



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Thursday, 27th November 2014

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

Volume 3, No. 31

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

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

Law Officers

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

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

The Castel

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

The West

Deputies R. A. Perrot, A. 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,
M. G. O'Hara, F. W. Quin, M. P. J. Hadley

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representatives L. E. Jean and R. N. Harvey

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

S. M. D. Ross, Esq. (H.M. Senior Deputy Greffier) (morning);
A. J. Nicolle, Esq. (H.M. Deputy Greffier) (afternoon)

Absent at the Evocation

H. E. Roberts Esq., Q.C. (H.M. Procureur)
Deputy M. J. Storey (*indisposé*); Deputy E. G. Bebb, (*absent de l'Île*);

Business transacted

Evocation.....	1911
Procedural.....	1911
Congratulatory to the Bailiff on official investiture of knighthood.....	1911
Billet d'État XXIV.....	1911
XV. Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools' site – Debate continued.....	1911
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.34 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.</i>	1941
Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools' site – Debate continued.....	1941
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 3.48 p.m. and resumed at 4.00 p.m.</i>	1955
Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools' site – Debate continued.....	1955
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.08 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 5.23 p.m.</i>	1966
Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools' site – Debate continued.....	1966
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.40 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 5.45 p.m.</i>	1970
Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools' site – Debate concluded – Propositions as amended carried.....	1970
XVI. Preparation of a New Electoral Roll – Propositions carried.....	1973
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.59 p.m.</i>	1974

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Senior Deputy Greffier

EVOCATION

Procedural

The Senior Deputy Greffier: Billet d'État XXIV, Article XV – the continuation of the debate on the amendment.

- 5 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, many of you are in new seats this morning, but I am told that is the best way of keeping everybody within their electoral districts.
I will call first Deputy St Pier.

Congratulations to the Bailiff on official investiture of knighthood

- 10 **The Bailiff:** Sorry, Deputy Lowe?

Deputy Lowe: Sir, may I, before we commence the debate today, please pass on congratulations from all the Members here in the Assembly on your official investiture yesterday, being knighted.

- 15 **Members:** Hear, hear. (*Applause*)

The Bailiff: Members, thank you very much. I am obviously very honoured. Thank you very much. My family and I had a wonderful day yesterday – although I was thinking of you all! (*Laughter*)

Billet d'État XXIV

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

XV. Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools' site – Debate continued

Article XV.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the Report dated 29th September, 2014, of the Education Department, they are of the opinion:

- 1. To approve the La Mare de Carteret Schools' project as detailed in Appendix 1 of that Report.*
- 2. To approve the Education Department progressing to tender for the construction of the La Mare de Carteret Schools' project.*

3. To delegate authority to the Treasury & Resources Department to approve a capital vote, charged to the Capital Reserve, of a maximum amount of £59.44 million (excluding inflation) to fund the La Mare de Carteret Redevelopment project subject to satisfactory completion and review of the Full Business Case to ensure that the project represents value for money for the States.

Amended amendment by Deputies Le Tocq and Langlois:

To delete all Propositions and replace them as follows:

1. To approve in principle the La Mare de Carteret schools' redevelopment project ("the Project").
2. To direct the Treasury & Resources Department to provide further interim project funding up to the 'Full Business Case' stage in order for the specialist project team to be retained.
3. To direct the Treasury & Resources Department, in consultation with the Education Department, to commission an independent review in order to determine the most appropriate scale, scope and specification for the Project and to present a report no later than 31st March 2015 setting out the conclusions to the Policy Council for consideration and approval.
4. To direct the Treasury & Resources and Education Departments, following Policy Council consideration and approval of the report referred to in Proposition 3, to undertake a formal value management exercise involving independent and appropriately qualified facilitators and the project team in order to ensure that the Project meets the recommended and approved scale, scope and specification and represents best value to the States.
5. To delegate authority to the Treasury & Resources Department to approve a capital vote, charged to the Capital Reserve, of a maximum amount of £65 million to fund the Project, subject to satisfactory completion and review of the 'Full Business Case.'
6. To direct the Treasury & Resources Department to report back to the States:
 - (i) should the Policy Council not reach agreement on the recommendations in the report in Proposition 3; or
 - (ii) should the Project progress, in its next States' Capital Investment Portfolio report on the outcomes of the process and with an update on the progress of the Project.

20 **The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

Before I begin, I should perhaps explain my sartorial elegance this morning, because it has been questioned by a number of people. This is the Rainbow Mufti Day tie. A number of people have commented that actually Deputy Langlois is always participating in Rainbow Mufti, but actually today he is relatively sedate compared to normal.

It is also thoroughly confusing that one move by Deputy Ogier has completely thrown me, because now everybody is in a different place, so after two and a half years, it is going to take a while to get used to that.

Sir, what I would like to do is, in essence, I think respond to some of the comments which have been raised in the debate so far, and then turn to some of the fundamental questions on which I believe this debate and this amendment rest.

Deputy Sillars obviously began the debate yesterday, and raised a number of issues. I am genuinely sorry that we have been unable to reach agreement before now. We have tried extremely hard. We have looked at sursis motivés. We have looked at amendments. We have, as everybody is now aware, been talking and talking and talking.

The Chief Minister registered his disappointment that, in a sense, we had reached this point, and I do understand that. However, I do not agree with Deputy Green. The Education Board is not a sovereign States' Committee and neither is the Treasury & Resources Board, and therefore it is entirely appropriate that the decision should rest on the floor of this Assembly. I do wish to say, as others have said, but to put it beyond doubt and I think people should hear it from me, as the Minister for Treasury & Resources, that I too believe that the schools are not fit for purpose.

In his speech, Deputy Sillars referred a number of times to a smaller school, and in some ways suggesting that Treasury & Resources were advocating a smaller school. That is not the case at all. We are not advocating simply cutting cost by cutting space. That is *not* our concern at all. It is about value for money, which is a broader issue and challenge.

He also says that there is a need to retain a broad and rich curriculum comparable to the other high schools. Again, I understand that, but what has not been explained, and I am sure he will do so in his summing up, is what the role of federation is in that. Because I do not believe – I have not heard it, I have not read it, I have not seen – Education have not articulated to me, at least to a level I understand, what a school of, for example, 480 cannot provide when it is in federation.

Let us remember that the design of this school began before federation had even been conceived, and its design has not changed, to my knowledge, as a result of federation. The problems which Deputy Sherbourne raised in debate yesterday were ones which I had presumed could be addressed by federation.

To be clear again, the £59.4 million that is requested is excluding inflation. That is a concern for us at Treasury & Resources, which is why we believe that the amendment is a more appropriate number to provide an upper cap, because £59.4 million excluding inflation, what does that mean? We cannot have an open-ended resolution to that effect.

Deputy Sillars also said that there would be no additional spending as a result of these proposals. But, of course, we do know that the best estimate – and it is only a best estimate so far – is that £184,000 of additional costs will be incurred to run the new schools annually, as a result of the additional space, and that point was picked up very well by Deputy Domaille. I have no idea where he is now.

Deputy Domaille: I am over here! (*Laughter and interjections*)

Deputy St Pier: Actually I circulated a day or so ago, sir, an e-mail from a Mr Andy Mahon from BDO, who have conducted the project assurance review. One of the questions he had raised was around this £184,000, and the Chief Officer for Education responded to him that in terms of the affordability of the £184,000:

‘I could easily write that this is affordable and will be covered through general revenue and we put in a bid for additional general revenue at the appropriate budget time.’

I think that was in essence, Deputy Domaille’s point. Or we absorb the costs when the school opens – highly possible and likely.

So we do not actually know at this stage how that will be funded. So just to address that point, which I think Deputy Domaille made very well yesterday.

Deputy Sillars has said a number of times that the money has been set aside for this school. I will give a categoric no, the money has not been set aside for this school. We have planned to set aside money for a whole range of projects, but there is a queue of other projects waiting which could be funded. And the point again was made extremely well by Deputy Gillson yesterday. We cannot spend this money twice. If we spend £5 million, £2 million, £3 million – whatever the number is – more on one project than another, we cannot then fund another project. So it is ultimately going to come down to taxpayers to have to fund any additional costs which are not required. So we must ensure value for money.

The Minister also referred to Treasury & Resources reviews, and I am going to come back to this point later. These are not Treasury & Resources reviews. These are the project reviews from the States’ approved process.

He also suggested that there will be a fear that the design would need to be ripped up. But actually, if there are any design changes as a result of this review, I am sure a great chunk of design will remain in place. For example, the brief already envisages that the schools are capable of being extended to around 900. I do not imagine that that will change. If the sports facilities are not at a competitive standard, that is not going to require, presumably, a redesign of the whole school.

Sir, this is probably a controversial statement, and it is not going to necessarily be welcome, but the States, and the Education Department – albeit, I would say, not *this* States, and not *this* Education Department – they are the ones responsible for letting down the pupils, in making the poor strategic decision to build Les Beaucamps High before La Mare. Deputy Gillson made that point yesterday. If La Mare had been prioritised before this, we would not be in the position now.

So I think an additional period of review now, it is not on my conscience that we are letting down a generation of children, as was portrayed yesterday in the speech, because actually we are put in that position by decisions of previous States and previous Education Boards, which have put us where we are now. And in any event there is absolutely no reason why there should be any delay in this project if the design is right.

We have a lost generation of children apparently, if we do not proceed immediately, and I agree with Deputy Trott. I do not want any generation, now or in the future, to build, own and maintain anything that is too big or too expensive and does not deliver core services in the most cost-effective way.

Deputy Le Tocq commented about the removal of Treasury & Resources from project boards and he regretted that. But I continue to defend that as having been the right decision. We are now responsible through the new process of managing projects, for managing and overseeing the whole portfolio.

If we sit on the Board, then there is presumed acceptance of what goes on that Board on behalf of Treasury & Resources. I would say that there actually is plenty of evidence that Education perceive that already. It is used as a justification for challenging questions later. So if you sat on the Board, you are not allowed to question anything at a later date.

Deputies Luxon and Langlois were seeking confirmation around the time lines, and yes, I will confirm to them it is my belief that there is absolutely no reason why this review will change the timeline of the project if the design is right.

Deputy Lester Queripel spoke about the cost consultant's report. With respect to Deputy Lester Queripel, sir, you need to understand the purpose of that report, and what that cost consultant was asked to do. That cost consultant is asked to confirm that the costs of this design can be benchmarked. So they are looking at this design. What they are not doing, what they have not been asked to do, is to look at whether it is the right design, and the right scale and specification for our needs.

Both Deputy Lester Queripel and Deputy Harwood questioned Proposition 4, and its reference to formal value management. But as Deputy Langlois said, value management, value engineering is now an ongoing integral part of our project management and contract management process. There is no deadline to it. That is why Deputy Harwood questioned why there was not a deadline. Well there is not one, because it starts, in fact it has already started, and some costs have already been taken out, as the Minister referred to yesterday. It is now an ongoing process until the project is complete. So it is a confirmation that that provides an integral part of the project management from here.

Deputy Lester Queripel also questioned the terms of reference, and what this review would be covering. And the draft terms of reference which Treasury & Resources have prepared on page 2, I think, do quite clearly state that the scale is about the pupil capacity requirements – and I am going to come back to that later, because that is absolutely critical – the resultant sizes of the school, the added value and the need for the additional facilities and the space guidelines. That is the key focus of this review.

Deputy Green made much play about the wording of the amendment and said it is in consultation with Education. It is not a joint direction, and he is absolutely right. But he put great emphasis on that. But I think that the amendment is immensely pragmatic. If Education are able to confirm that they are happy with the terms of reference, that is fine, but we cannot afford a further time delay whilst everybody goes away and starts disputing what the terms of reference should be and who should be involved. We need to just get on with this, and that in essence, I think, is what the amendment seeks to direct.

Equally, I think, the direction in the amendment that the ultimate decision rests with Policy Council was, I believe, intended to be just a pragmatic means of avoiding any further delay, and the whole process of its coming back to this Assembly. But, of course, the Chief Minister has now confirmed overnight that the Policy Council is very happy for this –

I will give way to the Chief Minister.

The Chief Minister (Deputy Le Tocq): Perhaps, sir, with your indulgence, I could, just for the record, quote from an e-mail that I did send to States' Members overnight and that was to indicate that, having listened to the debate yesterday and the concerns of a number of people, the Deputy Chief Minister and myself would want to give an assurance to this Assembly that we would bring a report on the outcomes of an independent review in time for the February States' Assembly sitting.

I explained the reasons we did not do that and the difficulties that we could not amend an amendment at this stage, but we are of course able to bring in an emergency Billet, and I have been advised it is well within the possibility of being able to do that. So we are willing to give that assurance to this Assembly.

Deputy Sillars: Sir, point of correction.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sillars.

Deputy Sillars: I believe I still sit on Policy Council, and I have not been consulted, so I do not know if everyone was, apart from myself. *(Laughter)*

The other point I would like to make is we are surely... due process – I am not a great fan of that, but we were discussing the amendment, not what might be coming later.

Two Members: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: I think clearly it is relevant, because the amendment does deal with what comes later if the amendment is passed, in terms of what the next step is.

Again, Deputy Green made comments about whether the agreement was going to be unanimous or whether by majority, and I think again that has been dealt by others. But actually, of course, the committee rules make it quite clear that it would be by majority.

Deputy Brouard asked why this review had not been undertaken now. I would say to Deputy Brouard... again I get very confused, trying to find everybody. The reason, sir, why it has not been done now is because it simply was not feasible.

There has been reference to there being a six-week gap between the publication of the Billet and now. However, of course, for the first two weeks, Education and Treasury & Resources were still in a process of information exchange, of requests and information being exchanged. So really it has only probably a little over three weeks, a little under four weeks, that has been available. That simply, I would suggest, sir, was not feasible for it to be undertaken in that time. But I will return to time lines again later, sir.

Deputy Fallaize said that we do not lack the information before us on which to make a decision, and I dispute that. I think we do lack key information, and again, I will return to that, when addressing what I believe to be the key issue in making a decision today, sir.

Again, Deputy Fallaize spent a lot of time, I think, focusing really on the theoretical rather than the pragmatic application of this amendment, in terms of the role of Policy Council, and that to me seems somewhat irrelevant now, particularly given the intention to bring an emergency report back to the February States' meeting for a final decision at that point.

Deputy Fallaize also said that it was open to Treasury & Resources to present different schemes of development. But I agree absolutely with Deputy Lowe. We are not designers. It is not our job to present a different scheme of development. It is our job to question and challenge the value for money.

Deputy O'Hara. Deputy O'Hara lambasted Treasury & Resources yesterday, and he spoke of the fear of attending Treasury meetings, and I think all I can say, sir, to Deputy O'Hara is: *we never forget. (Laughter)*

Deputy O'Hara: That is exactly what I am talking about. That is an absolutely *disgraceful* statement. *(Laughter)*

Deputy St Pier: It was intended to be in humour. I think perhaps most Members got the joke.

Deputy O'Hara: Well, in that case I will take it and laugh it off. Thank you. *(Laughter and interjections)*

Deputy St Pier: Well, I think somebody else referred to a previous... I did not get nearly as good a... That was a far better reaction than I ever could have dreamt of. *(Laughter)* But somebody else spoke yesterday about Treasury & Resources being neurotic. Sir, we have a job to do. I am not remotely embarrassed about us undertaking that job. You elected us to undertake a value for money management role, and we are not convinced that this project, in its current form, represents value for money, and it is our job to tell you that.

Deputy Harwood, again we spoke about value money management earlier, in response to Deputy Lester Queripel, and the point here is: it is all about targeting spend where it is needed, not where it is not. It is an ongoing process, and it is part of the procurement process involving the contractor, involving the users, involving the design team.

Deputy Trott is absolutely right: the post-implementation review for St Sampson's identified net savings of £3.5 million on a project of around £35 million. And he is also absolutely right that the one person we should listen to in this Assembly on this type of issue is Deputy Domaille because of all the experience which he has in his roles over the years.

Deputy Gillson said that the Education strategic planning decisions should be questioned and the reason they should be questioned is that they have got it wrong before. They got it wrong before in relation to the building of the Les Beaucamps High before La Mare. The original EDP envisaged three schools of 720 each. We now have a plan for 720, 660 and 600. So things do change, and it is entirely right that they should be questioned.

Deputy Gillson also questioned that we should only be building sports facilities that we need, and therefore where is the business case that stacks up that supports what he described as being 'nice-to-haves'?

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: I thank Deputy St Pier for giving way, and I said yesterday that I agree with him about what would have been the correct order for the projects, but is he implying that, in the event that La Mare de Carteret had been the second school to be rebuilt, he would now be here trying to convince the States not to redevelop Les Beaucamps High School, counter to the States' Resolution of 2002 to provide equality of provision for all high school students?

Deputy St Pier: I am not saying that. What I am saying is that the order of priorities has changed and that over a 13-year period, the scene has moved. That has been reflected by others and therefore it is entirely appropriate to be questioning where we are.

In terms of the sports facilities, as –

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Sir, is the Treasury Minister also aware that that resolution of 2002 was specific in saying that that was to be subject to affordability and availability of funds? Affordability encompasses everything associated with value for money.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: I do thank Deputy Trott for that intervention.

In terms of sports facilities, of course, on the other side, the question of the social and the economic gains that could support competitor level facilities could well justify the additional spend, particularly, in the context of a social priority school in a social priority area. That case has not, I would suggest, yet been made. It may well exist but it has not yet been made and that comment has been made by the various reviewers that have looked at it so far.

Deputy Gillson, I think, also was starting to look at this before he was perhaps cut short by the clock yesterday. But it is an interesting fact that Education were looking to close primary schools last year and part of the argument for that was we could not afford to keep half empty classes. Yet here we are, quite happily going ahead with the programme, knowing that we are building additional capacity, knowing that many of those classes will be half empty for significant periods, throughout the life of this project.

Deputy O'Hara, in the terms of the sports tourism: I think he really missed the point which Deputy Stewart was making, which was that we may have information about the current levels of sport tourism, but no work has yet been done about the incremental sports tourism that we may obtain by this project, and I think that work would help support the case for competitor level sports facilities.

The letter that was distributed to all States' Members refers to the fact that schools provision cannot be just in time. We cannot build 'just in time'. But, of course, it does not need to be. Because actually we know, one of the much more predictable statistics is what our numbers will be, because we know how many are in the system and how many are going to need educating in two, three or four years' time, which is the sort of length of period you would need if you were going to take a module approach to extending buildings in the way that is possible. So I think the argument that school provision cannot be 'just in time' is a very odd one.

Deputy Fallaize said that this whole project has been in gestation for years and, of course, he is absolutely right. But he seemed to be implying that because it had been so, we should carry on with the decision that was made 13 years ago. But there have been changes in process. We would now expect to get better value for money than we did for St Sampson's High School and we would expect to get better value for money than we did for Les Beaucamps High. It is an incremental process of improvement and I would expect that.

Now, of course, the Director of the EDP programme, who was, of course, the former Chief Officer for Education has been involved throughout, but the methodology for managing these projects has changed, and indeed that was referred to in the Strategic Assessment Reviews in October 2013. I am going to refer to a number of these reviews and their roles.

I am quoting:

'The review panel would like to register their overall observation that the EDP launched in 2002 before the financial constraints which now exist and prior to any effective mechanisms to prioritise capital spending should now be reviewed and updated to ensure that it remains fit for purpose in the light of the changed circumstances.'

Deputy Gillson, Deputy Brouard, Deputy Ogier, and I think a number of others asked, 'How did it happen? How did we get here? How could we have possibly got to this point where we have two Departments fighting it out on the floor of this Assembly?' Deputy Ogier, I think I may be misquoting him, I am not sure, but in essence he was saying, did we get it wrong? What went wrong? And I would say sir, to him and to others that I do not think that the process has failed at all. I would say emphatically no, we have not got it wrong.

Because actually what this process has done is that it has identified and it has brought us to the point where we understand the issues. We understand and we now need to make a decision and that decision rests with this Assembly. I would say it has not failed. It has worked. But I will return to some of the questions in a moment.

But I would also make some observations. Despite it being 13 years since the EDP was approved, actually it has been pretty rushed. For example, if you look at the Policy Council's memo, which commented on the draft report when it went to Policy Council, Policy Council observed that:

'The proposals for the communication and autism support centre have not discussed with the Children and Young People's Implementation Group, who are preparing the Children and Young People's Plan. There is no reference to the relocation of this service having been raised with service users or representative groups such as the Guernsey Disability Alliance.'

285 It may not be true, Deputy Sillars, but that is what I am quoting from what the Policy Council paper said.

The States' Report was presented to Treasury & Resources before we had the outline business case. There were all sorts of draft outline business cases around. I think we got to about version 22. But the final outline business case was – again, I stand to be corrected on this – but I think it arrived in the Department
290 on the Saturday before the Billet went to print. So we were working with a States' Report and a draft outline business case and that is, of course, what led to a 10-page letter of comment.

The Education Department were absolutely determined that they wanted to get it to this meeting of the Assembly. They have Members who will not be here next month. They wanted it debated this month. I completely understand that. We worked to seek to accommodate that as much as we could and I would
295 hope that the Minister would acknowledge that we did all we could to assist at every stage of this project to try and keep it moving.

But I would suggest, sir, that we would be compounding that rush if we rushed with a decision today and it is entirely appropriate that we should remember that if we had had the necessary information, to take Deputy Fallaize's point, then perhaps a decision would not have been made to build Les Beaucamps High
300 before La Mare at the time. To Deputy Ogier and others, I would say these questions *were* asked before.

So, right at the very beginning of the project, our Board, the whole Board, was asking, why are we having this project design at this stage before we have made decisions on the 11-plus? We recognise that we need a school but actually will it be built to this design if there any change to the entry system?

The Strategic Assessment Review of October 2013 commented:

'It was apparent that there was not clear consensus on the current proposal's strategic alignment to the EDP as it has evolved since its inception in 2002. There was not clear consensus on the existence of any post evaluation of the outcomes of previous projects within the EDP',

305 and importantly and critically, because I will return to it, there was not consensus on the capacity need of the primary and high schools.

In the Strategic Outline Case of January 2014, again, the question was raised... Forgive me, sir...

It would be advisable, it was said then:

'to refresh the demographic projections. It is understood that there are several policies in development which could have an impact on the use of the proposed facilities. These include a review into the Secondary Education Division, which may result in a federalised approach',

– which I referred to earlier –

'to delivering secondary education, and an anticipated review of the 11-plus selection. A discussion of future educational policy direction would be useful in justifying some of the design direction and other considerations currently being followed.'

310 Then it finally makes some points about the additional facilities.

Deputy Fallaize said there had been review, after review, after review. But, I do have some sympathy with him, because he is right. There have been lots of reviews. But with respect sir, he misunderstands the role of those reviews and their criticality in managing the process. There is nothing unusual about what has taken place so far, and actually to illustrate the point of what the roles of these reviews are, again, I would
315 refer Members to the letter, the e-mail which I was sent by the BDO partner, in relation to his role in the Project Assurance Review, which was not the most recent one, and he said, and I quote again:

'The gateway review looks at the likelihood of a project or programme delivering successfully if it were to move to the next stage.'

That is the comment which is frequently quoted by Education, saying they would fly through this with lots of green lights, they are absolutely capable of delivering this project, and that is the point that he was asked to look at.

320 But what he goes on to say is:

'It is not the purpose of a gateway review to challenge the detailed specification of the project as to whether it is the right specification. So we did not. Indeed, we would not have been able to do so with any rigour in a short two-day period. I can

understand T&R's questioning of whether there is a potential to de-scope the project and still deliver the business need. In the context of a lack of absolute clarity on overall affordability',

– Deputy Trott's point –

'a perception that the scope of the full project as defined reflects elements of an aspiration on top of a core business need, and I would probably be coming to the same conclusions myself if I were in their shoes.'

Education have provided answers. They have provided lots of answers. But they are not answers which I believe, we believe, are satisfactory to justify the proposals which are before you today, hence our letter of comment. What we have found, sir, is that if we ask questions, there are a number of different types of responses. One of them is volume. It is almost like an arms race. We issue a 10-page letter of comment, and there is a 21-page letter of comment back, with appendices. I issued some questions yesterday and I got eight pages back. So volume is one response.

Secondly, is answering questions with questions. So, in the Strategic Assessment Review, the reviewer suggested that it would be appropriate to have what he called an EDP Strategy Refresh. Naturally, we asked whether it was appropriate to have an EDP strategy refresh, and the question that came back is, it would appear, 'T&R are acting *ultra vires*?'.

Then I asked in my series of open questions, which are copied to all Members, and to which the Minister has kindly replied, why are we building spare capacity? And the response has come back, 'Can the T&R Minister point to any school with space not being used productively?' Well, of course I cannot! I am the T&R Minister. How would I know how space is being used? How is that an answer to my question? It does not answer my question. It just gives me another question.

Then we have the question in response... 'why were not these questions asked earlier?' Sir, I am absolutely sure that the teachers in our schools would not be saying to their pupils, when their pupils come to them and say 'Sir/Miss, why is it like this?' and they say, 'Why weren't these questions asked earlier?' We would not do that. Of course, we would not do that. So we are seeking to discredit the questions by suggesting some level of impudence to actually be asking the question and that is not, sir, a response.

Finally, the other response to a question is actually a response which is not really an answer at all, and let me give you an example of this. In the paper at the weekend, an article was written quoting from the press release from Education, which said:

'It also warned that if one of its schools ever became fully or partially out of action, it would still need to be flexible to cope.'

So a Mr Burford wrote in and he said, 'Why all of a sudden do they expect one of their schools to be out of action?' The Education Minister responded, at the Editor's request:

'We do not expect one of our schools to be out of action. What we are providing is a prudent response to the established needs.'

I have read that several times, sir, and I do not understand that answer. If the established –

Deputy Conder: Point of order, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Conder.

Deputy Conder: Can I ask the Minister if he is summing up on behalf of the Chief Minister or is he speaking to the amendment?

Deputy St Pier: I am speaking to the amendment. I am responding to the debate so far on the amendment, as I said, sir.

The established need includes capacity of meeting a business continuity crisis, which we do not expect, which is what establishes our need. It is an answer. It is definitely an answer. I can confirm it is an answer, but it is not an answer which is satisfactory, sir.

Sir, I really do come – and I am sure Deputy Conder will be grateful for this – to *the* issue which is at the heart of this amendment; which is population. The population numbers are absolutely key. Now, Deputy Green said yesterday that he was confident. Then interestingly, he qualified it quite quickly – immediately. He said, 'We are reasonably confident in the numbers.'

Sir, we have to be much more than 'reasonably confident in the numbers' when we are about to spend £65,000,000, and the thing that drives the numbers is this 5% cushion. The 5% uplift in population is absolutely critical. We know that the school of 600 will only actually be needed for a few years around 2026, based on Education's figures. But we also know that anything less than 600 is not considered viable. So the answer to the question has to be 600.

370 I would like Members, sir, to turn to page 2588 of the Billet, and sir, for me, this amendment very much come down to understanding or challenging this page. It is a little bit blurred – I am sure that is not intentional on Education’s part.

A Member: Thank you. Saving money. (*Laughter*)

375

Deputy St Pier: We will blame Policy Council for arranging its printing.

About two-thirds of the way down the page, sir, you have a table which is headed ‘Secondary School Numbers’. It begins in 2012 and it runs to 2042. It is over a 30-year period. We have secondary school numbers. We have secondary school numbers plus 5% and we have secondary school numbers minus 5%,
380 and we have various surplus capacity numbers at the bottom. If we look at 2014, the secondary school numbers there is 2,228, plus 5% is 2339, I think and secondary school numbers minus 5% is 2,117.

