plans remain intact. They do remain intact and the Report includes an update of progress in delivering those Policy Plans.
- 1455 Deputy Ogier has rightly identified the benefits of the slimmed-down approach. He also

1485 recognises the fact that the sections of the Report that describe the Policy Plans are by way of update on progress. I thank Deputy Wilkie for his endorsement of the Plan.

So, the question why should we have a Strategic Plan. The Plan is not a panacea and has never been put forward as a panacea for all our woes. The Plan does not attempt to identify every step in the journey to deliver the desired aims. It sets a direction for Government.

1490 The Plan attempts to lift our eyes above the present towards the long-term horizon. The major challenges that we face are of a long-term nature: demographics, climate change, infrastructure problems, energy, economic challenges, to name a few. We need to plan how to deal with those long-term challenges over the next 20 to 25 years. We need to develop a joined-up approach to those challenges and, sir, and States Members, it is through this Strategic Plan and the family of corporate and resource plans that populate this Plan, through which we can frame that joined-up approach. The Plan sets the framework within which individual policies must be placed, if we are to achieve co-ordinated outcomes for the benefit of this Island. The Plan offers a proactive approach to dealing with the problems that we face, by identifying those problems, by addressing those issues and by planning a co-ordinated approach to the delivery of those outcomes.

1500 Many Members have asked why should we adopt this Plan and not merely rely upon the Plan that was adopted by the States in 2011. That earlier Plan envisaged that it would be reviewed by the new States Assembly. The new Plan represents the views of this Assembly, as articulated at the various workshops that were held in November and January. This Plan focuses on the long term. This Plan attempts to draw together the three Corporate Policy Plans: the Fiscal and Economic Policy Plan, Social Policy Plan and the Environmental Policy Plan, rather than have each of those Plans standing alone. This Plan attempts to mould a political consensus from all 47 of us.

1510 Many Members have rightly focused on the importance of the Government Service Plan. If the States Strategic Plan is rejected, then there is a danger that there will be no agreed statement with which to guide the development of the Government Service Plan. Pages 360-363 of the Report provide the framework for the development of that Government Service Plan.

The States has, in recent years, recognised the importance of forward thinking and this Strategic Plan is a representation of that forward thinking. This Plan is an evolution in that process. The government that does not think beyond the present, that does not lift its eyes beyond the horizon, in my submission, sir, is not a responsible government.

I therefore urge all States Members to support this Report and to vote in favour of the Propositions and endorse the Plan.

Thank you, sir.

1520 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Storey, are you rising for some reason?

Deputy Storey: Yes, sir. It is just, before we go to the vote, because I feel that the only saving grace with this Report is the proposal to introduce the Government Service Plan, I would ask for a separate vote on Proposition 11, please.

1525 **The Bailiff:** Right. I was going to ask what separate votes people want.

Deputy De Lisle has already asked for a separate vote on Proposition 4. So we will have separate votes on 4 and 11.

Deputy Fallaize?

1530 **Deputy Fallaize:** Can I just ask for recorded votes, however many there are, please?

The Bailiff: Recorded votes, however many there are... *(Laughter)*

Any other separate votes?

1535 No? Well, to try to cut down on the number of recorded votes, I wonder if we take 4, then 11 and then everything else together, so that we will get it down to just three recorded votes, if everybody is happy with that.

So, the first vote is on Proposition 4: to approve the statement of a political direction of travel, as set out in the Plan.

1540 Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 29, Contre 15, Abstained 1, Not Present 2

	POUR	CONTRE	ABSTAINED	NOT PRESENT
1545	Deputy St Pier Deputy Stewart Deputy Ogier	Deputy Gillson Deputy Le Pelley Deputy Fallaize	Deputy Trott	Deputy David Jones Deputy O'Hara
1550	Deputy Spruce Deputy Collins Deputy Duquemin Deputy Dorey Deputy Paint	Deputy Laurie Queripel Deputy Lowe Deputy Le Lièvre Deputy Green Deputy De Lisle		
1555	Deputy Le Tocq Deputy James Deputy Adam Deputy Perrot Deputy Brouard	Deputy Burford Deputy Hadley Deputy Brehaut Deputy Gollop Deputy Sherbourne		
1560	Deputy Wilkie Deputy Inglis Deputy Soulsby Deputy Sillars Deputy Luxon Deputy Quin	Deputy Storey Deputy Bebb		
1565	Alderney Rep. Jean Alderney Rep. Arditti Deputy Harwood Deputy Kuttelwascher			
1570	Deputy Domaille Deputy Langlois Deputy Robert Jones Deputy Le Clerc Deputy Conder Deputy Lester Queripel			
1575				

The Bailiff: Members, the result of the vote on Proposition 4 was 29 in favour, 15 against, with 1 abstention.

I declare the Proposition carried.

We come now to vote on Proposition 11, relating to the Government Service Plan.

1580 Greffier, Proposition 11:

11. To note the Policy Council's intention to consult with States Members, States Departments, States Committees and other relevant stakeholders during 2013 P 2014 and as a first step, to present a report to the States in July 2013 setting out the principles for the development of a Government Service Plan to facilitate multiyear corporate and departmental planning and budgeting.

1585

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 32, Contre 12, Abstained 1, Not Present 2

	POUR	CONTRE	ABSTAINED	NOT PRESENT
1590	Deputy St Pier Deputy Stewart Deputy Ogier	Deputy Gillson Deputy Le Pelley Deputy Fallaize	Deputy Trott	Deputy David Jones Deputy O'Hara
1595	Deputy Spruce Deputy Collins Deputy Duquemin Deputy Dorey Deputy Paint	Deputy Laurie Queripel Deputy Lowe Deputy Le Lièvre Deputy Green Deputy De Lisle		
1600	Deputy Le Tocq Deputy James Deputy Adam Deputy Perrot Deputy Brouard	Deputy Burford Deputy Hadley Deputy Brehaut Deputy Bebb		
1605	Deputy Wilkie Deputy Inglis Deputy Soulsby Deputy Sillars Deputy Luxon Deputy Quin			
1610	Alderney Rep. Jean Alderney Rep. Arditti Deputy Harwood Deputy Kuttelwascher			
1615	Deputy Domaille Deputy Langlois Deputy Robert Jones			

1620 Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Sherbourne
Deputy Conder
Deputy Storey
Deputy Lester Queripel

1625 **The Bailiff:** The result of the vote on Proposition 11 was 32 in favour, 12 against, with 1 abstention.

I declare it carried.

I now put to you the remaining Propositions, all of them together:

- 1630 1. To approve the inclusion of the Statement of Government Values as part of the Plan. (Section 10.2)
2. To approve the revised Statement of Aims as set out in the Plan. (Section 10.3)
3. To approve the new Statement of Fiscal and Economic; Social and Environmental Policy Plan General Objectives and Themes as set out in the Plan. (Section 10.3)
5. To confirm that the States Corporate Policies continue to be appropriate for legal and regulatory purposes as set out within the Plan. (Section 10.7)
- 1635 6. To note the Fiscal and Economic; Social, and Environmental policy challenges identified in the Plan. (Section 10.4)
7. To note the update on the Island Resource Plan for Energy in the Plan. (Section 10.5 (10.5.4 to 10.5.17))
8. To note the update on the Island Resource Plan for Infrastructure in the Plan. (Section 10.5(10.5.18 to 10.5.31))
9. To note the update on the Island Resource Plan for Population Management in the Plan. (Section 10.5 (10.5.18 to 10.5.40))
- 1640 10. To note the update on the Island Resource Plan for Strategic Land Use in the Plan. (Section 10.5 (10.5.41 to 10.5.50))
12. To note all other sections of the 2013-2017 States Strategic Plan and accompanying report not specifically referred to in Recommendations 1-11 above.

1645 *There was a recorded vote.*

Carried – Pour 30, Contre 15, Abstained 0, Not Present 2

	POUR	CONTRE	ABSTAINED	NOT PRESENT
1650	Deputy St Pier Deputy Stewart Deputy Ogier Deputy Trott Deputy Spruce Deputy Collins Deputy Duquemin Deputy Dorey Deputy Paint Deputy Le Tocq Deputy James Deputy Perrot Deputy Brouard Deputy Wilkie Deputy Inglis Deputy Soulsby Deputy Sillars Deputy Luxon Deputy Quin Alderney Rep. Jean Alderney Rep. Arditti	Deputy Gillson Deputy Le Pelley Deputy Fallaize Deputy Laurie Queripel Deputy Lowe Deputy Le Lièvre Deputy Green Deputy Adam Deputy De Lisle Deputy Burford Deputy Hadley Deputy Brehaut Deputy Sherbourne Deputy Storey Deputy Bebb		Deputy David Jones Deputy O'Hara
1665	Deputy Harwood Deputy Kuttelwascher Deputy Domaille Deputy Langlois Deputy Robert Jones			
1675	Deputy Le Clerc Deputy Gollop Deputy Conder Deputy Lester Queripel			

1680 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, the vote on the remaining Propositions records 30 in favour, 15 against.

I declare them carried.

The effect of the three votes is that the Strategic Plan has been approved in its entirety.