Well, the 2,117, so that is secondary school numbers minus 5% is within a gnat’s whisker of what the school roll currently is at the moment.

385 So, the question I have is why do we start this in 2012, and why are we inflating by 5% for this entire period? I can understand that we have some uncertainty about what our school rolls are likely to be in 2042 and 2052 and 2062, towards the end of this period, but we know with absolute certainty – pretty well, bar a few people leaving and coming to the Island – what the school rolls are going to be in 2023 because those children were all born in 2012. If you take your finger across, sir, to 2017, you will see that the baseline surplus is 465. This is at the point that the school is opened, and with the best case scenario surplus of 700.

390 So, for me, sir, in undertaking this exercise, I would assume that as time extends we know we will have more uncertainty over the numbers, and that is where we would start to adjust the numbers. Maybe by 2025-26, there is say a 1% or 2% adjustment, and by 2035 maybe it is 3% or 4%, and by 2040 maybe it is 4% or 5%. But to assume 5% from 2012, when we actually know the base line already is below that, is very odd to me (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

395 The risk to demand at the colleges was introduced at a very late stage, as a justification for this. It is not in the States’ Report. It is not in the Outline Business Case. Business Continuity was introduced at a very late stage. Now, I accept that these are not the main drivers. I accept the response that the Minister kindly gave to me last night, that these are merely one of the factors. But these are all coming out now, as factors, to help justify additional capacity to get to the right answer. The right answer has to be 600. We know that,
400 because otherwise the school is not viable.

So now sir, for all those who are saying, why have we got to this point, and why are you questioning it now? Now is precisely the right time to review the scale and scope. The business case is iterative. It will change constantly as new information comes in.

405 This is the last chance we have before we commit to procurement and investment. So sir, this is a one-in-60-year decision. We have got to make sure we have got the right design, the right needs and the right value for money. The 5% increase in population assumptions is critical and it must be tested. The review should not delay the project if the design is right. It can be completed by the end of January. The States can meet again to discuss the matter in February and works can begin in May, if the design is right.

410 The outcome is not just about the student cohort, critical though they are. It is also about taxpayers (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.), many of whom will be students at La Mare and the taxpayers expect us to ensure value for money. There has *never* been a greater time when we need to demonstrate value for money in the delivery of essential services and therefore I strongly urge Members to support this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Pelley.

415 Sorry, Deputy Lester Queripel, are you rising on a point of order?

Deputy Lester Queripel: Yes please, sir.

The Bailiff: You have already spoken.

420

Deputy Lester Queripel: Yes please sir,

I did not want to interrupt the T&R Minister when he is talking, but I believe he is seriously misled the Assembly, sir. He said Deputy Green, Deputy Harwood and I were wrong to question the Propositions in the amendment. But he was wrong to say that.

425 We asked what criteria will this review employ that the Department themselves did not employ, and we still have not had an answer to that question. The way he structured his speech there, it sounded like he thought he had given us an answer to that, but he has not because –

The Bailiff: Well, maybe the answer will come when the debate is replied to, either by the Chief
430 Minister or if he has had to leave, by the Deputy Chief Minister at the end of the debate.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Well, it might be, sir, but that is living in hope, isn't it? (*Laughter*) I still believe that the T&R Minister seriously misled the Assembly, sir.

435 **Deputy St Pier:** Well, sir, perhaps as a point of correction, I absolutely was not seeking to question Deputy Queripel or Deputy Harwood's questioning of the Propositions. If I gave that impression, sir, I apologise. That was not my intention at all.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Pelley.

440 **Deputy Le Pelley:** Thank you, sir.

Most of what I was wanting to say, yesterday and today has been said either by the Chief Minister, Deputy Inglis, Deputy Gillson, and just recently by Deputy St Pier. I have sat here through a day or so of deliberation and my colleague next to me has seen me crossing off points one after the other, and even some of my key phrases have gone. So there we go.

445 I would like to start off really by saying that I do not really want to lose any friends on Education Council. I think they are taking umbrage at our due diligence in here of double checking that everything is as it absolutely should be. I do not want to micro-manage Education. But I think we have to be very, very careful that we do not go spending money that we have not got or that could be spent in other ways.

450 I have been lobbied like most of you by a great number of people, by e-mail. I have been stopped on the bus. Yes, I do use the bus. I have been stopped in the street and I have been phoned, and I have even been challenged by students from La Mare de Carteret, and I take my hat off to them for actually doing that.

It is not just a matter of giving them equality. I want that as quickly as possible. I would go back and say that in fact La Mare de Carteret was poorly built in the first instance. I was a teacher in the 1970's and I used to have meetings down at La Mare de Carteret from 1975 up to 2010. I was a moderator for English. I went down there many, many times and saw the actual condition of the school slowly deteriorate, year on year. I have even more recently been down there as an evening class student and seen it as an adult. It is not pleasant.

And whilst we are talking about shoddy buildings, yesterday we actually had some reference to the Houquette.

460 Now many, many years ago back in 1970's or 1980's, I was a Parish Constable out that way – although in those days, we called it to St Pier du Bois. It seems to have become anglicised to St Peter's recently, I thought that was somewhere in Jersey. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) But even in those days we had problems with the children having to dodge buckets of water when there was heavy rain, and one would hope that over the years, one has learned that you have to be very, very careful in your construction. I place a great deal on what Deputy Domaille has had to say, with his background knowledge in the business (**A Member:** Hear, hear.).

465 I do not want to question the integrity of the Education Board. I have the greatest respect for them. But I think we have to remember all the way through that our overarching remit is to be the guardians of the public purse, and £65 million is an awful lot of money. We want value for money. I want those children down at La Mare de Carteret to have value for money.

470 We have heard a fair amount of information being given out, more recently by the Chief Minister, who has tried to clarify the position that has happened overnight, and I am hoping that as this debate goes on, that some people who may have made their mind up yesterday may actually have time to reflect and think about exactly what may be on offer here and perhaps may change their decision and their voting to have been more in accordance with what the Chief Minister and the Deputy Chief Minister are aiming for.

I give way, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Harwood.

480 **Deputy Harwood:** I thank Deputy Le Pelley for giving way.

During the debate yesterday, would he not agree that most of the concern was about delay and the fact that the final decision was going to be taken by Policy Council? Assurances were given by the Chief Minister overnight to address those issues.

485 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Pelley.

Deputy Le Pelley: Thank you, Deputy Harwood,

I am hoping that there may be one or two more that will join you in that reflection.

490 I attended, as quite a number of us did, the Enough is Enough rally, which happened down on the White Rock. I also mentioned this at the St Sampson's Douzaine meeting on Monday. The message that I got from there is that people are a little bit fed up with stealth taxes and money being raised in every which way.

What they were trying to say is: ‘Can you please stop spending money unnecessarily? Can you be more fiscally responsible with the cash that you have raised in taxes from us?’ I think that came out loud and clear.

495 People are fed up with seeing all sorts of ways of tax revenue being raised from a smaller number of working people and they want to say, ‘Hang on, just stop spending – or stop spending where you do not have to spend. Nice-to-haves are not must-haves.’

La Mare de Carteret School is a must-have, but it is a must-have at the right price, and with the right conditions and the right things in place and I would urge everybody please to support this amendment, so we get the right thing at the right price in the right time.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Anybody else wish to speak on the amendment?

Deputy Le Lièvre.

505

Deputy Le Lièvre: Thank you, sir.

It is not my intention today to repeat many of the arguments, in fact *any* of the arguments made by my colleagues yesterday and I will furthermore try and restrict what comments I do make to matters more or less associated with the amendment, sir.

510 La Mare, like all secondary schools, other than the Grammar School and the colleges has to balance the needs of students with a very broad spread of ability and in some instances, with a very high social requirement. For the last 20 or so years it has done its very best to accommodate these conflicting demands, in what might be euphemistically described as a sub-optimal building.

515 The losers over the last two decades have been the children and teachers and ultimately society. The costs associated with these lost opportunities will be massive. We will never know what those are.

Today and yesterday we heard some of the arguments as to why Education and Treasury & Resources have failed to reach agreement on the size, specification and scope for the La Mare rebuild. Both sides are convinced that they are correct and despite last minute negotiations, which went well into... I have written ‘last night’, but it was the night before last – agreement on the best way forward has not been reached and that does not surprise me. T&R are responsible for the public purse and that is understood by all and it is a daunting task. Nobody would deny that.

520 Education is responsible not only for the adequate provision of schools suitable to provide for the proper education of the Island’s children, but also that the same schools cater for children of a mixed ability and mixed social backgrounds. Sometimes these very different responsibilities of T&R and Education might clash but it would be possible to square the circle by hook or by crook. However, at other times, we have to accept that a divide will remain, caused by a fundamental difference in outlook, and this gap can only be bridged with the intervention of this Assembly.

525 This is one such occasion. Both Committees believe fundamentally that they are right and neither is willing to give way.

530 We have heard from the Chief Minister that if we at Education are so sure of our figures, then we submit our case to further consideration to an independent review body. We should have no fear because our cause is right and so are our figures. Well, that might well be the case, but we do have a very real fear that such a review could discount relevant matters and reach a decision that was contrary to the very specific needs of the children at La Mare. Under such circumstances Education believes very firmly that it cannot gift any part of that decision-making process to some independent body.

535 To the Board of Education, this is a very real stumbling block. Value for money – we have heard that phrase mentioned over and over again this morning – is not always a good test or the most appropriate test when considering professional services that have to deal with complex social needs created by low incomes, poor housing, poor expectations, single parenthood and multiple failed relationships.

540 Now, the Minister of T&R made reference to the fact that we have not made a great deal about social priority, and I wasn’t going to mention it in my speech, but I am now, because it is important. Yesterday we heard mentions of the colleges and how they are different etc. Let me just explain to you how different they are.

545 First of all, we must understand that children in our secondary schools are of broad, mixed ability. The top 25% of our children are effectively creamed off via the 11-plus process. The remaining children, of which a much, much broader bandspread of educational needs, are placed in secondary schools. Now the difference of the social backgrounds of these children is absolutely vast.

550 If we take the Grammar School, it has just 3.3% of pupils who reside in social housing, and only 1.5% of its pupils supported by supplementary benefits. But if you take La Mare, in contrast, 11 times as many children are supported by the benefits system and eight times the number live in social housing. The needs of La Mare are different to the Grammar School. The needs of La Mare are different to both Beaucamps and St Sampson’s High.

We cannot, in Education, ignore that fact. It is important. These children are not educationally challenged, but they are challenged in other ways. Our job in Education is to provide facilities that match those very specific needs

We cannot ignore the fact that La Mare has very unfairly become a by-word for everything that is wrong in education – poor results, poor attendance, poor conditions and poor outcomes. This is all changing and improving very rapidly. A brilliant headmistress and equally sharp management team, supported by young vibrant teachers is turning this school round, and rapidly at that. Education wants to continue that trend, not at any price, but at the right price. We want La Mare to become a facility of choice: a community facility that offers centres of excellence in sport, in care, in outcomes, in the education of children on the autistic spectrum and in many cases the children that have had a very unequal start in life.

Value for money, although always desirable, does not always sit comfortably with such a vision. Education dreads the idea that its vision for La Mare is devalued by a body with no responsibility and no accountability. I ask you, where will this review team be in 20 years' time, when a new school is found not to perform as originally intended, when it has failed to become a facility of choice and when the students leaving the school have not achieved their optimum performance?

This Assembly owes it to the future students of La Mare to ensure that they have a chance of a first-class education aimed at the performance of the individual. Better education set in better conditions with better expectations and better outcomes, and that does not come cheap.

Let me make it plain: this is not about the number of the classrooms or the size of those classrooms. This is not about the sports facility or about the pre-school. This is not about the facilities for the 160 or so young women and men on the autistic spectrum. This is not about a gold-plated, glass-fronted vanity project. This policy letter is about providing facilities that encourage excellent performance in all fields: sport, academic and social. It encourages social responsibility and it is a value much praised by those who often wear a fiscal hat. We hear it so often in debates about social policy, social responsibility.

We want a school that imbues the students with pride in their establishment and they have got it even though they are taught in a ramshackle building. We want a school that encourages all learners that pass through both the primary and secondary schools to achieve their full potential. We want a school that provides its students with the skills to participate fully in Island life with a drive to always try to do better and, most importantly, produces well-rounded members of our society that become active contributors in all fields.

We often hear in this Assembly that we need to break the cycle of dependence on the state. Well, today presents us with the opportunity to invest heavily in a school facility that will do exactly that. If we choose not to invest adequately then do not look for change, do not look for improvement. Just expect more of the same. Education offers the opportunity to break out, to participate, to contribute and to belong. It is expensive. It was never going to come on the cheap. Nothing of any value ever does.

So Members, kick out this amendment and let Education finish the job that it started 14 years ago. Let me assure you that the investment of today will – it sounds slightly trite, but it will – pay dividends tomorrow.

One final thought, if, as predicted, we are going to have 19,000 workers and 40,000 dependants, let us at least make sure that the workers are well educated.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Le Clerc.

Deputy Le Clerc: Sir, I was in two minds whether to stand up, but I just feel I need to sort of clarify a few points.

I, like many Members, have received a huge amount of e-mails in respect of this project and the Report and I think the best way of expressing my views is to repeat what I have said in my e-mail response to many people. To put it into context many messages were asking me to not support the amendment and to vote for Education's Report. They advised me of the poor state of repair of the schools, in particular the primary school, saying that the La Mare de Carteret Primary School was by far the worst primary school in the Island, in respect of poor quality building and resources, and the need for upgraded facilities to bring them up to the standard enjoyed by other primary school pupils in the Island.

Like most of you, I do think the school should be rebuilt. But my concern is with the proposal, as it currently stands, and that it is Education's proposal.

We have faced immense emotional pressure from teachers, parents and students to start the works immediately and pressure from some of the public about spending too much. I agree with many of the teachers that contacted me that the schools are in a poor state of repair, but they are not alone. I spend quite a lot of time in Amherst School, and speak from first-hand experience. I have assisted, in that school, children in a cookery class in a room that I would describe as a cupboard. The only place we can assist children with their reading is in the school staff room, as there are no breakaway areas in that school. There

615 was a spare classroom last term, but, as now this is a three-form year entry school, that has been taken away. We offer breakfast club in a classroom that is required as a teaching classroom at nine o'clock. So, every morning we have to clear away the breakfast things so they can start.

Two other town schools, Vauvert and Notre Dame do not even have an on-site green playing field for their pupils. So there are other pupils facing disadvantages in their schools in other parts of the Island.

620 That does not mean I do not support the redevelopment of these two schools, the pre-school facility and the autism centre. My concern is the costs and I think that is why I want to support this review that has been proposed in the amendment.

I would also like to comment on some of the figures that Deputy Le Lièvre has given us this morning and that is regarding the people in La Mare that are on supplementary benefit. I would like to point out that the other schools, yes, La Mare is the highest – 17% of the children are on supplementary benefits, that is 625 75 children. Les Beaucamps has 14%, that is 73 children; and 13 % of St Sampson's, that is 88 children. So I just think we sometimes have to put this in context, as our emotions seem to overwhelm us.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

630 **Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, I will firstly speak on behalf of the Public Accounts Committee and then from a personal perspective.

As Members of the Assembly will be aware, the La Mare schools are not the first schools to be rebuilt in Guernsey. The last 10 years the high schools have been rebuilt at both St Sampson's and Les Beaucamps. 635 In this context, the PAC does note one glaring omission in this extensive States' Report and accompanying appendices. It does not contain any section outlining the lessons learned from the earlier high school developments.

However, we are not surprised by this, as a post-implementation review of the latest high school to be built, at Les Beaucamps, has not been undertaken despite the school being operational for a significant 640 period of time.

One of the PAC's mandated functions is to review post-implementation reviews (PIRs). These PIRs should be undertaken within six months of practical completion of any capital project. PIRs determine whether efficiency of project management and value for money have been achieved throughout the development of particular projects. Deputy Trott referenced just this, in respect of the St Sampson's High 645 PIR yesterday.

Any lessons to be learnt from a project should then be available to assist the project management for future capital projects. In order to understand where the lessons learnt were being incorporated from project to another, the previous Public Accounts Committee undertook a review in 2010 of the most recent PIRs it had received from the Education Department, culminating from the first phase of the Department's 650 Educational Development Plan. The main issue highlighted in PAC's report was that PIRs for the Education Department capital projects were, at that time, not being undertaken, nor disseminated in a timely manner. Lessons learned therefore were not being noted and instituted prior to the commencement of the next capital project. This PAC has considered it worthwhile to review the capital projects across the States of Guernsey since 2010, to determine whether improvements have been made in the last four years 655 and we will be publishing our findings in the near future.

But, more immediately, however, PAC has serious concerns regarding commencement of the La Mare project prior to a formal PIR being completed for Les Beaucamps, which has been open to students since September 2013. There have been numerous reports of issues relating to that campus, which is why the information gained would be invaluable for the proposed La Mare redevelopment. Despite having raised its 660 concerns on more than one occasion, with States' Property Services, which oversees all States' capital projects, a PIR is still outstanding.

The PAC was informed that the project as a whole was not considered complete until the sports hall was finished and so the PIR would not be undertaken until then. However, being mindful that the Education Department was hopeful that the La Mare redevelopment would go ahead in the near future, the PAC 665 suggested that the Les Beaucamps PIR should be conducted in two stages, reflecting the two phases of the project. This would allow a review of the school building to be completed ahead of the La Mare project. It would also ensure that any issues arising during its development be formally documented to assist the La Mare project board.

Unfortunately, the Committee's suggestion was rejected. This is not good governance.

670 The PAC therefore has serious concerns about the Education Department commencing a complex high cost project prior to the formal lessons learnt from the Les Beaucamps project being produced and disseminated.

Irrespective of whether the project team has a simpler composition to previous projects, there is no evidence to suggest that lessons learned have been or will be incorporated into the La Mare development.

675 The PAC also believes it is unfortunate that the existing agreed process for bringing forward major capital projects has not been followed in this case.

For T&R political representatives to withdraw from the project board, before the newly proposed SCIP arrangements were implemented is not good governance. The lack of a completed outline business case for a project of this scale, prior to submission of this Report to the States, again, is not good governance. These actions by both Departments may have led to the current impasse, which shows neither party in a good light.

Another notable omission from the proposal is a comparison of the ongoing costs of running the new build with the existing costs of the current school. When assessing the merits of the new build, surely this information is pertinent. What is spent now? We do not know from the Report. We know from page 2660 that the new site will cost £580,000 a year to run, and understand from a document circulated by the T&R Minister that this is £186,000 more than current costs. How will this be funded? None of this is apparent from the report. References are made in the response to Deputy St Pier's questions prior to the debate, which I will refer to later, but there are no figures to back this up.

Neither is there any indication of potential income from the use of community and sports facilities. Presumably if the pre-school will be run privately, rent will be charged or does the Department believe the business running it should get a new building for free?

It also seems surprising that the Report does not include any measurement of outcomes. The people of Guernsey might reasonably expect that the Department anticipates an improvement in the educational standards and attainment once the build is complete. Indeed, Deputy Le Lievre has spoken at length about that just now. However, what that improvement will be is not explicitly stated.

Finally I should like to say that clearly the PAC would be expected to welcome any attempt to provide assurance that a project, certainly of the magnitude and complexity of this one, represents value for money. However, the proposal to have T&R leading the review process concerns PAC from an independence point of view. If this review is to be truly impartial, then we believe it must be managed by an independent third party, such as the PAC and would welcome confirmation that such an approach would be acceptable.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, I thank Deputy Soulsby for giving way.

Actually there are two issues. I would like to ask her whether she would agree with me that in the Report she commented that there was no indication about the improvement in results. There might be an improvement of outcomes that might be expected, but does it not also surprise her that there is not any information about the improvement of outcomes from the schools that have been rebuilt? You would expect that to be pertinent information.

But the main reason I rose to my feet sir, is just in relation to the point which Deputy Soulsby has just made. Certainly from Treasury & Resources' perspective, we would have no problem at all with PAC having a role in this review we have got, if that gives her some comfort.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: I welcome both statements by Deputy St Pier and yes, of course, we would expect to have seen what outcomes have been achieved from those other schools.

Sir, on a personal level, I am very disappointed that despite the hard work of both Ministers, common ground could not be found by both Boards and therefore I have to make this speech today.

I fully support the development of a new school – of course I do. In response to Deputy Lester Queripel's comment that I was unable to go round the school with him, that was true, but I did tour the school at a subsequent date and saw for myself the state it is in. So I have no doubt it needs to be replaced and I suspect that is a view of most if not all of everyone here today. However, we are talking about what is needed, not what is wanted.

Now, reading this Report sparked memories of an earlier report and to a debate that took place a year ago. That report was also submitted by the Education Department, and called, 'Transforming Primary Education'. Having read the *Hansard* record of that debate, painful as it was, it quickly became apparent to me that statements made then are directly relevant to the debate we are having today.

Let me start with a comment made by Deputy Green. A year ago he stated:

'This policy letter should be supported today by all who wish to tackle the budget deficit.'

He went on to say:

'The States of Guernsey do not have the equivalent of a magic porridge pot that keeps on giving. Digging into our reserves as a community cannot go on and will not go on *ad infinitum*.'

Well indeed it cannot, and, of course, whether it is capital or revenue, it is all from the same pot, isn't it? I also reference what my good friend, Deputy Conder said last November:

'The reality is that our tax take from the economy is no longer sufficient to cover our revenue expenditure, capital development and sustain reserves. Put simply, we are living beyond our means.'

I would ask fellow Members, what has changed between now and then? (*Interjection by Deputy Fallaize*) Ah, we will go on to that, Deputy Fallaize. (*Laughter*)

We are also told by Deputy Conder that, and I quote:

'Every attempt to cut or curb spending will generate efficiencies. It has met with howls of public protest, special interest lobbying and resistance.'

Well, hold on a minute! (*Laughter*). I, like others, witnessed over a thousand people at North Beach a week last Sunday, who were making the completely opposite point! As Deputy Le Pelley just pointed out, at a time we are increasing taxes and charges, we are also looking at spending more and more. These are people, I knew, would never have gone to anything like that in the past – just ordinary working people. The tide has very much turned.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, on a point of order, Deputy Soulsby is misleading the States and anybody listening, by saying and continually saying, that spending is increasing. Public expenditure is *decreasing*. It is now 17.9% of GDP and it has decreased from 20% 10 years ago. It has decreased and it is still decreasing and the States and the members of the public should not be misled otherwise.

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: I totally disagree with what Deputy Fallaize has just said, and I will just explain why. As I stated during the Budget debate just one month ago, and as Deputy Gillson said yesterday, our funding is not keeping up with our capital spending. We are facing a capital reserve shortfall of £57 million by 2017. It is very uncertain whether this gap can be closed in the short to medium term.

I know, as Deputy St Pier has made clear –

Deputy Fallaize: Sorry sir, but on a point of order, sir –

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: – Deputy Soulsby is misleading the States.

The Treasury & Resources Department forecast a shortfall of £57 million, when they brought the Capital Investment Portfolio Report to the States in the summer. The most recent Report they have brought to the States on this subject is the Budget, which shows that the shortfall is considerably *less* than the £57 million to which she refers.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: I disagree with what Deputy Fallaize says.

We owe it to the taxpayers to ensure what we spend represents best value for money.

Now, I would like to turn to the size of the schools. This Report proposes building a primary school with 100 more pupil spaces than the existing one. Well, this got me scratching my head somewhat. I wondered whether I had entered a parallel universe. Last year, the Education Department presented us with projections which indicated a peak in pupil numbers in 2019 and then a considerable drop-off.

We were told by the Minister there were 751 spaces and when these figures were questioned, 'the numbers are secure, trust us'. Those of us who questioned the figures were told to do detention and write out 100 times, 'I will trust the Education Department's figures.' After all, we are not educationalists now, so how can we know?

We also had Deputy Fallaize's contribution to the debate. In his speech, he said that, and I quote:

'After Education's proposed closure of two schools, there will be 4,303 spaces, which provides sufficient capacity even at the projected peak of pupil numbers in the year 2019, after which the projection is that pupil numbers will drop off quite considerably.'

But not only that, Deputy Fallaize went on to say that he thought Education's figures were conservative and that a further 400 to 500 spaces could be found. How can the fact be that last year we are told that we can close two schools and still have bags of capacity when we reach peak pupil numbers, but now we are being told we need to build a new school with 100 more spaces?

And what about the secondary schools? Classrooms are built for 30. So an additional 20% compared with the current maximum, with 16% uplift added for extra space and then 5% for population growth. This is in addition to extensive unused capacity at other schools. According to this Report there is capacity for 2,580. But in October 2013, there were 2190 students. That is approximately 400 spare places now.

Not only that, but we are told a smaller school would restrict curriculum offer. Well, is that not what the Federation was meant to resolve? Whatever Deputy Sherbourne said yesterday to counter this, according to the documents set out in February, to parents, students and staff and called 'Transforming Secondary Education', it was. It states the Federation will address, and I quote:

'the difficulties that some students experience if they want to study minority subjects or subjects at a different level than is provided by their own school. The Federation will help to redress some of the present inequality of opportunities that students face by dint of the size of their school, or where they live.'

So I have the same questions as Deputy St Pier as regards what the Federation is meant to provide. Nothing in this Report explains adequately why such a big school is needed. The Department of –

Deputy Sherbourne: Can I...?

Deputy Soulsby: No, I am sorry, I will not give way.

Deputy Sherbourne: Point of correction.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sherbourne.

Deputy Sherbourne: In my comments yesterday, I was at great pains to explain that each of the schools should be able to provide a core curriculum and that the Federation itself enables schools to actually specialise and to provide centres of excellence in minority areas.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, Deputy Sherbourne. I just quoted exactly from your document, Transforming Secondary Education.

Nothing in this Report explains adequately why such a big school is needed. The Department obviously realises, and hence the letter on Friday, telling us they need to build a bigger school, in case another school has to close. Really? Create at some cost, for something you have no idea will happen, and if it does, have no idea when? Have scenarios been tested and other options considered than building a bigger school 'just in case'? That letter just emphasised to me that a review is needed.

I welcome the Chief Minister's assurance that Policy Council will return to the States' Assembly with a report on the outcomes of the independent review proposed, in time for the February States' Assembly sitting. I would hope that this would allay the concerns expressed by some Members yesterday.

I had originally intended at this point to make my closing comment. However, I cannot finish without commenting on a response sent by the Education Department in response to the T&R Minister's questions prior to this debate. I have to say, though, I was appalled by the discourteous nature of the reply, which as far as I am concerned, was totally disrespectful to a Member of this Assembly.

Now we look at the actual content. In response to Deputy St Pier's question, is it right to assume a 5% uplift in population projections for future proof? Policy Council suggest 1% to 2%. We are told, 'This is the difference between statisticians dealing with parameters of certainty and educationalists looking at the difference in the actual numbers between a base line number and a 5% uplift. So right, the former is a scientific probability-based estimate, and the latter are a wild guess?'

The response to Deputy St Pier's question as to why 420 spaces are now being provided at the primary school was not answered. In fact, by saying there would be a maximum 350 pupils actually seems to argue against the need for a 420 capacity school. I could go on, but I think Deputy St Pier has dealt with that letter quite eloquently.

So finally, I would like to say that we knew this debate would be always be an emotive one, just like that a year ago, although I did note that Deputy O'Hara did not get his hanky out yesterday. *(Laughter)* We have had e-mails from parents and teachers at La Mare saying how awful the building is, how the children feel like second-class citizens. We have even had the video, like last year. However, I refer back to what was said by many who spoke a year ago, epitomised by the words of Deputy Harwood, who said:

'Decisions must be driven by reason, not emotion.'