Billet d'État V

STATES ASSEMBLY AND CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE

Members' attendance Report noted

Article IV.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the Report dated 7th January, 2013, of the States Assembly and Constitution Committee, they are of the opinion to note the Report.

1685 **The Greffier:** Billet d'État No. V, Article IV, States Assembly and Constitution Committee, Record of Members' attendance for meetings of the States of Deliberation, the Policy Council, Departments and Committees.

The Bailiff: The Chairman of the Committee, Deputy Fallaize, will open the debate.

1690 **Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.

For the past decade or so, the States has retained a record of Members' attendance at meetings of the States Assembly and the States Departments and Committees.

1695 It falls to the States Assembly and Constitution Committee to compile this Report and, on this occasion, the Committee is laying the Report before the States, not as an Appendix but in this form for the reasons laid out in the Billet. This is the Report for the six months ended 31st October 2012.

I have nothing to add to what is published in the Billet, but will be pleased to respond to any points of debate or answer any questions that Members have.

1700 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy Gollop: I was –

1705 **The Bailiff:** Sorry, Deputy St Pier I was calling first.

1710 **Deputy St Pier:** Mr Bailiff, from the sublime to the ridiculous: I think the SSP was criticised, was much criticised as being an empty vessel. But I think if we really want to see a shabby, vapid, vacuous, pointless and misleading document, this is it, perhaps only to be surpassed by the Report that appears in next month's Billet.

To cap it all, it is accompanied by the mother of all pointless propositions on page 349. In case Members did not get that far, let me read it to you:

1715 'Whether, after consideration of the Report dated 7th January, 2013, of the States Assembly and Constitution Committee, they are of the opinion, to note the Report.'

1720 By my count that is at least 22 words too many and I have to say it is so much easier and so much more fun to criticise the work of others. (*Laughter*) Well, if we are not of the opinion, what are we to do? Somehow not to note what is before us? Propositions phrased in these terms in respect of the SSP were criticised by the Chair of SACC, who helpfully reminded us that, under Rule 2(2), such a Proposition should

1725 '...be construed as a neutral motion, neither implying assent for, nor disapproval of, the contents of the report concerned.'

This Report is, of course, of interest. It is, of course, very well intentioned, but it is, of course, also deeply flawed. It fails to record Members' attendance at sub-committees or Projet boards. It fails to record Members' attendance at presentations and public meetings. It fails to record other meetings in the ordinary course of Departments', Members' or Committees' business. It fails to

1730 capture Members' work on behalf of individual parishioners. It is unable to capture whether
Members have prepared for the meetings they attend. It fails to capture whether Members have
participated at the meetings they attend. It is unable to capture whether Members understand the
issues upon which they are making decisions (*Laughter*) and it does not enable users to make any
1735 qualitative judgement on the reasons, absence, or part absence from meetings. (**A Member:** Hear,
hear.)

Sir, I would suggest that, if Members are failing to pull their weight – which is presumably the
whole point behind the Report – then given the media, and particularly the advent of social media,
this will be well known without this Report. Please, let us not have the holy trinity of openness,
1740 accountability and transparency trotted out in an attempt to defend the preparation of this Report.
Openness and transparency surely has to be about providing meaningful, useful information.

The Policy Council did ask the States Assembly and Constitution Committee to review the
requirement to prepare this Report in light of the costs involved. SACC have declined to do so but,
instead, submitted the Report for this debate, which I welcome. I would be very interested to learn,
1745 through this debate, Members' views on the value of this Report and, in particular, whether I am
a lone voice in questioning the utility of it. I would like a recorded vote and ask Members who share
my views to vote against the Proposition, in other words, 'to not note' the Report, (*Laughter*) as a
plebiscite on the requirement to prepare it and, if this view prevails, perhaps then SACC may feel
more inclined to act.

Sir, the Financial Transformation Programme is about transforming the business of
1750 Government. We are asking our public servants to transform the public service including, amongst
other things, stopping those actions, which serve little purpose or add no value. If *we* fail, even the
simplest such choice, when it is absolutely in our control, then I will just be staggered. I am sure
that, for many, it is all just chicken feed and not worth worrying about, but that is a lost
1755 opportunity. It is precisely these simple examples which are an emblematic demonstration of the
wide-scale transformation that is still required and I was particularly pleased to hear Deputy
Lowe's plea in the last debate to avoid preparing non-productive Reports.

I would like to ask the Chair of SACC, in his closing remarks in this debate, to advise the
Assembly whether he and his Committee are aware of the total costs and time across the States in
1760 collating, preparing and publishing this Report. Does the Committee believe that it offers good
value for money and use of time? If they do believe it offers good value for money – and I
presume that they must have reached that conclusion in responding to Policy Council's request to
review the requirement – what criteria have they used and how have they reached that judgement,
particularly if they do not have full knowledge of the time and costs involved?

1765 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you, sir.
Follow that, in a way!

No. I was at a meeting in the last week of so when a senior retired politician made a few
1770 observations and he said you should not measure the *quantity* of people's appearances, you should
mention the quality. Then when another politician said, you should also bear in mind those who
speak at a meeting and make a valid contribution and those who stay silent, the response was
maybe more politicians should stay silent! (*Laughter*) So the point is you cannot easily measure by
1775 this crude analysis.

I would agree in part with Deputy St Pier that this document has become steadily more and
more irrelevant. It came into being two Assemblies ago, when I believe Deputy Le Cheminant was
Chairman of SACC. There was a feeling in those days – different era, different size of States even,
pre-2004, that there were some Members who were – I don't know – taking long holidays, or
1780 being absent quite a bit and, certainly – I do not know if Deputy Lowe will contribute to this
debate – but she knew, from feedback she was getting from her parishioners and voters, that the
public were concerned that some States Members were pocketing an allowance. They were
enjoying the benefits of being a States Member; they were voting on key debates, but not
necessarily putting the work in 100% of the time.

So this was done and it has morphed into various styles. I remember the last States Assembly
and Constitution Committee – which I think Deputy Fallaize was a member of, and long-serving
1785 politician, Deputy Rihoy chaired – weakened the power of this piece of work by taking out of it
some of its content. Certainly, for most of the last Assembly it not only included attendances at
States of Deliberation meetings and Board and Committee meetings, but it also included details of
sub-committees, which was useful, because you knew who was a member of sub-committees.

1790 Where it went wrong in the past was that some Departments – Education springs to mind particularly – would publish every single significant school board and sub-group, whereas others – I was an active Member of Scrutiny – did not want to go down that bureaucratic route and so they did not publish what they were doing. So it emerged Deputy Bréhaut did hardly anything when, in fact, he was in the office at least twice a day and I think the hardest-working Member consistently, 1795 was Deputy Adam, looking at himself. He was nearly always in the top three for the workload that he carried which, of course, he did, but there were others who work in a variety of different ways and the current format is clearly a nonsense.

1800 I think if you are going to do this, to give the public some degree of credibility for Members' workload, you really should include other KPIs, such as, maybe, attendances at official departmental presentations, maybe sub-committees where there are civil servants present that have some official role and perhaps days spent off-Island in States business, in whatever form. The current manifestation does give a very misleading picture. Strangely enough, I emerge exactly about average in it, but my point is I know it does not include the work I do on disability and with 1805 sub-groups, but it includes other commitments that maybe only lasted half an hour. So it is not fit for purpose, but I think voting against it is negative. It is up to SACC to go away and find a more cost-efficient and relevant way of putting this information across.

The Bailiff: Deputy Stewart.

1810 **Deputy Stewart:** I would go slightly further than Deputy St Pier to say, not only is this totally irrelevant and does not reflect the work of States Members but, actually, it is totally misleading to anyone that does not know the background, it would appear that Deputy Lester Queripel has attended no meetings and yet we all know of the hard work that he does around the parish and, of course, now he is on the Committee. So these statistics *could* be used to completely mislead and 1815 for a member of the public to see this – and actually, this is not a report it is just a spreadsheet.

There is no narrative to go with it to explain. There is no detail at all and this is totally unrepresentative of what we, as States Members, undertake and, for that reason, I will be not voting for the Report.

1820 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Bréhaut.

Deputy Bréhaut: Thank you, sir.

1825 It is a Report that is not perfect; it is imperfect. I think I am down for 34 or 35 meetings. I attend Projet boards, Road Transport Strategy and other things. The question is, cast your minds back to when the 20 plus of you were on the hustings and you get that question from the floor of the hustings, 'Do you think States membership should be published and made available to the public?' Your answer would probably have been, 'Of course it should be. Of course, we should know what those people are doing, of course we should know what meetings they attend.' This is 1830 flawed. It is not perfect, it is inaccurate and it needs some revision, but I will not vote this out, because I believe it is well intentioned and it does attempt to illustrate the commitment that Members show, though how we...

1835 When I was Chair of Scrutiny and we decided not to record the Billet meetings, not to record the pre-meetings before we had a formal meeting, at the time, in the Report published, it had our Members' attendance as low, when actually they were attending as many meetings as every other one was, so if we can fill in those holes and if we want to record sub-group meetings, record them. If we want to record Projet board meetings, record them. I think, again, cast your minds back to the openness and transparency agenda that so many of you sailed in on and when you get comfortable in your seats and you are a bit warm and cosy, do not throw the transparency and openness to one side. Work to improve openness and transparency, through this document, rather 1840 than to shelve it.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ogier.