We must remember that as much as we would love to throw money at this project, we have to consider need, not want. There are just too many unanswered questions for such a large capital commitment, when more and more of our citizens are rightly asking us whether we can justify our spending at a time when their own budgets are being stretched to breaking point. For that reason, I urge Members to support this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Perrot.

Deputy Perrot: Could I say, sir, how great it is to be back in the seat which I occupied in 1985, but the building is not really the same. *(Laughter)* With all respect, I think you have got to get a grip, and something has to be done about these chairs. *(Laughter and interjection)*

Others have declared their appreciation of our education system, and let me declare my own, without I hope descending into incontinent emotion. I am a creature of Guernsey's education system. My time at Hautes Capelles was utterly wonderful. The education provided there – in actually pretty inadequate facilities, I might have to say, in those days – was thrilling for me and instilled in me a love of English and a love of maths actually. I felt cared for and nurtured, and I hope that is what our young feel these days.

But anyway, as I am on my feet, thank you, Miss Gossett, for all that you did. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)** Thank you to the late Bert Watson for all that you did – I hope that your shade is listening. And thank you Miss Marquis for teaching me all that I ever knew or know about raffia work. *(Laughter)*

A number of my friends from the primary school system went on to very high achievements in all walks of life, in clinical psychology, in aviation, in aeronautical engineering and in journalism, just to name a few. All of those came from just ordinary, under-equipped schools. I am not saying that because I think schools should be under-equipped now, but teaching is more about the teachers and the curriculum actually, I think, than it is about the buildings.

Why do I say all of this? Well, I do not think that Members of the Education Department Board have a monopoly on passion for our education system or for an interest in it. Those of us who are not on the Education Board can feel equally deeply about it and we really do. But we should be able to challenge it.

If there are proposals being put up for a new school, we ought to be able to challenge that and all of the head shaking which I have seen on the part of Deputy Sillars and all of the gurning and all that sort of thing, when people are raising questions or objections, I find somewhat unattractive because it is implicit in that, that those of us who are raising a challenge are perhaps stupid in some way or wilfully distorting the truth.

As is the case with everybody else in this room, I wish La Mare to be replaced. I do not want it just to be replaced with a school which will last for the years that we want it to last. I want it to be replaced on time. But it must be the right school. Certainly everybody at Treasury wants it replaced. We are just as passionate about this, as interested in it as absolutely everybody else is. If Treasury had an office cat, *it* would want La Mare to be replaced and replaced on time. *(Laughter)* We do not 'not care' simply because we do not wear our hearts on our sleeves. We *do* care. We know it is one of the principal duties of Government to provide educational facilities.

It is up to the Education Department to do just that, but Treasury has a job to do, and that job is not laid down by us at Treasury, just coming up with some sort of grandiose idea. The job which Treasury has to do has been laid out by the States, by you, through you, sir.

The States, *only* four months ago, ratified the proposals under the Capital Investment Portfolio System and that system, of course, was the subject of a debate as engendered by the September Billet from last year. Now the SCIP System we have all signed up to. Perhaps we did not all vote for it at the time, but that was the decision of the States. We are bound by that. The SCIP System does not supersede any Department's project submitted by the Department for approval in principle by the States, but it does require Treasury & Resources to apply rigorous scrutiny via review – an idea so easily dismissed by Deputy O'Hara, who said, well, he is 'review sick'. I am sorry, the system which all of us have approved embodies reviews.

I will return to some of Deputy O'Hara's comments a little later.

So there we have it, part of our Government's duty is to provide schools. We are all happy with that. It is up to Education to come up with the proposals, and Education is then – because that is part of the process which we have established – supposed to follow the sequence laid out in the Billet. That appears... and I will just copy a technique of my friend Deputy Trott – could I refer Members to page 2687 of the Billet. In the middle of that Billet, there is a numbered sequence and it sets out the expected process and sequence for all States' Capital Investment Portfolio projects.

Then, in the penultimate paragraph on that page, which I shall read, it says this:

'Although the Education Department has undertaken all of the elements, it has not followed this sequence and has submitted the States Report prior to completion of the OBC [the outline business case] and before final issue and consideration of the project assurance review reports. The review teams found that a large amount of key information expected was not available and were not

able to review a completed OBC, which should be the basis for that review stage. This has made it extremely difficult for the Treasury and Resources Department to review this complex and substantial project report in the time available.'

895 So the question of why T&R has come to this somewhat late in the day is laid bare on that page and that answers the question posed by Deputy Brouard, why is T&R so late? T&R quite frankly has not been given the time to do a proper job, and part of the problem was that the Education Department took it upon itself not to follow the correct sequence.

900 Well, are we all going to do that in future? Are all Departments, when they come up with projects, going to be allowed simply to make up their own minds as to whether they actually do fall in with what we have laid down as a proper sequence of scrutiny or are they just going to go off on an adventure on their own? If the latter, well, of course, the SCIP process might just as well be thrown out. It has just got no relevance at all.

905 The States have agreed twice, as a result of last year's September Billet and as a result of the July Billet, that Departments must conform with a proper discipline in respect to project development. They also impose – the States have done – a huge workload on Treasury & Resources, not on the politicians but on all of those who are working for Treasury & Resources. A vast amount of work has been done in relation to this project, as it is by T&R staff to other projects and, of course, outside consultants. We have heard from one of them this morning, Mr Marne, via the Treasury & Resources Minister.

910 So is all of that going to be thrown away? Because if the amendment is not passed, as I have already said, we might just as well bin the SCIP process and start all over again. But up to now Treasury & Resources would have failed in its duty if it did not challenge a number of things. It is certainly not challenging whether there ought to be a school there. But it is asking questions about the size, so far as pupil numbers are concerned. But we have to acknowledge...

915 I beg your pardon. Is this to give way or is this a point of correction or point of order?

The Bailiff: I think it is to give way, because you were...

Deputy Perrot: No, I will not give way.

920 The real problem that we have at the moment, so far as the demographics are concerned is that the figures actually are going the wrong way at the moment. Instead of net immigration, we have net emigration. Now, I do not wish to frighten the horses here, but that is a potential problem in all sorts of ways.

925 So it is right, isn't it, if the last figures show net emigration of about 360 people over the last year, to question this idea about whether the 5% is a correct one? We have been working so far on the hopeful figure of 2% – 2% of immigration. We have challenged –

Deputy Harwood: Point of correction, sir.

I believe the figure is 200 rather than 2%.

930 **Deputy Perrot:** I beg your pardon.

The Bailiff: That was Deputy Harwood.

935 **Deputy Perrot:** I am so sorry. I thank Deputy Harwood, as he has done over very many years, he is able to correct me when I am descending into floods of emotion, so I thank him for that. (*Laughter*) Not only is he good at planning these days, but he is good at figures.

But is it right therefore to challenge that? Is it not right to challenge the size, so far as a 16% Guernsey uplift is concerned? And is it not right to challenge...? We may be wrong in challenging, but is it not right to challenge whether the additional facilities are appropriate?

940 As I said earlier on, we would be failing in our duty if we did not do that. If we did not do that I would quite expect somebody to be standing up to say, 'Well, what on earth was Treasury & Resources up to in not actually challenging those figures?'

945 At the risk of tedium, I must pick up on a couple of points raised by others during their speeches and there was criticism, of course, from the Chief Minister at the removal of Treasury & Resources personnel from project boards.

Well, it has to be understood that there is a difference now. Under the SCIP process, of course, there could be easily a conflict of interest with a Treasury & Resources person being on a project board, then coming back to Treasury & Resources to try to push that project through. Under the old system, it worked, up to a point. I was on a couple of project boards, although the Health and Social Security Department tried to boot me off one for not understanding what I was doing. But I was on another one and I thank Deputy Scott Ogier for his kind words about my presence on the Harbour Project Board.

It is all very well a Treasury person being on a project board, but I am not sure that a Treasury & Resources representative would necessarily, by himself or herself – actually we do not have any ‘herself’; by himself – to have all of the skills and knowledge which would be appropriate to developing a project right from inception. What would have to happen is that there will have to be a lot of Treasury staff on the Project Board and then, of course, the project would look much more like a Treasury & Resources project than one from the Department itself.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sillars.

Deputy Sillars: Sir, on a point of clarification the purpose of a Treasury & Resources representative on a project board is to give financial scrutiny, rather than to run the project themselves.

Deputy Perrot: Yes, I might return to that in a moment.

Deputy Sillars stated the obvious that we have here at La Mare de Carteret an... Is this a point of correction or a point of order or am I being asked to give way?

The Bailiff: I think Deputy Sherbourne is asking you to give way.

Deputy Perrot: Sorry.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sherbourne is asking you to give way.

Deputy Sherbourne: I am asking you to give way.

Deputy Perrot: Sorry, can I just put this on as I cannot hear?

The Bailiff: Deputy Sherbourne is asking you to give way, Deputy Perrot.

Deputy Perrot: Sorry, actually this is not working either. *(Laughter)* All right, I will.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sherbourne.

Deputy Sherbourne: I would like to ask Deputy Perrot if he would agree with me –

The Bailiff: Can you put your microphone on, please, Deputy Sherbourne?

Deputy Sherbourne: I do beg your pardon, sir.

We are both hard of helm. *(Laughter)* Would he agree with me that there is a great difference with regard to membership of a committee yet to be established, than actually removing themselves halfway through a process, when scope, scale and specification had been a given from the word go. There is a big difference, in my mind removing halfway through a process, than actually establishing a board without representation at its inception.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Point of correction. Am I allowed to correct somebody who’s spoken while giving way, sir?

The Bailiff: I think let Deputy Perrot reply and then if you wish to correct what Deputy Perrot said, you may do so.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: No, I wanted to correct something Deputy Sherbourne said, but there we go.

Deputy Perrot: I am more than happy to give way to Deputy Kuttelwascher at this stage. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Treasury & Resources still maintain political representation on some project boards but they were all project boards which were commenced before any that are in the SCIP process. We do not have political representation on any boards in the SCIP process. I still sit on two: Les Beaucamps Project Board and indeed the Airport Project Board.

Now, as regards La Mare de Carteret, the project board was only very recently commissioned and what happened before was not a project board, so Treasury & Resources would not have been there to look at the

scope and the scale or anything else, and in fact when La Mare de Carteret Project Board was commissioned, we, at that point, because it was part of the SCIP process, decided not to be on it, so at no time has Treasury & Resources had an input to the La Mare de Carteret Schools' project – politically that is.

Deputy Sillars: Sir, as a point of correction of a point of correction of a question, (*Laughter*) La Mare de Carteret Board commenced in December 2012 and Deputy Kuttelwascher and I asked for the Minister to join that Board and they came on. So, the point I am confirming is that Deputy Sherbourne is correct, is that in June 2013 they both left because they were conflicted. So we had already started that process.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Perrot.

Deputy Perrot: Well, that was all very interesting. (*Laughter*)

Anyway, Deputy Sillars said that we had at La Mare an inadequate school. I think that was the bit I had got to before I gave way to Deputy Sherbourne. Yes, of course, it is inadequate. But that is not a reason for ignoring the requirement of scrutiny in relation to value for money in the other matters that we have been talking about.

He also says that schools need space. Of course they do, but the space allowed has got to be reasonable. Hence the challenge: is this reasonable?

He also said that there had been accusations of extravagance. I am not sure that anybody within this Chamber has actually come up with any accusation of extravagance. Certainly nobody, so far as Treasury & Resources are concerned. We may have seen some ill-informed letters in the press. We may have seen some of the more cowardly anonymous messages, which come through the social media laying charges of extravagance, but I am not sure of any and certainly I am not accusing the Education Board of extravagance. Challenging figures is not the same thing as saying that those figures are deliberately extravagant. He said that money had been set aside: well, as the Treasury Minister said, of course, money has not been set aside.

Can I also pick up something else which the Education Minister has prayed in aid and that is that the Enough is Enough movement has somehow bolstered what he is trying to do about avoiding waste of money. If that had been its message, then I would entirely agree with it, but as I actually understand it, what that protest was about was very much more to do with emissions and the width tax. It was to do with a consumption tax and it was also to do with paid parking. What the Minister is talking about is very much collateral to all of that and it seems to me that the Minister is just using that process, rather as people sometimes use the Bible to mean it to say anything they wish it to mean.

He also said that we are likely to miss an opportunity to stimulate the economy. With all the elegance at my command, I say that is absolute *rot* because no-one intends to do that. We do intend, to use his metaphor, to get the spade in the ground in May and that can be done. The review can be done. The Policy Council can get this before the States in February. The project can start in May. It is simply misleading to say that we are going to miss this opportunity to stimulate the economy. It is also misleading to say that we are putting everything back by a year.

Deputy Stewart said that this is a one-in-60-year decision, and, of course, it is. But let us think about this, that if we get it wrong, it is a decision which will be wrong perhaps for 60 years, unless events actually change to offset the wrongness of that decision.

Deputy Green, while he said that he was reasonably confident in the figures. Well, that is all well and good, but we really do need, as the Treasury Minister said, to be completely confident.

He also said that this was a well-intentioned amendment. Well, talk about being damned with faint praise. (*Laughter*) This amendment was, in my view, completely necessary because what it means is the Policy Council is acknowledging that T&R has got to be able to go about its business properly and if it has not been allowed to, then there has to be an independent review on this.

Now, Deputy O'Hara. (*Laughter*) He said that he was... I did not make a note of the actual word, but he thought we had gone too far at Treasury & Resources and that he was nervous. His tail was between his legs when he comes to Treasury & Resources.

The powers exercised by Treasury & Resources are those given by this Assembly. If anybody during my time on the Board of Treasury & Resources feels that he or she has been treated with some lack of courtesy or dismissively, I would like to know about it, because I do not think that that is the way in which we conduct our business. It may be that somebody coming up with a foolhardy proposition or one that is not properly thought out might face vigorous questioning, but vigorous questioning is quite different from a lack of courtesy. It is also quite different from somebody trying to be obstructive. What it is meant to do is to elicit facts.

Deputy O'Hara then went on to say, 'Review after review after review – I am review *sick*.' It is not my fault that there are reviews built into the system. That I am afraid, through you sir, Deputy O'Hara has to live with. He will have to like it or lump it, and there is no point in his having a rant about it.

There is much else that I could say, but will not, and you will all be pleased to hear that, but Deputy Le Lièvre I must look at and answer, because he says that La Mare School needs to deal with a mixed social background, and we all know that. But what has that got to do with a review on the basis that we wish to see the review carried out, in particular a review on value for money? Review on value for money is a necessary part of the system, but in relation to the La Mare Project, the La Mare Project is predicated upon the fact that La Mare has to deal with children of a mixed social background and that is factored into the process of the review.

He also says that education is the opportunity to break out. I do not need him to tell me that.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you, sir.

It is a brief speech because I think the speech made by Deputy Andy Le Lièvre covered a great deal of what I was going to say. But I do get frustrated, sir, when Deputy Le Clerc implied that we should not get clouded with emotion, and I do not see it that way. How many times in this Assembly do people get to their feet and unashamedly say, 'I represent the squeezed middle in this community'? I represent the squeezed middle. People have no qualms at all from predominantly a make-up of middle class people in this Assembly, who are quite happy representing other middle-class people and wanting it on the record. When people come into this Assembly and start representing those who are on the margins, they become marginalised within this Assembly. The idea that you should not wear your heart on your sleeve, because sometimes it sounds like you are wearing your spleen on your sleeve, is just the type of debate, I think, we should have to get used to.

I believe these proposals are a real investment in people and in the community.

Now, if we wind the clock back, *long* before the FTP process, I was on the Housing Department with Deputy Jones and Deputy Dorey, and the Housing Department had to really grasp this nettle of who did they want to house. Who were the people in real social need? Who was in States' accommodation who actually perhaps should not be there? That was a long, tortuous, painful process. The result of that process has meant that under this broader, tighter definition of people in social need – and social need and all that entails – predominantly occupy States' housing and there is a great deal of States' housing in the proximity to the La Mare and that area. That is a significant issue and as the Deputy Minister of Planning, I want to avoid referring to planning, but when you are planning a school in this area or effectively two schools and an autism centre, when you are doing that, you must have due regard for the setting that this building would be in and any benefit you can wring out of that planning process and incorporate in the school and the plans.

Now, blandly, and I have just said it, there are two schools and an autistic centre. I am just so thankful that the Education Department have a focus in this area. I do not have an autistic child, but I have a child with certain issues and let me tell you, a broken child can become a fractured family if you are not careful. It is all-consuming. It is all you ever think about and it is what keeps you awake in the early hours of the morning. So this is not a need or a want. This is an obligation we have to a community to ensure that we reach people like that and reaching people like that costs money.

Parents with autistic children who put them onto the bus, at the bottom of the lane – if the bus will pick them up, of course, because that is not guaranteed a lot of the time – the very fact that the bus helper has changed means the child has to re-orientate their entire day around that one change. If there is a road closure on the way to school the child may not comprehend that road closure and that will impact on the day and the manner in which they approach the rest of the obstacles they have during the day. So, I do not want children like this further disadvantaged by bureaucrats and technocrats looking for value for money, when actually they have fundamentally misunderstood, and perhaps taken the very essence out of these proposals.

I just wanted to touch on this, because a number of people have referred to this Enough is Enough demonstration. We were invited down there as States' Members to justify GST proposals, which do not exist at this moment in time. The PSD Minister, whoever that was at that time, was asked to justify the waste proposals and nobody there raised... Deputy Ogier appeared down there expecting to get on the podium and was not invited to. It is fair to say that the Environment Minister was left somewhat exposed, if not set up, by campaign organisers, who wanted to talk about one thing in particular.

Now, T&R can always make a compelling case because the context for the States before today and this States is that we have a deficit, so those who are by nature and elected on manifestos that clearly demonstrate that they are fiscally conservative, that would be the make-up of this Assembly, that is the politics that we have to deal with.

But I agree with something that Deputy O'Hara said – and he took it on the chin and said he was frightened to go into T&R. I know what he means, actually, because if I look at the demise of the HSSD Board before the last, the Deputy Hunter Adam Board, when the Minister of T&R said he had lost confidence in the HSSD and their ability fiscally or with their Budget, the Board was dead in the water. So, T&R can flex modestly their muscles and have a disproportionate effect on policy.

So, also, I believe, in T&R there is a disconnect in my view and very recent experience, to even inviting Deputy Ministers of T&R to your Board with support staff, copying them all in on e-mails that when you arrive within the Board room at T&R, there is still something of a disconnect for whatever reason. That is an issue because sometimes if you are speaking to senior staff and you are speaking to perhaps the Deputy Minister, then you expect there to be a clearer understanding when you go into the room, and I do not know why that is not the case and of course, in the case of Education, it was further exacerbated by the representatives coming off of the implementation board, or whatever it was.

Members there are items within these proposals that cannot be readily costed but, of course, it is very difficult to make the case for community cohesion, to make the case for inclusion and to make the case for equality of opportunity with the current acute focus there is within this Assembly, quite rightly on the public purse, and we have heard in States' finances. But we should not lose sight of those objectives when we debate this project. I repeat, this is a huge investment in a community and if you are going to dismember this and try and reconstruct it in a way that you believe is more acceptable to the position you have within T&R or more acceptable to a community who may be somewhat disillusioned at the moment, I think there are enormous risks with doing that and we should not lose sight of those risks. I would urge Members not to support this amendment, sir.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Next I call Deputy Conder, then Deputy Dave Jones and Deputy Laurie Queripel.

Deputy Conder: Thank you, sir, Mr Bailiff, fellow States' Members.

We should perhaps remind ourselves that we are presently debating the amendment – an amendment which is to delete all Propositions of the Education Department's States' Report and to take the review for the time being out – in fact, according to the amendment, permanently out of this Assembly – and place it with a review committee, which will report to the Policy Council. That is the amendment which we are discussing at the moment.

So I do stand to oppose the amendment, but I would like to compliment a number of those who have spoken against my position, particularly Deputy Heidi Soulsby and the T&R Minister, who have given very good speeches.

But sir, I will speak to the amendment. I think we had speeches which have gone far beyond the issues contained within the Chief Minister and Deputy Chief Minister's amendment, and I do oppose it.

Sir, in my opinion, the Minister of Education, my colleagues on the Education Board and many others have made the case for why this amendment needs to be rejected and thereby allow us, the Government, this Assembly to get on with discussing the Propositions as to whether this Assembly, this Government agrees that La Mare de Carteret school should be rebuilt, or not, in accordance with the proposals presented by the Education Department in its States' Report. That is our responsibility.

Sir, this amendment is a distraction. A distraction, which if approved would simply replicate much of the analysis which has already been undertaken. A distraction which has the potential to cost this Assembly and our Island a considerable amount in terms of delay, sunk development costs and the impact of rising building costs. It is difficult to envisage a less timely, more potentially expensive eleventh-hour intervention than that proposed by the Chief Minister and the Deputy Chief Minister.

Sir, just an initial observation: the condition of the school and the reason for rebuilding the school have been made very well by other colleagues. Sir, we know that the structure of the school is a disgrace. It is a disgrace to a modern civilised society. It is now, it has been for years, and it is getting worse year by year. For those of you who are not familiar with the school and have not visited it recently, let me just quote the words of the Channel TV reporter Rob Moore on his live report from La Mare de Carteret School on Tuesday evening before this debate. As he entered one of the classrooms, he said, and I quote:

'The first thing that hits you is the smell – the overwhelming smell of damp.'

That is the first thing that struck the TV reporter, Mr Moore and that was his first visit to a school.

The children of La Mare de Carteret do not face that smell once. They face it every single time they go into their classroom, every time over five years. That is what successive years of inaction by previous Governments have condemned those young children to and now we want to prolong that experience. Be in no doubt, this amendment, if passed, no matter when any report is delivered, will delay the rebuilding of this school by at least a year. The delay to the process of appointing contractors will guarantee that.

Sir, I would just like to add a few further dimensions to the debate on this amendment, which I hope States' Members will reflect upon very carefully and then come to the conclusion that they must reject this amendment.

1195 Before I do that, I would just refer to the Chief Minister's opening words when he presented this amendment. I cannot quote him verbatim, but he said... I am sorry he is not in the Assembly now, but I know that the Deputy Chief Minister will reply on his behalf. I believe he said words to the effect that he was neutral in the dispute between T&R and Education Department. He was unbiased. He was simply trying to find a way forward. It is perhaps salutary and illuminative that every single Member of T&R who

1200 has spoken, and they all have, has spoken passionately in defence and in support of this amendment.

Sir, I have been a Member of the States' Review Committee since its inception. I have hardly missed a formal or informal meeting of the Committee or those with the public over the two years we have been engaged in our work. Throughout the process, culminating in the debate in the Assembly last July, the message has come through clearly and consistently that by a very large majority people of this Island and

1205 Members of this Assembly want to retain our committee system, which so underpins our form of Government and governance and which has served the people of this Island so well for so many years.

Sir, we sometimes forget, no matter how many times we remind ourselves that we, this Assembly, are the executive, the government and the legislature. It is upon us that the responsibility for deciding policy, overseeing the implementation of that policy and enacting legislation falls. That is a very large

1210 responsibility, but one which should be celebrated. It is why this amendment, no matter how well-intentioned is so pernicious. In July of this year, we rejected by a very large majority the idea of executive government. We chose not to introduce a system in which this Assembly delegated to a part of itself the power to determine and execute policy. We retained that responsibility to ourselves and, in my opinion, quite rightly so.

1215 Sir, colleagues, Policy Council is not the executive arm of this Assembly. The Chief Minister is not the executive head of this Government. The Policy Council and all the other Committees of this Assembly hold their authority through the mandates, which this Assembly, this Government gives them. So why is this amendment so wrong? Well, I think it is obvious. Let us examine two of the Propositions.

The fourth proposition says:

'To direct the Treasury and Resources and Education Departments, following Policy Council's consideration and approval,'

1220 – note the word *approval* –

'of the report in Proposition 3...'

This is after Treasury & Resources, not the Education Department, having, albeit with this Assembly's approval, commissioned an independent review to determine the appropriate scale, scope and specification for the school.

1225 Colleagues, this is your responsibility. This is why you were elected. You did not approve an executive to commission reports and appoint review panels to make decisions on your behalf, and we must not abrogate that most fundamental of our responsibilities to our electorate. It is our responsibility to determine policy and take responsibility of the financial stewardship of this Government on behalf of the electorate.

Now, there will be all sorts of reassurances from the authors and supporters of this amendment, that the States have the ultimate power to reject the finding of the review. But note, in Proposition 6, it says that

1230 Treasury & Resources will report back to the States – and I will come to the extraordinary events overnight –

'that Treasury & Resources will report back to the States [only] should the Policy Council not reach agreement on the recommendations in Proposition 3.'

Should our Policy Council not reach agreement on recommendations in Proposition 3. Colleagues, fellow States' Members, does that not sound to you rather like 'only if the executive arm of Government does not reach agreement'? (A Member: Hear, hear.)

1235 Colleagues do not be beguiled by this amendment. Do not abrogate your authority and responsibility to test the Education Department's Propositions, to breaking point if necessary, and if you so choose, reject them. You have all of the information in the 164 pages of this report and appendices, and the blizzard of information you have received from Treasury & Resources and Education and elsewhere.

1240 You have all the information you need to make a decision. That is our job. That is what we were elected to do and that is what we should be doing at this very moment. Do not give up that role.

Sir, democracy is precious. Our democracy is an old democracy, but it is a tiny one. It does not have all the checks and balances associated with much larger jurisdictions. The protection of our democracy comes with due process. Some Deputies, such as my good friend Deputy Fallaize, are often criticised before being process driven. But process is how democracy and governance are protected. It is precious. We have

1245 processes for dealing with disputes between two Departments. We bring those disputes to the floor of this Assembly, this Government. We have the responsibility to scrutinise and decide.

So what do you get when you start distorting the democratic process? You get last minute amendments being produced by the Chief Minister and the Deputy Chief Minister, badly drafted and without even the courtesy of discussing the amendment with the Minister responsible for the States' Report – our Education Minister, who is laying this Report.

1250 You get amendments which are so incoherent that they are described by the most senior and experienced Member of the Assembly as the worst amendment she has seen in her many years in the Assembly, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and equally in my few years in this Assembly. You get Propositions in the amendments which take scrutiny and review away from the democratic elected Government and given to an extra-parliamentary panel, selected and appointed by one side in the dispute and reporting to a Committee of this Assembly, the Policy Council, who will, according to the Proposition in this amendment, make the final decision.

And finally when the contradictions and anti-democratic nature of the amendment is revealed in debate, you have the undignified and unedifying spectacle of the Chief Minister figuratively scurrying around mid-evening, by e-mail offers, to unofficially amend his own amendment! (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) (*Laughter*) Something which he does not necessarily have the power to deliver and which he clearly has not discussed with his Policy Council colleagues.

1260 Sir, I stood for election to this Assembly, not least because I believe in proper democratic due process. There is no higher duty placed upon this Assembly and ourselves than the protection of our democratic institution and process. In the end, there is no higher responsibility placed upon us by elected representatives. Creating and promulgating poorly drafted amendments potentially weakens that process. Creating extra-parliamentary review groups certainly damages that process. Authorising a Committee of this Assembly to make such critical decisions subsumes democracy. Finally hawking around an unofficial amendment to an amendment by the Chief Minister, as I said, is undignified, unedifying and embarrassing. It has no democratic legitimacy. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

1270 Sir, this Assembly must reject this amendment. It must grasp its primary responsibility to scrutinise the Education Department's proposals and the opposition of the Treasury & Resources Department. That is our responsibility. Do not abrogate that responsibility. Reject this amendment. Debate the Propositions presented by the Education Department and make a decision, made based upon the case made by the Education Department and the opposition expressed. Let us fulfil our responsibilities to the electorate. Test and debate the Education Department's Propositions and have the courage to make and stand by our decisions.