1845 **Deputy Ogier:** Thank you, sir.

Yes, I do think this document is still a useful tool, given its shortcomings, but it could be made much better. Yes, we cannot gauge Members' understanding of a topic and we cannot gauge how much work they do outside of meetings. It does, however, give something. You can get an idea of who has a relatively light workload compared to others who might have a relatively higher

1850

workload.

It is not as accurate as it could be, as Deputy St Pier pointed out, but this is down to the last Assembly, stopping the reporting of sub-groups, Policy Council sub-groups, departmental subgroups, extra meetings by Departments for special purposes, for a reason that I could never work out at the time. It makes it much less of a document now as people coming new to it can quite obviously see.

1855

I think we should look at making it more meaningful, as it used to be, and that would add the depth in representation that Deputy Stewart and Deputy St Pier are looking for. We do need the transparency of this document. As Deputy Bréhaut says, I think you have to vote for this and then look at amending it afterwards, as required.

1860

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: Briefly, Deputy Gollop mentioned this initially came in under the stewardship of Deputy Dan Le Cheminant and the Report advises us that it was as the result of a Resolution of this House on 29th October 2010. Any reference to the Members' attendance records at the time would have shown that Deputy Dan Le Cheminant was not present. It was not out of any act of laziness, it was because he ceased to be a Member of this Assembly in May 2008!

1865

Deputy Gollop: Point of order. It started in Deputy Dan Le Cheminant's era, but the way it was re-done was changed in the last Assembly when they started to eliminate the subgroups.

1870

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: Sir, I agree totally with what Deputy St Pier has said and it is interesting to have two new Members of this Assembly speaking in the way they have done because it is misleading and it is inaccurate. We either go the whole hog and try and find a way of recording everything, which I think would be too time consuming and too expensive, or we cease to do this, which sends out definitely the wrong signals, at least for some of us.

1875

I am only speaking for myself because I was questioned by a journalist from the media, who phoned me up and said, 'Why were you absent for seven Policy Council meetings?' So I said, 'I was not absent for seven.' 'Well, that is what it says there.' So I said, 'Well, look, first of all, I was present actually at 9 out of the 15 meetings. I was late for part of one meeting because I was chairing the Home Department Board next door and the Policy Council, in their wisdom, had chosen to meet an hour earlier over the weekend, so I could not be there. I did my best. I was 15 minutes late, I think. It is not recorded there because there is not a place to record that sort of thing.'

1880

I was away on States business for three and, if she had read that, she would have... 'Oh, yes, what does that mean?' Again, you have got to explain all this. All I could say is, at the moment, the best of it is like a *Guernsey Press* headline (*Laughter*) and, as a result of that, I shall be voting not to record this. It is inaccurate because, in the Home Department, I know, as other Members know, that I was also late because of a delayed flight on one occasion, and yet it is not there. That is because the Home Department are not lenient towards it and when I was on Government business, or coming back from the BIC and my flight was in late and again it was about 15 minutes. That is not recorded there and again that was one of the problems, if I remember from the last way of doing it, when you did everything, that there was not a degree of unanimity right across departmentals and sub-groups and it is very difficult to get that, except at great expense, so I certainly think, as it stands at the moment, I am not going to note it, because it is not worth noting.

1885

1890

1895

1900

The Bailiff: Deputy Sherbourne.

Deputy Sherbourne: Yes, sir, it is a sad thing, really, to be talking about, because I trust everyone – every single person in this room – to meet their obligations to the electorate. We made a commitment to the people of Guernsey that we would do our best to govern the Island effectively.

1905

I think that the whole thing is a nonsense. It has grown out of a culture of blame, looking for scapegoats. (**Two Members:** Hear, hear.) I have never understood what it actually achieves. Keep a register, that is fine, but the control of Committees are in the hands of the Ministers, or the chairs of those Committees and if people are not pulling their weight then, obviously, they would need to

1910 be spoken to, but I would trust every single person in this room to attend wherever possible.
The public have got a right, I think, to know that we attend States Assembly meetings – every right – because this is where we do our business publicly, but the amount of work that goes on in committee... Education no longer lists individual Members' commitments to school boards and additional bodies. If you were to do that, you would almost double the amount of time that we
1915 commit to our boards and I am sure that goes for everyone.

So please accept the guidance you have been given by the Treasury Minister and *not* note this Proposition.

1920 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you, sir.

The only positive I can take from this document is that I am filed on the same level as Deputy Trott and Deputy Perrot, because we are all on nought. I find it a privilege to be on that level.
(*Laughter*)

1925

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby, then Deputy Lowe.
Deputy Soulsby.