Colleagues, please reject this amendment. (*Applause*)

1280 **The Bailiff:** Next, I call Deputy Dave Jones and then Laurie Queripel, Deputy Rob Jones and then Deputy James.

Deputy Dave Jones: Thank you, Sir Richard, Members of the States.

1285 We have been debating this for several hours now, and I am one of these Members who are now being torn from one position to another, and I suspect many of you are in the same camp as me.

There is no doubt that £60 million is a lot of money, even if you say it quick and there is no doubt that, as a Member of the Policy Council, and as a Member of the States, I want to make sure that that £60 million is being spent in the right place and that the school gives value for money.

1290 I think many of the problems that we have got here is that this school, the whole project is being out there in the public domain as £60 million for one school and the rest of it seems to have been lost in the ether: that this is actually two schools, an autism centre and some much-needed sports facilities.

1295 But I want to go back to something that Deputy Brehaut said and for a long time in the States... I found myself in total agreement with him this morning, and that has not happened between Deputy Brehaut and me in a long time. (*Laughter*) But he is absolutely right about the social issues on some of our estates. The Genats is the biggest estate near this site and we believe that the residents and the children of that estate will benefit greatly from this school and the sports facilities in the area.

1300 Too often, I have heard Deputy Hunter Adam and Deputy Dorey and other Health Ministers talking about obesity with children. The other problem with children at the moment is they seem to spend many hours stuck in their bedrooms looking at iPads and computers and all the rest, and anything that we can do to get them out there and engaged in the community and sports, as a classic way of doing that, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) then we ought to do that.

1305 The other point I just want to raise is this visiting T&R. Now, I have no fears about visiting T&R. When I go, I usually (*Laughter*) thank them all for turning up! (*Laughter*) In one recent T&R meeting – without breaking any confidences, but I am going to – (*Laughter*) I banged on the table and asked the Minister if I had 'patsy' tattooed across my forehead (*Laughter*) in a robust discussion that took place over £20 million

from the Corporate Housing Fund. I have to say that a robust conversation took place after that. But I do not actually have the same experience of others of feeling intimidated or frightened by T&R. I think really we expect too much from them in a way. We expect them to balance the Island's books. We expect them to not raise any taxes in the community. We expect them to allow projects to go through unscrutinised.

1310 But that is not how it works and I am drawn to this amendment, because I want the value for money, but I am torn away from this amendment because on Monday's Policy Council meeting, we were sort of given assurances this this actually could be done and not delay the project and yet I have heard a Member of Education this morning saying that, because of the delay with appointing contractors, it could be a year away. Well, if that is true, I cannot support this amendment. So, I am going to be looking for some real qualification on that particular issue.

1315 If this review can take place and it can be done by the end of February, then I am happy to support this amendment. If that review then causes a chain reaction of Education not being able to get all the ducks lined up to get the tender process on track, then that is going to cause me a real problem. But I want this school. I want it as bad as anybody in this room. We have the taxpayer to consider in this and we have to get value for money. I hear lots of talk about when Les Beaucamps was built, it did not have this. It had a swimming pool it should not have had. Those are the kinds of issues that need to be sorted out at this stage.

1320 But the thing I find astonishing is that this process has been going on for two years, and as a Member of the Policy Council I have to say this, I feel embarrassed that we are at this point as a Policy Council, having to ask now for a review. I know other Ministers do too, because it was their views on Monday that that was the case. But I understand also why the movers of the amendment want to have this review.

1325 So, in the summing up of Deputy Langlois, because, unfortunately, the Chief Minister has had to go to a BIC conference, I will need to be convinced that this will not be delayed by a year. Because if it is delayed by a year, then I simply cannot support it. But also I will need to know if what we were told on Monday at Policy Council, that this review can be done reasonably quickly, that that is the case too.

1330 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Laurie Queripel.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

1335 Sir, I acknowledge the e-mail that was sent around at the eleventh hour, assuring the Assembly that if the amendment is successful, the resultant report would come directly to the States rather than go to the Policy Council, sir. First point.

1340 Here is a classic example of government on the hoof sir, and coming from a source that denigrates government on the hoof sir, and seeks to encourage and promote corporate working and joined up government, it is a poor show and it is not leading by example, sir.

1345 The authors of the amendment should have been aware from the start that executive government by the side door, a select few making decisions behind closed doors on such a significant issue, was never going to be acceptable to many of us, and, indeed, it would not be acceptable whatever the issue that was being discussed or debated, sir. Attempting to bypass or undermine the sovereignty of this Assembly or this Parliament sir, is not acceptable. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

But for all that, sir, it may surprise some of my colleagues to hear that I have to, at least, consider supporting this amendment.

1350 Now sir, when Deputy Sherbourne spoke yesterday, he made a very good, a very strong case, for us to be aware of and sensitive to our social responsibility, our social obligation. Now sir, how much simpler and indeed joyful political life would be if social responsibility were our only obligation. But as we are aware, sir, we have other responsibilities – another being our fiscal responsibility and the art is to try and balance the two. That is why I was sort of drawn to the amendment.

1355 Because we all know, I think we all know, that the schools will be built, and they will be to a high standard. The amendment seemed to represent a way of balancing those two responsibilities, the social and the fiscal.

Sir, I agree with something that Deputy Fallaize said yesterday. He mentioned that Education could have considered presenting the rebuild options laid out in the Report as the Propositions. I actually discussed that with Deputy Fallaize on Monday and briefly with Deputy Dorey on Tuesday, and have actually pondered bringing an amendment to that end, sir.

1360 So I would have quite liked to have had the choice of voting for a less expensive option, even if it had only saved a couple of million pounds, reasoning that any saving is worthwhile during times of financial constraint. I think if Education had chosen to shape the propositions in that way, sir, this would have been a more straightforward debate. But I felt that it was too late to spring such a motion on the Assembly and, of course, technically it was anyway, sir.

1365 Going back to the amendment, I am not the sure what the motivation was or the intent was behind the wording. Perhaps it was an attempt by the Chief Minister and the Deputy Chief Minister, to avoid a public

spat between two Departments or to avoid political messiness sir, but sir that is the nature of politics and if we try and suppress or hide that, by definition we erode the principles of transparency and openness. The very principles that the electorate, the public, are asking us to promote, uphold and enhance.

I have to admit I do have concerns about the project, sir. I, like others, have misgivings about the whole process that has unfolded since 2002. I think bad choices have been made. The unnecessary rebuild of Beaucamps school, sir. I think the wrong school was closed when St Peter Port School was closed. I think this whole rebuilding programme has created a very expensive rod for the back of the States, sir. We are dealing with yet another legacy of a decision made by a States from an apparently golden era.

Sir, despite the assurances given overnight, the wording of the amendment has not changed and I will find it very difficult to vote for it in its current form. I cannot vote on words of assurances, sir. I can only vote on Propositions, so that is not good government and it puts a number of Members of this Assembly in a very difficult position. I am inclined not to vote for it, sir.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Rob Jones,

Deputy Robert Jones: Thank you, sir.

I have a son at La Mare de Carteret and I have seen that school change over the last three or four years. It has changed because of the culture that the new headmistress and the teachers and the students there have brought, despite the disadvantages of the building that those particular students, teachers have to work in.

I have to park that up to talk about this amendment.

For me, it was a very seductive amendment. It dealt with the areas that I am interested in, in scrutiny, value for money and ensuring that those sorts of elements are rigorously completed and are out there. The trouble I have, and it has been highlighted by Deputy Conder this morning and built on the arguments of Deputies Green and Harwood yesterday, is the process that... I am uncomfortable with that final approval lying with the Policy Council. Those arguments have been well said. I will not repeat them now. So that is the dilemma I have there, balancing it up with the scrutiny element of it.

The one question I would ask and the question I am asking arises from something that Deputy Perrot brought up in his speech. He highlighted the fact that the process by which Education took this through the SCIP sequence, in fact, it was out of sequence. I did wonder why we did not bring... or Treasury & Resources brought an amendment or even the Chief Minister and the Deputy Chief Minister. Why did they not consider bringing an amendment that was more appropriate along the lines of putting this back in to the SCIP process and ensuring that the SCIP process was done in sequence and enabled Treasury & Resources to have the time to complete their review?

I do not know if that has been answered in any of the speeches that we have had and maybe we have had a number of hours there. But, surely that might have been the better way of dealing with this, putting it back into the process coming back to the States and having the appropriate debate, as we are.

But I look forward to maybe Deputy Sillars or other Members of T&R who have not spoken and the Deputy Minister has to sum up as well, I think at some point, as to whether that was considered and why that might not have been the more appropriate route to have taken this Report and this capital project back into the correct process that has been set out in the T&R letter that is annexed to the Report.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy James.

Deputy James: Thank you, sir.

My comments will indeed be brief. I think there are very, very few issues in this whole debate that have not already been addressed.

But there are two issues that I would like to comment on. One, the comments by Deputy Soulsby on the Post-Implementation Review. I believe that this amendment would give a window of opportunity for Education to look at bringing a PIR on the Beaucamps School. And the reason why I believe that, and believe they are incredibly important was just to draw your attention to some of the disasters of some of the public buildings built by the States of Guernsey or on behalf of the States of Guernsey. Draw your attention to the roofs at Lighthouse Wards at the Princess Elizabeth Hospital. (A Member: Hear, hear.) Eleven years they have been built. Those roofs have been leaking virtually since the time they were built. At least seven rooms are out of commission because of leaking roofs. There is one good example.

Another good example in my view is the airport walkway. You walk through there, it is leaking. A lot of the metal fittings on the glassware are rusty. I think it is just so, so important. Even parts of the Princess Elizabeth Hospital new build, you see leaking roofs.

The second issue that I would like to address – Deputy Gillson briefly mentioned it yesterday – was we have heard accusations in this Assembly yesterday that this amendment is potentially undermining the

mandate of the Education Department. Well, I had a wry smile on my face because approximately this time last year, when Social Security brought its Uprating Report and there were those in this Assembly that suggested the formation of SWBIC and I think I got up and maybe others did, that said if this goes through it undermines the mandate of Social Security. Weird that, that some of those people that wanted SWBIC introduced are now saying that this undermines the mandate of the Education Department.

Deputy Conder, this morning, said, 'Ask yourselves why you were elected, why you stood for election to this Assembly.' Well, two very, very brief reasons that I stood. One, I want to see all of our schoolchildren to be attending decent schools. I want to see all the patients in this hospital being admitted to decent accommodation in hospital. But, perhaps more importantly, why I stood for election and what I would say to this Assembly, any project that requires this level of expenditure, I need to know before I put my name to it that it is indeed value for money.

So I support the amendment wholeheartedly.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Jean and then Deputy Gollop.

Alderney Representative Jean: I am concerned about this. I am concerned for several reasons. There have been some marvellous speeches – really, really, very good, particularly Deputy St Pier, Deputy Perrot, Deputy Conder and Deputy Sherbourne. I think their speeches have been enlightening, very interesting.

We are all concerned about La Mare. We are all concerned because it definitely does need rebuilding. There is nobody can doubt it and we know that the students there need the support.

One of the things that particularly concerns me and I want to take this out of the equation, or try to take it out of the equation, is this offence to the Board of Education – as regards if they are so unhappy about anybody looking at an amendment. I actually think that... I am like Deputy Dave Jones. I am very torn about this issue. It is a great concern to me. It is a lot of money. I think in many ways prudence is right. 'Enough is Enough', as Deputy Perrot pointed out, was about a different subject, but it is also the beginning of an expression of concern by the public about those particular things and other things and that is something that we should not take lightly. We spend public money.

There may be things to me that are possibly wrong with the SCIP process. Perhaps people should consider putting aside this difficulty with an interest of Policy & Resource and that representation probably should be there anyway.

This is about value for money, £65,000,000. The population figures interest me. They are not alarming for Guernsey, not by any means. I do not know fully what has happened this year and again, Deputy Perrot drew our attention to it. They are not alarming yet, but are they a sign that things are changing? That needs to be assessed, as regards the percentage.

We have a responsibility as well to the taxpayer and saying here in Guernsey and in Alderney as well and some of those are saying enough is enough. My point is this: the very important thing to me is I want to say, particularly to Education Council, as we make this decision, those of us that are torn and those of us who have taken a full side in this thing; the offensive bit of it must drop.

Education Council is important. Education Council is something I am proud of. I am quite happy with the membership of Education Council. I have heard rumblings. They are only talk in the background, that there might be resignation over this. Is this another stick to hold over us? I do not want anybody to resign. I have the utmost respect for Education Council. I want them to stay. I need them to stay. But I also need to be free to make my decision, torn or not, whether I go for the amendment, whether I go for the project. I am almost on the side of the amendment, I really am, because I think prudence is important now. We have problems with our money. We have problems everywhere. We have got to think about how we spend it and it is no offence to Education Council and I earnestly want you to get that message. I am desperate about it.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you, sir.

And I too, of course, entirely endorse what the Mother of the House, Deputy Lowe, said about congratulating you, sir, on your honour and you mentioned that you had had a happy day yesterday. Well, I do not think we did in this Chamber, (*Laughter*) and we are not having a terribly happy day today, despite your coming back, (*Laughter*) because this debate is proving to be rather difficult and has come at a bad time, I think, in the temper of the States.

There are certainly a lot of points to catch up on. Deputy Conder, for example, mentioned the States' Review Committee and as I understand it, we broadly agreed to have a Policy & Resources Committee in future. Well this is perhaps a good omen of what those kind of debates might be like, because it does seem to me that Policy Council is acting perhaps like the Policy & Resources Committee might act in the future.

It has been mentioned a number of times, SWBIC as a parallel or curious parallel here. I would say that it is not in every respect, because Deputy Le Lièvre, being a very shrewd amendment crafter, constructed a model of a committee that was a delegated team bringing together a mandated Member from Treasury & Resources, two from Social Security, two from Housing and two General. Now as I understand the amendment just proposes the Policy Council. So, we would have one representative from Education and 10 others. That clearly is a less democratic process than SWBIC.

I want to consider some new points. One important point is during the last Chief Minister but one's term of office, Deputy Trott, his Policy Council was surprisingly stable in terms of its membership and roles. We have had 30 Ministers, I believe, so far in this Assembly. There was only one change during the four-year term and that was when Deputy Sillars assumed the role that Deputy Steer used to have.

I mention that because Deputy Sillars has had the privilege now of working with three Chief Ministers and one has to consider the routing which he took to the position that he acquired. During the previous States, Deputy Steer had a comparatively easy time for a while. But she put forward the St Andrew's closure plan that was rebuffed by the States. Then it was returned to the States, this time in a slightly different format. Deputy Soulsby, amongst others, courageously resisted it, but it passed.

The point I am making is not only does the Assembly change its mind, but we had to accept collectively, even if I did not necessarily support it, that maybe Education had got it right and that the States had got it wrong the first time. Now, we are in danger of making the same fundamental decision today.

Another point was when there was a change of Minister at Education, what was the galvanising catalyst for that? Well, there were a number of factors, but I suppose the most predominant was the disappointing result of that time from La Mare de Carteret, and one or two other schools, and the subsequent appointment of distinguished educationalist, the retired headmaster, Mr Mulkerrin, who contributed his considerable experience to the process. Now Mr Mulkerrin has said he wants Education to go even faster in achieving a vision of excellence and what are the Board doing? They are trying to maintain the pace of the project.

I would also say that the dominating political issue of the last six months before what was quite a cataclysmic general election in Guernsey terms was the state of education in the schools, and the core of that issue was that one or two of the secondary schools were perhaps demoralised, demotivated, slightly declining and having a lower standard, not only than the colleges and the Grammar School, which can be expected, given the demographic in our system, but a lower standard than even schools in Kent – all the schools in Kent.

We had to do something and doing something meant creating a new Board, a new vision, a new team at the top and, frankly, investment in the schools.

So why are we now, we have short memories three years on, basically dragging our feet and worried about the implications? Why have we suddenly lost that zeal of the issue of 2011-12? If anything, our financial situation has got better, as Deputy Trott reminds us, in real terms. I believe we have had quite a lot of red herrings on that respect. We have been discussing why Beaucamps went first.

Now, it is true that the King Sturge Report did prioritise La Mare de Carteret back in 1999, but what changed? Windows are falling out of the Beaucamps. There are damp problems. It was a media issue. The States clearly went down the Beaucamps route first. Why did they do that, really, though? One was the beginnings of FTP and the consequences of Zero-10, which made accelerating a capital programme into a short space of time unrealistic with the economic model.

The other reason was, of course, the success of the Torode amendment, which I supported, so did Deputy Trott. The Torode amendment was not constructed by educationalists for the most part. It was a political amendment to safeguard the current system of education for the grammars and the colleges. I am not going to argue whether that was right or wrong. But it was a decision that was made and Education, we know, wanted three larger schools. But they were told by this Assembly to get on with four schools. They have now delivered and now we are resenting it and trying to downsize the size of the surviving school that is still to be done. That does not make sense.

Then, we move into the social priority areas. Now, I have, of course, a great interest in autism. I am one of the signed up people like Deputy Le Clerc for the 365 Campaign, and I have been campaigning, Deputy Domaille remembers this when I was on Scrutiny, about autism for nearly 10 years. Deputy Pritchard, when she was chairperson, was interested in moving forward on the issue, as Deputy Brehaut is today. The reality was, we were getting a mood music from some of the bigger social Departments that it was not really an issue in Guernsey. There were very small numbers. We knew that was not true. The charitable sector has made an impact and now we have to catch up. This facility is essential and should have happened, to be frank, at Les Beaucamps.

I was a bit disappointed at the reaction from some Members about the sports centre, because one area where we know Guernsey has always punched above its weight is in the sporting field. We achieve feats of excellence well above our size of population or area of resources. We need to continue and improve that even further and if we are going to have Commonwealth athletes, medal-winning footballers or Island Games champions, we really do need the facilities.

Have any Members looked at the demographics of the area round La Mare de Carteret? It is almost as populous as a town. In fact the Vale and the C  tel combined have more population than St Peter Port. But it is an area full of young families of all income types. They do not live in St Peter Port. They tend not to live in so much of the west of the Island. They live in that part and yet the recreational mix is not right. So there is a geographical reason for a sports centre, as well as an Island-wide reason and an educational reason.

Of course you could argue that, as one of my colleagues did to me yesterday, ‘Oh,’ they said, ‘John, you probably skived out of sports with a sick note from your mother. You did not do the PE.’ *(Laughter)* Now, I could say to you that I benefit from my fitness because of that, but I am sure that is a good argument to win for the amendment. *(Laughter)*

But I think there is another game changing argument that is even stronger than all of those points put together. I will make one point about facilities. Deputy Gillson and others were saying, ‘Maybe you could combine a gym and an assembly hall.’ Well needs must when the devil drives, but we are planning for the rest of this century.

I went to Elizabeth College, great school. We all support it and the Chief Minister was a dab hand on the organ in those days, and a school assembly hall is not a gymnasium. The benefactors of the College have worked hard to give some of our schools first-class facilities. I do not think we should give, what amounts to the public States’ sector any less. We must have a level playing field in terms of encouraging excellence.

But, in a way we have more than one – Oh sorry.

The Bailiff: Giving way to Deputy Gillson.

Deputy Gillson: Sorry sir.

Yesterday, I did not suggest combining the sports hall and the gymnasium. I do appreciate the need for both. I was querying the size of the sports hall, the need for 500 seats.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Correction, thank you very much.

Moving on to education as a concept, in a way we are fortunate enough to have two Education Ministers in this Chamber on the Policy Council, Deputy Sillars and Deputy Stewart, because Commerce & Employment have gone out of their way to look at skills and support creativity hubs, enterprise, the idea of a learning community, and all of that. Why is that happening? It is happening not only because educational needs and society is changing at a very, very rapid pace and our demographics are not encouraging. It is because Guernsey has to raise its game.

We are not a county council. We are not a small part of Scotland or England. We are a separate community that has to fund ourselves and we need to not only attract the best talent here, as immigrants to work, to be entrepreneurs in the Open Market or the Local Market, the population licence system. Most of all for social acceptance and cohesion as well as building continuity, we must educate and get the best talent, the best opportunity, the best potential out of local Guernsey children.

We really have to put in education as our top investment priority and it is absolutely crazy that we do not want a silver standard, a gold standard school for everybody. We know we have to ensure there are not so many children in the future who are disadvantaged, who are not in educational training, who are relatively unemployable, or demotivated or unskilled or under-skilled.

We cannot afford to afford to have the same educational standards as southern England. We have to go much further. We have to beat Jersey. We have to beat the Isle of Man or at least equal them. Education is our number one priority in order to build connectivity and economic success. So, if we are supporting the amendment, any possibility of delay and downsizing, that cannot be right, that cannot be good. And what will happen if this separate review body comes to the Policy Council and says Education are right? Will the Policy Council give in? Supposing they say Education were wrong. The Policy Council overrules them, then we would be in a position of having overruled professional advice we have had and be picking up the pieces.

We must reject the amendment and we must support the new school. Yes, I could criticise some of the procurement philosophies of Education. I think maybe from the start, we should have outsourced the design of schools to a different body, but that is missing the point. We are where we are and we must support the school today to ensure the project is timely and that students, whether they are sporty or autistic or in the primary or secondary sectors have the best possible opportunity and the school is not over-endowed with space, as you can see from the table. Indeed my colleague mentioned the difficulties Amherst School have. Absolutely right, but we need to set a new standard of improvement across the schools so that we have even greater educational success and performance and career success for the future. We cannot afford to risk having declining standards again.

1610 **The Bailiff:** Thank you.

I was going to call Deputy Dorey next. It is getting towards 12.30. Are you going to finish before 12.30 or...?

Deputy Dorey: Yes, I can be five minutes.

1615

The Bailiff: You will be five minutes. In that case, Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Thank you Mr Bailiff.

1620 I wish to speak just on the amendment. In my manifesto, I supported the rebuilding, so I will vote for the rebuilding of La Mare Schools, although I have some reservations. I want all children to have the same quality of buildings, but I will support the amendment. I would not have until we received the e-mail from the Chief Minister. I know it is not the ideal way to go about changing an amendment by e-mail. In fact I had an amendment prepared if this amendment had been passed, to amend it to change it so it would have to come back to the States, instead of the Policy Council. But I could never have been assured that that would
1625 have been supported, so in light of the fact it would have gone just to the Policy Council, I could not have supported it, but now I can. And it is a possibility of extensive change being proposed from that review, I think that had to be considered by the Assembly. It was unacceptable just to go to the Policy Council.

The reason why I support the review, most of the points have been made, but I will just highlight them. My concerns were, firstly, on the community facilities. I think they cost, in the Billet mentions £518,000, half a million pounds. I fully support the use of school facilities for out of hours. But I find it difficult to justify spending another half million on facilities at the school to be used during school hours and I have the equal concerns as Deputy Gillson about security at the school when you have people coming in using part of the school, who have nothing to do with the school. I also have concerns about not having a swimming pool. I fully understand if it did not have a primary school. But I struggle to understand, when we have a
1635 primary school on site, and the importance of teaching children to swim on an Island, why we do not have...

I cannot understand why on page 2551, it says:

‘Establishing the LMDC site as the focus for year round indoor sports training and competition is only affordable because of the decision not to include a school swimming pool’.

1640 I think that is wrong. If we had additional money for the additional sports facilities, I would fully support them, but if the casualty is a swimming pool when we have a primary school, I find it difficult to justify.

In fact, I would have liked even more radical review, which I do not think will come out of this. Currently, there are 439 pupils at La Mare. If you look at Beaucamps, St Sampson’s and Grammar School,
1645 there are effectively 309 vacancies at those schools. They are below their maximum. And as Deputy St Pier has referred to Appendix 3, where he looks at the 12 to 16-year-olds, in 2017, when the school will open, there will be, if we do not assume the 5% growth, there will 465 surplus places within the secondary system for 12 to 16. And even if we had the 5% growth, it is 321. I fully understand that this would change by 2026. It will be 109 if we have the 5% growth. They will be 14 short. But my concern is should we be
1650 building a building to cope with a peak?

I am also concerned about if we change the 11-plus system and it seems from what I have heard today, that that will come back to this Assembly and the effect on the secondary school system if we change it. Surely, the most sensible thing would be to have that debate first before we decide, because if we are going to change the system, we should do that ahead of making a decision on a school that will last 60 years. If
1655 we are going to change the system, I would much prefer we have a lot fewer 11 to 18 schools. As I understand and as Deputy Fallaize said in his speech, they are far more attractive to attracting the best teachers. I also passionately believe, and it is from my own experience, from with my own children and talking to their teachers, that three-form primary schools are the best type of schools, because it allows them to be set by ability.

1660 Currently at La Mare Primary, there are 281 pupils. We have the Castel School, which is not that far away, which used to be a three-form school, which is now a two-form school. We have, for example, La Houquette, which is dropping down to a one-form school.

So, those are the main reasons why I will support the review. Also parishioners have also contacted me and the other Castel Deputies about whether we really do need a new road as an exit to the school. If
1665 Members turn to page 2633, you would see that there is a proposed new site, and you see that there is an exit road which goes behind the houses and comes out in Rue de La Mare de Carteret. My concern is that that road has a footpath on it, yet the road exits into a road with no footpath. It does not seem the most sensible way of having an entrance to a school.

1670 Parishioners have also contacted us about drainage and the size of the school, but parishioners have also, who passionately believe that we should go ahead with building the school. So, from listening to what I have heard and I will still listen to the summing up speeches, but I do not want to delay the school. As long as I am, from what I have heard so far, I think that we can go ahead to deal with the school, without delaying it and having this Report come back to the Assembly. As long as I am confident that can happen, I will support the amendment.

1675 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Can I just have an indication. Does anybody else wish to speak on the amendment? Deputy Burford. In that case, it will be Deputy Burford and then Deputy Sillars after lunch.
Deputy Lowe?

1680

Deputy Lowe: Sir, could I just ask and perhaps if you can give consideration over lunch, because I have great concerns about making a decision today on an e-mail that we received last night. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) You make a decision on the amendment and the propositions that are actually on this amendment. There is nothing in here that we can actually say afterwards, well, we knew what we were voting for, because we have not got a clue.

1685

The Bailiff: That would be a matter for people in... the Minister and the Deputy Chief Minister.

Deputy Lowe: Well, this is the point I am trying to make, sir. We have no ideas of the terms of reference for this review. We have no idea this review is coming back to the States, how it will come back to the States.

1690

The Bailiff: I think you have made your speech, Deputy Lowe. You cannot make a second speech.

1695

Deputy Lowe: Well, it is to try and say... It is important sir, it is a huge amount of money, and I am trying to get some answers and put them on notice. I want all of these answers because I am not voting for anything unless I have got it in writing in front of me. Forget it!

The Bailiff: We will rise for lunch and resume at 2.30.

1700

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.34 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools' site – Debate continued

The Deputy Greffier: Continuation of debate on amendment to Article XV.

The Bailiff: And I call first, Deputy Burford.

1705

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

I am still undecided on this amendment. My principal concern is this. The new Island Development Plan will come into force in the middle of 2016. With it will come many development opportunities and therefore work for the construction industry. From an economic point of view, therefore, it would make a great deal of sense, if we are going to rebuild this school, to do it sooner rather than later.

1710

Clearly there is no point in doing a review if we already know the outcome. Therefore as we cannot say now what the outcome will be, we cannot say with any certainty whether the review will mean a delay in construction. But it is certainly a risk.

And my question is, will the economic effects of such a potential risk and the risk of delaying other development be taken into account in the review?

1715

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Does anyone else wish to speak on the amendment? No.

I call then on the Minister for the Education Department to speak immediately before the Deputy Chief Minister will reply to the debate. Deputy Sillars.

1720

Deputy Sillars: Sir, thank you.

To start with, I fully accept that T&R are doing their job. The real problem for me is the lateness and the timing of this discussion.

1725 Before I start my closing speech – I know this is not it unfortunately – let me address some of the comments made by colleagues during the debate.

Many of you have questioned how much delay there would be if this amendment goes through. I need to inform you of one piece of information, of a communication that has come to me today from my very good friend, Deputy Lyndon Trott, in which he says, and he has given permission to quote:

‘I was a Board Member of the Channel Islands’ largest firm of chartered architects and chartered surveyors for eight years.’

1730 I interject here to say that in that capacity, what I am going to read has further immense weight. Deputy Trott says:

‘I strongly agree for a variety of reasons that this amendment will delay the Project for a year.’

Deputy Trott has confirmed that he is happy in the interests of fairness for me to use this. In this spirit of that confirmation, can I explain a little further why we are so sure that a delay even to the end of January 2015, let alone February or March, will cause a year’s delay to the build.

1735 A construction project goes through defined stages which are laid down in industry-accepted practices. The stage we are at is detailed design. That gives us enough information to go out to contractors to seek initial pricing for the Project tender to be evaluated. During this process further technical design is worked up by the design team to allow the contractors to refine their pricing, which then allows us to receive competitively priced tenders which we can evaluate for value for money.

1740 This process from the point when the contractors are appointed, and we have held off doing this because of the uncertainty from what has happened today, until after this debate. The earliest now, with yet another review coming ahead which is outside of the SCIP process, that we can appoint a contractor to do this work will be after the outcome of the review, which whether it is the end of February or March will still mean a delay of three to six months before the contractor can be brought on board to start.

1745 Now if, Members, you approve our Propositions today, the contractors will all be informed and they can start the process straight away, tomorrow. This will still mean a July start date, not May, and I have been assured that we will still be able to just about make the opening date in 2017.

1750 This process will take a minimum of three months to be completed. If they cannot start that work until the end of February or March then we cannot start work on the site until September next year. This guarantees one year’s delay.

It is only when we get to those final tenders back from the contractor and have fully value engineered them that we can submit ourselves to the next SCIP review, with our full business case, and it is only after that we have successfully passed that the contract can be awarded and the work can start.

1755 That is why it is clear to us that the earliest we can actually start constructing on site will be well into the autumn of 2015. This delay, at least six months, after our original programme date for construction to start, means that with a two-year construction programme the earliest we can expect handover to us to arrange for children to move into the new schools is the summer holidays of 2018.

1760 Let’s not forget we cannot move two schools and all that entails without being able to use the six weeks’ summer holidays to do this without disrupting their education. This has been the same for every one of our new school projects.

Go back to perhaps individual speeches.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, before the Minister does that, I wonder if I could ask a point of clarification.

1765 **The Bailiff:** Yes.

Deputy St Pier: I was just wondering if the Minister could perhaps confirm what I think I have heard for the first time, that Education’s own timetable has moved from a spade in the ground, which I think was the phrase he used yesterday, from May to July? And that is the first point of clarification.

1770 The second point, sir, is in relation to the two preferred contractors who are already part of the process. I would be grateful if he could just explain why the project team could not be working with them over the next two months on value engineering the current programme so there is no delay following a States’ debate in February?

1775 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Sillars.

Deputy Sillars: Yes, I would like to, very much so, sir, because it shows the lack of understanding of the process. Yes, I did confirm that we will not be able to get a spade in the ground by May because of the delay of coming to today.

1780 We have not confirmed two, or anyone else, numbers of contractors, because actually we have got nothing to ask them to do at this stage. Until they know the size of the schools we are wanting to build what on earth are they going to design? What are they going to build, until we know...? This is the point – they know at the moment what we have all gone through, and that is what this debate is all about – I see Deputy Trott is nodding his head which I am pleased to see, he knows a lot more about this than I do. But if we

1785 have to redesign it, there is no way can we actually get this up and running. We are already late.

So, just to clarify and address the historic revisionism. T&R did not accept the amendment presented by Education which would have avoided this. The proposed terms of reference were not the stumbling block and not rejected by Education. Education offered an alternative amendment which T&R felt they could not accept. For the avoidance of doubt, it will almost be impossible for the project to be completed by the opening of 2017, Deputy Kuttelwascher. Unfortunately he does not simply understand the current project's status.

1790

He also raised this morning the attendance of T&R Deputies on the La Mare de Carteret Project Board. I went and looked into the history of this. The first formal meeting of that Board was on 21st November 2012. Deputy Kuttelwascher sent his apologies and in that same meeting it was minuted that I had asked for two political representatives of T&R to join the Board. Deputy St Pier then joined Deputy Kuttelwascher on the Board. But on 5th November 2013 – so a year later – a letter was received from T&R confirming immediate withdrawal of the T&R Deputies from the La Mare Project Board and all other projects because of the potential conflicts of interest. There is still an officer from T&R who sat on this Board all the way through.

1795

1800 Deputy Queripel, thank you for your excellent speech. The amendment asked for two reviews as you note and we are continuing to do more reviews under the SCIP process.

Deputy Stewart, I am afraid there will be a delay. His figures confirm that we will have to bring in new workers and families unless the economy will stagnate and decline. I will say more about that a little later.

Deputy Green, thank you for your supportive speech, I would just like to take the opportunity that he has asked me to say that some of his words have been taken out of context and were exaggerated, and he would not have put his name to our Billet if he had not fully agreed with us.

1805

Deputy Paint – I have got your problems, because I do not know where anyone is any more (*Laughter*) – Deputy Paint, regarding flood defences we would only be spending – I say only, loosely half a million pounds if it was needed. The works we have included are based on the advice from professional engineers, employed by the States on flood risk. We would leave it out but it would only increase the risk to the school. In addition by including it we are further providing protection for the neighbours to the site.

1810

With respect to the road which is not for 24/7 public use, at the meeting with residents we confirmed that we would be looking at this again.

Deputy Brouard, we did ask for a review in early October – exactly what is being suggested now, we asked for that in October and we were told by T&R that six and a half weeks was not time enough.

1815

Deputy Fallaize, thank you for your support and we firmly believe in our figures and without doubt it will cause a year's delay.

Deputy Hunter Adam – this is very confusing – hi there! (*Laughter*) Why was Les Beaucamps built before La Mare? I do not know. I think you were, or you may have been on the Board at that time, and you might know. More importantly we are where we are. Two years of net migration. If we carry on with Deputy Stewart's 19,400 figures, then we need to boost the economy which is down to the Commerce & Employment Department.

1820

I was with you on your visit to the Forest School, and I will reiterate the Forest has the highest square metre per student and it could be even more as you saw, but that is the top of the league for size. We are fully engaged, we are *fully* engaged with the SCIP process.

1825

Deputy Domaille, our results are better than England and Wales so why do you want to reduce our parent teacher result? So why on earth would you want to go back to the UK standards?

Deputy O'Hara, thank you for your speech, and I agree it is important for Departments to work together on States' corporate strategies. It is good to see it is possible.

1830 Deputy Harwood, thank you and I can confirm the delay will cause a delay, as I have outlined.

Deputy Lowe, thank you for your support.

Back to Deputy Hunter Adam again. There are 3,300 secondary schools in England and Wales and the great majority have occupancy below capacity levels. Why? Because they need flexibility.

My very good friend, Deputy Trott. Deputy Trott had said Deputy Domaille was the only technical professional in the Assembly. I could have agreed with that statement except now we understand there are at least two on the professional side of buildings.

1835

But if it was just about surveying and quantity, this to me is the heart of the debate. One of the true professionals in this Assembly is Deputy Sherbourne, as a former headteacher, who gave an excellent speech and explained to us why we need to go for what we need.

The St Sampson's PIR saved 7%, but the real lesson from this is that we now have a school too small. Why on earth should we be proud of that? To clarify his remarks regarding the 16% premium, in quoting from a letter, we would welcome the review of the 16% premium for primary. If we did it now and it changes then we incur additional costs, and it would also mean that we add more than 16% and perhaps match the space for the Forest. We felt that was going to be a difficult decision.

Yes, we have taken into account the dimensions. In terms of damaging consequences of delay, there will be reputational damage to the contractors' market, he should know that we cannot guarantee the work for local companies, as we have to follow T&R procedural guide lines. However, we do expect and I certainly will expect, a large proportion of the spend to be on Island, if by some chance a contractor is appointed off Island.

Deputy Inglis, to clarify some of the points and questions raised. Teachers and students need fit-for-purpose, appropriately designed and specified new schools. The headteachers and staff have been inputting into the design. This is not about want. We are meeting the needs to deliver an education system we require – 'we' being Guernsey.

In the first instance the original sports needs were identified by Culture & Leisure way back in 2009. Contrary to the view, his view, Beau Séjour cannot accommodate up to 500 spectators. The basic sports facilities are standard requirements for a secondary school. SAMP initiative was all about seeking to maximise dual use of facilities. That is what we are doing. Culture & Leisure delegated meetings to the Sport Commission. That is who we met with. Culture Leisure officers also took part in T&R's Project Assurance Review. The Education Department talked to the archaeological branch of Culture & Leisure and we have a report from them. There was a survey. And just to correct some more misconceptions we have spoken to KGV, and the Cobo Community Centre. We also advised the Castel Douzaine.

Deputy Spruce, in terms of scope of the project, the T&R Minister wrote to the Department in February 2013 welcoming the scope of the project and that we were thinking more corporately and consistently with the SAMP programme.

Due process, we have followed it. Can the Chief Minister or the Deputy Chief Minister, I should say now I guess, clarify where there was a non-compliance with the SCIP process by this Department, by our Department please?

Deputy Langlois, he said his amendment was to control political risk. We offered to do this in October and a complete review. This was rejected by T&R as not having sufficient time to complete the review. We would have agreed to a joint amendment with T&R if that had guaranteed no delay.

Deputy Ogier – oh he is not here. (*Interjection*) Oh hi, hello – put that knife away! – I wish to reassure him that the Education Department did meet all the internal control procedures and completed all the reviews required by T&R. Most Deputies do not seem to realise that we are still in the SCIP process. We have now to do a full business case. More value for money reviews, all of which is confirmed in the States' Report.

I quote Proposition 3 page 2296:

'subject to satisfactory completion and review of the Full Business Case to ensure that the Project represents value for money for the States'.

We are already going to go through that. Surely this amendment is not necessary. We have to do it anyway, it just adds risk, or actually it adds one year's delay.

Deputy Gillson, to my former very good friend – (*Laughter*) No I really do not mean that. It was too good an opportunity, (*Interjection*) sorry – (*Interjection*) No I did not, you know that too. I have to reiterate the point that the amendment is going to lead to delays and contrary to the good intentions will actually drive the costs up.

We did ask a number of Departments what they wanted on the site as part of the stakeholder engagement. As we said, safeguarding our children in our care is our paramount concern and taken very seriously as it is with yours – with the Ladies' College. We are not proposing anything that would endanger our students and pupils. The common use of school facilities by the community is wide spread and common. The community facilities are isolated and separate from the main school. All sports within members of the Sports Commission have to provide a youth policy and also have to undergo police checks.

In answer to your three questions, 'Can we afford it? Do we need it? And is it value for money?', the answer is yes, yes and yes.

Deputy St Pier, Deputy Sherbourne has, I believe, answered your question about the Federation and how it will operate. We believe the preparation and the business case is all about looking at the options and developing the preferred solutions having gone through a robust and rigorous option appraisal. It would appear to me a rather perverse process if T&R allowed us to continue to spend up to £1.3 million, if it

1895 thought that Education was working on the scale, scope and specification. You referred to the refresh of the EDP – he is regrettably quoting selectively. Yes we did ask about the *vires* aspect but then we went on to say that the refresh had been considered by the Board and was endorsed by the States with Education Board's Vision Education that the Assembly supported unanimously in July 2013.

1900 We have done the refresh and that review has led to a reduction in capacity and area. We have removed the swimming pool, which was an original component of the high school provision. We have responded to the States' strategic direction of travel that we should maximise the use of school facilities by the inclusion of other agencies in the use of the buildings.

1905 Deputy St Pier is aware that the SCIP process is iterative and the key documents that are pertinent at this stage are the outline business case. And the most recent project assurance review. Which says 'this is a well-managed and compelling business case.' He talked about a number of changes to the outline business case. Indeed there were as we responded to the comments from the reviewers. There were no substantive changes to the OBC at that late stage.

1910 This is clear if you read the Project Assurance Review Report and all that was said was that we needed to update by the date of this debate the revenue implications, and as far as we could at this stage of the Project's development. It should be made clear the overwhelming view of the T&R appointed panel was that the Project should be regarded as green and would have been designated as such were it not for the revenue costs that were still awaited.

The changes on the Saturday morning he referred to, involved simply repeating a sentence in the main body of the report in the executive summary as requested by the reviewers.

1915 How did we get to this date? What went wrong? The answer is clear to me. T&R relied on the project assurance process, which is what the States approved, as the proper quality assessment process. Now that it has given them the answer they do not seem to like, they are crying foul.

1920 Our complaint is that if they were not going to accept the findings of the review process they should have engaged more actively over the last 18 months. We pleaded with them to remain on the Project Board to no avail.

Deputy St Pier is wrong. The issue was raised by the CYPP Implementation Group. Education is on that Group, and unfortunately the Policy Council Paper in that respect was wrong.

1925 Deputy St Pier is wrong about the sports tourism. Education did talk to the Commerce & Employment officers and they confirmed the indirect benefit multiplier for the economic appraisal of the outline business case. We consulted with your staff, Deputy Stewart.

Deputy St Pier is wrong in my mind about the reports. They are the T&R reviews, they commissioned the reports.

Deputy St Pier is wrong about the budget for this project. Money has been put aside for the Project, as it had been prioritised.

1930 Our proposals for the College of Further Education were originally bumped as there was not enough money. And we were working with T&R to do that. There was £22 million in our original project for the CFE, and we want to work with T&R, and we have worked with T&R. We agreed to reduce that down to perhaps £5 million or £6 million, for which we are going through the process.

1935 Let me refer to the paragraph of the SCIP Billet July 2014: all pipeline projects represent robust strategic options – that was in July 2014 – have identified benefits, have reasonable cost estimates, it considers that these projects are the right projects to be included in the Capital Investment Portfolio. The La Mare de Carteret proposals are in that portfolio.

1940 With respect to affordability we can only finalise this once we get to the next stage of the full business case. We will mitigate the increases through income generation and if necessary we will have either to absorb any additional costs or seek additional funding in the 2017 Budget. But we will continue to refine these figures as we continue to work. We have demonstrated the cost implications of lower specifications. It does mean higher costs.

Sitting on the project boards allowed them to challenge and help inform the process, which is something we regret.

1945 I am pleased to say Deputy St Pier is right on one thing. We are doing value management and it is an ongoing process.

Deputy Soulsby, post-implementation reviews have all been published and are in the public domain. We are working with the States Property Services and the Beaucamps High School is due to commence in January, and it should take six to eight weeks.

1950 The lessons learnt from the previous PIRs and the experience at the Beaucamps have adopted and been used in this latest project. Please understand that with many other Departments' capital projects, the deadlines of completion on the PIR often has to take place with other competing priorities. Let us be clear that the formal process for Beaucamps within a year of practical conclusion is still not finalised because the year following practical completion concludes in February 2015. The PAC were advised of this fact by officers of T&R.

1955

The OBS was submitted and we were asked to update it as part of the normal process in one particular area the revenue implications. What he does not understand is that those revenue implications will be under review until the final design detail is worked up and the final operating and maintenance regimes are concluded. It is important for the States to note that they are looking for answers that cannot be given until the tender is in and the final design is concluded.

I strongly recommend that the expert panel's conclusion be remembered. 'This is an exceptionally well managed project with compelling business case justification to proceed.' This flies in the face of all the suggestions that we have not conducted this process properly. How many reviews do we want before T&R succeeds in getting their want?

Deputy Perrot, I am glad he understood caring and nurturing, and that he had a good educational experience. I mean that. We are of course trying to replicate those wonderful experiences that you describe Hautes Capelles as in all of our schools. He said that education is more about teaching than buildings. Why do you think the teachers are so adamant that their facilities need to be improved – the professionals? The reason why we have designed these buildings in the way we have is that we want the maximum amount of inclusion of the community, commerce, and the voluntary sector representatives in the provision of education. This is precisely why we need the areas we have defined in the two schools, because of their participation in the learning process. It will not be replaced on time if this procrastination leads to a review which will definitely delay.

Treasury, of course, has a job to do. Our complaint is that they have not done that job in the time. We believe that the Project Assurance Process indicated that the project was proceeding to the satisfaction of T&R. The question has to be why these questions were not raised during the process rather than at the last possible moment?

Not followed the sequence and has submitted a States Report prior to the completion of the OBC. This reschedule was agreed with T&R and we have not made up our own minds, we agreed all the dates together, with their approval.

Alderney Representative Jean, education and not being defensive: with the information we have, the knowledge we have, we are just passionate about getting it through to you, so please do not take this as being offensive. I would also like to say we have not said we will resign. I would also say that we have heard rumours that maybe some T&R Members may resign, so there is a lot of rumour about. What I would like to say is if there are any resignations from either Board it will be down to their own conscience and I sincerely hope that no-one will feel the need to resign, as we are all doing our jobs to the best of our ability (*Interjections*)

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Jean.

Alderney Representative Jean: Point of clarification.

I did not mean that you were offensive to me or that I was offended, not at all. Somehow that has been misconstrued. No, not at all, I never took any offence, anything that you have said.

Deputy Sillars: Thank you very much for your clarification and support.

Deputy Gollop – (*Laughter*) Deputy Gollop, a brilliant speech, it was much appreciated. I certainly appreciated it. I hope the rest of us appreciated it, because it was an important history lesson which clarifies to me why we are where we are.

Deputy Dorey, over the years we have occasionally adjusted catchment areas where there is a shortfall in certain areas. St Sampson's is overcrowded. We all know that. There will be an opportunity to move some children from the crowded conditions of St Sampson, but only if and when La Mare de Carteret is built, and fit for purpose. And parents will feel confident that their children will get the same experience and equality of opportunity.

I have covered the road, I think.

So to sum up, sorry this is taking a little while. An overwhelming theme of questions today has been will this proceed – I will just cut through that because I think I have made it very clear that there will be a delay if the amendment – this is good...

I think this is somewhere to start. This amendment recommends applying a rigorous financial check to the project to make sure it offers best value. It is in laymen's terms it says we have not done our sums right. That is nonsense, the cost of this project has been scrupulously examined at every step, and includes two rigorous value-for-money reviews appointed by T&R, and my friends from T&R are well aware of that, because they have been involved in the Project Teams from the start.

I find it troubling just two weeks ago, perhaps four weeks ago, after years of planning, at one minute to midnight in the timescale of this project, they decide that now is the time to impose an extra unnecessary layer of bureaucratic oversight. If I could just make a number of comments on the timing and motivation of this amendment, actually I think I have probably covered that.

I just want to go through some of the points in the SCIP process. T&R's guidance on the Project Assurance states:

'The Project Assurance Review is to assist Treasury & Resources in its governance and assurance role in protection of the public purse'.

No-one is going to disagree with that –

'The reviews in no way take responsibility from the sponsoring Department to the States for the successful delivery of their project and in achieving and demonstrating value for money and delivering the project benefits.'

2020 That is what their Report says. And what precisely does T&R's independent project assurance team say about the project. The review team's assessment is that:

'This is an exceptionally well planned and managed project with strong stakeholder support providing compelling business justification for proceeding.'

We are confident that we have this right. So I ask you why now, just a matter of weeks, in some cases just days before coming to present our proposals to you for your approval, did T&R start raising questions about the size, scope, specification of the project? These are questions that should have been asked right at the start of the process nearly two years ago. And we could have answered those questions.

2025 The highly experienced construction industry professionals involved in the project are astounded at this turn of events. They have pointed out that the scope and scale of the project is what the capital prioritisation bids stage completed in March 2013 and the strategic outline case stage presented to T&R's SCIP in January 2014 are designed to approve and confirm. So let's be clear where we are in the process. And we are in a process. The request for an independent review as suggested in this amendment follows completion and passing of our SCIP strategic outline case and outline business case reviews. Which themselves have included each time a value for money review by the independent cost consultant.

2030 The wide ranging value management review proposed by this amendment should have been commissioned at the original brief in 2013, and not left until considerable design, procurement, statutory planning, community engagement have all been undertaken.

2035 To question the brief at this late stage will delay the project, I have explained that. It will remove the project team from effective delivery of the scheme and damage the project's reputation and the community contractors and suppliers. It is a repeat but it is worth it.

2040 Not only did we invite two T&R political Members to be on the Board, we advised them that stepping down of the T&R Members from that project board is a key risk, and was highlighted as such in the risk schedule and has weakened the project team, I fully accept that.

The time scale of completing the independent review by 31st March or even 31st January which the Chief Minister suggests *may* be possible, are in our view impossible, given the need to appoint suitable experts – I have covered that really.

2045 We did... oh, I have done that.

I think really I am just going to get towards the end, you will be pleased to hear.

2050 Just one point. The business of transferring the children to the new schools with all their legacy equipment and the need to re-use IT equipment and maintain internet connectivity all of which has to remain in use in the schools until the date of their closure. This means that the only viable period to avoid disruption to schools teaching and learning is the summer holiday period.

Let's not forget we are talking about two schools and our children with the communication and autism difficulties, so a significant number of children and staff. You will therefore be looking at a delay to the Project until September 2018 before the new buildings can be occupied. Yet another year's delay we know.

Just an interesting point in the SCIP. This is what they say:

'It is important to state it is the clear intention that no additional processes or outputs will be required to be put on any project that a well-managed project utilising good practice would not normally incorporate.'

2055 We know we have done that.

We appreciate that this is a significant investment for the States and it is the largest single project in T&R's Capital Portfolio. It is also particularly important for the Island's construction industry. Education Department has sought the views of C&E's Construction Industry Forum as the state of the market and is prospectus for 2015.

2060 We have been advised there are several major private projects coming to an end in 2015. The Guernsey Housing Association's stock of properties will be developed. It is coming to an end with five out of the six sites finishing in February 2015.

The Construction Industry Forum believe that apart from the La Mare de Carteret the States have no real major construction projects in the pipeline.

2065 The C&E's Construction Industry Forum believe that the deal in the Island's development Plan review has done nothing but harm for the confidence of developers and individuals to move forward.

The Construction Industry Forum have commented that the lack of incoming people to the Open Market has considerably reduced the work from that source.

2070 The Commerce & Employment's Construction Industry Forum have informed us that individual Islanders and developers are finding it even harder either (a) to obtain finance or (b) to have the confidence or indeed both to invest in their homes and developments.

2075 The Construction Industry Forum have told us that for these reasons you will have worked out that the local construction industry is reliant on the La Mare de Carteret as a major development for them in 2015 and 2016 and therefore would be very supportive of Education in promoting the development of the new school.

The Construction Industry Forum has told us also that what is clear that is until the Island Development Plan is released, discussed and passed, and then Islanders, developers and banks gain confidence in the Guernsey economy that the construction industry is going to struggle.

2080 Realistically, as I think the Environment Minister supported, it will take two years for the IDP to work its way through and therefore La Mare de Carteret will be vital to the industry during that time, and of course that should mean a good price for the States.

This project is vital for our economy and one of our most important sectors, and I would hope that all Members of Commerce & Employment Board Members in particular will support this project and give a well needed stimulus to the construction industry.

2085 I confess I find it bizarre that T&R allowed Education to spend £1.3 million on the design and planning to date of which £750,000 was given to us in June of this year, June 2014. We asked for it and we received it to continue this process. So knowing full well that the scale, scope and design of the development to be.

There always knew the plans and implications and yet at no point did they express any concerns or raise any questions or ask any meetings to provide additional information.

2090 The logical conclusion to their challenge is that the fate of the project is placed in the hands of independent assessors. In other words the decision on the future of a vital amenity, an amenity which will serve high school, primary school children, pre-schoolers, children with autism, the Island's sportsmen and women for many years to come, will be decided away from this Chamber by men and women who have no democratic mandate to decide anything.

2095 Deputies, this would be a shameful neglect of our responsibilities. The people of Guernsey sent us here to take the big decisions, and it is our duty to carry out that responsibility with diligence with regard to the future of this Island. We stand or fall by these decisions. What we do not do is hand off the tougher ones to others.

2100 When we came to the Assembly for the Primary Transformation debate we asked you to vote with your heads rather than your hearts. Well, we asked you to do the right thing then and we are asking you to do exactly the same thing now.

On this occasion we want your heads and your hearts to inform your decision. We have demonstrated the value for money and been subject to independent reviews by T&R's consultants. There is a compelling business case. It does stack up and it is morally right, the thing to do for our children and these children.

2105 Thank you, sir. (*Applause*)

The Bailiff: Deputy Stewart.

Deputy Stewart: Sir, point of correction if I may, sir.

2110 **The Bailiff:** Yes.

2115 **Deputy Stewart:** Just about the discussions on sports tourism between our officers, the last piece of correspondence I have and it just took me a while to find the email, was dated 3rd November between Head of Marketing and Tourism, and the Chief Officer at Education, Deputy Sillars and Deputy Le Lièvre were copied in on this e-mail, and I will just quote a very short paragraph. It says:

'The point Kevin makes that whilst the figures may broadly and correctly reflect the value of sports tourists may contribute to the tourism industry, the figures presented do not show how the new sports facilities at the La Mare de Carteret will help to generate any material incremental value for the tourism industry. You and I...'

– that is the two officers, my Head of Tourism and Chief Officer at Education –

2120 'You and I discussed this during our meeting and we were of the same opinion.'

Thank you, sir.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, could I make a point of correction?

The Bailiff: Yes.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, point of correction.

The Propositions of the amendment are clear, that is to approve in principle the La Mare de Carteret School redevelopment project, and Proposition 2 is to direct Treasury & Resources to provide further interim funding, further interim project funding up to the full business case stage in order for the specialist project team to be retained.

Sir, I suggest that Deputy Sillars is in danger of misleading this Assembly, sir, with his statement that this amendment will lead to a delay. There is no reason, sir, why the team cannot continue as of tomorrow if this amendment is passed (**A Member:** Speech!) – it is a point of correction – it is a point of correction, sir. Because it is critical because it was central to Deputy Sillars' opening of his closing speech, that there is no reason, sir, why the team cannot continue with its work from tomorrow. The funding is there and the project is approved in principle.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sillars, do you want to respond to those two points?

Deputy Sillars: Yes, okay. The first point with Deputy Stewart, there have been meetings. Deputy O'Hara joined in on the conversation about the benefits of sports tourism. We were disappointed, I cannot deny, but I do not believe that our Chief Officer agreed that the figures we had were wrong. So, I cannot really comment on that.

More importantly though, or as important I should say – point of correction – the whole point, it seems to be the whole of this debate is actually about a delay. If we go straight forward with it... and actually the amendment we tried to bring with T&R would allow us to do that. We could not agree, I accept that. There were a few words we could not quite sort out. But we have to... The delay will be by not... We have still got more work to do, we accept that, as I have said in my speech. And that can be done.

We can then appoint the potential contractors to compete and work out the value – it is a valued process we are doing for the building. They can go on with that.