1930 **Deputy Soulsby:** I fully support the comments of Deputy St Pier and would like to add that, given it is six months out of date, it loses any value it may possibly have had in the first place.

Given all the talk about the SSP taking up civil servants' time, if we are to find anything to cut and free them up to do something more positive, it is this and, for that reason, I will be delighted to not note this Report.

1935 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

I need to remind Members why we actually had this in the first place. It was a call from your electorate. It was a call from the public to say *they* wanted to know if States Members were
1940 attending meetings and, indeed, were in this Chamber and, since that time, they have added if you are in the Assembly for voting and now that is being recorded, as well. Believe me, we have seen in the past where people have actually called their name here in the morning and, by quarter to ten, we have not seen them for the rest of the day. The sooner we have simultaneous electronic voting, that will flush those out, so I would welcome that.

1945 This was the public. It was said by Deputy Le Tocq, I think, somebody actually said well, it does not record that I was late, or it does not record there was a clash of meetings. Well, do not shoot the messenger because, in the past, it has been that if there is duplication of a meeting, there is a column there that says exactly that. You say if you are fogbound, you say if there is a clash of meetings and for it to be a huge administration, I mean, for goodness sake, you need to get a grip, really... This is taken from the minutes of who is present and who is not. It is as simple as that. It
1950 is on electronic equipment in each Department and each Committee.

The last States decided to get rid of all the sub-groups. I think that was a retrograde step, so maybe SACC might bring that back in. Then it was said, well, different meetings were not marked
1955 down. That is an administration fault. It is in your hands as political Members. You are the leaders in Departments and Committees. Any meeting where there is a minute taker is an official meeting and all of those have to be put on that record. Anything when you decided to have a get-together, or you decided on a presentation, that is what you are paid for. That is the extra work that you are expected to do, for the amount that you get as a States Member. You are expected to go and see your electorate. You are expected to go to presentations. I say presentations loosely because
1960 presentations used to probably be three, maybe four, a year and that was when it was relevant, when it was something really major coming to the States. Now you have presentations just for the sake of presentations because, if you have not got a good States Report with the detail in it, you should not need to go to a presentation to hear it, it should be a good Report. It is in the hands of all the Department Members and the Committee members to ensure it is a thorough evidence-based Report. If it is not, sling it back. Then you will not have to end up putting up with all these
1965 presentations, taking up staff time, to have it told to you what it was actually meant to be.

So I welcome this. It is still not right. It actually did a retrograde step. I hope that they come back, including sub-committees and I am pleased that part of that decision in the previous States was not only if you attended a meeting, but you attended part of a meeting. Again, that was a

1970 tidying-up process and that was more about the time when you claimed to attend a meeting and you would have Members turn up, be there for three quarters of an hour and they would go, but they could claim the same amount as everybody else that had stayed there and carried out the work they were elected to do on that Department or Committee.

1975 So I welcome this Report. It is not perfect, but if you want to close the door on the electorate, telling them a *part* of what you are doing, feel free to do so, but I think you are sending out the wrong message again, that you are reluctant to show *any* form of transparency or accountability, because it is slightly flawed and does not show what other things you do.

1980 How can you measure when you go and see a parishioner? How can you measure and start putting in time for that? If you are asking for all that sort of thing to do, you really are being totally irresponsible.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gillson.

1985 **Deputy Gillson:** It is complete. It is not the full picture, but it is impossible to actually give the full picture, because a lot of things are immeasurable, but it does identify the core activities and core responsibilities and the core attendance. So, in that, it is useful, it is broad brush but, as some people said to support the SSP, it is better than nothing and the electorate did want to know what people are doing and they do find it useful.

1990 As Deputy Brehaut said, a lot of people were elected on the back of transparency and now we are getting a year in, people saying, let us give the public less information. I think it is not perfect. I agree with Deputy Lowe reducing the amount of information by the last Government was a retrospective step, but it does give a flavour, it does give an indication and I think to vote against to note our Proposition is very silly, especially since the same Minister, only a quarter of an hour ago, voted to note seven Propositions.

1995 One point about why we brought it. We brought it to be debated to allow Members of Policy Council – because we knew that they did not like this Report – to specifically allow them to bring an amendment to change it and it is noticeable how silent they are in terms of bringing one – but there is still time.

2000 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey, then Deputy Conder.

Deputy Dorey: I agree with the last two speakers. It is an indication, but it is a balance between the level of detail and simplicity.