The point is unless these builders know what on earth they are bidding for... If they are bidding for a 600 school, a 16% increase as per our Billet, then yes they can get on. We always said there will be a delay of a couple of months, and I repeat it, you have brought it up, Deputy St Pier, why was it May to July? I explained that at that time.

So even with going full speed ahead now, we will still not get a spade in the ground until July. There is that delay.

But if there is any... because these contractors we do not dare get them let loose, because they have no idea what they are going to build. They do not know the size. They do not know anything that is going to happen. They do not know if they are doing a 480, a 420, a 600, an 800, we have no idea. So they will have to start all over again.

Now, it may be a tweak, but actually when you have got architects, it has got to be redesigned. A school is not just about an office block, all sorts of things have to then be brought into account, whether it is corridors, the size of the schools, the buildings, the exam halls and all those things. So the whole thing will have to be looked at again.

And I think I have made it very, very clear that there is no way this can go through without the delay if we do not approve our Billet today.

Thank you, sir.

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, may I make a small point of correction –

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: – and ask Deputy Langlois a question, sir, before he sums up?

In terms of the point of correction, I think Deputy St Pier was potentially misleading the States because it was accepted by the Chief Minister when he circulated his amendment that it was an amendment which had to be circulated more than seven days before the meeting at which it was to be considered. The reason for that is because it engages the Rule which says that an amendment to a Proposition which may have the effect of altering the timing of any works has to be circulated seven days in advance. So I think that is the acceptance of the proposer of the amendment, it may result in the delay of the project.

The question I would like to put to Deputy Langlois before he sums up is: 'would he please explain to the States, because I think it is unclear in the amendment, what the sequence of events would be that the amendment would trigger?' So could he be very, very clear when he sums up please what the sequence of

event will be, who will do what, what is it that the Policy Council will propose, or what the contents of the Propositions if the end report will be etc. —?

The Bailiff: This is going into a speech, Deputy —

Deputy Fallaize: Well, I am trying not to have to interrupt Deputy Langlois when he speaks, but if he is not absolutely clear about the sequence of events, I will stand up at the end of his speech and ask him what the sequence of events are.

The Bailiff: The Deputy Chief Minister will reply to the debate in the absence of the Chief Minister who has had to leave the Island on States' business.
Deputy Langlois.

Deputy Langlois: Thank you very much, sir.

Sir, this has been a very intense and passionate debate. It has left us with a clear decision to make and two opposing views which have been presented to us. I think it is very difficult for those outside of this Assembly in this room, to understand the level of concentration that has gone into the debate. I do not want to paint a picture for anybody outside to imagine that the place is nearly half empty; we are not the House of Commons after all. And I have never seen such a high level of attendance throughout the debate in my time in the States and that is how much it has engaged everybody.

I think importantly, and I hope that I am right with this observation, I think everybody has been listening as well. That again, I am not pointing out as something unusual, but it has been a rather more intense level of listening than on some occasions. And especially two people who have listened carefully are the Chief Minister and the Deputy Chief Minister. The Chief Minister not since a few hours ago because he has had to leave to attend the British Irish Council meeting in the Isle of Man, and travelling to the Isle of Man is almost a full day's work.

Apart from some process distractions, there are two clear positions in this debate. This is where the vision of Education meets the fiscal caution of T&R. That is what it is about. There are some other issues that need to be mentioned. But nevertheless, let's not lose sight of that as the main point.

Using the rather risky quote from some time ago in American politics 'read my lips', *I want the La Mare de Carteret schools rebuilt as soon as possible*, and that has been said by virtually everybody, and I am sure those who have not actually stated it in as many words believe it.

Now what the amendment does, and to anticipate some questions later on, what the amendment does it enables the reassurance of this financial review. Whether I will be able to satisfy certain questions regarding the precise details of the next steps remains to be seen. But the point is that the urgency of this is absolutely apparent, sir, from the conversations that have gone on, the speeches, the exchanges over the last few days. And all of the exchanges led to the placing of the Amendment and the discussion as to whether it could emerge in a form that could be accepted by all parties.

Does it carry a risk of delay? Yes. Deputy Fallaize is absolutely right to point out that the Rule whatever it is, sub, sub, sub (e), or whatever, or bullet point 3, led us to place that amendment just in time. Seven working days before this meeting.

And ultimately when you come to vote, you will be making a judgement call, on what the level of that risk is. If you vote in favour of the amendment you accept that risk, which in my view obviously, I would say is small. I would not place an amendment placing enormous risk on the events. Bearing in mind my previous statement, if there is a no to the amendment, the risk is of making a wrong decision on a one-in-60-years value for money...

The timing issue, we are being told of an inevitable delay, opinions on this vary. We have been told by others that there is not necessarily any delay. Especially if the review confirms the Education design of which the Education Department is so confident is the right design. Yes, there is a risk; my information is that the delay is not inevitable. Education can choose to continue work on the core part of the design in the interim. There is no question about that. That work will continue. And that is why I and the Chief Minister have given the States an absolute undertaking that this will return to the States in February in an emergency Billet.

There are rules, reasons why it is not being incorporated in the amendment, because the possibility of that, or the reality of that, has emerged since the amendment was discussed, since it was published. And to suspend the Rules to make that change we did not think was appropriate. The reason we have done it, the reason we have given it is (a) because we listened and (b) because, as pointed out, the States are sovereign in these matters and therefore within that time scale you can bring it back to the States.

The other aspect of this is that if anybody throws any doubt on the integrity of either myself or the Chief Minister and their willingness to fall in line with seeing through that undertaking, we now have *Hansard* which we did not have some years ago. I have heard some fairly ancient precedents mentioned, I mention

no names. We now have *Hansard* – the undertaking is there in public. It is being broadcast right now and that will happen.

So, why are we here, the point at which we are? Well it is clear the timing and sequence of the processes have not been perfect. We are not here to run a review on how the SCIP process worked which day who received what, how long before a meeting and so on, although we have heard an awful lot about it over the last 24 hours. And it is clear from the misunderstandings or from the distance that the two Committees are apart that that has not worked perfectly.

Policy Council and T&R in their role as reviewers prior to a States' Report which resulted in this case in an unprecedented 10-page letter of comment. Policy Council and T&R had very little time to work on those. That is the reality. That is the where the Reports went.

There has clearly been, I would say, a level of intransigence on the part of both Committees, and we have heard some comments about that in the last day. I do not want to add fuel to that fire. I simply want to point out that it takes two to tango in that sort of problem arising.

And so, the Chief Minister and I were left with a last minute role in this, taking on the responsibility of leadership of the Policy Council. It became clear to us that a form of mediation and form of other option was needed. We feared that if we came in to here and there was a straight forward confrontation in the States took place, that because of the problems and the uncertainty relating to cost and the current economic situation that the rebuilding would be lost and people would be sent back to square one which is something neither of us want to see. And as I have said I do not think anybody in here would want to see.

So we tried to work out how could independent mediation/review be used with minimum risk of delay and minimum use of excess spend. The wording of the amendment was designed to minimise delay. Of course, as soon as you do that, in this environment you are accused of executive Government and all sorts of nasty crimes, which is way beyond, way beyond, the scope of what we are talking about here. That has now been solved by saying this will come back to the States.

There is an absolute commitment by the Chief Minister and myself to bring this back to the States in February, that is on the public record, and if I say it many more times it is going to get tedious.

Far from a threat to democracy, which has been suggested at one point in this debate, this is leadership and co-ordination in action, which we are asked for all the time.

So, if we move briefly to mentioning some of the key speakers' points, we heard from a neurotic Treasury Minister... sorry, the Treasury Minister, as Minister of a neurotic Department I should say, now labelled. I think we have also heard an awful lot about experts and professionals. There are education experts and professionals, fine, it is good, we need people like that. There are finance experts and professionals in Treasury & Resources and we need people like that. There are project management experts and professionals, partly in Treasury & Resources, partly independent people. We need people like that. But, ultimately we are here as politicians making judgements calls about how we see the relative positions of those difference experts, and 'there ain't no rights and wrongs, I am afraid, folks!' This is where the judgement call and real political judgement falls and neither should there be any grudge about which judgement each of us makes today.

We move on from the Treasury Minister with his label to our forensic friend, Peter Gillson, whose research must have occupied him in many happy hours and much internet time. I would not like to have his broadband bill, but... Deputy Gillson I think helped us hugely yesterday, because, although at the end of his speech he clearly came down on – declared his own interest in terms of coming down on one side of the argument, he gave a very, very balanced set of facts, and that is a huge skill which many of us could learn from.

We heard from our holistic friend, Deputy Le Clerc who said we have got to look at the bigger picture we cannot just spend money piecemeal. And that is I think a good lesson to be incorporated into all this.

And then we hear from our legalistic colleague, Deputy Perrot. Good job he is legalistic in his career pattern, and he went through it again in very logical manner. I think it is important to note because of other comments that were made that it is very important to note his comments on people who want to see the money spent up to whatever limit is necessary on a social project of this sort, do not have a monopoly on compassion. Please do not accuse anybody who either votes for this amendment or questions and challenges the cost to the Island of not caring or not caring about the children.

Deputy Perrot introduced the concept of reasonableness, because we by that stage in the debate were hearing an awful lot of polar opposites, a little bit of hyperbole had crept in as it does when people get worked up. A little bit of exaggeration, and in true lawyer fashion he started using the test of reasonableness and saying what we are asking for is a move not from A to Z, but potentially to review whether we must challenge it to see if we should move from A to B or C. And that is what this is about. It is not a completely one side or another decision.

And Deputy Perrot in his judgement reiterated the time assurance that this will not necessarily mean delay.

We had some scare tactics that worried Alderney Representative Louis Jean, because he quite rightly got up later on and said let's not get all worked up about possible resignations all over the place. This is a healthy debate, there is a disagreement – funnily enough, that is what a debating chamber is about, the clue is in the name. It is debating two different points of view, and so I share with him the view that any talk of resignations or whatever is really not appropriate.

We then had a list of questions from Deputy Queripel. I am afraid I lost track about half way through the list. I did ask him this morning if I could check on the list and I will answer in detail because I may as well do it now, because you know full well that if I do not, he will stand up and ask them again. And Deputy Queripel sent me the list, on this rather fetching piece of yellow paper, by the way. It looks like quite an expensive pad to me. It is called a legal pad I believe, I do not know what conclusions we draw from that. (*Interjection*) What criteria will the review employ that the Department themselves did not employ? Challenging the population numbers and assumptions as well as the space standards. Those will be the challenges within the review.

What will the Chief Minister and Deputy Langlois do to ensure that vital dialogue takes place? More of the same that we have been doing right up to this point. It has been hard work and it has been a period of time in which you constantly have to keep on talking to people and using that mediation technique that I became rather too familiar with on another project recently.

Will the project team be involved in the review? Of course they will. Any independent reviewer has got to talk with the project team. They cannot do the review without involving the people who have done the work. So that is clear.

We then went into an area of some misunderstanding. Anybody who has not been familiar with this type of project and project management, value engineering is something that starts... I fully accept in terms of the layout – sorry, because of the way we lay out... 'amendments', that is the word I am looking for!. Because of the way an amendment is laid out, it has paragraph 1, paragraph 2, (a), (b), (c), (d) or whatever it is, and that is not an indication of the sequential set of steps. Value engineering starts the moment that a project is gaining momentum, and finishes certainly in some technicians views, some technical builders views, does not finish until about two years after the place has been opened. In other words all the snagging process is also subject to value engineering. Because when something I do not know falls off the wall or whatever, then you have got various options for repairing it and the cost of those options should be considered. So value engineering is a long ongoing process. It is not something that has to follow the first one; it is something that you are constantly working at, especially in a project of this complexity.

And therefore that answers the next question: shouldn't a date have been applied to the delivery of value management exercise? No, because the date is when the thing is delivered and although there will be target dates for the delivery of the building they will not necessarily be held or they may be even come earlier and therefore you do not set a date for the end of that up front.

When does the first spade go in the ground? Well, it depends who you believe and when you hear them say it. Like Deputy St Pier, I heard somebody say yesterday that the first spade would go in the ground on 1st May or early in May, that seems to have shifted today – that is what we will define.

Deputy Sillars' standpoint. I do not intend to start responding to all his responses to everybody else's questions, because we will be here forever. But I did want to pick up on one thing.

First of all, can I say that as somebody who was on the Education Board when St Sampson's was built I thoroughly and totally understand the frustration. We had quite a demanding Treasury & Resources Department at that time, chaired by a present Member of the Assembly, nay very demanding, who changed things fairly early on, and then changed them again, and then changed them at the last minute, and quite rightly the school ended up in a slightly different shape from where it started. In hindsight people are now questioning what was right and wrong about those interventions. But that is the way big projects work. Of course you have got to look back and say what lessons have we learned and so on. So I do understand your frustration. You think you are there and then suddenly you get pulled back again. Such is life with projects of this sort.

But please, Deputy Sillars, let's not forget the headline figure here of £65 million including inflation, because that is what we are talking about today.

Early in Deputy Sillars' speech, he outlined, and he did it on various interviews earlier in the week, a whole load of things as if they were sort of necessary evils – 'oh, we have got £6 million on this, and we have got £12 million on that and oh, because the ground is muddy we have got to do this,' and so on, as if, if you added them up in a different way, you would get to a different answer. No, we are talking about £65 million and I know they all come as separate components of the cost but they are all absolutely necessary.

Deputy Sillars: Sir, could I have a point of clarification?

The Bailiff: Deputy Sillars.

2365 **Deputy Sillars:** Sorry to interrupt.

The point of making it, we had been told by a lot of people that they could build schools for £20 million or £30 million, the point is it was all to do with the internet connectivity, it was all to do with the furniture, it was all to do with all sorts of other things. That is a huge amount of money, I fully agree with that. It was not just about building two schools, if you like.

2370 **Deputy Langlois:** Absolutely, and the point I am making is that £65 million is the bottom line.

Deputy Fallaize, subtly exaggerated language, the amendment is apparently not legitimate. I am fascinated by that phrase. I do not want him to explain it at length. Please do not. But it is the term 'not legitimate'. I am sorry, for the Chief Minister and Deputy Chief Minister to bring an amendment has got to be legitimate in our system. So let's not get hung up on words like that. And I did find *touché* because it is usually the opposite way round from the way he and I usually are. I did find the words well intentioned, if somewhat patronising, but there we are.

Deputy Sherbourne led up to a point in his speech where he said... I am not sure if he said he was disturbed by this, but his whole body language and tone was that he was disturbed by it. This Assembly seems to be achieving or adopting a fiscal mind set. Well, good-oh, folks! Most of us stood on the grounds of saying we have got to balance the books and that does not just mean the General Revenue Account. That means long term sustainability of our finances. And if this Assembly has got a fiscal mind set, then I am really, really pleased. I have not quite seen final proof of that –

2385 **Deputy Sherbourne:** Point of clarification, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sherbourne.

Deputy Sherbourne: Obviously I would need to check *Hansard* but I suggested that this Assembly has been dominated by a fiscal mind set which is slightly different.

Deputy Langlois: Thank you very much. Thank you for the clarification, because that sounds even better. If we have been dominated by a fiscal mind set, that is all right by me.

I think in a number of those speeches with the passionate supporters of the immediate build of this project at the currently estimated price, then I would simply remind people yet again that political passion does not make pound notes grow on trees. And all the political passion has got to be expressed, but there is a bottom line here.

Sir, I think there is little point in doing anything other than summing up what I saw as the main points here. I am sorry the Chief Minister has not been able to come here and finish the summing up. I hope I have done the amendment justice.

I think we are here in an area of decision theory, risk analysis. Right. There are two types of error I have learnt a long time ago, in relation to management decisions. I can never remember which is labelled A and which is labelled B, but it is not really very relevant. The first type of error can be illustrated by talking about going out and saying I want to cross the road, I want to cross the avenue, and I really do not want to walk to either the top or the bottom to use those funny traffic light things. I am standing by the avenue and I want to get to the other side, and I can make two errors in that decision. I can either stand back and be terribly cautious and suddenly realise there was quite a big enough gap to get across but if I make that error all I have done is wasted a small amount of time and I am still alive. The alternative is that I can look left and right make a wrong judgement on the speed at which a bus if there happened to be one round is passing and I can go under that bus. That is a more serious type of error.

Let's go for the first of those. Let's go for the review. Let's go to the cautious end of the world here today, and please support this amendment, and I am sure when we get there, sir, we will want a recorded vote.

2415 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

Would Deputy Langlois please explain the sequence of events that he envisages would be triggered, in particular if the States approve No. 3 and No. 6 in the amendment which he is seconding, please?

2420 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Langlois, do you wish to respond?

Deputy Langlois: Sir, I am only reading in case I have missed something within these words which clearly Deputy Fallaize may be reading into it, and I have not. It says:

‘To direct the Treasury & Resources Department, in consultation with the Education Department’.

2425 – that to me implies they have got to talk about it –

‘to commission an independent review’,

and the purpose of that will be to determine the most appropriate scale, to present a report no later than 31st March setting out the conclusions to the Policy Council for consideration and approval. Now since then the undertaking has been given that we will report back to the States in February and therefore that ‘no later than the 31st March’ will to my mind cease to have meaning. Does that answer your question?

2430

Deputy Fallaize: So will the Policy Council lay before the States the review, which is one thing, or will the Policy Council lay before the States the review and any recommendations about the school redevelopment project which they consider appropriate having taken into account the review? Those two things are quite materially different.

2435

Deputy Langlois: I would say almost certainly it will be the second of those two. There could be circumstances in which it depends on what the review says, in which the review is so self-explanatory that it will come with the recommendation saying, ‘There you are – get on with it.’

2440

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Sir, could the Deputy Chief Minister please explain to us who would be doing the review, how they will be selected and who will be selecting them?

2445

The Bailiff: Deputy Langlois.

Deputy Langlois: I refer you back to the wording to direct the Treasury & Resources Department in consultation with the Education Department to commission an independent review. Can I say who will do the independent review? No. Because we are directing two bodies to go away and appoint somebody independent.

2450

The Bailiff: We come to the vote then, Members, to the amendment proposed by Deputy Le Tocq seconded by Deputy Langlois, and there has been a request for a recorded vote.

2455

There was a recorded vote.

The Deputy Greffier: Voting this month begins with the South East District.

2460

Carried – Pour 26, Contre 18, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3

POUR

Deputy Soulsby
Deputy Luxon
Alderney Rep. Jean
Alderney Rep. Harvey
Deputy Harwood
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Domaille
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Stewart
Deputy Gillson
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Ogier
Deputy Trott
Deputy David Jones
Deputy Spruce
Deputy Duquemin
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Paint
Deputy James
Deputy Adam
Deputy Perrot
Deputy Wilkie
Deputy De Lisle
Deputy Inglis

CONTRE

Deputy Sillars
Deputy O'Hara
Deputy Quin
Deputy Hadley
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Robert Jones
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Sherbourne
Deputy Conder
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Le Lièvre
Deputy Collins
Deputy Green
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Burford

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Deputy Storey
Deputy Bebb
Deputy Le Tocq

The Bailiff: Well, Members of the States, the result of the vote on the amendment proposed by Deputy Le Tocq seconded by Deputy Langlois was 26 votes in favour, 18 against and I declare the amendment carried.

Deputy Sillars.

Deputy Sillars: Could I ask for a short adjournment for my Board to get together and understand what we want to do next.

The Bailiff: I propose there be – you are asking for five minutes, ten minutes?

Deputy Sillars: Fifteen would be good.

The Bailiff: Fifteen.

Deputy Sillars: Less than 15, but 15.

The Bailiff: Shall we say we will resume at 4.00 p.m.? I put that to Members. Those in favour, those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: We will resume at 4.00 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 3.48 p.m.
and resumed at 4.00 p.m.*

**Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools' site –
Debate continued**

The Bailiff: Well, Members, there are no further amendments, so we will continue with general debate.

Deputy Duquemin: Thank you, sir.

I know Deputy Sillars in his speech mentioned heads and hearts making a decision, but it was with a heavy heart that I did vote in favour of the amendment, but I am certain it was the right way to go.

Now, sir, obviously assuming that the amendment is passed as the new Proposition, my attention will turn to the terms of reference that the independent review will have to ensure that it reaches the correct conclusion.

My worry, sir, to put it bluntly is that the independent reviews red pen will scribble out things on the plan for the new schools at La Mare de Carteret that I believe will have merit, and provide the Island and the taxpayers that we have spoken about very often during debate with much needed value for money.

Mr Bailiff, it will not surprise colleagues that as both a Member of Culture & Leisure and also the political representative on the Guernsey Sports Commission, I will concentrate my analysis today on the sporting facilities, and more specifically the sports hall with the spectator seating.

My concern is that sport may be the sacrificial lamb in this whole process and that that is what will then be brought to the debate at the February States' meeting.

Sir, Culture & Leisure and the Guernsey Sports Commission were both consulted extensively during the development process and I was impressed to see the inclusion of spectator seating – 270 permanent seats with the ability to increase capacity up to 500, as part of the final plans for the site.

If Deputy Gillson perhaps was doing the review he would already have the lid off his big red marker pen and perhaps those seats would never see the light of day. But I hope to convince Members and perhaps instil in the minds of those creating the terms of reference for the review that they should be considered.

For me these seats have the ability to deliver positive economic, educational and social outcomes, and this is the reason why they should be considered by the review.

Positive economic outcomes can be derived from people off Island, positive educational outcomes can be derived for students living on Island, everywhere on the Island, and importantly positive social outcomes can be and must be brought about for those living in the local area.

Let's start with the positive economic outcomes derived from people off Island. The club level indoor facilities will attract competitions and visitors to Guernsey. Deputy O'Hara yesterday was right to, I put in

my speech, enthusiastically highlight this fact, and perhaps Deputy Inglis was also right to slightly temper his Minister's enthusiasm by looking at what might be the incremental gain over what we have got now at Beau Séjour. But I have no doubt that there is a solid case, financial case, that the £1.7 million extra for the spectator seating can be justified. Many doubt the value of sports tourism, including today Deputy Stewart at Commerce & Employment himself. But I see that there can be a benefit.

With each bed night being worth £85 for the local economy, we would need 20,000 bed nights to pay back and recover the capex cost. You could say that is only 333 each year over the 60 year life of the building. Or better still and more realistically, you could say that with 10 events each year, each attracting 100 people – that is, competitors, officials, family and friends and so on – each staying for an average of two nights – modest target figures – we would recover all of the capex in 10 years. Any which way, for me there is an economic business case and this should be considered by the review.

Let's move on to the positives educational outcomes for students living on Island, everywhere on the Island. Well done to the Education Minister yesterday for leaping to his feet to challenge Deputy Gillson and stress that sport is a key part of educational outcomes. I would like to repeat that, sport is a key part of educational outcomes. (A Member: Hear, hear.) Baroness Sue Campbell, a recent visitor to Guernsey at the invitation of the Sports Commission, spoke about the principle of physical literacy as being a vital a part of educational outcomes as the ability to read and write. And for me the spectator seating is an important asset if we as an Island are to take physical literacy seriously.

Mr Bailiff, we would never have a school concert or a school play without an audience but we often make no real provision to encourage parents and others to watch and support their children when they are playing sport, particularly indoors. In many ways, we sometimes positively sometimes discourage it. When there is a basketball tournament at St Sampson's High, I have personal experience of this, parents noses are literally pressed up against the safety glass of a corridor window high above the court, and those that are the lucky ones can probably only see half the court. Compare this to a packed grandstand when children are taking part in athletics.

I know that Deputy Kuttelwascher has already quoted from a film in this debate and I will too: 'Build it and they will come'. High schools in the USA make great provision for supporters to watch their school teams compete. For some students, maybe those who are not so academic, this is the one area that they can excel at and they should be encouraged to develop their special talents with the support of their peers and parents. For me there is a business case linked to educational outcomes.

And finally, let's move on to the positive social outcomes for those in the local area. Sir, I would like to shine a light on the work that the Guernsey Sports Commission carries out as part of its street sports initiative at Les Genats estate. I visited the evenings on several occasions and it is great to see. And for me there is a potential link between the street basketball court at the estate and the proposed facility at the nearby high school. The children living on the estate are after all as many have said in debate, including Deputy Le Lièvre the reason why it is a social priority school, and the primary reason that the school will be rebuilt in this exact location.

Sir, it is no accident that I am using basketball as an example because UK sport has already recently extended funding to basketball in light of the sports appeal to inner city, hard-to-reach teen boys who like the cool US culture associated with the sport. We need to, as Deputy David Jones said, get these children away from their play stations.

The Sports Commission Street Sports initiative could be extended so children/teens living on the estate and in the area were encouraged to play for teams in the basketball junior league if – and that was underlined, *if* – it took place on their doorstep and they had easy access. The success of this pathway approach to sport would be increased by the fact that they would quite literally only have to walk down the pathway from their home to the school to take part. Who knows, they might even create their own team – the Les Genats Lakers perhaps?

We would be helping put vulnerable young Islanders on the proverbial straight-and-narrow by using sport to raise self-esteem, give them a purpose, instil discipline, introduce aspiration. We could reduce the likelihood of petty crime and anti-social behaviour and remove the cycle of poverty that might exist.

Over the lifetime of even just three, four or five individuals, it literally is that small a number of people that we would need to change. If these lives are really changed and they can be, we would achieve a significant return on investment. But over 60 years imagine how this would have a positive impact on generations of youngsters. An invest-to-save initiative and this needs to be part of the review.

Sir, the public sector, third sector with support sponsorship from the private sector can make this sort of thing a reality. If we cannot engineer solutions like this in Guernsey then surely it cannot be done anywhere. For me there is a solid business case predicated on social outcomes, and once again it must be considered.

Economic, educational, social outcomes convince me that it is right for there to be spectator seating in the sports hall in the new build. And I make no apology for drilling down and concentrating on this specific area.

2575 I am happy for these outcomes to be reviewed, reviewed independently, but what I want is I want these outcomes to be presented as part of the review and not ignored or as Deputy Le Lièvre used in his speech when he used the word discounted.

I am concerned that the reviews red pen will scribble out these seats on the plan, blissfully unaware that they have merit. I have shared my thoughts with the T&R Minister after he emailed us a draft terms of reference (TOR) for the independent review, and I did ask Deputy St Pier if the TOR would allow for outcomes like this, or was I right in my fear that because perhaps they had not been included in great detail in Education's Outline Business Case (OBC), because this was not in the document, they would simply carry no weight. I will perhaps in general debate leave it to Deputy St Pier to say what he has already told me that needless to say he hinted Members to me that the answer would be that would possibly be the case and that they would sadly carry no weight.

As I said at the start it was with a heavy heart that I voted in favour of this amendment but it is with a joyful heart, if that is the correct word, that I do stand up as a champion for sport and encourage and enthuse all those with an influence to make sure that sport is treated very seriously at the review stage.

Thank you, sir.

2590

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

I think it is almost inevitable if the Propositions as amended are approved that the review will propose modifications to the Project. I say this with all due respect to the people who will be on the review team. We do not even know who they are or who they will be yet. So I am not impugning them in any way, but even to justify their existence I think that they will most probably suggest at least some modifications to the scope and size of the Project.

I also predict, sir, that what Deputy Duquemin fears is exactly what is going to happen, as a result of his and 25 other Members or whatever it was voting for the amendment, which the Chief Minister just laid.

Now, sir, I will vote against all the Propositions which will be put at the end of this debate, and the reason I will do that going through them and I will not take very long to do this, sir. But, I think the amendment has already achieved its objective which was to stop the approval of the Project which the Education Department laid before the States.

They laid before the States proposals to build the school for 600 students to build the community facilities to build the primary school etc. We had their scheme laid before us. The intention of the amendment was to stop the States giving approval to that scheme today, and I think that the amendment has achieved its purpose.

I am not saying the amendment was trying to stop the redevelopment of La Mare de Carteret School period. I am not saying that; I am saying it was trying to stop the scheme which was proposed by the Education Department, and clearly by knocking out all of the Education Department's proposals it has achieved that.

Now new Proposition 1, in my view, the States have already done that, the La Mare de Carteret redevelopment project has appeared on capital prioritisation lists at least one now I think we have all understood that it is a priority project for the last several months. I think if any Member of the States had been asked before this debate has the redevelopment of La Mare de Carteret Schools been approved in principle – not any particular scheme, but in principle – I think that any Member would have said yes, it is on the capital prioritisation list, we know Departments are working on it taking it forward. So I do not see any reason to vote in favour of new Proposition 1.

New Proposition 2 directs the Treasury & Resources Department to do something which they are already mandated to do, to provide further interim project funding. So I cannot see any purpose in voting in favour of Proposition 2.

Proposition 3, 'direct the Treasury & Resources Department to commission an independent review of the scale, scope and specification of the Project'. Well, of course, they are already able to do that anyway at any time. The Treasury & Resources Department could have commissioned an independent review of the Project because they are the custodians of the States' Capital Investment Portfolio. It is true to say that they may not have had time to do that, if the States had approved the Education Department's Propositions today, but they have been deleted. Those Propositions have been kicked out effectively and therefore there is now time for the Treasury & Resources Department to commission their independent review and Proposition 3 is therefore redundant.

Proposition 4, we have already been told by the Deputy Chief Minister when he summed up on the amendment that that is going to happen anyway, formal value management exercise it is part of the process that one would expect, and because inevitably the Project has been deferred in the sense that the Education Department's preferred scheme has been deferred the value management exercise can happen. We do not need a States' Resolution for that.

Proposition 5, I actually think would be ridiculous for the States to vote for. It is to delegate authority to T&R to approve a capital vote of a maximum amount of £65 million to fund the Project. How can the States approve, delegate authority to T&R to approve a capital vote for a Project of up to £65 million, when the States have not even determined the scale and the scope and the size of the Project?

We have just had a debate where the majority of the States have minded to apply particular value for money judgements against the La Mare de Carteret Schools redevelopment Project. If the States are so concerned about ensuring value for money, how on earth can the States delegate authority to T&R to approve a capital vote for up to £65 million? We have absolutely no idea now what scope and size this project will be. We have no idea whether it will include a secondary school and a primary school. We have absolutely no idea whether it will still include sports facilities, community facilities. We do not know what the size of the schools will be. We know absolutely none of that whatsoever and yet Proposition 5 asks the States to approve a capital vote for the Project of £65 million. Sir, I cannot do that.

And Proposition 6, I think is in effect redundant because it directs T&R to report back to the States should the Policy Council not reach agreement. But the Deputy Chief Minister has already told us the Policy Council – it is now not a matter of whether the Policy Council reaches agreement on the Project because they are going to bring it back to the States anyway. So T&R clearly do not need to be directed to report back to the States because the Policy Council has given an undertaken to report back to the States.

So I think all six – I think the amendment has achieved its objective, I did not agree with it, but I think it has achieved its objective. It has stopped the Education Department's preferred scheme in its tracks, and all of these six Propositions are redundant.

Now, moving on from that, the main reason that I will vote against them all is, because as this is constructed now, what the States are doing, and I am taking Deputy Langlois' interpretation of the amendment, the amended Propositions, and I am a bit uncomfortable doing that because I have always acted by the view that the States vote on what is actually before them rather than on one particular Member's reinterpretation of what is before them. But nonetheless I accept Deputy Langlois is an honest man and he is honestly telling the States the Policy Council will bring the matter back to the States. So under that interpretation if the Propositions as amended are approved what the States are voting for is for an independent review to be carried out for the Policy Council to receive that independent review and then for the Policy Council to lay Propositions before the States relating to the size and scope and specification of the school.

I do not believe the Policy Council is the appropriate Committee to do that. We have elected a body to advise the States on Education related matters. It is the Education Department. If the Propositions as amended are kicked out, the Education Department is free to come back to the States at any time it chooses with proposals for the redevelopment of La Mare de Carteret Schools. The Project is still in the States' Capital Investment Portfolio, and we will not have taken that role away from the Education Department. They will not be able to do it in the next few weeks clearly, it would take some months for them to do that, and in doing that they would be able to be informed by the Treasury & Resources Department commissioned independent review. And I would far rather, now that we have the independent review, that it is published, that all parties understand what is in it, and then the Education Department, as the properly mandated Committee to advise the States on education matters, takes full account of that review and comes back to the States with quite probably revised proposals for the redevelopment of the schools.

I think that is a job for Education. I do not think it is a job for the Policy Council (*Interjection*) and if the Policy Council do it, I fear that they will come back to the States laying out their preferred scheme and the Education Department will be in the absurd position of having to lay amendments to a report on the scale and size of a secondary school and a primary school. That to me seems absolutely bonkers.

I cannot conceive of the States putting the Education Department in that position, and nor, incidentally, can I can conceive of the Education Department freely allowing itself to be put into that position. I really do not think that is the responsible thing to do. So now it sounds odd to say I am now going to vote to reject all the Propositions as amended. But I do think the amendment has achieved its objective. Education's original scheme cannot proceed now the States have cleared out all of those Propositions. I think the best thing is to allow T&R to commission their review and then for the Education Department to take full account of that review and no doubt in the future lay amended Propositions before the States. I think that is the correct way to do it.

Therefore, sir, I will vote against all of the Propositions as amended.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher and then Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Thank you, sir.

I am totally sympathetic with the views of Deputy Duquemin.

I have a point to make here, is I think the Culture & Leisure Department could progress their case if they were to do their best to try and come up with some sort of review of the sport facilities that are actually

available on the Island, and whether they could produce a strategy for what sort of sports facilities may be should be available on the Island. And I am talking about both private and public if you like in the schools. Because at the moment there are all sorts of sports facilities all over the place, but I have never seen an actual strategy for the Island as to what sort of sports facilities we should have. What benefits they may have for our tourism and everything else, and I think that is lacking. I think, myself, that sports is very much part of education. When I was at school we used to call it PE – physical education. And besides jumping around in the gym we used to play cricket, rugby, tennis, circuit training, cross country.

In Jersey, the Culture & Leisure Department is subsumed under Education and I have got no objection with that. In fact with the review of Government, I would be quite supportive of such a thing happening – not destroying the work of Culture & Leisure but being part of the Education process. In which case this report would have had a lot more credibility, and I think that is the way to go – but that is sort of going at a tangent.

I thank Deputy Fallaize for his, what I call his typical *War and Peace* brevity style of deciphering exactly what this amendment means. (*Interjection*) That is all right. But my view is that I have said if these Propositions were amended, I would vote for it. I see his point of view, but it is not the only point of view of what it actually means. And I will, as promised, support the Propositions as amended.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: As a kick-off, Deputy Kuttelwascher makes an intriguing point that Jersey started its Council of Ministers with one less Minister than ourselves, they now have of course External Relations, because they did not have a Culture & Leisure team. Intriguingly as a side issue I believe the current Chief Minister has decided to reallocate the Portfolio of Heritage, Sports and Media to the Economic Development Department and they have lost Fisheries, so there has been this tension between sport as part of education and sport as part of the economy.

I have to say I endorse everything Deputy Darren Duquemin said, and believe that there is a future for sports tourism in the proposed site. My proof of that is you only have to look at the nearby Port Soif Rangers Club. Not only is it used as a site for team-winning States' archery, but it has many years had Gaelic football from our Island and so on. So my point is: bring the facility and you will attract numbers.

And I also support what Deputy Duquemin said about the community side of things. In fact, I am continuing my interest in disability matters and I will raise with the new Disability Disabled People's Champion and the team Deputy Le Pelley and so on, and the Guernsey Disability Alliance about the role they may wish to play in inputting to this review, which has to be timely.

I have got one technical question to ask again of the Deputy Chief Minister or whoever is summing up in this debate. That is, the Propositions that we have before us, that are now accepted, have as No. 3 that:

'To direct Treasury & Resources, in consultation with [Education] to commission an independent review in order to determine the most appropriate scale, scope and specification for the Project...

and to present a report no later than 31st March 2015.

The letter we had from the Chief Minister indicated February. But if it is to be an emergency Billet for the normal February meeting then presumably it would have to come out round about St Valentine's Day to give any meaningful chance of consultation and dialogue. (*Laughter*) That will... [*Inaudible*] and so we are voting for something that really has been superseded so I have got concerns about that.

I do not take as negative a view as Deputy Fallaize does though. I think we really have to support this as a package at this juncture because if you look for example at Proposition 1, it says:

'To approve in principle the La Mare de Carteret School Redevelopment Project'.

Now if we vote against that it could be seen by some in the community and in the profession that we are voting against it as a concept, which we are not. But more importantly as La Mare de Carteret has been presented as a package by Deputy Sillars, very well, and the team at Education, it is implicit within that Proposition No. 1 that we are voting for something along the lines of the current project, which must by implication include both the secondary and the primary school and the autism community centre and the additional sports facilities.

I see no negation of the sports role or the community or autism role, and so I think when we vote for this we are still voting for the whole package. And it would be wrong of Treasury & Resources or the Policy Council to assume that the Chamber is no longer interested in supporting those particular parts of the scheme. So I think we do have to go along with the amendment, imperfect though it is.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

I still have concerns about this amendment. Well, this amended Proposition that we have before us, because it makes very clear on No. 3:

‘To direct the Treasury & Resources Department, in consultation with Education Department, to commission an independent review’,

2755 and that is quite important, the words ‘independent review’ –

‘in order to determine the most appropriate scale, scope and specification for the Project and to present a report no later than ...’

and so it goes on.

My question will be here, where will we find this independence of this expertise? Presumably it will be outside the Island. Because the expertise currently about the educational needs and the size and specification is from the team that are dealing, or have dealt with that currently in the Education
2760 Department alongside the Project Team from T&R. So you have utilised all of those and then of course it has to be independent. So if your independent is looking outside of the States, which it has to do, there is not anybody else locally who has actually designed a school to my knowledge because it has always been ‘in-house’ so I guess it has now got to be from outside of the Island, in which case how much has been set aside for this? Who will be paying for it? Who will decide how many will be on this – because further down
2765 it actually uses the word ‘panel’? I cannot see in any way that you can use anybody locally, if you are looking for independent.

If you are looking for architects, I am not sure if there have been any architects that have designed the schools here, and of course if you are looking for an architect who may have done that before, and they are very few and far between I would think who have designed a school, they are going to eliminate themselves
2770 from being able to put in a tender for when you get to the stage where the States will then approve to go forward with it.

So this raises lots of question, this amendment. It is a sham. What we have got before us now is an absolute sham. And I have serious concerns about it, of the political manoeuvring that has been going on during this debate, all to the detriment of those that are waiting for this school to be built.

2775

The Bailiff: Deputy O’Hara.

Deputy O’Hara: Thank you, sir.

I am grateful for Deputy Darren Duquemin in bringing those various points forward. Obviously all
2780 Members of Culture & Leisure agree with everything he says.

Sir, this speech is obviously directed mainly towards sport and its position in our society.

However, before I embark on this I thought I should address the points made by my colleague and fellow Board Member Deputy Inglis.

You will recall that he was concerned that revenue would be lost at Beau Séjour through the provision
2785 of these new sports facilities. Indeed Deputy Gillson also referred to this because he was concerned that the loss at Beau Séjour would be increased.

Deputy Inglis is absolutely within his right to voice his opinion and I encourage that within my Board, as he knows.

His opinion in this instance referred as I said to the loss at the Centre caused by the absence of the three
2790 sports in question. However, reading the letters from the various sports organisations it was seen that Beau Séjour will still be used by those organisations to develop youth leagues.

It is true that they will not use the Centre all the time. However, it does give the Centre an opportunity to develop other areas and other sports which need to use those spaces. At times those sports people cannot get on the courts because they are already booked. So we do not see any loss being made there at all.

And at this point I would like, if I can, to repeat the points I made previously in the September Billet
2795 that the staff and the Board are making good progress into reducing the deficit at Beau Séjour, and yes Beau Séjour is constantly criticised because of the loss it suffers. The Centre is described as the heart of the Island providing a public amenity just like any other Department.

Members should also know that with the exception of a very, very small number of centres almost all
2800 similar leisure centres within the UK operate at a loss. We are no different. But we are working hard to reduce that loss, whilst at the same time looking to provide new attractions and involving the public to help us to find those new attractions which will benefit the thousands of users that come through our doors.

Sir, sport and active recreation plays a core role in promoting healthy and vibrant communities. Sport and active recreation plays a much broader role than just providing physical opportunity. It weaves the very
2805 social fabric on which our communities are built. It promotes health and well-being, reduces the economic impact of lifestyle related diseases, which also demand significant proportions of our health budget. It

provides employment opportunities. A vast array of benefits are derived from community based sport and recreation. However, the important role they play at the broader social level in promoting positively healthy outcomes and in building community capacity is in many ways underestimated and sadly at times undervalued.

Sport is a vehicle by which major events can be delivered to benefit the Island. Indeed this was the reason that I formed Sports Tourism in 2002, which was the foundation of the Events Group being formed in 2004 as part of our machinery of Government changes at that time.

The Events Group was formed with the joint efforts of the Culture & Leisure and Commerce & Employment Departments. The Group remains operative now and very active through the funding, through the welcome funding of a transfer of moneys from the budget of Commerce & Employment backed up by the staffing of the Culture & Leisure Department and the Sports Commission. It is very successful. It attracts many visitors to compete within the Island.

The benefit to our visitor economy is carefully monitored and grant applications have to follow strict criteria before money is released to any sporting event. Questions have been asked about the need to provide the County standard facilities at the proposed school.

Members, sport within the Island has reached higher levels over the last decade. Government should recognise this, and look to support to a far higher degree than we are doing at present.

The Island has seen sportsmen and women rise to county, national and international levels in their chosen sports: Heather Watson, Chris Simpson, Alison Merrien, Matt Le Tissier, Lee Merrien, Andy Priaulx – the list goes on and on. And I apologise to the many people past and present that I have not mentioned. All these athletes are Guernsey's ambassadors and the Island is rightly proud of them.

Many of our sports already have excellent county facilities: hockey, badminton, athletics, cricket, football, but three sports do not have those facilities. These are basketball, volleyball, and netball. And providing these facilities within the new school will enable them to rise to those national standards. It will allow our youth to aspire to national and even professional levels.

These increased county facilities will bring many visitors to the Island, whilst at the same time allow our athletes to compete outside of these shores and importantly act as our ambassador for this Island, a very important factor.

To this end I have taken the opportunity of gaining some basic information from some sporting organisations and Sports Commission in connection with the visitors coming to the Island to compete or indeed spectate.

Before I provide a few figures of overseas visitors, I thought it might be useful for Members to know that about 10,000 people travel between the Islands alone to compete at sporting level and that is a conservative figure, 10,000 people. Referring to the UK visitors we receive, approximately 2,000 competing in cricket, hockey, basketball, netball, volleyball and swimming come to the Island. Rugby might see something like about 1,000 visitors to the Island. Football via the Guernsey Lions attracts about 2,000 to 3,000 people as well as promoting Guernsey in approximately 30 fixtures outside of this Island.

So how many visitors would the proposed facilities draw to the Island? It will, of course, depend upon the leagues that they will perform in, but the support and following in basketball, netball and volleyball is huge – especially basketball. So I think I could anticipate a reasonable figure between all three sports very similar to the Guernsey Lions. We cannot establish that because it is how the sport promotes itself. But it is really a good opportunity and we believe that there will be quite a lot of people who would complete and come and watch.

Now the survey from Sports Commission has just been updated from £85 per person per day to £90 per person per day and if you start to apply those figures the return is noticeable.

Sadly, we are falling behind in providing sports facilities when compared to many other jurisdictions. These new provisions will greatly assist in raising our standards and it will be a great asset to the staging of the Island Games in 2027.

Deputy Kuttelwascher referred to Jersey and what they do over there, and he is quite right, to a certain extent. Jersey in fact are looking at the moment to try to form a similar kind of Commission and indeed as Deputy Gollop has stated they are looking indeed to give far more importance to sport all round and looking to develop a separate Department I believe. I know that there are feelings that perhaps Culture & Leisure could join Education or whatever people are thinking about. But I will say this now, it is my old chestnut that I *firmly* believe, that Tourism and Culture & Leisure and Heritage should be a Department totally on its own. That is my personal and firm belief, and I know also people feel the same within this Chamber.

Going back to the facilities, I strongly believe that these facilities will be a good investment, not only in sport but also in our visitor economy, and importantly our youth and community via the proposed Community Centre.

The links from the sporting facilities to those within the community centre are welcomed. They will become an integral part of staging events, and likewise the community centre will be able to utilise the

sports facilities. It is a good match. The use of the sporting facilities for community uses will be a great asset to the immediate area and the Island as a whole.

I do hope, like Deputy Duquemin has said, that when the red pen comes out, you do support this county facility. I think it is really important and it is something that we have been needing for a little while.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you, sir.

I think colleagues, this afternoon, respectfully, I feel you have made a colossal mistake. I think we have unfortunately... I respect it because it is the majority decision of the Assembly, but I think the consequences of voting for the amendment will be far reaching. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

If he reads Proposition 5, which I know Deputy Fallaize has done already:

‘To direct the Treasury & Resources Department, in consultation with [Education] to commission an independent review in order to determine the most appropriate scale, scope and specification’,

well, that is his sports centre gone. If he did not want anyone taking a red pen to it, then you should have supported the main Propositions.

I said before we fight, we struggle in this Assembly to give certain aspects of our society a voice. If you mention mooring fees you get feedback, if you mention TRP you get absolutely inundated, if you mention GST you are frightened to go to your inbox. But if you start talking about autism, and autistic centres, the lobby group I am afraid just is not there, because these people are under-represented.

If I was a Member of the Education Department following this result, I know what I would do but that is entirely up to them. But this Assembly has completely taken the mandate from another Department to an independent body, whoever those people may be, with what terms of reference? What are the terms of reference? There are no terms of reference to a review that this Assembly has approved by a majority.

So, you know what you are going to get: a smaller development, a smaller footprint, with things that the community feel they need, but others feel are not affordable. I am afraid it is... We have to go... It is the nature of politics, some decisions hurt. I have to say this one certainly does. I think the States have made an awful mistake this afternoon.

And again for those people who want to see a development at the schools all we have given them today is more uncertainty, *more uncertainty*, this will be costly, it will eat up time, and that irony of not only have we got to look for savings, but we are up against the clock and if it takes longer it is going to cost more. That whole mix is in there. And I am very, very disappointed obviously by this outcome.

And I am concerned that if we can do this once to one Department, then what does it say to any other Department in the future who are bringing far reaching proposals that it thinks were clearly in its mandate and it did have controls over.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Laurie Queripel.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

I must apologise because what I am about to say is probably more rambling than normal, sir, because I have not really collected my thoughts.

But, I would ask Members... they have not got to turn to it, but I will draw their attention to page 2571, sir. 2571, sir, is a list of the component parts that made up the Project, past tense and made up the Project. Included in there are things – the high school at £20,170,000; going further down, community suite £518,000; pre-school nursery £416,000. So that is the complete list of the component parts of the list of things that made up the project, sir.

And, sir, I said during debate on the amendment that I was drawn to the amendment, sir, because I wanted to be fiscally responsible and I wanted to act prudently, sir. But as we came towards the end of debate, sir, I realised that I had to vote against the Chief Minister and Deputy Chief Minister’s amendment, sir, because I realised that what the report might trigger, sir, is actually a re-design of the school, of the project. A pick and mix approach of all this component list, sir, of the project with all the associated extra costs and the delay.

That is when I realised, sir, and actually I spoke during my speech during the amendment debate, I spoke about an amendment that I considered bringing, sir, that would have laid out all those component parts actually. It was actually making the options in the report into the Propositions and Members could have the picked the parts that they wanted. And I was told by some Members, sir, Deputy Gillson, I think and Deputy Soulsby, that it was silly and that it was too late. And they are right, sir, what should have happened really, Education should have come back to the Assembly perhaps a year or 18 months ago, and

said, we look these are all the things we would like to include, you pick the things that you want and we will end up with a sort of collective project.

That is what PSD did during the last Assembly, sir, when they were presenting the Waste Strategy Report to the Assembly. They provided the Assembly with a number of different options, the different things that would make up the Strategy that Members wanted, and Members in the end decided on one – I think there was four or five options – Members decided that in the end by a majority to pick one particular Strategy it was made up of things like export of waste, in vessel composting, that kind of thing, sir.

But that is in effect what could happen now because this report is going to be commissioned, sir.

And as I said when I spoke to Deputy Gillson and Deputy Soulsby, they were right to say yes that would be a silly amendment to bring now because it would provoke a re-design of the school, because we would end up with some things from this list being approved and some things not being approved, sir.

But that is exactly what might happen, if in the end the report comes back and says, ‘Yes you can have, or we recommend there is a high school, we recommend that there is a primary school, a pre-school but we do not recommend the community suite, we do not recommend the total sports component facility’, sir.

Now if all those things are an integral part of the project, the design, that means the whole thing will have to be re-designed. So that is what, sir... As I say, I was torn for a long, long, time, but towards the end of the debate, I realised, sir, that is exactly what might happen. We might end up with a re-design, the report might recommend a re-design, some of these component parts might be taken out of the project, sir, and the whole thing would have to be re-designed as I say with the associated extra costs and the delay, sir.

So I will be minded again if we get to the end of the debate, sir, and we vote on the amended Propositions I will minded again to vote against the Propositions, sir, because I think we are perhaps in line for a re-design with a pick and mix approach, sir, and there will be extra costs, and extra delay.

So that is my thoughts on the matter, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy De Lisle, then Deputy Dorey.

Deputy De Lisle: Sir, I have always supported rebuild of La Mare High School. And I called for work to begin on the Project in manifestos in 2004 in this Assembly, 2008 and 2012, and been frustrated with the lack of progress, if you like, in terms of its development. I am hopeful that this time we will be progressing with the re-build of that school.

The intention to provide three new high schools with facilities comparable to those provided the Grammar School, has been clear for many years, since the 11-plus debate 12 or so years ago. Two of the three have now been built, but the re-build of La Mare High School remains.

Now the Project tabled by the Department is for the construction of much more than originally intended, and this is where I have a bit of a problem with the total scheme. Because we are going way beyond what was intended, which was three high schools of comparability in terms of building and facilities with the Grammar School.

But here we are going on to a new primary school, a pre-school nursery, communication autism unit block, a major sportsplex, all of which buildings, adding buildings and cost to what was originally intended.

Now, like Deputy Sillars, I tout restraint and accountability and control in spending with vigour applied like is applied in the private sector.

We find ourselves in an economic situation currently that requires even more vigour to basically apply, like the private sector, controls to spending. I think the population require this.

I spoke in the Assembly about the capital programme a few times when we had the Budget just recently. It has to be pruned. Just like we have begun pruning, if you like, the revenue budget, because cutting costs and reduced taxation are key to encouraging businesses to stay and come to this Island, and for economic growth in this Island. We have to be competitive. And therefore we have to use our resources very, very carefully.

So when I look at commissioning an independent review, I would hope, and it is an independent review in order to determine the most appropriate scale, scope and specification for the Project. I would hope that this will be a holistic review of the Project as a whole. And will look at what is necessary and what we do not have to have at the current time, so that it is a revised Project in totality.

Because at the moment the terms of reference of the review are unknown, and I would call for some deep consideration by the Project Team and the independent reviewer as to what we had agreed to originally, in terms of providing high schools of the quality that we had with the Grammar School, that we go back to those fundamentals and that we review and make sure that we carry out a holistic assessment of the situation.

Because in reality developing a primary school is jump starting primary redevelopment. And obviously causes, I would say, some consternation with other areas with primary schools that perhaps do not actually conform to the two, three form entry policy that the Department wants to provide for the future,

So I would ask then that we look very prudently at the spending on this particular Project. I feel that we are doubling, almost doubling, the spending that is necessary. (*Interjection*) And I would ask that we take, very, very critical note, of the facilities that we really do need in order to provide sporting facilities and a high school that is comparable to the other high schools that have been built.

2990 And we waylay for the moment some of these add-ons that are costing so much additional money at a time when we really cannot afford it.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

2995 **Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, sir.

I will not go as far as Deputy Fallaize in terms of asking you to vote against all six. But I take that in relation to the amendment that effectively in Proposition 3 we have crossed out Policy Council on the last line and put the States in. I would rather direct Treasury & Resources jointly with Education, but I am not going to split hairs over in consultation.

3000 But I do think it should be absolutely clear that we vote against Proposition 5 because it has got to come to the States, so it is inappropriate for us to delegate authority at this point in time.

And also vote against Proposition 6. I agree with Deputy Fallaize we need to be absolutely clear that the responsibility is not to T&R to report back to this Assembly. I do not want to see a Resolution of this Assembly saying it is the responsibility of T&R.

3005 I do not think Proposition 6 is needed because effectively Proposition 3 covers reporting back to the States. So please vote for Propositions 1 to 4 and against Propositions 5 and 6. That is basically what the amendment that myself and Deputy Fallaize were going to propose said.

3010 I would also urge the Education Department to look at both the primary and high schools. I visited both and I thank the staff for giving me time, making time for me to show me around. I was surprised at the condition of them and particularly the contrast between the high school and the primary school. The high school is definitely in a worse state.

3015 I am not going to go through all the points, but what disappointed me was that a lot of them could be fixed for not a great deal of money. Yes you will not fix all the major problems, but you could make the condition of them a lot better and a lot more acceptable.

Whatever happens students are going to be in there for at least two and half years, and therefore I think it is essential that Education puts some of their money they have in the routine capital budget to improve the condition of those schools.

3020 I went on to the Castel School Committee in 1997 and I was appalled at the state of the school at that time, but after a lot of lobbying Education did a considerable amount of work and the condition of that school was transformed, and I have seen what they can do.

3025 Even old huts which are often so heavily criticised, which seem well past their sell by date, that they refurnished them and they became very useful parts of the school. And it can be done. Yes, it does cost a bit of money but I think it is unacceptable to have pupils in those schools for the next two and a half years in those conditions. So I urge Education to put a little bit of money into those schools to improve the infrastructure.

3030 My final point is, it is mentioned during the debate on the amendment, was about the period of time to move into the new school. Many businesses will move premises over a week-end. Yes, it does involve man power, but I do not accept that it takes six weeks to move from one building into another, particularly when they are both on the same site. I would urge whenever that move happens to manage it in a way that it is done in a shorter period of time.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Sherbourne.

3035 **Deputy Sherbourne:** Thank you, sir.

Feeling as I do at the moment reminds me of a song, it is a song that starts, 'Pick yourself up, dust yourself down (*Laughter*) and start all over again.' (*Applause*)

3040 Obviously, as one Member of the Board I am terribly disappointed with the outcome. I agree with everything that people have said with regard to what you have wished upon yourselves. And we have witnessed that. We have witnessed already speeches, very good speeches actually, on subjects that I am totally supportive of. Sport, Deputy Duquemin, Sport, Deputy O'Hara. Not so sure that I supported the re-organisation of the States Committee system as proposed by my colleague to my left.

But the doors are open now for just this sort of approach.