2005 Nothing is perfect and if you have more detail, it costs more. It is an indication. It did serve a... and in the last Assembly there was one Member who was absent for a long period of time, for personal reasons, and the media do not pick that up, but they did pick it up when the Report was published and it is a very clear indication that that particular Member was away from the Assembly and meetings for a long period of time. So it does have a purpose. We do get paid by the public and I think we need to give some indication of our attendance.

2010 If you look at the previous system, attendances were noted and you got benefits based on your attendance. This is a simplified system; please do not throw it out. It can be improved, but we need something.

2015 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Conder, then Deputy Burford.

Deputy Conder: Thank you, sir.

I think there is a danger that we think we do protest too much. It is interesting that this Report is here for noting by Resolution of the States on 29th October 2010. It has to be here under that Resolution.

2020 The debate in many cases has been used to – and it is a little bit embarrassing to self-justify why one or two individuals' statistics do not look as good as they would wish. It is not perfect. I would echo Deputy Gillson, it is imperfect, but we did, many of us, at the Election, state that we would be happy for our record of attendance to be recorded and we want to be open and transparent with the public. If we do not like this, let us be honest, let us bring an amendment and let us debate this and say we do not want to do this any more, but to use a mechanism not to note a Report, which we are required – we, being SACC – to bring to this Assembly, is nonsense.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

2030

Deputy Burford: Sir, I am in full sympathy with Deputy St Pier and Deputy Sherbourne.

However, you only have to read the comments on a site such as ‘This is Guernsey’ to know that some members of the public think the only thing the Deputies do is attend a States meeting once a month. Removing information from the public domain will not help to dispel this view. I struggle to imagine that this Report is onerous in terms of time or money and I would second guess that, on the whole, given the choice, the public would prefer we keep this information.

2035

The Bailiff: Anyone else?

Deputy Bebb.

2040

Deputy Bebb: Briefly, I would like to say that, as a member of SACC, I am very disappointed, because when Policy Council made a request to SACC to look into this issue, I was the one person on SACC who was actually sympathetic towards their view. As a minority member on that Committee, I said, yes, I fully understand why some Members would want to get rid of it. That is exactly why the Report was brought the way it is. But the inability of the Policy Council to bring an amendment, in order to throw it out, or to actually bring an amendment, in order to bring in more understanding of all the sub-groups, shows that they are still *unwilling* to commit themselves to one direction or another. Once again, it is circular.

2045

If you want it out, bring the amendment. You still can; this debate is still happening. If you do not want it gone, please be silent and let us move on with things.

2050

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

2055

Deputy Kuttelwascher: I would like to ask H M Procureur, what actually voting against ‘to note’ means. (*Laughter*) We know what ‘to note’ means, (*Laughter*) but voting ‘not to note’, I am not sure. Does it mean that this is thrown out and we do not want it any more? I am sure it does not; or does it mean that we would like it amended, but we do not know what the amendment is?

2060

The Procureur: A majority vote against a Proposition ‘to note’ would be an emphatic refusal, neither to imply assent for (*Laughter*) nor disapproval of – (*Laughter and applause*)

Deputy Kuttelwascher: I actually knew the answer, but I was not sure if everybody else did! (*Laughter*) I am pleased it has been reiterated –

2065

Deputy Bebb: Sorry, no you didn’t!

Deputy Kuttelwascher: I did ask this question in the previous Assembly.

2070

Deputy Lowe: And that came from our leaders, sir?

The Bailiff: Anyone else?

Deputy Fallaize, then, to reply to the – oh, Alderney Representative Arditti, sorry.

2075

Alderney Representative Arditti: I assure you I will be very brief.

I do not feel that I can criticise SACC at all for bringing this Report. I think that the Resolution is flawed. I think the Resolution is a great shame. I do not believe that that Resolution is going to produce any *real* openness, transparency, or accountability. That is my worry.

2080

I do agree with Deputy St Pier and the Chairman of PAC. What worries me about this is that it has no substance because of all the missing information that Deputy St Pier listed, but that is no criticism of SACC. SACC has done what the Resolution has asked it to do. I shall vote to note. I do not see the problem in voting to note. I believe that the public is *always* better off with information, than without it.

2085

If I bring together those comments, I would just ask SACC if they would please include a health warning on any future Reports, explaining to the public the very limited value that this particular information has.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize to reply.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

2090 I am afraid I am going to disappoint the Ministers, who have so violently criticised this Report, because I am not going to rise to their bait, because actually I agree with them. I agree this Report does not give a complete picture of the work that any States Member commits to his or her States duties and, obviously, that is because it is absolutely impossible to measure how many parishioners' letters Members are responding to, how many emails they are sending, how much
2095 time they are spending on the telephone, how much time they are spending reading States Reports etc. So this is merely an attempt to record and publish that which can be measured.