3045 I was very worried at the start that we were just going to go in to a procession of statements being made in advance of the review that would promote one aspect of our proposals, our joined up proposals. I said

yesterday that I saw those proposals as something that Guernsey does not usually get. Joined-up thinking, work between Departments. Now, you have rejected that. That is fine. And we *will* battle on. We are made of pretty strong stuff.

3050 But I am very worried that this could deteriorate into, if you like, an opportunity for interest groups to apply all sorts of pressure upon the review body, that actually loses sight of the main reason that we actually started this Project in the first place. The re-build of two schools to enable the children in this Island to have an equal playing field whichever institution they went to. I think we must be very wary or conscious of that.

3055 I would make a plea now that Education are involved totally in this process. We want to play a part. We will want a seat on the review body if that is possible. How are you going to get in this Island and immediately, because you have determined a fairly short time scale for this, the expertise required to make a decision?

3060 We have spent two years debating issues around these proposals. Hours of debate, hours of reading, hours of consideration, to come up with these proposals. Fine, you have rejected them. But is that review body going to be conscious of every single point that we have considered over the last two years? Are they going to be that isolated from pressure that they can focus on those main issues? I doubt it. Until I see those terms of reference will I feel comfortable that the process about to start is going to end up with a really sensible solution?

3065 Just recently, in a report from the MNC the 'Guernsey way' has been rather ridiculed. I would suggest that what we have got today is the opening of the doors to a 'Guernsey fudge' and I think we must be very, very, wary about that. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

I thought the level of debate was really good over the last couple of days. Lots of very fair points to be made on both sides.

3070 And as Deputy Langlois mentioned in his summing up there was intensity and a real consideration of the debate. People were listening and that is good.

The tension, if you like, has left me and I am sure the rest of my colleagues feeling pretty down and exhausted at the moment. That is natural, you put a lot – every Department here bringing something to the States goes through that process. And I know that you will understand how we feel.

3075 But, please, please avoid a 'Guernsey fudge'. They taste really nice, (*Laughter*) they are very seductive, just do not go down the route of offering our children something that is less (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) than suitable for their needs.

Thank you.

3080 **The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak in general debate?
Deputy Brouard, when you get back to your seat.

Deputy Brouard: Just on a point of information.

3085 **The Bailiff:** Perhaps you would put your microphone on.

Deputy Brouard: Just on a point of information and permission really. Deputy Fallaize and myself would like to lay an amendment, sir, which will hopefully combine the thrust of the debate we have had today and also the aspirations of Education.

3090 **The Bailiff:** What are you asking? You are asking then that we adjourn until this amendment is produced?

3095 **Deputy Brouard:** We hope to have it circulated before end of play today, sir, the Law Officers are just working on the final –

The Bailiff: I think we are at the point of just winding up the debate actually. There is nobody else wanting to stand.

3100 **Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, it is ready, but it is being typed up.

The Bailiff: But we cannot debate it until we have got it. So are you seeking an adjournment so that it can be circulated and we can then debate the amendment before we wind up the debate.

3105 **Deputy Brouard:** Yes, please, sir.

The Bailiff: That is a matter for other Members. I put it to you do you wish to adjourn? Those in favour; those against.

3110 *Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.*

The Bailiff: I think, although there were vociferous *Contre* voices, there was a majority in favour of adjournment.

We will have a short adjournment so this amendment can be circulated.

3115

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

*The Assembly adjourned at 5.08 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 5.23 p.m.*

**Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools' site –
Debate continued**

The Bailiff: Well, Members, there is now an amendment that is being circulated, I will pause while you have a chance to obtain a copy and to read it for yourselves. But for the benefit of people listening at home, I will read the amendment out.

3120 It is:

‘To replace Proposition 3 as follows:

“3. To direct the Treasury and Resources Department, in consultation with the Education Department, to commission an independent review in order to determine the most appropriate scale, scope and specification for the Project, and to direct the Education Department to lay before the States as expeditiously as possible recommendations to fulfil the decision of the States to approve in principle the Project, having regard to the conclusions of the independent review, and for the avoidance of doubt, the independent review will be appended to the States Report”.

To replace proposition 4 as follows: “To direct the Treasury and Resources and Education Departments, following the independent review in Proposition 3 to undertake a formal value management exercise involving independent and appropriately qualified facilitators and the Project Team in order to ensure that the Project meets the recommended and approved scale, scope and specification and represents best value to the States.”

To delete Propositions 5 and 6.

And that is to be proposed by Deputy Brouard and seconded by Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Brouard do you wish to rise to lay the amendment?

3125

Deputy Brouard: Yes, sir.

The Bailiff: How long do you think you will be in opening?

3130 **Deputy Brouard:** Fairly short, sir.

The Bailiff: Because clearly there is a decision to be taken Members, whether we continue tonight (**Several Members:** Pour) or whether we adjourn and come back in the morning.

I am going to put to you the Proposition that we continue tonight. Those in favour; those against.

3135

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: We will continue tonight.

Deputy Brouard.

3140

Amendment:

To replace Proposition 3 as follows:

‘3. To direct the Treasury and Resources Department, in consultation with the Education Department, to commission an independent review in order to determine the most appropriate scale, scope and specification for the Project, and to direct the Education Department to lay before the States as expeditiously as possible recommendations to fulfil the decision of the States to approve in principle the Project, having regard to the conclusions of the independent review, and for the avoidance of doubt, the independent review will be appended to the States Report’.

To replace proposition 4 as follows:

'4. To direct the Treasury and Resources and Education Departments, following the independent review in Proposition 3 to undertake a formal value management exercise involving independent and appropriately qualified facilitators and the project team in order to ensure that the Project meets the recommended and approved scale, scope and specification and represents best value to the States.'
To delete Propositions 5 and 6.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

The amendment basically draws together the strands of the debate over the last day. We have the Proposition, I think most of us... well, everybody in the Chamber now accepts that we are going to have an independent review, it is going to be done by T&R, but we think that the person driving the education facilities should be left with Education. So we are asking for Education to come back to the States with the result of that T&R review.

So it catches the essence of what we have all wanted, but it gives the actual power through to Education.

The difficulty I have, and this was starting to appear, and this is why I placed the amendment, is that people are starting to stand up and say, 'Well actually I voted for the review but make sure you keep my bit in.' Well, that is not really fair. You had the opportunity with Education's proposal because the bits were in.

So let the review go ahead. Let Education take stock of that review. They are the driving force. There is no time for Education to come back. They will come back as quick as they wish to with that review appended with their proposals to go forward. And I would ask you all to support this.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize, you formally second the amendment?

Deputy Fallaize: Yes please, sir, and reserve my right to speak.

The Bailiff: Does anybody wish to debate this amendment? Deputy Perrot.

Deputy Perrot: Well clearly Treasury & Resources will not have had an opportunity of discussing this, so I speak really for myself and not on behalf of the Treasury Board.

It does seem to me to wrap up in a rather elegant way what we have been talking about. And it does, it gives anyway ultimate control to the States, because whatever is brought forward as a result of the formal review and the value management exercise. It does not really matter whether the Education Department is bringing that back before the States or whether the Policy Council or Uncle Tom Cobbley is bringing it back before the States. The point is we will still have charge. That the States will still be in control, and at least the Education Board will feel that they are guiding things.

I have to say that I did not really think that this was necessary, because I think that good faith must be presumed, and I could not see actually Treasury & Resources going off on a jolly of its own, as a consequence of today's vote. It never wanted to anyway. What it was doing was challenging along the lines which were set out in Treasury & Resources' letter. So I do not think that this amendment was strictly necessary.

But if it makes for some sort of a more equable atmosphere between both the Education Department and Treasury & Resources, and the States feel that they can repose trust in the system, then I personally will vote for – and will vote for this amendment.

Doubtless I have got something wrong and I will be terribly badly scolded by the Treasury Minister (*Laughter*) when he finds out what I have done, but clearly Members of the Treasury Board will have to vote in accordance with their individual consciences on this. But it does seem to me to be an appropriate amendment.

The Bailiff: Thank you.

Does anyone else wish to speak on the amendment? Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Yes, sir.

I have not had a lot of time to consider this. This is the problem with last minute amendments of this type (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and I could just imagine that what my friend, good friend and colleague, the Chairman of the States Assembly and Constitution Committee would be saying if I tried to pull such a fast one. (*Interjection*)

Deputy Fallaize: But he never would, would he? (*Laughter*)

Deputy Trott: Not these days, sir.

3195 So the first thing that strikes me, and again I have only had the same amount of time as other Members to consider the wording, is that there is no date in Proposition 3, and therefore no deadline. And the first thing that one fears is that without that this amendment could have the opposite effect to the effect that I think it is trying to achieve, and possibly slow down the process.

3200 Notwithstanding that, remember this report is still going to have to go before the Policy Council, because under the Rules of the States the Policy Council has the opportunity to comment on matters of this type. So the Policy Council will still consider it, and will still have the opportunity to append to it its thoughts and views, and as a result of that my initial reaction to it is that this has the potential to slow the process down, not bring it to the States more expeditiously.

3205 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Sir, many Members might consider me a bit of an expert on badly drafted amendments. *(Laughter)* But, no, I consider this one to be actually a useful amendment as far as it goes. I take Deputy Trott's point about the lack of a time deadline.

3210 But I think it eliminates the absurdity of 31st March deadline and clearly, well we had a whole Law yesterday, didn't we, about 'as soon as practicable' or 'as soon as possible'? It very much puts expeditiously has to be within the next three months it seems to me.

3215 Proposition 4 is perhaps more interesting, because it directs the Treasury & Resources and Education, working in harmony in concert, which I suppose is an improvement, because it does not set one Department against another. Following the independent review in Proposition 3, to undertake a formal value management exercise involving independent and appropriately qualified facilitators and the project team in order to ensure that the project meets the recommended and approved scale.

3220 Now, this is different effectively. It is not just to review. This appears to bring in a new type of personality, a facilitator, somebody who is qualified to be a facilitator. I would like to know more about the identity of that person.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Just a point of information –

3225 **The Bailiff:** Can you – I think Deputy Gollop is giving way to you.

Deputy Gollop: I am finished anyway, that is a question. *(Laughter)* That is a question to the proposers, what are the credentials for this individual or team of individuals?

3230 **The Bailiff:** Well, you cannot give way if you have finished.
Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

3235 If I could deal with Deputy Gollop's point first, actually the amendment does not propose anything different in the replacement Proposition 4, because it is taken entirely from the Proposition 4 as per the Le Tocq/Langlois amendment.

3240 Now the effect of this amendment is that it leaves – remember that we are discussing – the Propositions we are now discussing are the ones as amended by the Le Tocq/Langlois amendment. Propositions 1 and 2 are untouched, Proposition 4 is essentially untouched. Propositions 5 and 6 are removed, because Deputy Brouard and I do not believe the States should delegate authority for T&R to open a capital vote of £65 million on a project until the States have determined what that project should be. And Proposition 6 is clearly redundant, so there is no need to incorporate that in the new amendment.

3245 The key difference is in the replacement Proposition 3, which establishes, as clearly the majority of the States want, that there is an independent review of the scale and scope on the specification of the Project commissioned by the Treasury & Resources Department in consultation with the Education Department, as proposed in the Le Tocq/Langlois amendment, and then it is for the Education Department to lay before the States the recommendations which they believe are necessary to give effect to the States in principle approval of the re-development of the school site, having taken fully into account the work of the independent review team, and that review report in any event will have to be appended to the Education Department States' Report.

3250 So it puts it beyond doubt that it is for the Education Department to come back with proposals, quite possibly revised proposals, in light of the conclusions reached by the independent review body. But as Deputy Perrot has said most importantly it puts beyond doubt that it is for the States to determine ultimately
3255 the scope and scale and specification of the Project.

The amendment that was approved, the Le Tocq/Langlois amendment which is currently the Propositions, it is a bit of a dog's breakfast because actually the undertakings that have now been given verbally were not included in the amendment, and their amendment was constructed on the basis that this Project would not need to come back to the States, because the Policy Council were going to resolve it. Well clearly that is not what the States want, and therefore the way that amendment is constructed is not appropriate any longer.

I will give way to Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: I am very grateful to Deputy Fallaize, sir, because something else has just sprung to mind – and it is if it is the intention of the Movers of the amendment to maintain Proposition 2 which it is, which directs the Treasury & Resources Department to provide further interim Project funding, clearly this amendment has the potential to have a financial consequence. Because if the period is extended past the original deadline, the original deadline being in the amendment March, then additional funding could be incurred and that, if I understand it, sir, is outwith the Rules.

But the Chairman of the States Assembly and Constitution Committee will correct me if I am wrong.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, I think Deputy Trott is wrong, because clearly No. 2 is incorporated into the amendment, but it has to be understood that the one body in the States which has maximum possible interest in getting back to the States as quickly as possible to proceed with the Project is the Education Department. And the idea that the Education Department will take longer to do that than would the Policy Council, than would the Treasury & Resources Department is frankly absurd.

So I think Deputy Trott is, even more than I perhaps normally would, questioning how many angels can dance on the head of a pin. –

Deputy Trott: On a point of order, sir, just in case my good friend fails to give way, a second time. Can you rule on that? Because it does seem to me that it is a matter that your wisdom and judgement is needed on – (*Laughter*)

The Bailiff: Madam Comptroller, do you wish to give us some advice? (*Laughter*) It is not obvious to me that it may increase funds, but it may. What is your view?

The Comptroller: No it is not, and clearly it would be Rule 13(2) that is potentially engaged, and the wording all hinges around the word it may – is in a sense if there is a possibility that the delay is likely to cause delay because of the timing issue then there may be delay. But against that, as the Chairman of the Committee, Deputy Matt Fallaize has said, if Education – and the Education Department Minister may wish to comment on this, sir – give some assurance that there is going to be no further delay beyond what is already in the amended Proposition, then Members may be satisfied that that will not occur. But it is hanging around the word 'may' and neither your nor I with respect, sir, could be exactly 100% sure on that at this time.

The Bailiff: But aren't there two aspects to it? One is whether it causes delay and the other one is whether it will require any additional project funding that would not be incurred in any event. (**The Comptroller:** Absolutely, sir.) And it is not clear to me (**The Comptroller:** No.) on either of those grounds.

The Comptroller: I agree, sir.

The Bailiff: Certainly, I am not able to give a firm ruling, maybe the Minister can assist?

Deputy Sillars: I would not presume to give a firm ruling, sir, but we have been assured all the way through that T&R and Policy Council they want to get this back by March by including Education into it, I really cannot – all I can say is it will be even quicker, because that is the whole of our thrust is to do this quickly. So I do not think this is a realistic worry, but I understand why it was raised.

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, I think in practical terms it is clear that if the final report is in the hands of the Education Department that is actually the quickest way of getting it back to the States. But if the whole thing is going to hinge on that – the words are in the new Proposition 3, 'as expeditiously as possible' – if it helps to replace them with by no later than 31st March 2015, then that can be done. But I really cannot see that is a great issue. But if the States feel that that is an issue, then Deputy Brouard and I will amend it so

that it reads, 'by no later than 31st March 2015'. If Deputy Trott would prefer that and if that would enable him to vote in favour of the amendment, then I would be happy to suggest to the Proposer that is what we do. I see that Deputy Trott is nodding.

3320 So, sir, can I ask you whether you would need it to be done in print, or whether, sir, I could just do it standing here to substitute –

The Bailiff: Generally, it is not a good idea to be amending amendments once the debate on the amendment has opened, but Deputy Langlois.

3325 **Deputy Langlois:** Sir, this may seem a most unhelpful comment, but I think in the light of the conversation which is unfolding could be very helpful. I would not want to speak to this amendment until the Policy Council have had five minutes' adjournment because this is a last minute – this has come to us late, the original Propositions were carefully thought through, it will only take five minutes. But I would be far more comfortable if I could have five minutes with the Policy Council. *(Interjections)*

The Bailiff: Well, a five-minute adjournment, we will then have to take a view as to whether we do continue this evening or whether actually we call it a day and have –

3335 **Deputy Fallaize:** In that time, sir, would you prefer to see the words in the amendment 'by no later than the 31st March', rather than doing it verbally?

The Bailiff: I think, yes, yes. *(Interjection and laughter)*
We will rise, we will come back at quarter to.

*The Assembly adjourned at 5.40 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 5.45 p.m.*

**Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools' site –
Debate concluded –
Propositions as amended carried**

3340 **The Bailiff:** The amendment is being printed as we speak but perhaps Deputy Brouard you could just confirm exactly what wording you are changing and everybody can alter it in manuscript or Deputy Fallaize, whichever one of you is suggesting.

We have not yet printed the amended amendment so could you just tell us all what the revised wording is please, Deputy Fallaize.

3345 *Amendment:*
To replace Proposition 3 as follows:

'3. To direct the Treasury and Resources Department, in consultation with the Education Department, to commission an independent review in order to determine the most appropriate scale, scope and specification for the Project, and to direct the Education Department to lay before the States by no later than 31st March 2015 recommendations to fulfil the decision of the States to approve in principle the Project, having regard to the conclusions of the independent review, and for the avoidance of doubt, the independent review will be appended to the States Report'.

To replace proposition 4 as follows:

'4. To direct the Treasury and Resources and Education Departments, following the independent review in Proposition 3 to undertake a formal value management exercise involving independent and appropriately qualified facilitators and the project team in order to ensure that the Project meets the recommended and approved scale, scope and specification and represents best value to the States.'

To delete Propositions 5 and 6.

Deputy Fallaize: Okay. It says – why am I doing it by the way, sir?
It says: to replace Proposition 3 as follows: **(The Bailiff: Yes.)**

'To direct the Treasury & Resources Department, in consultation with the Education Department, to commission an independent review in order to determine the most appropriate scale, scope and specification for the Project, and to direct the Education Department to lay before the States by no later than 31st March 2015 recommendations to fulfil the decision of the States to approve in principle the Project, having regard to the conclusions of the independent review, and for the avoidance of doubt, the independent review will be appended to the States Report'.

3350 **The Bailiff:** So in other words, compared with what we have got the words ‘as expeditiously as possible’ come out and the words ‘by no later than 31st March 2015’, are substituted in their place. Fine.

Deputy Fallaize: Yes, sir.

3355 **The Bailiff:** Can I just have an indication of how many people wish to speak on this amendment? Right, just one. And how many people will then – sorry two, the Minister. How many people might then wish to speak in general debate, whatever the outcome on this amendment? Perhaps just one.

Right, I will put it to you again then, is it your wish that we continue this evening? Those in favour; those against.

3360 *Members voted Pour.*

The Bailiff: We will continue.

Then Deputy Langlois will speak on the amendment which is being circulated, in its revised form.

3365 **Deputy Langlois:** Thank you, sir, and my apologies to the Assembly and to Members for the brief interlude. Shall we get these circulated?

3370 The situation here was that the model was the model within mind with the previous with our amendment with the Chief Minister’s amendment and mine was that there would be three parties involved in the preparation of the revised report, if it is to be a revised report, after the review. The strength of that model in my mind was partly to do with the involvement of Policy Council both in terms of the Chief Minister, Deputy Chief Minister and in terms of Policy Council staff to facilitate the moving on of the relationships that have emerged.

3375 I am more than happy that the final report should be presented by Education. I understand the logic of this and so on, and I have now had assurances from both Departments that Policy Council will be involved through the process, and that we will not then go away for several week or a short number of months and then come back with the two Departments saying we still cannot agree. So on that undertaking I am very happy to recommend that we accept this.

3380 I would like to place on record, of course, that this supersedes the undertaking given by the Chief Minister and myself relating to the end of February. Therefore this changes, moves that particular goal post.

The Bailiff: Does anyone else wish to speak?

I will call the Minister. Deputy Sillars will speak.

Deputy Sillars: Thank you, sir.

3385 I shall be brief. Just to clarify I have not consulted with my Board, and assume they would have spoken if they were against this.

I fully agree with Deputy Perrot, and yes it does make it equitable and I shall be agreeing with this amendment.

3390 Deputy Trott, I shall try and ensure that we come back... well, we are going to come back by 31st March. The way I look at life is if I take part, if I am excluded or consult, we have had consultation before and there is always different levels of consultation. For example, in the amendment I was not consulted, but Policy Council was. But in this if you are not at the table, you are never going to get anywhere are you?

3395 So this is absolutely great, we can get back to the table and it is up to us to ensure that we really try and force this through by March. Because the worst case is we are going to have exactly the same debate again in February.

Deputy Gollop, yes we will work with T&R put our differences behind us and move forward for the sake of all the La Mare children and students. Somehow – I know I have said it – we have got to try and get this on the track. I do not know how on earth we are going to do it, but we have got to try.

Deputy Fallaize, yes, I agree.

3400 Thank you, Deputy Langlois, so let’s support this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard will reply to the debate on the amendment.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

3405 Can I firstly say, I think Deputy Perrot set the tone at the very beginning and I thank him for that pragmatic approach, Deputy Trott for his further honing of it and Deputy Langlois for his practicality of letting the two Departments work it out together.

And thank you Deputy Sillars for agreeing to it.

Please all support the amendment.

3410 And thank you to Deputy Fallaize for seconding it, although I sometimes think it was the other way round. (*Laughter*)

The Bailiff: Members we go to the vote on the amendment proposed by Deputy Brouard, seconded by Deputy Fallaize, which has in it Proposition 3, the words ‘by no later than 31st March 2015’. Those in
3415 favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.
3420 Any further general debate? Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Sir, I will be very brief.

It really focuses around the opportunity that this debate now presents the Education Department, in helping to ensure that we design the most appropriate building with regards scale and scope.

3425 And in making those comments I refer to comments yesterday from my good friend, Deputy Sherbourne, and I will remind the Assembly of what he said. He said the 11-plus is not an issue for today, but it will be very soon. Well, it seems to me, sir, that if the 11-plus is going to be debated either as a result of a Proposition by the Education Department, or a requête, during the remainder of this Assembly it makes complete sense for that debate to take place before the specifications for the design of the new school are
3430 completed, because there are quite obviously repercussions one way or the other.

So I would ask the Education Department, and indeed those who may be considering signing such a requête, to bear that in mind.

It is in my view very difficult if not impossible to be sure as to the size and scope that is necessary until the States has made its decision on that important issue.

3435 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Any further general debate? No. Deputy Sillars then will reply to the debate.

Deputy Sillars: Sir, I have written a long conclusion, but I do not think anyone is going to hear it, so if
3440 they wish me to not reply to each individual statement, I am happy not to do that.

What I do want to say though from the bottom of my heart. I would like to thank all the Deputies who voted for our policy letter.

I would also like to apologise to all the students, parents and teachers, that I have let down. I am very sorry.

3445 I do not know if I can say any more, I am not up to it.
Thank you. (*Applause*)

The Bailiff: Well, Members, we vote then on the amended, amended Propositions. Perhaps we will take them one by one, just so everybody is absolutely clear what they are voting on.

3450 First Proposition is to approve in principle the La Mare de Carteret Schools re-development Project. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

3455 **The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.

Secondly to direct the Treasury & Resources Department to provide further interim Project funding up to the full business case stage in order for this specialist Project Team to be retained. Those in favour; those against.

3460 *Members voted Pour.*

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.

Then Proposition 3 is the new Proposition 3 that has been inserted following the successful Deputy Brouard/Deputy Fallaize amendment. Those in favour; those against.

3465 *Members voted Pour.*

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.

3470 And Proposition 4 is the amended Proposition 4 from that same successful amendment. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare it carried.

And there is no longer Proposition 5 or 6, so that concludes those Propositions and that debate.

3475 There just remains one other matter, which I would expect we could probably deal with fairly quickly so can you call the next, the last matter please, Greffier.

HOME DEPARTMENT

XVI. Preparation of a New Electoral Roll – Propositions carried

Article XVI.

The States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the Report dated 18th August, 2014, of the Home Department, they are of the opinion:-

1. To approve the establishment of a new Electoral Roll for the 2016 General Election of People's Deputies.

2. To direct the drafting of legislation that shall provide for the validity of the current Electoral Roll to cease at 23:59 hours on 29th February 2016 and for the closure of the new Electoral Roll between that date and the date of the Election.

3. To approve an increase of £154,000 in the 2015 revenue expenditure of the Home Department to fund the costs of compiling the new Electoral Roll and managing the election process, funded by a transfer from the Budget Reserve.

4. To direct the Treasury and Resources Department to take account of the costs of compiling the new Electoral Roll and managing the election process when recommending the 2016 Cash Limit for the Home Department.

Deputy Greffier: Billet XXIV – Article XXVI – Home Department – Preparation of a New Electoral Roll.

3480 **The Bailiff:** The Minister, Deputy Gillson, will open the debate.

Deputy Gillson: Thank you, sir.

I will be brief. The next election is 17 months away, we need an Electoral Roll. We have two options, start a brand new one, or roll over the current one from 2012, and we are recommending starting a brand
3485 new Roll.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Is there any debate? Yes. Deputy Gollop and then Deputy Domaille.

3490 **Deputy Gollop:** I thoroughly endorse the idea of a new Roll. It is much better than a kick-started old Roll. I do have three observations to make though.

Firstly, well I would like to see SACC and the Home Department put a lot of effort into ensuring people get on to the Roll, and I think our registration of voters is still very small in comparison to other areas.

We will at some point have to consider automatic enrolment by the States, and maybe even compulsory
3495 enrolment.

And I do not know why we do not have better provision of automatic enrolment in Guernsey in contrast to other jurisdictions.

The Bailiff: Thank you.
3500 Deputy Domaille.

Deputy Domaille: Thank you, sir.

I will be very brief. It was at St Peter Port Douzaine earlier this week. Douzenier Danielle Sebire actually, queried why there was no reference in the report to the Douzaines, and particularly the annual use
3505 of the Electoral Roll for the Douzaines' elections. And she actually raised two constructive points which I would just like to very briefly raise now.

I ask if the Minister will consider leaving the website facility allowing people to register on-line open between Deputies Elections. This could make it easier for new voters to sign in and take part in Douzaine Elections.

3510 And I also ask if the Minister will consider taking email addresses of those registering on-line. This would allow the Department to email the voters when the next Electoral Roll is being prepared asking the voters if they wish to remain on the Register and if there are any alterations they wish to make. It is purely to make it easier for the voters to register.

Thank you, sir.

3515

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Thank you.

3520 I support having a new Electoral Roll after what happened in 2008. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) But my concern is that this is going to cost, with the staff, £198,000.

3525 We are setting up an electronic census and I just urge that we, like most other countries in the world, do not throw away our census, our Electoral Roll each time, and we find some way of avoiding the problems we had in 2008 but also mean that people do not have to re-register all the time. So I do not – I think the catch to that is that we do lose some people who forget to register and we really should be in 2014 having a method where we do not have to have people re-registering each time (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

It is not a good use of resources. It does not give people confidence in e-Government.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Any further debate? No. Deputy Gillson will reply.

3530

Deputy Gillson: Okay. Very quickly.

Deputy Gollop, yes, we will make every effort – page 2700 details everything that was done last year and we are going to do the same thing as last time. Same thing and more.

3535 Automatic enrolling, this applies to Deputy Dorey as well, yes, hopefully in future part of the Electronic Census Project would be to be able to keep a rolling Electronic Roll.

Deputy Domaille, the idea of e-mail reminders, I think is a good idea, something which I will take forwards.

3540 The Electoral Roll currently can be updated between elections for Douzaine representatives. It is closed at a certain date before an election and after it is reopened so that anyone moving in to a Parish can take part in the following election of Parishioners.

I think that is everything.

The Bailiff: Well, Members, there are four Propositions, they are on page 2704, which is the very last page of the Billet. I put all four Propositions to you together. Those in favour; those against.

3545

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I declare them carried, and that concludes the business for this meeting.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.59 p.m.