I am surprised that the Policy Council, or any member of the Policy Council, did not choose to lay an amendment. Other members of the Committee have explained that that is the principal reason why this Report was submitted for debate. The Policy Council wrote to the Committee and asked that we represented their view that the information contained in the Report was of no value and asked the Committee to reconsider its commitment to this record of attendance. The
2100 Committee wrote back to the Policy Council and said it had reconsidered and the Committee was still of the view that there was *some value* in retaining this information. The Policy Council then asked me to go and meet with them, which I did, and they offered their views and I offered the
2105 Committee's views. The Committee then wrote to the Policy Council and advised that it would not be proposing removing or abolishing this record, but that we would produce the Report for debate and the Policy Council was welcome to move an amendment to it. If they did move an amendment to abolish this type of report, technically, that would go beyond the Proposition, but the
2110 Committee said that it would not contest the States debating that sort of Proposition and would be perfectly happy for the States to resolve whether it wished the Committee to continue retaining this sort of information.

There has been no amendment, but as Deputy Bebb says, there is still time. The amendment does not need to be produced in advance and if any member of the Policy Council wishes to try to abolish this record of Members' attendance, then the Committee is still perfectly happy to have
2115 such an amendment considered by the States.

The Committee's position is quite clear. The Committee is not going to propose abolishing this record of Members' attendance, because it believes that, although it does not provide a complete picture, it is of some value. It does provide some measure of transparency and abolishing it would be a retrograde step, although I think the point made by Alderney Representative Arditti has a
2120 great deal of value and I will take back to the Committee the suggestion that, in future, when it is published, it is published with some sort of caveat to explain that it records only a small amount of the work that Members carry out.

Deputy St Pier asked how much time collating this information took up, how much staff time. Well, actually, it should not take the staff of Departments any time at all, because, of course, they
2125 are recording. They have a minute clerk present at all of the meetings that are recorded in this document and they are recording which of their members are present and which are not present. They then have to email that information to the principal officer of SACC. That cannot possibly take more than a few minutes. I understand that some Departments' staff are chasing around some
2130 of their Members, some weeks or months after the meeting to establish exactly why those Members were not present at a particular meeting. My view is that is their fault. If I were the member of staff, I would simply record the person as absent, without having provided a reason and send that information to SACC.

In terms of the staff time of the Committee's principal officer, I am advised that it takes about half a day every six months to collate all this information and put it together in this form of
2135 Report.

Deputy Gollop and Deputy Ogier both mentioned that it was changed in the last States, because the sub-group meetings were previously recorded. The problem that the Committee and its predecessors experienced was that Departments appeared to be completely incapable of recording Members' attendance in a consistent form. One Department would record almost every
2140 time one of their Members went through the front door. Other Departments refused to do that and recorded attendance only at main Board meetings. Because of that inconsistency, the Committee proposed to the last States that it be simplified and the present arrangements be adopted and the States agreed with that proposal. So the Resolution is binding on the Committee. Of course as the Procureur has pointed out, voting not to note the Report does not mean that the need to record this
2145 information will fall, the resolution that binds on SACC will still bind on SACC. This information will still have to be recorded and the Committee will still have to present this Report, albeit next time it will not be for debate, it will be as normal in an Appendix.

I think the only other matter raised, which was slightly tangential to this, was simultaneous electronic voting. Since it was raised, I suppose I ought to provide Members with an update. The

2150 position is that, as per the last update, which I think was provided at the November meeting of the
States, the Committee essentially has a Report prepared. The Committee is ready to report to the
States, as soon as the Treasury and Resources Department is able to provide the technical
2155 assistance necessary to enable the Committee to include in its proposals the technical matters
about exactly how the system of electronic voting could work. We have tried repeatedly to obtain
resources from the Treasury and Resources Department, but the position has been that none were
available in the first quarter. There was a suggestion that there may be some available in the
second quarter of this year and the Committee will be writing to Treasury and Resources again
imminently to ask for those resources but, effectively, the Committee is being held up and, as soon
2160 as the problem of obtaining resources can be resolved, we will report back on simultaneous
electronic voting.

I do not think there is anything else to say, other than the Committee is not going to propose
the abolition of this Report. Voting not to note it will not cause the abolition of this Report, but if
the Policy Council wishes to lay an amendment to this Report, the Committee would be pleased to
have it debated.

2165 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: We come to the vote, then.

As you are aware, Members, there is a single Proposition on page 349.

Those in favour; those against.

2170

Members voted Pour

The Bailiff: I declare it carried. (*Laughter*) I declare it carried.

That concludes the business for this meeting. I wish you all a very happy Easter.

2175

The Assembly adjourned at 12.53 p.m.